Appreciating Adaptive Leadership in Extreme Context: A Case Study of What is Working in the United Methodist Church's Chicago Urban Strategy

A dissertation submitted

by
Donna L. Darr

to
Benedictine University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy in Values-Driven Leadership

This dissertation has been accepted for the faculty of Benedictine University.

Michael R. Manning, Ph.D.  December 2016
Chair

Committee Members

Sean T. Hannah, Ph.D.  Wake Forest University
Tojo Thatchenkery, Ph.D.  George Mason University
Abstract

Leadership scholars call for researchers to study leadership in extreme contexts where risks of severe physical harm to organizational members or their constituents exist (Hannah, Campbell, & Matthews, 2010). The world is becoming more volatile, and “normal” organizations are facing dangerous contexts with increasing frequency. Leadership itself cannot be distinguished from the unique social dynamics of the context in which it exists. Thus, substantial research is required to know how leadership in extreme contexts operates and what constitutes effective leadership for unsafe contexts—perhaps the area where leadership is needed most.

Such is this case study of the United Methodist Church’s (UMC) Chicago Urban Strategy (CUS) that is operating in an extreme context of Chicago’s neighborhoods at a time of increased gun violence. Framed as a complex adaptive challenge, the CUS was launched by the Northern Illinois Conference (NIC) of the UMC in 2013 as a movement designed to mobilize, organize, strategize, and collaborate among UMC churches and other partners who seek to promote community safety, education and literacy, food security, and restorative justice in Chicago. The case study provides an appreciative story of 1) the NIC’s successful Safe Haven program in partnership with Chicago Public Schools (CPS) that is keeping school-aged children safe from violence on the streets when school is out, and 2) the NIC’s adaptive leadership response that is emerging and serving to mitigate Chicago’s extreme context.
As an adaptive outcome contributing to CPS’s Safe Haven Program, this NIC case study provides a model for a well-functioning Safe Haven program. Further, to advance leadership research in perilous contexts, the NIC case study extends a typology of adaptive leadership for a faith-based organization operating in extreme context by exemplifying the psychological, social, and organizational resources required to launch and sustain a successful “holding environment” for Safe Haven children. Even at this emergent stage in the Chicago Urban Strategy, the empirical findings reveal the NIC’s adaptive capacity fueled by a culture of experimentation and collective leadership efficacy.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

This is a story of success. Amid all that is not working in the extreme context of Chicago’s urban crisis and amid the United Methodist Church’s (UMC) untenable status quo after decades of plateau and decline, this is a story of what is working among diverse community stakeholders who are practicing adaptive leadership up and down the organization’s hierarchy in order to create Safe Havens for Chicago’s school-aged children and youth. Specifically, this is a case study of what is working in the Northern Illinois Conference’s (NIC) Chicago Urban Strategy (CUS).

Structurally speaking, the NIC is one of 56 UMC “regional conferences” in the U.S. covering “an entire state, only part of the state, or even parts of two or more states” (United Methodist Church [UMC], 2016, July 31). For instance, the state of Illinois is
represented by the Northern Illinois Conference (NIC) and the Illinois Great Rivers Conference (IGRC). The NIC includes over 400 local UMC churches with approximately 125,000 members and is an episcopal area assigned to Bishop Sally Dyck.

Unique to the NIC, the Chicago Urban Strategy (CUS) is a movement launched in 2013 by Bishop Sally Dyck inspired by NIC leadership and is designed to mobilize, organize, strategize, and collaborate among the NIC’s 400+ UMC churches and other partners who seek to promote community safety, education and literacy, food security, and restorative justice for Chicago.

The UMC’s Northern Illinois Conference is operating in an extreme context that exists in Chicago’s neighborhoods where there is a high magnitude of violent crime, illiteracy, unemployability, and poverty (Dold, 2013, October 6). At the same time, there is a distrust of law enforcement that led the U.S. Justice Department to launch a federal civil rights investigation into the Chicago Police Department (CPD) in December 2015 (Horwitz, Berman, & Guarino, 2015, December 8). Now, simultaneously, the American Medical Association and Chicago’s Cook County Board President have designated gun violence a “public health crisis” due to its epidemic status and collateral damage (Krauser, 2016, June 21). Yet all the while, as NIC Urban Strategy Coordinator, Pastor Robert Biekman declared for Chicago,
This place you’re talking about that is so horrible and so bad is where I work and where I live. Don’t write off my city [Chicago]. Someone looking from the outside in might want to write all of this off. I’m not willing to give up on it. By golly, you shouldn’t either. Overwhelmingly, people in Chicago are good, hard-working folk. (R. Biekman, personal communication, August 31, 2016)

So it is that this hydra-headed challenge is the context for UMC congregations and community dwellers located in Chicago’s at-risk neighborhoods.

At the same time, the UMC is itself a turbulent organizational context as mainline “denominational systems lag far behind other missional organizations, nonprofit and quasi-nonprofit, in making the changes required to thrive in the world as it currently exists” (Crabtree, 2008, p. 5). Such a turbulent context arises when “the environmental context in which organizations exist are themselves changing, at an increasing rate, and toward increasing complexity” (Emery & Trist, 1965, p. 21). And this raises a call throughout the UMC for deep, systemic change across the denominational-system.

**Two Overarching Research Questions**

The case study asks two overarching research questions. These two questions serve as an umbrella for three framing questions soon to follow.

1. **What is the United Methodist Church doing in its Chicago Urban Strategy that is working as defined by case study participants?** By design, this question directs our gaze to *what is working* amid all that *is not* working. And rather than
attempting to objectively define “what is working,” the question is intentionally open-ended in order to let NIC case study participants decide, define, and determine what works, what success is, and what to build on going forward. Thus, their perceptions are authoritative for determining what is working and what is success in this case study.

Underlying this question is also the realization that what we look for, we find. Called The Pragmatic Principle, “the questions we ask set the stage for what we ‘find’ and how we organize” (Ludema, 2000, p. 274). Akin to it, The Positive Principle asserts that “Organizations move in the direction of what they study. The more positive the topics and questions, the more positive the outcomes” (Cooperrider & Whitney, n.d.; Ludema, 2000, p. 274). Thereby, the first overarching question contains a pragmatic and positive seed of hope that is coming to life in the NIC’s Chicago Urban Strategy.

2. **What is the context within which the NIC’s Chicago Urban Strategy and UMC Safe Havens exist?** Integral to the nature of this case study, accordingly, we must observe the nature of the organizational context as a primary object of interest and a means to understand and appreciate NIC case study participants’ perceptions of “what is working.” After all, “reality derives its significance from the context and the interdependencies of the elements constituting it” (Thatchenkery, 2011, p. 20). In particular, for the NIC case study, “if we are to
understand completely the dynamics involved in the organizational context/leadership relationship, we need to study the adjustments and alterations that occur in the continuing relationship” (Porter & McLaughlin, 2006, p. 574). So the second overarching research question covers this aim.

**An Appreciative Nature for the Case Study**

“With our questions we make the world” (M. G. Adams, Schiller, & Cooperrider, 2004, p. 105). As we are being introduced to the overarching questions that frame this case study, we recognize that “every inquiry is an intervention, which means that the images embedded within the very questions we ask have enormous potential for unlocking possible, actionable answers [emphasis added]” (Boyd & Bright, 2007). Embedded in the nature of the NIC case study questions, therefore, is an appreciative inquiry aimed toward building, inspiring, and strengthening the capacity of Chicago community dwellers to work for the common good in their communities, as envisioned in the NIC’s Chicago Urban Strategy. “Unlike the traditional action research approach where the researcher wants to find what is going wrong and what needs to be fixed, in appreciative inquiry the focus is on affirming the ‘miracle’ that organizations [and communities] are” (Thatchenkery, 1992, p. 224).

So, within these overarching questions, “the invitation is there” for NIC case study participants “to contribute to dialogues from which the future will be determined” (Gergen, 2009, p. 78). Our words create worlds. And as we will see, these
“expansionist affirmative questions open the door of potential” (M. G. Adams et al., 2004, p. 112) for creating understanding and community.

**Purpose and Summary of the Research**

Specifically, this inductive NIC case study is focused on understanding the success of the UMC’s Safe Haven program for school-aged children in Chicago’s under-resourced neighborhoods. The purpose is to understand and appreciate what is working in the NIC’s response to this complex adaptive challenge. Note that “adaptive challenge” is a term adopted by Ron Heifetz (1994) as an expression for “problems that are not clear-cut or easy to identify” that “cannot be solved by the leader’s authority or expertise” (as cited in Northouse, 2016, p. 262). Heifetz asserts that adaptive challenges are indicated by “recurrent crisis,” “persistent conflict,” and “will require people to learn new ways” by means of “collective intelligence” (Heifetz, 2008, December 25).

By taking an appreciative approach despite this complex adaptive challenge, therefore, we will discover the wealth that is already there in connections and relationships not previously observed (Weick, 1989). To that end, data were collected from multiple sources including semi-structured interviews, field observations and events, multi-media sources, and historical records. Thematic analysis was used to analyze the findings (Braun & Clarke, 2006).
Three Questions to Frame the Case Study Findings/Results

Evolving from the process of conducting interviews, participating in and observing CUS activities, events, and groups in various contexts, and the “subtle interplay between theory, concepts, and data” (Silverman, 2013, p. 92), three key questions emerged that will be addressed in Chapters 4, 5, and 6 respectively—Chapter 6, in fact, addresses two linked questions. Now to serve as a guide throughout this work, here is a preview of these questions and a brief summary of their answers/findings per chapter.

Framework for Chapter 4
What is the context that is impacting the NIC and UMC Safe Haven leadership?

In direct response to leadership scholars’ urging for closer examination of contextual factors (Osborn, Uhl-Bien, & Milosevic, 2014), Chapter 4 contemplates present-day contextual conditions for the NIC and UMC Safe Havens. These contexts are presented to the fullest relevant extent (Yin, 2014) including evidence of Chicago’s extreme context (Hannah, Uhl-Bien, Avolio, & Cavarretta, 2009). Challenges, opportunities, and sentiments are presented from NIC case study participants’ “firsthand knowledge” (Rubin & Rubin, 2012, p. 60) as expressed in their interviews. Chapter 4 concludes by presenting UMC Safe Haven pastors’/directors’ awareness of 10 micro-to-macro contexts of concern as inferred from a collection of 33 of their inspiring stories of Safe Haven leadership and efficacy (Hannah, Avolio, Luthans, & Harms, 2008).
Framework for Chapter 5
What are NIC and UMC Safe Haven leaders doing to adapt to their context?

Reliant upon NIC case study interviews and data analysis, Chapter 5 reveals the provocative “tipping points” that launched the NIC’s Chicago Urban Strategy in 2013 and Chicago Public Schools’ (CPS) Safe Haven program earlier in 2009 when an intolerable magnitude in the status quo came to fruition. Then, Chapter 5 elaborates the down-to-earth story of partnering with CPS to launch and establish five well-functioning UMC Safe Havens in Chicago’s under-resourced neighborhoods. Using a metaphor of “gears in motion” to exemplify their thoughts and actions, we observe many “vital turns” being made by NIC and UMC Safe Haven leaders to listen, learn, and adapt to their contexts while being visibly committed to their values and vision.

Rooted in phenomenon-driven research that “generat[es] knowledge through an ideas-led and interpretive approach,” therefore, Chapter 5 “places theory in the background in order to capture, document, and conceptualize a phenomenon” (Schwarz & Stensaker, 2016). As a result, Chapter 5 debuts a newfound theory of a well-functioning UMC Safe Haven that is an exemplary outcome of the NIC’s adaptive leadership.
**Framework for Chapter 6**
Two questions are in focus for Chapter 6: **What are the NIC and UMC Safe Haven practices that relate to collective success in the midst of an extreme context?**

**What leadership practices are used to attenuate extreme context?**

The NIC case study answers a call for substantial research pertaining to the impact of organization context on leadership (Porter & McLaughlin, 2006), leadership in extreme context (Hannah, Campbell, & Matthews, 2010), and collective or shared leadership (Cullen-Lester & Yammarino, 2016). Respectively, we see these emphases in Chapter 4’s enriched details of NIC context and Chapter 5’s well-functioning UMC Safe Havens. Building on those chapters’ results in concert with evidence from across the case study’s findings, Chapter 6 culminates in a synopsis of the NIC’s practices that relate to collective leadership success. Quite literally, these practices serve as antidotes and attenuators to conditions of extreme context, i.e., attenuate = to weaken, shrink, diminish, or undo.

Chapter 6 opens with vivid success stories of UMC Safe Havens as a “holding environment” for the “developmental steps, problems, crises, and stresses of growing up” (Heifetz, 1994, p. 104) and an antidote for the “cradle to prison pipeline” (Edelman, 2007, July). Then, as antidotes for contextual complexity, Chapter 6 continues with 1) evidence of the CUS’s collective leadership structure that is emerging as “individuals with divergent views have full access to leadership and
social influence processes” (Hannah, Lord, & Pearce, 2011, p. 228) and 2) evidence of UMC Safe Haven pastors’/directors’ collective vision of games and play as an antidote to bullying and opportunities lacking in Chicago’s volatile neighborhoods. Finally, the culmination of Chapter 6 is a mega model (Figure 25) of NIC’s adaptive leadership response. Figure 25’s graphic visualization summarizes NIC’s six psychological, social, and organizational resources that embody collective leadership efficacy and thereby attenuate Chicago’s extreme context (Hannah, Avolio, et al., 2008; Hannah et al., 2009).

In summary, these framing questions for Chapters 4, 5, and 6 will serve as a thread throughout this work to guide and locate the reader within this rich and far-reaching case study story.

Here now, Chapter 2 conducts a literature review of adaptive leadership in extreme context and collective leadership efficacy that all serve to enlighten the overarching research questions and framing questions.

Going forward, Chapter 3 presents the details of the research methodology in preparation for Chapters 4–6. Concluding the case study data analysis, Chapter 7 presents two practical propositions and two research questions pertaining to advancing leadership in extreme context. Then, in the final lap, Chapter 8 shares the wealth of the case study findings for purposes of practice and research.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

There is a call for what works that is reverberating across the places and extreme contexts where leadership complexity and stakes are high, and failure is not an option we want to embrace. It is an authentic voice of pragmatism that acknowledges we are not where we need to be. We are oftentimes not being the leaders we are capable of being. We need a means for success amid the complexity and all that is not working.

Into these complex contexts and in response to this call for what works enter the theoretical frameworks of adaptive leadership in extreme context and collective leadership efficacy. Within these practical frameworks, there are hopeful signs for how leadership can be successful even in complex and turbulent contexts. And as this case study will reveal, these hopeful signs are coming to life through UMC leadership in Chicago’s at-risk, under-resourced neighborhoods where “imperiled livability” (Dold, 2013, October 6) is real as “violence has become the terrifying norm” (Davey, 2016, June 4). In fact, it seems as if these theoretical frameworks are conceptual tools that are uniquely suited and well matched to the emergent and amorphous nature of complex adaptive challenge.

This literature review sets the stage for connecting the content of the NIC case study findings with theory and practice. And like conceptual tools in a scholar-practitioner’s toolbox, we will review the literature that is sharpened and ready for use even when our work is experimental in nature—not in the scientific sense of an experiment, but
in the sense of trial-and-error or exploratory work. What are the right tools for such an adaptive challenge? First, we will need some tools for handling the inevitable complexity that comes with working in Chicago’s extreme context. In fact, we need to understand this real-world context as a primary object of interest. Chapter 4 is dedicated to this purpose.

Next, we recognize a need for adaptive leadership for such challenges. And as we will see in Chapters 5 and 6, we acknowledge that “a paradigm shift has occurred as many scholars now view leadership as a property of the collective, not the individual” (Cullen-Lester & Yammarino, 2016, p. 178). So, what are the tools that help us to visualize this relational view of leadership? Leadership efficacy is one essential tool as it includes leader + follower + collective efficacy—“reciprocally influencing each other’s sense of efficacy” over time (Hannah, Avolio, Walumbwa, & Chan, 2012, p. 680). Efficacy = confidence. In fact, of all the tools on our theoretical tool bench, efficacy is one of the most validated constructs in the behavioral sciences, “yet has been given relatively little attention in leadership theory and research” until recent years (Hannah, Avolio, et al., 2008, p. 688). As a case in point, we now know that transformational leadership positively correlates to follower efficacy and collective efficacy (Kark, Shamir, & Chen, 2003).

**Conceptual Tools for Chapter 4’s Framework**

While there are many tools available on a leader’s tool bench, these are the ones we will pick up and examine for the NIC case study’s literature review. And as we begin,
we will first examine the conceptual tools that are featured in Chapter 4’s focus on present-day contextual conditions for the NIC and UMC Safe Havens.

Recall that Chapter 4 answers the following: **What is the context that is impacting the NIC and UMC Safe Haven leadership?**

**Organizational context**

“Context counts” (Heifetz, Grashow, & Linsky, 2009, p. 209). As a context shifts in terms of societal norms or expected behaviors, *shared models of what constitutes good leadership also shift* and are redefined by the emergent context. Accordingly, our understanding of leadership is enhanced by making a concerted effort to concentrate on the nature of the organizational context as well as the interactions among two or more components of that context (Porter & McLaughlin, 2006).

Thus, *context is one of the primary determinants of leadership*. Context and situations influence leadership at any given moment (Vroom & Jago, 2007). And a contextual theory of leadership is one that recognizes that leadership is embedded and “socially constructed in and from a context” (Osborn, Hunt, & Jauch, 2002, p. 798). Actually, the line between context and leadership can get downright fuzzy because “a change in the context changes leaders, leadership, and leadership effectiveness” (Eberly, Johnson, Hernandez, & Avolio, 2013, p. 436). So it is that “context is co-defined with leadership” (Osborn et al., 2014, p. 592). Regarding technology’s relentless churn, as a case in point, we might ask ourselves. Are we leading the impact of technology’s
ever-changing context? Or is it leading us? In many respects, technology seems to march on, and we follow (Kellerman, 2015).

Not surprising, therefore, there is a chorus of leadership scholars who urge us to conduct a closer examination of contextual factors “to develop more robust models and leadership understanding” (Avolio, 2007; Osborn et al., 2002, p. 797; Osborn et al., 2014; Shamir & Howell, 1999). This is the rationale for Chapter 4’s concentration on NIC and UMC Safe Haven contexts.

**Extreme context**

Further, “leadership in extreme contexts may be one of the least researched areas in the leadership field” (Hannah et al., 2009, p. 897). Yet, perhaps, this is where leadership is most needed. So the NIC case study is taking place in this under-researched area of extreme context “where risks of severe physical, psychological or material consequences (e.g., physical harm, devastation or destruction) to organizational members or their constituents exist” (Hannah et al., 2009, p. 897).

By definition, in fact, there are five dimensions of extreme context: 1) *location in time*, e.g., extreme conditions can change minute to minute; 2) *proximity factors*, e.g., physical or psychological closeness to danger; 3) *form of threat*, e.g., gun violence, fire, etc. resulting in personal injury, death, or post-traumatic stress; and 4) *magnitude* or 5) *probability of consequences*, e.g., certainty of risk or enormity of outcomes (Hannah & Parry, 2014). More specific characteristics and evidence of NIC’s extreme context are presented in Chapter 4 on page 100.
Herein, the NIC is a faith-based organization engaged in civic leadership and partnership with Chicago Public Schools (CPS) Safe Haven program, Chicago Police Department (CPD), Mayor’s Office of Chicago, and local neighborhoods in an effort to keep kids safe from violence on the streets (Babwin, 2016, July 20). Unlike other organizations that normally operate in extreme context such as 1) “trauma,” e.g., E.R. or ambulance; 2) “critical action,” e.g., combat units; or 3) “high reliability,” e.g., normal police or fire; the NIC is 4) a “naïve” organization, a “normal” organization that is “thrust into extreme contexts by chance,” often “suffer[ing] from a lack of training and resources to respond to such events, thus intensifying extremeness” (Hannah et al., 2009, pp. 900-901). So it has been for the NIC. And given disturbing events of school shootings, etc. in recent years, “the number of naïve organizations that may be thrust into an extreme context is growing” (Hannah et al., 2009, p. 901).

That said, the nature of Chicago’s extreme context stubbornly persists for its community dwellers. Thus, through the Chicago Urban Strategy, the NIC hopes to move away from its classification as a naïve organization operating in extreme context, perhaps, to a new, faith-based adaptation of a “critical action” organization, yet to be presented and discussed in Chapter 8.

**Call for leadership research in extreme context**

Indeed, the NIC case study answers a “call to arms” for leadership research in uniquely-contextualized dangerous or extreme contexts “where volatility and
complexity dynamics create tension, instability, uncertainty, and unpredictability and make it difficult if not impossible for individual leaders to control the situation by themselves” (Hannah et al., 2010, p. S159). These volatile conditions are common characteristics of extreme contexts.

So, the findings of the NIC case study coincide with a call for leadership research in extreme context that is focused on critical areas such as group processes, group complexity, and organizational structure, systems, and adaptability (Hannah et al., 2010). Specifically, while prior research may focus on military, fire, or law enforcement leadership in dangerous context, this case study contributes a study of adaptive leadership practice by a “normal” organization operating in Chicago’s extreme context.

And while there are distinct differences in these realms of extreme leadership, prior research points to commonalities such as validation of courage (Goud, 2005), efficacy (Bandura, 1977; Hannah, Avolio, et al., 2008), and resilience (Masten & Reed, 2002) as relevant psychological resources for leadership in dangerous contexts. Further, because “no one person will have a complete grasp of ongoing [extreme] situations and actions” (Hannah et al., 2010, p. S174), group processes are paramount and most effective when “aligned with environmentally driven task demands” (Kozlowski & Ilgen, 2006, p. 78). Thereby, this sampling of prior research highlights key constructs
that are common across extreme leadership. This also sets the stage for our up-close look next at adaptive leadership.

**Call for adaptive leadership**

As we begin, we can place the NIC case study in the context of other research that has gone before it. In some respects, we join a chorus of others who are calling for adaptive leadership across the UMC including the UMC Council of Bishops (Cape, 2015, March 11; Degnan, 2015, November 3; Hahn, 2013, January 28; Huie, n.d.) and an *Adaptive Leadership Series* of five books by Abingdon Press, UMC’s Publishing House. However, only one book in the series by Virginia Bassford includes any references to adaptive leadership as a leadership construct (Bassford, 2012). Others in the series are quiet on the topic (G. G. Hunter, 2011; Rasmus & Escobedo-Frank, 2012; Rendle, 2011; Weems, 2011). Noteworthy, Ron Heifetz and Marty Linsky (2011) of Harvard’s Kennedy School have in recent years consulted with the UMC Council of Bishops in an effort to guide the denominational leaders to view their work as a complex adaptive challenge that calls for adaptive leadership. Duke Divinity School, a UMC seminary, has also welcomed Ron Heifetz to speak to the Convocation and Pastors School (Heifetz, 2008, December 28).

As Peter Northouse (2016) pointed out, other faith-based organizations and mainline denominations also call for adaptive leadership including, for instance, the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) (Valentine & Kirkpatrick, 2009) and a collaboration of Reformed Church in America (RCA), Christian Reformed Church in North America
Despite this call for adaptive leadership across the UMC and other denominations, however, there is minimal research available for review in this area of study—not surprising, perhaps, as “the theoretical underpinnings of adaptive leadership remain in the formative stages” (Northouse, 2016, p. 257). Yet, interest in adaptive leadership is increasing (Yukl & Mahsud, 2010). For instance, Northouse dedicated a chapter to adaptive leadership in his most recent edition of Leadership: Theory and Practice (2016). According to Northouse (2016), in fact, the context for most research in adaptive leadership is in health care with respect to improving the practice of medicine by “view[ing] patients as complex adaptive systems” (p. 278), e.g., “behaviors that providers used while interacting with family members facing the challenges of recognizing that their loved one was dying” (J. A. Adams, Bailey, Anderson, & Galanos, 2013; J. A. Adams, Bailey, Anderson, & Thygeson, 2013, p. 329).

Two recent dissertations are noteworthy. Bryan Sims (2009) of Regent University conducted a case study of the UMC’s Northwest Texas Conference entitled Complexity, Adaptive Leadership, Phase Transitions, and New Emergent Order. And Linda Schubring (2013) of Fuller Theological Seminary also completed a case study entitled A Study in Adaptive Leadership: How Christian Associates’ Teams and
Individuals in Europe Navigate Change. Accordingly, both studies illuminate emergent processes.

**Adaptive leadership**
What is adaptive leadership? For purposes of the NIC’s case study, various distinguished leadership scholars offer important perspectives on adaptive leadership (DeRue, 2011; Hannah, Eggers, & Jennings, 2008; Hannah et al., 2009; Heifetz et al., 2009; Heifetz & Laurie, 1997; Heifetz & Linsky, 2002; Northouse, 2016; Uhl-Bien, Marion, & McKelvey, 2007). And to be clear, this literature review leans toward helping us to appreciate how adaptive leadership is multilevel, contextual, emergent, and collective.

According to Northouse (2016), Heifetz’s *Leadership Without Easy Answers* (1994) is the first seminal work on adaptive leadership. More follower-centered than leader-centered, “adaptive leadership is the practice of mobilizing people to tackle tough challenges” (Heifetz et al., 2009, p. 14) across “multiple levels, including self, organizational, community, and societal” (Northouse, 2016, p. 257). Anyone can exhibit leadership irrespective of position. In fact, “the term follower is not used [throughout writings by Heifetz and his co-authors] because it implies a submissive role in relationship to the leader” (Northouse, 2016, p. 273).

Strengthening these theoretical underpinnings, Uhl-Bien, Marion, and McKelvey conceptualized adaptive leadership as an element of Complexity Leadership Theory.
Better suited for 21st-century organizations driven by globalization and technological revolution, adaptive leadership is framed not as residing in a person or a specific act, but as a “complex interactive dynamic from which adaptive outcomes (e.g., learning, innovation, and adaptability) emerge” (Uhl-Bien et al., 2007, p. 298). Therefore, adaptive leadership is not used to tackle some predetermined goal. Rather, it is an “emergent, interactive dynamic” and process that is productive of adaptive outcomes—“in which groups need to learn their way out of problems that could not have been predicted [emphasis added]” (Uhl-Bien et al., 2007, p. 300).

Joining this 21st-century change in leadership perspectives, DeRue and Ashford (2010) exposed leadership as an adaptive process by magnifying its “social complexities and emergent properties” (as cited in DeRue, 2011, p. 145). Adaptive Leadership Theory frames leadership as a socially complex and adaptive process in which leader and follower identities are negotiated and renegotiated over time:

In this leadership identity construction process, individuals claim leader and/or follower identities for themselves and grant leader and/or follower identities to others. People can claim a leader identity through acts such as referring to oneself as a leader or displaying particular identity cues (e.g., looking the part; Swann, 1990), or grant a leader identity to others by deferring to them in a meeting. Likewise, people can claim a follower identity via acts such as not speaking up unless called upon, or grant a follower identity to others by not including them in an important decision. To the extent that claiming acts are reciprocated by granting acts, subsequent claiming acts are prompted and the construction of leader and follower identities ensues....

Yet, the claiming and granting of leader and follower identities shifts among group members over time, such that one actor who claims a leader identity at one point in time will subsequently grant a leader
identity to another actor and claim a follower identity for him or herself. This dynamic and shifting pattern of identity construction can occur in micro-moments of interaction, or over longer periods of time. In either case, the result is leader and follower identities being negotiated and re-negotiated over time, and individuals shifting in and out of both leader and follower identities (although not concurrently). (DeRue, 2011, pp. 136-137)

So, DeRue’s (2011) painstaking effort to describe Adaptive Leadership Theory here gives us a common language for describing a social, dynamic, and processual perspective of adaptive leadership—“one that moves beyond hierarchical, individualistic, one-directional, and de-contextualized notions of leadership” (p. 145).

Finally, Hannah, Eggers, and Jennings (2008) have offered a multilevel framework of Complex Adaptive Leadership. At the macro level, complex adaptive leadership is a “collective social process and an emergent phenomenon resulting from complex interactive network dynamics [emphasis added]” (p. 81). Here is the proof of it. When emergent, complex behaviors of a collective of individuals, groups, etc. “produce new knowledge, learning, creative ideas, and, ultimately, adaptive outcomes” (Hannah, Eggers, et al., 2008, p. 81), these emergent behaviors constitute adaptive leadership. Further, it is the network dynamics and network-centric mindset of adaptive leadership that we are able to more clearly see and appreciate through this work by Hannah, Eggers, and Jennings (2008), all presented from the perspectives of macro, meso, and micro levels of analysis, as illustrated in Figure 2. This multilevel, micro-
to-macro perspective is key for our understanding of adaptive leadership. In fact, the NIC case study is a *meso level analysis* with some attention to connections between micro and macro levels.

**Complex adaptive challenge**

Barely begun, we have already mentioned “complex” or “complexity” 24 times. It is here to stay. And Heifetz, Grashow, and Linsky (2009) have declared, “You need to understand that complexity” (p. 92). By increasing our cognitive complexity, the good news for leadership effectiveness is that a heightened level of self-complexity offers us a wider “behavioral repertoire” to 1) draw upon in diverse situations, 2) maintain high-quality relationships across diverse social networks, and 3) make progress on tough issues (Hannah, Eggers, et al., 2008, p. 111; Heifetz et al., 2009).

Ranging from a micro-to-macro perspective, as we will appreciate more closely in Chapter 6’s focus on collective success, we need to *increase our cognitive complexity in order to effectively adapt* to the demands of a complex environment. In fact, steering away from *too much or too little* may be the best way to reach a most
productive level of complexity. This is known as *requisite complexity*, meaning that “a system must possess complexity equal to that of its environment in order to function effectively” (Uhl-Bien et al., 2007, p. 301). So, in a sense, it takes complexity to defeat complexity.

Closely related, “the most common cause of failure in leadership is produced by treating adaptive challenges as if they were technical problems” (Heifetz et al., 2009, p. 19)—as if we can solve them with what we already know. Technical fixes do not solve complex adaptive challenges. Instead, as we will see in this NIC case study, making progress with adaptive challenges requires *experiments, new discoveries*, and *new learning* from numerous places across the organization or community. “Not easy to tackle and often resisted, adaptive challenges are difficult because they usually require changes in people’s assumptions, perceptions, beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors” (Northouse, 2016, p. 262). This is akin to Edgar Schein’s (2010) assertion that underlying beliefs and core values are deeply held in organizations and require years to evolve and change. Ron Heifetz has concurred: “Adaptive problems don’t get solved fast. It takes time to run experiments” (R. Heifetz, personal communication, November 4, 2016).

In complex contexts, in fact, according to Complexity Theory, interdependent factors inevitably give way to unexpected dynamics, and what might appear to be isolated events can interact to create unpredictable outcomes over time (Kellerman, 2015;
Marion & Uhl-Bien, 2001; Uhl-Bien et al., 2007). Thus, complexity can compound within and among organizational contexts. So we will discover in Chapter 4’s results/findings.

**Conceptual Tools for Chapter 5’s Framework**

Recall that Chapter 5 answers the following: What are NIC and UMC Safe Haven leaders doing to adapt to their context?

For our purposes in literature review, it is the absence of reliance on the existing literature that is counterintuitive for Chapter 5’s conceptual framework. Employing a phenomenon-driven research approach, Chapter 5’s scholarly goal is to “put the phenomenon at the forefront” as a means for “building knowledge and developing ideas rather than a narrow focus on theory or data” (Schwarz & Stensaker, 2016, pp. 1, 3). The implication is that “useful, desirable, or positive aspects already exist in the current condition of people, situations, or things, but sometimes they must be revealed, unlocked, or realized” (Thatchenkery & Metzker, 2006, p. 7). Largely under-represented in organizational change research, in fact, phenomenon-driven research values “multiple knowledge-building pathways to place and extend the central idea” and “drive the conversation further” (Schwarz & Stensaker, 2016, pp. 12, 15).

As much as it is possible, therefore, we seek to free ourselves in Chapter 5 from a “theoretical straightjacket” of theory-driven research or “a narrow understanding of
what constitutes a contribution” (Schwarz & Stensaker, 2014, p. 478) in favor of “allowing for the emergence of new phenomena” (Schwarz & Stensaker, 2016, p. 2). We make room in Chapter 5 to see new phenomena and appreciate change in the making because, as William Pasmore (2014) has asserted, “We won’t get to find our way to the future by remaining entrapped in the theoretical straightjackets we have created for ourselves” (p. 370). Richly nuanced in its real-world context, thereby, Chapter 5 opens our eyes to appreciate the well-functioning UMC Safe Haven phenomenon that is rising out of NIC’s culture of experimentation and the Chicago Urban Strategy.

And since there is no prior research on CPS’s Safe Haven program, the NIC’s case study is a unique contribution of a well-functioning UMC Safe Haven exemplar. “Good exemplars are challenging to find” (Schwarz & Stensaker, 2014, p. 489) according to phenomenon-driven research scholars. And especially valuable are exemplars that illustrate “change as a series of multiple events (‘multiple changes’)” (Schwarz & Stensaker, 2014, p. 493) as we will observe in Chapter 5’s “vital turns” being made by NIC and UMC Safe Haven leaders in order to listen, learn, and adapt to their contexts.

**Conceptual Tools for Chapter 6’s Framework**

Recall that Chapter 6 answers two questions: What are the NIC and UMC Safe Haven practices that relate to collective success in the midst of an extreme context? What leadership practices are used to attenuate extreme context?
A paradigm shift to collective leadership

Leadership is changing. Gaining ground in academia and practice, “the traditional image of leader as hero, savior, or white knight is slowly being replaced with a new image; that of a collective group of people exerting influence and taking action” (Chrobot-Mason, Gerbasi, & Cullen-Lester, 2016, p. 298). Indeed, The Leadership Quarterly dedicated April 2016’s special edition to Collective and Network Approaches to Leadership. And to help us understand this shift in mindset, Table 1 is a concise tool for comparison of a traditional, leader-centric perspective versus a collective perspective of leadership. This sets the stage for our up-close look at NIC’s collective success in Chapter 6.
Table 1. Comparison of Leader-Centric vs. Collective Perspectives of Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Leader-Centric Perspective of Leadership</th>
<th>Collective Perspective of Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>History of leadership theory and research in management journals</strong></td>
<td>Hierarchical, leader-centric theory is dominant in 84% of leadership research (between 2003 and 2008) (DeRue, 2011, p. 127).</td>
<td>A theoretical shift is occurring toward a more social, dynamic, and processual perspective on leadership with a need for leadership at all levels of an organization (Uhl-Bien, 2006).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Historical context of business, work, and society</strong></td>
<td>Large, bureaucratic organizations typify the norm.</td>
<td>Contemporary organizations are “more interdependent, dynamic, and decentralized” (DeRue, 2011, p. 132).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Origin of Leadership</strong></td>
<td>Leadership is born in humans “fixed with certain endowments such as traits” (Avolio, 2011, p. 75).</td>
<td>Leaders and followers are born and made. “Leadership is on average 30% heritable [born] and 70% developed or experientially based [made]” (Hernandez, Eberly, Avolio, &amp; Johnson, 2011, p. 1182).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stability in leadership identity</strong></td>
<td>Once internalized, leader identity “becomes a static and enduring feature of the person” across diverse situations and time (DeRue &amp; Ashford, 2010, p. 628).</td>
<td>Leader and follower identities dynamically shift and evolve among group members through a social construction process of “individual internalization, relational recognition, and collective endorsement” (DeRue &amp; Ashford, 2010, p. 629).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimensions</td>
<td>Leader-Centric Perspective of Leadership</td>
<td>Collective Perspective of Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assumptions of influence direction(s)</strong></td>
<td>Leaders exhibit one-directional, top down influence.</td>
<td>“Leading can take on multiple directions, moving down, up, or across formal hierarchies” (DeRue, 2011, p. 128) and is “independent of any formal role or structure” (DeRue &amp; Ashford, 2010, p. 627).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perception of followers</strong></td>
<td>Leaders act, and followers react (Avolio, 2007).</td>
<td>Leaders are followers, and every follower is a leader (at least potentially) (Bennis, 2007).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction of leadership</strong></td>
<td>Leadership is something “one actor ...does to the rest of the group” (DeRue, 2011, p. 129). The “unit of analysis is the individual” (Uhl-Bien, 2006, p. 665).</td>
<td>Multiple actors relationally co-construct the process of leadership through “granting” and “claiming” acts of leading and following that evolve over time (DeRue &amp; Ashford, 2010).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agency of leadership</strong></td>
<td>Leadership is “a mechanism of control designed to react to and/or reduce environmental variability” and dysfunctional disruptions (DeRue, 2011, p. 138).</td>
<td>Leadership is “the process by which social systems change ...through socially constructed roles and relationships” (Uhl-Bien, 2006, p. 668). Disruptions are contexts that may not be dysfunctional (DeRue, 2011).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collective goal attainment</strong></td>
<td>A primary leadership role is for a hierarchically-superior actor(s) to impose and ensure that group members adopt and carry out a shared vision or goal (DeRue, 2011).</td>
<td>Viewing leadership as a leading-following process results in collective meaning-making and action that obviates the imposition of a shared goal or purpose (DeRue, 2011).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimensions</td>
<td>Leader-Centric Perspective of Leadership</td>
<td>Collective Perspective of Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution of outcomes</td>
<td>The tendency is to attribute and “identify the leader as the main cause of collective performance” (Hackman &amp; Wageman, 2007, p. 43).</td>
<td>“Attributions of blame and achievement are unwarranted given the complex, interdependent set of variables operating in nearly every leadership context” (S. T. Hunter, Tate, Dzeweczynski, &amp; Bedell-Avers, 2011, p. 243).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontology (the nature of reality)</td>
<td><strong>Realist</strong> assumes an objective reality that “views individuals in relationships as separate, independent bounded entities” (Uhl-Bien, 2006, p. 665).</td>
<td><strong>Relational</strong> assumes a social reality, viewing “all knowledge of self and of other people and things...as interdependent or codependent constructions existing and known only in relation” (Uhl-Bien, 2006, p. 665).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These comparisons give us a glimpse of the shift from individual to collective leadership constructs—the new direction where definitions of leadership are going.

All that said, of course, “formal leadership roles and structure continue to play an important role in modern organizations despite many organizations becoming flatter, team-based, and more reliant on dynamic, informal leadership emergence” (Cullen-Lester & Yammarino, 2016, p. 176).

**Leadership efficacy**
We have one more tool to examine in this toolbox of theoretical frameworks. It is *leader efficacy*. Ubiquitous in psychology and related fields, twentieth-century
American psychologist, Albert Bandura, championed self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977; Maddux, 2002). Since Bandura’s seminal work, efficacy’s construct has been extensively validated in the behavioral sciences. And in the last decade, the construct of efficacy has been further strengthened to encompass leadership theory and research through Dr. Sean Hannah’s in-depth concentration on leadership efficacy (Hannah, 2006; Hannah, Avolio, et al., 2008). Later in Chapter 6, in fact, we will look closely at collective leadership efficacy as it pertains to the NIC’s case study. Now, in Table 2 is an essential overview of efficacy’s construct ranging from the micro to macro level.

As you study Table 2, observe the difference in leader efficacy and leadership efficacy. Faced with a complex adaptive challenge, we might liken leadership efficacy to a force of confidence within each of us and yet shared among us as a mutual belief in our collective potential that becomes a predictor of our collective performance. According to Bandura and Locke (2003), there is no more essential tool for “enhanced motivation and performance attainment” (p. 87). Efficacy beliefs “affect whether individuals think in self-enhancing or self-debilitating ways, how well they motivate themselves and persevere in the face of difficulties, the quality of their emotional well-being and their vulnerability to stress and depression, and the choices they make at important decisional points” (p. 87). For this reason, we include efficacy in this case study’s theoretical toolbox. Two particular star bullets (★) in Table 2
highlight characteristics of Leadership Efficacy that may be particularly tuned to the NIC’s CUS and Safe Haven program.
Table 2. Differentiating Leadership Efficacy from a Micro to Macro Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Efficacy</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Micro Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader (Follower)</td>
<td>• A positive psychological state.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>• Confidence = Efficacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Promotes effective leader (and follower) engagement, flexibility, &amp; adaptability across varying challenges in complex organizational contexts (Hannah, Avolio, et al., 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Can be enhanced through leadership development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meso Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Efficacy</td>
<td>• An emergent and collective process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Leader + Follower + Collective Efficacy = Leadership Efficacy (all in one).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collective efficacy is “gained through successful group interaction, yet stored in the minds of individuals in that group” (Hannah, Avolio, et al., 2008, p. 683).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “A specific form of efficacy associated with the level of confidence in the knowledge, skills, &amp; abilities associated with leading others” (Hannah, Avolio, et al., 2008, p. 669).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>★ “Has been proposed to be critical for leader effectiveness under crisis and extreme situations” (Hannah &amp; Parry, 2014, p. 623).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>★ Recognized as needed for complex adaptive leadership (Hannah, Avolio, et al., 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Macro Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Leadership Efficacy</td>
<td>• Emerges “through diffusion of shared mental models at collective levels” (Hannah, Avolio, et al., 2008, p. 683).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Organizational Efficacy)</td>
<td>• Brought to life &amp; sustained in a supportive organizational climate/culture.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Literature Review

These are the conceptual tools that seem best suited to connect the content of the NIC case study findings with theory and practice. We will observe that the emergent nature of these theoretical constructs is a match with the emergent and experimental nature of the NIC’s Chicago Urban Strategy and Safe Haven program. Therefore, this literature review has cherry-picked key theoretical frameworks that fit with the themes and patterns that arose from the case study’s interviews and field observations.

By nature, in fact, these conceptual frameworks are interrelated as a “web of concepts” that are distinctive of practicing adaptive leadership in extreme context. In other words, effective adaptive leadership is, by nature, 1) multilevel, e.g., micro, meso, and macro levels of organizing; 2) contextual, e.g., always and best understood in context; 3) emergent, e.g., dynamically and nonlinearly evolving among group members; and 4) collective, e.g., a shared leadership of divergent views through formal and informal relationships and social influence processes.

Thus, this is not an exhaustive review of Heifetz and colleagues’ adaptive leadership principles, e.g., “identify your loyalties” (Heifetz et al., 2009, p. 187), “protect voices of leadership from below” (Heifetz & Laurie, 1997, p. 137), or “mobilize the system” (Heifetz et al., 2009, p. 109), to name a few. While these prescriptions are provocative and compelling, as yet, we do not have a body of research that helps us to
move these concepts into practice. “Originally intended as a practical framework for theory building, adaptive leadership is based on ideas and assumptions, but not on established research.... Very little empirical research has been conducted to test the claims of adaptive leadership theory” (Northouse, 2016, p. 276). Therefore, in this NIC case study, we seek to contribute a qualitative study that employs some of the concepts of adaptive leadership and demonstrates how these are put into practice.

What other possible constructs could have been employed? Given the call for change that is inherent in the CUS, we might have chosen to focus on transformational leadership. After all, transformational leadership has been studied for the last 30 years and has risen to dominance in leadership research and practice (Avolio, Sosik, & Berson, 2013). And a distinction of transformational leadership is the focus on a quality of relationship and interaction between leaders and followers. On the other hand, adaptive leadership is focused on the process of involving a whole organization’s skills, knowledge, and abilities in adapting to a context. No doubt adaptive leadership and transformational leadership could work well in tandem within the CUS. In fact, leadership scholars assert that we can benefit from “more integrative and multi-theoretical frameworks” of leadership (Hannah, Sumanth, Lester, & Cavarretta, 2014, p. 602). That said, given the adaptive challenge of the NIC’s Chicago Urban Strategy and a dearth of research on adaptive leadership in extreme context, we kept the focus in this case study to the “web of concepts” that embody adaptive leadership.
Now we turn to the case study’s origins in Chapter 3’s Methods.
Chapter 3: Methods

It is only when the community dwellers are asked about their lives and how they have changed—for better or worse—that one begins to understand how the program has functioned. (Gegen, 2015, p. 69)

Commencing the Study

I remember well the moment that this study was born. It was February 2013, as newly-appointed Bishop Sally Dyck and I met in her downtown Chicago office shortly after I was accepted into Benedictine University’s Ph.D. program in Values-Driven Leadership. Bishop Sally readily accepted my offer to channel my research to the UMC’s Northern Illinois Conference and suggested on the spot that we focus on the NIC’s newly-formed Chicago Urban Strategy. Foremost in her mind were some “incredible expectations that I will help Chicago churches in particular,” she declared (S. Dyck, personal communication, February 26, 2013). As this story will later reveal, Bishop Sally heard forthrightly in those days from longtime United Methodist and the Chicago Police Department (CPD) Chief, Eugene Williams and from UMC Pastor Jacques Conway that if inner-city UMC churches ceased to exist, it would occur on her watch because the situation was dire. Thus, the NIC case study began in this context. And as I discovered, Bishop Sally was already committed to making a difference in Chicago. Strategically, she requested a meeting with Chicago Mayor Rahm Emanuel on January 10, 2013, to introduce the UMC, “find a partnership with the city/mayor’s office,” and “identify 4–5 key strategic initiatives that all United
Methodist churches will be able to engage in for the welfare of their communities” (S. Dyck, personal communication, January 10, 2013). Hear her sentiments:

I’m new to Chicago, but my heart breaks for this city; a city that everyone seems to love so much and yet has such an underbelly of need, poverty, corruption, violence, and fear. I feel called to empower the United Methodist Church to make a difference in Chicago so that it may be a place of peace for its children and that its communities may thrive. (S. Dyck, personal communication, February 21, 2013)

Thinking back to those early days, in fact, CPD Chief Williams recalled his conversations with Bishop Dyck:

So we talked and talked about the possibilities. And she shared her love for wanting to do something in the inner city. You know, wanting to, and we were in the throes of a pretty violent time in terms of shootings and killings. And she expressed her desire to want to bring the resources of the Conference [NIC] to bear, to do whatever she could. She wanted to be a, you know, a partner in trying to make things better for inner-city Chicago. And I wasn't completely taken aback but, you know, I go, this is really cool, you know, that she would want to do that. (E. Williams, personal communication, January 22, 2016)

Most important in my mind at this early juncture was my hope and belief that with Benedictine University’s talented bench of scholars alongside us, we could summon a response within the NIC to answer the UMC’s Call to Action, published by the Council of Bishops (2012, September). And I was inspired as I heard from my husband, UMC Pastor Rich Darr, Th.D., that Bishop Sally was calling for the development of a culture of experimentation in her inaugural message to clergy throughout the NIC. Further, this all sounded promising as I was being encouraged as
a Visiting Professor at DeVry/Keller Graduate School of Management (KGSM) to pursue a Ph.D. I have enjoyed teaching *Leadership and Organizational Behavior* and *Managing Organizational Change* at KGSM since 2001. As the researcher for this CUS case study, I am an “attached insider” (Van de Ven, 2007, p. 269) to the NIC as a member of the United Methodist Church of Geneva (UMCG), Illinois, and spouse of UMCG’s Senior Pastor Rich Darr.

And at a deeper level, I know now that offering my Ph.D. studies for use by the NIC was an act of self-concordance rising from my own life story, as Shamir and Eilam (2005) explained in “What’s Your Story?” *A Life-Stories Approach to Authentic Leadership Development*. My father returned home with brokenness from World War II, having stormed the beach at Normandy, France. My parents divorced. My mom gained custody of my siblings and me, and in a process of rebuilding our family, we ended up going to a nearby Baptist church where we were welcomed and affirmed. Who I was, who I am, and who I might become is rooted in those good-enough childhood experiences from my church community. And while I am now a United Methodist, I realize that I lead from a conviction that the church still has a role in society for bringing faith and hope to life.

Thus, my participation in this research is an unfolding of my life story. In a sense, as I connect the dots from then to now, I was a child from a war-torn family that discovered a safe haven in our neighborhood church. And I am affirmed in this stance
as “one should enter the research process motivated by one’s values” (Gergen, 2015, p. 63). Creswell (2009) verified that researchers’ “interpretations cannot be separated from their own backgrounds, history, contexts, and prior understandings” (p. 176).

So that day in February 2013, Bishop Sally Dyck became my organizational sponsor for this independent, unfunded research. And Pastor Robert Biekman, NIC Urban Strategy Coordinator and pastor of Maple Park UMC, later became my co-sponsor in partnership with Bishop Sally. In keeping with Silverman’s (2013) rule of “spell out the (sometimes contingent) factors that made you choose to work with your particular data,” (p. 353) the specific approach to the research occurred in three steps.

**Choosing a Case Study**

When Bishop Sally and I met with Dr. Mike Manning, now my dissertation chairperson, in January 2014, Dr. Manning explained that most research questions and hypotheses arise from a desire to change, to understand, or to evaluate a phenomenon. “I would like to understand,” Bishop Sally clarified. So Dr. Manning suggested that we adopt a case study approach for the NIC research. Hence, the NIC case study provides an in-depth means to study, analyze, and understand the Chicago Urban Strategy as an emerging movement using multiple sources of data collection, such as interviews, observations, documents, and artifacts (Creswell, 2013). Further, a case study embodies a “natural affinity” for qualitative research because of its “empirical focus on the situated and particular” (Langley & Abdallah, 2011, p. 223). Yin’s (2014) classic definition affirms how case study methodology emphasizes a
rich contextual understanding. A case study is “an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon (the ‘case’) in depth and within its real-world context” (Yin, 2014, p. 16).

**Choosing a Research Question and Inductive Approach**

Then, in November 2014, Dr. Jim Ludema, Director of the Center for Values-Driven Leadership, offered this overarching research question: **What is the United Methodist Church doing in its Chicago Urban Strategy that is working?** This is a pragmatic question intended to begin with the phenomenon of the CUS, set aside theory, and look for what is working well. And it fits well with the experimentation spirit of the CUS as Bishop Sally had likened this work to flying an airplane while still building it.

Notwithstanding the research question’s “deductive inference” (Silverman, 2013, p. 146) of *appreciative inquiry* that looks for what works in an organization as a means to discover and build on success (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987), we conducted this NIC case study without *a priori* constructs of interest or criteria applied to the overarching research questions. In qualitative research, “Theory or hypotheses are not established *a priori*” (Creswell, 2009, p. 195).

