



THE JACOB RADER MARCUS CENTER OF THE
AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES
A DIVISION OF HEBREW UNION COLLEGE – JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION

MS-831: Jack, Joseph, and Morton Mandel Foundation Records, 1980-2011.

Series F: CIJE Accrual, 1981-2011, undated.
Subseries 2: Dan Pekarsky, 1981-2011, undated.

Box
80

Folder
13

Strategic Plan. Jewish Educational Leadership (JEWEL) planning.
Meetings, 1997-1998.

For more information on this collection, please see the finding aid on the
[American Jewish Archives](http://AmericanJewishArchives.org) website.

AGENDA

Monday, October 26

- 9:00-12:00 Review of Dan and Ellen's documents (EVERYONE)
12:00-1:00 Lunch
1:00-4:00 Workplan (KAB, GZD, SDF, EG, PCH, BWH)
4:00-6:00 KAB, GZD, EG Meeting

Tuesday, October 27

- 9:00-10:30 TEA Problem Based Learning Module (KAB?, GZD, SDF, EG, EH, LZS)
10:30-11:30 Study Group Plans (EVERYONE--DNP on the phone)
11:30-12:30 Interview Study--Place of Jewish Texts in Leadership Development (KAB, GZD, SDF, EG, PCH, EH)
12:30-1:00 Lunch
1:00-2:30 Next Steps (KAB, GZD, SDF, EG, PCH, EH)

From: "Goldring, Ellen B" <ellen.b.goldring@vanderbilt.edu>
To: Dan Pekarsky <pekarsky@mail.soemadison.wisc.edu>
Date: 10/23/98 3:15PM
Subject: Re: JEWEL

Hi Danny,
I had a chance to do a quick read of your document and as usual I'm very impressed and there is lots to talk about.

One of the things that I think about is the arenas of everyday leadership--where does Jewish fit in? Although you do mention in your document hiring practices, conflict resolution etc, I worry that we end up with the Divine (perhaps your conversations which are Jewish) and the MUNDANE (is there Jewish there?). Because of these types of questions, I had suggested to ELI to do an interview 'study' of Jewish leaders and ask them to reflect on their "Judaism in use" theories and models as they practice leadership. When you directed the Cleveland Fellows, what was Jewish about your leadership?

At any rate, lots to think about.
See you Monday,
Ellen

On Thu, 22 Oct 1998 08:35:41 -0500 Dan Pekarsky
<pekarsky@mail.soemadison.wisc.edu> wrote:

> Hi, Ellen. I gather from a conversation with Gail that you and she are thinking to spend part of Monday discussing the paper I wrote. I'll send it along to them. Any reactions to the paper?

>

> Talk to you soon.

>

> D.

>

Ellen Goldring
Professor, Educational Leadership
Peabody College - Box 514
Vanderbilt University
Nashville, TN 37203
615-322-8000
Email: ellen.goldring@Vanderbilt.Edu

MEMO TO: CIJE Colleagues
FROM: Dan Pekarsky
RE: The Jewishness of Jewish educational leadership
DATE: October, 1998

INTRODUCTORY

Framing this document as a memo rather than as a paper somehow makes it seem less daunting a challenge, but I am hopeful that the ideas to be developed will, if we decide that they are pertinent to the work ahead, form the basis for a more systematic and comprehensive piece. My immediate purpose is to articulate some ideas concerning the fundamental nature of **Jewish** educational leadership -- ideas that go beyond what I take to be "givens" in the context of our work, namely, that a Jewish educational leader is Jewish and that he/she is exercising leadership (at a communal, institutional, or programmatic level) in relation to Jewish education.¹

A Jewish educational leader might be the director of a Jewish educating institution (like a summer camp, an Israel program, a congregational educational program, a college of Jewish studies, and new kinds of educating institutions/programs); he or she might be the leader of an institution or program dedicated to the cultivation of Jewish educators (including the leaders of such institutions) in pre- or ins-service phases; he or she might also serve as an educational leader operating in a denominational or local, communal organization dedicated to developing and enhancing Jewish education in its particular domain.

In addition to distinguishing Jewish educational leaders based 1) on the kind of educational contexts in which they work, 2) on whether they lead "direct-service" institutions/programs or agencies/programs designed to improve the quality of Jewish education,

¹"Jewish education" is understood as "the education of Jews, informed by the purpose of contributing to their growth as Jewish human beings."

and 3) on the level of seniority they occupy in the larger system of Jewish education, it may be useful to draw to other distinctions. The first is between leadership roles in existing institutions and programs and the kind of leadership that is needed to launch new, or new kinds, of institutions. While the skills, aptitudes, and dispositions for these roles surely overlap, there may be significant differences as well that are pertinent to selection of candidates, to training, and so forth.

The second is the important distinction between professional and lay leadership. Lay leaders play a pivotal role in Jewish education at all levels; and is it of critical importance that the question concerning the nature of **Jewish** educational leadership be asked in relation to lay as well as professional leaders.

Before going on to discuss the distinctive character of Jewish educational leadership, I want to point to an uncomfortableness I feel with the concept of "a Jewish educational leader." The term suggests a distinction between educational and other kinds of leaders of Jewish organizations and programs, e.g. Federation directors, congregational rabbis, the directors of Jewish Community Centers or Social Service agencies, or the publishers/editors of Jewish newspapers or periodicals. There is a sense in which this distinction is warranted: for the individuals we identify as Jewish **educational** leaders have as their principal and publicly recognized purpose the achievement of avowedly educational purposes, whereas the others may not understand their roles as primarily educational. At the same time, it is worth remembering that policies and practices encouraged by an editor, a Federation director, or a congregational rabbi have significant educational consequences even though they are not understood as fundamentally educational in their purposes. How, say, a Jewish community chooses to address problems of poverty within or outside of the Jewish community, or the kinds of hiring/firing or

sick-leave practices that operate in a Jewish organization -- these kinds of things may, for better or worse, powerfully educate various constituencies concerning what it means to be Jewish or a Jewish organization. That is, even leaders whose role is not publicly identified as primarily educational play, whether they acknowledge or like it or not, a powerful educating role, influencing beliefs, attitudes, and commitments in important ways. There is an important sense in which they, too, are Jewish educational leaders -- and in terms of their impact there may be times when they prove the most significant of our educational leaders. It may therefore be worth pondering such matters as whether we are exclusively interested in leadership roles associated with avowedly educational purposes, or whether part of our challenge is to get Jewish leaders who don't think of themselves as "educators" to take seriously the inevitable (and often powerful) educational dimension of their work.

