R E P O R T   R E S U M E S

ED 013 485   EA 000 719
SEMINAR ON CHANGE PROCESSES IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS.
BY- TOPE, DONALD E.   AND OTHERS
OREGON UNIV., EUGENE
                                          PUB DATE   FEB 65
EDRS PRICE   MF-$0.25 HC-$0.96   24P.

DESCRIPTORS- SEMINARS, *EDUCATIONAL CHANGE, *SUPERINTENDENT
ROLE, *EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, ADMINISTRATIVE POLICY,
*ADMINISTRATOR ROLE, *PUBLIC SCHOOLS, CHANGE AGENTS, EUGENE,

      SUMMARIES OF THE SEMINAR AND OF FOUR GROUP DISCUSSIONS
IN THE SEMINAR ON CHANGE PROCESSES IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS ARE
PRESENTED. TOPICS OF THE FOUR GROUPS INCLUDED--(1) LANGUAGE
USAGE AND THE ROLE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT, (2) RESEARCH IN
EDUCATION, (3) ADMINISTRATOR'S DECISIONMAKING PROCESSES, AND
(4) EDUCATIONAL INNOVATION. DONALD E. TOPE OF THE UNIVERSITY
OF OREGON SUMMARIZED THE SEMINAR AROUND FOUR MAIN POINTS--(1)
THE ADMINISTRATOR DOES MAKE A DIFFERENCE, (2) THE INSIGHTS
AND KNOWLEDGE OF THOSE WHO STUDY HUMAN BEHAVIOR AND HUMAN
INSTITUTIONS ARE RELEVANT TO SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION, (3) THERE
IS A NEED FOR RESEARCH INTO THE PRACTICAL PROBLEMS OF
EDUCATION, AND (4) THERE IS A DISTINCTION BETWEEN THE
ADMINISTRATOR ACTING AS THE ADVOCATE OF CHANGE AND ACTING AS
A MEDIATOR. THE COMPLETE DOCUMENT, "CHANGE PROCESSES IN THE
PUBLIC SCHOOLS," IS AVAILABLE FROM THE CENTER FOR THE
ADVANCED STUDY OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION, UNIVERSITY OF
OREGON, EUGENE, OREGON 97403, FOR $2.00. (HW)

Change Processes
in the
Public Schools

Change Processes
in the
Public Schools

RICHARD O. CARLSON
ART GALLAHER, JR.
MATTHEW B. MILES
ROLAND J. PELLEGRIN
EVERETT M. ROGERS

A publication of
THE CENTER FOR THE ADVANCED STUDY OF
EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON
Eugene, Oregon

$2.00

Foreword

Organizations have careers in much the same sense that individuals have careers. In the tracing out of organizational careers, a number of changes can always be detected, even among the seemingly most stable organizations.

Change in organizations comes about in many ways. Some changes occur with the size of the organization and some changes occur with the maturation process. Also, organizational change results, sometimes dramatically but most often not, from the succession of people through key offices. Similarly, a kind of evolutionary change in organizations can be seen as they adapt to forces within or conditions of their environments. To some extent, changes of this order can be called "organizational drift" because they frequently go unnoticed by those who direct the affairs of an organization. The effect of these rather gradual changes are almost imperceptibly viewed over a short time span but sometimes loom large when the overall career of the organization is considered.

In addition to organizational change that might be characterized as drift, change comes about in organizations by design or deliberate plan. Being seemingly "self" conscious about ends to be achieved and means of achieving ends, organizations strive for survival, if not perfection, and seem constantly to be proposing and carrying out change plans. It is this latter type of change, *planned change*, which is treated in this publication.

This publication is a report of a seminar conducted with public school officials by the Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration at the University of Oregon. The seminar, considered a pilot venture, had as its main objective the enhancement of the school officials' understanding of the planned change processes and of their skills in carrying out planned change. In formulating the design of the seminar we were aided by members of the Committee on Inservice Education of the Oregon Association of School Administrators. Some changes in the order and nature of events were made while the seminar was in progress; these changes resulted from the almost continuous conversation with the consultants and other interested persons on the question, "How are things going?"