Consistent with an *inductive approach* to inquiry, therefore, we conducted *post hoc* a “fine grained analysis” (Silverman, 2013, p. 357) of the practices adopted by NIC case study participants as discovered in the “likely linkages between [the] opinions,
activities, and interests” (Silverman, 2013, p. 142) expressed in their rich stories. As guided by Cooperrider, Barrett, and Srivastva (2013), we directed our efforts to “understanding how and under what conditions something was created, the choices considered and not taken, as well as the paths chosen, the conjectures, the possibilities, the accidental and unintended” (p. 187). “The attempt is therefore to understand not one, but multiple realities” (as cited in Creswell, 2009, p. 195).

**Choosing a Focus on CPS’s Safe Haven Program**

Finally, in December 2014, Bishop Dyck and Dr. Manning independently recommended that we sharpen the focus of the case study to spotlight the NIC’s collaboration with Chicago Public Schools (CPS) Safe Haven program. From Bishop Sally’s perspective at that juncture, UMC Safe Haven programs represented real progress on all four CUS priorities, including community safety, education and literacy, food security, and restorative justice. From Dr. Manning’s perspective, the focus on Safe Havens necessarily narrowed the scope of the research as opposed to attempting an unrealistic focus on the entire Chicago Urban Strategy.

The NIC took a bold step and gained CPS approval in 2014 for nine United Methodist churches in Chicago to become Safe Haven sites for keeping at-risk children out of harm’s way during spring break (Biekman, 2014, March 5). Now sustained beyond 2014’s initial experiment, this NIC case study spotlights and tells the up-to-the-minute story of the five United Methodist churches with greatest immersion and “staying power” in CPS’s Safe Haven program including summer and year-round,
after-school participation for K–8th grade children. The five longest-running UMC Safe Havens were selected by Bishop Dyck and Pastor Biekman for the focus of this NIC case study because their participation and contribution is most extensive.

As a recent case in point, Figure 3 shows Maple Park UMC’s Safe Haven children featured on ABC 7’s Eyewitness News when the kids hosted a lemonade stand during spring break 2016. Kaitlyn Douglas, one of the Safe Haven children, told ABC 7’s Leah Hope, “All my life I wanted to make a lemonade stand, and I wanted the ingredients, but I didn't have the ingredients” (Hope, 2016, April 18). So to build skills in financial literacy, the kids worked together to create a “business plan” and earned $80 by selling lemonade for 25¢ per cup.

Cynthia Turner, long-time member and matriarch of Maple Park UMC, has observed a marked difference in the Safe Haven kids who hosted the April 2016 lemonade stand and those same kids when they arrived at the Safe Haven two years prior. Through her unique perspective as a retired CPS Language Arts teacher, she has seen
and pointed out specific growth and learning here in her description of *the same* children then and now.

The kids started out in the Safe Haven [spring/summer 2014] with such negative, negative mindsets, with low self-esteem. These same kids today are still in the program. And they have changed so beautifully into, “I can do things. I am somebody.” It’s a beautiful thing to see them.

They had a lemonade stand recently [spring 2016]. And I came into the church. They were the sales persons. These same kids were so clever and so sweet. It was great....Through this Safe Haven program, they have all kinds of round table, round circle, role play, talking about “What do I want to be? Why am I this way? But I can be this other way.” There are so many opportunities for them to share and open up and release that this has changed these kids. They’ve been molded into another kind of kid. A beautiful little kid. It’s wonderful.

The curriculum is working. Kids are learning to control their behaviors, control themselves, and control their emotions. Kids are learning to work together. They are learning even more to work independently by themselves. And they’re learning their strengths. Because we all have a gift. I think some of those kids have discovered a gift already.

Stated succinctly by CPS’s Office of Faith Based Initiatives, “The Safe Haven program [started in December 2009] provides a reliable, no-cost alternative for students and parents during breaks from school. It seeks to engage students in workshops that focus on positive conflict resolution, anger management, anti-bullying, and anti-violence practices” (Chicago Public Schools [CPS], 2015, December 16). As of June 2015, for example, approximately 120 churches throughout Chicago participated in CPS’s Safe Haven summer program (WGN Web Desk, 2015, June 2). And from the NIC’s perspective, the UMC’s participation in Safe Havens
begins to fulfill the CUS’s purpose as a movement designed to promote community safety, education and literacy, food security, and restorative justice for the children and youth of Chicago.

From the foregoing it is clear that the NIC’s Safe Haven program is a beginning focus in answering the question of what the UMC is doing in its Chicago Urban Strategy that is working. Thus, as a primary purpose of this case study, it is critically important for the NIC to understand what is already working in its Safe Haven programs in order to 1) do a more effective job in serving to protect the safety of Chicago’s children while 2) telling a story of effective strategy that positively impacts the NIC’s (2016, October 25) vision:

Making and supporting vital Christians in vital congregations that engage with their communities and the world for peace, justice, and mercy.

In addition, in a much broader sense, this research can help the NIC to discover key organizing successes in order to light many candles of success throughout its extensive programs. This may also help the NIC and community partners to achieve larger objectives and revitalize efforts in the Chicago region.

**Research Method and Philosophical Assumptions**

The “DNA” of the research question is rooted in a socially-constructed and reflective pragmatism, as summarized in Table 3. The overarching research question is this:

**What is the United Methodist Church doing in its Chicago Urban Strategy that**
is working as defined by case study participants? In fact, if we view this research question as a method for intervention, which it is, our method becomes the lens for interpretation. “Organizations move in the direction of what they study” (Ludema, 2000, p. 274). So, by “deductive inference” (Silverman, 2013, p. 146), a positive question generates an “affirmative cognitive ecology ...to envision new potentials for the future [emphasis added]” (Cooperrider, 1990, p. 16). This aligns with the core purpose of NIC’s Chicago Urban Strategy.

**Philosophical assumptions and interpretive framework**

To approach a social phenomenon pragmatically imports understanding and appreciation into the interpretive framework. For our purposes in interpreting the NIC case study, as Hatch and Cunliffe (2013) assert, understanding and appreciation are from an ontologically and epistemologically different place than explanation or knowing why. “Knowing why something works lends itself to controlling outcomes,” (p. 270), which is not the stated purpose of the NIC case study. Rather, “understanding provides insight and a deeper feeling for the thing, the person, or the process at which understanding is directed” (Hatch & Cunliffe, 2013, p. 270). In other words, “Explanation ...comprehends through causal connections whereas understanding ‘knows’ its object ...from the inside” (Thatchenkery, 2002, p. 116).

Similarly “appreciation is not oriented to the control of outcomes or even to insight; it is oriented to the unfolding of possibility through, as Dewey [(1934)] would have it, artistry, intention, and imagination” (Hatch & Cunliffe, 2013, p. 270). Some might
call this orientation “the appreciative eye” (Gergen, 2015, p. 205). And in sync with the CUS, Dewey’s pragmatism was socially-oriented to the wider reaches of society where “Dewey contends that the success of theories is based on their ability to realize the [community’s] goals of societal improvement and development” (Van de Ven, 2007, p. 57).

That said, the NIC case study is primarily focused on a meso level of analysis, a study of group interactions and behaviors within the NIC. Yet, in order to fully appreciate the NIC’s organizational context, the case study will give some attention to connections between micro and macro levels. Benedictine University’s Visiting Professor Bruce Avolio put it this way: “The most important thing in leadership and other sciences is to know your level of focus/analysis, and that is guided by your model/theory” (B. Avolio, personal communication, September 29, 2014).

Table 3 summarizes the interpretive frameworks and philosophical beliefs inherent in the NIC case study.
Table 3. Interpretive Frameworks Inherent in the NIC Case Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpretive Framework</th>
<th>Ontological Beliefs (the nature of reality)</th>
<th>Epistemological Beliefs (how reality is known)</th>
<th>Axiological Beliefs (role of values)</th>
<th>Methodological Beliefs (approach to inquiry)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Constructionism—Buttressed by Pragmatism</strong></td>
<td>Reality is socially constructed through our lived experiences &amp; interactions with others with an emphasis on what is useful, supportive, &amp; “what works.”</td>
<td>Knowledge is socially constructed in the relationship between the researcher &amp; the researched, shaped by individual &amp; social experiences.</td>
<td>Values are honored, negotiated, &amp; validated among individuals in a community of agreement.</td>
<td>A literary style of writing is used. Use of an inductive method of emergent ideas is obtained through methods such as interviewing, observing, and analysis of texts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“A constructionist orientation lends itself to a <em>reflective pragmatism</em>” (Gergen, 2015, p. 68).</td>
<td>“Research findings can inject life into an idea in a way that helps us appreciate its significance and plausibility” (Gergen, 2015, p. 66).</td>
<td>“The constructionist approaches validity as a reflective pragmatist” (Gergen, 2015, p. 63).</td>
<td>“It is only when the community dwellers are asked about their lives and how they have changed—for better or worse—that one begins to understand how the program has functioned” (Gergen, 2015, p. 69).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Adapted from (Creswell, 2013, p. 36)*
Research Design
A case study research design is appropriate given its “revelatory potential and richness of data” (Langley & Abdallah, 2011, p. 205) especially in light of the CUS’s emergent nature and complexity of contexts including CPS, CPD, the Mayor’s Office of Chicago, UMC, and surrounding under-resourced Chicago neighborhoods. Specifically, one of the strengths of case study research is a capacity to include “experiments” such as the NIC is undertaking in the work of the CUS and “to examine contextual conditions to the fullest extent that might appear relevant” (Yin, 2014, p. 214). So also this NIC case study design fulfills the contemporary call for more attention to the role of organizational context as a prime mover of leadership behavior and outcomes (Porter & McLaughlin, 2006).

In tandem, a qualitative research design is appropriate for the NIC case study as it is an essential means for discovering and giving voice to the participants’ unique and multiple perspectives. The following is Creswell’s (2013) classic definition:

Qualitative research begins with the assumptions and the use of interpretive/theoretical frameworks that inform the study of research problems addressing the meaning individuals or groups ascribe to a social or human problem. To study this problem, qualitative researchers use an emerging qualitative approach to inquiry, the collection of data in a natural setting sensitive to the people and places under study, and data analysis that is both inductive and deductive and establishes patterns or themes. The final written report or presentation includes the voices of participants, and the reflexivity of the researcher, a complex description and interpretation of the problem, and its contribution to the literature or a call for change. (p. 44)
For purposes of this case study, qualitative research opens a door to understanding the meaning that participants ascribe to their lived experiences especially as it pertains to providing Safe Havens for Chicago’s at-risk children. So qualitative inquiry honors a focus on individual meaning within the complexity of the present-day context (Creswell, 2009). One aim of qualitative research is to bring us closer to the phenomenon being studied as if we are actually there (Bansal & Corley, 2011).

**A Summary of Methods Used to Create the Overall Story**

I generally followed Silverman’s (2013) guidance and his layout of steps for conducting qualitative research. Once I completed my first set of interviews with UMC Safe Haven pastors/directors and those interviews were transcribed, I had some time before my next set of interviews to contemplate and categorize the pastors’/directors’ stories into three groups of stories by theme. Specifically, using thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006) and narrative analysis for social context (Murray, 2003), I searched for patterns or themes across all of their stories in relation to the overarching research questions. In so doing, I identified clear definitions of themes and developed and used a formal coding process to collate these stories into three main themes of extreme context, leadership efficacy, and Safe Haven “holding environment” (Heifetz, 1994). These three collections of vivid stories as told by Safe Haven pastors/directors have become central building blocks for the case study story.

After completing my next and last set of interviews with a necessarily wider sample of CUS participants/partners who have complementary but different experiences from
Safe Haven pastors/directors (Rubin & Rubin, 2012), I then chose to go back with “an open mind” through the entire set of interview data that I had collected. In order to give equal attention to each data item and in an effort to “reflect the meanings evident in the data set as a whole” (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 91), I invested enough time to search the entire data set for coherent themes in relation to the overarching research questions. Here is a synopsis of my search for themes across the whole data set:

- Through my reading and re-reading of interview transcripts afforded by this comprehensive review of the data, I observed anew recurrent themes and processes to which Safe Haven pastors/directors attributed meaning and purpose in the launch and well-functioning of their Safe Haven programs. Relying upon phenomenon-driven research (Schwarz & Stensaker, 2016), therefore, I collated and thematically coded these repetitive processes from across their stories as a means to capture, document, and conceptualize the emergence of a well-functioning UMC Safe Haven phenomenon and exemplar.
- As a check for completeness in this comprehensive review, I also spotted and coded some additional Safe Haven pastors’/directors’ stories that fit with the aforementioned themes of leadership efficacy and Safe Haven “holding environment.”
- Finally, through the comprehensive review of the data and my awareness of micro-to-macro dynamics across different levels of the data analysis, I observed some collective behaviors and collective performance by NIC case study participants as told in their interviews. I grouped these unique observations of
collective performance and featured them accordingly as practices that relate to the NIC’s collective success in the midst of an extreme context, in particular, practices of collective leadership efficacy and collective requisite complexity.

In brief, this has been an overview of the methods I adopted to clearly define patterns and themes, to refine their interpretations, and to validate their presence within the NIC case study. All in all, I used these methods to fit themes together in relation to each other and in relation to the overarching research questions and literature that are the theoretical framework for the case study’s analytic narrative and overall story.

Here now is a more detailed summary that highlights the theoretical concepts observed in the actual process of data collection and analysis.

**An “Aerial View” of the Research Approach to Data Analysis**

Table 4 gives an “aerial view” of the research approach and methods, which theoretical concepts emerged, how they are interrelated, and where each one is located in this case study as a means for “convey[ing] a clear connection between data and theory” (Bansal & Corley, 2011, p. 236). Examine Table 4 to see that the study’s data analysis occurred in two phases and on two levels, e.g., focused first on micro/meso and then on to meso/macro concepts. Notice also the key concepts of efficacy, requisite complexity, and adaptive organizing structures that were discovered as critical resources for adaptive leadership in extreme context.
Table 4. A Flow of Theoretical Concepts Observed in Two Phases of the Data Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1 data collection/analysis:</th>
<th>Resources Attenuating Chicago’s Extreme Context through Adaptive Leadership</th>
<th>Phase 2 data collection/analysis:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 2015 – Jan. 2016</td>
<td><strong>Micro/Meso</strong></td>
<td><strong>Meso/Macro</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical concepts observed in Phase 1’s data analysis:</td>
<td><strong>Efficacy</strong></td>
<td><strong>Requisite Complexity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extreme context</strong> in Chicago</td>
<td>10 contexts of concern for UMC SH pastors/directors (Table 13)</td>
<td>A reliable “holding environment” for UMC Safe Haven children/youth (Table 22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leader efficacy</strong> of UMC SH pastors/directors as a <em>ps</em>ych <em>res</em>ource that attenuates extreme context (Table 15)</td>
<td><strong>Individual requisite complexity</strong></td>
<td>A tenet of adaptive leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collective leadership efficacy</strong> of case study participants &amp; CUS partners as social &amp; organizational resources attenuating Chicago’s extreme context (Figure 25)</td>
<td><strong>Positive force of kid’s games and play as an antidote to bullying and other conditions of extreme context (Figure 21)</strong></td>
<td>A well-functioning UMC Safe Haven model (Figure 15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>An effective adaptive leadership response</strong></td>
<td><strong>Collective requisite complexity</strong></td>
<td><strong>Adaptive leadership</strong> as new knowledge &amp; adaptive outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan.–April 2016</td>
<td>UMC Safe Havens share in CUS’s collective identity &amp; urban agenda (Chapter 6, page 249)</td>
<td>UMC Safe Havens share in CUS’s collective identity &amp; urban agenda (Chapter 6, page 249)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical concepts observed in Phase 2’s data analysis:</td>
<td><strong>A social regulatory structure</strong> that coexists with traditional structures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 gives us a quick snapshot of the flow from Phase 1 through Phase 2 that will be described in greater detail here in Chapter 3:

**About Phase 1’s data collection and analysis**

- True to inductive data analysis (Creswell, 2009), the NIC case study was conducted and analyzed from the “ground up” beginning with interviews of UMC Safe Haven pastors/directors closest to the phenomenon.

- Awareness of Chicago’s extreme context arising from Phase 1’s interviews and field observations warrants a pragmatic reflection on adaptive leadership as a core theoretical construct for the NIC case study even as “many organizations [in volatile contexts], such as the U.S. military, are moving toward more adaptive and network structures” (Hannah et al., 2010, p. S175). Ron Heifetz has concurred: “Combat is a constantly-adapting context” (R. Heifetz, personal communication, November 4, 2016). In fact, leadership scholars *fuse* adaptive leadership in *conjunction with* extreme context as “one of the most important areas for future research on extreme events and contexts” (Hannah et al., 2009, p. 908). In kind, I began to immerse myself in this scholarly literature.

- As depicted in Table 4, Phase 1’s data analysis exposed an interrelated “web” of conceptual frameworks *related to adaptive leadership occurring in extreme context*.

- There was a natural pause and time for reflection between Phase 1 and Phase 2 interviews as UMC Safe Haven pastors’/directors’ interviews occurred in
November 2015. And no other participants were willing/able to schedule an interview during December 2015 through January 15, 2016.

**About Phase 2’s data collection and analysis**

- Phase 2’s interviews necessarily included NIC leaders and civic partners who were closest to the CUS phenomenon, its origin, its emergence up to now, and its association with CPS’s Safe Haven program.

- Arising from Phase 2’s interviews, an awareness of the evolution from micro-to-macro and/or individual-to-collective concepts warrants a pragmatic reflection on how adaptive leadership may attenuate the multilayered conditions of extreme context, e.g., “attenuat[ing] negative and enhanc[ing] positive emotions in followers may be an important area in researching effective leadership for dangerous contexts” (Hannah et al., 2010, p. S162). Accordingly, *qualitative research methods allow us* to “explore dynamics across different levels of analysis, which is challenging for quantitative analysis” (Bansal & Corley, 2011, p. 235).

- Finally, Phase 2’s data analysis forefronts *collective* conceptual frameworks known to attenuate extreme context through an effective adaptive leadership response.

As mentioned earlier, we will refer to and describe Table 4’s Phases 1 and 2 in more depth going forward here in Chapter 3’s detailed description of methods used to complete the NIC case study.
Phase 1. Data Collection and Analysis

Getting acquainted with UMC Safe Haven sites and criteria for selection

It was a bright summer day in August 2015 when my sponsors, Bishop Sally Dyck and Pastor Robert Biekman, invited me to ride along with them as they pre-planned in one day to visit each of five UMC Safe Haven summer program sites during the hours of operation between 10:00 a.m.–2:00 p.m. So we stopped to visit Elston Avenue UMC, Faith UMC, Generation to Generation (G2G) UMC, Maple Park UMC, and South Shore UMC. These five UMCs obtained recurring approvals from CPS and satisfied all requirements to host a Safe Haven program during designated breaks from school, i.e., winter, spring, summer, and/or after school. In exchange, CPS provided required curriculum, free breakfast and lunch daily for every child/youth, and $200 per day/$1,000 per week to each church in support of staff and program costs.

Bishop Sally and Pastor Robert selected the five UMC Safe Haven sites to be featured in the NIC’s case study and informed me of their decision in August 2015 as we embarked on our one-day tour to the church sites. They reasoned that for research purposes, these five UMCs had achieved sufficient experiences by offering at least one six-week summer Safe Haven program. Pastor Biekman mentioned, “They also demonstrated a kind of passion and seemed to have the infrastructure for the long haul, e.g., strong leadership, etc.” (R. Biekman, personal communication, August 6, 2016). Later in data analysis, Table 17 on page 175 offers an overview timeline of Safe Haven participation from 2014 to 2016 as gleaned from their interviews.
From Pastor Biekman’s perspective, the five featured UMCs also represent a variety of Chicago communities with Elston Avenue UMC on the north side; Faith UMC on the south side bordering the Englewood neighborhood; G2G UMC on the southeast side in the Hegewisch community; Maple Park UMC on the far south side in the West Pullman neighborhood; and South Shore UMC on the south side near Lake Michigan’s shoreline. Figure 12 on page 99 provides a thumbnail map featuring the NIC’s geographic region with all five UMCs located on it.

Worth mentioning, five other UMCs hosted a spring break Safe Haven at least once prior to summer 2015. As it turned out, however, these UMCs did not subsequently match CPS requirements for transitioning on to host a summer Safe Haven.

Specifically, according to Pastor Biekman, CPS’s general criteria for approval hinges on such factors as 1) being in a critical location, e.g., where there are no other CPS summer activities and no other Safe Haven programs; 2) 25 kids-per-day minimum Safe Haven attendance; and 3) the church’s ability and capacity to operate a summer program, i.e., a 6-week summer Safe Haven is a much more significant commitment than hosting a Safe Haven at spring break. Furthermore, at the time of this writing, CPS is reducing the number of approved Safe Haven sites due to overall budget constraints.
In any case, our August 2015 visits to the five UMC Safe Haven program sites were enjoyable as everyone seemed to be expecting Bishop Sally’s and Pastor Robert’s arrival and especially as the Safe Haven children were present and playing games outside or keeping cool inside with activities in air-conditioned classrooms or gathering spaces. And even as the five-in-one-day schedule kept us mobile, we had time for hellos with each church’s pastor/director, teachers, volunteers, and some of the children as they presented their summer projects, art work, and favorite songs.

**Co-creating UMC Safe Haven participant interview questions**

Our August 2015 one-day tour was an important getting-acquainted day for me as my next visit to these church sites would be in November 2015 for interviews with each Safe Haven pastor/director. In fact, as we pulled away from our last church stop and with the essence of the day’s experience fresh in our minds, I asked Bishop Sally and Pastor Robert what interview questions they would like for me to ask Safe Haven directors in order to answer the overarching research question of what is working in the NIC’s Chicago Urban Strategy. With pen in hand as we rode along the expressway, I recorded verbatim Bishop Sally’s and Pastor Robert’s recommended questions. From there, I typed them up, verified them with Dr. Manning, and that is how Table 5’s list of interview questions was created. As it turned out, during the actual interviews, all participants accepted these questions without changes or additions.
Table 5. Safe Haven Participant Interview Questions

The main purpose of this interview is to capture your experience and perspectives about what is positive about the Safe Haven program at ___FILL IN HERE___ United Methodist Church. You have a unique perspective that can significantly contribute to the NIC’s case study and to understanding what is already working in order to 1) do a more effective job in serving to protect the safety of Chicago’s children while 2) telling a story of effective ministry that positively impacts the NIC’s mission.

The purpose, format, methods, and questions for this interview were reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of Benedictine University along with Bishop Sally Dyck and Pastor Robert Biekman. Your participation in this interview is entirely voluntary. You may withdraw your participation at any time during the interview. And please feel free to pass on any individual questions.

1. Could you briefly describe your role and responsibilities in your church’s Safe Haven program, i.e., how long have you participated, during spring, summer, or after school?

2. What difference do you think Safe Haven might/did/will make in the lives of the kids? In other words, what's going to be different?

3. What makes this work, i.e., practically and meaningfully?

4. How have others contributed and helped to make this work (getting at community partners who have been integral, i.e., a seminary intern, Mayor Emanuel's One Summer Chicago workers, & other agency volunteers)?

5. What's been the impact on your church?

6. How willing would your church be to risk doing another Safe Haven-type program (getting at increasing a capacity within churches to do more outreach to the community)?

7. How have Safe Haven parents been impacted?

8. What kind of needs did you see/become aware of?

9. What would you have done this summer if you didn't participate in the Safe Haven program? What do you think the kids would've been doing if not at Safe Haven?

10. What's been changed in you?

11. How are you different?

Thank you for your help and contribution to the NIC case study.
Gaining unanimous agreement to publish interviewee’s names, locations, and identifying characteristics

The NIC case study officially commenced with Benedictine University’s Internal Review Board approval in November 2015. And I chose to interview Safe Haven pastors/directors first as a primary focus for understanding what is working in the CUS. Before each scheduled interview with the Safe Haven pastors/directors, I supplied Table 5’s questions along with a letter of informed consent (in Appendix A) for the purpose of their review and preparation ahead of time. Then over a one-month period, we conducted and digitally recorded the interviews on locale at their church facilities where it was easy to find a comfortable meeting place. And for security’s sake, I travelled with my husband, Pastor Rich Darr, to and from the inner-city church sites.

Months later, on March 29, 2016, as I shared with Bishop Sally Dyck some highlights of the “what's working” story that emerged from the interviews and research, Bishop Sally suggested that case study interviewees might be willing for their identities to be known. I had not considered the idea, but I agreed with Bishop Sally as I reflected in the moment on transparency as a key characteristic for authentic leadership (Avolio & Gardner, 2005), etc. Further, for our purposes in the NIC case study, “dialogue [e.g., interview] embodies some of the character of qualitative research itself—exhibiting the authors’ voice, illustrating context, and demonstrating transparency [emphasis added]” (Bansal & Corley, 2011, p. 233).
So from there, I checked in with Pastor Robert Biekman to request his agreement with asking each case study participant for permission to reveal her/his name, location, and identifying characteristics. And I consulted with Dr. Mike Manning on research protocol. He advised that obtaining written permission to use individual names would satisfy the informed consent requirement. He also advised that all participants should have the opportunity to review the dissertation prior to its publication (M. Manning, personal communication, April 20, 2016). Thus, as seen in the e-mail below, I implemented Bishop Sally’s recommended stipulations for gaining unanimous consent from all NIC case study interviewees. And as of May 4, 2016, we received a unanimous “Yes” response. So now, throughout this case study’s data analysis, findings, and implications, the names, locations, and identifying characteristics of case study participants are revealed. That said, names of non-participants, such as Safe Haven children and parents, do not appear in these writings (except as reported by ABC 7 Eyewitness News earlier in this chapter).

From: Donna Darr
To: ______All NIC Case Study Participants_____
Sent: April 20, 2016
Subject: Requesting Your Response of Yes or No

Dear Participants of the Northern Illinois Conference Case Study:

This is Donna Darr. I am sending this e-mail in conjunction with our NIC case study sponsors, Bishop Sally Dyck and Pastor Robert Biekman.
Question regarding your informed consent: Would you be willing for your name, location, and identifying characteristics to be revealed in the write-up of the NIC case study dissertation? Please feel free to reply to this e-mail by saying YES or NO.

You will recall that you have already consented to excerpts from the interview to be included in the final dissertation report. However, the informed consent form you signed expressly stated that your name or identifying characteristics would not appear in these writings.

Rationale for this follow-up question regarding your informed consent: Given that a “what's working” story has arisen from our interviews and site visits regarding the NIC's Chicago Urban Strategy and Safe Haven program participation, Bishop Sally, Pastor Robert, and I feel that there would be a benefit to letting readers know who you are as participants and how you have experienced success in your ministry and work together.

Unanimous agreement required: Bishop Sally recommends that we reach a unanimous decision. So, unless everyone says YES, we will leave it as.

Opportunity to review for accuracy: If you unanimously agree to reveal your names, you would have an opportunity to review the dissertation (during a pre-established time period) to confirm that the content is correct as it pertains to you.

Sincerely,
Donna

Introducing Phase 1’s interview participants
Generally speaking, the 14 case study interviewees are primary “eyewitnesses” and “first on the scene” participants in the emergence of the NIC’s Chicago Urban Strategy and Safe Haven “experiment.” They were “there” when the Urban Strategy went from being an idea to being actionable. By faith and by trial and error, they have “first-hand knowledge” of the sights, sounds, and “moments of elation and
disappointment” (Rubin & Rubin, 2012, p. 60) in this emergent and multifaceted story. Thus, their views, opinions, and reflections are authoritative because they were “on the scene” as the CUS and UMC partnership with CPS’s Safe Haven program came to be. To reassure credibility of results, the 14 NIC case study interviewees represent “complementary experiences” as well as “different points of view” (Rubin & Rubin, 2012, p. 60) as it pertains to the NIC’s Chicago Urban Strategy and Safe Haven program.

Beginning with Phase 1, therefore, Table 6 summarizes seven UMC Safe Haven pastors/directors, their interview locations, and the length of the interviews. They were closest to the phenomenon from “day one” when the first Safe Haven kids walked through the church door. At this emergent and experimental stage, these are the leaders who were sufficiently experienced to answer Table 5’s interview questions.

Later in Chapter 3, Phase 2 interviewees are presented in Table 8 on page 78.
Table 6. List of Phase 1’s Interview Participants (14 Total Participants)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title/Function</th>
<th>Participant Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Interview Method</th>
<th>Length of Interview</th>
<th>Length of Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UMC Safe Haven (SH) Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastor &amp; SH Director</td>
<td>Adonna Davis Reid</td>
<td>South Shore UMC</td>
<td>On site; In person &amp; Telephone</td>
<td>115 minutes</td>
<td>22 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister &amp; SH Director</td>
<td>Linda Gathing, i.e.,</td>
<td>Faith UMC</td>
<td>On site; In person</td>
<td>73 minutes</td>
<td>37 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Minister G”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastoral Intern &amp; SH Director</td>
<td>Andy Gilg</td>
<td>Elston Avenue UMC</td>
<td>On site; In person &amp; Telephone</td>
<td>87 minutes</td>
<td>16 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastor &amp; SH Director</td>
<td>Hannah Kardon</td>
<td>Elston Avenue UMC</td>
<td>On site; In person</td>
<td>68 minutes</td>
<td>33 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastor &amp; SH Director</td>
<td>Ayla Samson-Zaki</td>
<td>Generation to Generation (G2G) UMC</td>
<td>At Elston Avenue UMC; In person</td>
<td>93 minutes</td>
<td>19 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH Volunteer/Matriarch</td>
<td>Cynthia Turner</td>
<td>Maple Park UMC</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>40 minutes</td>
<td>4 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH Director</td>
<td>Carla Williams</td>
<td>Maple Park UMC</td>
<td>On site; In person</td>
<td>99 minutes</td>
<td>43 pages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sharing observations from Safe Haven interviews and site visits

There was energy in the air at each of the church sites when interviews were conducted with Safe Haven pastors/directors in November 2015. At Elston Avenue UMC, where three interviews occurred sequentially with Pastor Hannah Kardon, Pastoral Intern Andy Gilg, and Pastor Ayla Samson-Zaki (of G2G UMC), we sat down at a big table in a comfortable multi-purpose room with the door opened wide to let in cool air and to offset the heat of a new furnace that was working a bit too well. All the while, jets on a flight path to O’Hare Airport lumbered in over our heads, and as I later discovered, muffled a few of the interviewee’s digital voice recordings, albeit for a moment.

From a distance as we approached South Shore UMC, I noticed a Safe Passage worker standing on the street corner wearing a bright yellow “CPS Community...”
Watch” vest, “one of nearly 2,000 unarmed workers providing safe passage for children going to and from Chicago’s public schools” (CPS, 2015, April 15; Reynolds, 2014, September 5). Yet once inside, I experienced a similar energy at South Shore UMC as I had observed at Elston Avenue UMC. In preparation for my interview with Pastor Adonna Davis Reid, in fact, I was enthusiastic as ahead of time I watched their Safe Haven video stories posted at the church’s web site (South Shore United Methodist Church [SSUMC], 2015, November 3). As she arrived, Pastor Adonna signaled to me before starting the interview that she needed to give greetings in the church office and to a woman’s group meeting in the parlor. Then we met for our interview in a sitting area that is adorned with rich interior wood and opens onto the church’s entrance hall where visitors were buzzing in to announce their arrival. Pastor Adonna and I later completed our interview by phone because we needed more time.

Safe Haven Director Carla Williams and the folks at Maple Park UMC have created a quality children’s space for Safe Haven
and other kid’s programs located in a semi-basement below the original sanctuary with many windows that let in natural light and a view of nearby homes in the neighborhood. We met there for our interview, and I felt surrounded by bright displays of children’s artwork, kid-sized tables and chairs, a story-telling area, a new food-service area, and a banner overhead declaring, “This is a positive thinking area!” Adults seem attracted to this space too as evidenced by various people stopping by to see Carla. I was moved by Director Carla’s expressed passion for children.

Later, by phone, I also interviewed Cynthia Turner, a long-time member and matriarch of Maple Park UMC who volunteers in the Safe Haven program and initially served as Co-Director with Carla Williams.

Finally, as we arrived a bit early for my interview with Minister Linda Gathing (Minister G) at Faith UMC on the day before Thanksgiving and their Feeding the Community Thanksgiving Dinner, we waited as the church door was locked, and the street seemed deserted. Soon after, as Minister G arrived and we began our interview in a conference room situated above the church’s lower-level kitchen, we began to hear the sounds and sense the energy of

Figure 8. Faith UMC
Thanksgiving dinner preparations getting underway. We even paused the interview at one point to savor the aroma of something beginning to bake in the oven. And as I left the interview, I felt moved and inspired by Minister G’s commitment to the children. I felt excited too about the Thanksgiving feast that I sensed was in store for the surrounding community. Yet I must admit that I also felt a trace of fear as I stepped outside and again sensed an uneasy inactivity on the streets outside of the church that pre-Thanksgiving day.

**Identifying key theoretical themes from Phase 1’s data analysis**

With a natural pause in my interview schedule between Phase 1 and Phase 2 (summarized in Table 4), I had time to reflect on UMC Safe Haven pastors’/directors’ stories as shared in their interviews. Their immersion in conditions of Chicago’s extreme context is unmistakable. And I was primed by Visiting Professor Bruce Avolio to pay attention to “context, and how that facilitates not only how we study leadership, but also how it is practiced and developed” (B. Avolio, personal communication, September 29, 2014).

In fact, Dr. Avolio’s assertions introduced me to *A Framework for Examining Leadership in Extreme Contexts* (Hannah et al., 2009). And as I began the back-and-forth “repetitive interplay between theoretical ideas and empirical evidence” (Van de Ven, 2007, p. 187) in Phase 1’s data analysis, I spotted four major theoretical concepts across UMC Safe Haven pastors’/directors’ stories.
Initially I did my own transcription of interviews, and then I chose to hire a professional transcription service in order to speed transcription time and allow me to concentrate on data analysis. And though I had assumed that I would use the common practice of line-by-line coding to locate themes in the interview transcripts (Charmaz, 2014) and even did so for the first three interviews, I soon began to see the data as more relevant in the form of mini-stories or vignettes. Sometimes “patterns are illustrated through themes, and other times through stories” (Bansal & Corley, 2011, p. 236). Pastoral Intern Andy Gilg confirmed my observation in his interview when he said, “I recognize that I answer with stories.” Other pastors/directors answered with stories too as, of course, stories are “depositories of meaning” (Shamir & Eilam, 2005, p. 403).

So I chose to work with interviewees’ stories/vignettes as the primary unit of analysis in the search for patterns. Van de Ven (2007) has upheld the value of story narratives as indicating “time, place, attributes of the characters, attributes of the context, ...and information that may be essential to the interpretation of the events” (p. 224).

“Compelling narratives will also situate the present condition in the context of the past ...and in doing so propel us into the future” (Gergen, 2009, p. 150). So this NIC case study features many “highly specific but powerfully illustrative vignettes” (Langley & Abdallah, 2011, p. 222) in order to “bring the reader closer to the phenomenon being studied” (Bansal & Corley, 2011, p. 235) than might otherwise be possible. Murray (2003) and Silverman (2013) would classify this method as a
“constructionist approach to narrative analysis” of social context that “treats interview data as accessing various stories or narratives through which people describe their world” (Silverman, 2013, p. 238).

1. Identifying extreme context
Right up front, we can spot five dimensions of extreme context (Hannah et al., 2009) within some explicit sentiments regarding trouble, trauma, or danger that were expressed in 10 stories by Safe Haven pastors/directors during the course of their interviews. This collection of stories is presented in Table 12 on page 108.

2.a. Identifying leader efficacy
Next, one remarkable pattern arose from across UMC Safe Haven pastors’/director’s interviews in spite of their challenges of leadership in extreme context. Specifically, no cynicism or lack of conviction was expressed or exhibited. We had not met before or only briefly, and I was surprised and moved by their courage of conviction. Without exception, pastors/directors one after the other told the story of their experiences without voicing or hinting at a lack of self-motivation or self-doubt. Their sentiments such as “I will not leave these children,” or “I will not stop,” or “Consistency is very important” stayed with me as I pondered their tenacity in tenuous circumstances. Like the force of a magnet within me, I began to pursue and ponder theoretical frameworks to help me understand and appreciate the motivation and confidence I witnessed among these UMC Safe Haven pastors/directors.
Ultimately, I recognized and classified their self-motivation and conviction as an attribute of *leader efficacy* and a potential *attenuator of extreme context* (Hannah et al., 2009). And as a means for “continually cycling between theory and data” (Eisenhardt, 1989, p. 549), I chose to comb through all Safe Haven pastors’/directors’ interview transcripts in order to assign a code to their illustrative stories according to the four domains of leader efficacy explicated by Dr. Sean Hannah in his seminal work (Hannah, 2006; Hannah, Avolio, et al., 2008):

- Leader efficacy for thought/learning (Code = LET/L)
- Leader efficacy for self-motivation (Code = LESM)
- Leader efficacy for means (Code = LEM)
- Leader efficacy for action (Code = LEA)

2.b. Identifying 33 stories of Safe Haven pastors’/directors’ leader efficacy

Specifically, I identified, coded, and accumulated 33 remarkable stories from Safe Haven pastors/directors that stood out to me as outstanding *illustrations of the four domains of leader efficacy* (Hannah, 2006), albeit set in Chicago’s volatile context. For me, each one of these 33 vignettes uniquely captures a moment of leading from a conviction. Expressed in brief, the 33 stories exemplify Safe Haven pastors’/directors’ depth of thought, willingness to learn new skills, intention to make a difference, resourcefulness to find internal and external means, and vision for success. All combined, *these 33 stories have become a central building block for this case study’s analysis*. Just ahead in Chapter 4, therefore, the 33 stories are a featured data collection summarized in Table 14.
3. Identifying individual requisite complexity
Throughout their interviews and in my reflection on their interview transcripts, I also observed that UMC Safe Haven pastors/directors appear to be paying attention to 10 “contexts of concern” that pertain to their unique contextual settings. I classified these 10 micro-to-macro contexts in Table 13 on page 116 as a means for showing how these pastors/directors are keeping in mind this broad range of contexts in their minute-by-minute practice of Safe Haven leadership. For me, this is an illustration of individual requisite complexity (IRC) observed here in Phase 1’s data analysis. Thus, in Table 15, as I mentioned above, I chose to display these 10 contexts of concern in conjunction with their 33 stories of leader efficacy as a central building block for this case study’s analysis.

4. Identifying a reliable “holding environment”
Likewise, as I began to immerse myself in the literature of adaptive leadership, I was drawn to Ron Heifetz’s “holding environment” (Heifetz, et al., 2009) as illustrative of the UMC’s work with Safe Haven kids. No doubt what caught my eye was Heifetz’s (1994) definition of a “holding environment” as analogous to a mother’s reliable care for her child—a “safe place” to be and grow. I chose to adopt this adaptive leadership concept of a “holding environment” as an apt “test” of success/reliability for the range of Safe Haven “success” stories voiced by pastors/directors in their interviews. Consequently, a collection of 14 “success stories” in Table 22 on page 235 are held up to the “test” of a reliable “holding environment” for kids as defined by Heifetz (1994).
In summary of Phase 1, therefore, these are the four conceptual frameworks that “jumped out” at me as first impressions and themes observed across pastors'/directors’ interviews: extreme context, leader efficacy, individual requisite complexity, and “holding environment.” As described above, I employed them by integrating them with three unique collections of UMC Safe Haven pastors’/directors’ stories, typed them up accordingly, and submitted them to Dr. Manning for review in March 2016. So, these became key theoretical building blocks in the interrelated “web of concepts” employed in this case study.

**Phase 2. Data Collection and Analysis**

After beginning with Phase 1’s interviews focused on the UMC’s Safe Haven program, I began to widen out my focus enough to gain interviews with the primary participants and community partners in the founding story of the NIC’s Chicago Urban Strategy and especially in any aspects leading up to and including the UMC’s participation in CPS’s Safe Haven program, as depicted in Figure 9. I considered the case study to be incomplete without interviewing the NIC leaders and civic partners who were closest to the CUS phenomenon, its origin, its emergence up to now, and its association with CPS’s Safe Haven program. While practicing “purposive sampling” by first interviewing persons closest to the UMC Safe Haven phenomenon in Phase 1, therefore, I fulfilled
Silverman’s (2013) recommendation “to focus on a small part of your sample in the early stages, using the wider sample for later tests of emerging generalizations” (p. 153). This “wider sample” of Phase 2’s interviewees also satisfies the selection criteria of “interviewees who have had complementary experiences, as well as those who represent different points of view” (Rubin & Rubin, 2012, p. 60), albeit at this emergent stage of the CUS.

Described later in Chapter 3 on page 87, note that I ran into some reasonable “dead ends” as I attempted to establish two outcome measures of Safe Haven success that could be custom-built for this NIC case study.

**Preparing for Phase 2’s interviews**

In preparation for the Phase 2’s interviews, I supplied to each interviewee ahead of time a variation of Table 7’s “open-ended questions” (Creswell, 2009, p. 131) as a possible starting point for the interview questions along with a letter of informed consent (in Appendix A).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7. Interview Questions Pertaining to the Chicago Urban Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Could you briefly describe your role and/or responsibilities as it pertains to the NIC’s Chicago Urban Strategy, i.e., your participation, personal interests, etc.?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. From your unique perspective, what have you witnessed or observed that you feel is working in the UMC’s Chicago Urban Strategy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Are you aware of any unheralded or otherwise overlooked successes of the NIC’s Chicago Urban Strategy?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introducing Phase 2’s interview participants

I knew that I wanted to save for last the interviews with case study sponsors, Bishop Sally Dyck and Pastor Robert Biekman. So all in one day after other interviews were completed, I conducted my interview with Bishop Sally while seated across from her at the glass-top table in her downtown Chicago office. And soon after that, I conducted my interview with Pastor Robert as we sat down at an off-to-the-side lunch table at Pita Heaven beside a wall of windows overlooking Michigan Avenue.

Next, I reached out to interview Pastor Jacques Conway at his church office located at St. Matthews UMC. It was Pastor Jacques in February 2013 who pointedly challenged Bishop Sally “to look, look closely at what’s happening in our black inner-city churches....And I knew once she looked, her heart would not let her close her eyes” (J. Conway, personal communication, January 15, 2016).

In a similar way, CPD Chief Eugene Williams challenged Bishop Sally before she even completed her move to Chicago to take seriously how “the United Methodist Church is uniquely structured so as to be able to impact the whole city” (S. Dyck, personal communication, February 16, 2016). Chief Eugene is a long-time member of South Shore UMC and President of Chicago’s National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives (NOBLE). He handed to Bishop Sally in those early days the Community Anti-Violence and Restoration Effort: CARE for Chicago City-County Action Plan (Biebel et al., 2012, July 19) to convince her of “things that were really
working and making a difference in the communities” (S. Dyck, personal communication, February 16, 2016).

And to complete our interview at CPD headquarters, Chief Eugene sat down across from me at a conference room table not far from his office overlooking the city of Chicago. During the interview, he signed onto his laptop linked to a big-screen monitor in order to present NOBLE’s work in Chicago and, as an example, to highlight that police officers plan now to visit and interact with the children at Safe Haven sites as a way to improve police-community relations. Far-reaching in his responsibilities, in fact, when I called Chief Eugene in December 2015 to schedule this interview, he picked up his phone to answer my call even as he was waiting to join a meeting with U.S. Justice Department officials who were in Chicago to commence a federal investigation of the Chicago Police Department.

From there, I reached out to interview Rev. Rubén Austria, Founder and Executive Director of Community Connections for Youth (CCFY) when he was in Chicago visiting Grace-Calvary UMC from his offices in Bronx, NY. At the same time, I reached out to Pastor Rodney Walker, Executive Director of Albany Park Community Center in Chicago and pastor of Grace-Calvary UMC, who has helped the CUS strategy team to think of different resources, models, and restorative justice practices that could be shared across congregations.
Rev. Rubén, Pastor Rodney, and I met in September 2015 at CCFY’s three-day Alternatives to Incarceration (ATI) Training Institute. This three-day ATI event was held at Maple Park UMC and was organized by Pastor Robert Biekman in fulfillment of a grant CCFY received from The Public Welfare Foundation, and it has grown into an ATI Collaborative of faith-based and community stakeholders extending across Roseland in Chicago (Watson, 2016, May 4). Creating ATI awareness is aimed at equipping grassroots faith and neighborhood-based organizations to “understand the language and design of the juvenile justice system, the logic of community-based alternatives, and best practices in ATI programs” (CCFY, 2016, May 9).

As this case story will later reveal, CPS’s Safe Haven program is more than meets the eye. Specifically, a Safe Haven program = an ATI program. In other words, each Safe Haven program has potential to provide positive early childhood intervention from what Marian Wright Edelman (2007, July), President of Children’s Defense Fund (CDF), called the “Cradle to Prison Pipeline” as portrayed in Figure 10.

Nationally, 1 in 3 Black and 1 in 6 Latino boys born in 2001 are at risk of imprisonment during their lifetime. While boys are 5 times as likely to be incarcerated as girls, there also are a significant number of girls in the juvenile justice system. This rate of incarceration is endangering children at younger and younger ages. This is America’s pipeline to prison….
CDF’s vision with its Cradle to Prison Pipeline campaign is to reduce detention and incarceration by increasing preventive supports and services children need, such as access to quality early childhood development and education services and accessible, comprehensive health and mental health coverage. (Children's Defense Fund [CDF], 2016, May 8)

Rev. Rubén Austria simply stated, “Any support that’s given to children and youth in high-incarceration communities is an intervention in the cradle-to-prison pipeline” (R. Austria, personal communication, May 3, 2016).

Finally, assisted by Pastor Biekman, I reached out to interview Rev. Renaldo Kyles, Founder and Director of CPS’s Safe Haven Program and the Office of Faith Based Initiatives. We met for our interview in Rev. Kyle’s office at CPS headquarters in Chicago.

Table 8 summarizes Phase 2’s NIC case study participants, the interview locations, and the length of the interviews. Recall that Phase 1’s list of participants is in Table 6 on page 63.
Table 8. List of Phase 2’s Interview Participants (14 Total Participants)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title/Function</th>
<th>Participant Name</th>
<th>Organization (Located in Chicago unless noted otherwise)</th>
<th>Interview Method</th>
<th>Length of Interview</th>
<th>Length of Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UMC Northern Illinois Conference</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop</td>
<td>Sally Dyck</td>
<td>Northern Illinois Conference</td>
<td>On site; In person</td>
<td>48 minutes</td>
<td>17 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastor &amp; Urban Strategy Coordinator</td>
<td>Robert Biekman</td>
<td>Maple Park UMC</td>
<td>At Pita Heaven; In person</td>
<td>38 minutes</td>
<td>18 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastor</td>
<td>Jacques Conway</td>
<td>St. Matthews UMC</td>
<td>On site; In person</td>
<td>65 minutes</td>
<td>10 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastor</td>
<td>Rodney Walker</td>
<td>Grace-Calvary UMC</td>
<td>At Gary UMC; In person</td>
<td>46 minutes</td>
<td>29 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Partners</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Founder &amp; Executive Director</td>
<td>Rev. Rubén Austria</td>
<td>Community Connections for Youth—Bronx, NY</td>
<td>At Grace-Calvary UMC; In person</td>
<td>64 minutes</td>
<td>16 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Founder &amp; Director of Safe Haven Program</td>
<td>Rev. Renaldo Kyles</td>
<td>Chicago Public Schools Office of Faith Based Initiatives</td>
<td>On site; In person</td>
<td>38 minutes</td>
<td>17 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief; Bureau of Support Services</td>
<td>Eugene Williams</td>
<td>Chicago Police Department</td>
<td>On site; In person</td>
<td>76 minutes</td>
<td>34 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL for Phases 1 and 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 hours &amp; 49 minutes</td>
<td>315 pages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Identifying collective theoretical themes spanning Phases 1–2 data analyses

Recalling Table 4’s “aerial view” of the research approach, Phase 2’s data analysis necessarily forefronts collective conceptual frameworks known to attenuate extreme context through effective adaptive leadership response. This necessity flows from an awareness of the need for “a fuller and more integrative focus that is multilevel ...focusing on ways to integrate the context at multiple levels of analysis into leadership models [emphasis added]” (Avolio, 2007, p. 31). Fitting for this meso-level case study analysis, “context gives the necessary depth and grounding to studies that move from the meso to the micro levels of analysis” (Langley & Abdallah, 2011, p. 228). Thus, as I continued a “repetitive interplay between theoretical ideas and empirical evidence” (Van de Ven, 2007, p. 187), I spotted four collective theoretical concepts that span Phases 1–2 and encapsulate this integrative, multilevel focus of adaptive leadership in context.