JEWISH EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

What is distinctive about **Jewish** educational leadership? In answering this question, I want to steer a path between two perspectives which, though very different, both suggest, if not a dismissive attitude to this problem, a reformulation of the challenges we face. One of these perspectives asserts that the essential skills and dispositions associated with educational leadership are generic, and that therefore the educational leader who will be leading a Jewish educational effort should be getting the same training as educational leaders in the non-Jewish world who occupy similar niches in the educational system. Skills relating to administration, to conflict-resolution, to strategic planning, to working with boards, to representing the institution to internal and external constituencies, etc. can be learned in a kind of generic way; and this learning (which could go on in an Educational Leadership program at, say, Vanderbilt or Harvard or some other institution) can then be supplemented with an additional program of learning designed to acquaint

the future Jewish educational leaders with the particular institutional realities, constituencies, aims, and educational content in relation to which he/she will apply his/her generic leadership skills and knowledge.

If we take this view seriously, we might conclude that it is a waste of effort to create an institution for cultivating Jewish educational leadership. Rather, we should invest our funds a) in recruiting high quality individuals for programs of study in state-of-the-art educational leadership programs in general education, and b) in the development of a program designed to enable those who have the appropriate leadership skills to integrate into and to meaningfully apply these skills in settings informed by Jewish educational purposes.

A second perspective that casts skepticism on the effort to offer a general characterization of **Jewish** educational leadership differs from the first in that it does recognize something distinctive in Jewish educational leadership; but, according to this perspective, there is something amiss in the suggestion that this “something” can be characterized in general terms that will apply to the variety of Jewish educating efforts and environments. Here I have in mind the perspective of our own Goals Project, which could be taken to suggest a position like the following: “There are a multitude of powerful conceptions of the nature of Judaism and of the kind of Jewish life we should aspire to, collectively and as individuals. Each such conception or vision carries different implications for the process, organization, content, and aims of Jewish education, inclusive of the way the purposes, dilemmas, activities, pre-requisites, and guiding principles of leadership are understood. If, then, it is true that the nature of leadership must be understood through the lens of the vision, this suggests that not just the content and aims of Jewish education, but also the approach to planning, to conflict-resolution, to supervision, to teaching, to evaluation etc. will be interpreted through the lens of the vision. Therefore, it is misleading to speak of Jewish

educational leadership as though it were something generic (in the sense that it is in any meaningful sense the same across Jewish communities, whatever their guiding conception of Judaism).

An implication of this second perspective might be that if there is to be a JEWEL, its job will be the following:

1. it will strive to develop an array of models of Jewish educational leadership, each tied to a particular conception of the nature, significance, and purpose of Judaism and Jewish life;
2. it will then develop training-models that in their forms and aims are coherent with these paired conceptions of Judaism and Jewish educational leadership;
3. it will recruit into JEWEL individuals with leadership potential who are already identified with a particular vision and/or it will provide opportunities for individuals identified as having strong leadership potential to develop a compelling vision of Jewish life;²
4. it will provide individuals identified with a particular understanding of Jewish life with appropriate leadership development opportunities (as defined by #2).

Each of these perspectives points to truths that will be important for us to take into account as we think about the development of JEWEL. There may well be some generic educational leadership skills and dispositions that are learnable in educational settings that are not distinctively Jewish -- skills and dispositions which, having been learned, acquire a Jewish cast by virtue of the context, content, aims, and clientele that define Jewish educational settings. And it is also likely, as what we have called "the Goals perspective" suggests, that significant aspects of

² Note that from the standpoint of the perspective under consideration, this last formulation is problematic, for the formulation suggests that it is possible to characterize "strong leadership potential" in independence of a particular vision of Judaism and Jewish life -- and this is precisely what this perspective denies.

Jewish educational leadership are so integrally bound up with particular understandings of the nature of Judaism that it doesn't make sense to characterize them in any generic terms.

This said, the fact that each of these perspectives may have something to offer us as we try to get clearer on nature of Jewish educational leadership does not entail they are correct in their shard denial that there are significant features of Jewish educational leadership which are, on the one hand, sufficiently distinctive to be marked off from the general area of educational leadership and, on the other hand, sufficiently general to be applicable (albeit in different forms and with different emphases) to educating efforts informed by diverse conceptions of Judaism. In developing JEWEL, our assumption is that it is possible to identify features of Jewish educational leadership which fall, as it were, in between the legitimate scope of these two perspectives -- features of Jewish educational leadership which are neither generic to all educational leadership nor so narrowly connected to any particular conception of Judaism that they cannot be relevant to forms of Jewish educational leadership that are tied to other conceptions of Judaism. Below I try to sketch out some of these features..

TOWARDS A CONCEPTION OF *JEWISH* EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Building on a history of conversation concerning leadership within the CIJE community, I want to suggest a number of features of Jewish educational leadership that would, if recognized as important, help to define the aspirations and educational program of JEWEL. In developing these points, I have found the metaphor of "conversation" particularly helpful. That is, Jewish civilization or tradition can be understood as a conversation concerning a number of important matters that had the power to enrich and give a Jewish cast to the thought and practice of a Jewish educational leader. These conversations are identified below, along with some ideas about

how participation in this conversation relates to the work of a Jewish educational leader.

Before proceeding, however, it is essential to add that attention in this particular paper to critical conversations and dimensions of leadership that grow out of Jewish sources and civilization is decidedly not intended to suggest that Jewish educational leaders will be understood exclusively in Jewish terms or that concepts, ideas, theories, and debates found in the general literature on educational leadership are not be central to Jewish educational leadership. On the contrary, a credible approach to Jewish educational leadership may insist that Jewish educational leaders be initiated into pertinent conversations concerning leadership and education to be found in the general, as well as in the Jewish, literature, and that they understand their roles in categories that draw on the richness of both these traditions. But exactly how Jewish ideas, perspectives and debates pertaining to leadership and their counterparts in the general culture are to be connected to each in our understanding of a Jewish educational leader and in the cultivation of such leaders is far from obvious; these are matters worthy of serious discussion. With this qualification, I proceed to propose some features or dimensions of **Jewish educational leadership**.