The seminar, held in Portland, Oregon in October, 1964, revolved

around two major elements: (1) small group discussions of papers prepared for the seminar by four consulting social scientists, and (2) what were termed "clinic sessions." These sessions brought the school officials and the social scientists together in small groups where attention was given to specific change problems that had been, and were being encountered by the school officials. In advance of the clinic sessions, the school officials prepared memoranda of their specific problems.

All of the events of the seminar are not reported here, nor does the order of the contents of this publication follow the order of the seminar itself.[1]

The publication includes three of the four papers prepared for the seminar by the consulting social scientists—those by Matthew B. Miles, Art Gallaher, Jr., and Everett M. Rogers. Unfortunately we were unable to secure publication rights to the paper by James Q. Wilson and consequently his work does not appear here. The papers by Richard O. Carlson and Roland J. Pellegrin, although they were read during the seminar, were not part of the grist for the mill in the clinic and discussion sessions. It will be noted that the papers of these latter two contributors present different perspectives on planned change from those contained in the papers by the consultants and in the summaries of the group discussions.

The final section of this publication is a summary of the seminar itself which was made by Donald E. Tope at its concluding session.

<div align="right">

RICHARD O. CARLSON
KEITH GOLDHAMMER
Seminar Coordinators

</div>

February, 1965
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON, Eugene, Oregon

---

[1] Although absent from this publication, a discussion of *The Jackson County Story* was included in the seminar. This case study exists in published form and may be obtained from the Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon. (*The Jackson County Story, A Case Study*, by Keith Goldhammer and Frank Farner. University of Oregon, Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1964.)

Contents

[vii]

6

Seminar on
*Change Processes
in the
Public Schools*

A. SUMMARIES OF GROUP DISCUSSIONS
B. SUMMARY OF SEMINAR

Summaries of Group Discussions

Seminar on
Change Processes in the Public Schools
OCTOBER 14-16, 1964

Group A—MATTHEW B. MILES

We began our work by getting some underbrush out of the way, as I saw it. This centered around the problems of language (using words in special ways, jargon, not being simple and direct). We agreed that these were faults both of the behavioral sciences and of education, and we tried to install a ground rule that when somebody didn't understand something that he stop then and there and say "What do you mean?" We seemed to be able to use this rule relatively well.

We then launched into a discussion which kicked off with the idea (which I was advocating pretty strenuously) that we all have theories of operation, and theories of change. It is never a question of having no theory. All of us have ideas, guidelines, or a kind of framework of principles which guide our work. We began our discussion by trying to understand what some of the various personal theories around the group were.

We then looked at a series of aspects of change situations which various people around the table thought were crucial. Here is a list of these:

(1) Where the change comes from—is it external or internal to the system?

(2) The relative speed with which the change is introduced.

(3) Its timing, in relation to other changes or events in the system.

(4) The style of implementation; for example, does it need to be "grass rootsy" or is it possible that arbitrary imposition-type changes can also become installed?

(5) How dissatisfied people are with the status quo. Here again, we raised the question—"Is it necessary that people be dissatisfied in order for change to take place?"

(6) The role of curiosity and inquiry.

(7) Money and "forced compliance." I gave an example in which people had been paid to carry out changes; these changes not only

[79]

became installed but were accompanied by enthusiastic attitudes. This led in turn to the idea that having active experience with something new often changes the attitudes of acceptance radically.

(8) The general attitude toward innovation and change—favorableness or unfavorableness—existing in a particular organization.

At that point in our discussion, we focused very clearly, I felt, on the question of separating what actually occurs in an organization from our wishes, desires, or good-bad judgments about them. This led us into, not surprisingly, the role of the superintendent.

We worked for quite a while on various roles, in relation to change, which he might carry out. We ended up with four, and we hoped with each one to look at the consequences—that is, to get away from the idea that it is good to be "X" or bad to be "X." Rather, if you are "X," what are the results likely to be as far as the state of the organization and the change are concerned.