1. Identifying a process for being a well-functioning UMC Safe Haven

As my first pursuit after completing Phase 2’s interviews, Dr. Manning sent me back to go through the data again. And so I did. In April 2016, I cleared the dining room table, printed out all of the verbatim transcripts of the interviews, got out my scissors, diligently clipped the data into pieces of transcript excerpts or vignettes, and laid out these pieces by themes onto my table. Specifically, I classified 187 stories/transcript excerpts by theme/topic using “general qualitative coding ...to sort and synthesize the material” (Charmaz, 2014, p. 121) as displayed here in Table 9. And quickly, a
majority of stories and interview sentiments collected under the eight thematic headings highlighted in green.
Table 9. Eight Themes/Topics Identified in Data Analysis and Combined to Create Figure 15’s “Gear” Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme or Topic Identified in Phases 1–2 Data Analysis</th>
<th>Related Gear from Figure 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive challenge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUS (Chicago Urban Strategy)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defeats/overcoming obstacles</td>
<td>Center &amp; Gears 2 &amp; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners/volunteers</td>
<td>Gear 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Haven (SH) operations</td>
<td>Center &amp; Gear 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful SH outcomes</td>
<td>Basis for Table 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting good behaviors</td>
<td>Gear 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMC goals/standards</td>
<td>Gears 1, 3, &amp; 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMC &amp; CPS goals/standards</td>
<td>Center &amp; Gear 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer development</td>
<td>Gears 1, 2, &amp; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision/next steps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Center Gear:** Being a well-functioning UMC Safe Haven
- Commitment to Safe Haven’s purpose
- Satisfying CPS & UMC requirements
- Gear 1: All about partners
- Gear 2: All about volunteers & workers
- Gear 3: All about support
- Gear 4: All about local church

**Gear 1: Building relationships with community partners**
- UMC, NIC, & Garrett Seminary
- Nearby social services agencies
- Local CPS schools
- Police, Fire, & Mobile dental lab
- Promotional media & online forums
- Mothers of Safe Haven kids

**Gear 2: Tapping into readiness & talents of volunteers/workers**
- Finding it tough to get volunteers
- Assimilating workers through individualized consideration
- Sharing lessons learned among UMC Safe Havens
- Orienting volunteers through shared leadership
- Going from volunteer to vocation

**Gear 3: Supporting good child, youth, & adult behaviors**
- Espousing core values for positive youth development
- Responding to behavioral or emotional problems
- Working out choice of language
- Working out high emotions when playing games
- Working out use of phones & electronic devices

**Gear 4: UMC as more than a Safe Haven**
- Sharing a spiritual heritage
- Extending Safe Haven to offer Teen Night or Parent Night
- Extending Safe Haven schedule to help working families
- Adapting to Safe Haven kids & families
- Modeling women as pastors in church leadership
- UMC being more than a park district
As I kept working at this thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006) over a week’s time and then returning to it time and again, I could see the benefit in this exercise as it necessarily fleshed out my perspectives to a saturation point. As the eight prominent themes in Table 9 were compiled, I began to see some recurring processes across Safe Haven sites. My first hint of these processes came as Safe Haven pastors/directors described how they began their efforts in one way, ran into a roadblock, and needed to re-group and begin again. For example, their efforts to attract and retain volunteers/summer workers were unfruitful at first, so by trial and error, they took a different tact, e.g., applying for One Summer Chicago (OSC) workers to be placed/employed in the summer Safe Haven program (OSC is a summer jobs program for Chicago youth), etc. Note that these challenges become developmental learning experiences as they “challenge the adequacy of a person’s current thinking and mental models” (Hannah & Lester, 2009, p. 37).

By studying Table 9’s thematically-grouped stories and by using small sticky notes, UMC Safe Haven work processes became visible to me as “gears in motion” (Gears 1–4 in Table 9). I first wrote down these observations as some steps, put them in order, and then connected them with arrows progressing around in a clockwise direction. Then, as I kept working with the stories from Table 9’s prominent themes, I began to write down steps for a different, but related process. Ultimately, I observed “a revealing repetition” (Thatchenkery, 1992, p. 226) of multiple nonlinear processes.
(Gears 1–4) that interconnect into one composite process for a well-functioning UMC Safe Haven program, which I present in Chapter 5’s Figure 15 on page 178. Read Chapter 5’s richly-nuanced descriptions and stories by UMC Safe Haven pastors/directors to best understand Figure 15’s “gears in motion” metaphor and phenomena.

To be clear, Figure 15 is a thematic and graphic abstract arising from Phases 1–2 data analyses and “general qualitative coding” (Charmaz, 2014, p. 121). Charmaz (2014) has verified a “relevance when you offer an incisive analytic framework that interprets what is happening and makes relationships between implicit processes and structures visible” (p. 133). Thereby, Figure 15 is a newfound theory of a well-functioning UMC Safe Haven that emerged in this NIC case study.

Most important to our study of leadership in extreme context, Figure 15 represents an adaptive outcome of the NIC’s adaptive leadership as UMC Safe Haven pastors/directors “move beyond the limits of existing knowledge to create new knowledge and systems through dynamic processes [emphasis added]” (Hannah et al., 2011, p. 218). After all, when emergent, complex behaviors of a collective of individuals, groups, etc. “produce new knowledge, learning, creative ideas, and, ultimately, adaptive outcomes” (Hannah, Eggers, et al., 2008, p. 81), these emergent behaviors constitute adaptive leadership.
As it turns out from a research perspective, in fact, we can more easily discover process-oriented findings in qualitative studies (Langley & Abdallah, 2011). In sum, real-life stories or “‘texts-in-context’...[help us to] understand the temporal unfolding of the process” or processes, as exhibited in this NIC case (Langley & Abdallah, 2011, p. 228). And “compared with a static view, the process view allows for deeper appreciation of the subtleties and complexities inherent in human actions” (Manning & Binzagr, 1996, p. 279). Thereby, “deep contextual understanding” becomes possible (Schwarz & Stensaker, 2016, p. 16).

**2. Identifying collective leadership efficacy**
Consistently at this juncture in my data analysis, I sought to observe any multilevel theoretical constructs inherent in the case study findings. “Robust leadership theories must acknowledge the reality that leader behavior is shaped by multiple factors operating at different levels of analysis” (Hackman & Wageman, 2007, p. 44). One such multilevel, *multi-resource* construct is *collective leadership efficacy* best understood in this case study as an *attenuator of extreme context*, i.e., “reduc[ing] the probability or magnitude of extremeness of an event and/or an organization’s ability to respond” (Hannah et al., 2009, p. 909).

Even at this developmental stage of the Chicago Urban Strategy, I could readily identify from the data analysis some existing *and* emergent *psychological, social,* and *organizational resources* that are the NIC’s current embodiment of *collective leadership efficacy* (Hannah et al., 2009). And from across my data collection,
observation, and analysis, I have summarized these rich resources in Chapter 6’s Table 23 on 268 and classified them as six attenuators of Chicago’s extreme context.

Then, with Table 23’s six attenuators in mind, I moved on to construct Figure 25, which is adapted from a typology of extreme context by Hannah et al. (2009, p. 899). This Figure 25 mega model on page 271 is intended to provide a means to “stand back” and appreciate a multilevel view of the case study’s findings as it portrays the NIC’s collective leadership efficacy, adaptive leadership response, and UMC Safe Haven “holding environments” all operating in the midst of extreme context.

3. Identifying collective requisite complexity
Closely interrelated with the “web of collective concepts” employed in this case study is collective requisite complexity because it is embedded in context. Call to mind that to appreciate context is to appreciative complexity. So, to appreciate the one, we must appreciate the other. In so doing, a unique and compelling case of collective requisite complexity arose from my data analysis and from looking closely at the tally of UMC Safe Haven pastors’/directors’ 10 contexts of concern in Table 16 on page 162.

Summarizing here, I recognized from looking closely at Table 16’s tally how pastors/directors are observing that games and play are a positive, multivalent, and multi-context “force” within the UMC’s Safe Haven program that serves to offset some restraining forces in the extreme macro context. In other words, matching complexity with complexity, some pastors/directors believe that the positive force of
play counteracts complex, contextual restraints that prevent Safe Haven children from essential learning due to the lack of opportunities for them to safely play outside in their neighborhoods, school yards, etc. Exemplifying collective requisite complexity in action, therefore, this belief in the “positive force” of play is influencing some pastors/directors to elevate the centrality of games and play to strategic importance in their Safe Haven programs. For specifics, read the results of this analysis in Chapter 6 beginning on page 254.

4. Identifying social regulatory structure that coexists with traditional structure

Finally, the cross-case data analysis provides some evidence of a “collective identity” and an “urban agenda” that is emerging across diverse community partnerships and relationships through a social regulatory structure comprising the Chicago Urban Strategy. Essential for collective leadership to flourish, social regulatory structures are “active patterns of group identities, group goals, group emotional tones, and shared leadership structures that guide group processes” (Hannah et al., 2011, p. 218). As described in Chapter 6 on page 247, I observed some compelling evidence of a new social regulatory structure that illustrates the NIC’s adaptive organizing in tandem with the NIC’s traditional structure.

Wrapping up Table 4’s “aerial view,” this completes my summary of how the key concepts emerged through Phases 1–2 of data analysis, how they are interrelated in a multilevel “web of concepts,” and where each one is presented within this case study.
Other Data Sources

Searching for successful Safe Haven outcome measures
Director of OFBI, Rev. Renaldo Kyles, provided some verification measures for the success of CPS’s Safe Haven program (beginning on page 171). Otherwise, however, I ran into some “dead ends” (Silverman, 2013, p. 355) in my search for outcome measures. Here is a summary of two methods that I researched in hopes of establishing an outcome measure of Safe Haven success that could be custom-built for this NIC case study.

1. Participation in Safe Haven programs by Chicago Public Schools children may positively correlate to school attendance and reduction in truancy
In March 2015, I met to brainstorm with Police Chief Frank Kaminski of Park Ridge, IL, formerly Police Chief of Evanston, IL, and President of the Illinois Association of Chiefs of Police. Chief Kaminski reasoned that participation in Safe Haven programs may promote increased school attendance and a reduction in truancy—staying away from school without good reason. Therefore, he recommended collecting actual names of children who are participants in the UMC Safe Haven program so that these children’s names could be compared with Chicago Public Schools attendance records.

As I began to pursue this potential outcome measure, Dr. Mike Manning and I received a go-ahead from Benedictine University’s Internal Review Board that “gathering existing data from the schools ...is typically an exempt case” and as such, I would “need consent or a permission letter from the school(s) to show they acknowledge granting you access to the attendance lists” (M. Manning, personal
communication, April 2, 2015). However, as I worked with Pastor Biekman to get a permission letter from CPS, we eventually learned from CPS’s Research Manager in September 2015 that release of any student level data requires parental consent along with student name, student ID, and school name or birth date.

Thus, I came to a reasonable dead end when I presented this prospective outcome measure with CPS requirements to Pastor Ayla Samson Zaki, director of G2G UMC’s Safe Haven program. Knowing of G2G UMC’s two years of experience hosting an after-school program, I contacted Pastor Ayla hoping that we might identify a representative group of 12–20 children 1) who were after-school participants for both years, and 2) whose parent or guardian would be available and willing to provide consent for release of their child’s attendance/truancy data. Such a data analysis might, for example, show improvement in attendance/truancy during the time period of a child’s Safe Haven involvement at G2G UMC.

Pastor Ayla appreciated how such an evidence-based outcome measure could lend validity to the NIC case study. However, she anticipated that a Safe Haven parent or guardian that would be asked to give consent for access to their child’s attendance/truancy record would likely feel reluctant, suspicious, or view this request as an unwelcome interference. Pastor Ayla explained that school attendance tends to be a touchy topic since it may highlight personal or family issues, such as a lack of reliable access to transportation to get a child to school, etc. For this reason, she
believed that this request for parental consent could produce more harm than good with respect to building long-term relationships with Safe Haven parents or guardians (A. Samson Zaki, personal communication, November 3, 2015). After speaking with Pastor Ayla and understanding her rationale, I shared this conclusion with Dr. Mike Manning, and we chose to pursue this option no further.

2. Participation in Safe Haven programs by Chicago Public Schools children may be inversely related to victimization rates for the same time period.

Given Chicago Police Department’s reliance on CompStat for extensive tracking and analyses of crime incidences, Park Ridge’s Chief Kaminski further proposed that victimization rates for children, including violence, abuse, or neglect, might be reduced for targeted time periods in identifiable areas surrounding Safe Haven program sites. After all, Safe Haven was founded in an effort to protect children “from violence on the streets” (D’Onofrio, 2012, June 28). Eventually, in December 2015, I had an opportunity to speak directly with CPD’s Bureau of Support Services Chief Eugene Williams about this potential outcome measure, how victimization rates are measured by time period, and whether these measures could be effectively correlated with the presence of Safe Haven program sites in Chicago. Chief Eugene could not support this correlation. Given a complexity of factors and unobserved variables in Chicago neighborhoods, Chief Eugene had no confidence in a claim that the presence of one or more Safe Haven sites in a given area could be causally linked to a drop in children’s victimization rates for any time period. On the basis of Chief...
Eugene’s conclusions, I chose to close out this option (E. Williams, personal communication, December 16, 2015).

In summary, I noted the absence of these objective measures as a limitation of the case study in Chapter 8. Otherwise, the evidence that was developed through the case study methods and theoretical concepts serve as the empirical proof of what is working in UMC Safe Havens at the time of this writing.

**Gathering additional CUS field observations**

Since the official launch of the Chicago Urban Strategy in May 2013, I have immersed myself in CUS events as often as my class and work schedule permitted me to be present. Since receiving IRB approval, for example, here in Table 10 is a taste of four events I have participated in that were CUS-sponsored. Each event has been designed to promote learning through some form of active participation.

**Table 10. A Sampling of CUS Learning Events**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Title/Time/Date</th>
<th>Who Should Attend</th>
<th>Chicago Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Celebrating the Death of Gun Violence in Our Time: Youth Summit</td>
<td>Youth ages 6th through 12th grade</td>
<td>St. Matthews UMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 a.m.–2:00 p.m. (Northern Illinois Conference [NIC], 2015, November 21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Urban Summit: A Time for Healing &amp; Building</td>
<td>Lay and clergy urban ministry practitioners serving neighborhoods experiencing violence;</td>
<td>Maple Park UMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 a.m.–2:00 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Title/Time/Date</td>
<td>Who Should Attend</td>
<td>Chicago Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(NIC, 2016, February 27)</td>
<td>teachers; parents; social workers; families; faith-based community organizers; advocates and activists; restorative justice practitioners.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking It to the Streets: Chicago Urban Summit 9:00 a.m.–12:30 p.m. (NIC, 2016, April 30)</td>
<td>Clergy/lay serving urban communities; students &amp; practitioners of public theology; community organizers.</td>
<td>Elston Avenue UMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith in the Public Square: Chicago Urban Summit— Becoming the Prophetic, Pastoral, &amp; Political Church 9:00 a.m.–4:00 p.m. September 24, 2016</td>
<td>All invited.</td>
<td>Morgan Park UMC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Receiving CUS historical documents and field notes**

In January 2015, Bishop Sally loaned to me three of her own 1-inch binders of information that she saved since the start-up of the CUS. These contain copies of information such as handwritten notes; e-mails, memos, and letters; meeting presentations; pamphlets and reports; and sermon notes. The binders were marked as listed below:

- Chicago Urban Strategy
- Community Safety
- Education and Literacy
Also, since February 2013, I saved e-mails, brochures, flyers, reports that I received, and my own handwritten and detailed field notes from every meeting with Bishop Sally, Pastor Robert, and any CUS-sponsored event.

**Clarifying concepts through memo writing**

“Start your memo writing now,” Dr. Manning advised me when I met with him in August 2015 (M. Manning, personal communication, August 5, 2015). For research purposes, memos are “preliminary analytic notes” (Charmaz, 2014, p. 4). By writing memos in the research process, you “catch your thoughts, capture the comparisons and connections you make, and crystallize questions and directions for you to pursue” (Charmaz, 2014, p. 162). And I found that I instinctively acted upon Dr. Manning’s advice after I completed and began to reflect on my interviews with Safe Haven pastors/directors at year’s end. Faced with a concept I did not understand or a need to organize my thoughts, I felt compelled to sketch something out (on paper or electronically). I used “freewriting” or “clustering” (Charmaz, 2014, pp. 184-188) to conceptualize an idea and to keep refining it until it snapped into clarity. “Clustering gives you a non-linear, visual, and flexible technique to understand and organize your material …to produce a tentative and alterable chart or map of your work” (Charmaz, 2014, p. 184). I seem to think in visuals, so I am helped by concepts displayed graphically. And I frequently use PowerPoint as a “drawing board.” Table 11 summarizes my memo writing and highlights specific tables or graphics that I presented in Chapters 5–7.
### Table 11. Summary of Memo Writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Creation Date</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Memo Title (with Estimated Number of Refinements)</th>
<th>Displayed In</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/29/2015</td>
<td>Table</td>
<td>A High-Level Overview of the NIC Case Study (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2/2016</td>
<td>Table</td>
<td>Where Adaptive Approaches Align with Behavioral-Based Theories of Leadership (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/9/2016</td>
<td>Graphic</td>
<td>Adapted Framework of NIC in Chicago’s Extreme Context (12)</td>
<td>Chapter 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/16/2016</td>
<td>Text Only</td>
<td>Freewriting about NIC Partner Organizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/16/2016</td>
<td>Text Only</td>
<td>Freewriting on Observations from Bishop Sally’s “Organization” Binder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/18/2016</td>
<td>Table</td>
<td>A Timeline of UMC Safe Haven Participation (7)</td>
<td>Chapter 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/25/2016</td>
<td>Text Only</td>
<td>Freewriting About Pragmatism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/13/2016</td>
<td>Table</td>
<td>Hoped-for Growth &amp; Relatedness Possible Selves vs. Hoped-for Existence (Feared) Possible Selves (Sosik, Chun, Blair, &amp; Fitzgerald, 2013).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/13/2016</td>
<td>Graphic</td>
<td>Being a Well-Functioning UMC Safe Haven (7)</td>
<td>Chapter 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/26/2016</td>
<td>Graphic</td>
<td>Upward Spiral to Success (5)</td>
<td>Chapter 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/27/2016</td>
<td>Graphic</td>
<td>Being a Well-Functioning UMC Community Partnership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now I will turn to Chapters 4, 5, and 6 to share these findings and results of my data analysis.
Chapter 4: Findings about the Contexts that Impact NIC Leadership

Our understanding of leadership could be improved by making a concerted effort to focus directly on the nature of the organizational context as a primary object of interest, rather than treating it as almost an afterthought. (Porter & McLaughlin, 2006, p. 573)

Recalling Chapter 4’s Framing Question

What is the context that is impacting the NIC and UMC Safe Haven leadership?

This is the question that Chapter 4 sets out to answer in direct response to leadership scholars’ urging for closer examination of contextual factors. “Leadership is embedded in context, and cannot be understood absent context” (Osborn et al., 2014, p. 599). Leadership and context are inseparable.

Looking at NIC’s Context as Nested from Macro to Micro Levels

We declare up front that we are making the assumption in this NIC case study that context is critical for determining leadership. In fact, the foundations of social constructionism and hermeneutics inform us that our “reality derives its significance from the context and the interdependencies of the elements constituting it” (Thatchenkery, 2011, p. 20). So, Chapter 4 is dedicated to the importance of perceiving the nature of the NIC’s complex contexts.

Relying on Figure 11 as our conceptual framework, therefore, we lay out the NIC’s organizational contexts ranging from macro to micro levels as if nested one inside the
other. Thereby, as much as is practical, we will describe and characterize each context as a “distinct world” within which the NIC is embedded. This also prompts a reminder that the NIC case study is a meso level analysis with some attention given to connections between micro and macro levels.

Source: Adapted from (GTRI, 2016, April 26)

**Figure 11. Macro to Micro Levels of UMC Safe Haven Contexts**

Acknowledging Figure 11 as an overview framework, we use it as a tool to visualize the case study data discovered regarding the NIC’s context relative to the following:

- **The UMC (Global).**
- **Northern Illinois and Chicago’s extreme context.**
- **The Chicago Urban Strategy’s Safe Haven programs.**
- **Safe Haven pastors’/director’s own contexts of concern.** Presented here in Chapter 4, the data analysis reveals 10 contexts of concern that Safe Haven pastors/directors are keeping in mind while working to launch and sustain Safe Haven programs in their unique settings. Critical to the study, these 10 contexts of
concern in combination with Safe Haven pastors’/directors’ aforementioned 33 stories of leader efficacy are a central building block for the case study’s analysis and interpretation.

- Then, for each level of the NIC’s contexts presented here, we will pause briefly to summarize the status of challenges, opportunities, and sentiments concerning each context as discovered in the data analysis.

In conclusion, as a final step in Chapter 4, we will create an integrated view of Safe Haven pastors’/directors’ awareness of NIC contexts. This integrated view will allow us to appreciate the case study’s empirical evidence that shows how the NIC’s context is influencing Safe Haven pastors’/directors’ leadership. We begin with this aim in mind.

**NIC Position within the UMC’s Denominational Context**

The research question and findings for this NIC case study align with the purpose that we expressed in our first draft of a research proposal as co-authored with Bishop Sally Dyck in August 2013 (Darr, 2013). Specifically, we stated that the NIC seeks to shift away from a storyline of decline that is widespread across the UMC’s denominational system and is reinforcing a culture of fear and blame (UMC, 2012, September). Instead, through a culture of experimentation, the NIC seeks to individuate and emerge with a storyline of hope and vitality for the future (Darr, 2013, pp. 7-9). Indeed, we know that “organizations follow certain ‘storylines’ that
shape their identities, priorities, values, and directions” (Ludema, Whitney, Mohr, & Griffin, 2003, p. 51).

**Challenges, opportunities, and sentiments**
Russell Crabtree (2008) has verified that status quo is untenable for mainline denominations such as the UMC because there is “a system-wide depletion of one or more critical resources” that are “required to thrive in the world as it currently exists” (pp. 5, 27). Crabtree has also verified that the UMC is out of step with its global context. After all, “as the organizational system is no longer adapting to its external environment, the internal organizational system becomes disordered” (Hannah, Avolio, Cavarretta, & Hennelly, 2010, February, p. 10). As a next step, therefore, Ron Heifetz and Marty Linsky (2011) have in recent years consulted with the UMC Council of Bishops to steer the denominational leaders to view their work as a complex adaptive challenge that calls for adaptive leadership. Accordingly, *Bishop Sally Dyck has embraced adaptive leadership in her call for a culture of experimentation throughout the NIC.* And the NIC’s Chicago Urban Strategy is such an experiment. Simply stated, “adaptive leadership work is iterative: you try something, see how it goes, learn from what happened, and then try something else” (Heifetz et al., 2009, p. 10).

Yet, while the UMC is grasping for the future and how it can meet the needs in communities where churches exist, sentiments are conflicted. On the one hand, Bishop Sally confirms that the “perception of shrinking resources” that is occurring in
the UMC’s denominational context often creates fear, blame, and “provokes competition over what remains to be divided” (Hatch & Cunliffe, 2013, p. 259). On the other hand, there is hope, witnessed in this NIC story, where the denominational context is being brought to consciousness, and the difficult truth can be faced. As Pastor Jacques Conway put it, “When you acknowledge there’s an issue, then you have started the process of healing and change” (J. Conway, personal communication, January 15, 2016). Such are some of the NIC’s challenges while co-existing within the UMC’s turbulent organizational context.

**NIC Context of Northern Illinois**

Encompassing 19 counties and the northern third of Illinois, here in Figure 12 is a Google Maps thumbnail image for the NIC with multi-colored pins by district, showing the distribution of 400+ local churches totaling approximately 125,000 members. As seen here, the NIC is bordered by Lake Michigan on the east; Interstate 80 on the south; the Mississippi River on the west; and Wisconsin’s state line on the north. The UMC’s region south of the NIC is called the Illinois Great Rivers Conference (IGRC). Among 70 UMCs located in Chicago, the five yellow stars in Figure 12 signify the five UMC Safe Haven churches that are featured in this case study.
As it pertains to the Chicago Urban Strategy, Bishop Sally states, “We don’t have a church of 10,000 in Chicago, but we have 10,000 across the city limits, and then, of course, supporting churches beyond who also care about Chicago” (S. Dyck, personal communication, February 16, 2016). Thus, from strictly a structural perspective, we can appreciate how the NIC is uniquely structured to be able to impact the city of Chicago. Herein is a great opportunity. Herein, of course, is also the CUS’s challenge to fruitfully foster a collective NIC consciousness in support of this opportunity. This work is underway in the spirit of the CUS.

**Figure 12. A Thumbnail Map of NIC Churches**
On her visits, Bishop Sally believed that she has seen “a glimmer of hope” in UMC Safe Haven churches including “hope for their community and the kids in the community, hope for their church to be engaged” (S. Dyck, personal communication, February 16, 2016). Going forward, Pastor Robert expressed a hope for connecting more of the NIC suburban churches with the work of CPS’s Safe Havens.

**NIC Safe Haven Program in Chicago’s Extreme Context**
Headlines tell a story of an extreme context of violence and fear for many at-risk neighborhoods in Chicago where UMC churches reside. At the close of Quarter 1 (Q1) 2016, *The Washington Post* sounded an alarm over *Chicago’s staggering rise in gun violence and killings* (Berman, 2016, April 2). While *USA Today* reported *Chicago’s murder rate soars 72% in 2016; shootings up more than 88%* (Madhani, 2016, April 1). And now Chicago’s Cook County Board President and Cook County Health & Hospitals System endorse the statement by the American Medical Association (AMA) that gun violence is a *public health crisis* (Krauser, 2016, June 21).
Source: Adapted from (Chicago shooting victims, 2016, September 30).

Figure 13. Proximity of UMC Safe Havens to Where People Were Shot in Chicago Neighborhoods January 1–September 30, 2016

Here at the end of Q3, Figure 13 places this news of violence in geographic context as it reveals where 3,234 shootings occurred, resulting in 555 homicides (Chicago shooting victims, 2016, September 30; Mahtani, 2016, October 31), based on an online map that receives daily updates by Chicago Tribune. Darker shades of blue
indicate Chicago communities with higher concentrations of victims. And to give proximal perspective, the five UMC Safe Havens featured in this case study are placed by location here inside Figure 13.

**Challenges, opportunities, and sentiments—By CPD Chief Eugene Williams**

As a case in point, CPD’s Bureau of Support Services, Chief Eugene Williams, offered appreciation for South Shore UMC’s Safe Haven program amid Chicago’s extreme context. Chief Williams has a rich history in this Chicago neighborhood as he was raised in South Shore, graduated from South Shore High School, and has been an active member of South Shore UMC since that time.

Here Chief Eugene painstakingly explains from his own experience how kids become attracted to gangs while being “unsupervised, uncared for, and unloved.” As an alternative, a Safe Haven prevents “feeding them to the wolves.”:

I know some of the problems that we've had in—and speaking personally in our area in the South Shore, in the South Shore area there, you know—with violence and so forth. And the Urban Strategy and Safe Haven is not a, it's not the answer to everything there. But it certainly is a tool. It certainly is an alternative. And I'll just share with you some personal insight.

We have some young kids from the community that come into our church that can sometimes be disruptive, difficult to deal with during the Monday through Friday that we are running the Safe Haven program. I then see them coming to church on Sunday. I see how they sometimes interact when they're at church, and you know, more than a handful of times I've had to step up and say something to them or calm them down or tell them, “No, you can't act out like this.” But here is the benefit. The benefit is Monday through Friday during the Safe
Haven program—rather than being out on the street corner, or unsupervised at home because their mother or their father might be at work, or wherever it is that kids are, you know, being hurt—they’re giving us grief in the Safe Haven program and church.

My deepest appreciation is the fact that there is some place for them to go, and they are sitting in a United Methodist Church. You know, and they're all sitting here attentive and whatever. But they are in a United Methodist Church, and they're not out on the corner where there are, where elements are competing for their attention. And it's been my experience through all my years of working in the police department and seeing so much of this up front, firsthand, our young people are crying out.

And if there's no one there to fill the void, no one to say that they care about them, it becomes very easy for the gang element to step in. So the reason that the gangs are so effective is [that they tell kids], “Come with me. I'm going to put you up. You are part of something. We are going to protect you. If somebody does something to you, we're going to take care of it for you.” If you're not showing up [referring to the church or community], if you're not filling that void, you're going to allow them [the children] to escape to an element where somebody can say, “Hey, come over here. We’ve got your back. We're going to make sure you’ve got this. We're going to make sure you’ve got love. We're going to make sure that we protect you. We're going to make sure.”

That's what happens if you're out there.

You know, not all of them are maybe at that level. But, you know, there are ones that could easily slide into that type of lifestyle because they are left to their own devices unsupervised, uncared for, and unloved. Then we're feeding them to the wolves.

So as much consternation as it might sometimes be with them running through the church like, my goodness, you know, some of the church members are like, “Oh, what are you all running here?” We know. We know. We know. Poor pastor, you know, she's like, it's the kids. It's the kids. We have to show them love. They [church members] are like, “They're tearing the church up.” But the greatest appreciation is the fact that they are here [in the church] and not out there.

And then, but I'd gladly, I'd gladly take that grief, Donna, you know, every day than to not open the newspaper. And I get, on my
Blackberry, on my Samsung, every shooting, every incident that takes place in the City. And we've had people shot down the street from the church. And, you know, my greatest fear in the world is for me to have one of my e-mails come back to me and say, we have a young person shot around 74th. And, you know, I'm just saying, right now I'm talking about, it is so close.

As a high-ranking Chicago police officer with 32 years of service, we see verification of Chicago’s extreme context in Chief Eugene’s sentiments and in his deep appreciation for how Safe Havens can protect children and youth.

**Challenges, opportunities, and sentiments—By Bishop Sally Dyck**

Bishop Sally Dyck contributes here her unique perspective and sentiments in her hope of healing for churches and communities who are suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) in Chicago’s extreme context. She sees this as one complex adaptive challenge for the NIC:

I think more clergy and laity and members of the church have forms of PTSD than we probably can even imagine. And what does that do, as well as to the kids? You know, what does that do to, I mean, what can we do to address it, recognize it, help heal it, if you can? And also maybe to understand some of the ways in which the church isn't always very healthy. What's PTSD done to the health of the church? So if the church is the body of Christ, could it be the church has PTSD in some communities?

And so I think that's really the adaptive challenge that we have. It's not a program [referring to the CUS]. It's a process. So the concern is always, you know, what will keep this process going? How do you institute it, if you can? What will be its engine in the future?

**Challenges, opportunities, and sentiments—By Safe Haven pastors/directors**

Finally, we encountered stories in the data analysis of how NIC case study participants are aware of and grieved by Chicago’s extreme context. In particular, we
can spot five dimensions of extreme context (Hannah et al., 2009) within explicit sentiments regarding trouble, trauma, or danger that were expressed by Safe Haven pastors/directors during the course of their interviews.

First, here is a brief description of all five dimensions of extreme context:

1. **Location in time**
   One way that we can assess the presence of extreme context is through a lens of time.

   In one year’s time, shootings for Q1 increased 88.5% from 2015 to 2016 (Madhani, 2016, April 1). This is recent time. Dr. Leah Gunning Francis, author of *Ferguson & Faith* (2015), an aftermath story of Michael Brown’s death in Ferguson, Missouri, declared, “We’re in an urgent 911 situation [in inner-cities], and we have been in it for a long time” (personal communication, April 30, 2016). This is historic time. In any case, “Leadership will be affected minute by minute as micro-contexts and extreme events become more or less extreme” (Hannah & Parry, 2014, p. 617). So, increased gun violence in recent time is one proof of the extreme context in which Safe Haven programs operate.

2. **Magnitude of consequences**
   Magnitude of consequences indicates an unbearable threshold that surpasses a high priority status and becomes an imperative for leadership response (Hannah et al., 2009). In Chapter 5, this case story will reveal some “tipping points” expressed by the NIC case study participants when an intolerable magnitude in the status quo came to fruition. In fact, we might declare that the NIC’s Chicago Urban Strategy was born in
2012 out of this unbearable magnitude of the real and perceived consequences of day-to-day life for UMC inner-city churches and their communities.

3. **Probability of consequences**
Magnitude and probability of consequences are related when, as an intolerable magnitude arises, a probability of extreme consequences rises accordingly. Such is the situation in Chicago’s under-resourced neighborhoods where “imperiled livability” (Dold, 2013, October 6) becomes a “pressure cooker” for perpetuating probable outcomes and unsafe behaviors. As Darrius Lightfoot cautioned, there is a high probability that youth will continue to “work in the ‘underground economy’ [of drugs, gangs, etc.] in order to survive” (D. Lightfoot, personal communication, April 30, 2016). In fact, the sustained existence of the Safe Haven program since 2009 reveals CPS’s awareness of probable harm for school-aged children when school is out. And the UMC’s involvement in CPS’s Safe Haven program reveals the NIC’s leadership response of “possibilistic thinking” (Hannah et al., 2009, p. 902), planning, and preparation that is warranted in response to this high probability of extreme consequences.

4. **Physical or psycho-social proximity**
Figure 13 alerts us to a close proximity to gun violence for UMC congregations and their neighborhoods. Proximity is expressed in both physical, psychological, and/or social terms (Hannah et al., 2009, p. 906). “It is even possible that individuals not in physical proximity might experience even greater effects of the extreme context or event than those in physical proximity [emphasis added]” (Hannah & Parry, 2014, p.
616). As a case in point, psychosocial anxiety may be even higher for UMC churchgoers and pastors who trek into at-risk UMC churches as commuters from their residences elsewhere in Chicagoland.

5. Form of threat
The fifth and final dimension of extreme context is the risk or form of threat that is being faced by UMC Safe Haven participants, families, and communities. The nature of the risk or threat can be 1) physical (e.g., hunger, personal injury, death), 2) psychological (e.g., panic, grief, post-traumatic stress), or 3) material (e.g., imperiled livability, loss of home, incarceration). Whether brief or prolonged, a risk or threat is an exposure to a sense of danger, harm, or loss.

Now, to illustrate UMC Safe Haven pastors’/directors’ awareness of trouble, trauma, and danger while working with Safe Haven children, Table 12 presents verbatim quotes that exemplify by inference all five dimensions of extreme context. These mini-stories were expressed in their responses to the Safe Haven Participant Interview Questions posted in Chapter 3.

Table 12’s layout with a checkmark in orange-highlighted columns is designed to identify which dimension(s) of extreme context appear to be implicitly valid within each of the Safe Haven pastors’/directors’ expressions of concern.
Table 12. Evidence of Five Dimensions of Extreme Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbatim Quotes from Safe Haven (SH) Pastors/Program Directors</th>
<th>Location in Time</th>
<th>Magnitude of Consequences</th>
<th>Probability of Consequences</th>
<th>Physical/Psychosocial Proximity</th>
<th>Form of Threat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thinking that generation after generation of people getting subsidies &amp; not getting skills predicts trouble for a long time.</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiced by SH Director Carla Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We appreciate—I appreciate—subsidy programs. But just like we spoke before, I don’t believe anyone should spend a lifetime on a subsidy. I think that is the biggest problem we have in the balance of those that don’t get subsidies and those that do. The ones that don’t get it [referring to subsidies] don’t understand. They wonder, why don’t you just get up and work? Well, it’s not that easy. And there aren’t that many jobs. And the jobs that are out there, are they really enough to survive on? And there’s so many factors. Then those that are getting it, a lot of times, that’s generation after generation after generation after generation. And I think that’s wrong too. I think it builds a sense of defeat when you have to wait on when someone [who] tells you you can eat, go to the doctor, and be okay. I think that defeats anybody. So unless we find a way to balance that, to give people skills, to find ways that they can be significant and be a part of, I think we’re going to be in trouble a long time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing a Safe Haven to children who are suffering on many levels without resources, knowledge, &amp; food security.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiced by SH Director Carla Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our children are suffering on many levels, and our</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Verbatim Quotes from Safe Haven (SH)
Pastors/Program Directors
(Underscores were added for emphasis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location in Time</th>
<th>Magnitude of Consequences</th>
<th>Probability of Consequences</th>
<th>Physical/Social Proximity</th>
<th>Form of Threat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

families are too. And they don’t have the resources. They don’t know. And this at least gives them something to begin with. It’s [referring to the Safe Haven program] not all the answers. It’s not. Our problems are a lot bigger than this. But I know throughout, between 10:00 a.m. and 2:00 p.m., the children are going to eat twice a day. They’re going to be at a place where they’re learning about being people in this world. They are going to build relationships with adults and children and hopefully learn to interact better with them. They’re going to have fun. Hopefully their interests develop. They’re exposed to things that they’ve never been exposed to. And that’s why it’s needed.

**Seeing the Safe Haven program as existing in a desert.**

*Voiced by SH Director/Minister G*

This area is a desert when it comes to everything except for that little store around there. You know, there’s no K-Marts, Wal-Marts, nothing that’s close....So, you know, we just, to me, besides Safe Haven, you know, after Safe Haven, what then? You know, then there’s a desert again.

**Predicting kids’ dramatic response to being afraid & hurt.**

*Voiced by SH Director Carla Williams*

And that’s where I think a lot of our babies are at. They’re scared. They’re afraid. They don’t want to be hurt. They’ve been hurt.

We have things that, we have logic. We have other reasoning that they’re not able to do yet. We’re able to use rationale and, you know, reason this and say, okay,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location in Time</th>
<th>Magnitude of Consequences</th>
<th>Probability of Consequences</th>
<th>Physical/Psycho-Social Proximity</th>
<th>Form of Threat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

that makes sense. And, no, I don’t quite understand it, but I can a little bit. They don’t have that ability yet. All they know is black and white. You hurt me, you know, that’s how they see things. And that’s why they react so dramatically too.

A child doesn’t understand in a lot of aspects why they’ve been hurt. [Children wonder,] “Why would you talk to me like that? Why would you treat me like that?” So their response is going to be dramatic, because they’re feeling dramatic. They’re feeling heavier.

“Falling through the cracks” children who are a burden to parents or grandparents are recruited by gangs in keeping with gang mentality.

Voiced by SH Director/Minister G

You know, it's that gang mentality. They, the gangs, that's how they recruit. They show children something that they don't get at home. And, you know, unfortunately, this is the way the world is. And this community, and not just this community, in a lot of communities, grandparents are raising children because children, their parents, for whatever reason, they're falling through the cracks. They can't raise them. And sometimes for grandparents, they're tired. And so they don't necessarily have that nurturing caring. They feel like it's a burden. They don't have that nurturing caring thing, so they [the children] need to know that somebody does love them, because the gang ...

Minister G’s eyes well up with tears.

Hearing from Safe Haven children who live down the block about some trauma going on in their lives.

Voiced by Pastor/SH Director Hannah Kardon

✓
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location in Time</th>
<th>Magnitude of Consequences</th>
<th>Probability of Consequences</th>
<th>Physical/Psychosocial Proximity</th>
<th>Form of Threat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We were once walking a couple of children home with one of my teenage volunteers from the church who I asked to come just for Safe Sanctuary’s reasons....And so we both were walking with them. And they [the children] started to open up about, you know, seeing their parent really struggle with getting a job and with being ill and having no health care, about one of their parents being murdered, about just some really challenging things that they had gone through in their life. And I think, you know, every church is diverse and has problems. And we are certainly, have a lot going on in the church, but many of our teenagers and children have really had that experience of a loving, caring extended family. And I think for them to realize that right down the block and in kids who don’t look any different from you, you can’t like tell from interacting with them, there’s really some challenges and some trauma and some difficult stuff going on that they’re walking around with, that they’re dealing with. I think that was a real learning for some folks in the church.

**Bringing the Safe Haven children inside quickly to avoid incidents going on outside the church building.**

*Voiced by a SH Director Carla Williams*

I’m hoping that eventually we’ll get the field out back, because if we get that, that would allow us to have some green space. We’re working on trying to have it. But I’m hoping that that will be a part of it, because that will take it up a whole new level, where the children can be outside and be. And it’s even, what I like about that area is it’s enclosed. So it’s not open to the exposure of what might be happening on the street.
Verbatim Quotes from Safe Haven (SH) Pastors/Program Directors
(Underscores were added for emphasis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location in Time</th>
<th>Magnitude of Consequences</th>
<th>Probability of Consequences</th>
<th>Physical/Social Proximity</th>
<th>Form of Threat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

sometimes.
You know, that’s another thing. We’ve had incidents, where things are going on in the neighborhood, and we had to bring the children in quick, because. And that’s part of what’s going on right now.

**Feeling too unsafe when it gets dark early to offer an after-school Safe Haven program at the church.**

*Voiced by SH Director/Minister G*

[On offering also an after-school Safe Haven program] ...And trying to get other people to make that commitment, it would be. The young people are too busy, you know. And the older people are, they don't feel safe, because it gets dark so early, so they don't want to be here. So we don't have an after-school program. But I think if we had an after-school program, that would impact even more youth. You know, it really would.

**Kids praying to get home safely while Mothers Against Violence is organizing outside of their Safe Haven amid heightened neighborhood fear about summer shootings.**

*Voiced by SH Director/Minister G*

Especially in this neighborhood there was a lot of emphasis on the shootings that went on this summer [2015]. And the Mothers Against Violence or something like that, they were out there [outside of the church], so some of the kids from the community, they knew about them. So they'd always pray [kids learning to pray] that we'd safely come back on Monday....People are afraid in this community, though, with the shootings and stuff.
### Verbatim Quotes from Safe Haven (SH)
**Pastors/Program Directors**
(underscores were added for emphasis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location in Time</th>
<th>Magnitude of Consequences</th>
<th>Probability of Consequences</th>
<th>Physical/Social Proximity</th>
<th>Form of Threat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Getting a feeling or seeing that children are in danger and knowing that home may be violent or there is no home.**

*Voiced by SH Director Carla Williams*

You see children hanging out on the corner, and you think, well, they’re just *gangbanging*, or whatever. When you don’t know that they might not be able to go home, or they don’t have a home to go to, or where home is violence.

And, you know, you don’t, we’re not making assumptions. And when you have a program like Safe Haven, it gives you a direct connection. I’ve had babies that, now the program starts at 10:00 a.m. I have children outside this door at 9:00 a.m. in the morning. And I’m asking, “Why are you here? What are you doing?” And it’s like, [they say] “I don’t know.” Well, I know. You start to get a feel. I say, “Come on in, baby. Come on in.”

Or they’re hanging around afterwards, you know. “You’re supposed to be going home. Can I help you?” I say. So, like I said, it gives you a personal sense. It lets you see. And some of it is heartbreaking. Some of it is very heartbreaking, and it’s hard not to, again, judge, especially when you see children that are in danger. And not necessarily physically. You can be in danger in a lot of ways, you know.

And a child’s self-esteem, a child’s self-worth, just to know they’re important, that they’re God’s children, and you’re important to Him. That is a place that you don’t see until you get up close and personal. And even children that, you see the parents, and you don’t realize, and the parents don’t realize, what they do in their lives, that it bothers a child.
All told here in sentiments expressed by Chief Eugene Williams, Bishop Sally Dyck, and Safe Haven pastors/directors, we can appreciate how the CUS’s Safe Haven program is an experiment in adaptive leadership response due to intolerable conditions of extreme context. And as we will observe more in Chapter 5, intrinsic in this CUS movement is the shared belief that community capacity building is best accomplished by collaboration among indigenous community partners without overreliance on CPD, CPS, the Mayor’s Office, etc.

**NIC Safe Haven Pastors’/Directors’ 10 Contexts of Concern**

Bruce Avolio has clarified here: “It’s the historical, proximal, and distal context that ends up shaping how we come to enact and understand leadership....It shapes the way we think and the way we behave” (as cited in Volckmann, 2011, June, p. 12). In keeping with these assertions, the data analysis of Safe Haven pastor/director interview responses reveals their awareness of 10 contexts of concern within the processes of their day-to-day Safe Haven program leadership. And as displayed in Figure 14, we can visualize these 10 contexts beginning from the micro context of Oneself (lower left of Figure 14) and widening out in scope to the macro context of the Envisioned future (upper right of Figure 14) with related and relevant levels of context in between.
In fact, here in Table 13 below is a concise description for each of these 10 contexts. And going forward in this chapter, we will put Table 13’s classifications to use to reveal how these 10 contexts of concern interact and interconnect, albeit within the
chosen confines of our meso-level analysis. In so doing, we can begin to appreciate how cognitive self-complexity increases as the number of contexts of concern increases. Here are the 10 contexts of concern discovered in this data analysis:

Table 13. Ten Contexts of Concern for Safe Haven Pastors/Directors Based on NIC Case Study Data Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10 Contexts or Objects of Concern</th>
<th>General Descriptions Based on Interviews &amp; Field Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oneself</td>
<td>Oneself as a context refers to six NIC case study interview participants, including the Safe Haven program director, pastor, or pastoral intern. One’s self-identity is the recognition of one's own potential &amp; qualities as an individual in relation to social context (Terry, Hogg, &amp; White, 1999).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children &amp; youth</td>
<td>Children &amp; youth as a context refers to the K–8th grade neighborhood school children who are enrolled &amp; participate in a UMC-sponsored Safe Haven program. Participation may range from occasional to full participation during hours of operation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>Home refers to a Safe Haven child’s place of residence. Home may or may not be a place of permanence, stability, or safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family, parents, &amp; grandparents</td>
<td>Family, parents, &amp; grandparents of Safe Haven children may be from all walks of life, diverse nationalities, &amp; various faith traditions. Safe Haven children may or may not be living with or in the care of family, parents, or grandparents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMC Safe Haven &amp; volunteers/workers</td>
<td>UMC Safe Haven refers to a selected United Methodist Church that has been approved by CPS to host a winter, spring, summer, or after-school program on the church premises. Each Safe Haven site… • Must be equipped with appropriate facilities, staff, teachers, volunteers, &amp; a minimum enrollment of 25 K–8th grade children per day in order to maintain approved status with CPS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Contexts or Objects of Concern</td>
<td>General Descriptions Based on Interviews &amp; Field Observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Must use &amp; present CPS-provided curriculum regarding positive conflict resolution, anti-bullying, financial literacy, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMC local church &amp; Northern Illinois Conference (NIC) of the UMC</td>
<td>UMC local church refers to various aspects including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Church building &amp; grounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Members of the congregation &amp; community at large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mission &amp; values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Programs &amp; activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIC refers to the following aspects (though the NIC encompasses many other components &amp; functions):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bishop Sally Dyck &amp; District Superintendents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pastor Robert Biekman &amp; Chicago Urban Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 400+ UMCs located throughout northern Illinois (70+ UMCs located in Chicago)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local school &amp; Chicago Public Schools (CPS)</td>
<td>Local school refers to any neighborhood school attended by Safe Haven children &amp; youth. In general, elementary schools offer minimal physical education &amp; no art or music activities. CPS’s Office of Faith Based Initiatives is the sponsor for the Safe Haven program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-risk neighborhood</td>
<td>At-risk neighborhood refers to “the set of social and economic conditions that place individuals ‘at-risk’ of failure or of encountering significant problems related to employment, education, self-sufficiency, or a healthy lifestyle....The problems or failures encountered by those labeled at-risk are oriented toward the future but linked to current conditions” (Smrekar, 2016, March 5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Contexts or Objects of Concern</td>
<td>General Descriptions Based on Interviews &amp; Field Observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National &amp; global culture</td>
<td>National &amp; global culture refers to being “born into a society that teaches people its culture [values &amp; beliefs]. And because culture is shared among people, it helps to define the boundaries between different groups and affects how their members relate to one another” (Schermerhorn, Hunt, &amp; Osborn, 2008, p. 38).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envisioned future</td>
<td>Envisioned future from a perspective of hope is “what we aspire to become, to achieve, and to create....It conveys concreteness—something visible, vivid, and real. On the other hand, it involves a time yet unrealized— with its dreams, hopes, and aspirations” (Collins &amp; Porras, 1996, pp. 66, 73).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Challenges, opportunities, and sentiments**

Despite the conditions of extreme context and an awareness of these 10 contexts of concern, in their interview responses, all six UMC Safe Haven pastors/directors were *conspicuously committed* to their work. Without exception, one after the other told stories revealing their perseverance and resourcefulness despite steep challenges of launching a successful Safe Haven program in oftentimes tenuous circumstances. There was no cynicism. No lack of conviction was exhibited. Throughout their interviews, pastors/directors conveyed a realistic optimism. Thus, Safe Haven pastors’/directors’ *conspicuous commitment* to their work signifies implicit *leader efficacy* as specified in their 33 featured stories coming up in Table 15.
Yet, as Bishop Sally has declared now and again, “This is a lot bigger deal than doing Vacation Bible School.” Becoming and being a Safe Haven program means starting from scratch by fulfilling the following:

- Being selected by CPS and meeting minimum standards for site selection, safety, enrollment, breakfast and lunch service, and use of CPS curriculum.
- Attracting and providing activities for a per-day minimum of 25 K–8th grade kids.
- Finding, attracting, and orienting volunteers and summer workers to work, play, and create projects with the children, serve meals, etc. throughout the summer and/or after-school.
- Promoting and supporting good child, youth, & adult behaviors.

At this moment in time and in this array of NIC contexts, therefore, it is critically important for the UMC’s Chicago Urban Strategy to understand what is already working in its Safe Haven programs in order to 1) do an effective job in serving to protect the safety of Chicago’s children while 2) telling a story of effective ministry that positively impacts the NIC’s vision and mission. After all, *time* also serves to frame the context of leadership. And “important leadership phenomena cannot be understood from an a-temporal viewpoint” (Shamir, 2011, p. 311). So given all of the foregoing contextual factors, there is *no better time than now* for this case study analysis.
An Integration of Safe Haven Pastors’/Directors’ Awareness of NIC Contexts

Further, there is no better way of demonstrating how Safe Haven pastors’/directors’ leadership is determined by context than by exemplifying it in action. To that end, we will merge and assimilate their 10 contexts of concern with their 33 stand-out stories of leader efficacy. As a reminder, these 33 stories will become a central building block for this case study’s analysis as presented here and in future chapters.

Introducing Safe Haven pastors’/directors’ 33 stories of leader efficacy

To introduce this database of 33 stories, here in Table 14 is a summary of each story’s synopsis statement that uniquely captures a moment of leading from a conviction.

Table 14 introduces us to these UMC Safe Haven pastors/directors and their leader efficacy = confidence. For purposes of organization, the stories are grouped in 7 thematic categories exemplifying Safe Haven pastors’/directors’ depth of thought, willingness to learn new skills, intention to make a difference, resourcefulness to find internal and external means, and vision for success. Look over these 33 synopsis statements to get a sense of their diverse leadership challenges and opportunities.
Table 14. Summary of 33 Stories of Safe Haven Pastors’/Directors’ Leader Efficacy

**Leader efficacy for thought & learning:**
Leaders thinking of “effective solutions for leadership challenges and dilemmas” (Hannah, Avolio, et al., 2008, p. 676).

1. Thinking of oneself knowing God & relating it to seeing the “God part” of children light up when playing games.
2. Being glad to be a Safe Haven & tearing up at the thought of the children’s persistent desires to be hugged due to deficits in their lives such as lack of love.
3. Thinking a Safe Haven = A place where a child knows “I’m okay” for a few hours per day. Thinking we underestimate children’s fear & anxiety to go to school or home.
4. Admitting that it’s hard to learn to deal with teens starting from where they are & helping them understand their important part in the human race.
5. Recognizing & changing a tendency to “entertain” kids with games & finding ways also to incorporate and enjoy quiet times with kids.
6. Eye-opening to see a Muslim child refuse to bow (in a game), seeing it through the lens of Christianity, asking oneself, & being helped to grow in faith.
7. Learning a life lesson by the seat of our pants of what a small decision & a small church can do with a trust in God & God making it good.