1. Participation in a conversation concerning educational and other kinds of leadership.

Over a period of thousands of years, Jewish civilization has given rise to a multitude of images of leadership and to varied discussions of the responsibilities, risks, dilemmas, and necessary conditions of educational and other kinds of leadership. Joseph, Moses, Aaron, Joshua, Deborah, Samuel, Saul, David, and Solomon, Bar Kochba, the Sages of the Rabbinic period, the Hassidic rebbes overseeing their communities, well-known heads of Yeshivot of different kinds across the ages, Zionist leaders like Hertzl, Ben Gurion, Golda Meir, and Menachem Begin, the leaders of European Jewish communities under Nazi siege during the

Holocaust -- these represent only a few of the examples and images of leadership to be found within Jewish history. Each such image is associated with a style of leadership in relation to particular social and economic circumstances, with the characteristics that make for good - or bad - leadership, and with the challenges and dilemmas to which leaders respond, and with the consequences of responding to these circumstances in one way rather than another.

Along with these complex, situated images of leadership, there are to be found within Jewish tradition, varied discussions of leadership and of particular leaders. Samuel's critique of Saul, rabbinic perspectives on the responsibilities of leaders under different circumstances, and Ahad Ha-am's "Moses" represent but a few of examples of significant discussions of the nature of leadership that have gone on in Jewish history.

Taken together, these complex images of leadership, including its challenges, dangers, and limits, and discussions about the nature of leadership can be understood as an ongoing, polyphonic conversation concerning the nature of leadership, a conversation that includes varied voices and that is marked by particular themes, questions, insights, concerns, and concepts. In the course of this conversation, the nature of leadership - its hallmarks, its styles, its challenges, its guiding principles, its risks, and so forth - is variously explored, debated, and through this process, illuminated.

A Jewish educational leader is an initiate into this conversation. He or she is familiar with the language and the literature that make up this conversation; a Jewish educational leader is capable of situating his/her role and activities in relation to the questions, issues, images, and insights to be found within this tradition. Being party to the conversation does not determine in any specific sense how the leader understands his or her work, but it provides a valuable

vocabulary through which to articulate its character and challenges.³

2. Leadership and vision.

The very first principle In CIJE's evolving Guiding Principles document asserts the following:

"Vision at the heart. The soul of an educating practice or institution is a guiding vision that identifies in a compelling way its paramount aspirations. An adequate guiding vision points to the attitudes, knowledge-base, dispositions, and skills to be encouraged in the learner. An adequate vision is grounded in serious encounters with powerful Jewish ideas that concern the nature and moral challenges of Jewish and human existence in the cosmos, in history, and in contemporary America. Such a vision, if genuinely shared, energizes the participants and provides an indispensable basis for educational decision-making and evaluation. A vision is a **guiding** vision only to the extent that it permeates the entirety of an institution's life, from hiring practices, to architecture, to daily learning experiences, to budgetary decisions."

This principle carries significant implications for our understanding of Jewish educational leadership. If, as suggested above, Jewish tradition can be understood as an extended and multi-faceted conversation concerning the nature of leadership, it is also a conversation concerning the essential nature and significance of Judaism and the kind of life we should be living as Jews. This age-old and continuing conversation takes place within and between the Torah, the Talmud; among religious philosophers; between Hassidim and Mitnagdim and Epikorsim; between

³ I owe the metaphor of a "conversation", as used in this discussion, to the writings of Michael Oakeshott and Alasdair MacIntyre.

Charedim and Secularists, and so forth. A Jewish educational leader ought to be familiar with significant perspectives found within this conversation and to have situated himself or herself in relation to the voices that make up this conversation. That is, against a background of familiarity with a range of these perspectives, the Jewish educational leader is able to identify, explain, and render compelling a vision of Jewish existence in its individual and communal dimensions that will guide his or her work as an educational leader⁴.

More specifically, our organizational commitment to the centrality of vision suggests that a Jewish educational leader needs to be aware of the importance of vision, and to be familiar with an array of visions that might serve as organizing principles for Jewish education; is himself or herself committed (in the spirit of Ahad Ha-Am's characterization of Moses as leader) to a vision of Jewish existence; has the ability to represent and convey a powerful vision, grounded in Jewish ideas, to constituencies within and surrounding his/her institution; has the ability to help the constituencies that make up an educating community clarify a vision that will both inspire them and guide their work; understands how such a vision must suffuse the life of an educational program or institution and have the ability to move the institution to greater coherence between vision and practice; is able and disposed to evaluate the extent to which the practices associated with the vision actually serve to promote it; is able and disposed to interpret and adapt the vision in response to change circumstances and new understandings.⁵

⁴ It is noteworthy that this feature of Jewish educational leadership seems at least on the surface consistent with, and not unrelated to, Mordecai Nisan's recent piece on an "identity-model" for the development of leadership for Jewish education.

⁵Note that there is an ambiguity in this characterization of the relationship between leadership and vision. On the one hand, it suggests that the leader must be genuinely committed to a powerful vision of Jewish existence and to an associated vision of a desirable educating

To say of the Jewish educational leader that he/she represents, articulates, and communicates to various constituencies the institution's guiding vision is to suggest a significant sense in which Jewish educational leadership is as much (if not more) a moral vocation as it is as a technical role. The leader represents a moral ideal (a vision of what Jewish existence at its best is) and is adept not just at using it to shape institutional practice but is also able to help his/her faculty and other constituencies keep faith with that ideal despite the demoralizing tendencies of routinization.

As the foregoing suggests, there are multiple dimensions to a Jewish educational leader's work that pertain to vision: the development of personal and institutional visions, the ability to develop support for a vision, to work through its implications for curriculum, admissions standards, physical and social organization, and so forth, and, equally important, to understand its implications for the way leadership itself is to be understood and operationalized -- all of these are important matters. And they are matters which need to be thought through systematically as we develop JEWEL's curriculum and its admissions criteria.

3. Jewish educational leadership and the conversation on ethics.

institution; on the other hand, it suggests that a leader needs to be able to help a community of critical stake holders develop and clarify a vision that will guide their work. The first seems to suggest someone who has worked out a personal vision and then tries to shape an educating institution in its light; the second suggests someone who facilitates the development of a vision in a community and then identifies himself/herself with the vision that results from this effort. This tension can be approached in a number of ways: one possibility, for example, is that the two alternatives posed are the poles of a continuum, and that the ideal leader falls somewhere in between the two poles, with different balances appropriate to different settings; a second possibility is that these two alternatives speak to different kinds of educating leaders, each of which may be effective with different constituencies and in different circumstances.