The first role was *content initiator*. Here, the superintendent says, for example, "I am for kindergarten." He may say this openly or in a closed or indirect way. Any one of these roles can be carried out explicitly, on the table—"I am for the introduction of kindergarten, and everybody knows it." Or one can be a content initiator indirectly, or covertly, in a closed way.

The second role is *process initiator*. This role is not that of pushing hard on the content of the innovation, but that of actively setting plans in motion (e.g., setting up a committee that includes people from various levels of the system and the community to work on the issue of kindergarten). Here the superintendent is not taking a position on the content, but is trying to set a structure in motion which will let people, including himself, work on the problem.

The third role we talked about was that of *mediator*. Here the superintendent is not actively pushing either for content or for process, but to aid, in a sense, the initiative of other people (his assistant, building principals, somebody in the community or whatever). He is a kind of catalyst in which other people are doing the main content push, the main process push, but he is, in a sense, in a kind of mediating, facilitating kind of role.

The last role was *squasher*. You can openly or indirectly block an innovation by sitting on it, by saying "that's no good, it won't work," or by letting it be known that you think it won't work.

We didn't talk about the consequences of all of the roles, and we disagreed a lot, interestingly I thought, on what the consequences were. For example, it was pointed out that if you take the mediating role and the innovation is a success, other people get the credit. If it's a failure, it may still be your neck. Or, if you take the content innovating role saying "I am for kindergarten, and I think it's a good idea," the consequences in the case of success or failure, especially failure, may be fairly harsh. You have stuck your neck out, plumped for a particular thing, and it may be much harder to initiate other innovations in the future. We also talked about the "sneakiness" of the mediating role as a potential problem in terms of consequences.

Some other points were made about these roles. First, that one doesn't choose one of these four roles and apply it mechanically in all inno\ ʻive situations. The problem facing the chief school executive is to look at a situation and select from this array of roles, behavior that will work, and that is compatible with his own durable style. It was pointed out that some people can't be mediators for the life of them; certain other people, if you asked *not* to be a content initiator, are under terrible tension—they've just got to give their opinions.

Secondly, we discussed the characteristics of the immediate task. Some curricular innovations might appropriately require a mediating style, for example, and it is possible that certain administrative innovations could be carried out essentially by content initiation. ("This is what we're going to do, and this is how I feel about it.")

We then closed with, I think, a couple of interesting ideas. We had been talking up to that point almost as if the superintendent were the key—as if he were the only person in the situation and as if his way of operating an innovative role was going to be the sole determinant of the consequences. The group began backing away and pointing out that there are figures called building principals and various other figures in the system, and that working with them turns out to be very crucial. Lastly, we came up with the idea that it would be fun to go back to our systems, make a check list of these four types of innovative roles, and ask our principals to fill it out, both in terms of "how you see me" and "how you would like me to behave," on different kinds of innovative issues.

Group B—EVERETT M. ROGERS

Group B this morning, focused most of our attention on promiscuous questions for research. I would like to list briefly these research questions suggested by the group.

1. We expressed a need for a national, and less than national, coordinating agency for educational research, a new agency (or perhaps some existing organization) that would produce syntheses of existing research studies, and future research studies, so that one is not faced with a multitude of individual research results which sometimes contradict each other. This would also be an agency that would, hopefully, give advice on implementation of research results at the local level.

2. The need for research to more clearly evaluate educational innovations was also stated. Granted that changes in education are sometimes difficult to evaluate, in a broad sense, we thought there was a need for research on, and resulting recommendation of, which innovations will give what results. We hope that this might tend to decrease the presence of "fads" in educational change.

3. The need for research on educational campaigns, particularly educational financial campaigns, was expressed. Such studies might be made, for instance, of why campaigns fail or why they succeed;

the use of, for instance, fear appeals and threat appeals in these campaigns and the informational nature involved in these campaigns; the presenting of one side versus two sides of issues in these campaigns; and, in general, an analysis of why is it, what is it, with some campaigns that make them succeed.