**Leader efficacy for self-motivation:**
Leaders revealing “intentions for their effort allocations” (Hannah, Avolio, et al., 2008, p. 677).

8. Pushing on to impact youth in the community & wishing to see a greater participation from other church members who are not ready to serve in the Safe Haven program.
9. Promising never again to leave this work with children after experiencing how upsetting it is for kids to lose parental bonds.
10. Finding one’s value in valuing the children & the church.
11. Telling teenage summer workers every day to pull their pants up [referring to “sagging” fashion among boys] & hoping this will come back to their minds some day when going toward a responsible job.
12. Making it through frustration & discouragement by always having a spot in your heart for the children.
13. Hoping, praying, & sometimes going home to cry while trying to make a difference that is significant enough to make life better for the children.
14. Praying for strength to supply what the children need while looking to
someday when someone else will care enough to do the same.

15. Listening to jazz music to connect the children with the generations of jazz & blues music & musicians before them.

16. Developing affordable field trips during Safe Haven hours even for children who normally never get to go on a trip

**Leader efficacy for means and/or resources to perform tasks:**
Leaders’ means for becoming and being a Safe Haven.

17. Feeling energized by a mutually-attractive alignment of values, identity, & resources among all Safe Haven stakeholders.

18. Deciding by faith to continue on after being suddenly cut by CPS (for temporary low enrollment). Rallying with funds & affirmation from other UMCs.

19. Pausing among church leaders & pastor to consciously assess readiness & commit to becoming a Safe Haven.

**Leader efficacy for means and/or resources to perform tasks (continued):**
Leaders’ means for accomplishing child & youth development.

20. Modeling other avenues of expression besides anger & aggression (alternatives to bullying).

21. Playing cooperative learning games to practice cooperation & show how children need each other (alternatives to bullying).

22. Lifting up high school volunteers by giving them responsibility to lead children’s activities and discover their gifts.

23. Wishing for the means to take Safe Haven kids to Chicago or Millennium Park & thinking it’s crazy for them to live in Chicago and never experience it.

24. Focusing extensively on games & play as formational for children to learn kindness, problem-solving, sportsmanship, & teamwork.

25. Validating children’s expressions of their feelings as they listen to music and learn to paint still lifes of flower vases.

**Leader efficacy for means and/or resources to perform tasks (continued):**
Leaders’ means for impacting Chicago & community.

26. Photocopying children’s letters about Safe Haven & sending them to Chicago’s Mayor & CPS headquarters to show gratitude & impact on kids.

27. Liking Safe Haven as a means for being visible outside the church & signaling that the church is in on what’s going on in the community.

**Leader efficacy for action:**
Leaders visualizing “success scenarios” or “successful future outcomes” (Hannah, Avolio, et al., 2008, p. 676):

28. Affirming, loving, & not judging while holding children & teenagers accountable when they choose wrong in order to help them do better & not
| 29. | Hoping a Muslim child will remember acts of Christian acceptance if/when Muslim-Christian tensions arise. |
| 30. | Hoping kid’s experience of meeting diverse peoples will be noticed by & discussed with parents. |
| 31. | Loving how a child’s positive church experience means church is a more likely place to go in a future time of need. |
| 32. | Being certain of a child’s future awareness of God. |
| 33. | Trying to build a self-assured person. |

Going forward, Table 14 serves as a quick reference for remembering individual stories or groups of stories within the database of 33 stories. Also, we will occasionally refer to the stories by number in future analysis.

**Integrating Safe Haven pastors'/directors’ 33 stories of leader efficacy with 10 contexts of concern**

Now to enrich our understanding of Safe Haven leadership in context, in Table 15 we can study and absorb Safe Haven pastors'/directors’ 10 contexts of concern by inference across their 33 unique stories of leader efficacy. Their sentiments and behaviors herein signify their depth of commitment and attention to context(s) as expressed in their interview responses, albeit for a snapshot of time in November 2015.

First, an explanation of Table 15’s first entry will be helpful. Here is some clarification for each of the elements in Table 15. For ease of use, this format and layout applies throughout Table 15’s presentation of the 33 stories.
Each story is introduced with a synopsis statement. Each is numbered from 1 to 33 for purposes of identification.

The author’s name is identified.

Underscored text identifies content in the story that best illustrates the author’s expression of commitment/leader efficacy.

Ten micro-to-macro contexts of concern are displayed in concise columns as previously defined in Table 13.

Inferred from the author’s story (to the left), checkmarks & gray highlighting indicate any of 10 contexts that the author appears to be keeping in mind in her/his decision-making, actions, etc.

Throughout Table 15, checkmarks with a yellow highlight indicate the highest counts of 9 or 10 inferred contexts. These highest counts will be tallied later for data analysis purposes in Table 16.
Table 15. Safe Haven Pastors’/Directors’ Attention to 10 Contexts of Concern as Illustrated by 33 Stories of Leader Efficacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbatim Quotes from Safe Haven (SH) Pastors/Directors (Underscores were added for emphasis)</th>
<th>Micro-to-Macro Contexts of Concern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leader efficacy for thought &amp; learning: Stories 1–3</strong></td>
<td>Onself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We begin here with Stories 1–3 that help us to immediately appreciate <em>what Safe Haven pastors/directors are thinking</em> about helping Safe Havens kids to grow, feel loved, and be safe. All the while, story after story, we begin to observe also how Safe Haven pastors/directors appear to be keeping in mind 1 or more of 10 contexts of concern.</td>
<td>Children &amp; youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Thinking of oneself knowing God &amp; relating it to seeing the “God part” of children light up when playing games. Voiced by Pastor/SH Director Hannah Kardon</td>
<td>Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are also things you learn that are really important through like playing tag and doing a chalk drawing with your friend and playing Gaga Ball, which became the most fun game of the summer for all of our kids. That you learn about how having fun is a part of being human. You learn about how to work with the people around you and not become captured in sadness or anger when you lose. How to delight when you win in a way that’s open</td>
<td>Family, parents, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SH volunteers/workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UMC church/NIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local school &amp; CPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At-risk neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nat’l &amp; global culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Envisioned future</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and like drawn in of the people around you. How to work with strangers who are different sizes than you or speak different languages. That play tapped into this core, elemental part of who the kids were. And you could see the God part of them light up when we were playing games for hours on end. They never wanted to stop. And they wanted to stay until 3:00 [p.m.] and 4:00 and 5:00. And they wanted to come back early the next morning. And they wanted to play and draw and create and make. And it just made me think of how lacking those opportunities are compared to when I was being educated.

We barely have P.E. time in elementary schools now. Nobody has arts or music. Those are some of the things that I think about every day when I think about what made me who I am and what made me know God and what we do in the church.

And I think part of what was great about Safe Haven is that we did do some of that educational stuff, right, we had extra math worksheets. But the focus was really you can’t play if you’re alone. You can’t play if you walk out on the block, and you’re the only kid there. But if you have a place to go every day where you know that there are 40 kids and adults to referee from the sidelines, you can play in a way that I did all the time when I was a kid. I was allowed to bike ride.
Right? And go meet a bunch of other folks. Before summer Safe Haven, I did a coffee a day with people for Lent in the community because I wanted to get to know the neighborhood better. I met 3 mothers who were on antidepressant or anxiety medication because of how much they worry about their children being hurt or kidnapped or taken or whatever. And it’s a sickness that we don’t allow kids to have freedom anymore. And this is a way that their parents could be assured that they were safe. And they could have the freedom to play.

2. Being glad to be a Safe Haven & tearing up at the thought of the children’s persistent desires to be hugged due to deficits in their lives such as lack of love.

*Voiced by SH Director/Minister G*

Well, while we’re here, they’re going to know that somebody loves them, you know, because they come here and give you a hug, and that’s important.

I learned that in subbing [in public schools], when I first started subbing. I said, what are the deficits in these kids’ lives that they come in in the morning to hug the teacher? That’s not something I ever thought of doing. Like my mama hugged me, you know, but these kids come in, they come in giving you a hug. And when they get ready to leave, some of...
Verbatim Quotes from Safe Haven (SH) Pastors/Directors
(Underscores were added for emphasis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Micro-to-Macro Contexts of Concern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oneself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children &amp; youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family, parents, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH volunteers/workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMC church/NIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local school &amp; CPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-risk neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat'l &amp; global culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envisioned future</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

them will stop what they're doing, wait a minute, everyone, and they give me a hug. And, you know, when I think, it brings tears to my eyes now when I think about it, but it is so funny. They need to know that they're loved, and I think that's one of the biggest things that these kids don't have nowadays. They're not sure if they're loved, you know. They don't know. So you can tell them, you know, I put food on the table for you. That don't mean nothing to them, you know. They get food at school. You know, they might go half over the way, but they need to know that somebody loves them. They really do. So for that reason, I'm glad we're here.

3. Thinking a Safe Haven = A place where a child knows “I’m okay” for a few hours per day. Thinking we underestimate children’s fear & anxiety to go to school or home. Voiced by SH Director Carla Williams

Well, I think it [Safe Haven] makes a difference in several areas. First of all, the Safe Haven provides just what its title is, a safe haven. Although it’s a few hours in a day, it’s a few hours in a day that a child knows, I’m okay. I’m okay. And I think we underestimate or really don’t know the volume of fear and anxiety that our children deal with daily just going to school, just getting to school, or even sometimes, going
Verbatim Quotes from Safe Haven (SH) Pastors/Directors
(Underscores were added for emphasis)

And so this is a place that they can come, they’re accepted, they’re not judged, they can share how they feel. Because that’s the one thing I do encourage here, the moments in the, the way the curriculum is broken down, it’s a discussion time. And sometimes it’s difficult to find time, but I try to find time, and I try to make my counselors understand, it’s important for the children to talk. It’s important for the children to share, because children go through life, and so many times they’re not asked. They’re told what they’re going to do. And so I want the place to be a place where they can share, where they can give their wants, their desires, their dreams, their problems, their issues, the things they’re afraid of, the things they need. So if they have that, you know, it’s okay. At least that portion of the day.

Leader efficacy for thought & learning (continued): Stories 4–7
Table 15 continues here with Stories 4–7 affirming how Safe Haven pastors/directors are open, willing to learn complex skills, and willing to challenge their own thinking even when “it’s hard,” “a challenge,” “eye-opening,” and when “flying by the seat of our pants.”
4. Admitting that it’s hard to learn to deal with teens starting from where they are & helping them understand their important part in the human race.

*Voiced by SH Director Carla Williams*

I think that’s also with everything we’re talking about right here, right now is learning to deal with people, as Pastor always says, from where they are. That is the hardest challenge in the world. And understanding it, and especially with these teens today, being able to get them where they are and work there. That, sometimes, that where they are isn’t a pretty place. And that’s hard to; it’s hard to make them understand the importance of being a part of the human race.

5. Recognizing & changing a tendency to “entertain” kids with games & finding ways also to incorporate and enjoy quiet times with kids.

*Voiced by Pastoral Intern/SH Director Andy Gilg*

There’s one particular woman in our church who is a new member. She started coming, and she really found a love for the church in the Safe Haven program. She just started coming when Safe Haven was getting started....So 16 hours a week she was devoting. And often she would spend time afterwards cleaning up and would get there
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbatim Quotes from Safe Haven (SH) Pastors/Directors</th>
<th>Micro-to-Macro Contexts of Concern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Underscores were added for emphasis)</td>
<td>Oneself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children &amp; youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family, parents, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SH volunteers/workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UMC church/NIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local school &amp; CPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At-risk neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nat'l &amp; global culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Envisioned future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>early to help kids sign in. And she was one who was always sitting with the kids and enjoying kind of quiet moments with the kids and was never one to really jump up and say a lot or anything like that but was just always a presence for the kids who maybe weren’t as active or moving around as I was. And that was actually a challenge for me and something that changed me from this experience was recognizing that my tendency in leading a group of kids is to go immediately to like playing games in order to entertain them, and to play games to do things that are a little bit rambunctious. But like during this time of leading this group, I’ve also realized there are kids who are not like that. And it ended up being a bit of a challenge for me to find ways to incorporate quiet times, times to incorporate just recovering, and those kind of things.</td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Eye-opening to see a Muslim child refuse to bow (in a game), seeing it through the lens of Christianity, asking oneself, & being helped to grow in faith. **Voiced by Pastoral Intern/SH Director Andy Gilg**

Yeah, I learned so much. There was even an instance where we played a game. It’s a game called Ninja, but the game starts out by everyone standing in a circle and sort of doing
Verbatim Quotes from Safe Haven (SH) Pastors/Directors
(Underscores were added for emphasis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Micro-to-Macro Contexts of Concern</th>
<th>Oneself</th>
<th>Children &amp; youth</th>
<th>Family, parents, etc.</th>
<th>SH volunteers/workers</th>
<th>UMC church/NIC</th>
<th>Local school &amp; CPS</th>
<th>At-risk neighborhood</th>
<th>Nat'l &amp; global culture</th>
<th>Envisioned future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a bow. And you say to start the game you kind of say, “Bow to your sensei.” And to have one kid who was Muslim go, “No, I don’t bow to anyone but God.” And to kind of hear that and go, oh yeah, like to realize that and to see it and understand it better was eye-opening for me. And that happened in several instances where sort of my own, the lens of Christianity that I see the world through, to have that taken away sometimes, [how] it makes me understand others was eye-opening and helped me grow a lot in my faith as well; to kind of make me ask, well, do I think it’s O.K. that we do that? From my Christian perspective, what does that mean? And it wasn’t just that. There were several instances that happened throughout.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Learning a life lesson by the seat of our pants of what a small decision &amp; a small church can do with a trust in God &amp; God making it good.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Voiced by Pastor/ SH Director Hannah Kardon*

I think my automatic trust in God, that immediacy of my trust in God is greater because I’ve seen how much we were kind of flying by the seat of our pants on a lot of this stuff. And God really just blessed and honored it and made it good. And made it good like it wasn’t us. You know, it was just really God made it good. And I think what a
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbatim Quotes from Safe Haven (SH) Pastors/Directors</th>
<th>Micro-to-Macro Contexts of Concern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Underscores were added for emphasis)</td>
<td>Oneself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children &amp; youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family, parents, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SH volunteers/workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UMC church/NIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local school &amp; CPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At-risk neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nat'l &amp; global culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Envisioned future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small church can do, like I’m going to carry that with me for the rest of my life, the impact that you can make with small decisions and just like commitment in your heart, and we're just gonna try. And we’re just gonna make it happen. And we’re just gonna see.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Leader efficacy for self-motivation: Stories 8–16**

In a broad range of unique settings and circumstances, Stories 8–16 give us a taste for Safe Haven pastors’/directors’ values and extent of commitment to their work.

Here we glimpse what motivates them to keep going and why they persist even through discouragement, frustration, and going home some days to cry.

8. Pushing on to impact youth in the community & wishing to see a greater participation from other church members who are not ready to serve in the Safe Haven program.

*Voiced by SH Director/Minister G*

[What's been the impact on your church?] That's a good question. I think it's been a greater impact on me than the church in general. You know, they're glad I'm here. They're glad I'll do it, because most of them are not going to do it. It's that simple, you know. They, and we just had annual planning, and it's so frustrating to me that there's a need, but then, you know, one of, once that one lady
said, well, you know, I've done it already. It's
time for the younger people to do it.
You know, I said, well, God hasn't stopped
giving you the energy to do things....But I
have to remember the kids and keep on
pushing, put it that way, you know. And if
we're going to have a Methodist Church, if we
don't start impacting our youth in our
communities, we're not going to have a
Methodist Church, you know.
They like, yeah, now they like the fact that we
have kids, and we have plenty of kids and that
our kids are bringing in other kids....So, you
know, there is some impact there. I just would
like to see a greater participation about the
church members. That's what's frustrating for
me.

9. Promising never again to leave this work
with children after experiencing how
upsetting it is for kids to lose parental
bonds.

**Voiced by SH Director/Minister G**
And when I came back [after working at
another church], ...the kids were kind of like
upset. Well, why did you leave me and that
kind of thing, you know? And it was like, you
know, you sub [in public school] just fine
with the kids. And you know, I never realized
how it would affect them when I left....You
know, once you establish a bond with

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbatim Quotes from Safe Haven (SH) Pastors/Directors (Underscores were added for emphasis)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| said, well, you know, I've done it already. It's time for the younger people to do it. You know, I said, well, God hasn't stopped giving you the energy to do things....But I have to remember the kids and keep on pushing, put it that way, you know. And if we're going to have a Methodist Church, if we don't start impacting our youth in our communities, we're not going to have a Methodist Church, you know. They like, yeah, now they like the fact that we have kids, and we have plenty of kids and that our kids are bringing in other kids....So, you know, there is some impact there. I just would like to see a greater participation about the church members. That's what's frustrating for me.
<p>|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Micro-to-Macro Contexts of Concern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oneself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Voiced by SH Director/Minister G**
And when I came back [after working at another church], ...the kids were kind of like upset. Well, why did you leave me and that kind of thing, you know? And it was like, you know, you sub [in public school] just fine with the kids. And you know, I never realized how it would affect them when I left....You know, once you establish a bond with
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbatim Quotes from Safe Haven (SH) Pastors/Directors</th>
<th>Micro-to-Macro Contexts of Concern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Underscores were added for emphasis)</td>
<td>Oneself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children &amp; youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family, parents, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SH volunteers/workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UMC church/NIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local school &amp; CPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At-risk neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nat'l &amp; global culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Envisioned future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>children, they don't need you to walk [away], because I guess so many other people walk out of their lives a lot of times, their fathers, their mothers. You don't know what's going on with them, especially their fathers, so, I said I would never do that again. So when I started the Safe Haven program, I wanted to make sure that I was going to, always going to be there for them, you know, and that was important to me, especially since some of the kids, like five of the kids, are my own grandkids, you know, so I'm going to be there for them. I'm going to be there for every, all the other kids.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Finding one's value in valuing the children &amp; the church.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiced by SH Director Carla Williams</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I really need, and this is a need, I need to make a difference. I need to feel that I’m not leaving this world worse than when I got in it. I have to. It’s just, and it becomes more and more every day. And I’m torn, and I’m fighting it. And it’s like, where do I go, what do I do? But I am seeing so much, that it’s like, God, somebody got to do something. And I know I ain’t got all the answers, but I got to do something. And that’s how I feel right now. I feel like, and that’s why it’s so, I hold onto the church. I hold onto this position. I hold onto, I hope they always need me, and I</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Verbatim Quotes from Safe Haven (SH) Pastors/Directors**  
(Underscores were added for emphasis)

| don’t know if that need will be strong or not, but I hope I’m always needed, because I need them. Honestly, I need this place. This place keeps me. This place gives me value. The children give me value. And I just want to fulfill that. I want to make sure that I can at least share that with the babies that come in life. That they know they’re valued. They need to be valued. Too many of our babies aren’t valued. I’m sorry. **Safe Haven Director Carla’s eyes well up with tears.** |
| 11. **Telling teenage summer workers every day to pull their pants up [referring to “sagging” fashion among boys] & hoping this will come back to their minds some day when going toward a responsible job. Voiced by SH Director Carla Williams** |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Micro-to-Macro Contexts of Concern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oneself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The hard part was dealing with where our teenagers are right now. Want me to tell one big challenge I had with the boys [One Summer Chicago workers]? And I only had like six boys, five or six boys. The majority of them were girls. [It was] pants hanging below the behind [referring to “sagging” pants fashion]. And it was like and my problem, and it ran Trustee David plumb crazy, he would be so angry some days. It got to the point where I had to go buy a rope and say [to the boys],
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbatim Quotes from Safe Haven (SH) Pastors/Directors</th>
<th>Micro-to-Macro Contexts of Concern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Underscores were added for emphasis)</td>
<td>Oneself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children &amp; youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family, parents, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SH volunteers/workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UMC church/NIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local school &amp; CPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At-risk neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nat'l &amp; global culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Envisioned future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Look, either tie them up or go home. That means you don’t get paid today.” But, you know, then I had to deal with the constant, but, Ms. Carla, da, da, da, and they’ve got arguments for everything. You can’t make me believe that you can’t live four hours in a day [10:00 a.m.–2:00 p.m., Safe Haven hours] without your pants being below your behind. We have to find a way to get through. Trustee David, he wanted to send the boys home every day, [saying] “I ain’t going to keep telling them, pull their pants up.” [I said], “Yeah, David, we are. You know, yeah, we are. Every day, we’re going to tell them to pull their pants up. Every day, I’m going to fuss with them. Every day, I’m going to check on them. That’s just the, because sending them home is not an answer. Sending them home is not a solution.” They haven’t gotten it. And I don’t know if they’re going to get it before they leave. But at least if they’ve gotten told every day for the last six weeks, then hopefully back there somewhere [in their minds], it’s going to come back up again. And at least it won’t be a surprise when they’re finally going to that job that they do have to stand up and be accounted and, you know, accountable for what they’re doing. But, like I said, I don’t think we can give up on them. I really don’t. We don’t give up on ours. Oh, no.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Verbatim Quotes from Safe Haven (SH) Pastors/Directors

(Underscores were added for emphasis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Micro-to-Macro Contexts of Concern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oneself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children &amp; youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family, parents, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH volunteers/workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMC church/NIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local school &amp; CPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-risk neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat'l &amp; global culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envisioned future</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 12. Making it through frustration & discouragement by always having a spot in your heart for the children.

*Voiced by SH Director Carla Williams*

Naturally, the things that it takes to do the job can be quite challenging and frustrating and even sometimes discouraging. You have to admit that, discouraging. But it’s a matter of keeping in focus what it is that you’re trying to do and who it’s about. It’s not about me, it’s not about the church. It’s not even about the parents. For me, it’s always been about the children. That’s always been my spot in my heart, children. I don’t know why, as I say, but it has. And so that’s when, that’s how you make it through that. But like I said, once I did that, got up and did that, that’s part of the job.

#### 13. Hoping, praying, & sometimes going home to cry while trying to make a difference that is significant enough to make life better for the children.

*Voiced by SH Director Carla Williams*

All I can do is try....I go home and cry many a day. I’ve had days that it’s more....And you can’t change it. You can’t, I can only make my difference here and hope and pray that the difference I make here will one day be significant enough to make their lives better. But they go home to the same thing. They go...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbatim Quotes from Safe Haven (SH) Pastors/Directors</th>
<th>Micro-to-Macro Contexts of Concern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Underscores were added for emphasis)</td>
<td>Onself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children &amp; youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family, parents, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SH volunteers/workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UMC church/NIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local school &amp; CPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At-risk neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nat'l &amp; global culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Envisioned future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>home to the same pressures. They go home to the empty house or the empty refrigerators, the cold homes with no water. They go home to those same things.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Praying for strength to supply what the children need while looking to someday when someone else will care enough to do the same.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Voiced by SH Director/Minister G</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It makes me know that there is a need and that, you know, I <em>pray for strength</em> to be able to help supply, you know, God's children what they need to go on just so that maybe someday when I'm not here there'll be somebody who'll care enough to do the same thing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Listening to jazz music to connect the children with the generations of jazz &amp; blues music &amp; musicians before them.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Voiced by SH Director/Minister G</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And when they get stuff that they're not accustomed to, I think it makes them, like I said, a little better person. You know, I played jazz for them, because it's like jazz is a dying art. You know, you don't have a lot of jazz. A lot of the great jazz musicians are dead, you know, and there are not a lot of young ones coming up that are really into jazz. And that's something that like my generation and the generation before me, they were into</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbatim Quotes from Safe Haven (SH) Pastors/Directors</td>
<td>Micro-to-Macro Contexts of Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Underscores were added for emphasis)</td>
<td>Yourself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children &amp; youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family, parents, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SH volunteers/workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UMC church/NIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local school &amp; CPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At-risk neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nat'l &amp; global culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Envisioned future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jazz and blues, you know, so that's why I play them for them, and that's why I made them sit down, put your heads down, listen to the music. What do you hear? What goes through your mind? Draw what you heard.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Developing affordable field trips during Safe Haven hours even for children who normally never get to go on a trip.</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Voiced by SH Director Carla Williams
I developed, because we’re not required to, but we’re allowed to through the summer program do trips [field trips]. So I have provided trips. And there was a fee. But I felt, if you don’t, I think people do better when they have to contribute at least a little. At least a little.

And, too, it also allowed me to be able to sponsor children that weren’t able to go, that normally wouldn’t be able to go. Because I charged a flat rate for the trips. So anything above allowed me to supply the meals for my staff [One Summer Chicago workers] if I needed to, buy extra supplies for different programs we did. But more than anything, it allowed me to take the children that normally never got to go on a trip. And I have quite a few. This year, it showed a bigger need than ever.

Last year, most of, I can say last year at least 75% to 80% of my parents paid their trip fee
Verbatim Quotes from Safe Haven (SH) Pastors/Directors
(Underscores were added for emphasis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Micro-to-Macro Contexts of Concern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
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<tr>
<td>Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>SH volunteers/workers</td>
</tr>
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<td>UMC church/NIC</td>
</tr>
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<td>Envisioned future</td>
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</table>

the first week of, first week to second week, you know, within the first month of the program. Their trips were already paid for. This year, you could tell they’re struggling, because parents paid right at, some of them, the day of the trip. But like I said, I tried very hard to figure out trips that wouldn’t be costly and that would allow more children to go. And then it’s hard, because you have to fit into 10:00 to 2:00. How many places can you go within 10:00 to 2:00?

Leader efficacy for means and/or resources to perform tasks: Stories 17–19

Leaders’ means for becoming and being a Safe Haven

As we “switch gears” a bit in our focus, Stories 17–19 give us a glimpse into a collective rationale and values for launching a Safe Haven program at Elston Avenue UMC and deciding to keep it going when CPS suddenly stopped funding due to temporary low enrollment of Safe Haven kids (fewer than 25 kids per day).

In essence, this experience became a collective “test” of commitment to rally the necessary resources and press on. Later, in fact, we will appreciate this time of collective decision-making at Elston Avenue UMC as collective efficacy.

17. Feeling energized by a mutually-attractive alignment of values, identity, & resources among all Safe Haven stakeholders.

Voiced by Pastor/Director Hannah Kardon
### Verbatim Quotes from Safe Haven (SH) Pastors/Directors
(underscores were added for emphasis)

[About becoming a Safe Haven] It was like, oh, here’s an opportunity that fits into the _Urban Strategy_. Our Bishop cares about it. Other churches care about it. We’re not alone in trying to do it. And it fits really well with our pre-existing core values [children & family] and our identity and our resources. You know, we couldn’t do everything that was suggested. But we could do this thing. And we could do it well. And it fit into what we actually care about.

And one of the leaders was like, you know, we have 300+ churches in the Conference [NIC]. Only six of them did Safe Haven, and we were one of them. You know, that was really meaningful to her that this was something that everyone had been invited to do, and we managed to do it. So I think the places where there’s multiplication of investment, energy, ability, inspiration. Those have been kind of the places.

18. Deciding by faith to continue on after being suddenly cut by CPS (for temporary low enrollment). Rallying with funds & affirmation from other UMCs.

_Voiced by Pastor/Director Hannah Kardon_

Our funding was cut by CPS half-way through, but they were still willing to have us do the program because they thought our program was good. But we just couldn’t get

### Micro-to-Macro Contexts of Concern

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oneself</th>
<th>Children &amp; youth</th>
<th>Family, parents, etc.</th>
<th>SH volunteers/workers</th>
<th>UMC church/NIC</th>
<th>Local school &amp; CPS</th>
<th>At-risk neighborhood</th>
<th>Nat'l &amp; global culture</th>
<th>Envisioned future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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### Verbatim Quotes from Safe Haven (SH) Pastors/Directors
(underscores were added for emphasis)

- The money; we prayed; we met; we made the decision we’re going to continue on. Right? We had that mustard seed. And then coming back from it was the District Superintendent saying that he would fund us. Two churches said that next summer they would fund us if it happened again. You know, like, when we kind of made that decision; God is working here; we’re going follow God’s call; God really showed us how blessed things can be when we just decide we can do them.

- 19. Pausing among church leaders & pastor to consciously assess readiness & commit to becoming a Safe Haven. **Voiced by Pastor/Director Hannah Kardon**

  Meaningfully, I think a big part of what is meaningful was that we took the time to really commit as a community, you know. Are we really up for this? Like do we really have ownership? And we made the decision, yes. So, there was leadership of the church involved—not just me [the pastor].

| Leader efficacy for means and/or resources to perform tasks: Stories 20–25 |
| Leader’s means for accomplishing child & youth development |

Continuing with a focus on rallying resources in Stories 20–25, we see Safe Haven pastors/directors resourcefully reaching for the means to nurture Safe Haven kid’s development. In their own ways, for instance, we witness Safe Haven...
### Verbatim Quotes from Safe Haven (SH) Pastors/Directors
(Underscores were added for emphasis)

- Pastors'/directors’ aims to be a positive role model; to use games and play as an *means for kids learning to cooperate with each other* (an alternative means for teaching anti-bullying as required by CPS); and to use painting still lifes as an *means for kids to express their feelings*.

### Micro-to-Macro Contexts of Concern

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Oneself</th>
<th>Children &amp; youth</th>
<th>Home</th>
<th>Family, parents, etc.</th>
<th>SH volunteers/workers</th>
<th>UMC church/NIC</th>
<th>Local school &amp; CPS</th>
<th>At-risk neighborhood</th>
<th>Nat'l &amp; global culture</th>
<th>Envisioned future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20. Modeling other avenues &amp; options of expression besides anger &amp; aggression (alternatives to bullying).</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Voiced by SH Director Carla Williams*

And a lot of you, people say, I’m tired of the anti-bullying. Well, the reality is antibully is not going anywhere. *Bullying* is not going anywhere. If anything, it’s getting worse. And I think that, again, is something that we talked about earlier, it’s the technology that has displaced the personal **element in relationships**. So our children, it’s a little different when you say a mean word on a computer or in a telephone than if you say it to someone’s face when you actually can see the hurt you placed on them.

So I think that plays a part. So here, and with dealing with that, *we try to help the children learn how to interact, communicate, have other avenues of expression besides anger and aggression*. And also let them realize that that
is not the way we should be when everything tells them that’s how it is. That’s, I mean, everything they see today shows them, this is how we act, this is what we do, you know. The music, the TV, the computer, everything says, this is where we responded to conflict. And if we at least allow them a place to be where they see another avenue, that’s what we are. That’s what we are. We’re an option. We’re an option to decide whether they’re going to go this way or give them something different. So I think that’s the difference, and that’s one way their lives are changed. They have new options, so I think that was it.

21. Playing cooperative learning games to practice cooperation & show how children need each other to do things (alternatives to bullying).

Voiced by SH Director Carla Williams

And the [CPS] curriculums, for the most part, it surprised me. The anti-bullying, I think that has become more of, let them lead that. I let the children lead discussions. We bring out topics, we talk about, and then let their discussions lead us. It’s not as much, because they give us a curriculum. But I use this as a guide now, because a lot of our children have been here more than once, so they know it. What I’ve incorporated is
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Micro-to-Macro Contexts of Concern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oneself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children &amp; youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family, parents, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH volunteers/workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMC church/NIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local school &amp; CPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-risk neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat'l &amp; global culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envisioned future</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

what we call cooperative learning games. If we teach them to cooperate with each other, eventually the bullying will stop, when they learn how to, that they need each other to do things. So I’m adding, especially for Christmas break, that’ll be heavy. We’re going to do a lot of cooperative learning games so that they will be dependent on each other to do things. So that’s another way of teaching anti-bullying without teaching anti-bullying.

22. Lifting up high school volunteers by giving them responsibility to lead children’s activities & discover their gifts.

*Voiced by Pastor/Director Hannah Kardon*

High school students in the Chicago Public School system need 40 hours of service to graduate from high school....So, this last spring, we had somewhere between 10–20 high school students be part of the [Safe Haven] program....They really step into themselves. I think high schools more and more treat teenagers like children. And teenagers need that way to become adults. And they really are given responsibility, responsibility that is overseen, Right? So that if it was misused, that would not cause harm to younger children. But, we found some extraordinary leaders through that. A couple leaders, one of whom came back for the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbatim Quotes from Safe Haven (SH) Pastors/Directors</th>
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<td><em>(Underscores were added for emphasis)</em></td>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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<tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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<td>Nat'l &amp; global culture</td>
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<td>Envisioned future</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

summer just ‘cause he found it so fun. And he like, he’s going to run the world. He was really great with kids, really great with organization. But we really got to lift them up, talk about how great they were, and some of them were teenagers who like school is maybe not their primary spiritual gift. But we could really lift up and say, like you are benefiting these children. You are so great when you lead a game, and that’s not an easy thing to do. So that practically volunteers were necessary. And practically, that relationship with the high school was really great.

23. Wishing for the means to take Safe Haven kids to Chicago or Millennium Park & thinking it’s crazy for them to live in Chicago and never experience it.

*Voiced by SH Director/Minister G77*

I would love, and I know we can’t do that, to take the kids downtown, because some of them have probably never been downtown, and just walk around. You know, we with our older children being big enough to take on the responsibility of like four of the little ones, and with the adults that we, we have enough, we just don’t have the means, you know, and I wish we did. That was always my biggest thing, is taking kids someplace that they’ve never been before.
And I say that, and it's funny, because my son said his friend had posted on Facebook, he remembers when he used to go to the drive-in with his mother, which was me, you know. That's why I say the children are always good, you know. And I said, that is so funny, but kids, you know, the things you remember that makes you become a person that will be interested in doing something like that for the next generation, and I guess I got along with kids because of my own mom. She used to, and she, and I used to always say my mother used to take me and seven to eight of my friends on the bus places, you know. And so once I got grown, and I was driving, my mother never drove, I said, now, I have a car, and I'm off over here. I can take my kids someplace, you know. But it was, like I say, once again, it was a different time. You didn't need the expense that involves taking kids someplace. It wasn't there like it is now. But I would love to take the kids, and not to the zoo, because the schools always take them to the zoo. I'd like to take them to places that they're not going to go to otherwise or walk around downtown, you know, or walk them through Millennium Park just to walk through it, you know, if you've never, you can't say that you've never been. It's, to me, it's the craziest thing to live somewhere and have never experienced the place that you live in.
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<td>SH volunteers/workers</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>And Chicago is such an awesome place to visit, you know.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Focusing extensively on games &amp; play as formational for children to learn kindness, problem-solving, sportsmanship, &amp; teamwork.</td>
<td>✓  ✓  ✓  ✓  ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiced by Pastor/Director Hannah Kardon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I also think games really really impact child development. Like that’s sort of the research side that I know. Games and play really are formational for children. And they’ve been almost completely cut out of the Chicago Public Schools school day. So, this was an opportunity for them to learn sportsmanship and kindness, and that was really a focus during the summer. And problem-solving skills and teamwork.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Validating children’s expressions of their feelings as they listen to music and learn to paint still lifes of flower vases.</td>
<td>✓  ✓  ✓  ✓  ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiced by SH Director/Minister G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They listened to some music, and then I put some vases on all of the tables, and they drew still lifes, because they, first, they complained about the fact that they couldn't draw, but then when I pulled out the paint, it made it, you know, nice, so they got to paint still lifes, you know. They would talk about each other's pictures. That is beautiful, and that's what you feel. And so, you know, that's one of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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things that I like to instill in these kids, is that it's about how you feel. You know, they may not get that otherwise. And that's how I think it made a difference in the lives of the kids, because they want to come back, you know. That's the other thing, they want to come back. They're proud to show their parents what they've done all day long. You know, it wasn't like we were just sitting here doing nothing.

Leader efficacy for means and/or resources to perform tasks: Stories 26–27
Leaders’ means for impacting Chicago & community
Finally, as to rallying resources, some Safe Haven pastors/directors are resourcefully finding ways to visibly demonstrate Safe Haven’s impact on their church and community. Stories 26–27 share these creative and practical means.

26. Photocopying children’s letters about Safe Haven & sending them to Chicago’s Mayor & CPS headquarters to show gratitude & impact on kids.

Voiced by Pastor/SH Director Adonna Davis Reid
What we also did as a result of the first program, I told you the kids were writing every day. Well, one of their writing prompts was: What have you liked about Safe Haven or being here? And I took those letters, copied them, and sent them downtown [Chicago] to a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Micro-to-Macro Contexts of Concern</th>
<th>Oneself</th>
<th>Children &amp; youth</th>
<th>Home</th>
<th>Family, parents, etc.</th>
<th>SH volunteers/workers</th>
<th>UMC church/NIC</th>
<th>Local school &amp; CPS</th>
<th>At-risk neighborhood</th>
<th>Nat'l &amp; global culture</th>
<th>Envisioned future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Micro-to-Macro Contexts of Concern</th>
<th>Oneself</th>
<th>Children &amp; youth</th>
<th>Home</th>
<th>Family, parents, etc.</th>
<th>SH volunteers/workers</th>
<th>UMC church/NIC</th>
<th>Local school &amp; CPS</th>
<th>At-risk neighborhood</th>
<th>Nat'l &amp; global culture</th>
<th>Envisioned future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
variety of offices. And so that garnered some support, I think, from maybe the Mayor, perhaps, the Safe Haven headquarters or whatever.

The impact on the church, I think it’s opened up their eyes. Oh, before I leave that, I didn’t do that with the letters in order to get anything. I just did it because I wanted them to know that we were grateful for being part of the program, and this is the impact that it’s had. This is something you should know. You’re not here, but this is the impact that it’s having on these kids.

For one of the kids, I had to read her letter over a couple of times because I thought, wow, why is this child like knocking her teacher? The letter was all about how she hated science [saying], “I hated that. I never got it. I don’t like to go to that class. You know, I always feel embarrassed. I just hate it. Nobody ever explains it right.” And then the last sentence was, finally, “I get it. Finally, I get it.” And I thought, oh, one of the teachers who was doing science really got through to this child.

Significant, right. Okay, impact on the church, as I said, the church had not really done anything this extensive with children in a while.
<table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Underscores were added for emphasis)</td>
<td>Oneself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Liking Safe Haven as a means for being visible outside of the church &amp; signaling that the church is in on what’s going on in the community.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Voiced by SH Director/Minister G*

You know, like if you just stood outside and cleaned up, and, you know, you're the pastor of the church, and you're out here sweeping up, you know, and that kind of thing. That was one of the things I've tried to do over the summers to be visible. You know, I would go outside. They'd say [people walking by the church], oh, you're one of the, you're the [senior pastor]; I said, no, I'm not the senior pastor of the church. I am one of the pastors of this church. And they like to see you out there. They, if your community sees you in the community, they possibly will start to feel like, oh, you are part of what's going on in this area, you know, especially other than Sunday, you know. They need to see, you know.

I feel that we need to be intentional about being outside of the church. That's what I like about the Safe Haven, you know. It helps you along. It gives you some exposure outside of the church. Your church is doing something. Maybe that's a church I want to get involved in, you know. And that's what you have to look at nowadays. You have to be visible in your community. They're not going to take
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Leader efficacy for action: Stories 28–33
Now, concluding Table 15, Stories 28–33 have in mind an *envisioned future* that is inspiring Safe Haven pastors’/directors’ commitment to their work. While confidently hoping for an as yet unrealized future goal, Safe Haven pastors/directors are being affirming, accepting, and offering a positive church experience amid their diverse contextual challenges in the present day.

28. Affirming, loving, & not judging while holding children & teenagers accountable when they choose wrong in order to help them do better & not stay in despair.

*Voiced by Pastor/SH Director Ayla Zaki Samson*

I think clearly the difference is a difference of affirmation. It’s because in my experience in the after-school program and also as a pastor when dealing with families with children, children need guidelines. And most of the time, they will choose wrong. Unfortunately, because that’s just life, you know, and that’s life experience. And you have to give them room to choose. And when they do choose wrong, there has to be where they can say mistakes are made, but they don’t need to be
made again. So, I think the balance of, you know, holding children accountable for their behavior and their moral and ethical standards over against affirmation has to be retained all the time.

I have experienced all levels of risk being from children who have been involved in, and I’ve worked more with teenagers, with teenagers who have been involved in smoking marijuana, doing all kinds of promiscuous behavior, and they are so many times pushed out of the house because of their behavior patterns.

But when they have come to the program and they have been affirmed and not judged, they have been told you make a mistake, but that doesn’t mean you continue making that mistake; that you have a potential, that you are beautiful, and you’re so smart, and you have a chance to fix this. You know, parents can be very tied down by checking their children when they are doing something wrong. So they do not have the energy to make that affirmation. But whereas an outsider in the after-school program, you know, you are close enough to the child, but you’re not that emotionally attached that you can make that affirmation. But make it in the sense that you are not enabling the child but actually holding them accountable in love. And you know, helping them to understand.
**Verbatim Quotes from Safe Haven (SH) Pastors/Directors**  
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> you know, there are consequences, and you’re too young to waste your life like this. You are actually so smart.

> So, in other words, you know that affirmation goes a long way because they feel that, yeah, I can. If I choose to, I can change, and I can do better. And I think that’s where the church really needs to step in. You know, when we do these programs, whether it’s Vacation Bible School, which has nothing to do with another organization, or we do our own programs and we invite children, *I think this is very crucial and very much needed. Even among children who already have households that are affirming and nurturing and loving, I think sometimes a word of affirmation coming from outside the home can be a source of great blessing.*

> I am a believer that we should always keep both of these spectrums together. You know, those whose lives are doing well, so that they can appreciate, or those who go home, and it’s not going well. And for those who it’s not going well, see that it can be better. You don’t have to be in this situation.

> So, I have to tell you that some of the teenagers that I have come across over the last year and even years before that, those affirmations may not show themselves right away. But over the years, you know, they remember that, you know, that they were
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<tr>
<td>loved by somebody in this place, or they were affirmed. You know, God can work in them to nudge them to help them to do better and not stay in despair and hopelessness. Because I feel, and I will state to my coordinators, they are only going to be with us for a very short time, and we can inject as much love and affirmation in them as we can.</td>
<td>Children &amp; youth</td>
<td>Family, parents, etc.</td>
<td>SH volunteers/workers</td>
<td>UMC church/NIC</td>
<td>Local school &amp; CPS</td>
<td>At-risk neighborhood</td>
<td>Nat'l &amp; global culture</td>
<td>Envisioned future</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Hoping a Muslim child will remember acts of Christian acceptance if/when Muslim-Christian tensions arise.</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Voiced by Pastor/SH Director Hannah Kardon</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But one of the things I think about that...One of those little girls in that [Muslim] family group; I took roll call every day. Right? And one day I was taking roll call at lunch. And they like to say silly things, you know. And one of them kind of thought she was going to get me. And I said her name. And she goes, “Assalamu alaikum” [(a common Islamic greeting, “Peace be with you”)]. And I said, “Wa alaikum salaam” [(“And upon you be peace”)] and went onto the next name. And she looked at me like I’ve never seen eyes so big, like what?! <em>Laughter.</em> What?! How does she know? <em>Laughter.</em> How does she know? And after that, she was a lot more kind of close to me, like shared a lot of things with me, thought I was very funny. And it was just the idea that people knew about that</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>dimension of her life and could respond to that dimension of her life, I think, was both hilarious to her. Right. And she’s someone who I think gets a love from a lot of places in her life. That’s a great family. But it ... You know, I think to have someone from our church have that piece of knowledge and have that kind of loving relationship, if there was ever a time when there was a Christian-Muslim divide in her life where people were mocking or bullying each other at school or there was that kind of tension that comes up in life now that we have decreased tools to talk about religion, I hope she would think of that. I hope she would think of our church. I hope she would think of our volunteers, and I hope she would think of that moment. And I hope, you know, that she would either call us or know that that’s not how all Christians will respond to her as a fellow child of God, if not a brother in faith.</td>
<td>Oneself Children &amp; youth Home Family, parents, etc. SH volunteers/workers UMC church/NIC Local school &amp; CPS At-risk neighborhood Nat’l &amp; global culture Envisioned future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Hoping kid’s experience of meeting diverse peoples will be noticed by &amp; discussed with parents.</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Voice by Pastoral Intern/SH Director Andy Gilg*

I want to say that I think they were impacted as far as watching their kids interact with others. I’m hopeful that now those kids ... like this might be very idealistic of me, but I’m
### Verbatim Quotes from Safe Haven (SH) Pastors/Directors
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Micro-to-Macro Contexts of Concern</th>
<th>Oneself</th>
<th>Child(ren) &amp; youth</th>
<th>Home</th>
<th>Family, parents, etc.</th>
<th>SH volunteers/workers</th>
<th>UMC church/NIC</th>
<th>Local school &amp; CPS</th>
<th>At-risk neighborhood</th>
<th>Nat'l &amp; global culture</th>
<th>Envisioned future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hopeful that those kids after having that experience of meeting all sorts of new people maybe will act in a way that their parents notice. Or maybe their parents are already very attuned to those differences and can continue conversations. I think that any time those new world views are given to someone, it impacts those around them as well. And so, I’m hopeful that that happened. I also recognize that, unfortunately, some kids may have gone home to parents who wanted nothing to do with any kind of diversity and any time maybe they thought about it, it was shut down by their parents and things like that. And I’m hopeful that’s not the case, but the reality is, the situation is that it might be. Unfortunately.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. Loving how a child’s positive church experience means church is a more likely place to go in time of need.  
Voiced by Pastor/SH Director Hannah Kardon

I think long-term another big thing for me is that I saw children have their first positive experience with a church or with any religious community. Right? That we had grandmothers and mothers and fathers reporting to us, “Oh, you know, he or she was saying the other day, I can’t wait to go back to the church. Can we go today? Can we go to the church tomorrow?” For them, a lot of kids...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbatim Quotes from Safe Haven (SH) Pastors/Directors</th>
<th>Micro-to-Macro Contexts of Concern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Underscores were added for emphasis)</td>
<td>Oneself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don’t have a positive experience with a religious community now. I love that they know that this is a place that they can come for safety and for help and for home even if it’s not for a program. It hasn’t happened yet, but I do feel like this means that down the road if they are in a time of crisis, a time of struggle, or a time of searching, a time of questioning, they’re more likely to think of churches as places they can go to delve into that more than they were before. Right? Because it tends to be off the radar.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Being certain of a child’s future awareness of God. <em>Voiced by SH Director/Minister G</em></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And so that’s why I wanted to make Safe Haven fun, and I wanted them to be learning something. And unfortunately—well, I shouldn’t say unfortunately—I guess somewhere down the line they'll know that God loved them and sent somebody into their lives [children &amp; youth]. You know, I was going to say, unfortunately, ...we can't teach about God, but somewhere in the back of their minds, it had, it'll eventually say, it must have been God to send that person into my life. And I know it will be, I have no doubt in my mind, whatever you say.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Trying to build a self-assured person. <em>Voiced by SH Director Carla Williams</em></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(Underscores were added for emphasis)

Well, I think part of it, the fact that we allow them to learn more about being who they are; it gives them a sense of self-assurance. [We’re] trying to build a person here. You’re trying to tell them they’re okay where they are. That doesn’t mean they don’t need to improve, but I’m going to love you, I’m going to care for you, and then...that’s basically what it means. [There’s] nothing you can do about it.

You can try to make me mad. You can do all these things. But and just that sometimes children just need to know that. And that changes their lives. It changes how they look at themselves. It changes how they address each other.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Micro-to-Macro Contexts of Concern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oneself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children &amp; youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family, parents, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH volunteers/workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMC church &amp; NIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local school &amp; CPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-risk neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat'l &amp; global culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envisioned future</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, as we mentioned earlier, this rich database of 33 Safe Haven pastors’/directors’ stories will serve as a key building block for analysis and interpretation of the case study’s findings in Chapters 6 and 7.

**A Tally from Table 15’s Integration of 33 Stories with 10 Contexts of Concern**

Finally, as one other way to appreciate the micro-to-macro contexts that Safe Haven pastors/directors may be keeping in mind, Table 16 is a brief excerpt of Appendix B’s
complete counts of 1) the highest occurrences of contexts in any one
pastors’/directors’ story, indicated by yellow-highlighted checkmarks ✅, and 2) the
sums of micro-to-macro contexts across all 33 stories. Yellow highlighting identifies
highest counts for ease of reference. Hastening to recall that these represent a static
snapshot of time when Safe Haven pastors/directors were interviewed in November
2015, we will return to interpret these findings in Chapter 6. For now, based on Table
16, here is a summary of the contexts of concern most often inferred from
pastors’/directors’ stories (in descending order):

- Safe Haven & volunteers/workers (32)
- Oneself (31)
- Children & youth (29)
- Envisioned future (24)
- UMC local church & NIC (19)
Table 16. Tally of 10 Contexts of Concern Excerpted from Appendix B

| 10 Contexts of Concerns with Highest Occurrence (Highlighted in yellow as in Appendix B) | Oneself | Children & youth | Home | Family, parents, etc. | SH volunteers/workers | UMC church/NIC | Local school & CPS | At-risk neighborhood | Nat’l & global culture | Envisioned future | Totals by Row |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Thinking of oneself knowing God & relating it to seeing the “God part” of children light up when playing games. | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 10 |
| 20. Modeling other avenues of expression besides anger & aggression (alternatives to bullying). | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 9 |
| Totals by Column | 31 | 29 | 8 | 14 | 32 | 19 | 12 | 9 | 7 | 24 |

**Summary of the NIC’s Safe Haven Contexts**

Recall that we set out to answer Chapter 4’s framing question: **What is the context that is impacting the NIC and UMC Safe Haven leadership?** Accordingly, we used Figure 11 on page 95 as an overview framework and a tool to visualize the NIC’s macro-to-micro contextual framework including:

- **The UMC (Global).**
- **Northern Illinois and Chicago’s extreme context.**
- **The Chicago Urban Strategy’s Safe Haven programs.**
- **Safe Haven pastors’/director’s own contexts of concern.**
Akin to Russian dolls nested one inside the other, we have verified that the NIC is operating in complex and interconnected contexts. And given that “leadership does not take place in a vacuum” (Porter & McLaughlin, 2006, p. 559), we will return to these findings in Chapter 6 in order to appreciate how context is impacting NIC leadership and how NIC leadership is impacting context. That said, a more expansive study of the NIC’s context is beyond the scope of this case study.

