



The Beacon

A Publication of The Pennsylvania
 School Study Council

Spring 2008

VOLUME 4, NUMBER 3

Fundamental Purposes of Education and Differentiating between Public and Private Schooling

Daniel R. Schochor
 The Pennsylvania State University

The Fundamental Purposes of Education

The core values and purposes of education are very difficult to pin down and define in unambiguous terms (Hodgkinson, 1991). To most people, when they think about education, they think about what goes on within school walls, and maybe the walls of universities and colleges, but according to Hodgkinson, this is only part of what education as a whole truly is. Education as a whole includes much more than simply school-related education; however for purposes of this particular paper, the term education will be limited to its meaning as it relates to primary and secondary education. Hodgkinson proposes that the purposes of education can be broken down into three main components; these components being aesthetic, economic, and ideological.

The aesthetic component to education can be traced back to the times of the Ancient Greeks. The purposes behind education in their times were, “truth, beauty, goodness, justice, happiness, self-fulfillment...” (Hodgkinson, 1991, p. 17). It was believed by the Ancient Greeks that a person who was learning for these aforementioned reasons could become intellectually liberated. It could be said that this form of education was not interested in producing any sort of truly tangible results, but rather concentrated on the development of a student’s psyche and feelings of self-worth, while also making sure that any student who completed their academic studies would grow up and become a productive member of their burgeoning democratic society. Hodgkinson goes on to state that the aesthetic purposes of education are still very much in existence, but that they are no longer pure. Wherever aesthetic purposes seem to reside, they are undoubtedly intertwined with either ideological or economic purposes.

The economic purposes of education were said to have originated in the Ancient Roman Empire, and were created for the simple purpose of transforming education into an avenue leading towards greater societal efficiency (Hodgkinson, 1991). A simple example of economic purposes in education can be found at any local vocational school or vocational program within a larger school. Hodgkinson goes on to make clear the interconnect- edness between the aesthetic purposes of education and the economic purposes by bringing up the medical profession and stating that the monetary remuneration received by a doctor may lead to that individual enjoying

Editor:

Carly Ackley
The Pennsylvania State University

Editorial Board:

Bernard J. Badiali
The Pennsylvania State University

Dennis Baughman
Northeastern School District

Marilyn Begley
The Pennsylvania State University

Paul T. Begley
The Pennsylvania State University

William L. Boyd
The Pennsylvania State University

Susan C. Faircloth
The Pennsylvania State University

Debra M. Freedman
The Pennsylvania State University

Preston C. Green
The Pennsylvania State University

William T. Hartman
The Pennsylvania State University

Salvatore F. Luzio Sr.
Riverside School District

J. Daniel Marshall
The Pennsylvania State University

James F. Nolan
The Pennsylvania State University

Jillian Reese
The Pennsylvania State University

Kai A. Schafft
The Pennsylvania State University

Roger C. Shouse
The Pennsylvania State University

Jacqueline A. Stefkovich
The Pennsylvania State University

Iris M. Striedieck
The Pennsylvania State University

John W. Tippeconnic
The Pennsylvania State University

Angela Tzilkowski
The Pennsylvania State University

different aspects of life more closely related to the aesthetic, and that without the economic advantage to this profession, that individual may not have the opportunity to delve into more aesthetic hobbies.

Finally, Hodgkinson describes the ideological purpose of education as, “The impulse to perpetuate and advance a nationalistic spirit, to inculcate rising generations with a nationalist (or euphemistically *patriotic*) ethos is universal” (Hodgkinson, 1991, p. 25). The ideological purposes of education include any sort of citizenship training, and even more intangible, any kind of moral, or character education can be categorized as ideological in nature. This purpose of education spans countless countries, for Catholic schools exist well beyond just Vatican City, and yet they all have the purpose of indoctrinating the student with Catholic ideals such that when these students grow up, they remain loyal to the church. Strike (2003) adds to this scholastic dialogue by proposing that schools can be analogous, or even take the form of independent communities, and in doing so they can have incredibly strong ideological overtones that can both improve the school environment, or become a detriment to the school in question depending on the specific situation and the goal of said school.

These three categories do a fine job of distilling the incredibly wide spectrum of educational purposes. The trick beyond identifying all of the possible purposes of education is figuring out which of these purposes drives the school or schools in question, and which of the educational purposes are simply being used as window dressing. Can all three purposes be found in the mission of a specific school? Of course, however I would contend that simply being mentioned in a school mission does not offer legitimacy to an educational purpose, rather it is in the action a school takes that one can truly analyze in order to determine what a school values, and what a school believes is of less importance. Finally, as Florence Kluckhohn pointed out all the way back in 1961, one of the most important facets of all cultures is how they perceive value and purpose; that is to say what is worth doing and why (Kluckhohn, 1961).