It was noted above that in a significant sense Jewish educational leadership, though it involves varied technical skills, goes beyond technique in its emphasis on vision. Another way in which Jewish educational leadership goes beyond technique is in its emphasis on the ethical dimensions of institutional and educational practice. The social and educational practices of a Jewish educating institutions must be ethical to the core not because of the fear of law-suits, or even because this will give rise to a positive social climate and worthy educational consequences, but for the more fundamental reason that exemplary ethical conduct that is not to be compromised in the name of efficiency or effectiveness is an irreducible element in Jewish educational leadership as we understand it. Note that to speak of **ethical** Jewish educational leadership is to suggest not just conformity to ethical standards and rationales taken for granted in general education but also to be familiar with and to draw on ethical concepts, precepts, principles, stories, questions, and ways of thinking about ethical dilemmas found within Jewish tradition. Here, too, the metaphor of conversation is of value: for Jewish tradition is also a continuing conversation concerning what is morally required of us in different roles and circumstances. While it makes little sense to urge that a Jewish educational leader should act this way or that in any particular set of circumstances, it is reasonable to expect that he or she regards conformity to ethical imperatives as essential and that his or her thinking be informed by the tradition's wealth of intellectual tools, insights, debates, questions, and images. This would include on opportunities to study and reflect on traditional Jewish understandings of significant ethical dilemmas that educational and other kinds of leaders face⁶, as well as on traditional approaches to these dilemmas.

⁶ The kinds of ethical dilemmas I have in mind include: the tension between the needs or well-being of the individual (be it a bad teacher or a difficult kid, etc.) and the welfare of the group; the place and limits of truth-telling in the leader's relationship to boards, parents, teachers,

4. Jewish educational leadership and the conversation concerning education.

A fourth conversation going on in Jewish civilization that is pertinent to the work of a Jewish educational leader is a conversation concerning that nature and aims of education. This conversation encompasses a plethora of discussions, including arguments concerning the importance of learning, its relationship to deeds, its place in a balanced life, and the characteristics needed to be a successful learner; discussions about the aims of learning and the kind of pedagogies, settings and activities that are likely to facilitate important kinds of learning with different kinds of students; and varied perspectives on the relationship between teacher and student and on the place of education in the life of a community and the community's responsibility for education. A Jewish educational leader is a participant in this conversation; he or she is able to draw on the ideas and debates found within this rich conversation in deliberations concerning the process, aims, and organization of education in his or her own arena.

5. Leadership and learning

CIJE's evolving Guiding Principles document includes the following principle:

"Learning -- both the means and the end of education. In an adequate educating institution the activity of learning is intrinsically rewarding, while meaningfully contributing to the student's growth and daily experience as a Jewish human being as interpreted by its community's guiding vision. We think it likely that if the student's learning-experiences regularly satisfy these demanding standards, the student will develop into a person with the capacity and disposition to engage in serious Jewish learning regularly and enthusiastically. This is important because we believe that however differently various sub-groups understand the aims of Jewish education, Jewish education should always aspire to empower and dispose the student to be a learning Jew, whose activities as a learner guide and enrich his or her approach to life."

and students; issues pertaining to confidentiality, etc.

If, as this principle suggests, the ideal of “a learning Jew, whose activities as a learner guide and enrich his or her approach to life” is at the heart of Jewish educating institutions, Jewish educational leaders must, in more than one important sense, be wholeheartedly identified with this principle. Not only must they be committed to hiring policies and educational practices that will do justice to this commitment, they themselves will need to embody this principle in their own lives. Jewish educational leaders must themselves be serious about and regularly involved in their own Jewish learning.

Note that to speak of the Jewish educational leader as a learner is consistent with the metaphor of conversation that has been used to explain the Jewish dimension of the Jewish educational leader’s work. Recall in this connection the way life-long learning is interpreted in our statement of guiding principles:

“Centrality of Jewish ideas and texts. We understand Jewish tradition as a conversation about the most important things which every Jewish human being has the right to be a part of. Within this historical conversation can be found insights, questions, and ways of thinking that have the potential to challenge, deepen, and transform our understanding of our situation in the world and our challenges as Jewish human beings.

These ideas are to be found in classical Jewish texts like the Torah, the Siddur, and the Talmud, as well as in other products of Jewish cultural creativity including novels, poems, films, music, and the plastic arts. Jewish practices can also be understood as texts that articulate powerful Jewish ideas.

A central challenge of Jewish education is to facilitate personally meaningful encounters with this textual tradition, the kind of encounters that lead to an appreciation of the ideas it embodies, as well as to a desire and capacity to become, through continuing Jewish living and learning, active participants in the conversation in which these ideas are voiced, interpreted, debated, and expressed in daily life. A hallmark of a successful Jewish education is that the learners come to view Jewish texts as lifelong companions and as sources of meaning and guidance.”

NEXT STEPS

This is as far as I've managed to get with this effort in the available time. My suggestion would be to review it with attention to: a) the usefulness, formulation, unclarity and/or wrong-headedness of particular distinctions and claims regarding Jewish educational leadership; and b) missing elements. More generally, it would be important to clarify whether the kind of points included in this document speak to the kinds of concerns and needs that called forth the request to formulate a conception of Jewish educational leadership that, when suitably developed, will guide the development of JEWEL.

① Approach to change ② Null-set ③ Leadership - characteristics
 ④ Embody vision = Be

Course of Study ↓	Setting for learning →	Seminar learning	Field Based, e.g. mentoring	Problem Based Learning	Individualized Education Plans
Personal Vision of Good Jewish Education	Knowledge Skills Dispositions	J, E, M/L, P/H*	J, E, M/L, P/H	J, E, M/L, P/H	J, E, M/L, P/H
Institutional Vision of Good Jewish Education	Knowledge Skills Dispositions	J, E, M/L, P/H	J, E, M/L, P/H	J, E, M/L, P/H	J, E, M/L, P/H
Theories of change	Knowledge Skills Dispositions	J, E, M/L, P/H	J, E, M/L, P/H	J, E, M/L, P/H	J, E, M/L, P/H
Implementation	Knowledge Skills Dispositions	J, E, M/L, P/H	J, E, M/L, P/H	J, E, M/L, P/H	J, E, M/L, P/H
Research and Evaluation	Knowledge Skills Dispositions	J, E, M/L, P/H	J, E, M/L, P/H	J, E, M/L, P/H	J, E, M/L, P/H

*Jewish studies, Education, Management/Leadership, Philosophy/Humanities

B) From person to institution
 ↓
Intermediate step!! - Devel. Vision

Challenges

①

② Concept of Change

③ Horizontal categories

④ Imaginableness - Big Picture

Finish Ed / Management / Leadership

Our concept of
leadership!