We carry this awareness of the NIC’s organizational context now into Chapter 5’s findings and look up-close at what is working in the CUS and UMC Safe Havens.
Chapter 5: Findings from NIC’s Safe Haven Phenomenon—Leaders’ Stories of Adapting to Context

What’s working [in the NIC’s Chicago Urban Strategy] is that now we have a solid foundation to build on. We have awareness. We’ve had opportunity to participate. And, not only to participate, but we’ve had some issues that have called us to action, the shootings, the marches, what’s going to happen in the school system in the next several months with the strike that’s going to come. We’re good. We’re in the race now. Yeah. We weren’t in the race. We were on the sidelines. But now we’re in the race. People know we’re there. The elected officials know we’re there. Our congregations know we’re there. We’re no longer the spectators. We’re participators. That’s what working.

UMC Pastor Jacques Conway
Neighborhood UMC of Maywood, IL
St. Matthew UMC of Chicago, IL
January 15, 2016

Recalling Chapter 5’s Framing Question

What are NIC and UMC Safe Haven leaders doing to adapt to their context?

Thanks to the transparency and generosity of NIC case study participants, here in Chapter 5, we see beyond surface-level descriptions into relationships, connections, and interdependencies not previously observed in the CUS’s Safe Haven phenomenon. In fact, this is a primary goal of theory construction (Weick, 1989) as it helps to make the implicit more explicit in order to increase our understanding.

So, from the dramatic tipping points that launched the NIC’s Chicago Urban Strategy to the socially complex and emergent dynamics that brought five Safe Havens to life, Chapter 5 unfolds the adaptive story of this phenomenon. By means of a
phenomenon-driven research approach, in fact, Chapter 5 “places theory in the background in order to capture, document, and conceptualize a phenomenon” (Schwarz & Stensaker, 2016, p. 12). And in the process, a model for a well-functioning UMC Safe Haven emerges as *an adaptive outcome* born by the Chicago Urban Strategy (CUS).

As summarized in Chapter 3’s Methods, Chapter 5’s leaders’ stories of adapting to Chicago’s extreme context are drawn directly from their interviews. Therefore, except where noted otherwise, the quotes contained throughout Chapter 5 are verbatim quotes from case study participants’ interview transcripts.

**A Tipping Point to Commence the NIC’s Chicago Urban Strategy**

According to the stories of case study participants such as Pastor Jacques Conway, an intolerable magnitude in the status quo came to fruition in May 2013 when the NIC launched the Chicago Urban Strategy (CUS). Culminating in the time of Bishop Sally Dyck’s arrival in Chicago, it was as if prevailing forces converged in response to the unbearable conditions and probability of consequences for inner-city UMC churches and their communities. We can listen in here to their reminiscing as Bishop Sally, CPD Chief Eugene Williams, and Pastor Jacques tell the story of those CUS beginnings.
Upon her arrival, Bishop Sally recounts how she was immediately confronted about inner-city Chicago, and particularly so by Chief Eugene, who was eager to share his own vision for the NIC and to share what is working in Chicago’s at-risk neighborhoods.

It really is a story of once I was assigned here in September of 2012, I immediately began to get messages from people, I mean, the way in which they talked about it. “We're hoping that you will come and that you will help, really, the Chicago churches, United Methodism, to make a difference in our city.” And I will always say that I know that there were local churches who were trying and clergy who were trying. But overall they had really fallen off the radar screen of any of the major governmental institutions, which in Chicago is pretty important. In the Mayor's office, Chicago Public Schools, Chicago Police Department, United Methodism wasn't really regarded as a player. And then the—I think he's called the Deputy Chief, Eugene Williams, of the police department—handed me this report from the Mayor's office that was put together by a community group that identified what were the things that were really working and making a difference in the communities [CARE for Chicago City-County Action Plan (Biebel et al., 2012, July 19)].

And he challenged me to take it seriously. And he believed that the United Methodist Church is uniquely structured so as to be able to impact the whole city. And I think I didn't quite appreciate that at the time. You know, we don't have a church of 10,000. But we have 10,000 [members] across the city limits, and then, of course, supporting churches beyond who also care about Chicago. So I was on a long flight to the Philippines shortly after that and read it over, and really began to connect some of what people have been saying when I was assigned here, wondering how this would work.

At that time, Chief Eugene was one of Bishop Sally’s first contacts in Chicago because he was serving as the NIC Trustee responsible for preparing the parsonage for her family residence. Chief Eugene maximized those first meetings to get to know
Bishop Sally. Yet, at the same time, he admits here that he was surprised that she wanted to live in Chicago and not in outlying Naperville, Illinois, where the prior NIC bishop chose to live. He was surprised by her commitment to inner-city Chicago:

I asked her. I said, “You want to be in Chicago as opposed to Naperville as your home?” And she's like, “No, I want to be in the city. I want to be in the inner city. I want to embrace, absorb everything that's going on in the city. I want to be in the city. I don't want to be out.” “Oh, wow, okay,” I said. And so our conversation, you know, was kind of surprising given, you know, things that were going on in Chicago.

So we talked and talked about the possibilities. And she shared her love for wanting to do something in the inner-city. You know, wanting to, and we were in the throes of a pretty violent time in terms of shootings and killings. And she expressed her desire to want to bring the resources of the Conference [NIC] to bear, to do whatever she could. She wanted to be a, you know, a partner in trying to make things better for inner-city Chicago. And I wasn't completely taken aback but, you know, I go, “This is really cool,” you know, that she would want to do that.

So our conversation went from there to, ....at that time I probably had probably like 32 or 33 years as a police officer, had a host of relationships, had the ability to reach out to ecumenical, you know, entities, the Mayor's office, elected officials, and so forth. So I started down the road trying to steer and direct and give information to her as to how we could get into the Mayor's office, get a meeting for her so she could introduce herself as a new, you know, Episcopal leader of the United Methodist Church in the Chicago area and so forth and so on. And I kind of just threw those things out. She picked up on it and moved forward with it.

Herein we start to see prevailing forces begin to converge in Bishop Sally’s desire to bring the resources of the NIC to bear in Chicago and in Chief Eugene’s vision for the UMC to impact the whole city of Chicago. And at this time, Pastor Robert Biekman
was appointed as the NIC’s Urban Strategy Coordinator. But Bishop Sally goes on to
tell about her unequivocal meeting with Pastor Jacques Conway that raised the bar
and left her with more questions than answers.

And then one very fateful morning I was preaching in a church in
Maywood and the pastor [Pastor Jacques], I got there early, which I
often do, and the pastor just, you know, recalled all of the “saints” in
his life who had really made a difference, and made a difference for
him but made a difference for communities. And he also essentially
challenged me. He was like, “You came here. And you have to make a
difference in this. We need you to make a difference.” And so I went,
“Oh, my gosh, how do I do that?” Chicago, it's the most ingrown city
I've ever lived in. Chicago, it's the most complicated city. Cleveland is
probably right after it [where Bishop Sally served in prior years of her
ministry]. But, you know, and I just got here, so I'm an outsider. And
how do you read this context? How do you mobilize these churches?
Will they even follow such leadership? But I figured out a way to, you
know, to kind of get somebody to help us begin to organize. And he's
[Pastor Robert Biekman] just such an organizer par excellence that,
you know, he's really made all the difference in this moving.

And so, you know, we rallied support initially, but it was never about a
one-and-done event. It was always about how do we build capacity in
these local [UMC] churches, and by that both clergy and laity in these
communities to reach out, and care for areas that they could address?

And Pastor Jacques remembers how he laid it all on the line that morning with Bishop
Sally. As a former police officer before he became a UMC pastor, Pastor Jacques
figured that he had this one chance on Sunday, February 24, 2013, to speak from his
heart to Bishop Sally, even if it might “piss her off.” Here Pastor Jacques generously
shares his rationale for risking to speak up, to catch Bishop Sally “off guard,” and to
claim that “if it doesn’t happen, it’s gonna be on your watch.” Without intending to
issue a threat, Pastor Jacques laid out the dire circumstances for inner-city UMCs.

“This is the moment we have to have something from you, Bishop,” he declared.

When Bishop Dyck came, I felt this was the last go-rah because under her watch, we’re either gonna rise or sink. We had no more leverage and lee-way to just float. It just wasn’t gonna happen. And she took on that challenge. I don’t know what her purpose was before she got here, if that was something that she already thought of, but I don’t care. It was just that I had her at my suburban church. She was there to preach. And I said, “Bishop, I’ll never have an opportunity to have a bishop in my office one on one. So, I’m going to say what I have to say, and then you do what you gotta do. Chuckle. But I gotta take advantage of this opportunity.” And that’s when I shared with her that there has to be some leadership from her seat in our City because if not, you can pretty much “X out” our black United Methodist Churches in the Southern District. We won’t be around.

The first I wanted to do was acknowledge that there’s an issue, because in my time in our Conference, we had no bishops say that there’s an issue that has to be addressed. We had to have some acknowledgement. “Bishop, I want when you get back to look. Look closely at what’s happening in our black inner-city churches. Do that,” [I said.] That was a success for me to say, yes, she’s gonna do it because that has not been done. You can’t fix what you don’t see. And so, that was a victory. Because she had agreed to look at our inner-city churches. And I knew once she looked, her heart would not let her close her eyes. I hadn’t had an opportunity to challenge a bishop to look. So, I knew once she saw that there was a problem that her skill set and her desire and the Spirit within her would lead her to do something about it. Now, was I expecting four years later some miraculous answers and problem solving? No. No. Of course not. The problem is too in-depth to feel that it can be fixed with a Band-Aid. It has to be a complete reconstruction surgery, and that takes time to do. But when you acknowledge there’s an issue, then you have started the process of healing and change. And so that was the success for me....

I made a proclamation that under your watch, if you don’t do anything, you will go away carrying the burden that you missed the opportunity. So I was like a crier of the Old Testament that this is what needs to happen. I could’ve been wrong. But I just felt from my heart of heart that these few minutes that I had her before she preached that I better take advantage of that and let her know, not knowing if I was going to
piss her off by making such a statement. But it was important that I didn’t worry about ramifications more than I did about making the point because if I didn’t piss her off at that point, there would be some time in the future that then I would probably do something anyway. *Laughter.* Yeah, it’s probably gonna happen. With my personality, it’s gonna happen.

A white female, 5’4” or 5’6” whatever she is, you know, 105 pounds. To get to this point, she has some toughness about her because she had to run into some obstacles to get to this point, especially to get to the Northern Illinois Conference, which is a challenge in and of itself. She knew this was not gonna be just a walk in the park. She knew that. I think she had to remind herself, “Yes, I do, and I don’t have time to figure out all the things that have to happen. I can’t say, let’s have a study committee for the next six months.” I could hear her saying, “I’m going to do something right now.” She knew that this was a very demanding Conference. And people want to come here. Yeah. This is the 3rd largest city in the United States of America. We have the whole gamut from rural to urban to very, very well off, you know, from a whole list of clergy: Filipinos, Koreans, African Americans, you just name it. We have it all. I don’t know how many other Conferences have such diversity as this one does. So, this [Conference] was on her “I want to go” list, I’m sure. When I cornered her, like a paparazzi photographer, I think she said, “Man, they aren’t gonna even let me have a chance to get a feel of the land. I can’t even decorate my office.” *Laughter…*

I think I caught her off guard. She was not expecting that. I mean, we had a chance to meet a couple times, but she really didn’t know me for me. And so, I think for her to hear me in that moment, she probably was thinking, “O.K., this guy is really passionate, and he’s bold.” And I told her, “If it doesn’t happen, it’s gonna be on your watch. It’s gonna be on you. You’re the one. When you leave, it’s gonna fall on you.”

And I think she was,...I mean I was in police work for 20+ years. I can read body language. And that was something. You don’t want to hear that. You don’t want to hear that if it doesn’t work, they’re gonna blame me. Well, the reality is, they always blame the leader. They always blame the leader. But I didn’t say that to her as a threat. I said it to her in the sense that, “I want you to be aware that this is the moment that we have to have something from you, Bishop. Because no one else has done it.”
Bishop Sally heard the message alright, because it was still on her mind the next morning when I showed up in her office to introduce myself and to offer to channel my research to the NIC. As mentioned earlier, that Monday morning she voiced to me her awareness of the “incredible expectations that I will help Chicago churches in particular” (S. Dyck, personal communication, February 25, 2013). She was still reflecting on those high expectations that she heard from Pastor Jacques the day before. So from data analysis, it seems these were some of the prevailing forces that became the tipping point for the official launch of NIC’s Chicago Urban Strategy in May 2013.

**A Tipping Point for CPS**

Along these lines, Founder and Executive Director of CPS’s Safe Haven program, Rev. Renaldo Kyles, tells of the prevailing forces that came together to launch the Safe Haven program in December 2009. Apparently, it was a success from the start with support from Mayor Richard M. Daley, CPS CEO Ron Huberman, and from various pastors and churches in inner-city Chicago. These prevailing forces set the stage for the UMC’s eventual involvement, though the NIC was not primed to participate until Spring Break 2014. Here, Rev. Kyles recalls how he got the idea for Safe Havens. “The Lord just gave it to me, that’s all,” he said.

I serve as the Director of the Office of Faith Based Initiatives here in Chicago Public Schools, and I’m a director and manager and founder of the Safe Haven program, which started in December of 2009.
At that time, we saw a rise of violence towards our youth, and then, during the breaks the kids are out of school with nowhere to go. Parents can’t afford babysitters, day camps. So I was like, we have to do something to keep the kids off the streets. So I went to our CEO [at CPS]. What better places, I said, to open up than the churches? So we piloted the program of 27 churches during the Christmas break [2009], and it was such a success that the mayor, at the time, Mayor Daley, said, “Let’s do it again for spring.”

[In spring 2010,] we went from 27 churches up to 50 churches. Spring break went so well, he said, “Let’s do it for the summer.” We did it for the summer. We went to 75 churches. So every year has been an increase. And then, you know, thankfully, when Mayor Emanuel came aboard [2011], he saw the value of the program and increased funding. So we have had up to over 400 churches that have participated citywide in Safe Haven….

Once I took it to our CEO, because at that time, you know, the city was being pressured, so it was like right, the timing was perfect. Once I brought it to him; there was no resistance from Ron Huberman, our CEO at the time. He was very supportive. And then once the mayor found out, he was very supportive. So, you know, it really, I was amazed to see the support. We never had any pushback.

Yeah, you know, like I said, once going through my mind, okay, we are about to have Christmas break. Where are these kids going to go? And it just, the Lord just gave it to me, that’s all. Let’s call a couple pastors. I called up a couple pastors like, hey, what do you think about opening the churches up while the kids are on Christmas break? They were like, “Wow, let’s do it.”

We can appreciate the vast partnership that Rev. Kyle’s vision has sparked in this city-wide Safe Haven collaboration among CPS, the Mayor’s Office, and 400+ churches. Here we see how Rev. Kyles believes that the Safe Haven collaboration prevailed due to “one common good”—a desire for children to be safe from violence.

It’s a challenge of bringing people together, and trying to find a common good, as always, you know, even with the different
denominations. Bringing everybody from different faiths, different denominations, different race and creed all together for one common good. That’s been, it was a challenge. But now, everybody gets it.

Because if you’re a child of God, it’s your, there’s no way you can have, you can constantly see the violence against children, and it doesn’t affect you.

And Rev. Kyles provided some vital statistics to corroborate Safe Haven success:

“Since its inception in 2009, we have had close to 10,000 students who have participated in Safe Haven, and not one student has been a perpetrator or a victim of any type of crime or violence,” he reports. “Right now, we have close to 300 churches on our waiting list that want to be a part of Safe Haven. So that speaks volumes.” And regarding CPS’s upcoming school breaks, “We are presently running 60 churches for after school. And we’re running 100 for this coming spring break [2016]. And in the summer, we’ll be running 100 again.” At the time, however, Rev. Kyles knew of no research or official CPS records that he could provide to substantiate or supplement these statistics.

**Being in Partnership with CPS’s Safe Haven Program**

Table 17 provides an overview of the five UMCs with greatest immersion in CPS’s Safe Haven program from Spring Break 2014 up to the time of this writing. Further, here is a list of 11 more UMCs that have stepped up one or more times to offer Safe Haven programs during CPS’s Winter Break or Spring Break. An asterisk (*) identifies six new Safe Havens for Spring Break/Summer 2016.

- Bethany/El Buen Pastor UMC
Assembled from facts provided by Safe Haven pastors/directors, Table 17 gives a taste of the energy and resourcefulness that is required to launch and sustain a Safe Haven program. We will refer to Table 17 throughout this data analysis in order to reveal the collective story of the UMC’s well-functioning Safe Haven program, including times when the program was paused, discontinued, or CPS stopped funding (indicated by ❌). For now, we observe from Table 17 that all five UMCs have offered Safe Havens for winter, spring, and summer breaks (highlighted in green).

And throughout two school years, G2G UMC and South Shore UMC have offered after-school Safe Haven programs for CPS Quarters 1–4 (highlighted in purple).
Table 17. A Timeline of UMC Safe Haven Participation from 2014 to 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safe Haven UMCs</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring Break</td>
<td>Summer Break</td>
<td>After School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elston Ave</td>
<td>April 14–18</td>
<td>June 30–July 4</td>
<td>5 wks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2G</td>
<td>July 21–25</td>
<td>July 28–Aug. 8</td>
<td>22 wks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Shore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= 1 week = After school for CPS Quarters 1–4 = UMC Safe Haven paused, discontinued, or funding halted

NIC case study timeframe ends here
Appreciating New UMC Safe Havens and Congregations

Bishop Sally Dyck is encouraged by new UMC churches that have signed up to offer Safe Haven programs in partnership with CPS in their communities. She sees that inner-city congregations are encouraged too by feeling affirmed and sensing that they are not alone.

One of the greatest, I'll tell you, one of the most encouraging things to me, a sign that things are working, is that so many more churches, 10 signed up, to do Safe Haven, to try Safe Haven, you know [10 new proposed sites ended up being six new Safe Havens approved by CPS for spring/summer 2016]. And it's taken a couple of years, but they're going, “Hmmm, there might be something here. Huh, we might actually be able to make a difference in our community,” and, “Hey, I also heard it might make a difference in our church, you know.”

So they're willing to go through the hard work and the difficulty of it all because they've seen over there that it makes a difference. So that's been an encouragement to me that actually the Urban Strategy is making a difference.

Speaking of the hard work and difficulty of it all, we transition next to view the collective findings of what is working across Table 17’s five UMC Safe Haven contexts. Bishop Sally is right. Just as new UMCs are seeing that becoming a Safe Haven “makes a difference,” here we begin to see the links from individual to collective processes and collective action—the beginnings of the CUS as a social movement.
Being a Well-Functioning UMC Safe Haven

“Case study researchers should systematically attempt to assess the likely linkages between opinions, activities, and interests” (Silverman, 2013, p. 142). So it is in this data analysis that a collective story of a well-functioning Safe Haven emerged by spotting some “likely linkages” (Silverman, 2013, p. 142). Gradually, for instance, essential processes became visible as Safe Haven pastors/directors described how they got their programs up and running. Then related processes became visible as pastors/directors discovered what works in their contexts. Some common values even emerged especially for supporting good child, youth, and adult behaviors and expression of emotions. Roughly captured in Figure 15, these processes began to look like a “motion picture of linkages” that are “geared” for success, each gear with its “points” for well-functioning. Following are Figure 15’s main points, if we boil it down:

- Center Gear = All about standards and common practices.
- Gear 1 = All about partners.
- Gear 2 = All about volunteers and workers.
- Gear 3 = All about support.
- Gear 4 = All about local church.

And from a collective perspective, things work when all “gears” are functioning.
Figure 15. A Well-Functioning UMC Safe Haven: Linkages between Opinions, Activities, and Interests of Safe Haven Pastors/Directors
**Center Gear. All About Standards and Common Practices**

So, to present the results of a cross-case search for patterns in the data, we will elaborate on the key findings of each “moving piece” in Figure 15. We start with the Center Gear in the diagram, as shown here in Figure 16. Here we will see how the five UMCs became committed to Safe Haven’s purpose and to satisfy CPS’s requirements for participation. Fulfilling these requirements is the foundation for “putting in motion” the well-functioning of Gears 1 through 4.

**Committing to Safe Haven’s purpose**

*First impressions of Safe Haven*

In anticipation of Spring Break 2014, Bishop Sally Dyck and Pastor Robert Biekman hosted a Safe Haven invitation and kickoff meeting for UMC pastors and CPS. Pastor Hannah Kardon remembers that it felt like a big deal at the start, but Elston Avenue UMC decided to give it a go.

So the way that we began our relationship with Safe Haven was the first year that I was here [at Elston Avenue UMC] was the first year that Methodist pastors were asked to attend this meeting with Chicago Public Schools where they were laying out various faith-based programs, and we were encouraged. Basically everyone was told, “Oh,
you can do Spring Break Safe Haven.” And it was this big thing. And we weren’t sure if we could do it. But we decided to do Spring Break, which is a one-week program. So we did the Spring Break Safe Haven in the spring of 2014, and we really, really were impacted by that and loved that. So we wanted to do the Spring Break again in 2015 and were offered the opportunity also to do the summer in 2015.

Pastor Adonna Davis Reid first learned about Safe Haven the year prior when she was invited by a clergy colleague to visit their church’s Safe Haven on the next block over from South Shore UMC. She even inquired about becoming a Safe Haven, but CPS was not accepting applications at the time. Even so, she describes the decision to go ahead as a “leap of faith.”

I went to this program with Bishop Sally, I was like, “Oh, well, this is great.” I was already familiar with the program. So after that, we got the invitation to apply for Safe Haven. So it was kind of like outside timing that was imposed on us. And so that’s why it was a leap of faith because I hadn’t really said, “Okay, this is something we are for sure going to do.” We’ve been authorized to do it through CPS, so now we’re going to do it. It was like we got the invitation, and so I told the people we need to respond to this because this is really a concern in the community, including the various aspects of the Urban Strategy that Safe Haven addresses of community safety, educational literacy, and food security.

From these first impressions of Safe Haven, now two years later, pastors/directors are more specific about the rationale for their commitment to Safe Haven participation.

That said, their stories reveal some real struggles in getting from then to now.

Overcoming challenges in establishing a Safe Haven program
Reflecting the tenuous nature of operating in Chicago’s extreme context, this data analysis shows on-and-off first experiences in launching some of the UMC Safe
HAVENS. Listening to their stories here, we can appreciate the unexpected challenges and surprises for these pastors/directors and their churches.

As a case in point, Pastor Adonna’s story illustrates a multifaceted challenge in getting the Safe Haven up and running at South Shore UMC, including a personal loss for Pastor Adonna in the death of her father. She describes the year as intense and difficult. Yet, as we see from Table 17, South Shore UMC has persevered and grown into a year-round program while offering 30+ weeks of an after-school Safe Haven for two consecutive years. And as we will see shortly, Elston Avenue UMC experienced some of its own start-up challenges.

First, Pastor Adonna reflects here on South Shore UMC’s first experiences with summer Safe Haven in 2014 when surprisingly, “Unlike some other programs that turn people away, we didn’t turn anyone away....So we wound up with like 100 kids.” It was “very stressful” with so many children, and “it really strained the church’s resources and sensibilities because this was more than they [the church] had done in a long time.” As it turned out, South Shore UMC had to learn to deal with these fluctuations in Safe Haven attendance over time.

Pastor Adonna explains that the community is transient where residents stay only for a short time. “That’s the frustrating point....You invest a lot of time and effort and energy and love only to find the context that we’re in is oftentimes transient. People
are always saying, ‘Well, I may be moving, or my mom’s talking about us moving.’

Or they do move. Phone numbers are disconnected.” This makes it impossible to
build long-term relationships with Safe Haven children and their families. Yet, South
Shore UMC has persisted despite these challenges by seeking to learn and adapt to
their transitory neighborhood context.

So our spring break program morphed into a summer break program
[in 2014]. And to do six weeks is a lot different than doing one week.
And so we engaged. [To bring in more workers to help,] we tried to
develop a partnership with One Summer Chicago [a Chicago-
-sponsored program that offers summer employment to youth between
the ages of 14 and 24]. That didn’t work so well….Nobody told me
until we were halfway into the program that these were troubled kids. I
mean at-risk youth. So to put them in a very stressful situation was not;
it was very challenging. And the very first week of the program, my
father died, and the director of the program took gravely ill. She’s
okay now, but she had to back away…..

So that was very difficult, but again, from CPS’s standpoint and I feel
from the kids’ standpoint and the families’ standpoint, it was a success
because the kids kept coming even when I had to shut the program
down [temporarily for funeral attendance; identified by ☒ in Table
17]….And even with that, we still wound up with like over 50 kids
every day. But, you know, we made it work.

So on the basis of that, we moved into an after-school program. Well,
that was going to be 22 weeks….And we had some people coming in
to help from other United Methodist Churches. And there were other
people who we recruited, again, from outside the church to the point of
partnerships [retired school teachers, etc.] to make an after-school
program work. And that was going okay. I wasn’t as hands-on as I had
been, and for whatever reason, the numbers [of children] went way
down.

And part of that, I think, was a response to what people knew had
happened over the summer. And then it really strained the church’s
resources and sensibilities because this was more than they had done
in a long time. And so they went to the opposite, you know, like where
it was almost like the goal was to have the minimum [Safe Haven kids]. Maybe that’s not true, but that’s the way it felt because they were trying. You know, it was like we don’t want to get *over* the number that we can handle. And we’re going to have these nice organized groups. And there were some fabulous things that happened as a result of that.

And as it turned out, South Shore UMC was not alone in their on-and-off beginnings with Safe Haven. Director Carla Williams from Maple Park UMC mentioned, “We originally had the after-school program, but we were not able to maintain the required 25 children a day [CPS requirement]. So we lost that program” (identified by in Table 17).

And CPS’s Safe Haven Director, Rev. Kyles, readily acknowledges here that meeting the 25-per-day minimum of kids “is not as easy it sounds.”

I never forget this. Whenever I talk to pastors about being a part of Safe Haven, they’re like, “Oh, 25 kids. We can get 25 kids.” Well, then after they get in the program they realize, oh, getting 25 kids every day is not as easy as it sounds. Because one of the things you have to realize, all because you have 50 kids on Sunday, don’t mean that you’re going to have 50 kids on Monday because most of the kids at your church on Sundays are not from your community. And that’s what has been one of the key things a lot of pastors have learned.

Pastor Hannah Kardon, Pastoral Intern Andy Gilg, and Elston Avenue UMC encountered a challenge in meeting CPS’s minimum enrollment requirement too.

Barely underway with their Safe Haven summer program in 2015, CPS cut off funding to Elston Avenue UMC’s Safe Haven because attendance fell below the per-
day minimum of 25 children (identified by ☐ in Table 17). This was quite a shock.

However, through a rally of resources within the NIC’s Chicago Northwestern District, CPS considered Elston Avenue UMC’s program to be in good standing and allowed it to continue as a self-funded Safe Haven. Pastor Hannah explains below:

And part of why CPS selected us for summer was that our numbers for spring were the highest of most churches on the north side. But that was because of some specific confluence of events in this neighborhood. People plan their summers much farther ahead in this neighborhood. They have to in order to get into parks programs. So we had a lot of parents say, “Oh my gosh, if I had known about this many months ago, like I would’ve loved to do this.” But since CPS doesn’t tell you until May or June, we had good numbers during the summer, but we didn’t hit the mark [25 children per day] every single day. So about half way through, our CPS funding went away.

But the District really stepped in and helped us to meet the gap. And since then, we’ve been approached by the two of the wealthier churches in the NIC about funding us for next summer if we were to continue the ministry. So that’s been just a huge gift.

And for Pastoral Intern Andy, this adverse turn of events became a gift of affirmation in disguise:

Well, we knew that we were kind of in hot water, so to speak, with the program, and so I went out and did a lot of door-to-door sort of handing out flyers. Pastor Hannah posted things in several places, in several online message boards and community message boards and neighborhood message boards. And we ended up getting a lot of kids to come. Unfortunately, from Safe Haven’s funding standpoint, that was too little too late. And that is when the church, the District, and the Conference [NIC] stepped in and helped us fund the rest of the summer.

After that, we actually had at least 25 kids every day, and typically over 30 kids every day, which was very interesting. There’s theological things you say about that. There’s logistical things. There’s
a lot of things you could say about that, but that’s what happened.

I’m studying theology, so I’m like thinking about the theology of what I’m saying. I think that at the time and still to a degree now, I feel like that was God sort of saying that it was a good program to have. The fact that it continued on, that the church affirmed the program’s existence, the fact that kids then began showing up, I think, were all things that pointed to we were doing the right thing. Yeah. As far as what makes the work meaningful, that had a big impact on our church.

To go back, that had a big impact on me that all those things were sort of affirmed. And it did feel a little bit like I was being affirmed in those things, being affirmed as the director, which was very helpful. And I experienced a lot of grace in that as well, that I knew what the parameters were going in. We didn’t hit those parameters. We didn’t hit those markers. But that the District and the Conference and this church continued to support me in working to get there, and I think and we ultimately did a lot of good because of the grace that was provided in the various ways....

I think the District and Conference stepping in gave the church a sense of affirmation as well, that yes, what we are doing is right. And the fact that we could say that we impacted 70 kids’ lives throughout the summer was a big deal. The young adults and adults that did help usually went away, I think, fulfilled in some way or another. I think there were some adults who ended up just feeling very excited that they were able to help out and could see the sort of impacts that were happening.

Pastoral Intern Andy’s sentiments segue well to pastors’/directors’ impressions of their current commitment to Safe Haven.

Current impressions of commitment to Safe Haven
Pastor Ayla Samson Zaki of G2G UMC believes there is a strong positive correlation between the church’s consistency in Safe Haven and the church’s credibility in the community. In other words, through G2G UMC’s multi-year commitment to offering a year-round Safe Haven, G2G UMC becomes a credible voice in chorus with other
churches to “start dealing with the issues that have to deal with families and youth” in
the community at large. And this earned credibility begins to fulfill the vision and
purpose of the NIC’s Chicago Urban Strategy. All the while, Pastor Ayla believes
that this occurs by serving “without any expectation in return.”

So this is a great opportunity for us as a church to not only partner
with CPS whose program, SH, is sponsored by CPS, but also to use
this program to do outreach in our community on behalf of the church.
It has been a great tool for us as a church to do outreach among
families with little children, but also with teenagers and youth of our
community.

So, the overall strategy, the Urban Strategy of the Northern Illinois
Conference, I think the Safe Haven after-school program can be a
great source of outreach as well as a platform where we can, if we
engage more churches to do this, you know, this can be a great place
for us to be a source of blessing to our community, but also have some
credibility to be a voice in our community, you know, so that the
churches can together, you know, start dealing with the issues that
have to deal with families and youth. So, collectively, I think we have.
We can make a very strong platform.

I think that’s where the potential is. But once again, it has to be
consistent. You know, I feel that the churches if they do embrace this,
it can be a source of great blessing. But consistency is very important.
Consistency in really loving the children of the community like Jesus
would love them. Also, really serving them without any expectation in
return. I think they sense it when you are not putting any conditions
on. “Oh, you have to join the church, or you have to…. You know,
just loving them and serving them and being there for them. I think
that in itself, consistently. I don’t mean just do it for one week for
spring and six weeks for summer, and then you’re absent. I think
consistency really helps for you to become very prominent among
families with children in your community. Then they start recognizing
you as someone who really, genuinely goes out to serve the children
and youth of the community without any conditions.
Finally, for Minister G at Faith UMC, the basis for committing to Safe Haven’s purpose is for the kid’s sake. As she put it, “They're safe, they're prayed for, and they've been shown love.”

**Satisfying CPS & UMC requirements**
From across the stories of Safe Haven pastors/directors, we begin to visualize “a day in the life” of a UMC Safe Haven program. Here in Table 18 is a view from the perspective of the UMC’s and CPS’s minimum requirements and standards for program operation. This is a summary gleaned from the data analysis.

**Table 18. Summary of Required Safe Haven Program Responsibilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPS and UMC Requirements for Safe Haven Operation</th>
<th>Description of Tasks and Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UMC Safe Sanctuary (UMC, 2016, May 21)</td>
<td>Anyone working with children, youth, or involved in any children’s or youth ministry must be Safe Sanctuary certified. Applicants must complete and pass a criminal background check and participate in Safe Sanctuary orientation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Hours of operation                              | • Hours are 10:00 a.m.–2:00 p.m. for winter, spring, or summer break.  
• Hours are 3:00 p.m.–6:00 p.m. for after-school program.  
• Program hours may be extended depending on the local church situation. |
| Safe Haven required action and recordkeeping     | CPS requires each Safe Haven program to:  
• Submit daily records of Safe Haven children’s attendance to ensure the minimum of 25 children per day.  
• Ensure a criminal background check for workers and |
CPS and UMC Requirements for Safe Haven Operation | Description of Tasks and Responsibilities
--- | ---
Daily food service | CPS contracts with a local food vendor to deliver free breakfast and lunch (for after-school) to be served each day for all Safe Haven kids.
Use of CPS-sponsored curriculum | Presentation of CPS-provided curriculum is required. Modules include the following:
- Anti-Bullying.
- Financial Literacy.
- Food Consciousness.
- Not a religious curriculum.

Safe Haven Founder and Director Rev. Renaldo Kyles explains. “It’s just not a babysitting program. So we added a curriculum, which was antiviolence. So we did anti-bullying, conflict resolution, cyber bullying. We’ve also, each year, you know, because of the continued success of Safe Haven, we have had organizations come to be a part. Like now, we’re partnered with Junior Achievement. We added a financial literacy piece that has been very helpful with the kids.

So it’s not a place where the kids just go to church and have fun. It’s a structured program. And once people find that out, and even people in upper management, [the] Mayor’s Office, when they really hear the nuts and bolts of what Safe Haven is about, they are really blown away.”

Legally, public schools cannot teach religion to students. So, as Pastor Ayla explains, “They are very intentional in letting us know that because it’s a Chicago Public School sponsored program, they want to make sure that we are not proselytizing, and we are not indoctrinating the children because you might have children whose parents are very conscientiously or, you now, have openly atheistic backgrounds, or they might be Muslim, or they might be Hindus, or whatever religious background they
## CPS and UMC Requirements for Safe Haven Operation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Tasks and Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>may have. So once again, they do not want us to make this a religious program.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPS payment to UMCs for hosting a Safe Haven program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UMC participant churches receive $200 per day/$1,000 per week for meeting CPS requirements while hosting a Safe Haven program. These funds help to pay for Safe Haven staff and program costs, e.g., arts and crafts materials. However, if overall attendance falls below 25 minimum children per day for more than three days, the church is at risk for CPS’s withholding payment of funds and stopping the Safe Haven program for that site/session.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The funds go directly back into paying for the program” Pastor Robert Biekman explained. “It doesn’t provide for any kind of profit for the site. For churches with shrinking congregations or resources fewer and further between, it allows the church to live into its mission with no direct cost to the church. In this way, there is an overlap between our mission and CPS’s mission because we care about children.” (R. Biekman, personal communication, August 6, 2016)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation in CPS-sponsored forums (not required)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safe Haven Directors are notified and encouraged to attend CPS-sponsored meetings and forums. Past meeting highlights include the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Safe Haven pastors invited to share their experiences with Mayor Rahm Emanuel. According to Pastor/Director Ayla, “The Mayor actually helps CPS to fund this program.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Press conference to feature CPS’s partnership with African American colleges for basketball events in order to encourage inner-city students to connect to a college.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building inspections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPS requires initial and ongoing, intermittent site inspections of the Safe Haven church facility.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Moving on now, the case study’s data analysis reveals other linkages and points of well-functioning. Gears 1–4 in Figure 15 explicate the UMC Safe Havens’ holistic program activities, vital and diverse relationships, and overall affirmative environment. We will examine the points of each gear one by one. Building relationships with community partners is the focus for Gear 1.

**Gear 1. Building Relationships with Community Partners**

As displayed in Gear 1, the case study’s collective stories expose how creating and sustaining a Safe Haven is a product of community connections and relationships. Pastor Robert Biekman affirms, “We need to lift together. The burden is on us when we attempt to do it alone” (R. Biekman, personal communication, September 24, 2015). And contemporary leadership literature concurs. “In the public sector, networks are relied on extensively as an organizing form that brings together multiple organizations to facilitate the achievement of a common goal” (Cullen-Lester & Yammarino, 2016, p. 178). This is akin, in fact, to the network-centric mindset that is necessary for complex adaptive leadership (Hannah, Eggers, et al., 2008).

To that end, Question 4 of the *Safe Haven Participant Interview Questions* asked the following:

How have others contributed and helped to make this work (getting at community partners who have been integral, i.e., a seminary intern, Mayor Emanuel's One Summer Chicago workers, & other agency volunteers)?
And Table 19 summarizes pastors’/directors’ impromptu responses to Question 4 from across the data analysis. The purpose of Table 19 is not to provide an exhaustive list of community partners and volunteers. Rather, this serves as a sampling of the variety of contributors who created the holistic program of activities offered by UMC Safe Havens. This is the starting point for a well-functioning Safe Haven—reaching out, finding allies in unexpected places, building relationships, and learning to trust new allies to equip each community’s unique context.

**Table 19. A Sampling of Community Partners and Volunteers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Work or Service</th>
<th>Elston Ave. UMC</th>
<th>Faith UMC</th>
<th>G2G UMC</th>
<th>Maple Park UMC</th>
<th>South Shore UMC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Community Partner, Volunteer, or Social Network</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMC, NIC, and Garrett Seminary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local church members or pastor:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• At Elston Avenue UMC, Pastoral Intern Andy Gilg said, “I started attending church right away at the beginning of the summer to kind of build those relationships and be able to recruit volunteers to help out on a day-to-day basis.”</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• At Faith UMC, Miss Shirley is “my right-hand lady. She goes to the [CPS] meetings with me, and she helps when nobody else will help,” said Minister G. A CPS cook and a couple of high school girls worked as summer helpers. Faith UMC’s Pastor Nanabray also visits now and then.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• At G2G UMC, Pastor Ayla’s son, a college student, offered free drum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
lessons to 4 or 5 students who stayed after the summer Safe Haven program to take drum lessons.

- At **Maple Park UMC**, Ms. Jones serves meals and accompanies field trips. Sister Viv from Park Café supplements if food is short or no food arrives. Trustee David “comes every day to help me by my side to have a male influence in the program,” Director Carla said. Pastor Biekman listens and is supportive too.

- At **South Shore UMC**, retired teachers “came in to do some educational activities with intention,” Pastor Adonna said.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suburban UMC churches and the Chicago Northwestern District of the NIC provided funding support and commitment for the future.</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seminary intern, Andy Gilg.</strong> Bishop Sally’s husband, “Ken Ehrman found us an intern through Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary who also had experience doing church camps,” Pastor Hannah explained.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Nearby Social Service Agencies

| One Summer Chicago (OSC) workers. “One Summer Chicago is an initiative that provides youth with employment and enrichment opportunities during the summer months. OSC offers summer employment to youth between the ages of 14 and 24” (One Summer Chicago | ✓ | ✓ | |

| Type of Community Partner, Volunteer, or Social Network | Location of Work or Service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Elston Ave. UMC | Faith UMC | G2G UMC | Maple Park UMC | South Shore UMC |
(OSC), 2016, May 22). OSC workers are allocated by authorized social service agencies throughout Chicago’s neighborhoods.

**Phalanx Family Services**, working in conjunction with the Mayor’s Office, authorized 22 One Summer Chicago workers in 2015 to fill jobs at Maple Park UMC’s Safe Haven program. Director Carla explained, “Phalanx gave me above what I applied for. I asked for 10 to 15 [workers]. They gave me 22. And that allowed me to be even more secure with the extended care program.” As described later, Maple Park UMC extended their summer Safe Haven hours from 7:30 a.m.–4:30 p.m. to accommodate parents’ work schedules.

**Local CPS Schools**

*Local schools and principals.*

“Principals were really great in helping us get the word out to people,” said Pastor Hannah, “and we got to put inserts in the flyers and in the folders” kids took home.

Pastor Hannah also expressed a credibility advantage with being CPS-approved for Safe Haven: “I could say [to school principals], ‘We have been background-checked. We are CPS-approved. This is not a religious program. This is about serving kids.’ And they welcomed us in.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Community Partner, Volunteer, or Social Network</th>
<th>Elston Ave. UMC</th>
<th>Faith UMC</th>
<th>G2G UMC</th>
<th>Maple Park UMC</th>
<th>South Shore UMC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local high school students.</strong> “High school students in the Chicago Public School system need 40 hours of service to graduate from high school,” explained Pastor Hannah.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Police, Fire, and Mobile Dental Lab</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4th District CPD officers</strong> “came in and talked about security and how a child can be safe on the streets,” Pastor Ayla said.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPS officers</strong> came to visit or present an anti-bullying class. Chicago Alternative Policing Strategy (CAPS) emphasizes “increased lines of communication between the community and the police” (&quot;Chicago alternative policing strategy,&quot; n.d.).</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fire station.</strong> Pastor Ayla explained, “Our neighbor is a fire station. So, they brought in their trucks to our parking lot. They sprayed water on the kids, and they let them go onto their trucks, and talked about fire safety.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mobile Dental Health Care</strong> provided free teeth cleaning and dental care for Safe Haven children.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promotional Media and Online Forums</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Banners</strong> and <strong>Flyers.</strong> Vinyl banners announce the Safe Haven program outside of all five UMCs. Also, Pastoral Intern/Director Andy passed out pre-printed flyers door-to-door in the surrounding community.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Even in this brief sampling, we see that partners in Table 19 are fundamental for the basic functioning of UMC Safe Havens. In Gear 1, we also see a myriad of ways that UMC Safe Havens are reaching out in their communities, building relationships, and putting trust in their community partners to keep their commitments and provide essential services for Safe Haven kids. Pressing on with fundamentals, we can build now on Table 19 in presenting Gear 2’s focus on tapping into the readiness and talents of volunteers and workers.

### Gear 2. Tapping into Readiness and Talents of Volunteers and Workers

Closely related to Gear 1, Gear 2 is focused on attracting and assimilating volunteers and workers. And according to the data analysis, pastors/directors are learning how to get it done by trial and error. This works. Ironically, Edgar Schein considers trial-and-error learning by experience to be our best option. “Experience is the teacher. If

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Community Partner, Volunteer, or Social Network</th>
<th>Location of Work or Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nextdoor</strong> and <strong>EveryBlock</strong> online message boards for social networking. “Those I use a lot for ministry,” Pastor Hannah said.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mothers of Safe Haven Kids</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mothers</strong> of Safe Haven kids offered their help and “brought us homemade food multiple times,” Pastor Hannah expressed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elston Ave. UMC</th>
<th>Faith UMC</th>
<th>G2G UMC</th>
<th>Maple Park UMC</th>
<th>South Shore UMC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
you’re open to experience, experience will guide you as to where you ought to go” (E. Schein, personal communication, April 12, 2014).

**Finding it tough to get volunteers**
The data analysis validates that it can be tough to attract workers and volunteers. Pastor/Director Adonna puts this in perspective, for instance, for South Shore UMC’s after-school Safe Haven:

The capacity really is all about the human resources as well as the financial. The two are related because sometimes it’s hard to get people to commit. Everybody thinks, “Oh, we’ll just get more volunteers.”

Well, I have not been that successful in getting people to simply volunteer for anything that’s going to be really inconvenient for them or to get the consistent and the committed buy-in over a long period of time, saying “I’m going to show up every Tuesday and Thursday for the next 25 weeks [for after-school Safe Haven].” That’s, you know, that’s a problem. So the capacity piece, I don’t know. I think it’s a little bit difficult.

And Director Carla experienced this challenge in the process of Maple Park UMC becoming an employment site for One Summer Chicago (OSC) workers.
You had to figure out a way to, once we found out where we were going to get staff [from OSC through Phalanx Family Services], because that’s the hardest part about the Safe Haven program for most of the churches, because you need staff for the volume of children that may come through that door. And to get reliable staff, it usually depends on a salary. You don’t want to think like that, but, and it’s true.

**Assimilating workers through individualized consideration**

Director Carla goes on to thoughtfully explain how Maple Park UMC assimilated 22 OSC summer workers into their 2015 summer program in a way that was optimized for success. In this process of assimilating OSC workers, Director Carla appears to be modeling “individualized consideration,” a well-known characteristic of transformational leadership, as she “pays attention to the individual employee and his/her needs” (Avolio, Waldman, & Yammarino, 1991, p. 13). Skillfully juggling the unique needs of 22 OSC workers is a challenge Director Carla is willing to tackle in order to make it a meaningful summer enrichment experience for everyone.

After I got the children in [OSC workers through Phalanx Family Services], the young adults in, then we discussed which, who likes, you know, I’m going to let it be on you. Who likes to rise early, get up early? Who likes to stay late? Who has another job? Who’s in summer school? And that way, I was able to put them where they would do better. It gave less challenges and issues, you know. So that’s how I did that....Learning from the year before, they [Phalanx] allowed me a week before the program [in 2015] that the kids could come in. Whereas the year before, for the summer program, they started the same day the children started here. So there was no training....

Because the thing that we found, the hardest part about our teen set is they don’t believe they have to do anything. They really don’t. They don’t have direction. They don’t really respect authority. It’s about what they want, when they want it, how they want it.

I mean, some of them were great. Some of them were very good. What
worked was, well, what I found worked was that I had them to, enough of them, to supervise the children like I needed to have them supervised. Because you realize, we had 80 children enrolled. We had an average of 45 to 50 a day. Okay. That’s a lot of babies. And between the ages of 5 and 13. Big span. So and we were talking about different levels, ages, money, well, you know, all that.

So with the teens [from OSC], it allowed me to fulfill a lot of positions. So the fellas, I used a lot of them for maintenance. They did a lot of the cleanup. There were young ladies that had children of their own. They understood children better. So they might have the little people. We had those that were, let’s say, didn’t have siblings but might have cousins or either, just were fun loving. They might do better with the activities.

Sharing lessons learned among UMC Safe Havens
In a show of sharing stories among UMC Safe Haven directors and learning together in the process, Pastor Adonna echoes that, next time, she too expects to assimilate OSC workers/interns a week or two before the summer Safe Haven begins:

On the Monday morning [first day of summer Safe Haven], the interns were showing up at the same time as the kids. I didn’t even have the opportunity to give them a tour of the building, let alone any training. Now I’ve heard from one of our sister churches who’s doing this. She insisted that anybody who’s coming to work, come a week or two ahead of time, and go through some training and preparation for work. So if we were to do it again, I would demand that that be the case.

Orienting volunteers through shared leadership
In concert, Pastoral Intern/Director Andy thought it was a lot of fun that high school volunteers “stuck around” to work at Elston Avenue UMC’s Safe Haven beyond completion of their required 40 service hours. Here, Director Andy describes how he shared leadership with these high school students. He concludes, “It really worked to give them chances to lead.”
There were some kids who began showing up simply because they needed volunteer hours and then stayed after their volunteer hours were completed. For school, they’re required [40 hours of service required to graduate] and stayed because it was fun, which was fun for me to see and helpful to have those kids stick around and kind of be helpful. Yeah, so that was a lot of fun.

I also, whenever we had volunteers like that, in particular, and adult volunteers as well but specifically the kids, it really worked to give them chances to lead in instances as well. When we played games, I often kind of explained what the game was and asked them if they would be willing to explain it to the kids, sort of be the referee, things like that where they were being given that space to kind of have it be a little bit of a laboratory for their own leadership as well. And as would be expected, different volunteers responded differently to that. There were some volunteers who said, “I’m just here to hang out and help out. I don’t really want to lead.” That’s great. And I certainly didn’t want to push them into something they were uncomfortable doing. But there were definitely some kids who when asked to do that really jumped at the chance. And several of them really excelled at it. And that was cool to see.

That’s something that is completely subjective to me. In watching them lead, you could sort of tell which of those volunteers really took on that challenge and were willing to say, “Hey, you guys need to be quiet,” or whatever needed to happen or really willing to yell and give directions; and who knew to talk over the airplanes [low overhead on approach to O’Hare]; or to stop talking whenever a plane flew over and things like that; like thinking about the logistics of just communicating with the group. It was really interesting to watch different volunteers, how they handled those situations.

There were others who did a really good job but maybe were very quiet and soft-spoken people. And so the kids couldn’t hear. Or maybe took to heart not being a disciplinarian to the kids, and so they may have even struggled a little bit with giving direction like giving very firm rules to anything or a game or something. So that was particularly interesting to watch. Had we had more volunteers, I think it would’ve been really fun and a growing experience for both the volunteers and I to kind of sit down with them at lunch and say, to kind of process a little bit what that looked like, if they were nervous, if they struggled with something, or whatever.
Winding up these trial-and-error stories of assimilating workers and volunteers in Gear 2, we see some evidence that Safe Haven pastors/directors are attracting and retaining them at least partially by their desire to help them be successful, by providing individualized consideration, and by offering shared leadership opportunities.

**Going from volunteer to vocation**
Finally, Minister G was pleased that one of the high school volunteers at Faith UMC concluded her volunteer experience by declaring, “I think I’ll be a teacher.” Minister G remarked, “That’s good. The Safe Haven gave her a chance to work with the kids.” Previously, “She didn’t want to do anything that ever had anything involved with kids.”

**Gear 3. Supporting Good Child, Youth, and Adult Behaviors**
Speaking of working with kids, some deeper-level values for youth development emerged in this cross-case search for themes and patterns. Once again, from the Safe Haven pastors/directors as we observed in Chapter 4’s Table 14, we see their depth of commitment to kids’ growth, love, and protection despite steep challenges.

**Figure 18. Gear 3 = All about support**
Espousing core values for positive youth development

Seen here and elsewhere in their stories, Safe Haven pastors/directors spoke of “trying to love these kids the way that God loves these kids;” “affirming and not judging;” “help[ing] them, not punish[ing] them;” “includ[ing] them, not dismiss[ing] them,” “not want[ing] to give up on him;” and “sending them home is not an answer…[or a] solution.” Several of the Safe Haven pastors/directors told stories of being unsure at times as they worked to live out these values amid the inevitable challenges of responding to the children’s or even summer workers’ behavioral or emotional needs.