How it is that Educational Purposes Change

As Begley (2007) points out in “The Nature and Specialized Purposes of Educational Leadership,” the relative strength of the purposes of education that drive school curriculum generally depends on two major factors; time and location (as location relates to culture). These two factors not only can affect district-wide curriculum policy, but they can also have a great impact on single classrooms and the school environment as a whole.

One has to look no further than No Child Left Behind to see what a legislative mandate can do to schools across the country. A school leader existing during this particular educational era has no choice but to focus on student achievement in the areas of reading and math. Marcia Gentry, a school administrator had this to say in reaction to the re-authorization of ESEA, better known as No Child Left Behind,

Instead, states are being forced to create high-stakes tests to which educators must teach and on which groups of students must show "Adequate Yearly Progress" or face the demoralization of being labeled a failing school, and all the sanctions that accompany such a designation. And none of this has much to do with how much actual learning, quality instruction, and individual student progress occurs in the schools (Gentry, 2006, p. 24).

Clearly this legislation has impacted not just school leaders, but the entire educational community, and has school leaders scrambling in a desperate attempt to keep their schools from suffering the most unfortunate fate of having federal funding revoked or being labeled a “failing school.”

Begley (2007) points out that he believes No Child Left Behind to be a precise example of something he calls, “a transactional relationship between learner and educator” (p. 6). This kind of transactional relationship is the epitome of what Hodgkinson has labeled an economic purpose of education. The learner needs to know specific information, not to become a better or more responsible citizen of a community (ideological purpose) or to improve their own lives by becoming in any way fulfilled (aesthetic purpose), but instead students need to memorize the information fed to them by their teachers in order to pass a test so that they may, in turn, go to college or aspire beyond high school, and so that the test score may reflect positively upon the teacher responsible for teaching their students whatever subject is being tested.

In the previous section of this paper it was suggested that many times schools will operate with one educational purpose in mind, however that purpose will naturally intertwine itself with other educational purposes and thus students will not simply be experiencing one isolated educational purpose during their time in school. However, according to Begley (2007) it is exactly this kind of high stakes testing that is driving all other purposes of education so far towards the margin that they are hardly recognizable as being a part of the current educational landscape.

It should be noted, however, that the No Child Left Behind bill was not the first time that the government felt the need to impose itself upon education. All the way back in 1958 the Soviet Union launched Sputnik, the first machine successfully launched into outer space. President Dwight D. Eisenhower immediately decided that the United States needed to challenge the Soviets, and be the first nation to put a man on the moon. The best way that he and his cabinet felt that goal could be accomplished was by creating a tight connection between the federal government and public education, and at this particular time that meant inundating subjects relating to the sciences with various resources hoping that they might produce a generation of science and math students capable of sending an American into space (Mungazi, 2003). Citing just this single example demonstrates the effect that timing has on educational purposes. Comparing where we are now in America and where we were less than fifty years ago, one can see that the educational purposes have really shifted not only in what is being taught, but exactly how it is that the taught curriculum is being measured.

In addition to time being a factor, cultural differences simply grounded in different geographic locations can certainly affect

the purpose of one's education. Now living in Pennsylvania, I drive past towns that remain populated by the Amish whenever I go home to Baltimore, and many times the thought has crossed my mind about how much they miss out on in terms of global education on a daily basis due to their strict lack of technological devices and lack of communication with the "outside world." In this case, their education is based on incredibly strong ideological purposes (such strong ideological purposes that they are the only group of Americans that have passed the Supreme Court's test allowing them to never step foot inside of an accredited public school), but has a strong economic purpose to it as well (their classrooms are the farms they must till and the structures they must build to sustain themselves). Moving geographically into a city (Baltimore, Philadelphia, etc.) one will find a multitude of vocational schools which have nothing to do with ideology and everything to do with economic purposes of education and perhaps related to that economic end, an aesthetic component based on the idea that once a student has graduated with certain technical skills that will allow them to sustain themselves financially, they can begin to perhaps delve deeper into their psyches and fulfill deeper desires because of their financial security.