Conception of leadership

Conception of change

Conception of learning
Theory

→ Need to make
explicit & defend.

skills/knowledge
Disposition

Indiv Program

Field based

Job
stud

Prob-
Based

Assess
of
Expense

Personal
VISION

Insights
V.

Implem

Research
Evaluation

JEWEL - Pilot

Think/Do

What: Institutional transform

What ^{Source}	Jewish	Ed	Management	Principles-based learn
or	Indiv. Practice	Field Based Exp	Jewish Educ	
↓				
Personal				
v.				
Inst. v				
People				

Challenges

Skills

Knowledge

Dispositions

that

cross?

Ethical

Personal Integrity

Self-esteem

Oriented toward action

What does it take to transform your situation?

Inside each, there are

NOT FOR QUOTATION
OR PUBLICATION
FOR INTERNAL USE ONLY

Mandel Institute Seminar on Conceptions of Training

"Identity Model" for Developing Leadership in Education Professor Mordecai Nisan

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem
June, 1996

(a) *Training model for developing leadership in education*

1. I want to distinguish between two models for developing educational leadership. Neither is necessarily exclusive, but they do represent two competing approaches to leadership development in education and certain other fields. I shall call them the *Training Model* and the *Identity Model*. The Training Model is the method commonly accepted in most manpower training programs, including training of senior staff. Even if it is not applied in its pure form, in practice it is the dominant model at the declarative level. The Identity Model has not, as far as I know, been developed or presented as yet, but even without a distinct conception it crops up in certain training programs.
2. According to the Training Model, leadership development entails, first and foremost, providing prospective leaders with appropriate tools to execute their tasks: that is, abilities, skills, methods and even attributes required to achieve the greatest number of goals in a given task. The emphasis, then, is on means, assuming that the goals are given and known.
3. This model of training accords with the rational model of decision-making and behavior, what psychologists call the expectancy value model. According to this model, a person facing a choice among different behavioral alternatives will choose that which offers the greatest utility (where utility is a function of the value of the anticipated result multiplied by the probability of achieving that result). The rational model does not concern itself with the goal, which is perceived as a given: to achieve the greatest possible utility. Similarly, the element of value in the model is also

greatest possible utility. Similarly, the element of value in the model is also a given and finds expression in the individual's preferences. This model is offered as both normative and descriptive -it purports to suggest how one should choose and how people make choices given certain goals and preferences. Indeed, the model presupposes an individual with goals sufficiently defined to enable him to choose among life's options. Accordingly, a training program is not geared toward goals (other than the goals of the project toward which the participant is directed, since a recognition of goals is an important tool for executing the task).

4. Avoiding preoccupation with goals conforms with the liberal approach. A central tenet of the liberal approach is the belief that society must not intervene in an individual's value system beyond demanding that he not impair the rights of others or harm the community. This conception is sometimes adopted for the education of schoolchildren; it is far more intensively applied for adults, including, of course, educational leaders at various levels. Adults, it is assumed, have a clear conception of their values and their life-goals together with the intelligence to evaluate them. The premise is that the individual is the best judge of his life-goals.

5. A second underlying assumption of the rational model is that means and goals are distinct and non-dependent, that the tools used are distinct from the direction toward which the activity is geared. The tools employed to achieve goals are perceived to resemble the contents of a tool box and can be transferred from one task to another. That is, tool serves the operation without influencing its direction.

Not
entirely
fair
ascribing
this

kind of naivete to proponents of this model

6. The distinction between means and goal is the cornerstone of training programs which focus on equipping the trainee with tools needed to perform his task. It underlies most training programs in our society in a diversity of fields, among them education. The broad array of tools acquired in such programs ranges from expertise in economics and administration to methods for improving instruction, imposing discipline, and cultivating motivation.
7. This approach to training—supplying and developing tools which can be transferred from one task to another—is both reflected and reinforced by the growing phenomenon of people changing occupations and roles on the

assumption that skills acquired, developed, and displayed in one sphere will serve equally well in another. Thus the manager of a food-marketing chain becomes a computer executive and then moves on to a senior government security position.

8. This conception also dictates training methods. Since we want the tools and skills we acquire to be not context-dependent but transferable from one realm to another and from one field to the next, we try to inculcate them in the most general, abstract manner possible, without undue focus on any particular subject. Someone who was trained to teach Bible should acquire skills or tools which enable him to teach every chapter of the Bible as well as other subjects, and not only the specific chapter in which he trained. Psychological studies on transfer in learning seek to discover (without great success) the optimal conditions for transfer - for example, uncovering the principles which constitute the basis of learned behavior.
9. Nowadays, this conception of the content and method of training is increasingly emphasized. In light of the explosion in volume of knowledge, the types of activity required of people, the diversity of experiences they undergo, and the frequent changes that occur in our world and our lives, it is argued that the goal of training should be to instill skills for coping with different roles in shifting circumstances and conditions. Flexibility and adaptability would seem to be a primary goal of training, especially for high level positions.
10. Without attempting a complete critique of this training conception here, I do wish to cite two limitations which are directly relevant: (a) We do not always find it easy to articulate the "tools" or skills needed to perform a role (particularly the role of leadership). (b) Even if we know the role's requirements, we do not understand definitively how to teach and develop the relevant skills. It is far from clear, for example, what contribution a lecture on decision-making makes to the development of decision-making ability.