Responding to behavioral or emotional problems

Pastor/Director Ayla expressed, “I see tremendous needs in the lives of the children.” And here Pastor Ayla explains how she and the Safe Haven coordinators working with her at G2G UMC steer away from enabling problem behavior, require children “to apologize and admit their fault,” and then, “we are more than happy to accommodate them and give them another chance.”

I’m not a believer of enabling. Enabling is very problematic. So, we know when the child walks in [to G2G UMC’s Safe Haven], and they’re dressed inappropriately, we have to address it. The child walks in, and, you know, their behavior is not acceptable. We address it. There’s no way that we’re going to enable. So, a line has to be drawn there…

We had one young man. Actually this is, he’s a 7th grader and had a lot of issues at home, brought the same issues to the program. And he was in “time out” many, many times. And we were also on the verge of saying that we need to just tell him not to come back until I had a conversation with him and his mom and found out more of what’s going on inside the home that is actually affecting his behavior. This
young man started to change slowly and gradually. We had to give
him two days of suspension one time and another. So, over time, his
suspension got less and less. Of course, you know, the thing is that he
understood that we didn’t want to give up on him. We could’ve easily
just said that you cannot come anymore. But because we kept giving
him chances, and we would make him apologize. Apology is big in our
program. We are very forceful in if you do something wrong, you have
to apologize. The problem comes when you refuse to apologize. Then
we will take steps. You know, and of course, the three-part warnings.
But, if they are ready to apologize and admit their fault, we are more
than happy to accommodate them and give them another chance. That
has been a practice that has worked for us very, very well.

To resolve things and to be, [for the child or youth] to say that, you
know, “Yes I made a mistake, and I accept my punishment, and I’m
willing to do better.” When a child refuses to apologize, then we take
them more seriously. And in the case of this young man, every time he
did something wrong, it took him some time, but he would apologize.
And so that’s why I think it worked. It made it easier for us to give
him only two days of suspension.

Similarly refusing to expel several boys from South Shore’s Safe Haven,
Pastor/Director Adonna saw some change when the boys returned after a three-week
suspension and discovered she had been praying for them while they were gone:

We had some kids that were suspended from our program for some
serious infractions of our rules. And I had been told by others, “They
should be expelled. If they were at a public school based on what
happened, they would’ve been let go and sent to an alternative school
or juvenile detention or whatever.” And I said, “You know what? I
cannot, with integrity, get up and speak in the church every Sunday
about the redemptive power of Christ or about how we serve a God of
second chances—really innumerable chances, and then put these kids
out forever. I’m not ready to say that now. Maybe at some point if
whatever they did is way beyond our capacity to deal with it in terms
of security, or they’re putting other people in jeopardy or harm’s way.
Well, we have to revisit that then.” But I wasn’t at that point.

And so, they were suspended for like three weeks, maybe even a
month, and then they came back [to Safe Haven]. So these boys came
in, and I was talking to them about what happened….I asked them, “Does it surprise you that I’ve been praying for you even when you haven’t been here? I pray for everyone, even the ones who are no longer here.” And one said, “Well, my mama prays for me.” And I said, “Yes, but I’m not your mom.” Then their mouths fell open. It kind of clicked with them that this person really cares. Just to know that somebody’s praying. Even if you don’t know it, they’re praying for you, and caring about you, and loving you even when you’re not present. It’s huge. So one of them, that seemed to really make a difference. The other, I’m not so sure based on his behavior.

Coming as a related surprise, Pastor/Director Ayla goes on to tell of a mother she asked not to come back to visit the Safe Haven:

Believe me. There are challenges. Last summer, we had a mother we had to ask her not to come back. You know, she was picking at the kids. And she was saying strange things. And so I had a hard call. The coordinators were telling me, she’s becoming a handful. I mean, we encourage parents to come and stay, but really, she was just becoming very difficult for us. So, anyway, I had to tell her she cannot come back. You know, so there are many challenges of that nature. We’ve never had to kick a child out. But we had to kick a parent out. Can you believe that?

**Working out choice of language**

At Maple Park UMC, Safe Haven Director Carla Williams at times had to confront some One Summer Chicago (OSC) teenagers/workers about their choice of language while working at the summer Safe Haven. In the process, Director Carla concedes that these OSC workers are *children learning how to work with children*. And though she finds it “draining,” she tries to help the workers by instilling values such as, “It’s your job to help them, not punish them.”

Director Carla values this learning experience for the OSC workers as she prefers
“not to dismiss them,” but “to include them” in this important summer job opportunity—better than working at McDonald’s because they are exposed to good values in caring for children. A current UIC Great Cities Institute study confirms, “For young people in Chicago—especially blacks and Latinos—conditions of joblessness are chronic” (Holmes, 2016, January 25).

I had to tell some children [OSC workers] about their language. “Well, what made you think it’s okay to cuss at my [Safe Haven] children?” I said.

And it’s like [the workers said], “Well, they make me so angry, they just…”

“Excuse me,” I said. “You make me angry. Have I ever cursed you?”

“No, Ms. Carla,” [they replied].

“Well, then I don’t expect you to. And to understand something, you are my child. They are too. And you don’t. I don’t let nobody cuss you. And I will not allow you to curse them.” And that’s where I had to go with them. I basically took a mother role from that position. But it was so, that was draining. That was the part that was draining, trying to make them understand. “These are the things. This is a job.”

And that was another thing, they, half of them never held a job. Or if it was, it’s not a job where they interact with people. You know, working at McDonald’s somewhere, it wasn’t anything that they felt the need to be human. And so I had to train them. “These are babies. And regardless of whether you understand why they act the way they act. I might not understand why you act the way you act. But that doesn’t give me the right to abuse you in any way, shape, or form.” And as the older person, “It’s your job to help them, not punish them.” So that was the day-to-day thing that I had to deal with.….  

One Chicago is just like the Safe Haven. It gives the children [OSC workers] exposure. It’s a learning experience. But it’s an exposure that they need. They need to learn how to live in this world. And they don’t have many opportunities to do that…. I mean, to dismiss them or not
want to include them, is that an answer? Does that show them what to do? No.

At Elston Avenue UMC, Safe Haven Co-Directors Pastor Hannah Kardon and Pastoral Intern Andy Gilg collaborated on their program leadership. And Pastor Hannah reflects here on one youth that she cautiously dismissed from the program after he did not respond to warnings, meanwhile wishing she had more care options available to offer him and/or his family. Yet, she needed to keep all children safe.

The one really difficult thing when I look at Safe Haven, which I think we made the right choice, but it was a challenging one. There was a boy who was one of the oldest ones. So he was 13 and bigger than the other kids. And he just had a lot of anger and was just surreptitiously like pinching kids, hitting kids, and we just didn’t have the resources to surround him, I think, with the kind of care and investigation that would’ve made keeping him in the program safe for the other 35 or 40 kids. You know?

And so, we ended up. I tried to call his parents for follow-up a couple times. And it didn’t work out. But we had to tell him that he couldn’t come back to the program after a couple warning days. And I just wish that we had been able to say to them, like, “Here’s someone he can talk to. Here’s a mentor in his life. Here’s someone who can work with him on anger in a one-on-one way.” And, while I have my list of referrals of sliding-scale psychologists, it’s not quite the same. And I just wish that there were more care options for him.

Shortly thereafter, stepping in to serve as Safe Haven Director while Pastor Hannah was away on maternity leave, Pastoral Intern Andy gave a lot of thought to how to support good behaviors among the children while collaborating with the Safe Haven volunteers. In the best way, Andy reveals here how he is still reflecting on what
worked well for him and others in this context. He is reflecting too on some disconnect he senses between affirming and being in authority:

As far as discipline went, adults [volunteers] were told that discipline should be channeled through [me] or Pastor Hannah so that they could be people who were just there to be compassionate towards the kids. They could sort of say, “Hey, could we not do that?” Things like that. But if it escalated beyond that in any sort of disciplinary action, it went through Pastor Hannah or [me], which I think was good for volunteers in that they could maybe feel that they didn’t have to do that. But I do also think that it could’ve taken some authority away from volunteers as well, because if they were someone who really took that rule very seriously, they may not have spoken up when they could’ve when they saw something wrong. So that’s something that I’m reflecting on still as to whether or not that was the best practice….

And I will say also, having those volunteers was incredibly helpful for the reason that if they had not been there, it would have been very, very difficult for me to both be that presence that is sort of; it’s very hard to be the authority, be kind of the disciplinarian in a lot of those sort of instances and be the person to accomplish a lot of the affirming and a lot of the like, well just playing games with the kids, coloring with the kids. Like it’s, there’s sort of a weird, kind of a disconnect that can happen for me anyway. And that’s not the same for everyone. It was helpful for me because then I could kind of. I could maintain that and jump from place to place where people needed to be talked to. And I say, discipline has a bad rap. So when I say discipline, I mean sitting down and talking with the kids about maybe the decisions they made and why those were helpful or unhelpful, which again is a strategy that takes more time and requires more volunteers. And so, the degree of that effectiveness did depend on the number of volunteers we had each day.

**Working out high emotions when playing games**

We see throughout this data analysis how games, play, music, arts, and crafts are relished by the Safe Haven kids. With arguably next to none of these activities incorporated into the CPS school day and next to no safe places for kids to be outside
and play in at-risk neighborhoods, we will highlight in Chapter 6 the important implications for positive youth development that are inherent in games and play.

For now, Pastoral Intern Andy Gilg talks about what he learned while playing and refereeing games in the context of the Safe Haven kids’ high emotions and heightened sense of fairness. Both Pastor Hannah and Pastoral Intern Andy thought the kids lit up when they got to play Gaga Ball:

And there’s one particular game called Gaga Ball that I learned at a camp. And I don’t know if you know of it or not. And it’s kind of a cross…a definite variation of sort of a dodge ball-esque game. But you’re aiming, sort of. Well, it’s a rubber ball, and you’re hitting it with your hand. But you can’t pick it up. And you’re trying to hit people’s knees or lower. And if you do, they’re out. If they block it or whatever, then you’re safe. That’s a really rough explanation. But it’s one of my favorite games too. But the kids loved it. And so what we ended up doing is, they would always have it at the end of the day. It was their favorite game.

It’s also a game—and this is kind of the rough parts about it—it’s also a game that moves very quickly. And it requires a referee. And so I would often be the referee. And there are a lot of issues of catching kids cheating and things like that where I could definitely tell they got hit or whatever, but they would not go out. And so then kind of figuring out that line of keeping them accountable to the rules, but also letting them learn to follow the rules on their own was kind of a challenge. And sportsmanship was a big thing for several of the kids, learning to be “good sports” during that game because it is a very fast-paced, can be very fast-paced and really be a very emotional game too because it’s a game where people are slowly getting out. And you get down to the last three people or last two people, and then it’s really emotional if you get out. And so kind of learning too. There were some different instances of learning to manage those emotions that came with that, learning to acknowledge that it was a high-emotional setting and figuring out ways to do that.
Working out use of phones and electronic devices

Pastoral Intern/Director Andy Gilg placed a value on limiting use of phones and electronic devices for kids and adults. Here he presents his rationale and depth of thought, including how he wanted to guard against how kids “feel like they’re competing against adults’ electronic devices at times.”:

One of the things that was important to me and that I kind of told all my volunteers and prepped them to do was that they should really work to not be using any electronic devices around the kids because there’s been research that I’ve read and things that I’ve seen and theories posited that people, that kids have begun to feel like they’re competing against adults’ electronic devices at times. And so I’m unsure of the scientific viability of that, but I do sense that that is important. And regardless of the “scientific-ness” of it, I think that simply being present as an adult among a group of children is exceptionally important.

And I think we really worked to do that. Some of my younger… actually, I can’t even really categorize that based on age. There were times everyone struggled with that—me included—where your phone is something that you use constantly, but we really did work to do that.

We also had a rule that kids should not be using their electronic devices by the same token. And so I felt that that was really an equalizer too as far as between kids and adults. While the adults needed to have authority to do particular things, I don’t think a phone needed to be included in what set them apart. So that was important. Yeah. And the other thing I always told my adults is to just to make sure that the kids know that you care about them.

And in the following segment, Andy goes on to describe how limiting phone use actually worked out and why it was very important to him because, “It’s something that I think everyone needs to work on.”:

Like, I constantly had to check, remind kids not to be on those things. And I actually started working to just tell them not to bring them to the day, but recognizing that a lot of parents feel like their kids have to
have their cell phones with them. And so kind of trying to tow that line. So the rule kind of ended up transforming into, “Don’t let me see your technology.” You know, “If you have it, that’s fine. I can understand that maybe your parents require you to have it. But, don’t let me see it. And if I do see it, make sure that you let me know that you’re texting your parents or calling them, or whatever.” And we really, really worked to keep that.

I mentioned to you also that we really worked to have volunteers and adults also not be on their phones. And so maintaining that sense that we are also holding ourselves accountable to that rule….And I did explain any time I was using the phone. I would say, “This is to make the camp better for you or for your safety.” And I kind of explained that the only time you’ll see me using my cell without asking you are for these reasons. And so that was something that was very important to me, kind of not only having that boundary for them as kids, but also maintaining that even adults use that boundary. And it’s not something that I’m older than you, so I get to do this. It’s something that I think everyone needs to work on.

Not surprising, Safe Haven Director Carla shares some of Director Andy’s views on phone use, especially for the OSC workers assigned to work at Maple Park UMC’s Safe Haven:

I did not want to remove the telephones from the children [summer workers], from the young adults, because it allowed us to be in contact with each other. Because along with those forms [to be filled out for CPS], I had a counselor list. On everybody’s board, they had a counselor list. So if they needed to contact me, or if a child that was with another group was displaced, call. You can call each other. But the policy was, the phones were to remain off, on vibrate, and you’re not to use it unless that was the case.

But, oh. I mean, it got to the point where I had to walk through and say, give me your telephone. I said, you know, it’s going to get to a point where you all are going to have a basket, and you’re going to put the phones in, and I’ll put them in my office, and we’re going to be done with it. That’s it.
So Gear 3’s data analysis summarizes how Safe Haven pastors/directors exercised their authority while unswervingly seeking to keep their core values of offering love, affirmation, and help, and not dismissal or punishment. Also, these stories reveal how they worked out an agreed-upon process for supporting and modeling good behaviors, emotions, and safety for everyone in their unique contexts.

And we can validate Pastoral Intern Andy’s astute observation of the apparent tension in being in authority and being affirming. Edgar Schein (2010) referred to authority and intimacy as archetypal issues in work life especially in multicultural settings. Specifically, intimacy refers to rules governing “what to call each other, how much personal life to share, how much emotion to display, whom to ask for help and around what issues” (p. 105). And as defined here, Schein (2010) confirms that this leadership tension exists between intimacy and authority.

**Gear 4. UMC as More Than a Safe Haven**

Last but not least, this data analysis brought to life the ways that Safe Havens are helping their congregations to become more aware of what’s going on in the surrounding community. All the while, Safe Haven children and
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families are beginning to discover the UMC as more than a Safe Haven. This final section of the data analysis is “geared” to highlighting these discoveries.

**Sharing a spiritual heritage**

Across the data analysis, UMC pastors/directors are finding ways to share their spiritual heritage with Safe Haven children and their families while respecting CPS’s required restriction for religious education. Pastor Ayla Samson Zaki has a vision for making this happen. Here, for instance, Pastor/Director Ayla explains her prior experience with an after-school program and her rationale for finding means to offer spiritual nurture. “We are called to inject spiritual strength…to be intentional in providing spiritual nurture,” Pastor Ayla declares, so as she describes it below, she looks for ways to extend the Safe Haven program in order to provide this spiritual nurture:

I feel that you cannot, as a church, do programs if you are not intentional to do it or make it an outreach effort. As a church, you cannot run social programs if there is not a component of outreach in them. Because, you know, for years, myself and Rev. Zaki [Pastor Ayla’s husband is District Superintendent of the Chicago Northwestern District] was a pastor also in churches many years. We have experienced that, you know, programs are very good in themselves. But we are called to inject spiritual strength that cannot come from just providing emotional and psychological and social, you know, efforts. They cannot come. I mean, really you have to be intentional in providing people spiritual nurture. So, you cannot address a child’s, you know, emotional and psychological and social needs if you don’t address his spiritual needs. And I think, we miss the point in doing these programs when we do not take that seriously, that component seriously.

So in my experience in the past, when I was fresh coming to do an after-school program, my focus was all in making sure they’re having fun, which is, of course, very important for them to be able to enjoy
being in an after-school program. So, activities were big.

But I realized over time that the child that walks in sad may have a great time for those three hours, but he’s going to walk out sad again because he’s going back to the same environment he came from. So, what is the church’s contribution to his three hours with us that has helped him to recognize why he’s sad, why he does not need to continue being sad? Let’s just set an example. And I feel that, you know, in Christ, we have so much to offer, you know. There is so much power in our spiritual heritage that we can offer children and youth that we are doing them a disservice when we’re not offering it.

**Extending Safe Haven for Teen Night or Parent Night**

As a case in point, G2G UMC and Maple Park UMC offer programs that extend the Safe Haven program hours to make it possible for children, youth, and parents to participate. Pastor Ayla talked about what is working now at G2G UMC with Teen Night and her hope of hosting a Parent Night. Pastor Ayla stated, “We have a very strong presence as a youth center [at G2G UMC] because we conduct a lot of community and youth programs in our building other than the church’s program and worship services.”

Last year, I did something like that with the youth group, the teenagers that came in [for after-school Safe Haven]. And it was very helpful, very helpful, because what I did. We had a teen class right after the after-school program ended. So the program ends at 6:00 p.m., and I would have my teen class. We would call it Teen Night once a week at 6:00–8:00 p.m. so that teenagers who would want to choose to stay would stay—not that they were made to, but many of their friends if they’re staying, then the rest would stay. And they came. We would talk about teen challenges in high school, what is, you know, holding teenagers back academically, socially, morally, ethically. And we will discuss many issues concerning, all the way from, you know, dating violence, all the way to promiscuity, all the way to how we are called to, you know, be a people who have a high standard, maintain a high standard as Christians.
So, it was a very eye-opening experience for me because many of the teenagers came from challenging backgrounds. And I sensed they needed affirmation. And they needed someone to tell them or help them navigate the teen stage. They asked, “You know, so what worked for you, Pastor, when you were a teenager? And how can it work for me (given the challenging circumstances that they’re faced with)?” And when I’m talking about challenging, I’m talking about financial challenges at home. Maybe you do not have a father. In many cases, there is no father at home. Then sometimes, one of the parents may be addicted to alcohol or drugs. Or the teenager himself might be exposed to, you know, all kinds of issues at high school like bullying and peer pressure. So, it varies from young men to young women.

So, when I opened the table, inviting on the table, and opened them to have these discussions, it was very helpful. And, many of those students this year, I’m hoping that they’ll come back. So, we will continue that forum. And this group was mixed of Christian and those who were nominal Christians. So, that’s what I felt really worked, really worked, and was a great source of blessing for us.

Building upon getting to know the community better, Pastor Ayla hopes for G2G UMC to host a Parent Night so mothers especially can “know they are not alone and that somebody can affirm them” because, as she put it, “I’m seeing the same problem here, here, in different places, but the same situation.”

We’re hoping to start like a Parent’s Class, especially mothers, you know, who are really experiencing challenges at school, behavior challenges, just to get them together and get them to talk so that they can air out, you know, that my child is going through this so that they know that they are not alone and that somebody can affirm them and give them some form of resources so that can be helpful. So I was just talking with my coordinator. And she’s a very wonderful person. She speaks both English and Spanish. And I was telling her, I said, “Maybe we should invite them once a month to come together, you know, make it like an event. We can, you know, eat together and then take a topic and let them come and have some time together—just the parents.” I’m hoping something like this will come about.

Because I’m seeing the same problem here, here, in different places, but the same situation. I think it [Safe Haven] opens our eyes to the
need that exists because we cannot just, you know. I feel every church needs to have that outward look. There’s no way that you’re too far from this, you know. This is probably right in your back yard. So, not addressing it and not, you know, bringing it inside for prayer and for reflection and for service, then I don’t know how we can be faithful to our Gospel. We have to, no matter how much. It can lead to other things, you know, like helping the youth, helping with parents. I think there is room for increasing our capacity. Definitely.

**Extending Safe Haven schedule for working families**

In another way, Maple Park UMC extended their Safe Haven hours 1) to accommodate working parents from the church so that their children could participate in summer Safe Haven and 2) to introduce prayer and discussion time. Director Carla describes how this worked:

There are limitations within the program. And although we understand what they’re trying to do [CPS], we are a church. And I wanted to be able to offer more. But like I said, we still fell within the limitations that you’re not able to speak on Christ or religion or anything like that. And also, with the first year [2014], we realized that some of the neighborhood children weren’t able to come, because, you know, Safe Haven is only running from 10:00 to 2:00 p.m. And that’s a really, it’s good, but it’s a strange spot in the day.

And for parents that work, which I’ve found that those parents were primarily the parents of the church. So we were offering a program that my church members couldn’t participate in because they couldn’t find a way to have their children here in that little section of the day.

So this year… I got permission to do an extended program. So we were able, now that was at a cost, but it was a very, you know, minor, very minimal cost. But it allowed me to open the doors earlier and leave them open later [7:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.], which allowed our children to come…. So that was a time that I could introduce different difficult things or just prayer if nothing else. Just discussion time, just talk about that, anything.
Adapting to Safe Haven kids and families
In the course of their interviews, as presented here in Table 20, Safe Haven pastors/directors described some ways that the congregation is adapting and learning alongside Safe Haven children and families.

Table 20. UMCs Adapting to Safe Haven Kids/Families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Church Location</th>
<th>Events and Learning Moments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Faith UMC       | Getting in the habit of praying.  
Minister G explained, “Always on Friday we have prayer, you know, getting the kids in the habit of praying. So everybody was praying for everybody, ‘Thank you for my family. Keep us safe.’” |
| G2G UMC         | Christmas play performed by Safe Haven children.  
Pastor/Director Ayla describes, “So, we conducted a Christmas play, and these were the kids who did the Christmas play. And they came to church to do it on Sunday morning, and they brought their parents. So, for me, that was a great success story. I had long conversations with one mother who could not believe that her daughter was doing something like this, who herself was first very, how should I say, maybe suspicious of our church, and second of all wondering why is her daughter so keen in coming. And then when she had a conversation with me, she was very happy. She was also at peace with the fact that this is one place she can allow her daughter to be active and be proud of. So, these are the things that were working.” |
| G2G UMC         | Thanksgiving dinner rescheduled to welcome after-school Safe Haven families into the celebration.  
“Well,” said Pastor Ayla, “I have to make sure that our church is on board with this. So, you know, we have to have people understand that this [Safe Haven] is something very important that we are doing as an outreach effort. Of course, that also means that when we have, for example, our upcoming Thanksgiving Dinner. We are opening it to all the...
Church Location | Events and Learning Moments
---|---
| families in the after-school program. So that means we’re not going to hold it at our usual time. We’re going to hold it earlier so that they can be part of our celebration. So they’re very much on the same page with the pastor concerning this program and how we can use it to, you know, to welcome others from the outside. So, impact-wise, yes, it has been a source of blessing because it brings a literal resource to the church. And then, it brings people who would otherwise not walk inside, you know. And it gives visibility to the church.”

South Shore UMC | **Safe Haven children presenting their speeches to the congregation.**

To get prepared for a speech contest, Safe Haven after-school children were invited to present their speeches to the congregation at Sunday Worship Experience. Pastor/Director Adonna described the benefit to the church. “We’ve engaged the congregation in supporting that, to recognize their investment in this, to show that, yes, they’re [Safe Haven kids] getting water all over the floor. Something was written on the bathroom stall. And there are all these kids. And they’re in the garbage in the yard. But, this is what you get for that. This is the investment of this congregation in the lives of these children to create a different trajectory.”

**Modeling women as pastors in church leadership**

Five of six Safe Haven pastors/directors in the NIC case study are women. Seeing a woman in religious leadership was a meaningful surprise especially for some mothers in Elston Avenue UMC’s neighborhood. Pastor/Director Hannah shares about the “big impact” for them during Spring Break in 2014:

And I heard that from parents, particularly our first spring break. This is a heavily Catholic neighborhood historically. And I am now 29, then a 27-year-old woman, who’s named as the leader of the community. The second spring, I was heavily pregnant. You know, like I just was a lot of things that people weren’t used to seeing in religious leadership.
And so I had particularly several of the single moms come up to me and just say, “Like, I love seeing you do this. I love seeing you be recognized as the leader of the church. It’s like made a big impact on me.” And they, you know, ended up discussing a couple of pastoral care issues with me of difficulty with family, with kids, with friends. You know, I think they don’t have a church home. And I think we could do that for them because they felt that trust because the program wasn’t hitting them over the head with anything that’s wrong with them or proselytizing.

Pastor/Director Adonna is also modeling “a woman in ministry, in leadership of the church” as she has attracted some “empowered helpers” from among the Safe Haven children who have begun to imitate her leadership on Sunday and to voice their respect for God and God’s house.

Some of these kids, like I said, come to Sunday school. They come to church. They don’t come as families, but they come. This happens with one young lady in particular and with some of the other kids too when I open the doors of the church every Sunday….

So when I walk the aisle while people are singing, this young lady wants to walk with me. So I’ve been sharing with her, “Now what do you do when you walk? You shake the people’s hand that you’re going past, and you welcome them to the congregation…..”

So we had some kids mess up the resource room upstairs, and she and another young lady, they’re like little ducklings. They like to follow me around. And they run up, and you know, they’re looking for hugs, and they’re just kind of always around, which is great. If they see in me what I never saw, which is a woman in ministry, in leadership of the church, well, great. Who knows? They could be being imprinted to go into ministry. I don’t know, or at least to just be, again, a disciple of Jesus Christ.

So anyway, we’re upstairs cleaning up the resource room, and I was really upset because I knew some kids had run in and just were being mischievous. They had overturned all the games. And so we were trying to sort the Monopoly money and put the little Battleship pieces back. So they were trying to talk to me. And one of them said to the
other one, “Stop talking to her because she’s really upset.” And then they started talking to each other, “How could somebody do this? Don’t they know this is God’s house? They must not respect God.”

Again, children who come under Safe Haven are now involved in the life of the church, who now see themselves as empowered helpers.

In case we are unaware, “Because in Western cultures implicit leadership theories work against women (Scott & Brown, 2006), Blacks (Rosette, Leonardelli, & Phillips, 2008), and other minorities, it makes it more difficult for perceivers to recognize minority individuals as exhibiting leadership” (Hannah et al., 2011, p. 228).

**UMC being more than a park district**

Finally, distinct from the Park District, Pastor/Director Ayla presents a provocative rationale for “inject[ing] Christian values than can help and support families” rather than “just do[ing] community service programs.” Thus, while the UMC seeks to adapt to serve the community well, the UMC seeks also to be true to its vision.

If we as a church do not take our Christian faith to the children, it’s not going to happen automatically. Because in our culture, there is, how should I say it, neglect of the Christian values, you know, and sometimes because of all the challenges that parents, children, youth experience, the church has a very good place where it can inject Christian values that can help and support families.

I think that is where the church needs to stand strong. Do not sidebar that you are church and that you have something very important to share with the community, which is your Christian faith. I don’t think we should put that aside and just do community service programs because, you know, programs are offered everywhere. So what is distinctive that we are offering? You know? I think that needs to come out strongly because many times when I ask the children. So, you know, some of them actually come to the after-school program three times a week. Then the other time, they go to either CCD, the Catholic
church, or they go play sports, you know, to activities they’re involved in. So they’re not with us the whole week. Some of them are just, you know, absent a few days here and there. So, I have asked them, “What’s the difference, you know, in you going to CCD or you going to the Park District volleyball, or, you know?” So, that is the question that needs to be asked. And sometimes you have to take an extra effort to affirm them from the Christian point of view rather than just being there and being available.

This completes the data analysis for Gear 4 even as it verifies UMC Safe Haven pastors’/directors’ deep commitment to their calling and spiritual purpose in their work.

**Keeping a Safe Haven “Geared” for Success**

Now we ask, **What are NIC and UMC Safe Haven leaders doing to adapt to their context?** For our interpretive framework, Figure 15’s metaphor of “wheelworks” in motion is intended to appreciate the vital “turns” in thought and action that NIC case study participants and their congregations are making as they seek to accomplish the following:

- Be open, not closed.
- Explore our environment to have more accurate information to make better decisions.
- Stay true to God, to ourselves, and to the NIC’s vision.
- Attend to others even when the pressure is on.
- Counter the effects of extreme context.
These distinctive mechanisms serve as the “grease” for the vital “turns” of a well-functioning Safe Haven. “Social mechanisms” are defined as “theoretical cogs and wheels that explain how and why one thing leads to another” (Anderson et al., 2006, p. 102). Here, in fact, is a summary of how these mechanisms make the UMC Safe Havens an exemplar for others to consider.

**Being open, not closed**

“We need to be open, not closed—constantly exploring ourselves, others, and our environment” (Boyatzis & McKee, 2005, p. 136). As we appreciate what is working, Figure 15 is a vivid “motion picture” of the many ways Safe Haven pastors/directors are allowing themselves to be in connection and explore working relationships with diverse community members. Given their sustained energy over time, their willingness to be open and not closed is evidently one “self-fueling” ingredient in their secret to success.

**Exploring our environment to have accurate information to make better decisions**

Learning requires openness. Often “we see what we think, rather than think about what we see” (Boyatzis & McKee, 2005, p. 130). Figure 15’s stories of Safe Haven pastors/directors show that they are paying attention to what is going on in their communities. They are alert and awake to new information, e.g., transitory neighborhood contexts surrounding the Safe Haven (Center Gear); working parents’ schedule conflicts with Safe Haven hours of operation (Gear 4); or Safe Haven teenagers’ perspectives on what is holding them back academically, socially, morally,
or ethically (Gear 4). In these and other circumstances, the pastors/directors and their UMC congregations show evidence of listening, learning, and adapting to fit their environments.

**Staying true to God, to ourselves, and to the NIC’s vision**

UMC Safe Haven pastors/directors are visibly committed to living their values in their expressed devotion to God, being true to their calling, and being faithful to their mission. Perhaps we see this most clearly in their espoused values of “affirming and not judging,” “help[ing] them, not punish[ing] them,” etc. as these values are put into practice in their support of good children, youth, and adult behaviors (Gear 3). Given this commitment by Safe Haven pastors/directors to live by their core values, we are not surprised that they are creating a community attraction to their Safe Haven programs.

**Attending to others even when the pressure is on**

Closely related, Safe Haven pastors/directors have earned credibility by being true to their values in the midst of hard work. Expressed in their words, the work has at times been “intense,” “very difficult,” “very stressful,” and “draining.” It has “strained the church’s sensibilities and resources.” Figure 15’s stories, however, reveal that Safe Haven pastors/directors remained attentive to the work despite the challenges and persisted in honing necessary knowledge, skills, and abilities—often by trial and error—to “gear” the program for success.
Countering the effects of extreme context

Finally, we have begun to appreciate how UMC Safe Havens are actually countering the effects of Chicago’s extreme context by providing a safe, reliable, and positive place for neighborhood children and youth to be when school is out. Stay tuned. Straight ahead, we will look at countering extreme context much more closely in Chapter 6.

In closing Chapter 5’s data analysis, Figure 15 is the NIC’s “wheelhouse” exemplar for a high-functioning Safe Haven. Expressed as a pragmatic theology of Christian mission, we verify from Figure 15 that the centrifugal nature of these UMC congregations increasing their awareness through Safe Haven involvement in their communities is being reinforced by the centripetal nature of people from their communities integrating more into the life of the congregation.

And as Dr. Mike Manning expressed in reviewing this data analysis, “This is an important thing for the survival of the UMC. What you’re finding across the churches is what’s going to be part of the key requirement to revise the church” (M. Manning, personal communication, July 29, 2016).
Chapter 6: Findings of NIC Practices Related to Collective Success in Extreme Context

We need to lift together. The burden is on us when we attempt to do it alone.

Pastor Robert Biekman
NIC Urban Strategy Coordinator
September 24, 2015

Recalling Chapter 6’s Framing Questions

Two questions are in focus for Chapter 6: What are the NIC and UMC Safe Haven practices that relate to collective success in the midst of an extreme context? What leadership practices are used to attenuate extreme context?

Chapters 4’s enriched details of NIC context and Chapter 5’s well-functioning UMC Safe Havens give us eyes to see higher-level constructs that are present in the case study findings. Returning to the scholar-practitioner’s conceptual toolbox that we opened up in Chapter 2, here in Chapter 6 we aim to appreciate findings that relate to collective success that is evident in the NIC case study. Having “an appreciative mindset” involves “intentionally looking for beauty in the details, looking hard” to bring attention to “the present successes” and what is “already occurring” (Thatchenkery, 2011, pp. 33-34). Herein, we appreciate four primary constructs as foundational building blocks for the NIC’s Chicago Urban Strategy:
1. **How UMC Safe Havens are successful “holding environments.”** For Ron Heifetz (1994), a central tenet of adaptive leadership is the “holding environment”—the literal and figurative place where adaptive work is done. Specifically, our aim here is to appreciate the unique nature of a “holding environment” for UMC Safe Haven kids who need a place to be safe and grow amid extreme context.

2. **How NIC’s context is priming individual and collective requisite complexity.** Complexity is embedded in context. *So to appreciate context is to appreciate complexity.* Guided by Dr. Sean Hannah’s theoretical frameworks and tools, we will see evidence of requisite complexity that is present and being created through the NIC’s adaptive structure and leadership of the CUS and UMC Safe Havens. “More complex groups thus generate greater adaptive capacity” (Hannah et al., 2011, p. 230).

3. **How NIC’s collective efficacy is a predictor of collective performance.** Before we wrap up Chapter 6, we will “slow down” briefly to look closely and properly ascribe value to leadership efficacy and agency with the aim of appreciating a higher-level construct of collective efficacy. Specifically, there is evidence of a collective “mustard seed” and a collective confidence that is coming to life in the NIC’s Chicago Urban Strategy.
4. **How NIC’s collective leadership efficacy is attenuating UMC Safe Haven contexts.**

Culminating at the end of Chapter 6, we will “step back” to appreciate Figure 25’s mega model of NIC’s *collective leadership efficacy* = organizational efficacy.

Herein, NIC’s six *psychological, social, and organizational resources* are combined to attenuate/mitigate extreme context in which UMC Safe Havens exist.

Therefore, to exemplify these four theoretical constructs and tools, we will reference a span of evidence from across the case study’s data findings. 1) Via Chapter 4, we will draw new insights from Table 15’s 33 stories of Safe Haven pastors’/directors’ leader efficacy and Table 16’s tally of their 10 contexts of concern. 2) From Chapter 5, we will recall moments from the CUS’s founding story and from Elston Avenue UMC’s decision to go forward when CPS’s funding was stopped. 3) New in Chapter 6, we will be introduced to UMC Safe Haven “success stories” as proof of a reliable “holding environment” for children/youth. 4) Also new in Chapter 6, we will glimpse evidence of the NIC’s *collective structure* that is laying groundwork for CUS success. By looking at the case study findings from this higher-level and free-ranging vantage point, we can complete our data analysis here in Chapter 6. So we begin.
1. Appreciating UMC Safe Havens as Successful “Holding Environments”

A central tenet of adaptive leadership

To most deeply appreciate UMC Safe Havens’ success, we adopt Ron Heifetz’s “holding environment” (1994) as a central tenet of adaptive leadership. Initially based upon frequent observation of a mother’s attentive holding of her child, pediatrician and psychiatrist Donald Winnicott (1896–1971) developed the concept of the “holding environment” to represent the stages of life development. Key to healthy development is “the continuation of reliable holding in terms of the ever-widening circle of family and school and social life” (Winnicott, 2002, p. 238). Throughout the stages of life, therefore, a reliable holding environment is both a literal and figurative “safe place” to be and grow. And substitute holding environments serve an essential purpose in the event of unreliable or unsafe family, school, or social surroundings.

Heifetz’s (1994) assertion is that for kids/youth, the holding environment “serves as a containing vessel for the developmental steps, problems, crises, and stresses of growing up” (p. 104). For most children, this is the family, or it could span out beyond “extended families to foster families, adoption services, social service agencies, and the court system” (Heifetz et al., 2009, p. 155). In fact, when children are raised in a holding environment that is extremely weak, Heifetz and his colleagues project that, “As a last resort, prisons serve as holding environments, containing individuals and giving them one last chance to take hold of themselves and behave responsibly” (Heifetz et al., 2009, p. 155).
Intervention in the cradle-to-prison or school-to-prison pipeline
Here is where NIC participants would take exception with Heifetz. Among high-incarceration communities, prison is *not* a last resort. Rather, it is a *presumptive path*.

The Children’s Defense Fund calls this path the Cradle to Prison Pipeline (Edelman, 2007, July). Michelle Alexander, author of *The New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration in the Age of Colorblindness* (2012), describes the conditions:

For African American children, in particular, the odds are extremely high that they will have a parent or loved one, a relative, who has either spent time behind bars or who has acquired a criminal record and thus is part of the under-caste—the group of people who can be legally discriminated against for the rest of their lives. For many African American children, their fathers, and increasingly their mothers, are behind bars….  

For children, the era of mass incarceration has meant a tremendous amount of family separation, broken homes, poverty, and a far, far greater level of hopelessness as they see so many of their loved ones cycling in and out of prison. Children who have incarcerated parents are far more likely themselves to be incarcerated.

When young black men reach a certain age—whether or not there is incarceration in their families—they themselves are the target of police stops, interrogations, frisks, often for no reason other than their race. And, of course, this level of harassment sends a message to them, often at an early age: *No matter who you are or what you do, you're going to find yourself behind bars one way or the other. This reinforces the sense that prison is part of their destiny, rather than a choice one makes* [emphasis added]. (Sokolower, 2011–2012, Winter)
Echoing Michelle Alexander’s prediction of police targeting young black men, Darrius Lightfoot (F.L.Y., 2016, May 1) confirmed that the summer of 2016 is again stirring community fears of youth being targeted by Chicago Police stops. Further, when summer is over and school starts again, “police officers in schools have become synonymous with ‘safety.’ It is taken for granted that they belong in classrooms.” As one CPS student put it, “They’re criminalizing us. They’re treating us like we’re in prison” (Kaba & Edwards, 2012, p. 2). The school-to-prison pipeline, as it is called and depicted in Figure 20, “describes how harsh school discipline policies and law enforcement policies intersect to feed young people into the prison system” (Kaba & Edwards, 2012, p. 3). So, in their neighborhoods and in school, kids may easily internalize the presumptive prison pipeline.

Thus, NIC Urban Strategy Coordinator, Pastor Robert Biekman asserts that “the more communities and churches see themselves as an essential partner to reinforce and restore village function, the greater will be the intervention in the cradle-to-prison pipeline” (R. Biekman, personal communication, June 4, 2016). And specifically for
our purposes in this NIC case study, *UMC Safe Havens are a micro context with a potential to interrupt the presumptive path by being a reliable “holding environment”* continuing to offer “preventive supports and services children need, such as access to quality early childhood development and education services” (Children’s Defense Fund, 2016, May 8)—even if for a few hours a day.

**Description of Heifetz’s “holding environment” for kids**

To visualize UMC Safe Havens as successful holding environments, here briefly are Ron Heifetz’s (1994) four defining characteristics of an effective holding environment for kids. We will make use of these specific descriptions next in support of a collection of “stories of success” voiced by UMC Safe Haven pastors/directors.

1) **“The child’s growth can be protected and guided”**

Heifetz (1994) describes his rationale for embracing the “holding environment” metaphor as it pertains to adaptive leadership. For Heifetz, this is the literal and figurative “safe place” where adaptive work is accomplished:

> For a child, the holding environment serves as a containing vessel for the developmental steps, problems, crises, and stresses of growing up. Within the parental hold, the child’s growth can be protected and guided….For my purposes, I extend the use of the term “holding environment” beyond parental and therapeutic relationships. A holding environment consists of any relationship in which one party has the power to hold the attention of another party and facilitate adaptive work. (pp. 104-105)
2) “Social structures and relationships will perform predictably” in keeping with prescribed values and skills

“For social living to succeed, we all need to believe that our social structures and relationships will perform predictably in keeping with the norms to which we ourselves subscribe….Trust has two components: predictable values and predictable skills” (Heifetz, 1994, p. 107). In fact, we can spot these predictable ingredients “in motion” in the UMC’s model of a well-functioning Safe Haven as presented in Chapter 5.

3) “A containing vessel [exists] for the developmental steps, problems, crises, and stresses of growing up”

The holding environment serves as “a containing vessel” to provide for protecting and guiding a child’s development and growth (Heifetz, 1994, p. 104)—a “safe zone” to be for the inevitable ups and downs of growing up.

4) Pacing, sequencing, and organizing of support services meet various specific needs “Keeping the program well and running” as expressed by Pastor/Director Ayla Samson Zaki, is fundamental to sustaining a successful Safe Haven holding environment (Heifetz, 1994).

**Overview of evidence for UMC’s successful Safe Haven “holding environments”**

Here is how we can relate Heifetz’s “holding environment” for kids directly to UMC Safe Haven experiences. In the course of the data analysis, a mixed collection of Safe Haven pastors’/directors’ stories became identified and saved as “Safe Haven success stories” because of their representative nature and range from simple pleasures to sacred moments in the life of a Safe Haven (seen in Table 9 on page 81). Over time
then, in moving back and forth from data analysis to discovery of adaptive leadership characteristics, these “success stories” seemed representative also of Ron Heifetz’s premises for a reliable “holding environment” (1994). So it is that this collection of success stories is being held up to the “test” of an effective holding environment for kids as defined by Heifetz.

To introduce the “stories of success” collection, here in Table 21 is a summary of each story’s synopsis statement. Taking a minute to look over these 14 diverse synopses, in fact, we pause to appreciate how these exemplify moments of adaptive work in progress. Also, we begin to appreciate how each one exemplifies one or more of Heifetz’s four “holding environment” characteristics. Next up in Table 22 are the actual stories voiced by Safe Haven pastors/directors in their interview responses.
### Table 21. Summary Evidence of Successful Safe Haven “Holding Environments”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>14 Synopsis Statements as Evidence of Successful UMC Safe Haven “Holding Environments”</strong></th>
<th><strong>1</strong></th>
<th><strong>2</strong></th>
<th><strong>3</strong></th>
<th><strong>4</strong></th>
<th><strong>Descriptions</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Keeping Safe Haven children safe.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Providing big benefits to kids &amp; parents by offering reliable &amp; stimulating childcare for free.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Glimpsing a child’s concern at the prospects of no Safe Haven for the summer.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“1. The child’s growth can be protected &amp; guided” (Heifetz, 1994, p. 104)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Young brothers opening up &amp; bonding with a mother figure at the Safe Haven.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Achieving a sacred purpose by keeping the program well &amp; running in order to be present &amp; ready to affirm a mother when distressed about her son’s anger issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>“2. Social structures &amp; relationships will perform predictably” in keeping with prescribed values &amp; skills (p. 107)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Having an abundance of fun that attracts Safe Haven participation.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Learning &amp; loving to jump rope.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Realizing the benefit of a trip to the zoo since many children have never seen a zoo animal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>“3. A containing vessel for the [child’s] developmental steps, problems, crises, &amp; stresses of growing up” (p. 104)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Coordinating with a mobile dental service for children to receive care &amp; fix a cracked tooth while attending the Safe Haven program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Working it out with One Summer Chicago workers who wanted to be at the Safe Haven longer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>“Pacing, sequencing, &amp; organizing support services that meet various specific needs (p. 109)”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Meeting kids’ needs for food, air conditioning, time away from parents, &amp; getting excited when kids keep coming.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Seeing academic improvement as kids learn to take care of their homework responsibilities first (in after-school Safe Haven).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Hearing single moms say how much it meant &amp; thinking it was a “God thing” that it worked out for their children to be around attentive &amp; caring high school guys who were Safe Haven volunteers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Seeing it as a blessing that teenagers come to Safe Haven to be with other kids, get something to eat, relax, &amp; feel safe enough to take a nap.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A collection of success stories as evidence of UMC’s Safe Haven “holding environments”
Presented now in Table 22 is the collection of 14 success stories voiced by Safe Haven pastors/directors that were discovered in the cross-case search for themes. And as a “test” of success, each pastor’s/director’s mini-story is classified, by inference, according to Ron Heifetz’s four defining characteristics of a child’s “holding environment” (1994).

As we are moving toward completion of our data analysis here in Chapter 6, appreciate how these stories exemplify adaptive and even transformational moments as UMC Safe Havens are providing a safe place to be, to reflect, and to grow while also countering real and perceived ill effects of Chicago’s extreme context. After all, these purposes are at the heart of the NIC’s Chicago Urban Strategy.
As we begin, some explanation of Table 22’s first entry might be helpful. Here is some clarification of the format and layout throughout Table 22.

The author’s name is identified.

Underscored text identifies content in the story that best illustrates one or more defining characteristics of a child’s “holding environment.”

Four of Ron Heifetz’s descriptions of a child’s “holding environment” are provided as concise statements. Each one is numbered from 1 to 4 for reference purposes.

Inferred from the author’s mini-story (to the left), checkmarks and green highlighting indicate one or more defining characteristics of a child’s “holding environment” that are implicit in the author’s story.
Table 22. Evidence of a Successful Safe Haven “Holding Environment”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Holding Environment” Descriptions for Categories 1–4</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“The child’s growth can be protected &amp; guided” (Heifetz, 1994, p. 104).</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Social structures &amp; relationships will perform predictably” in keeping with prescribed values &amp; skills (p. 107).</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“A containing vessel [exists] for the developmental steps, problems, crises, &amp; stresses of growing up” (p. 104).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacing, sequencing, &amp; organizing of support services meet various specific needs (p. 109).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Verbatim Quotes by Safe Haven Pastors/Directors (Underscores were added for emphasis)

   Voiced by Safe Haven Director/Minister G
   I like when they say at the Safe Haven [at various CPS meetings for SH directors] that none of the children that have participated in Safe Haven have ever been in trouble or harmed, you know, endangered. That’s, you know, that’s that covering we give them;….our Safe Haven children are safe.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Providing big benefits to kids & parents by offering reliable & stimulating childcare for free.
   Voiced by Pastor/Safe Haven Director Hannah Kardon
   I think one of the coolest things was how, I think the childcare thing was big. Right? Because we were only 10:00 to 2:00. So a lot of parents expressed the challenge in finding childcare that was affordable but also childcare. I think, especially for the slightly older, you know, that kind of like 3rd to 5th grade range where they’re older than a little kid babysitter, but they’re not old enough to do it on their own. Stimulating childcare that they want to go back to and aren’t going to complain to you about all night. So there was that need.