The mission statement from Monmouth County Vocational School District states, "The Monmouth County Vocational School District prepares students for an evolving workplace and further education through specialized academic, career, and technical programs and lifelong learning opportunities." (MCVSD, 2007). The juxtaposition between an Amish way of life, their educational experience, and the educational experience of a student within the MCVSD is one of countless examples of how simple geography can alter the dominant educational purposes that dictate the practices of school leaders.

Finally, in private schools, educational purposes can change with a simple change at the top of the hierarchy. A prominent all-male independent school was perceived to be having a difficult time in terms of discipline with their students. Members of the Board of Trustees felt that current students were not living up to the high behavioral expectations of the school, and therefore they were hoping that a change at the top would create the kind of disciplined environment they had encountered in their time at the school. Johnson et. al. (1961) outlined a headmaster's responsibilities:

- Select the methods for carrying out the policies of the board.
- Handle the day-to-day operation of the school.
- Hire and fire teachers.
- Enroll and dismiss students (Johnson, et. al., 1961, p. 34).

It is imperative to understand that these listed powers are not powers that the board has any say in whatsoever. How a school is run and the personnel with which it is run is up to the full discretion of the headmaster, so it should not be very difficult to understand exactly how it is a headmaster could change the purposes of education from the top down in an independent school setting. In his or her personnel management, in their decisions on varied issues concerning student discipline and student enrollment in the school, headmasters have a vast amount of control when it comes to deciding what the purpose of education is when a student walks through their school's doors, and how it is that these purposes will be transmitted to them.

The Purposes of Education and Their Impact on School Leaders and Environments

To be a great leader, one must absolutely know his or her constituency, and in the case of education, that constituency is synonymous with the student body, parents, and surrounding community. In addition, a great school leader must also be able to identify what it is that makes their community unique and how this community has perceived, currently perceives, and will perceive the educational purpose of their school. Understanding all of these things will allow the school leader not only to deal with outside entities effectively, but it will also allow them to ponder how it is, "these transcending meta-values...can be applied in specific contexts..." (Begley, 2007, p. 8).

Therefore, school leaders must be aware of their school's particular mission, and what educational purpose it serves first and foremost, and why it serves this particular mission in order to be as effective as possible. Along with the school's educational purpose, a school leader must be very responsive when it comes to dealing with the surrounding community. A successful school leader will be responsive to the communities they work in, while not necessarily allowing the strongest voices within the community to simply impose their various wills upon the school (Begley, 2007).

As was brought up with No Child Left Behind, there are times when it seems one educational purpose is being tended to at the absolute expense of the other educational purposes, which is the polar opposite from what Begley considers ideal. (2007) In times like these, school leaders need to depend on themselves and use themselves almost like educational compasses so as not to get lost during turbulent times. Begley (2007) suggests that school leaders put, "their professional goals and purposes at the forefront of their administrative practices" (p. 7).

In addition to school leaders utilizing their own experiences and knowledge as a way to deal with issues that arise within school communities, Begley suggests that school leaders can use the purposes of education to guide them through educational dilemmas, which Begley defines as problem that allows, "a choice between equally unsatisfactory alternatives" (Begley, 2007, p. 10). These purposes of education can be used almost like unwritten policies in that a school leaders' knowledge of them can allow them to make decisions by looking at potential consequences through a single lens. The lens in this case is the dominant educational purpose of the school in question.

Finally, Begley suggests that educational purposes can be used as a way to galvanize whole districts or school buildings towards specific ends. For example, a school principal could see that they have an incredibly diverse, and thus a very cliquy student body. In order to counteract this somewhat detrimental societal phenomenon, the school building could look to ideological purposes

of education for a way to address this problem. Because the ideological purposes of education stress ideas such as community and other shared ideals that can come in the form of nationalistic or patriotic tendencies, it would be a great way to organize a campaign against the damaging clique forming that might be taking place in a school building or district.

Private vs. Public Schools: What's the Difference?

To begin this section, I feel as though it is necessary to define what exactly is meant by "private" or "independent" schooling. A definition given by Johnson, Gummere, Parkhill, Parkman, and Springer is that, "an independent school is typically a non-profit institution, independent of political control and support, owned and operated by trustees serving without pay in the public interest." (Johnson, et.al., 1961, p. 1) This statement does a fine job of articulating and highlighting some of the more important and pertinent differences between public and private schools. An interesting take on the responsibilities of public school leaders is offered by Bass (2000) when he states that,

Increasingly, the leaders of learning organizations will set goals either through participation or direction of their various constituencies. In the case of [public] school systems, as learning organizations, they will strive to align the educational interests of relevant governmental agencies, school boards, superintendents, principals, teachers, students, parents and the community. (p. 18)

Clearly public school leaders simply have a much wider spectrum of constituencies to accommodate, whereas private school leaders must first accommodate the board of trustees, and second, they must accommodate the parents of current students. Beyond those two major demographics, outside of school walls, private school headmasters need not concern themselves with any other specific constituents or single personalities.