* * *

(b) *On the status of goals in human consciousness*

1. I want to take issue with the two assumptions which underlie the instrumental approach to education and training: that adults (who are our concern here) have clear goals and it is not for us to intervene; and that means and goals are two independent, relatively non-dependent, elements.
2. We shall first consider the assumption concerning goals. Undoubtedly, all people have wishes they want to fulfill and plans they would like to implement which go beyond their immediate, non-reflective "preferences." These wishes and plans forge the system of goals which guides their choices. Often, however, this system is vitiated by at least two important limitations -- the range of goals and their distinctness and depth.
3. A person entertains intentions, wishes, goals, and plans for a narrow range of subjects—some crucial to his existence, some socially predicated, and others that he developed over the years. It is possible, and even probable, however, that he is oblivious to important potential goals in the areas in which he is most closely associated, even more so in areas in which he is not involved. An awareness of new goals (and active involvement in them) may open exciting new horizons which will expand his range of possible goals and options.
4. Even when an individual entertains goals vis-a-vis a particular subject, they can be very general, lacking distinctions and depth. A case in point is the goal of national education. Teachers seek to develop the pupil's ties and loyalty to the nation (generally important goals in their lives). But very often they have no clear conception of the demands, limits, forms, and dangers of this national loyalty. At the same time, the goal also lacks depth: it is not always clear what the foundation and justification are for fidelity to the nation, what the status of this duty is vis-a-vis other values, how binding such loyalty is in the face of other principles, and so forth.
5. In general, people act according to the law of diminished effort, even at the cognitive level. People will rarely make an effort to clarify to themselves the goals of their behavior beyond what is demanded by social circumstances and by the situation at hand—and generally not much is

demanding. It is possible to function with a mediocre level of distinctness and depth about goals. It is only complex, intractable problems which force people to clarify goals and values more sharply. Yet even such clarification may be limited to what is perceived as needed in order to resolve the problem, temporary, and local. People usually act according to schemata which spare them the need to clarify goals and means.

6. We have mentioned the distinctness and depth of goals with reference to the cognitive dimension. These two variables are also related to the dimension of commitment to goals. I assume that the more distinct a goal is (known in its details, categories, limits, and conditions) and the deeper it is (awareness of its presuppositions, justifications, and implications), the greater the commitment. This is not to say, however, that these elements alone determine commitment. This assumption is based on the idea that distinctness and depth place the "self" within a richer and more complex net and thereby lead to greater commitment. / ?
7. The assumption of a relation of non-dependence between means and goals also appears invalid. The means and tools available to us influence our perception of goals. Things we perceive as impossible or difficult to achieve, or which we think we lack the means to accomplish, we will not set as goals. On the other hand, if the appropriate means to achieve a particular category of goals comes within grasp, we will be disposed to adopt those goals. Goals we are unable to define either through the means to achieve them, or by gauging their attainability, will often elude us.
8. A second problem concerning the connection between means and goals is that some goals are incompatible with certain means. For example, the strategy of the rational model, with all its attendant tools—planning, calculating, weighing of utility—is not reconcilable with goals such as love, grace, or generosity. If you try to calculate the utility of these goals, their character is altered and, in fact, they vanish.
9. The two points adduced above suggest that acquisition of means is not a neutral act vis-a-vis goals. Indeed, despite the view that science and technology are indifferent to goals, the means developed in these fields have influenced the goals of modern man. The rise of the rational model in the social sciences was accompanied by a change in the realm of goals

(values). Goals which can be defined, calculated, and measured in terms of utility (such as economic success) are given priority over goals which are less given to such definition or measurement. At the same time, they are deleterious to goals related to values of love, self-fulfillment, personal integrity, and the like, which by their nature are not utilitarian.

* * *

(c) *On the need for dealing with goals and on the nature of that occupation*

1. Important conceptions in the philosophy of education suggest that enriching, clarifying, declaring, deepening, and developing the range of possible goals a person sets himself (hereafter: goals) are major objectives of education. The educated person is one who is aware, receptive, and ready to experience a rich array of goals. Such a person realizes his abilities more fully and that is one criterion for the good life. This approach will bring us to the conclusion that an educational leader should possess a broad, clarified, and deep picture of goals, for they are a central component of the purposes of education.
2. The arguments brought thus far suggest that occupation with goals must constitute a central element in training for educational leadership and similar fields. Such occupation will contribute to the development of a proper view of goals and will be a wedge against the danger of narrowing and impairing them. The result should be that the point of departure for an educational discussion will be the goals, and that even when we move to the (necessary) stage of means, we will not lose the point of view created by the goals.
3. "Goals" is a term which is suitable for those who hold the rational model, those whose activity is always goal-directed. In the rational model goals (or values, as they are called there) can be one's "preferences," even if these have not been rationally evaluated. In the present context, however, the term "goals" is geared to values (for example, in the sense of a "good" situation being one which is worthy of aspiration in contrast to need or desire) [A value is a goal which the individual has considered and come to appreciate as being good and worthy]
4. Occupation with goals (or values) is meant to induce proper knowledge (distinctness, depth) of the range of goals which have arisen in the culture, including their connections and interrelations (for example, dependence or contradiction between values). Such occupation will necessarily include a discussion of [the criteria for choosing among possible goals.] Indeed, a proper understanding of goals, one that also takes into account their justification, will *ipso facto* refer to the considerations which guide us in setting or giving preference to goals.

Important
but
Vague.

Does
more
need to
be said
here?

For
example:

5. Occupation with goals cannot stop with knowing and understanding them. A necessary additional step here is to clarify ways for giving expression to goals or values. A goal (or a value) which we do not know how to express is not a fully rounded goal. Moreover, the goal's mode of expression must also be examined and evaluated. Not every mode of expression is equally suitable.

6. Occupation with goals or values has been a central theme in human thought through the ages. Theologians and moralists, prophets and philosophers, creative artists and statesmen—each in their different conceptual and creative approaches—have deliberated and anguished over questions of values. The result has been to broaden, clarify, and deepen the range of available goals. To be occupied with goals or values is thus to delve into and experience this aspect of thought and creative work in your culture and other cultures.

7. Occupation with goals and values occurs at various levels and by different modes: from the aesthetic experience of encountering works of art through stories about people and the complexity of their lives, a knowledge of the history of groups and peoples to philosophical deliberation about the meaning of life. Central questions in the educational discourse belong in this sphere.

8. Occupation with goals is focused on contents. But these are contents with a standing meaning, at least for a person in a particular culture and period. There is no fear that occupation with goals will become outdated, as may happen to scientific theories. The substance of occupation with values, including considerations for their choice, are like indispensable building blocks and foundations.

9. The argument put forward earlier, that acquisition of means might narrow the range of goals and impair them in part, should not, of course, be construed to mean that means have no place in a training program. The means placed at our disposal by science and technology are a prodigious human achievement, and it would be foolish to ignore them. We must, however, protect ourselves against the danger of their inordinate use. Occupation with goals affords such protection, though we must remain aware of the danger that quality and status of “means” will attract attention,

while cultural works based on values are perceived to be of secondary importance (as occurs throughout the educational system).

10. There is no limit to occupation with a goal. The "net of meaning" which imbues the goal with its richness and depth is infinitely elastic. It is possible to clarify the goal's meanings and consequences, the conditions in which it is valid, its limits, its status in comparison with other goals, its positive aspects, and so on. The educator is expected to produce a net of sufficient richness and complexity to make intelligent decisions based on analysis and evaluation.