   And the other thing that parents said to us, I think, you know it’s not an ideal childcare situation. 10:00 to 2:00 is not the easiest time to make it work with a job, but it still made a real impact on people’s ability to go to work, get their errands done, do what they needed to do. It’s hard to find childcare these days. The fact that they didn’t have to spend that money, I think makes a real impact on the everyday life of their family no matter what economic level they’re at. And I think it’s both like the literal economic impact of saving that money, of not | | | |
### "Holding Environment" Descriptions for Categories 1–4

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>“The child’s growth can be protected &amp; guided” (Heifetz, 1994, p. 104).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>“Social structures &amp; relationships will perform predictably” in keeping with prescribed values &amp; skills (p. 107).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>“A containing vessel [exists] for the developmental steps, problems, crises, &amp; stresses of growing up” (p. 104).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pacing, sequencing, &amp; organizing of support services meet various specific needs (p. 109).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Verbatim Quotes by Safe Haven Pastors/Directors</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(Underscores were added for emphasis)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>having to spend it, of having childcare.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3. Glimpsing a child’s concern at the prospects of no Safe Haven for the summer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Voiced by Safe Haven Director/Minister G</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One of them, the grandmother, she has custody. I forgot about her. She came. She said, “You know what? Bud…” [fictitious name], she calls her grandson Bud. She said, “Bud was, he was about crazy when he thought you all weren’t going to have nothing for the summer. He was so happy when he, because he was, he’s a two-year, you know, this was his second year [attending Safe Haven]…”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4. Young brothers opening up &amp; bonding with a mother figure at the Safe Haven.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Voiced by Pastor/Safe Haven Director Pastor Ayla</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For example, without taking names, two brothers whose mother is in jail; so they’re being raised by father and grandma; we felt that they really wanted to be with the coordinators [Safe Haven female co-leaders], like they felt the mother figure there. And, you know, they would spend a long time, long discussion talking about themselves and talking about their lives. And these were two young brothers who were really very quiet initially. And eventually, they opened up, and up til now, they’re part of the program. And I thought that was just a beautiful place for them to bond with what might be lacking at home. So, that was a great blessing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5. Achieving a sacred purpose by keeping the program well &amp; running in order to be present &amp; ready to affirm a mother when distressed about her son’s anger issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Voiced by Pastor/Safe Haven Director Pastor Ayla</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Just two days ago, we were having a conversation with this</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### “Holding Environment” Descriptions for Categories 1–4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>“The child’s growth can be protected &amp; guided”</td>
<td>(Heifetz, 1994, p. 104).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>“Social structures &amp; relationships will perform predictably” in keeping with prescribed values &amp; skills</td>
<td>(p. 107).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>“A containing vessel [exists] for the developmental steps, problems, crises, &amp; stresses of growing up”</td>
<td>(p. 104).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pacing, sequencing, &amp; organizing of support services meet various specific needs</td>
<td>(p. 109).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Verbatim Quotes by Safe Haven Pastors/Directors