4. Research is needed on images of the role of school officials, particularly the chief school administrator. Why is it that school administrators (they feel) have low credibility in the eyes of the public? In other words, why is it that your populace doesn't trust you when you say something? The research question may be more properly framed by asking "What are the public images of the school official?" One reason for feeling that this question was important was that some school administrators thought that, on at least a few occasions, the populace, all of the populace. did not place complete credibility in what the school administrator said publicly.

5. I'm not really sure how to put it in a research question, but, in general, the question was—"Why is it (maybe there is an assumption here, too) that the public schools are a common object of frustration as expressed on the part of the public?" Or, put in farm boy language, "Why are schools dead horses that the public keeps kicking?" I guess really maybe the basic question is, "Is this true?"

———————————

Group C—James Q. Wilson

I asked the group to tell me what their guidelines are; their common sense rules of thumb; their proverbs, if you will, of good administration. We got quite a list, in fact, 17 items. There was, I think, considerable agreement that this was a representative list.

Then I pointed out, as the people who suggested these items were fully aware, that many of the items were mutually contradictory. I suggested that one way of indicating the degree to which they were contradictory was to divide them into two columns and to give as labels to these two columns, titles which were first given to such traits by the first theorist of administrative behavior and organizational decision-making—Nicolo Machiavelli. He wrote of the differences between the lion and the fox and the importance to the Prince of knowing when to be a lion and when to be a fox.

The fox-like traits, which are these days stated as "supportive," "participative" traits include the following:

Go slow! Don't make decisions rapidly. Gain the confidence of your staff and community or board. Be a good listener and a courteous listener. Try to understand different points of view, and different values. Don't try to get ahead of public opinion. Create a climate hospitable to innovations, suggestions and cooperation. Give recognition where recognition is due to the efforts of others.

Then, in the lion's column are such statements as:

Sometimes you have to be a leader. Sometimes you have to be courageous and take risks. Remember public memories are short.

Don't rely on public good will. Don't be afraid to move ahead. Sometimes you have to be decisive. Don't let people box you in. Be sure you have objectives, even if you don't state them to the community at large.

I think that these lists have two characteristics which I would like to mention very quickly. One is that this is essentially the same list that I get when I ask this question of business executives. This suggests to me how common the concerns are of administrators and how common the approaches to the solutions of these problems are.

The second comment I want to make is that most of the people acted as if they were always "eagle scouts." Although they did mention under both the list of lion-like traits and the list of fox-like traits many things which Machiavelli had suggested, they conspicuously failed to mention other things that were on his list such as flattery, cooptation, deceit, bribery. There was silence for a while, then some people in our group admitted this by saying, "Well, it is true that you can't always tell everybody all the truth all the time. When you're trying to respond to a parent's appeal to have his child assigned to teacher A, rather than teacher B, you can't always tell them that, indeed, teacher B is better than teacher A." You must sometimes follow "reasons of state" as Machiavelli said and for the good of the organization, conceal a bit of the full story. In giving recognition to people, you often have to give recognition where recognition is not due. Sometimes this comes pretty close to flattery.

The real problem, of course, is not how hygienic or how devious the items on this list may be. The real point is, "What can social science tell an administrator who formulates a list of guidelines which are internally inconsistent?" Is there anything that social science can suggest that would lead him out of this box? My position on this is that, by and large, there is not. There is a great deal of research needed to be done in education and in educational administration, and I encourage Oregon and anybody else to do good research. But, it seems to me, on this particular point—how you improve upon this list of proverbs—social science has relatively little to say. It has relatively little to say for two reasons. One is empirical, one logical.

Empirically, it is very easy to think of extraordinarily successful administrators who, to an extraordinary degree, embodied the lion-like characteristics almost entirely or the fox-like characteristics almost entirely. In the army, General George Patton ran the Third Army like a lion; General Eisenhower ran SHAEF headquarters like a fox. In the field of federal administration of public housing programs, Robert Moses of New York City ran the public housing program like a lion, his successors are now running it like a fox. (It's hard to tell who has been the most successful.)