Because analogies can be effective ways of expressing similarities between two outwardly unrelated situations, I would like to draw a comparison between public and private schooling. The Army is a publicly funded institution that, like most other government funded institutions must follow a codified set of rules and regulations if they want to continue to receive government funding. Blackwater, on the other hand, is a privately owned and operated business that performs many of the same functions that the Army does, but because it is privately funded the rules and regulations set forth by the government which the Army must follow have little meaning to them (Blackwater, 2007). Therefore, one can begin to see the differences between the two institutions, and although loyalty to the mission would still be viable in the Blackwater setting, the way in which one goes about completing the given mission, and how that mission is originally decided upon consists of wholly different processes than what occurs within the United States Army.

Basically, though the general task of public and private education is the same, their specific missions are not. In addition to the specific missions being different, the way that independent schools go about completing their missions can also be very different from the way public schools accomplish their goals. It can also be assumed that the way in which independent schools accomplish their goals is fairly, if not wholly, unregulated by state bodies. It simply becomes a question as to where their operating monies are coming from in determining how it is an independent school decides to operate.

Public schools receive their money at the behest of local entities, state governments, and to a small degree, the federal government, while private schools get the vast majority of their money from their students' parents, and from past alumni. Though I would never suggest that private schools are as destructive to the overall mission (which, in the case of schooling is to educate the youth of America) as Blackwater seems to be in Iraq, the similarities between the two seem to legitimize the analogy.

In order to decipher the differences between driven leadership practices in private and public schools, it is paramount that the pervading educational purposes which set these two types of institutions apart are identified. First of all, it is vital to understand that there is an incredibly vast array of private schools that exist in the country. They range from preparatory schools, to schools whose focus is located primarily in alternative education, but for the purposes of discussion both in this paper, I will be focusing mainly on private, preparatory, secular schools. Madsen (1996), an author who focuses on independent schooling states that,

Because the board members, parents, and principals share power, all constituencies feel a sense of ownership which leads to accountability of student outcomes. School participants work toward the same mission and goals because they have a vested interest in maintaining the school community. A sense of belonging, continuity of traditions and an inner connectedness provides meaning to the participants. Creating school ownership is dependent on the leadership and management of the private school principal. (p. 1)

Though the above statement might seem like a conglomeration of buzzwords, it paints an accurate picture of private school administration. It is no coincidence that words like continuity, tradition, and community find their way into the same paragraph when referencing private school leadership. Looking more deeply at this statement, it would be logical to say that the private school experience includes a heavy dose of ideological overtones. I would even say, referring to both my experience and the literature, that in order for many of the academic goals that secular preparatory schools espoused to be achieved in reality, the schools must possess a incredibly strong ideological foundations.

These foundations will lead to positive reputations within the community, which will lead to more qualified teachers and administrators applying for teaching and administrative vacancies. The Gilman School, one of Baltimore's oldest and most respected preparatory schools has all members of the Gilman community (faculty, staff, administration, and students) abide by the motto, "Be Gilman." Though it seems a bit odd in that one cannot be a school, the point is that all members of the Gilman commu-

nity, when they leave Gilman's school grounds, reflect upon Gilman in one way or another, and that "being Gilman" means that you act in a way that will enhance and solidify the reputation of The Gilman School beyond its walls once one has left the campus.

The term "academic goals" is used, pervasively throughout independent school literature, and for the purposes of this paper (and the vast majority of independent preparatory schools) this term equates to the question, "where do the high school graduates get accepted to college?" Though these same private schools might bombard an administrative or faculty interviewee with ideas about classical curriculums and standardized test scores, the bottom line for all of these schools is that their local (and in a few cases national) reputation as a school remains strong by providing results which point to their ability to get students into the "top tier" of colleges and universities. Gilman School's mission statement reads, "The program is college preparatory, designed to help boys gain admission to and then flourish at selective colleges and universities..." (The Gilman School, 2007) The question then becomes, what effect does knowing the educational goal of a preparatory school have on that school's leadership?