- I'd like examples of goals.*
11. Occupation with goals does not mean positing one goal and clarifying it while preaching its realization. That would be indoctrination. But even a critical examination of one or a few goals will not satisfy us. That would be to narrow the sphere of goals. Indeed, a proper clarification entails examining the goal within a comprehensive framework, with reference to other possible goals and in different conditions. Only that type of clarification can produce richness and clarity in terms of knowing the goals and depth with regard to their basis and the nature of their demands.

12. A clarification of goals in this manner, far from constituting indoctrination, actually saves the individual from being unintentionally "indoctrinated" by his past and present environment. The clarification process helps the individual extricate himself from the bonds of experience within his environment and choose his goals rationally and consciously. During this process, he will weigh and evaluate the impact of the "unavoidable" aspects of his existence: origin, environment, experience.

13. Attainment of the condition described—clarity, distinctness, and depth vis-a-vis goals—seems to me a primary condition for leadership in any sphere which has more than a limited, one-dimensional goal. It certainly applies to the field of education. A distant, academic awareness of goals, however, is also insufficient for leading. Leadership requires choosing a goal or direction, against the background of the entire range of goals. It is not enough for a leader to know the goals; he must be committed to them.

A conception is needed which links a cognitive with an emotional aspect, an "objective" aspect and a personal one. I call that conception "identity," following the use of the term in psychology.

* * *

(d) *On identity and identity-guided actions*

self-def. and self-perc. are inter-related.

1. Beyond the way in which people perceive themselves, they also tend to define themselves. Unlike self-perception, which is fundamentally passive, self-definition is active, involving choice and the adoption of certain attributes as being essential to the self. Such a definition is needed not only to satisfy the individual's need for clarity about himself (who he is) but also so that he can function effectively in a complex reality which demands a choice among behavioral alternatives and among affiliation with a broad array of groups. Self-definition entails a choice of direction for one's activity; as such, self-definition has stimulative force and guides behavior.
2. The definitions which the individual adopts for himself are, in part, his choices and, in part, acceptance of a given situation. In the first case, he has a sense of freedom of choice among alternatives—for example, about his ideological leanings or the direction of his studies. In the second instance the individual confronts seemingly "imposed" givens: family and national affiliation, personal traits, an event in life which leaves an indelible mark, and so forth. In these cases the individual feels that life has dictated his self-definition. But he is aware of this and decides consciously to accept the particular definition or try and repress it or reshape it. In the modern and postmodern period self-construction has become a central factor in shaping identity.
3. We shall call the aggregate of definitions which a person chooses, or consciously accepts for himself, "identity perception." Erikson and other psychologists ascribed to the individual's identity perception his sense of existence, a sense of his continuity over time and permanence beyond ephemeral situations. Observations and empirical findings suggest that people tend to preserve their identity and give it expression in their behavior.

4. Identity consists of many elements - some of great importance, others less so. The elements differ in importance to the degree that the individual considers them essential parts of his identity; that is, if they were to disappear or change, it could be said that the individual had substantively changed. The importance of each element is expressed by the degree to which the individual is adamant about preserving and expressing that element in his identity.
5. A distinction can be drawn between elements of identity which the individual perceives as universal or common to all (such as morality), those elements perceived as shared by the members of a particular group (such as national identity), and those seen as personal, playing a major role in one's self-definition which differs from the way others define themselves (my specific, personal project). All components of identity, and particularly the interaction between them, constitute the individual's distinctive identity.
6. It follows, therefore, that identity constitutes an important factor in determining human behavior. It sets limits to behavior: people will not behave in a way which contradicts their identity, but they will initiate behavior which expresses their identity. Such behavior can stem directly from identity (if it demonstrates my Jewish identity, for example) or indirectly (behavior which is required because I am a loyal citizen and, therefore, obey the law-- even if I do not find it meaningful).
7. This conception of identity brings us to a distinction between actions which are identity-derived and other types of behavior. Actions not identity-derived include most behavior dictated by biological needs, actions geared to earn a living not give expression to our identity, and so forth. In contrast, there is a significant part of behavior which is guided by identity: actions which the individual initiates in order to manifest his identity, or those for which identity sets directions and limits. We shall call actions of this sort "identity-guided."
8. Identity-guided actions are distinguished primarily from those geared toward maximizing utility. The rational model of behavior explains all human behavior as directed toward the maximization of utility. The idea of

in this realm (?)

identity-guided activity stems from the fact that some human behavior does not easily fit the rational model, and an explanation based on identity seems more appropriate and fruitful than one based on utility.

Develop.

→ Sometimes, though, a quest for satisfaction defined by the identity

9. Identity-guided actions are performed from a sense of appropriateness or duty, not by a quest for satisfaction. They are perceived as deriving from "myself" and are not dictated by the external demands or passions which rule me. Whereas utility-guided actions are perceived to be exchangeable with other actions which promise similar or greater utility, identity-guided actions are considered non-exchangeable (for example, I cannot exchange my commitment to my family for some other cause).

* * *

(e) *On the educator's identity and the identity of the institution for developing leadership*

1. Parallel to the distinction between utility-guided and identity-guided activities, we can distinguish between roles in society geared toward maximizing utility and those related to identity. The role of factory manager is generally directed toward achieving maximum utility. The role of rabbi or educator or ideologue is identity-oriented; those filling such a role are expected to help shape people's lives, to set limits on the one hand and goals on the other.
2. The role of educator combines both types of behavior. School is mandated to prepare its pupils to function in society in a coordinated, effective manner by producing and achieving maximum utility. Yet, its task is also to help those same pupils develop a personal identity -- identify and evaluate goals, and choose goals for themselves. Indeed, there is general agreement that school should "subordinate" utility to identity—that it should create a situation in which considerations of identity will guide, limit, and direct the pupils' view of utility and their behavior.
3. If the field of education is related to the development of identity, then educational leaders must possess a developed conception of identity. A leader's role is to analyze and weigh alternatives, develop initiatives and directions for action, make decisions, and stand in the forefront of their accomplishment. In the realm of education, the linchpin of all this is identity. Consequently, a basic demand from an educational leader is a

developed sense of identity which underlies his judgments, initiatives, and decisions.