The second problem, though, is more complicated. Not only is it easy to find good cases of lion-like leaders or fox-like leaders and not only is it hard to find convincing reasons for persuading lion-like leaders to be more fox-like and vice-versa, there are also certain logical problems that confront social science when it tries to help an admin-

istrator eliminate the inconsistencies, and thus, to know the circumstances under which to apply one rule rather than another. The reason for this is that social science attempts to produce propositional knowledge—generalized knowledge or generalizable knowledge about things that are true most of the time, to most of us, under most circumstances. It can state, for example, what the characteristics of populations are. It can give you the frequency distribution of attributes. It can tell you, not only how many people have red hair, black hair and blond hair, it can also tell you what is the distribution of I.Q., of political preferences, of teachability, of creative impulses. Social science can also generate propositional knowledge which has to do with the analysis of variance. It can try to explain what the effects are of changing a particular variable, or what the relationship is between two variables. But it can only do this under very special circumstances—when it has a relatively clear and unambiguous measure of what the effects are and when it can control the changes. In other words, it has to have a measure of output and it must have experimental control to deal with the problem of variance.

Now, this is useful knowledge for many purposes. It is most useful to a school superintendent, it seems to me, when the problem at hand depends on his knowing the characteristics of his pupil population, the sorts of things they will respond to, the distribution of attributes among them, the likely consequences of making certain changes in curriculum, etc. But my point, I feel, is that most of the time the superintendent doesn't concern himself with these matters. During only a small fraction of his time is he concerned with what the organization does, how it teaches kids, or how it contributes to the welfare of society. The superintendent, particularly in the small districts, spends most of his time on maintaining the organization—dealing with the board, the teachers, the community, conducting the organization's foreign affairs and managing its administrative problems. This often has little to do in a direct sense with educating children, although in the long run it has a great deal to do with it.

It is with respect to these problems that non-propositional knowledge is most important. What are the things that an administrator needs to know to be able to tell under what circumstances he should apply a rule from the lion list and under what circumstances he should apply a rule from the fox list? It seems to me, there are several things he needs to have. He needs to be a good guesser. He must have an ability to make probability estimates about unique events, not about how many times heads will come up if you flip a coin 50 times, but whether the school board chairman will take course A or course B.

Secondly, he must have a knowledge of the motives of people, but not people in general. Social science can tell him a great deal about the motives of people in general under certain circumstances. He needs to know the motives of a handful of people who may or may not fit certain general rules and propositions, and this is something he can learn only by direct experience—if indeed he can learn it at all.

Thirdly, he has to be able to make value judgments—"What ought we to do in this circumstance?"; "If I have to choose, what should I

choose?" On this again, social science may indicate what, in the majority of cases, will be the consequences of certain alternatives, but usually the choice is so constrained, so narrow, between two such rather limited alternatives that this generalized knowledge isn't very valuable. He simply has to know, under the circumstances, which direction into the dark he should leap.

Fourth, he needs an analytical ability to find in the welter of detail, circumstance, personality, time, rhetoric and emotion, the crux of the issue. He must avoid details, or the periphery of the issue, but spend his time focusing his energies on the thing on which everything else depends. And again, social science also tells you in general terms on what certain outcomes depend. But, the school superintendent, like most administrators, is not dealing with general problems. He has to feel out for himself whether to apply a rule from the lion list or the fox list, just as he has to decide for himself under what circumstances generalized, propositional, social science knowledge is usable and under what circumstances he is dealing with a state of affairs which is the exception to the rule, which is not consistent with the kind of knowledge that social science has generated.

It seems to me, as we end the conference, we should not conclude that we ought to have a lot of research, or that every school superintendent should be research-oriented. We may take good administrators and make them into lousy social scientists. The kind of knowledge that research can give you may be very valuable depending on the kind of information you need to know. But I'm convinced from reading the questions that were on the list you submitted that few issues depend for their resolution upon propositional knowledge.

––––––––––––

Group D—Art Gallaher, Jr.

In line with the general theme of the conference, "Change Processes in the Public Schools," we sort of indirectly arrived at two basic assumptions. One of these is, of course, that the school administrator can apply data in the form of innovations; secondly, that these data are primarily the product of research.