Having worked in, and attended these schools for my entire life; the private school in question must satisfy its tuition-paying constituency. In that regard, the educational purpose that must drive its leadership would be economic in nature, leading to a bit of a transactional relationship between parent and administrator. This transaction, when fleshed out involves the parent giving the school money, the school then giving the student the best opportunity possible to go to the college or university of their choice. There simultaneously exists a similar transactional relationship between teacher and student; the teacher tells their students what they need to know to do well on the tests that these "top tier" colleges and universities look at, the students perform well on these tests, and the teachers' reputation is consequently enhanced. However transactional these private schools seem on the surface, there is much more to them than simply the exchange of money for favorable college acceptances. As noted before, these independent schools must lay a very solid foundation based upon ideological and at times, aesthetic purposes of education such that students, faculty members, parents and administrators alike feel the internal need to do right by the school for reasons that span beyond simple transactions.

Purpose driven leadership practices

At this juncture, it is important to recognize that school leadership practices can be broken down in many ways, and some of the most generally accepted forms of school leadership include: managerial leadership, instructional leadership, transformational leadership, participative leadership, moral leadership, and contingent leadership.

Instructional leadership focuses on the actual teaching and learning that is going on within school walls, and calls for the principal or headmaster to play a key role in such activities. In addition, the term instructional leadership extends to intangible things like school culture which has a definite effect (albeit indirectly) on student learning and teacher efficacy (Leithwood & Duke, 1998). As Leithwood points out in an earlier publication, "This term [instructional leadership] symbolizes the importance, to school leadership, of an emphasis on student growth, and on much of the direct service provided by schools in fostering student growth." (Leithwood, et. al. 1994, p. 9) Instructional leadership is a student centered way of viewing school leadership and clearly focuses on a school leader's ability to make the instructional experience for student within his or her school as positive and effective as possible.

Managerial leadership is more about focusing the work of a principal or headmaster on "functions, tasks, or behaviors" (Leithwood & Duke, 1998, p. 40) thereby allowing subordinates to complete their tasks with less trouble and effort. This view on leadership is all about completing tangible duties, and leaves out much of what Leithwood considers visionary in nature. Finally, managerial leadership includes what might be considered in other scholarly circles, "organizational leadership" and "transactional leadership." (Leithwood & Duke, 1998)

Transformational leadership is much more reactionary than instructional and managerial leadership in that its focus is on change in that transformational leaders not only react positively to change, but they also, at times, will induce change. Wilpert, a scholar on the subject of transformational leadership points out an interesting idea concerning transformational leaders,

Transformational leaders are those who respond positively to change and who actively induce change. The theory extends traditional transactional approaches to leadership as an exchange between leader and follower by adding the dimensions of charisma, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration... (Wilpert, 1995, p. 1)

Transformational leadership even delves into the importance of having a vision for whatever organization one might be the head of, and trying to instill the change necessary to make that vision become a reality. A transformational leader inspires those around him or her, to the point where subordinates truly buy into the leader's ideas and concepts about where the organization can go, and begin to give more of themselves to the organization. Through this process their (the employees) own self-worth and self-esteem exceed their previous levels thus benefiting not only the employee, but the organization as a whole (Shamir, House & Arthur, 1995).

In private schooling a transformational leader is necessary so that the relationships among parents, teachers, and administrators do not begin and end in transactional manners. More is needed from preparatory school leaders than simply placing their students in well respected colleges and universities. Though transactions are an enormous part of independent schooling, there is more to them than simply trading money for a chance at admission to a very selective college or university. Parents send their students to these schools so their children may experience not only the academic virtues espoused by the school, but so the student may also be molded developmentally by the strong communities created at most independent schools.

Participative leadership contends that school leaders should not engage in unilateral decision making processes, but rather they should invite different members of the faculty, staff, and administration to help make decisions that will affect the whole school or organization (Leithwood & Dukes, 1998). In addition to encouraging member participation and a wide variety of ideas from

many different backgrounds, a leader must be cognizant of possible groupthink mentalities that have the potential to hijack participative group decision making (Chen, et. al., 1996).

Leithwood and Dukes (1998), next propose the idea of moral leadership, or simply leadership that is primarily focused upon the morals and ethics of the individual school leader. Sergiovanni goes as far as to state that anytime there exists a discrepancy in power between two individuals, the relationship between them becomes a moral one, because the empowered entity has the power and the means to take advantage of the follower. In Sergiovanni's mind, "Leadership combines management know-how with values and ethics." (Sergiovanni, 2001, p. 14)

Finally, the contingent form of leadership is brought to light by Leithwood and Dukes (1998) when they state that, "This approach assumes that what is important is how leaders respond to the unique organizational circumstances or problems which they face as a consequence of, for example, the nature and preferences of coworkers, conditions of work, and tasks to be undertaken" (Leithwood & Dukes, 1998, p. 42). This form of school leadership implies that the single most important aspect of leadership is context, and that depending on the context a school leader is given, they should act appropriately which can mean different things when immersed in different specific situations.