(underscores were added for emphasis)

```
young man as I told you, and he has anger issues, so we had him call and bring his mother in, and before she even stepped in, she was crying, you know. Myself and my coordinator, we were able to talk to her, and she said, well, this son of mine is causing me a lot of trouble in school. And now he’s gotten in trouble here. But then she continued to talk, and she was telling us all the issues she’s been having. Her husband is incarcerated. And even though he’s in jail, he’s dictating to her from there. And so, you know, she was just heartbroken and tired as a mother taking care of children on her own with no help. So she was crying from just the fact that she was exhausted. And then having to hear his, you know, negative complaints and stuff all the way sitting from jail, you know. Anyway, so we ended up praying with her. We affirmed her. We strengthened her. And when she left, she was at peace, and she was smiling.

And you know, I was telling my coordinator, thank you so much for, you know, if she [the coordinator] had not stepped out and called her [the mother] from the truck, she would be sitting in her truck crying, you know. So she went out and told her, “Please come in, and we’ll talk to you. Let’s talk.” So, you know, in some ways, I think we built her up when she was so down in just affirming her and just telling her both myself and my coordinator. And we said, you know, it is hard to be a mother. So, you’re doing something good. And she needed to hear that. She’s doing something good. I mean, despite the fact that this boy’s giving her so much trouble, so you know. And she wants him to do well. So that was such a blessing.

So when I left church that day, I was, you know, I said “Thank God. Who are we but that you [God] have used us to bless this woman today?” You know, so, no matter what we do, and I```
### “Holding Environment” Descriptions for Categories 1–4

| 1 | “The child’s growth can be protected & guided” (Heifetz, 1994, p. 104). |
| 2 | “Social structures & relationships will perform predictably” in keeping with prescribed values & skills (p. 107). |
| 3 | “A containing vessel [exists] for the developmental steps, problems, crises, & stresses of growing up” (p. 104). |
| 4 | Pacing, sequencing, & organizing of support services meet various specific needs (p. 109). |

### Verbatim Quotes by Safe Haven Pastors/Directors

(Underscores were added for emphasis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| don’t know how to assess success. I think that is something that is really beyond our understanding. I think God has a different standard altogether. And we are just asked to be obedient. I think it runs through everything, Obedience. And not only keeping the program well and running, but obedience in being available and ready to bless someone. You know, not every time we will have something to give, but we can always affirm and bless others by our presence as a church and as individuals and believers of Jesus Christ. |

6. Having an abundance of fun that attracts Safe Haven participation.  
*Voiced by Safe Haven Director Carla Williams*

Oh, we’ve had an abundance of fun. We’ve had, besides, I’ve been blessed, I mean, the program has been blessed. We have. Honestly, we’ve had people come from every place and any place. Every time I turn around, someone new is saying, can we participate now?

| ✔ | ✔ |

7. Learning & loving to jump rope.  
*Voiced by Safe Haven Director Carla Williams*

But you wouldn’t believe when we first got the jump ropes, the child will actually tell you, “I don’t jump rope.”


And then, it was funny, “Why don’t you jump rope? Because you don’t know how to jump rope. So now let’s deal with that part of it,” I said. And now once we [practiced], you saw, that’s the first thing they would come in for every day. Soon as we get the free outdoor time, [they ask,] “Ms. Carla, can we get the jump ropes?”

<p>| ✔ |  |  |  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Holding Environment” Descriptions for Categories 1–4</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“The child’s growth can be protected &amp; guided” (Heifetz, 1994, p. 104).</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Social structures &amp; relationships will perform predictably” in keeping with prescribed values &amp; skills (p. 107).</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“A containing vessel [exists] for the developmental steps, problems, crises, &amp; stresses of growing up” (p. 104).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacing, sequencing, &amp; organizing of support services meet various specific needs (p. 109).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbatim Quotes by Safe Haven Pastors/Directors (Underscores were added for emphasis)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Yes, go get the jump ropes.” That’s the same baby that told me she don’t jump rope. But it was a matter of letting them learn what it means to be a child, to have fun as a child.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Voiced by a Safe Haven Director Carla Williams

But we do the zoo, because you’d be surprised at how many children have never seen an animal up close in person.

I mean, and just, and you realize. It’s so funny that how many things we really don’t realize; we don’t acknowledge. I’ve asked children to draw an animal, and they are so frustrated and upset, and they don’t even want to try. Well, then you realize, well, they’ve never really seen an animal. So, like I said, we do the zoo.

| 8. Realizing the benefit of a trip to the zoo since many children have never seen a zoo animal. | ✓ | ✓ | | |

9. Coordinating with a mobile dental service for children to receive care & fix a cracked tooth while attending the Safe Haven program.

Voiced by Safe Haven Director/Minister G

Oh, yeah, they came [a free Mobile Dental Health Care van]. We had a little girl that had a cracked tooth, a tooth that was chopped in half, and he [the dentist] fixed her tooth, and she started smiling. She kept putting her hand, I said, “Don’t do that. You are so pretty.” They would come from 10:00 to 2:00. That’s the time we were here. And they would take care of our kids. And if their parents had a medical card, they would take care of them too, you know, and he [the dentist] would stay, you know; he came three times.

And, yeah, you go in. There's a dental chair and a hygienist and then everything all set up. And he did, he, like I say, he did the kids, because some of them needed school exams, so that’s, | ✓ | ✓ | | |
### “Holding Environment” Descriptions for Categories 1–4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>“The child’s growth can be protected &amp; guided”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Heifetz, 1994, p. 104).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>“Social structures &amp; relationships will perform predictably” in keeping with prescribed values &amp; skills (p. 107).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>“A containing vessel [exists] for the developmental steps, problems, crises, &amp; stresses of growing up” (p. 104).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pacing, sequencing, &amp; organizing of support services meet various specific needs (p. 109).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Verbatim Quotes by Safe Haven Pastors/Directors

(Underscores were added for emphasis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Working it out with One Summer Chicago workers who came early &amp; wanted to work at the Safe Haven longer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Voiced by Safe Haven Director Carla Williams</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Referring to scheduling work hours for One Summer Chicago workers at the Safe Haven:] And I put a couple that would come in early and a couple that….And then it was so funny though, the couple that I have coming in early, next thing you know, the ones that are supposed to be here 10:00 to 2:00, I’ve got at least five of them coming in earlier than that. What are you? They wanted to be here early too. So I’m like, fine, if you want to come. But you still got to stay until 2:00, you know. But they didn’t care.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Meeting kids’ needs for food, air conditioning, time away from parents, &amp; getting excited when kids keep coming.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Voiced by Safe Haven Director/Minister G</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We're here. We have some food for the kids. If it's too hot, they can stay inside in the air conditioning. And it gives the parents a break to keep them from wanting to kill their kids, you know. And they don't bother me, you know. Like I said, it gives them something to do. I enjoy seeing them enjoy themselves. I really do, you know. And I'm aware when they, I get excited when they come back day to day to day too. So that means they're enjoying themselves, because if they weren't, they wouldn't come back.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### “Holding Environment” Descriptions for Categories 1–4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>“The child’s growth can be protected &amp; guided” (Heifetz, 1994, p. 104).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>“Social structures &amp; relationships will perform predictably” in keeping with prescribed values &amp; skills (p. 107).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>“A containing vessel [exists] for the developmental steps, problems, crises, &amp; stresses of growing up” (p. 104).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pacing, sequencing, &amp; organizing of support services meet various specific needs (p. 109).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Verbatim Quotes by Safe Haven Pastors/Directors

(Underscores were added for emphasis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quote</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 12. Seeing academic improvement as kids learn to take care of their homework responsibilities first (in after-school Safe Haven).  
Voiced by Pastor/Safe Haven Director Ayla Samson Zaki
In the year and a half that we have been doing Safe Haven after-school program, I see tremendous needs in the lives of children. For example, one child who has been with us now the 2nd year, him and his brother. When they started with us last year, he was failing at his school because he did not have anyone at home who spoke English. So he had no homework help at home. So when he came to us, you know, we had one coordinator who could speak in Spanish. So she was helping him every day to do his homework. And now from a failing student, he’s a B student. So I see right off the bat there’s, you know, academic improvement in one of them.
And I’ve seen also among the others, those whose parents are not at home when they go home, they’re not necessarily taking care of their homework. But when they come to the after-school program, there’s a very conscious effort. You know, intentionally the coordinators are making them take care of their homework responsibilities first before getting into other things. So, overall I’ve seen kids have just taken for granted that they need to take care of that. And then they can do other things, play, etc.
And those who have not seriously taken care of their homework have also suffered. We have known students whose parents complained that they did not do this in their homework, or they did not pursue a project that they were supposed to do. And it’s not that it is our responsibility that we have to have them do their homework. But I’ve seen that. | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
### “Holding Environment” Descriptions for Categories 1–4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>“The child’s growth can be protected &amp; guided” (Heifetz, 1994, p. 104).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>“Social structures &amp; relationships will perform predictably” in keeping with prescribed values &amp; skills (p. 107).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>“A containing vessel [exists] for the developmental steps, problems, crises, &amp; stresses of growing up” (p. 104).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pacing, sequencing, &amp; organizing of support services meet various specific needs (p. 109).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Verbatim Quotes by Safe Haven Pastors/Directors (Underscores were added for emphasis) |
|----------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|
| academic pursuit has been a great help with the children. You know, they have really benefited from that aspect. | 1    | 2    | 3    | 4    |
| 13. Hearing single moms say how much it meant & thinking it was a “God thing” that it worked out for their children to be around attentive & caring high school guys who were Safe Haven volunteers. | ✓    | ✓    | ✓    | ✓    |

Voiced by Pastor/Safe Haven Director Hannah Kardon

One that I thought was really interesting was, you know, I shared the way that we worked with this high school to have these high school volunteers and the impact that I thought it had on the high school volunteers. It also ended up having an impact. You know, there is no one “cooler” to a 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> grader than a 10<sup>th</sup> or 11<sup>th</sup> grader. Right? The adults are fine. But the teenagers are the pinnacle of amazing. Laughter.

So we had a much higher percentage of boys in our volunteer corps than girls, for whatever reason it was. And I think both it was lovely to see the boys, some of them had younger siblings and just were on it from day one. Others didn’t, and they kind of learned that caring thing. But what some of the parents said to me is, you know, we had a lot of kids from two-parent and extended families. And we had a lot of kids from single-parent families. And a lot of the single-parent families were moms only. And a couple of the single moms said to us, like, “It’s really meaningful for my kid to have these young men who are really caring and really present, just to be around a whole bunch of men who are having fun with them and paying attention to them and being loving.” And that was something that we like, that was just totally a God thing. Like we didn’t plan it. We could not have predicted it. I would not have perceived it. But that was great.
### “Holding Environment” Descriptions for Categories 1–4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>“The child’s growth can be protected &amp; guided” (Heifetz, 1994, p. 104).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>“Social structures &amp; relationships will perform predictably” in keeping with prescribed values &amp; skills (p. 107).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>“A containing vessel [exists] for the developmental steps, problems, crises, &amp; stresses of growing up” (p. 104).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pacing, sequencing, &amp; organizing of support services meet various specific needs (p. 109).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Verbatim Quotes by Safe Haven Pastors/Directors

(Underscores were added for emphasis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. Seeing it as a blessing when teenagers come to Safe Haven to be with other kids, get something to eat, relax, &amp; feel safe enough to take a nap.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Voiced by Pastor/Safe Haven Director Ayla Samson Zaki*

I think some students have learned to just be in the program over against being some place where they were alone. So the benefit for having a place in the after-school program, you’re with other kids, you get to eat when you’re hungry. Their dinner is not ready when they go home until their parents come back until 6:00 p.m.

So when they come to the program, they can have a snack. They can have a sandwich. And many of them, I have noticed especially among teenagers who come. I’ve noticed they take a nap. We have two couches. They’re sitting and just taking a nap. I don’t know if it’s because they’re in sports and they’re so tired out by the time they come. So, they’ve already had their nap or something. And I think that that’s a blessing, you know, that they can find comfort in a place where they just come in, take their snack, and sit down, and they’re napping.

And last year, that was our experience with the teenagers. There’s a high school that’s just a block away from us. So they just walk in. Sometimes they walk in with their own younger siblings because we also have a pre-school not too far from us. And that has been a source of blessing.
Unmistakable positive energy
Reflecting on the essence of these “holding environment” stories of safety and growth amid extreme context, we point out a positive energy that is evident here.

“Eyewitnesses” to the Safe Haven “holding environment” atmosphere, this sampling of success stories by Safe Haven pastors/directors, albeit limited, conveys positive sentiments that seem to express a positive energy that must not be underestimated in importance. In their own words, they “get excited” and consider these moments “a source of blessing,” “one of the coolest things,” “an abundance of fun,” and “a beautiful place.”

Foremost now, we turn attention next to the benefits of embracing contextual complexity.

2. Appreciating How NIC’s Context is Priming Individual and Collective Requisite Complexity
From Chapter 2’s Literature Review, we recall Dr. Sean Hannah’s proof of adaptive leadership. When emergent, complex behaviors of a collective of individuals, groups, etc. “produce new knowledge, learning, creative ideas, and, ultimately, adaptive outcomes” (Hannah, Eggers, et al., 2008, p. 81), these emergent behaviors constitute adaptive leadership. With this proof in mind, we will look more closely now at the constructs of complexity that are embedded in context. In so doing, our aim is to appreciate at a deeper level how contextual factors are priming NIC’s leadership for success.
Contextual factors that prime requisite complexity and generate adaptive leadership

Remember that adaptive leadership is a contextual view of leadership—always and best understood within context (Uhl-Bien et al., 2007). “Much of leadership thinking has failed to recognize that leadership is not merely the influential act of an individual or individuals but rather is embedded in a complex interplay of numerous interacting forces” (Uhl-Bien et al., 2007, p. 302).

Further, complexity is embedded in context. So to appreciate context is to appreciate complexity. In other words, “complexity must be absorbed and lived with rather than reduced” (Boisot & McKelvey, 2010, p. 420). It follows, therefore, that more effective and adaptive leadership calls for requisite complexity—steering away from too little or too much to arrive at a level of complexity that is “equal to that of its environment” (Uhl-Bien et al., 2007, p. 301). Appreciating complexity in this way has its rewards.

Complexity is generative and will positively influence leaders’ readiness to develop further complexity in the future. This is because more complex leaders have more internal associations with which to process and interpret unique and novel experiences. Cognitively complex leaders process information more thoroughly and expertly and perform tasks better because they use more dimensions to discriminate among stimuli and yet see more commonalities among these dimensions. (Avolio & Hannah, 2008, p. 339)

Hence, creating requisite complexity refers to “the ability of an individual to perceive and react to the internal and external organizational environment from multiple and sufficiently complex perspectives so that the complexity of individual understanding
achieves congruence with the complexity of the situation [emphasis added]” (Lord, Hannah, & Jennings, 2011, p. 109). Noteworthy, this is true for creating individual and collective requisite complexity.

Evidence of individual requisite complexity within UMC Safe Haven pastors’/directors’ stories of commitment
There is no better way to appreciate individual requisite complexity (IRC) in the NIC case study findings than to recall UMC Safe Haven pastors’/directors’ implicit attention to 10 Contexts of Concern that were evident in their 33 stories of leader efficacy in Chapter 4. Recall Table 15 on page 125. Almost as if we are there, Table 15 exemplifies many complex adaptive moments when Safe Haven pastors/directors were called upon to “rise to the occasion” and “respond to task, social, self, or emotional aspects” (Hannah et al., 2011, p. 217) while keeping contextual factors and core values foremost in mind.

To depict Safe Haven pastors’/directors’ range of contexts, for example, we verify from Table 16’s tally (page 162) that 31 of their 33 stories imply the micro context of “Oneself,” an essential self-awareness and recognition of one’s own potential and qualities in relation to social context (Terry et al., 1999). At the same time, in contrast, 24 of their 33 stories infer the macro context of “Envisioned future.” Thereby, we see their “vision strength” (Berson, Shamir, Avolio, & Popper, 2001, p. 56) that expresses confidence for the future even though there are formidable challenges in the present.
To “thicken” the implicit evidence of Safe Haven pastors’/directors’ cognitive self-complexity or IRC, we see in Table 16’s tally that 32 of 33 stories reveal their sharp focus on the well-functioning of the “Safe Haven & volunteers/workers”; 29 of 33 stories necessarily keep a close watch on the needs of Safe Haven “Children & youth”; and 19 of 33 stories are mindful of important “UMC local church & NIC” priorities. In effect, we can indicate from this sample range of results that Safe Haven pastors’/directors’ IRC is uniquely “primed by contextual factors” (Hannah et al., 2011, p. 226), even as they remain resolute in commitment to their work.

Now building on this conceptual foundation, we widen out our focus to observe evidence of collective requisite complexity (CRC) within the NIC case study. In so doing, we are compelled by the belief that “more complex groups thus generate greater adaptive capacity” (Hannah et al., 2011, p. 230). After all, this desire to increase adaptive capacity is a primary aim of the NIC’s Chicago Urban Strategy. But first, we begin with some conceptual building blocks that are essential for our understanding of CRC.

**Collective leadership and social regulatory structures that create collective requisite complexity (CRC)**

Remember that adaptive leadership is also a collective view of leadership. So to build collective complexity, *collective structures* and *collective leadership processes* are critically important. In fact, “collective leadership processes are an important part of
the social regulatory structure that creates collective complexity [emphasis added]” (Hannah et al., 2011, p. 219).

What is a social regulatory structure? This term is likely new to us. Aside from what we might think of as a traditional organizational structure, social regulatory structures are the key social structures within which collective complexity emerges as a result of key processes such as 1) active collective identities, e.g., “members contribute to the collective welfare without expecting direct personal benefits” (Hannah et al., 2011, p. 224); 2) group goal orientation; 3) positive group affect; and 4) formal and emergent leadership structures that broaden the opportunity for each individual to lead (Hannah et al., 2011). Thus, through these dynamic processes collective requisite complexity is created as “individuals with divergent views have full access to leadership and social influence processes” (Hannah et al., 2011, p. 228).

From across the data analysis, as it turns out, the NIC case study findings provide reflections on both NIC’s traditional organizational structure and NIC’s social regulatory structure as seen in the CUS’s adaptive organizing up to this point. These findings in combination provide a snapshot perspective of the NIC’s emergent adaptive structures up to the time of this writing.
Evidence of NIC’s adaptive structure for the Chicago Urban Strategy

Bishop Sally Dyck’s observations of NIC’s CUS structure
During one visit with Bishop Sally earlier on in the course of this study, she reflected, “All of this [CUS and UMC Safe Haven program] is happening outside of any formal NIC structure” (S. Dyck, personal communication, n.d.). So it is…by design. In the spirit of John Wesley (1703–1791), founder of Methodism, the structure of the CUS is designed as a social movement of people and churches inspired to serve the needs of their communities. In a kindred spirit, in fact, DeRue and Ashford (2010) have affirmed that adaptive leadership is “a broader, mutual influence process independent of any formal role or hierarchical structure and diffused among the members of any given social system” (p. 627).

Pastor Robert Biekman’s observations of NIC’s CUS structure
More recently, Pastor Biekman, NIC Urban Strategy Coordinator, offered his perspective on the resilient nature of the emerging CUS movement and the structural groundwork of “an urban network” and “urban agenda” that is being built for the future of the CUS. In this endeavor, Pastor Robert reveals his respect for “the power that we have, not just individually as local churches, but then also collectively.” Here in his interview response, we can visualize this collective power through Pastor Robert’s vision:

I think what's working is that it’s building, you know, kind of a movement that is resilient enough to withstand pastoral appointment changes, bishop appointment changes, you know, reassignments. And even resilient enough to withstand all we’ve been dealing with, like with Chicago Police Department, the threat of lost jobs with Chicago Public Schools, all of the things that just happen that you have no
control over oftentimes, but can destroy what you're doing, and just chop the legs right out from under you.

So I think we’re, in methodology, we’re building a movement, and building a network that is going to be resilient enough to withstand that. We’ve had enough meetings with pastors. And we’ve asked each pastor, for instance, to identify an urban network liaison within their church, which will then allow us to have the kind of sustainability that goes beyond the pastor.

We’ve been able to kind of put together some, a definition or some bullet points around what is an urban network, what does it do, what does it look like to be involved in building an urban agenda. That’s one of the things that makes us resilient. We're developing an urban agenda, i.e., these are the three things that we need to advocate for as Chicago United Methodist urban churches.

The other part is then having churches to understand their power, you know, the power that we have, not just individually as local churches, but then also collectively. So if there are issues that we want to deal with around immigration that are on the north side and then, perhaps, in the Hispanic/ Latino communities, we’re able to then come as African American churches to come and support our brothers and sisters in this particular issue, you know. I said I want to be able to pick up the phone and get 500 people to come together around meaningful things. (R. Biekman, personal communication, February 16, 2016)

While we had not likely thought of it in these terms, Pastor Biekman’s reflections on what is working in the CUS point to an emerging social regulatory structure for the group that is “better suited to elicit unique contributions and shared leadership” (Hannah et al., 2011, p. 219). Collective structures optimize this potential to encourage and support contributions from diverse members.

Specifically, in Pastor Biekman’s expressed “methodology,” we see some emergent ingredients that are inherent in the prior description of a social regulatory structure at
work. Here is a quick summary of these essential indicators: 1) “Identity work,” i.e., “collective construction of relevant identities” (Hannah et al., 2011, p. 227) is being nurtured by the CUS in order to activate a collective identity of Chicago United Methodist urban churches within a broader “urban network” of inner-city churches. 2) A “goal-orientation climate” (Hannah et al., 2011, p. 222) is visible through group goals that are forming as “bullet points” of “an urban agenda” in order to advocate for “issues” and “to come together around meaningful things,” e.g., UMC’s Safe Haven programs. 3) The group’s emotional tone aims to be “resilient enough to withstand” inevitable change and threat by 4) “having churches understand their power” both individually and collectively.

Even in this brief recap, we appreciate how this emerging structure equips the CUS and its network of community partners to more effectively respond, learn, and lead amid extreme complexity. In this way, “the social identity approach to leadership asserts that when people categorize themselves and others in terms of a shared social identity (as “us”), this has important consequences for social, organizational, and political behavior in general [emphasis added]” (Steffens, Mols, Haslam, & Okimoto, 2016, p. 728).

Rev. Rubén Austria’s observations of NIC’s CUS structure
Finally, one of the NIC’s partners, Rev. Rubén Austria, Executive Director of Community Connections for Youth in Bronx, New York, spots something unique in the NIC’s implementation and structure of the CUS. Rev. Rubén describes the NIC’s
stance as “an eye-opener” and something he has not seen before, “Like oh-h-h, so this is what it looks like when a denomination is actually like supporting something as opposed to being an impediment to…. ‘Wow. That’s significant.’” Rev. Rubén shares his observations as an “outsider” to the NIC:

What is neat about the Urban Strategy; and I don’t know if I’ve ever seen it. For us [at CCFY], working with the UMC was kind of really a pleasant surprise. Like oh-h-h, so this is what it looks like when a denomination is actually like supporting something as opposed to being an impediment to.

And I think for us in most of our work, it’s kind of been like the church as a whole has usually kind of just been, you know, either somewhat apathetic to this [inner-city youth] work or sometimes even like hostile to it….Once you kind of get up to the institutional power in the church, this is usually not a priority.

And our experience has been more with like independent churches, you know, and not so much with big denominations or anything. But it’s just. We had always kind of had this belief that it’d be great if a whole denomination or church leadership took this on as a cause, but that’s really not gonna happen.

And so I think what was really, like really beautiful for us in terms of encountering the UMC Urban Strategy. It’s like. This strategy is embraced from, like fully from the Conference level. It’s not one of these things where it’s, O.K., you’ve got a few committed people who really want to do it, but they’re like the red-headed stepchild. Or, you know, everybody else in the denomination is saying, “We really need to focus on international missions. Or we need to focus on evangelism. Or we need to focus on whatever it is.” Right? But to actually have sort of an institutional, like full-bodied support for this, along with a mechanism [the CUS] to kind of disseminate it was like really an eye-opener for us.

We’ve probably looked at something like a denomination often as an impediment to doing this [inner-city youth] work. But when you add a denominational structure that is supportive and actually wants to invest and also kinda gives the freedom to let it go as it needs to go, we were kinda like, “Wow. That’s significant.” (R. Austria, personal
Rev. Rubén is right. This emerging NIC/CUS adaptive structure is significant. And for our purposes here in focusing on structure to optimize adaptive leadership in extreme context, we now have eyes to glimpse how the NIC’s traditional denominational structure is working in tandem with the CUS’s social regulatory structure. In other words, the NIC is learning to “walk the line between too much and too little structure” (Weisbord, 2004, p. 475). That said, our data analysis as it is does not provide more than this glimpse.

Metaphorically, therefore, we might borrow from Mary Jo Hatch and liken this NIC/CUS structure to jazz music that is performed in successive riffs of improvisation while built upon one tune’s structure, thereby bringing “structural stability and flexibility into direct connection” (as cited in Hatch & Cunliffe, 2013, p. 115). Hatch (2013) calls this “organizational improvisation” (p. 114). Quite literally, according to Hatch (2013), this metaphor of jazz is one way of visualizing a renewing social structure for the CUS while co-existing with NIC’s traditional structure.

Finally now, we highlight one promising finding of collective requisite complexity (CRC) that was discovered among UMC Safe Haven pastors’/directors’ 33 stories of commitment—a bright promise envisioned in the positive power of children’s games and play.
Evidence of collective requisite complexity within UMC Safe Haven pastors’/directors’ stories of commitment

We are learning that CRC occurs as we “move beyond the limits of existing knowledge to create new knowledge and systems through dynamic processes” [emphasis added] (Hannah et al., 2011, p. 218). To bring this to light, one such finding is evident in Safe Haven pastors’/directors’ views of games and play as an antidote to bullying and other conditions of extreme context. Here is how this is so.

Specifically, various Safe Haven pastors/directors expressed the centrality of games and play within their program’s success. Recall Table 16’s tally of 10 contexts of concern. In particular, as seen in Table 16, story 1 of 33 highlighted all 10 contexts of concern. Story 20 highlighted 9 of 10 contexts of concern. And stories 21 and 24 are closely related. So, it makes sense for us to give attention to these pastors’/directors’ stories that “hit on” all/most contexts of concern and thereby elevate games and play as formational for Safe Haven kids.

How can we understand the significance of these multi-context stories? It is as if Safe Haven pastors’/directors’ stories in concert are beginning to tell a “CRC story.” In other words, pastors/directors are observing that games and play are a positive, multivalent, and multi-context “force” within the UMC’s Safe Haven program that serves to offset some restraining forces in the extreme macro context. At least, that is what some pastors/directors are witnessing and envisioning according to their stories.
Excerpted directly from Safe Haven pastors’/directors’ interview responses in Table 15’s stories 1, 20, 21, and 24, Figure 21 endeavors to *illustrate their vision* of these two offsetting “forces” at stake in Safe Haven contexts. In other words, Figure 21 is expressed in their own “collective words.”
Figure 21. Positive Forces of Games and Play vs. Restraining Forces in Safe Haven Contexts: As Expressed by UMC Safe Haven Pastors/Directors
What does Figure 21 signify? Simply stated, Figure 21 is a variation of Kurt Lewin’s Force Field Analysis, which suggests that actions can be taken to decrease restraining forces and/or to increase positive forces as a means for shifting the status quo (as cited in Palmer, Dunford, & Akin, 2009). Consequently, through Safe Haven pastors’/directors’ eyes, Figure 21 gives us a practical sense of matching complexity with complexity as some pastors/directors believe that the positive force of play counteracts complex, contextual restraints affecting Safe Haven kids and their families. Practically speaking, therefore, we verify from the data analysis that this discovery by Safe Haven pastors/directors is influencing them to elevate games and play to strategic importance in their Safe Haven programs. Thereby, with this prime example, we illustrate one way that NIC’s context is priming CRC.

With that, it is time to “rest” from our exploration of IRC and CRC conceptual frameworks. And as we summarize this up-close look at complexity, we neither seek to over-dramatize nor reduce its importance. Rather, from here on, we seek to absorb and live with requisite complexity as an effective means for generating greater adaptive capacity.

Before we wrap up Chapter 6, we call attention to NIC’s collective efficacy that is becoming a predictor of NIC’s adaptive performance. We will “slow down” briefly here to look closely at and properly ascribe value to leadership efficacy.
3. Appreciating How NIC’s Collective Efficacy Is a Predictor of Collective Performance

Could there be a construct more valuable for carrying out leadership than self-efficacy? Take a look:

How individuals behave is more dependent on the beliefs they hold about their capabilities (self-efficacy beliefs) than by what they are actually capable of accomplishing. These self-efficacy beliefs exercise a measure of control over individuals’ thoughts, feelings, and actions. They influence the choices they make and determine how much effort they will expend on an activity or how resilient they will be when confronted with challenges. The higher the self-efficacy, the greater the persistence and resilience. (Thatchenkery & Metzker, 2006, p. 22)

As lifted up in importance by Dr. Tojo Thatchenkery, we want to “change the cadence” briefly now and direct our attention to closely observe NIC leaders’ confidence and appropriation of their roles and responsibilities, otherwise known as efficacy and agency. The two are closely related because “higher levels of self-efficacy provide the internal guidance and drive to create the agency needed to pursue challenging tasks and opportunities successfully [emphasis added]” (Hannah, Avolio, et al., 2008, p. 670).

At the same time, our purpose in Chapter 6 is to visualize the higher-level construct of collective efficacy. Thus, we are especially interested in the links between leader (follower) efficacy, collective efficacy, and collective performance that has emerged in the CUS and participation in CPS’s Safe Haven program. We “slow” our pace in
preparation, therefore, to first respectfully savor the characteristics of these constructs “at work” within the case study findings.

**Distinguishing leader efficacy and leadership efficacy**

Thinking back briefly to Chapter 2’s Literature Review, what is the difference in leader efficacy and leadership efficacy? Put simply, the *leader efficacy* beliefs or confidence of one person can influence and serve to build *leadership efficacy* for the group. As a case in point, “We can envision a highly efficacious team enhancing the leader efficacy of the individual leader, just as we can see how the leader can build higher levels of collective efficacy” (Hannah, Avolio, et al., 2008, p. 674). Aha! This is what we aim to observe. And if we align with scholars’ contemporary views that *leadership is a property of the collective*, it follows that efficacy necessarily applies to both leaders and followers. Importantly then, efficacy is as described here:

Leaders' (followers') beliefs in their perceived capabilities to organize the positive psychological capabilities, motivation, means, collective resources, and courses of action required to attain effective, sustainable performance across their various leadership roles, demands, and contexts. (Hannah, Avolio, et al., 2008, p. 670)

Tailored to help us understand *leadership efficacy*, in particular, Dr. Sean Hannah’s (2006) research has verified “new” efficacy domains including efficacy for *thought, self-motivation, means, and action*. These domains, briefly summarized in Figure 22, represent the *essential psychological resources* that buoy leaders to “rise to the occasion,” as we have often witnessed in these NIC case study results—particularly in Table 15’s 33 stories of Safe Haven pastors’/directors’ *leader efficacy*. 
While we seek not to zero in on any one characteristic here in Figure 22, rather, we bring this summary of efficacy characteristics into view to appreciate that these are the “cognitive processes and frameworks” (Hannah, 2006, p. 1) that enhance leader performance. “Efficacy cannot be separated from the processes of human agency in which those beliefs operate” (Hannah, 2006, p. 3). Like air to breathe, efficacy and agency “make” leaders and leadership possible. And Dr. Hannah (2006) believed this occurs as “a cycle of positive development.”

We assert that efficacy and agency are interactive; leaders must take
ownership of their enacted role and experience before they will act on the
confidence provided by their leadership efficacy. Those beliefs and resulting
performance successes will in turn provide the confidence for the leader to
further exercise agency in their leadership domain or environment, resulting in
a cycle of positive development” (p. 5).

In fact, this cycle of development is self-reinforcing as it stimulates pursuit of more
challenges and, thereby, further enhances efficacy beliefs. So it goes for leader,
follower, and collective efficacy.

Collective efficacy activated as a shared belief
By definition, collective efficacy is “a group’s shared belief in its conjoint capabilities
to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce specific levels of
accomplishments [emphasis added]” (Hannah, Avolio, et al., 2008, p. 680). All the
while, it is “stored in the minds of the individuals in that group” (Hannah, Avolio, et
al., 2008, p. 683). Thus, collective efficacy is activated when group members are
inspired or moved to accomplish a given task based on their perceptions of and
successful interactions with supporting followers, leaders, and peers. Collective
efficacy is a means for group performance.

Use of appreciative questions to discover collective efficacy in NIC’s
case study stories
Throughout NIC case study participants’ stories, time and again we witness how
much one leader’s efficacy beliefs enhanced the other and then enhanced collective
efficacy. To capture these moments as evidence of collective efficacy, here are three
groups of appreciative questions that verify and help us to visualize NIC’s collective
efficacy coming to life. As evidence also of NIC’s collective leadership, who can say
which one is the leader and which one is the follower in each of these unique moments?

**Evidence of collective efficacy in the CUS’s founding story**
Recall the tipping point that commenced the NIC’s Chicago Urban Strategy. Was it CPD Chief Eugene’s vision of the UMC as “uniquely structured so as to be able to impact the whole city” that ignited the spark that became the CUS? Was it Bishop Sally’s expressed determination to reside in inner-city Chicago that convinced Chief Eugene to promote his vision for the UMC? Or was it Pastor Jacques’ proclamation, “This is the moment that we have to have something from you, Bishop” that sealed the deal? For such an undertaking as the CUS, it seems that each leader’s efficacy beliefs served to buoy the others. And, perhaps, all came together on a divine cue.

**Evidence of collective efficacy in Elston Avenue UMC’s decision to continue on when CPS funding stopped**
Recall Elston Avenue UMC’s decision to go forward despite CPS’s stopped funding. When CPS suddenly stopped Safe Haven funding due to low enrollment, was it Pastor Hannah’s, Pastoral Intern Andy’s, and the church leaders’ “decision that we’re going to continue on” even when “we just couldn’t get the money” that inspired the NIC, District Superintendent (DS), and other UMCs to step in with affirmation and contribute the lost CPS funding? Was it the trust that Garrett Seminary and Ken Ehrman placed in Elston Avenue UMC by assigning them a Pastoral Intern that enlivened a spirit of resiliency within the congregation? Or was it Pastoral Intern
Andy’s conscientious commitment to a new leadership role that inspired church leaders to continue on and spurred the NIC/DS/UMCs to offer support? Indeed, there seems to be abundant leader efficacy visible in this story—a collective “mustard seed”—all inspiring and building up to collective efficacy and agency as Elston Avenue UMC went on to complete their six-week Safe Haven and “impact 70 kids’ lives throughout the summer [2015].”

**Evidence of collective efficacy in 10 new UMC Safe Haven sign-ups**

Recall new UMCs that opened their doors as Safe Havens during Spring Break 2016. What sparked these 10 new UMCs to sign up to be Safe Havens for Spring Break 2016? Was it a buzz spreading among the social networks of UMC inner-city churches that stirred their attention, as Pastor Robert Biekman described it, “to understand their power ...not just individually as local churches, but then also collectively”? Or was it the success of other UMC Safe Havens that became a predictor of success for these new churches? While the answers to these questions lie beyond the scope of this case study’s data analysis, we can affirm through these three appreciative scenarios some evidence of shared belief that is coming to life in places within the NIC—a shared belief that morphs into a “collective confidence” (Hannah et al., 2009, p. 685).
Summarizing NIC’s collective efficacy as a predictor of collective agency and performance

These three groups of appreciative questions that were posed from NIC participants’ stories are intended to illustrate Figure 23’s framework of leadership efficacy. In Figure 23, we see the constructs of collective efficacy embedded in shared leadership. Remember that leaders are followers, and every follower is (at least potentially) also a leader (Bennis, 2007). And “leading can take on multiple directions moving down, up, or laterally across formal hierarchies” (DeRue, 2011, p. 128) and is “independent of any formal role or structure” (DeRue & Ashford, 2010, p. 627). Therefore, leaders and followers both possess efficacy beliefs.

So, even at this emergent and experimental stage of the NIC’s Chicago Urban Strategy, as illustrated in the prior appreciative questions, we see validation that NIC group members are amassing some shared belief in their cooperative capabilities that is beginning to serve as a predictor of collective agency and performance, as depicted in Figure 23. Here is how that looks in action:

Source: Adapted from (Hannah, Avolio, et al., 2008, p. 671)
When leaders and followers share a positive view of their abilities to constructively influence each other, and then support each other and perform well, we suggest that unique organizational cultures may emerge where these contextual factors not only shape leadership efficacy, but will also be impacted by leadership efficacy over time. (Hannah, Avolio, et al., 2008, p. 670)

Importantly, there is real promise in the NIC’s progress to date. And to ascribe realistic value to these efficacy constructs at work within the NIC, Bruce Avolio (2011) has echoed that building collective efficacy “can effect a transformation, both in context as well as in performance” (p. 144). Therein is a “pot of gold.”

4. Appreciating How NIC’s Collective Leadership Efficacy (Organizational Efficacy) Is Attenuating Extreme Context

There is an audacious assertion in Dr. Hannah’s and his colleagues’ research revealed in A Framework for Examining Leadership in Extreme Context (Hannah et al., 2009). Specifically, this bold assertion is that “leadership is not just passively influenced by extreme contexts, but can interact with the context and serve to intensify or attenuate levels of extremity [emphasis added]” (Hannah et al., 2009, p. 898). In other words, there is potential for NIC and CUS leadership to attenuate—to weaken, shrink, diminish, or undo—ill effects of extreme context through the CUS movement and Safe Haven participation. Suffice it to say, the NIC is not interested in intensifying levels of extremity through its leadership or lack thereof.

So what works to undo or weaken extreme context? Based upon the extensively-researched efficacy literature, it is the multilevel effects of collective leadership
efficacy that serve to weaken levels of extremity or the threat of it. And the NIC case study findings provide evidence of collective leadership efficacy in the midst of NIC’s participation in CPS’s Safe Haven program. In particular, Table 23 is a resource-based view of this case study’s findings as it presents six NIC attenuators to Chicago’s extreme context that have come to light across the case study’s data analysis. These are the emergent resources that sum up the NIC’s collective leadership efficacy at the time of this writing.

Six emergent resources as proof of NIC’s collective leadership efficacy
Grouped by Psychological, Social, and Organizational Resources as defined by Hannah et al. (2009), Table 23 summarizes six NIC attenuating resources that exhibit NIC’s adaptive leadership response and undergird the NIC’s well-functioning Safe Havens:

1. Leader efficacy.
2. Developmental learning experiences.
3. Collective efficacy.
5. Culture of experimentation.
6. Shared mental models.

Here now in Table 23 is a combined presentation of these six NIC attenuating resources with a mention of supporting evidence for each one based on the case study
findings. Look over this summary to appreciate these resources that are *present* and *emerging* within the NIC’s Chicago Urban Strategy.
Table 23. Summary of Six Attenuators of Extreme Context in NIC’s Case Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psychological Resources + Social Resources + Organizational Resources = Collective Leadership Efficacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Leader efficacy for thought, self-motivation, means, &amp; action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Developmental learning experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Collective efficacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Network-centric mindset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Culture of experimentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Shared mental models</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Leader efficacy is visible across:
   - Table 15’s 33 stories of Safe Haven pastors’/directors’ commitment to their work.
   - Many trial-and-error experiences in discovering Figure 15’s well-functioning Safe Haven practices.

2. Table 15 & Figure 15 reveal developmental learning experiences that “challenge the adequacy of a person’s current thinking & mental models” (Hannah & Lester, 2009, p. 37).

3. Collective efficacy is visible in:
   - The founding story of the CUS.
   - Elston Avenue UMC’s collective decision-making & rally in response to CPS stopping funds.
   - Six new UMC Safe Havens approved by CPS for Spring Break 2016.

4. A network-centric mindset is becoming visible in the emerging CUS urban network & agenda that is shared by Chicago’s urban UMCs & pastors.

5. In clergy and lay leader forums, Bishop Sally Dyck promotes adaptive leadership & a culture of experimentation as a process for working through the NIC’s complex adaptive challenges. The CUS & NIC’s Safe Havens are such an experiment.

6. The CUS movement is visible as a shared mental model among:
   - UMC Safe Haven congregations.
   - Suburban UMCs.
   - Community partners such as CPS, NOBLE, CCFY, & others beyond the bounds of this case study.
In summary, we can appreciate that Table 23 is evidence of rich micro-to-macro resources that exemplify NIC’s organizational adaptability. “Organizational adaptability can be an important attenuator in extreme contexts….In such contexts, an organization’s level of adaptability is tied directly to its ability to collect and make sense of complex information in its environment and adjust accordingly [emphasis added]” (Hannah et al., 2009, p. 910). Strategically speaking, in fact, this ability to make sense of and adjust accordingly to complexity is in step with Bishop Sally Dyck’s endorsement of adaptive leadership and an NIC culture of experimentation as a means to “catalyze” social dynamics “toward adaptive organizational outcomes by setting the proper conditions and fostering certain functional behaviors or activities” (Hannah et al., 2010, February, p. 25).

A mega model of NIC’s Safe Haven program in Chicago’s extreme context
Now in an attempt to wrap up all of these findings into one mega framework, Figure 25 is a multilevel view of the case study’s findings as it portrays the NIC’s collective leadership efficacy, adaptive leadership response, and UMC Safe Haven “holding environments” all operating in the midst of extreme context. Indeed, Figure 25 is a composite of the NIC case study data analysis that allows us to “stand back” and understand what is working from a micro-to-macro level of perspectives.

Note: Graphic elements that appear in gray on Figure 25 are the original graphics from Hannah et al.’s (2009) Figure 1. Typology of Extreme Contexts (p. 899)
(inserted below). All other color graphic elements in Figure 25 were inserted and adapted in order to illustrate the impact of the CUS and NIC’s Safe Haven program in Chicago’s extreme context.

Source: Adapted from Figure 1. Typology of extreme contexts (Hannah, Uhl-Bien, Avolio, & Cavarretta, 2009, p. 899)

Figure 24. The Basis for Figure 25’s Adapted Framework
Figure 25. A Mega Framework of the NIC’s Safe Haven Program in Chicago’s Extreme Context
Here is a key to understanding Figure 25’s significance:

Six NIC attenuators of extreme context are presented here, as summarized in Table 23.

The extreme context of Chicago’s under-resourced neighborhoods is represented in orange.

“Nested” in Chicago’s extreme context, NIC’s Chicago Urban Strategy is represented in blue.

NIC’s Safe Haven program is represented in green.

What does Figure 25 mean? By means of collective leadership efficacy, NIC’s adaptive leadership response is attenuating Chicago’s extreme context through NIC’s reliable Safe Haven “holding environment.”

In Figure 25’s conceptualization, the six attenuators that embody collective leadership efficacy provide evidence of the NIC’s “organizational adaptability”
(Hannah et al., 2009, p. 910). This visualization depicts one aspect of the NIC’s attenuating or “undoing effect” on extreme context as it pertains to UMC Safe Havens. Akin to Russian dolls, Figure 25 depicts UMC Safe Havens as reliable “holding environments” (Heifetz et al., 2009) nested in the NIC’s Chicago Urban Strategy, and all nested in Chicago’s extreme context of at-risk neighborhoods—a mega graphic illustration of adaptive leadership response by the NIC.

As a crucial byproduct, in fact, we could also declare that Figure 25 depicts NIC’s requisite organizational energy. Organizational energy is a capacity to “transform organizational resources into capabilities that produce adaptation to the internal and external environment, while feeding excess energy back into the system to continue growth” (Hannah et al., 2010, February, p. 16).

**Wrapping Up the Case Study Data Analysis**

We may have “strained our brains” here in Chapter 6, all in the pragmatic spirit of using Chapter 2’s scholar/practitioner’s conceptual toolbox to substantiate several foundational constructs that are undergirding the NIC’s Chicago Urban Strategy. Even so, substantiation is one aspect of achieving requisite complexity and “looking hard” to bring attention to “the present successes” and what is “already occurring” (Thatchenkery, 2011, pp. 33-34).

We definitely took a “hard look” at core foundational constructs here in Chapter 6. Herein we answered two framing questions: **What are the NIC & UMC Safe Haven**
practices that relate to collective success in the midst of an extreme context?

What leadership practices are used to attenuate extreme context?

Specifically, we substantiated UMC Safe Havens as a successful “holding environment” for kids. We worked hard to substantiate how NIC’s contextual factors and adaptive structure are priming individual and collective requisite complexity (IRC and CRC). We substantiated NIC’s collective efficacy. And as a culmination of the NIC case study findings, we substantiated NIC’s organizational efficacy as we observed in Figure 25 how the NIC’s six psychological, social, and organizational resources are serving to undo UMC Safe Haven contexts. With these conceptual tools well in hand, here we stop.

And based on our work in Chapters 4–6, we are well positioned in Chapter 7 to present some practical propositions for the NIC’s Annual Conference and UMC churches. Also, we present two research questions for advancing leadership in extreme context.
Chapter 7: Propositions and Research Questions

I prefer a church which is bruised, hurting, and dirty because it has been out on the streets, rather than a church which is unhealthy from being confined and from clinging to its own security.

Pope Francis
November 2013

Recall how far we have come in our analysis of the NIC case study findings. In Chapter 4, we established the NIC within a nesting of micro-to-macro contexts multilayered within Chicago’s extreme context. Remarkably, despite this multi-complexity of context and challenge, Chapter 5’s results indicate that UMC Safe Havens are high-functioning exemplars. And in Chapter 6, we went further to establish core theoretical constructs that are undergirding collective success for the Chicago Urban Strategy and UMC Safe Havens. So, here in Chapter 7, we are now at a juncture to discuss two practical propositions and two research questions for future research and study.

First, we pause to respect a ripe opportunity to serve as we are at the crest of a three-pronged nexus:

1. **A paradigm shift in leadership.** “A paradigm shift has occurred as many scholars view leadership as a property of the collective, not the individual” (Cullen-Lester & Yammarino, 2016, p. 178). *The Leadership Quarterly* dedicated
April 2016’s special edition to *Collective and Network Approaches to Leadership*.

In fact, “Work is *simultaneously* becoming *more collective and more technologically dependent* [emphasis added]” (Charlier, Stewart, Greco, & Reeves, 2016). This contextual shift requires our attention as it changes leaders, leadership, and leadership effectiveness (Eberly et al., 2013).

2. **Chicago as a more extreme context than Los Angeles or New York.**

![Homicide Rates graph](source)

*Source:* Adapted from (Fessenden & Park, 2016, May 27).

**Figure 26. Chicago’s Homicide Rate Compared to L.A. and N.Y.C.**

On Memorial Day 2016, *The New York Times* began a year-long series by dispatching reporters, photographers, and videographers to Chicago. As evident in Figure 26, “It is a level of violence that has become the terrifying norm, particularly in predominantly black and Latino neighborhoods on the South and
West Sides. With far fewer residents, Chicago has more homicides than Los Angeles or New York” (Davey, 2016, June 4). In fact, “blacks and Hispanics in Chicago expressed significantly less hope than their counterparts in New York that their children would escape gang life” (Fessenden & Park, 2016, May 27). And there are 30+ UMCs located in these Chicago neighborhoods.

3. **An adaptive challenge for the NIC of building a resilient movement, urban network, and urban agenda in collaboration with grassroots faith and neighborhood organizations in under-resourced Chicago neighborhoods.**

This movement is the NIC’s Chicago Urban Strategy aimed at community safety, education and literacy, food security, and restorative justice. Intrinsic in such a movement is the belief that community capacity building is best accomplished by collaboration among indigenous community partners *without overreliance* on the CPD, CPS, Mayor’s Office, etc. William Pasmore (2014) put it this way: “Many of our hopes for the future lie in the hands of collaborative networks and associations among organizations in the public and private sectors” (p. 369). Realistically, Ron Heifetz acknowledges, “We need people with the staying power to work for futures we will not see” (R. Heifetz, personal communication, November 4, 2016).

At this three-pronged nexus, the case study data analysis is based upon an appreciative search for what is working in NIC’s CUS. And the data findings suggest
some provocative propositions and research questions that arise from connecting the content of the case study findings with existing theory and practice. These two propositions are applied to NIC’s Annual Conference (the regional association of NIC leaders including Bishop’s office) and to 400+ UMC churches throughout the NIC. These propositions and research questions also apply to leadership in extreme context wherever it may be occurring.

Throughout this chapter, each proposition and research question is clearly marked by a section heading, a statement or question, and followed by supporting rationale based on the case study data analysis. For each one, it is our aim to show how the NIC case study is embedded in the current research and supporting literature. We begin with Proposition 1.

**Proposition 1: Link between NIC’s Experimentation, Appreciative Intelligence, and Success**

Proposition 1: The more NIC’s Annual Conference/UMC churches engage in experiments/experimentation and build on the positive results of those, the more it will increase appreciative intelligence and success.

We return where we started to the first overarching research question: What is the United Methodist Church doing in its Chicago Urban Strategy that is working as defined by case study participants? Of all discoveries in this case study experience, this one may be most profound. Rooted in the appreciative inquiry literature, we know that it is the questions we ask that determine our direction and what we find.
And from the literature on adaptive leadership, Ron Heifetz and Donald Laurie (2001) knew it too as they declared that leaders are adaptive when they “identify the adaptive challenge and frame key questions [emphasis added]” (p. 135). So, our research question has within it a “power of reframing”—a means to discover “useful, desirable, or positive aspects [that] already exist in the current condition of people, situations, or things” (Thatencherry & Metzker, 2006, pp. xiii, 7).

And by letting the ability to cognitively reframe guide the findings of the NIC case study, we can now point out some ways that the NIC has gained appreciative intelligence® in the process—a “capability to distinguish the intrinsic opportunity for achievement in the current situation” (Parkkinen, Lehtimäki, & Thatencherry, 2015, p. 105). On the Harvard Business Review’s 2006 reading list (Landry, 2006), read Appreciative Intelligence: Seeing the Mighty Oak in the Acorn (Thatencherry & Metzker, 2006).

**Being willing to look through a “what's working” frame and appreciate the positive**

We have witnessed that there is a life-giving energy in the pursuit of “what’s working.” And to a person, all NIC case study participants seemed to sense it as evidenced by their willingness to look at the Chicago Urban Strategy’s Safe Havens through a “what’s working” frame. According to Dr. Tojo Thatencherry, this willingness is the first step toward appreciative intelligence. In the practice of “intentional higher appreciation,” you 1) deliberately practice reframing,
2) appreciate the positive, and 3) explore how the future can unfold from the present (Thatchenkery & Metzker, 2006, p. 118).

Here is how this is done. By living into a “what’s working” framework embodied in the case study interview questions, NIC case study participants acted in Quadrant 3 of Figure 27’s Practice stage—an intentional and higher level of appreciative intelligence—far from Quadrant 1’s Status Quo (unintentional, lower appreciation). By definition, Quadrant 2’s Assess stage marks essential consciousness of when, where, and to what extent we are acting or thinking in appreciative ways. However, it is Quadrant 3’s Practice stage that is optimum for developing appreciative intelligence. We affirm that NIC case study participants have been operating in Quadrant 3’s optimal stage in the process of conducting this research.

**Being willing to let success ensue**

What next? As surprising as it might sound, Quadrant 4’s Success stage is an unintentional outgrowth of Quadrant 3’s Practice stage. “As your
qualities of persistence, conviction in your actions, tolerance for uncertainty, and resilience grow, you begin to reap the rewards of success” (Thatchenkery & Metzker, 2006, p. 118). Remarkably, these characteristics of success seem to mirror the NIC’s Safe Haven success story as we heard stories of persistence, conviction, and resilience amid uncertainty and complexity throughout this data analysis. By trusting that we would find “success” through the “what’s working” question, we found it in abundance.

Are we saying that success is unintentional? Yes. In their own way, Ron Heifetz and Marty Linsky (2011) echoed the unintentional nature of successful adaptation in their analogy to evolutionary biology:

Successful adaptation has three characteristics: (1) it preserves the DNA essential for the species’ continued survival; (2) it discards (reregulates or rearranges) the DNA that no longer serves the species’ current needs; and (3) it creates DNA arrangements that give the species’ the ability to flourish in new ways and in more challenged environments. Successful adaptations enable a living system to take the best from its history into the future. (p. 26)

In fact, a willingness to let success ensue is inherent in the nature of the NIC’s culture of experimentation—a good thing because a definition of success is often elusive from one person(s) to another. “The odd thing about success, like other intangible concepts, is that when it is not limited to a specific definition, observers usually agree on its presence in an individual or context” (Thatchenkery & Metzker, 2006, p. 140). So, ironically, though success is often difficult to define, we seem to know it when we see it. Thus, rather than pursuing it, success ensues (Frankl, 1946, pp. xiv-xv).
**NIC’s upward spiral of building appreciative intelligence through adaptive leadership**

Figure 28 helps us to visualize the life-giving force in the NIC’s appreciative practice of “what’s working” as it fosters an upward-spiral effect of “broadened thinking that accompanies positive emotions” (Fredrickson & Joiner, 2002, p. 175). Figure 28 combines concepts from the literature of adaptive leadership and appreciative inquiry.

Progressing upward from Step 1 through Step 3 in Figure 28 has carried NIC case study participants through an “Experiment Zone” to new awareness and success that is central to tenets of adaptive leadership. And given the proof of high-functioning UMC Safe Havens presented in Chapters 5 and 6, the NIC and CUS are poised for future success. In fact, Step 4 hints at the possibility for “positive ‘self-fueling spirals’ of development and performance” (Hannah et al., 2010, February, p. 13). And in the spirit of appreciating the positive, Figure 28 leaves us with one remaining question: What else can we find that is working? Looking through a positive frame as practiced in this case study research, it seems that wherever we look, we will find it.
Figure 28. NIC’s Upward Spiral of Building Appreciative Intelligence through Adaptive Leadership

So, as future research and practice unfolds, we propose from the outcomes of this NIC case study that there will be good support to uphold Proposition 1’s “upward spiral” for building appreciative intelligence through adaptive leadership.
Proposition 2: Link between Requisite Complexity, Adaptive Capacity, and Adaptive Performance

Proposition 2: The more that individuals and adaptive systems of the NIC Annual Conference/UMC churches match the complexity of their context(s), the more this requisite complexity will be a catalyst for creating adaptive capacity and adaptive performance.

There is one more proposition that will be fruitful for future research and practice. For this one, we must bring to mind Chapter 6’s evidence of individual requisite complexity (IRC) and collective requisite complexity (CRC) that is present and emerging in 1) NIC’s adaptive structure (p. 249) and 2) Safe Haven pastors’/directors’ discovery of games and play as a positive force for counteracting complex, contextual restraints affecting Safe Haven kids (p. 254). Admittedly, these theoretical constructs are inherently complex and, as such, are drawn from general cognitive complexity, complexity theory, and the law of requisite complexity (Lord et al., 2011; Uhl-Bien et al., 2007).

Source: Adapted from Figure 1 (Hannah, Lord, & Pearce, 2011, p. 220).

Figure 29. Formation and Potential Outcomes of Collective Requisite Complexity (CRC)
That said, based on research by Hannah, Lord, and Pearce (2011), Figure 29 posits potential for *group adaptive capacity* and *group performance* outcomes when CRC is present. “Adaptive capacity is broadly defined as the ability to effectively change and modify behavior (or internal and external environments) to achieve fit between desired and actual circumstances and thereby promote group and organizational performance [emphasis added]” (Hannah et al., 2011, p. 221). In support of this definition, in fact, sociologist of religion, Nancy Ammerman found that “‘civically’ minded congregations could only adapt effectively if they understood the complexity of the community they sought to represent and benefit [emphasis added]” (Eiesland & Warner, 1998, p. 76).

Instinctively, therefore, we might assert that the process depicted in Figure 29 is already occurring through the NIC’s Chicago Urban Strategy and Safe Haven program. However, this assertion goes beyond the evidence discovered in the data analysis. Rather, we present Figure 29 to show the interdependence and relationships between these key concepts. And we appreciate how Figure 29 depicts that when *group performance* occurs, it “feeds back” *individual learning* and *group learning* to the adaptive system in order to keep the cycle going.

Perhaps Figure 29 is one more way to conceptualize how “greater complexity allows a more nuanced understanding of environmental changes, and it supports the capacity to invent more novel and appropriate responses” (Hannah et al., 2011, p. 216). This
capacity to invent more novel approaches or experiments is a primary aim of NIC’s culture of experimentation and Chicago Urban Strategy. And this fits with Ron Heifetz’s assertion, “Legitimize experimentation. Learn fast from failure. Over time, those experiments get sorted out for which is most successful, and that accumulates into more experiments” (R. Heifetz, personal communication, November 4, 2016).

**Research Question 1: Taking into Account A “Faith-Based Critical Action” Classification**

Research Question 1: How is the description of a “critical action organization” that proactively engages in extreme context (Hannah et al., 2009, pp. 900-901) more complete and accurate with the inclusion of a “faith-based critical action” classification, e.g., for organizations such as Salvation Army, NIC’s CUS, etc.?

In response to a “call to arms” by Hannah, Campbell, and Matthews (2010) for advancing leadership in dangerous contexts, this NIC case study is a meso-level analysis focused on critical research areas such as *group processes*, *group complexity*, and *organizational structure*, *systems*, and *adaptability*. Specifically, while prior research may focus on military, fire, or law enforcement leadership in dangerous context, this meso-level case study contributes a study of adaptive leadership practice by a faith-based organization in collaboration with civic partners in Chicago’s extreme context.

Given new insights and emergent success of the NIC as a faith-based organization providing civic leadership and operating in extreme context, the characteristics of a
“naïve” organization (Hannah & Parry, 2014) seem to be an inaccurate description of the NIC’s Chicago Urban Strategy. For the NIC to remain “naïve,” in fact, is an untenable position given the NIC’s vision and close proximity to under-resourced Chicago neighborhoods. Rather, based on case study findings, future reflection might be valuable in order to characterize a new, faith-based adaptation of a “critical action” organization that may be characterized by the following criteria.

**Purposely and proactively engaging in Chicago’s extreme context**
NIC’s Chicago Urban Strategy exists to purposely and proactively go toward and engage in Chicago’s extreme context and at-risk communities in order to foster community capacity building through multi-agency collaboration, e.g., the emerging ATI Collaborative that is focused on Chicago’s Roseland community (Watson, 2016, May 4). Pastor Biekman skillfully expressed the aim of such a proactive stance of engagement as “turning participants toward the world with authority” (R. Biekman, personal communication, July 21, 2016).

**Operating collectively through an urban network of churches and community partners**
The case study results provide evidence of the NIC’s CUS operating collectively through building and co-creating an “urban network” and “urban agenda” of UMC and other urban churches and civic partners, as voiced by Pastor Biekman. This is a “network-centric mindset” that fuels complex adaptive leadership (Hannah, Eggers, et al., 2008).
**Being willing to be “on call” and activated quickly**

Being willing to be activated swiftly means being “on call” in some fashion “to come together around meaningful things,” e.g., a silent march, prayer vigil, etc., again as expressed by Pastor Biekman. Being “on call” in this way, whether for urban or suburban UMCs is itself an expression of commitment and engagement for “critical action.”

**Cultivating “trauma informed” faith communities**

Building cultural competencies across the NIC through “more extensive collective training and simulations” (Hannah et al., 2009, p. 901) is an effective means for “critical action.” At the time of this writing, in fact, Dr. Colleen Cicchetti, Director for the Center for Childhood Resilience at Lurie Children’s Hospital in Chicago, is partnering with the NIC to create “trauma informed” faith communities/congregations in order to recognize and address symptoms of PTSD in Safe Haven kids, families, etc. (Raviv, 2010, Spring). As expressed earlier by Bishop Sally Dyck, likely clergy, laity, and even churches suffer from PTSD. Yet, from a perspective of hope, “research suggests that when leaders and their groups conduct collective meaning-making sessions and create a safe and supportive environment to reflect upon prior traumatic events, members are better able to deal with negative psychological effects [emphasis added]” (Hannah et al., 2010, pp. S162-S163).

**Claiming “critical action” as NIC’s positive collective identity**

In any case, creating this new “faith-based critical action” classification may coincidently be a means for “positive identity construction” (Dutton, Roberts, &
Bednar, 2010). This makes sense as “a work-related identity becomes more positive as it develops a better fit with internal and/or external standards” (Dutton et al., 2010, p. 269). So, by defining what a “faith-based critical action” organization is, the NIC may simultaneously crystallize a positive collective identity for urban ministry in extreme contexts like Chicago. From Chapter 6, recall that activating a collective identity is an essential ingredient for effective collective leadership.

**Research Question 2: Reaching for Emotional Affect to Interrupt the Cradle-to-Prison Pipeline**

Research Question 2: In what ways does attention to and validation of kid’s emotions/mood in high-incarceration communities serve to interrupt the presumptive cradle-to-prison pipeline?

Indications are that “leaders’ abilities to attenuate negative and enhance positive emotions in followers may be an important area in researching effective leadership for dangerous contexts” (Hannah et al., 2010, p. S162). Therefore, one final topic for future reflection pertains to the emotions that Safe Haven pastors/directors are feeling or imagine that others are feeling, as excerpted from their stories and presented below in Table 24. These emotions were expressed pertaining to Safe Haven children, their parents, congregations, and pastors'/directors’ own emotions. Read over Table 24’s list to observe positive emotions or behaviors (marked by a +) and negative emotions or behaviors (marked by a −).
### Table 24. Emotions Observed or Expressed by Safe Haven Pastors/Directors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotion or Related Behavior (+ or –)</th>
<th>Related Expression Voiced by Safe Haven Pastor/Director</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>About Safe Haven children</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+Accepted</td>
<td>“accepted; they’re not judged”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+Delight</td>
<td>“delight when you win in a way that’s open and like drawn in of the people around you”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+Love</td>
<td>“she gets love from a lot of places in her life”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+Love</td>
<td>“somebody loves them”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+Love/Care</td>
<td>“I’m going to love you; I’m going to care for you”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+Mother figure</td>
<td>“they felt the mother figure there”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+Not captured in sadness</td>
<td>“not become captured in sadness or anger when you lose”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+Self-assurance</td>
<td>“gives them a sense of self-assurance”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–Abandonment</td>
<td>“the kids were kind of like upset; why did you leave us?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–Afraid</td>
<td>“scared; they’re afraid”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–Anxiety</td>
<td>“he was about crazy when he thought you all weren’t going to have nothing [Safe Haven] for the summer”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–Dramatic or heavy</td>
<td>“feeling dramatic; they’re feeling heavier”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–Fear</td>
<td>“we underestimate or really don’t know the volume of fear and anxiety”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–Frustration</td>
<td>“I’ve asked children to draw an animal, and they are so frustrated and upset, and they don’t even want to try”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–Hurt</td>
<td>“They don’t want to be hurt; they’ve been hurt”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–Hurt</td>
<td>“if you say it to someone’s face, then you actually see the hurt you placed on them”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–Love</td>
<td>“not sure if they’re loved”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–Suffering</td>
<td>“suffering on many levels”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–Tension</td>
<td>“there was that kind of tension that comes up in life now that we have decreased tools to talk about”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion or Related Behavior (+ or −)</td>
<td>Related Expression Voiced by Safe Haven Pastor/Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>religion”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**About parents of Safe Haven children**

| +Peace                              | “when she left, she was at peace, and she was smiling” |
| −Anxiety                            | “mothers who were on anti-depressant or anxiety medication because of how much they worry about their children” |
| −Crying                             | “before she even stepped in, she was crying” |
| −Heartbroken                       | “she was just heartbroken and tired as a mother taking care of children on her own with no help” |

**About people from Safe Haven congregation**

| +Enthusiastic                       | “some of them would be real enthusiastic; some of them wouldn’t [about Safe Haven]” |
| +Excited                           | “[Safe Haven] made them more excited” |
| −Unsafe                            | “they don’t feel safe [at church after dark]” |

**About Safe Haven pastors/directors (speaking of their own emotions)**

| +Affirmed                          | “it did feel a little bit like I was being affirmed in those things, being affirmed as the director, which was very helpful” |
| +Excited                           | “I get excited when they [Safe Haven kids] come back day to day” |
| +Hope                              | “I do feel like this means that down the road if they are in a time of crisis, a time of struggle, or a time of searching, a time of questioning, they’re more likely to think of churches as places they can go” |
| −Cry                               | “I go home and cry many a day” |
| −Frustrating and discouraging      | “the job [Safe Haven director] can be quite challenging and frustrating and even sometimes discouraging” |
| −Heartbreaking                     | “and some of it is heartbreaking” |
| −Tears                             | “it brings tears to my eyes” |
Given the “affective revolution” (Barsade, Brief, & Spataro, 2003) that is underway in organizational behavior literature, including a broader understanding of emotion constructs and how they influence organizational life and leadership (Connelly & Gooty, 2015), future study could explore how emotion may be a powerful contagion for supporting child, youth, and adult development in UMC Safe Haven life experiences and in the life of the congregation. We know, for instance, that “individual change is more emotional than rational. Further evidence suggests that the contagious power of emotions explains how groups may overcome obstacles and behave in unified ways” (Tobey & Manning, 2009). And this contagious power may complement content and learning experiences that will be featured in “Becoming a Trauma Informed Faith Community,” soon to be hosted by Lurie Children’s Hospital in partnership with the NIC.

Thus, these related questions go to the “beating heart” of this work’s future impact:

- Since “leadership challenges are often affect-laden,” are Safe Haven pastors/directors already successfully demonstrating efficacy for “emotional self-awareness” and “emotional self-regulation” as seen in Table 24 (Hannah, 2006, p. 187)? This seems feasible and admirable. However, this is beyond the scope of data collected for this case study.

- Further, could a specific attention to Safe Haven kid’s expressions of emotion or mood serve to further interrupt the presumptive cradle-to-prison pipeline? How
could this be so? In her seminal work on “feeling rules,” American sociologist, Arlie Hochschild (1979) has asserted, “A reexamination of class differences in child rearing suggests that middle-class families prepare their children for emotion management more, and working-class families prepare them less. In this way, each class prepares its children to psychologically reproduce the class structure [emphasis added]” (p. 551). In other words,

Middle-class parents tend to control via appeals to feeling, and the control is more of feeling. The working-class parent, by contrast, tends to control via appeals to behavior, and the control is more of behavior and its consequences (Kohn 1963; Bernstein 1971). That is, the middle-class child is more likely to be punished for “feeling the wrong way, or seeing things in the wrong light,” or having the “wrong intention,” whereas the working-class child is more likely to be punished for wrong behavior and its consequences. The class difference socialization amounts to different degrees of training for the commoditization of feeling. This is yet another way the class structure reproduces itself [emphasis added]. (Hochschild, 1979, pp. 570-571)

So, when UMC Safe Haven leaders validate kid’s emotions as observed in the data analysis of Table 24, does this become a “preventive support” (CDF, 2016, May 8) for children and youth in high-incarceration communities where attention to kid’s feelings may not be the norm? In other words, could this validation of a Safe Haven child’s emotion or mood serve as one brilliant way to further interrupt the presumptive cradle-to-prison pipeline that unwittingly “prepares its children to psychologically reproduce the class structure” (Hochschild, 1979, p. 551)?
Thanks to Visiting Professor Yochi Cohen-Charash of Baruch College and Graduate Center of City University of New York (CUNY) for introducing Arlie Hochschild’s research.

- Finally, in a similar vein, would the NIC want to *embrace as a core value* the positive youth development (PYD) approach espoused by UMC Safe Haven pastors/directors in Chapter 5’s data analysis (page 200)? Consistent with appreciative intelligence, PYD has far-reaching implications for care of children/youth as it “resists conceiving of the developmental process mainly as an effort to overcome deficits and risk. Instead, it begins with a vision of a fully able child eager to explore the world, gain competence, and acquire the capacity to contribute importantly to the world” (Damon, 2004, p. 20). These seem to be compelling core values of inestimable worth.

**Summary of Case Study Propositions and Research Questions**
Based on NIC case study findings, Chapter 7’s practical propositions and research questions call attention to directions for future research and study. These are summarized here in Table 25. Yet, given the extreme context and immediacy of needs in the NIC’s complex adaptive challenge, all have implications for current practice. Future research and experimentation is needed to determine if these propositions and research questions will hold.
Table 25. Summary of Propositions and Research Questions for Future Research and Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Concepts</th>
<th>Proposition (P) or Research Question (RQ)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimentation, Appreciative Intelligence, and Success</td>
<td>The more NIC’s Annual Conference/UMC churches engage in experiments/experimentation and build on the positive results of those, the more it will increase appreciative intelligence and success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requisite Complexity, Adaptive Capacity, and Adaptive Performance</td>
<td>The more that individuals and adaptive systems of the NIC Annual Conference/UMC churches match the complexity of their context(s), the more this requisite complexity will be a catalyst for creating adaptive capacity and adaptive performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shifting from “Naïve” to “Faith-Based Critical Action” as Key for Leadership in Extreme Context</td>
<td>How is the description of a “critical action organization” that proactively engages in extreme context (Hannah et al., 2009, pp. 900-901) <em>more complete</em> and <em>accurate</em> with the inclusion of a “faith-based critical action” classification, e.g., for organizations such as Salvation Army, NIC’s CUS, etc.?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attenuating Negative &amp; Enhancing Positive Emotions as Key for Leadership in Extreme Context</td>
<td>In what ways do attention to and validation of kid’s emotions/mood in high-incarceration communities serve to interrupt the presumptive cradle-to-prison pipeline?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In conclusion, Table 25 points out the key concepts in play for each proposition and research question by providing an at-a-glance summary for ease of reference. We turn now toward Chapter 8’s final lap in the NIC case study.
Chapter 8: Implications and Future Possibilities

Over the course of centuries, black churches served as “hush harbors” where slaves could worship in safety; praise houses where their free descendants could gather and shout hallelujah; rest stops for the weary along the Underground Railroad; bunkers for the foot soldiers of the Civil Rights Movement.

They have been, and continue to be, community centers where we organize for jobs and justice; places of scholarship and network; places where children are loved and fed and kept out of harm’s way, and told they are beautiful and smart and taught that they matter. That’s what happens in the church....

*President Obama’s Eulogy for State Senator, Rev. Clementa Pinckney*

*College of Charleston, SC*

*June 26, 2015*

Through my childhood church experience, my family and I were *saved* in all the ways that it is possible to be saved: spiritually, socially, and emotionally. And I believe that the Christian church *still has a saving role* standing for faith and hope in society today and tomorrow. As we have witnessed in these NIC case study results, a well-functioning church community is still a place of faith, hope, and love—a place to be safe and grow. I have dedicated my dissertation research to uphold this sacred purpose.

*“Relaxing” Without Assurance of Success or Pre-Determined Outcomes*

Hence, this is a sacred success story. Yet, we have not concerned ourselves here with UMC denominational “success” statistics such as total church membership, average weekly worship attendance, paid denominational apportionments, or the like. Nor
have we concerned ourselves with controlling outcomes beyond living by core values and NIC’s vision. When our work is experimental, there is no guarantee of outcomes. Rather, in the spirit of practicing adaptive leadership through appreciative intelligence, we relaxed in the NIC’s culture of experimentation that expects no assurance of success and needs no pre-determined goal. Merely by setting out to find what is working, we discovered ample success. We discovered success because we asked and listened with expectancy.

Herein, we took a step toward collective learning. Appreciative intelligence knows ahead of time that already-existing and desirable aspects of people, circumstances, or things are “hiding” in plain sight and waiting to be found (Thatchenkery & Metzker, 2006). We could overlook or underestimate these desirable aspects because we are “wide asleep” to their pervasive and powerful presence. But we did not overlook them here. Quite the contrary, our faith-filled knowing and follow-through to find and affirm these positive aspects of people, situations, and things is for me a key learning from this NIC case study research.

Throughout this study, in fact, I am reminded of Philippians 4:8–9 from The Bible (The Message version). I liken appreciative inquiry to the wisdom of these verses. Paraphrasing here, Paul, the apostle and writer of Philippians, while in prison waiting for his execution in Rome, advises that whatever things are true, noble, reputable, authentic, compelling, and gracious, we would do well to think on these things. For
me, this is the fundamental nature of appreciation—searching for and thinking on these things.

I believe that many principles of appreciative inquiry fit well with theological themes. “The Bible gives commands about being grateful and thinking positively, demonstrates the usefulness of stories and images, and values community and interconnectedness. Most centrally, the Bible describes finding joy and hope in the midst of problems and darkness” (Miller, Denneque, & Cunningham, 2014, p. 49). By design, we have lived out these themes in this NIC case study research. In this spirit, therefore, I claim Philippians 4:8–9 (The Message version) as this case study’s epilogue (page 318).

I see this appreciative frame of mind in Pastor Robert Biekman’s sentiments on Chicago too. “Don’t write off my city,” Pastor Biekman cautioned. “People tend to lift up and highlight things that create headlines. But in our rush to judgment, let us not dehumanize people. There are a heck of a lot of good people in Chicago. Overwhelmingly, people in Chicago are good, hard-working folk” (R. Biekman, personal communication, August 31, 2016).

**Prime Movers in NIC’s CUS Movement**
Bishop Sally Dyck, inspired by NIC leadership, has responded to the UMC’s *Call to Action* (United Methodist Church, 2012, September) and to Chicago’s urban crisis by promoting an NIC culture of experimentation and by launching the Chicago Urban
Strategy (CUS) as a movement among diverse community partners who seek the welfare of Chicago and its citizens. In particular, this case study features NIC’s partnership with CPS’s Safe Haven program that is sponsored by the Office of Faith Based Initiatives (OFBI).

In sync with leadership scholars (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995; Hernandez et al., 2011), therefore, Figure 30 depicts the prime movers of NIC’s CUS movement as evidenced by this case study. Specifically, we observed examples of how the CUS is primed by context, time, leaders, and followers. Each one is a source of leadership. In Chapter 4, in fact, we examined the NIC’s present-day contextual conditions to the fullest relevant extent (Yin, 2014) because “reality derives its significance from the context” (Thatchenkery, 2011, p. 20).
In this way, Figure 30’s depiction concedes that NIC’s leadership and CUS is buffeted and moved by the “prevailing forces” of context, time, leaders, and followers. At the same time, now Chapters 5 and 6 verify that the CUS and its Safe Haven program are also a “prevailing force” as a well-functioning “holding environment” and adaptive system for UMC Safe Haven kids. This is the promising evidence confirmed in this case study. And going forward, Figure 30 hints that this adaptive CUS story has far-reaching potential value beyond Chicago as an exemplar for other urban contexts.

**Significant Unforeseen Events Related to NIC’s CUS**

Speaking of shifting contexts, listed briefly here in chronological order are news stories and events we did not foresee as the NIC case study began in February 2013. These events raise concern about our common humanity and serve to reinforce the NIC’s commitment to work in Chicago’s under-resourced neighborhoods.

1. In July 2013, the **Black Lives Matter movement began** after George Zimmerman’s acquittal in the shooting death of Trayvon Martin and became nationally recognized for its street demonstrations after the deaths of Michael Brown in Ferguson, Missouri, and Eric Garner in New York City ("Black lives matter," n.d.).

2. According to the Associated Press’ annual poll of U.S. news directors and editors, the **top news story of 2014 was police killings of unarmed African
Americans as well as the investigations and protests in their aftermath.


3. The U.S. Justice Department launched a federal civil rights investigation of the Chicago Police Department (CPD) in December 2015 following November 2015’s video release showing a CPD officer shooting Laquan McDonald (Horwitz et al., 2015, December 8).

4. Through NIC leadership and sponsorship, a FAIR COPS Ordinance is gaining support across Chicago’s communities. The ordinance calls for establishing an office of Police Auditor in Chicago’s municipal government with authority to “inspect the entire system of policing patterns of misconduct, order the investigation of specific cases of police abuse, and make policy changes” (Jackson, 2016, April 18; NIC, 2015, December 3).

5. Finally, at this case study’s conclusion in September 2016, CPS announced widespread cutbacks to school programs due to its severe budget deficit (Perez Jr., 2016, August 17). Included in these cutbacks, CPS’s Safe Haven program now comprises a reduced total of 30 Safe Havens. What is the immediate impact for NIC case study participants? G2G UMC is 1 of 30 Safe
Haven after-school programs still funded by CPS. South Shore UMC’s after-school program has been *discontinued* due to the recent cutbacks. *Barely underway as a new UMC after-school Safe Haven*, United Church of Rogers Park UMC now seeks to carry on *without* CPS funding (Hacker, 2016, October 19).

**Acknowledgement of NIC and CUS Leadership**

Suffice it to say, this is a perfect point in this writing to recognize and affirm Bishop Sally Dyck, Pastor Robert Biekm an, NIC’s CUS leadership, and CUS partners such as CPS’s OFBI and Community Connections for Youth in Bronx, New York, for working together in stride to respond to these present-day challenges, threats, and opportunities for leadership in Chicago’s volatile context.

Further, we are indebted to all 14 NIC case study participants for their transparency and generosity in sharing their faith-filled stories. Their generosity is a gift. Sociologist of religion, Nancy Ammerman (2005) has affirmed that religious narratives “are among the many sources on which we draw in identifying with each other, in aligning our mutual action, and in imagining how situations might be different” (p. 147). Quite literally, their stories are the bedrock for these research findings.
Sharing the Wealth for Practice and Research

Therefore, given the exemplar status of UMC Safe Havens and this case study’s unique contribution to empirical research regarding faith-based adaptive leadership in extreme context, I will present some implications and compelling social mechanisms that arose across the case study’s findings and in conjunction with research by Dr. Sean Hannah and Dr. Tojo Thatchenkery. By definition, social mechanisms are “an observed relationship” of “how one thing leads to another” (Anderson et al., 2006, p. 103).

In particular, I believe that the case study findings offer a wealth to 1) CPS’s OFBI and Safe Havens, and 2) clergy and leadership of mainline denominations and seminaries. Following is an effort to share the wealth from the NIC’s case study on behalf of each of these audiences.

1. Implications and Mechanisms for CPS’s OFBI and Safe Havens

Theoretical models are of great value to me as I am drawn to conceptual frameworks that help me to quickly visualize and understand abstract ideas and “likely linkages between opinions, activities, and interests” (Silverman, 2013, p. 142).
Recall Figure 15: A well-functioning Safe Haven model

Based on these “likely linkages,” Figure 15 from Chapter 5 (seen here as a thumbnail of page 178) is a richly nuanced, practical, and evidence-based theoretical model for a well-functioning UMC Safe Haven phenomenon. Figure 15 is rooted in the down-to-earth stories of six UMC Safe Haven pastors/directors and their collective experiences from 2014–2016. Through their up-close moments of Safe Haven life, we can learn about their successes as we are able to see beyond surface-level descriptions into relationships, connections, and interdependencies not previously researched among CPS Safe Havens. In fact, according to Rev. Renaldo Kyles, Director of CPS’s OFBI, this research is the first to feature CPS’s Safe Haven program.

As such, Figure 15 may be an invaluable tool for CPS’s OFBI to share with new Safe Haven churches or with existing Safe Haven churches who wish to learn more about meeting CPS standards; creating community partnerships; attracting and retaining volunteers and workers; supporting good behaviors and expression of emotions; and being more than a Safe Haven for kids and families in the community. Figure 15 is an exemplary snapshot of day-to-day Safe Haven life. On these merits, I recommend promoting awareness of this research with CPS’s Superintendent, the Board of Education, and the Research Review Board.
For future practice, here are some outstanding social mechanisms that made a difference in Safe Haven pastors’/directors’ stories of success:

**Learning by trial and error**
For me, it is affirming to know that organizational scholars such as Edgar Schein believe that most often we learn by trial and error. “Experience is the teacher. If you’re open to experience, experience will guide you as to where you ought to go” (E. Schein, personal communication, April 12, 2014). Across their stories, I admire UMC Safe Haven pastors’/directors’ courageous spirits of experiential learning despite their steep challenges.

**Escaping the burden of attempting to do it alone**
This is one of my favorite sayings from Pastor Robert Biekman, NIC’s Urban Strategy Coordinator. “We need to lift together,” Pastor Robert urged. “The burden is on us when we attempt to do it alone.” It is common for leaders to implicitly assume that leadership means we need to figure things out on our own. Yet, Pastor Robert’s assertion is spot on. Our best hope for learning is in building capacity through multi-agency action and multi-level relationships (Hannah & Lester, 2009). We see that UMC Safe Haven pastors/directors escaped this burden of doing it alone by cultivating community partnerships and became successful in the process.
Assuming that the nature of every child is full of potential

Honestly, I was profoundly moved by the core values of *positive youth development* that UMC Safe Haven pastors/directors exemplified in their stories, e.g., “Support, not punish.” For me, this is striking because images of youth as problems “have long held sway in the child care professions, the mass media, and the public mind” (Damon, 2004, p. 14). Instead, as glimpsed in Safe Haven pastors’/directors’ stories, “the positive youth development approach aims at understanding, educating, and engaging children in productive activities rather than at correcting, curing, or treating them for maladaptive tendencies or so-called disabilities” (Damon, 2004, p. 15).

Equally, I must say that I was drawn to these positive images of youth development also interwoven into CCFY’s three-day Alternatives to Incarceration Institute offered at Maple Park UMC in September 2015 (Community Connections For Youth, 2016, May 9).
2. Implications and Mechanisms for Clergy and Leadership of Mainline Denominations and Seminaries

Higher education and leadership development are trending toward experiential learning (Kolb, 2014). Research is trending toward scholar-practitioner methods that may be “more penetrating and insightful than when scholars or practitioners work on the problems alone” (Van de Ven, 2007, p. 9). So it seems fitting for this presentation to encompass clergy and leadership of mainline denominations and seminaries as centers for clergy learning and vocational instruction. For this combined audience of collective leadership, therefore, I will point out some shared wealth in these NIC case study findings.

Recall Figure 28: A model for building adaptive leadership

The call for adaptive leadership is being heard across faith-based organizations and mainline denominations. In direct response, this NIC research provides an empirical case study of “what’s working” where few studies exist.

There is high value in our study of what is working as “scholars are recognizing that the power of positive imagery is not just some popular illusion or wish but an expression of the mind’s capacity for shaping reality [emphasis added]” (Cooperrider, 1990, p. 14). Therefore, we must study what works as defined by those closest to the phenomenon. “By bringing attention to what is already working in the system, the
process reduces the resistance to change typically present in most change efforts” (Thatchenkery, 2011, p. 48). And given the emergent nature of both theory and practice herein, the timing of this research is optimal for “testing” adaptive leadership’s theoretical framework in conjunction with the NIC’s complex adaptive challenge.

To that end, Figure 28 (seen here as a thumbnail of page 283) contributes a theoretical model for building appreciative intelligence by means of adaptive leadership. Figure 28 is based upon case study participants’ stories of the NIC’s experimentation in launching the CUS and the ensuing success of UMC Safe Havens. There are four upward steps in Figure 28 that indicate how denominational, seminary, and/or congregational/community collaborations can create their own recurring process for success. In essence, Figure 28 is the secret to success in this CUS story.

Recall Figure 25: A model for what works in urban ministry
Likewise, according to Rev. Rubén Austria, CCFY’s Executive Director in Bronx, New York, the NIC’s Chicago Urban Strategy is “what it looks like” when a mainline denomination supports, invests in, and is “not an impediment to” assuming a greater role in building a diverse coalition of faith-based and community partners to effectively support at-risk youth and their families in inner-city neighborhoods.
Thereby, this NIC case study is an emerging model of effective urban ministry through adaptive leadership.

Specifically, Figure 25 (seen here as a thumbnail of page 271) contributes a theoretical mega model of NIC’s adaptive leadership response in Chicago’s extreme context. Adapted from Hannah et al. (2009), Figure 25 is a multilevel view of the case study’s findings as it portrays the NIC’s collective leadership efficacy, adaptive leadership response, and UMC Safe Haven “holding environments” all operating in the midst of extreme context. Indeed, Figure 25 is a composite of the NIC case study data analysis that allows us to acclaim what is working from a micro-to-macro level of perspectives. That said, Figure 25 is not intended for use as a “one size fits all” generalized model for effective extreme leadership due to the inherent complexity and changing nature of extreme contexts (Hannah et al., 2010).

**Accelerating and setting the context for leadership development**
Given the success achieved by the NIC’s well-functioning Safe Havens, a valuable next step would be to explore these experiences from the perspective of leadership development while embracing a view of leadership as a product of the collective, i.e., clergy, laity, leaders, followers, etc.

Future study might seek to appreciate, for instance, which level of leadership development was attained according to Figure 35’s *Leadership Development Methods*. Adapted from Visiting Professor Dr. Joyce Osland’s global leadership
development model, Figure 35 attributes high development potential to “experiential rigor” or “immersion experiences” that are “high contact/high challenge” and emphasizes “complexity, degree of emotional affect, intensity of experience, and developmental relevance” as key dimensions for transformation (J. Osland, personal communication, August 16, 2014). UMC Safe Haven pastors/directors seemed to voice or exhibit many of these dimensions in their interviews.

Source: Adapted from Leading in the Global Economy, presented by Dr. Joyce Osland of San Jose State University on August 16, 2014, at Benedictine University, Lisle, IL.

Figure 35. Leadership Development Methods
Likewise, for accelerating leadership development, Visiting Professor Bruce Avolio and Sean Hannah have endorsed Figure 35’s high-impact experiences and *trigger events* such as 1) mastery experiences; 2) incremental goal-setting (and steadily increasing the level of challenge); 3) adaptive (vs. maladaptive) self-reflection; and 4) a positive, strengths-based organizational climate (Avolio & Hannah, 2008). These high-impact experiences serve to *trigger and accelerate leadership development* because they “challenge the adequacy of a person's current thinking & mental models” (Hannah & Lester, 2009, p. 37).

Edgar Schein has concurred that a climate of psychological safety is needed to overcome learning anxiety and foster learning (Coutu, 2002). When psychological safety is high, “team members are more likely to overcome threats of embarrassment and admit errors, ask for help, and discuss problems” (Day, 2000, p. 603). To the point, “the possibility of deep community change is most probable when community members feel a strong sense of trust, psychological safety, and commitment to the process” (Boyd & Bright, 2007, p. 1025).

Therefore, the following questions pique my curiosity for future exploration of leadership development:

- Does the NIC’s experiment with UMC Safe Havens exemplify high-impact leadership development according to Figure 35? If so, which method(s) of leadership development emerged in this case?
• As a point of comparison, how does the complexity of leadership in Chicago’s extreme context as exhibited in the NIC case study equate to the framework of global leadership complexity, i.e., multiplicity, interdependence, ambiguity, and flux (Mendenhall, Reiche, Bird, & Osland, 2012)? Global leadership complexity is often heralded as most complex. However, given the multi-complexity of leadership challenges in extreme context seen in this case study, I am now curious to know the similarities and differences in these leadership realms.

• Finally, how do we know if we have successfully developed the attitudes and behavior that result in high-performing adaptive leaders? To the point, how might NIC’s leadership development design imitate the nature of adaptive leadership that is multilevel, contextual, emergent, and collective?

Leaving these as open-ended questions for future study, finally, here are outstanding social mechanisms in support of adaptive leadership development.

**Absorbing and living with complexity**
We applaud that NIC case study participants are not shrinking away from the complexity of their unique and challenging context(s). Quite the contrary, they are leaning into it. In fact, NIC’s CUS story bears out how “complexity must be absorbed and lived with rather than reduced” (Boisot & McKelvey, 2010, p. 420). To that end, tolerating uncertainty, embracing ambiguity, and trying to “approach complex mental
processes directly” (Thatchenkery & Metzker, 2006, p. 112) are effective means for absorbing and living with complexity.

**Responding positively to leadership attempts by others**

Given our talk here of trial-and-error learning and “rising to the occasion” in the spirit of NIC’s culture of experimentation, I am drawn to means for creating a supportive climate that inspire self-improvement and an unconditional positive regard for others as they move out to experiment and learn. Succinctly stated, here are some effective means for creating and sustaining a supportive climate that arose from the case study research. I like how these are humanistic and encouraging in nature.

- “Giving others freedom to excel” (Thatchenkery & Metzker, 2006, p. 102).
- Nourishing *positive shifts in individual* and *collective identity* through affirmation and positive feedback (Anderson et al., 2006).
- Increasing *access* to affirmation and encouragement in response to *leadership attempts* by others (Dutton et al., 2010).

I worked for many years in a supportive climate/culture at Hewitt Associates in Lincolnshire, Illinois, so I have personally experienced how *this works well*. And it *creates wealth* as we have shared in these results of the NIC case study.

**Developing an appreciative eye**

If we look for the deficit in ourselves, in others, or in our world, we will surely find it.

In the same way, if we look for what is life-giving, capacity-building, hope-filled, etc., we will find it too. Time and again, we witnessed a life-giving energy in the NIC
case study as we looked for and found what is working well in the UMC’s Safe Haven programs. Thus, we are learning that an appreciative eye develops by deliberately practicing reframing as a means for reappraising reality (Thatchenkery & Metzker, 2006). What we see depends on what we look for. And often “we see what we think, rather than think about what we see” (Boyatzis & McKee, 2005, p. 130).

With that, the finish line for this work is now in sight. And as is good practice, I will close this case study with a presentation of its limitations and with my concluding thoughts.

**Limitations of the Study**

Every study has its limitations. One of the primary limitations of this study is that our focus by design is limited to UMC Safe Havens.

Otherwise, a complete story of what is working in the CUS must include the exemplary work of the FAIR COPS Ordinance; the Alternatives to Incarceration (ATI) Collaborative that is coming to life in Chicago’s Roseland community (Watson, 2016, May 4); and the

*Source: Video screenshot with Pastor Robert Biekman featured third from the left (Jackson, 2016, April 18)*

**Figure 36. NIC’s Call-to-Action Press Conference for the FAIR COPS Ordinance**
UMC Urban Churches Network, as previously mentioned. For more, read the 2015 Urban Strategy Report (NIC, 2015, August).

Another limitation of the study is inherent in its emergent nature and snapshot in time. Critics may contend that the study could have benefited from a more extensive and sustained data collection process, e.g. instead of one-time interviews, perhaps, multiple interviews and observations may have revealed more in-depth or valuable insights.

A further limitation is inherent in the formative stages of adaptive leadership’s theoretical underpinnings. More empirical research, such as this case study, is needed to test the claims of adaptive leadership theory. “Without evidence-based support for the tenets of the model, the ideas and principles set forth on adaptive leadership should be viewed cautiously” (Northouse, 2016, p. 276).

Finally, as described in Chapter 3’s Methods, perhaps with more time we could discover an appropriate outcome measure or verification of Safe Haven success that could lend a further validity to the study’s findings, e.g., an aggregate measure of student-level data from CPS, etc.

**Concluding Thoughts**
When we began this NIC case study, Bishop Sally Dyck stated that she wanted “to understand,” and as we attempted to stay true to this purpose, we learned a lot.
Principally, we learned about NIC’s collective leadership efficacy and organizational structure, systems, and adaptability that are working in order to sustain a well-functioning UMC Safe Haven program while operating in Chicago’s extreme context.

Through it all, we learned to appreciate how context is impacting NIC leadership and how NIC leadership is effectively impacting context where Safe Haven children are safe and growing in a reliable “holding environment.”

Now one question remains. What else can we find that is working? If we are willing to look, we will surely find it in ourselves, in others, and in the world.
Epilogue

Summing it all up, friends,
I’d say you’ll do best by filling your minds and meditating on things
true, noble, reputable, authentic, compelling, gracious—
the best, not the worst;
the beautiful, not the ugly;
things to praise, not things to curse.
Do that, and God, who makes everything work together,
will work you into God’s most excellent harmonies.

Philippians 4:8–9, The Message
Appendix A: Sample of Informed Consent Letter

To: Potential Interview Participant
From: Donna Darr
Subject: Informed Consent to Participate in Northern Illinois Conference Case Study
Date: ______________________

Dear FILL IN NAME HERE BEFORE SENDING TO INTERVIEWEE

My name is Donna Darr, and I am a Ph.D. student at Benedictine University. In sponsorship and partnership with Bishop Sally Dyck and Rev. Robert Biekman, NIC Urban Ministry Coordinator, I am conducting a case study of the United Methodist Church’s Chicago Urban Strategy with a focus on understanding the success and positive practices of its Safe Haven program for school-aged children. Thus, the research question asks: What is the United Methodist Church doing in its Chicago Urban Strategy that is working?

As to purpose, this NIC case study may significantly contribute to both the church and academy. The UMC and other mainline Protestant denominations may benefit from positive lessons learned. The sacred and secular academy may benefit as seminary and university professors, researchers, and organizational change practitioners gain knowledge of theory and practice.

Thank you for your willingness to participate in the interview. Your participation is voluntary. You do not have to answer any questions you do not want to answer. If at any time you do not want to continue with the interview, you may decline. Your time and involvement is profoundly appreciated. The entire interview will take approximately 1 to 1½ hours. To maintain the essence of your words for the research, I will record the information. At any time you may request to see or hear the information I collect.

The interview will be digitally recorded, and the interviewer may take notes. This is done for data analysis purposes. The digital recording will be transcribed by the interviewer and kept confidential in a password-protected computer. All individual identification will be removed from the hard copy of the transcript. Participant identity and confidentiality will be concealed using coding procedures. The researcher will also maintain a copy of the data on a password-protected computer.
Excerpts from the interview may be included in the final dissertation report or other later publications. However, under no circumstances will your name or identifying characteristics appear in these writings. If, at a subsequent date, biographical data were relevant to a publication, a separate release form would be sent to you.

I would be grateful if you would sign this form on the line provided below to show that you have read and agree with the contents. Please return it by email to me at donnadarr@earthlink.net. An electronic signature is acceptable.

____________________________________
Your electronic signature above
(If you have problems with the electronic signature, please call or text me at (___) ____-____.)

This study is being conducted in part to fulfill requirements for my Ph.D. in Values-Driven Leadership at the graduate school of Benedictine University in Lisle, Illinois.

The study has been approved by the Institutional Review Board of Benedictine University. The Chair of Benedictine University’s Institutional Review Board is Dr. Alandra Weller-Clarke. She can be reached at (___) ____-____, and her email address is _______________. The chairperson of this dissertation is Dr. Michael R. Manning. He can be reached at (___) ____-____ for further questions or concerns about the project/research.

Sincerely,

Donna Darr
Ph.D. Candidate, ABD
Benedictine University
Center for Values-Driven Leadership
## Appendix B: Tally of 10 Contexts of Concern

### 10 Contexts of Concern as Inferred in Safe Haven Pastors’/Director’s Stories of Commitment

(Highest counts highlighted in yellow)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Oneself</th>
<th>Children &amp; youth</th>
<th>Home</th>
<th>Family, parents, etc.</th>
<th>SH volunteers/workers</th>
<th>UMC church/NIC</th>
<th>Local school &amp; CPS</th>
<th>At-risk neighborhood</th>
<th>Nat'l &amp; global culture</th>
<th>Envisioned future</th>
<th>Totals by row</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowing God &amp; relating it to seeing the “God part” of children light up when playing games.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being glad to be a Safe Haven &amp; tearing up at the thought of the children’s persistent desires to be hugged due to deficits in their lives such as lack of love.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking a Safe Haven = A place where a child knows “I’m okay” for a few hours per day. Thinking we underestimate children’s fear &amp; anxiety to go to school or home.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admitting that it’s hard to learn to deal with teens starting from where they are &amp; helping them understand their important part in the human race.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 10 Contexts of Concern as Inferred in Safe Haven Pastors’/Director’s Stories of Commitment

(Highest counts highlighted in yellow)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leader efficacy for thought &amp; learning (continued):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Recognizing &amp; changing a tendency to “entertain” kids with games &amp; finding ways also to incorporate and enjoy quiet times with kids.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Eye-opening to see a Muslim child refuse to bow (in a game), seeing through the lens of Christianity, asking oneself, &amp; being helped to grow a lot in faith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Learning a life lesson by the seat of our pants of what a small decision &amp; a small church can do with a trust in God &amp; God making it good.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leader efficacy for self motivation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Pushing on to impact youth in the community &amp; wishing to see a greater participation from other church members who are not ready to serve in the Safe Haven program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Promising never again to leave this work with children after experiencing how upsetting it is for kids to lose parental bonds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader efficacy for self motivation (cont.):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Finding one’s value in valuing the children &amp; the church.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Telling teenage summer workers every day to pull their pants up [referring to “sagging” fashion among boys] &amp; hoping this will come back to their minds some day when going toward a responsible job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Making it through frustration &amp; discouragement by always having a spot in your heart for the children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Hoping, praying, &amp; sometimes going home to cry while trying to make a difference that is significant enough to make life better for the children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Praying for strength to supply what the children need while looking to someday when someone else will care enough to do the same.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Listening to jazz music to connect the children with the generations of jazz &amp; blues music &amp; musicians before them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Contexts of Concern as Inferred in Safe Haven Pastors’/Director’s Stories of Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Highest counts highlighted in yellow)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Oneself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Children &amp; youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Family, parents, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. SH volunteers/workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. UMC church/NIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Local school &amp; CPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Nat’l &amp; global culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Envisioned future</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Leader efficacy for self motivation (cont.):**

| 16. Developing affordable field trips during Safe Haven hours even for children who normally never get to go on a trip. | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 |

**Leader efficacy for means and/or resources to perform tasks:**

| 17. Feeling energized by a mutually-attractive alignment of values, identity, & resources among all Safe Haven stakeholders. | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 |

| 18. Deciding by faith to continue on after being suddenly cut by CPS (for temporary low enrollment). Rallying with funds & affirmation from other UMCs. | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 |

| 19. Pausing among church leaders & pastor to consciously assess readiness & commit to becoming a Safe Haven. | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 |

| 20. Modeling other avenues of expression besides anger & aggression (alternatives to bullying). | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 9 |

<p>| 21. Playing cooperative learning games to practice cooperation &amp; show how children need each other (alternatives to bullying). | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 6 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10 Contexts of Concern as Inferred in Safe Haven Pastors’/Director’s Stories of Commitment (Highest counts highlighted in yellow)</th>
<th>Oneself</th>
<th>Children &amp; youth</th>
<th>Home</th>
<th>Family, parents, etc.</th>
<th>SH volunteers/workers</th>
<th>UMC church/NIC</th>
<th>Local school &amp; CPS</th>
<th>At-risk neighborhood</th>
<th>Nat'l &amp; global culture</th>
<th>Envisioned future</th>
<th>Totals by row</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oneself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children &amp; youth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family, parents, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH volunteers/workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMC church/NIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local school &amp; CPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-risk neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat'l &amp; global culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envisioned future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leader efficacy for means and/or resources to perform tasks (continued):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Lifting up high school volunteers by giving them responsibility to lead children’s activities and discover their gifts.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Wishing for the means to take Safe Haven kids to Chicago or Millennium Park &amp; thinking it’s crazy for them to live in Chicago and never experience it.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Focusing extensively on games &amp; play as formational for children to learn kindness, problem-solving, sportsmanship, &amp; teamwork.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Validating children’s expressions of their feelings as they listen to music and learn to paint still lifes of flower vases.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Photocopying children’s letters about Safe Haven &amp; sending them to Chicago’s Mayor &amp; CPS headquarters to show gratitude &amp; impact on kids.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 10 Contexts of Concern as Inferred in Safe Haven Pastors’/Director’s Stories of Commitment

(Highest counts highlighted in yellow)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Oneself</th>
<th>Children &amp; youth</th>
<th>Home</th>
<th>Family, parents, etc.</th>
<th>SH volunteers/workers</th>
<th>UMC church/NIC</th>
<th>Local school &amp; CPS</th>
<th>At-risk neighborhood</th>
<th>Nat'l &amp; global culture</th>
<th>Envisioned future</th>
<th><strong>Totals by row</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27. Liking Safe Haven as a means for being visible outside the church &amp; signaling that the church is in on what’s going on in the community.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leader efficacy for action:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Affirming, loving, &amp; not judging while holding children &amp; teenagers accountable when they choose wrong in order to help them do better &amp; not stay in despair.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Hoping a Muslim child will remember acts of Christian acceptance if/when Muslim-Christian tensions arise.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Hoping kid’s experience of meeting diverse peoples will be noticed by &amp; discussed with parents.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Loving how a child’s positive church experience means church is a more likely place to go in a future time of need.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Being certain of a child’s future awareness of God.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Trying to build a self-assured person.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals by column</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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