We then focused our attention on the problem of the "middle ground"—how to get the social scientist to communicate his data in a form that can be understood and applied by the school administator; and, getting the school administrator to come to the middle ground in a way so that he can understand research data and transform them into innovations. The middle ground, then, lies between the scientist and the practitioner.

These were our concerns: First, with the general problem of relating the researcher and the practitioner, since innovation must rest on a body of basic knowledge; and secondly, with how this conference relates to this general problem of the middle ground, and with how successful we've been in developing some ability to communicate with and understand each other.

In terms of the first problem, that of getting research data to the practitioner, a number of conclusions were arrived at in our particu-

lar group. One is a criticism by the school administrators that practical problems are not researched enough; that they are forced, whether they want to or not, to rely upon common sense knowledge, that they have to "fly by the seat of their pants" for the most part; that the kinds of practical problems which the school administrator faces, and which he must have innovations to solve, are not really given enough research attention.

The second conclusion was that there is a lack of communication between those who do the research and those who are in positions to apply it. That is to say, there is a lack of communication in those areas where there are data that can be applied—it simply does not always get down to the unit of application. Some of the administrators pointed out that they get involved in research designs that emanate from the University and other places, but the results of this research seldom get back to them. In some cases it does, but more often they participate and give time in assembling data and that is the last they ever hear of it.

The recommendation, in terms of these two kinds of problems, by the administrators, is that researchers go into the field to design their projects; that researchers get into ongoing educational systems; that they consult more with school administrators about the kinds of practical data that are needed. The group was quite candid, too, in its admission that administrators are also at fault in this process. They say they have difficulty getting into the middle ground and that one of their main problems is that they are not sophisticated enough about research design and basic tools of research. There are other variables that are involved here—there is no point in mentioning many of them because they are the common kinds of problems that have come up here in practical ways throughout the whole meeting—such as the problem of time. For example, how does one get time to simply assemble the data of research?

There was also a fear expressed on the part of the administrators that research in education is becoming more sophisticated, and although this is a good thing, the people who have already "been through the mill" and who are out in the ongoing systems will find it increasingly difficult to understand the findings of such research. Thus, practitioners are going to be further removed from the middle ground than they already are. They see this as a definite problem of the future.

These are the major problems we talked about in trying to get together. We then turned our attention on how this conference, as one kind of vehicle—pilot that it is—has functioned in arriving at a middle ground. This was really our major concern.

I think one of the most significant suggestions made by the group is that there needs to be something of a decompression period before getting involved in the business of a conference. Most of the participants came immediately from their problems, their desks, and, it takes a while to really get into the swing of things. It might be a worthy proposition to consider having a couple of days free (a retreat or something like this) to study the papers. It is also felt that it might be

a good idea to have an hour or two so that one can go through the paper (if he had studied it previously, of course) just before confronting the consultant.

It was felt, too, that some of the group dynamics sessions the first day tended to become too generalized. Both the participants and the consultants were blamed for this. The participants very often got so concerned with exchanging ideas on their own problems that they strayed too far from the central topic, and the consultants were not always as careful as they might have been in controlling the discussions.

These problems are only listed here because we can't go into their discussion. In ranging over them, however, a number of substantive sub-topics were brought up. For example, the question was raised whether or not the administrator is the crucial variable on which we could focus attention and direct a change in the internal system of the school. After all, the acceptance or rejection ultimately comes from the teacher. We raised the question (we didn't answer it) whether or not we should be focusing so much attention on the administrator. Certainly we questioned the assumption that administrators themselves can necessarily effect change.

Also the problem of role definition was brought up, especially the conflicting role images held by the various publics in the community that the school administrators must relate to. This, incidentally, is thought of as an area that needs considerable research. The problem of how to communicate to various segments of the public—how to maintain lines of communication, both formal and informal—was also a suggested topic for research. Finally, we discussed briefly the problems of research in ongoing school systems.