Obviously all of these leadership practices have their places in the overall definition or makeup of an effective school leader; however some of these leadership techniques become dominant in different areas and particular situations. For example, in public schools it has come to my attention (through classes I have taken here at Penn State, interactions with public school administrators, and an internship I am currently completing) that the principal is responsible for an incredible amount of bureaucratic information that takes many different forms.

There is paper work that must be filed for disciplinary reasons, budgetary reasons, personnel reasons, and counseling reasons just to name a few. Therefore, to excel as a public school principal, one must be at least somewhat proficient as a managerial leader. Of course this by no means relegates public school heads solely to managerial matters, however they must pay these policies their proper amount of attention, or else they will find themselves out of favor with the local school board, or worse, in trouble with the law.

In private schools much less paper work exists in general, and the same can be said for the school leader. In addition, all budgetary matters, no matter what they have to do with, get sent to the school's finance director, not to the headmaster. In addition, disciplinary referrals or demerits are taken care of and written up by the Dean of Students. Only when there is a case in which expulsion is being weighed as an option does a headmaster step in at any point during the disciplinary process.

Speaking in terms of participative leadership, private schools may have an advantage of their public school brethren. In the contracts handed out and signed for private school faculty positions, the final clause generally reads, "and additional responsibilities as assigned." This is basically a catch all phrase used in case there is an emergency and a teacher needs to be present or designated to perform an activity they had not agreed upon before the time in which they signed their contract. With this clause, it may be easier to coax teachers into participating on different committees and in different groups, and although it would be preferable to have all teachers serving on school committees to be present on their own volition, in reality, that is rarely the case regardless of what a contract explicitly states.

I have come to understand that anything done by teachers and not specified within their contracts would earn these teachers extra pay in the public school arena. Coaching and monitoring gym classes are included in private school contracts, whereas in public school, all of these responsibilities mean extra pay for the teachers involved. These issues of pay do not exist at private schools because of the other duties as assigned clause.

Finally, it became apparent that because of time constraints, principals in large schools might only able to evaluate 10-12 teachers per year. Though I would certainly never say that a public school principal was in any way, shape, or form disconnected from the classroom, the time he or she is able to devote directly to classroom related activities seems to be dwindling by the year. In private schooling, teacher evaluations, in the form that they take and the frequency with which they are done are all decisions made by the headmaster. Therefore, the headmaster must be a very effective instructional leader, and understand what would be best in terms of teacher supervision, evaluation, and professional development options.

Purpose Driven Leadership and Private Schools

As I stated earlier, the educational purposes served at the preparatory schools I am focusing on are dominated by ideological tones, followed closely by the economic (transactional) function, and quite honestly, and most likely to Hodgkinson's chagrin, the aesthetic purpose of education has nearly been completely lost (though rhetoric of aesthetic purposes abound within school mission statements). This ideological dominance could be attributed to what Strike refers to as the "thickness" of private school values, meaning that they are, as Strike puts it, "robust and life encompassing" (Strike, 2003, p. 69). The problem is, however, that as these values become thicker, they exclude more people from being a part of the community to which these schools belong.

This unique ideological issue could end up being a problem for private school heads because they would be seen as isolating their schools from their community at-large. A community service director has been hired at the Gilman School to directly combat this threat. Gilman does not want to be seen as an elitist or isolationist institution, so this gentleman's job consists of determining ways in which Gilman can reach out to its surrounding community and share its resources in an attempt to expose the less financially fortunate members of the community to opportunities they may not encounter otherwise. This whole situation, however, would never be a problem at a public school because public schools draw on the students that geographically surround the school, thereby eliminating any risk that they might be seen as isolationist in nature.

On the positive side of the thick, thin argument; independent school communities themselves tend to run incredibly smoothly because of their thick value system. This thick value system can be seen in all parts of the independent school, even as far

as the admissions office where decisions are made every semester concerning which applicants will fit into the school community the most effectively, and which applicants may not fit in well at all. Those that appear to be misfits simply will not be admitted, whereas those that seem to compliment the school value system well will be admitted.