4. Identity can be perceived by an individual as complete and yet be undeveloped. Like goals, as we saw earlier, identity can be diffuse, lacking in depth, and mute. It can be diffuse in the sense that it fails to distinguish between its different aspects and their implications; it can lack depth in the sense that it is not aware of the foundation, scope, and limitations of the element of worth within it or the necessary commitment to it; and mute in the sense that the individual lacks understanding of the suitable modes for its expression.
5. The central expectation of an educational leader will, therefore, be that he possesses a developed identity—distinct, deep, and articulate—sufficient for him to provide intelligent answers to questions about the direction of activity. But he should also—and here we move beyond what we said about goals—have sufficient inner validity and forcefulness to trigger behavior. There are two aspects to this expectation: cognitive and motivational. Cognitive relates to understanding, analysis, and raising appropriate considerations; motivational relates to the strength of will to act and the ability to persist in the face of obstacles, both internal and external.
6. The leader with a developed identity will act from an inner motivation linked to his conception of worth. ~~That motivation is a condition for realizing an important goal of education which was mentioned before: behavior guided by a conception of worth and not solely by considerations of utility. Such behavior will not depend on expectations of utility.~~

Explain

Dimensions
of ID
level

The development of identity in general, or in educational leaders in particular, may have several aspects. There is a personal facet where the individual clarifies his identity for himself, finds previously hidden elements, discovers blockages and contradictions, examines the validity of his different identities and their implications, etc. When the individual clarifies his social identity, its meaning and demands, and its depths and richness, he operates on the socio-cultural facet. A third facet is the universal, which finds expression primarily, though not exclusively, in the realm of moral imperatives. The different facets of identity develop in a number of arenas.

8. The principal arena for developing identity is social experience. This occurs through interaction with others in the framework of social systems. The richness and depth of interactions is reflected in the richness and depth of the individual's evolving identity. An important aspect of the developed identity is awareness of the range and depth of "other" identities.
9. Identity development, like the development of goals, is based on acquaintance with human culture and creativity. Just as a person has intuitions about nature which science subsequently develops (either by sharpening or refuting), it is possible and worthwhile for an individual to develop and enrich his intuitions about himself, his values, and his plans by occupying himself with human thought and creativity through the ages.
10. We have suggested that the development of identity entails, among other things, an encounter with human thought and creativity. This encounter cannot be comprehensive, of course; it must be narrowed to a specific selection. Unavoidably, that selection will come from the person's own culture, but it can expand to encompass human creativity as a whole. Reliance on national culture and on the thrust of its expansion are both fraught, however, with an implicit declaration about identity. Indeed, any activity relating to the development of identity entails a certain choice and, as such, a commitment to a particular direction.
11. An institution for the development of educational leadership cannot, and is not entitled to, shirk from deciding and declaring its choice of direction or its identity. The institution can choose a pluralistic approach and cast a very broad net of goals. Or it can select a narrower field. It can place greater or lesser emphasis on national culture, on themes related to social equality and justice, on values (as opposed to means), and so forth. The identity of the institution determines the sphere of the options to which it will give expression and the lines which must not be crossed (for example, rejecting democracy or negating Zionism.).
12. The institution's identity has facets of which its members are aware, and concealed aspects, which are not generally consciously recognized, but exert considerable influence (e.g., the hidden curriculum in schools). Some aspects of the institution are determined from the outset while others

emerge and evolve in the course of the institution's life, deriving from the experience of the group active within it.

13. ? . | It should be stressed that defining the institution's identity is necessary not to "succeed" in shaping the identity of those whom it trains. Such consideration might be valid with children and teenagers, but not with adults who are training for leadership. It is necessary to define the institution's identity to determine its activity, and, at the same time, to avert, as far as possible, influences which people do not expect and of which they are not aware—this to prevent "quasi-indoctrination."

* * *

(f) *The connection between vision and goals and identity*

~~Explain~~

The two foci proposed for training leadership—mapping a value system and developing identity (self-definition which involves commitment)—appear to be necessary (though not sufficient) conditions for the existence of a vision. They are not, as some would argue, millstones that sink visions.

Explain 2.

2. | A vision suggests a new conception of goals released from the shackles of the here-and-now. But that release is not a creative outburst unrelated to concrete reality. The release implicit in the vision is anchored in an awareness of the existing system and its limitations. A vision cannot ignore either those which preceded it (and their fate) or the reality. This is so not only because every individual has a point of departure rooted in a particular time and place, but also because the very concept of "vision" is based on the idea of going "beyond" something, beyond the previous "visions" which collapsed or disappointed. The existing reality, including the accepted value system, is therefore the springboard for the new vision.

3. | If the existing situation constitutes a point of departure for the vision, then we can reasonably expect that starting-point be well-known to the visionary in all the aspects described for goals. Otherwise, the vision may find itself repeating what has already been said or ignoring important ideas raised in the past. Such a vision is not worthy of the name. At best it is a vision with weaknesses, perhaps even an irresponsible vision.

4. A close knowledge of the point of departure and the accepted system of goals is, however, insufficient to produce a vision which transcends the present reality. A further condition is the existence of a developed identity in the subjects relevant to the vision. The commitment latent in identity is necessary not only so that the individual strives, daring to free himself from the existing system and articulate a new vision, but also so that he evaluates and weighs his ideas on the way to formulating a responsible vision worthy of the name.
5. This argument maintains that it is impossible to order a "vision" from an "expert." The expert can propose alternatives for action (including some which seem very distant) and attach profit and cost tags to each. Such proposals can be innovative, but in the absence of identity-based motivation, they will not evolve into a vision. Without inner motivation and commitment to the subject, it is impossible to attain the sum of qualities which transform a particular concept into a vision. Included in that totality are qualities unavailable to those whose point of departure is utilitarian.
6. Once we have been introduced to the vision, of course, there is nothing to prevent us from evaluating it according to utilitarian criteria. We should, however, be aware of its ethical dimension, which does not lend itself to utilitarian evaluation and comparison. The relative ease with which an evaluation is made according to utilitarian criteria may prevent us from understanding and giving proper weight to the vision's "identity-based" aspects, since these are not easily defined and measured.
7. These arguments eliminate *ab initio* the counter-argument that identity and the conception of a goal interfere with the emergence of a vision. Indeed, psychologists note the possibility of fixation in our conceptions and our behavior in different functions. This may be applicable not only to the perception of means but to goals as well. This analysis indicates, however, that the essence of a vision lies in its ability to overcome such "fixation," while the perception of goals and identity are necessary preconditions for the evolution of a vision.