Summary of Seminar on
Change Processes in the Public Schools

DONALD E. TOPE
University of Oregon

I've developed my summary around four major points. Dick Carlson started us off on an important concept that should have been encouraging to you—that the administrator *does* make a difference. Some recent research points to the fact that how the administrator does act, how successful he is in his district, has a major impact on the education enterprise. This impact is over and beyond the availability of resources and point directly at the administrator and his administrative style of operation.

The second major point in summary, to me, was the extent to which we came to realize that the insights and knowledge of those who study human behavior, and human institutions is relevant to school administration. The prepared papers provided a great deal of interest, concern, and discussion pointing to the relevance that these concepts have to school administrators and to their operations.

The papers also provided a good deal of comparability, of agreement. There was the agreement that education in this country has a great deal of goal ambiguity and that this is an interfering factor in terms of trying to effect changes. Part of this ambiguity, of course, is due to the fact that there is the same kind of ambiguity in our society. We are a pluralistic society and any attempt to develop a definite set of agreements with regard to goals would probably be actually against the kind of society we have. Nevertheless, when a change is being considered, defining the goal is an important aspect of the change and the change process.

I think that there was general agreement with the notion of the diversity of the educational enterprise, the internal diversity within the establishment. This is not new to you, but our consultants emphasized the interference that this degree of diversity, the increased specialization in education has for effecting change. Such concepts as the *low interdependence* among people in the educational enterprise due to the fact that they have their own specific jobs; and *role invisibility*, the extent to which the teacher is not closely supervised, are factors to be taken into account in effecting change. Part of the challenge for the school administrator is that of providing some means for developing an adoption process when changes are being considered; a process

[89]

which provides for discussion, a kind of forum where the criticisms about present practices can be brought into the open, where some opportunity to make evaluations can be induced or encouraged. Out of this kind of discussion, of bringing various elements within the educational enterprise into communication, we may be able to create a greater degree of interdependence. What may result is a recognition that a change in one aspect of the educational structure may indeed affect other elements in the structure.

I think you have been provided a great experience in how to use consultants effectively. Outside people have been recognized as offering one means by which change can be given some consideration in a school district. And, the way in which you utilize consultants from the outside is one of the means you have of bringing about at least the consideration of change.

There has been general agreement, it seems to me, that an important aspect of education is the lay-professional relationship—the importance of the client group to the schools and to the administrator. The client group provides the basis of support. Success in administration rests finally on group support for the enterprise. The administrator, I think, was given a very excellent precaution: that in serving the client group he would have to be very careful that he wasn't becoming subservient to it.

A fourth general agreement was the distinction between the administrator acting as the *advocate* for change and the administrator acting as a *mediator*. Involving himself as an advocate to the extent that he is inflexible in being able to see possibilities of adaptations in the suggestions for change, to see ways that might overcome some of the resistance to change, will reduce the effectiveness of the administrator. The concept of effecting change being political in nature brings a very important concept to the administrator. In recognizing himself as a politician in the best sense; in trying to bring about a situation where general support can be generated within the organization as well as in the external environment in which the school exists, the school administrator has his major role. We have throughout this seminar given recognition to the crucial role of the administrator in office. Because he is not setting himself up as the advocate in the change operation does not mean that he is less important. The role that he plays as a politician is still a most effective and most important one.

There was general agreement in thinking of the environment for change—both within the organization itself and external to the organization as a vital factor in change. Here, such things as the often mentioned need for a sense of timing comes into effect. Maybe we will not be able to research this point, maybe this is just not the kind of question that *can* be researched. The administrator still has to try to gauge this matter of environment to see when the proper timing is for announcing the change, for getting the motions, the arrangements, the machinery into action for the consideration of change. A sense of timing is an important ingredient in the whole change process.

There was general agreement, I think, on the importance of specifying the outcomes of change. Such agreement is one way in which

some frustration, some misunderstanding can be avoided. If there is clear enunciation, a clear explication of the intended outcomes of a change, a better atmosphere for considering a proposed change is provided. It is well to keep in mind here, that being a domestic operation, the school doesn't have much in the way of profit motive to act as an inducement. Nevertheless, I think we can take some comfort in the fact that studies of job satisfaction indicate that the specific salary is not necessarily the important ingredient of job satisfaction. Other factors, paricularly those having to do with working relationships, human working relationships within the organization, stand even higher than the item of salary itself in job satisfaction. This is the kind of inducement that must be included in the objective of the change.