School community members understand each other and respect each other because of their existence within the community and there is simply not much friction among students and teachers. Simply speaking in a physical sense, "Violence is not a word commonly associated with elite private schools. Indeed, implicit in the physical and philosophical affect of independent schools today is the virtual absence of physical violence" (Nash, 1999, p. 227). This understanding and feeling of community stretches beyond a simply physical nature. This lengthy statement taken out of the Gilman mission statement plainly states that the school is a community in and of itself with values, expectations, and goals all its own.

Above all else, Gilman School helps boys evolve to become men of character. The qualities of integrity, honor, leadership, humility, and service to others cannot be fostered separately by specific programs, but instead must be woven into all aspects of the school community. To that end, Gilman School emphasizes a strong and comprehensive honor system, a community service program, an assembly program that promotes respect for the dignity and rights of each individual, and significant leadership opportunities. (Gilman Mission Statement, 2007)

Gilman, however, is not the only place that offers this feeling of a tight knit community with thick values. This is a shining example of some of the thick values that pervade independent school walls, and make them places that may, from the outside, seem relatively exclusionary. However, it is these same thick values that allow Gilman to run so smoothly administratively, and in student-centered matters.

Related Problems Faced by Independent School Leaders

A problem faced by independent school leaders is the constant necessity for fundraising. Not only do these educational professionals need to be adept at running their schools, they must also be adept at raising the amount of money necessary to take on difficult and resource devouring tasks such as vast building projects. In the book, "New Strategies for Educational Fundraising," Michael Worth states that, "The president's role in fund raising is an integral part of his or her larger educational and support activities." (Worth, 2002, p. 65) Though Worth uses the term president, headmasters face the same exact issues because they, unlike public school leaders, have no steady form of school income and funding other than student tuition.

Conclusion

The fundamental purposes of education are applicable to all forms of education at all levels, and are therefore absolutely of paramount importance to truly understand. Without the actual understanding of these purposes of education, it would be very difficult to understand how exactly it is that they affect education at the building, district, state, and national level, and perhaps more importantly it would be exceedingly difficult to utilize these purposes as a way of directing school practices, or even evaluating where a certain school stands with regards to its public mission statement.

As Begley (2007) points out numerous times, these educational purposes can help to inform the practices of school leaders in their daily work, especially if it means allowing a school leader to truly understand what "effective learning" truly means in his or her specific school environment. As was stated earlier, a vocational school and an independent preparatory school will consider "effective learning" two very different things, and neither of them will be anymore correct or wrong than the other, but without the knowledge of educational purposes in general that nuance could be lost on a school leader.

Finally, private schools are very different than public schools; however they can also be very different from one another. One of the many goals of this paper was to quickly outline different researched forms of school leadership and place those different forms of leadership into a simulated private school environment to analyze the pros and cons of each. From that brief discussion many different conclusions were drawn as to what forms of leadership might work best in private schools and why, and what forms of school leadership might be less necessary in order to be a successful independent school head.

References

- Ashburn, F. (1961). Chapter 1 Introduction. In *A Handbook for Independent School Operation*, Johnson, W., Gummere, J. F., Parkman, F., Parkhill, W., & Springer, E. L. (Eds.) (pp. 1-9). Princeton, NJ: D. Van Nostrand.
- Bass, B. M. (2000). The Future of Leadership in Learning Organizations. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 7(3), 18.
- Begley, P. (2007). The Nature and Specialized Purposes of Educational Leadership
- Blackwater, (2007) <http://www.blackwaterusa.com/> Retrieved: 12/5/07
- Chen, Z., Lawson, R. B., Gordon, L. R., & McIntosh, B. (1996). Groupthink: Deciding with the Leader and the Devil. *The Psychological Record*, 46(4), 581+.
- Gentry, M. (2006). No Child Left Behind: Neglecting Excellence. *Roepers Review*, 29(1), p. 24.

- Hodginkson, C. (1991) Education is Special. *Educational Leadership: The Moral Art*. Albany: State University of New York.
- Kluckhohn, F. (1961) "Dominant and Variant Value Orientations:" in Clyde Kluckhohn and Henry Murray, eds., *Personality in Nature, Culture, and Society*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Leithwood, K., Begley, P. T., & Cousins, J. B. (1994). *Developing Expert Leadership for Future Schools*. London: Falmer.
- Leithwood, K., & Duke, D. L. (1998). Mapping the Conceptual Terrain of Leadership: a Critical Point of Brks="Brks Departure for Cross-Cultural Studies. *PJE. Peabody Journal of Education*, 73(2), 31-50.
- Madsen, J. (1996). *Private and Public School Partnerships: Sharing Lessons about Decentralization*. London: Falmer Press.
- Monmouth County Vocational School District. <http://www.mcvsd.org/> Retrieved: 11/27/2007
- Mungazi, D. A. (2003). National Leadership, Education and Understanding among Nations. *International Journal of Humanities and Peace*, 19(1), 13+.
- Nash, P. A. (1999). Chapter 12 Disturbing the Peace: Multicultural Education, Transgressive Teaching, and Independent School Culture. In *Peace building for Adolescents: Strategies for Educators and Community Leaders*, Forcey, L. R. & Harris, I. M. (Eds.) (pp. 226-240). New York: Peter Lang.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (2001). *Leadership: What's in It for Schools?*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Shamir, B., House, R.J. & Arthur, M.B. (1993) The Motivational Effects of Charismatic Leadership: A Self-Concept Theory. *Organization Science*, 4, No. 4.
- Strike, K. (2003). Community, Coherence, and Inclusiveness in *The Ethical Dimensions of School Leadership*. Begley, P. & Johansson, O. (pp.69-87) Netherlands: Springer.
- Strong, D. K. (1961). Chapter 3 Administration. In *A Handbook for Independent School Operation*, Johnson, W., Gummere, J. F., Parkman, F., Parkhill, W., & Springer, E. L. (Eds.) (pp. 32-64). Princeton, NJ: D. Van Nostrand.
- The Gilman School, *Mission Statement* <http://www.gilman.edu/aboutus/schoolmission.asp>. Retrieved: 12/3/2007
- Wilpert, B. (1995). *Organizational Behavior*. pp. 59+.

Editorial Objectives: The Beacon, as a publication of The Pennsylvania School Study Council, seeks to publish with emphasis on practitioner appeal regarding themes related to K-12 teaching, school leadership, and district administration.

Manuscript Requirements: All articles will be reviewed by the editor to determine their suitability for this publication. In addition, at least two additional reviewers will conduct blind reviews of submitted articles. You may submit attached articles electronically to Laura Walstad at ljw15@psu.edu. All electronic submissions must be identified in the subject line of the email as "Beacon Submission Request." Paper submissions will also be considered provided adherence to the following guidelines. Three copies of the manuscript should be submitted. Manuscripts should be double-spaced and leave wide margins. Manuscripts should not identify the author(s) of the work. A separate page should be included which provides the author(s)' details, including contact information (address and e-mail). In addition, an abstract of 100-150 words should be included, as well as up to six keywords, which identify the central subjects, addressed in the manuscript. Diagrams, tables, and figures should be kept at a minimum, appear in black and white, and follow the manuscript in numbered order corresponding to numbered placeholders in the text. References should appear in the following APA format.

The editor reserves the right to make changes to the manuscript to ensure that it conforms to the house style. Generally, manuscripts should be between 2,500 and 5,000 words in length. Prospective author(s) must include a statement which indicates they agree to the submission of the manuscript, and that the manuscript has not been published, and is not under consideration for publication, in part or in substance, elsewhere.

PUBLICATION DETAILS: The Beacon is an independent publication of The Pennsylvania School Study Council (www.ed.psu.edu/pscc), which is dedicated to improving education by providing research information, professional development activities, and technical assistance, enabling members to meet current and future challenges.

EDITORIAL CONTACT INFORMATION: Address all papers, editorial correspondence, and subscription information requests to: Pennsylvania School Study Council, attn: Editor Laura Walstad, 200 Rackley Building, Department of Education Policy Studies, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania, 16802, United States of America. Tel. 814-865-0321 Fax 814-865-1480 E-mail: ljw15@psu.edu

This publication is available in alternative media on request.

The Pennsylvania State University is committed to the policy that all persons shall have equal access to programs, facilities, admission, and employment without regard to personal characteristics not related to ability, performance, or qualifications as determined by University policy or by state or federal authorities. It is the policy of the University to maintain an academic and work environment free of discrimination, including harassment. The Pennsylvania State University prohibits discrimination and harassment against any person because of age, ancestry, color, disability or handicap, national origin, race, religious creed, sex, sexual orientation, or veteran status. Discrimination or harassment against faculty, staff, or students will not be tolerated at The Pennsylvania State University. Direct all inquiries regarding the nondiscrimination policy to the Affirmative Action Director, The Pennsylvania State University, 328 Boucke Building, University Park, PA 16802-5901; Tel 814-865-4700/V, 814-863-1150/TTY. U.Ed. EDU 05-19