I think there has been agreement also in bringing our attention to the fact that there is increasingly a concern for the larger environment of education. Perhaps we have been too insular in thinking of the school primarily as a community operation. We are beginning to be reminded more and more that the major decisions are being made at the state and the national level. We must become more alert and more sensitive to the national interest. We must be alert and alive to the happenings that are occurring in the larger society which affect the school. In this connection, I was reminded that it is important for the school administrator today to change his reading habits so that he becomes conversant with some of the happenings in the larger society. There must be improved communication which will give the local administrator a better sense of the national picture. The importance of travel as one of the ingredients in change needs recognition. You, as the administrator, must become more and more the cosmopolite in your concern and understanding of the relationships of the school and the society of which it is a part.

Well, the third general item of my summary is this whole concept of the need for research, presented most effectively by Dr. Pellegrin last evening, and also in the kind of summary that was given to us this morning. There are several aspects of this, it seems to me, that have been brought out during this seminar. One of the problems which must be solved is the awareness on the part of the administrator, of research that has been carried out, as well as that which is under way. This, it seems to me, points definitely in the direction of an in-service program for school administrators. I think Dean Jacobson mentioned many times to you that his understanding of what's happening in the field of medicine is relevant here. Dean Baird of the University of Oregon Medical School claims that more money in his budget is spent now on in-service programs for physicians than in pre-service preparation programs. We may well be looking forward to this kind of a change in the expenditure of resources for preparation of school administrators. This seminar is, indeed, one example of our trying to find better ways of developing in-service programs with you. I think that it is significant that, in the initial planning of this seminar, there was consultation with your executive group.

Another aspect of this emphasis on research is the extent to which you can participate in studies; the extent to which you can encourage

research going on in your district. In many respects you may need assistance on the part of this over-all state program in research, but I'm sure that much effort will be carried on in your district—if it's to be viable and meaningful in the operation of schools.

Another aspect of this research effort is your willingness to be studied. I don't think we'll be able to get very far in our studies of administration and the administrative process unless we are actually welcomed into your operation. We've been delighted in our research since the early days of CPEA to get the kind of cooperation that we have in Oregon. This is due to your willingness to become "guinea pigs," as it were, and allow yourselves to be studied.

Another aspect of this interest in research is the increased availability of money for research, particularly research having to do with certain kinds of innovative practices and their adoption at the district level. The school administrator is going to have to recognize the necessity of being alert and alive to the possibilities of getting some of these funds available in his district for research activities.

Well, fourth, and the final part of my summary is a little look into the future. Until we have research that gives us an unusual degree of understanding and confidence in the results about administration and about educational administration, we have to recognize that in many critical decisions, "you're damned if you do, and damned if you don't." The thing that I got out of the case that was discussed yesterday was that, in such situations, you're better off being damned for doing the thing that your experience, your training, your professional commitments indicate to you is the better of the alternatives provided. Your professional reputation is the thing at stake.

But, having said this, I recognize that in administration you need some luck, and so, in bringing a benediction to this experience, this seminar, let me close with that—may good fortune attend you!

Participating School Officials

Milt Baum	R. La Verne Marcum
Willard Bear	Clyde Martin
Elliott Becken	Nathaniel H. Moore
Walter Commons	M. L. Morey
Kenneth Erickson	Ellis H. Neal
Fred L. Esvelt	Douglas Olds
Russell M. Esvelt	Henry O. Pete
Wayne Foster	Owen O. Sabin
George M. Henderson	Joe H. Stewart
Bernard Hughes	William E. Stewart
Edwin T. Ingles	Ken Stuart
J. W. King	John Thrasher
Hauton Lee	Nile G. Williams
William E. Lewellen	Thomas E. Woods

Marlen D. Yoder