DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 093 569 SE 015 908

AUTHOR Crumb, Glenn H.
TITLE Self-Identification as a Tool for Temporary System Evaluation.
PUB DATE Mar 73
NOTE 7p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching (46th, Detroit, Michigan, March 1973)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Research; *Inservice Education; *Leadership Styles; Leadership Training; Science Education
IDENTIFIERS Research Reports

ABSTRACT

Presented are some findings concerning self-identification as a tool for temporary system evaluation based on the reactions of participants in a resource personnel leadership training workshop. Goodson's model for classification of individuals by influence style (tough battler, friendly helper, and logical thinker) was used to self-categorize the participants into three subgroups. Each group was then asked to conduct a brainstorming session to develop program content for a seminar to be presented the following week. There was a high correlation between the content of the lists compiled by a subgroup and the characteristics of influence style as identified by Goodson. There was also an extreme lack of overlap of topics generated by the three subgroups. The investigator concluded that the limited observational evidence collected tended to be supportive of the statement that either the adult educators were able to "play the game" by a set of rules to which they were briefly introduced or self-select into a group with a theoretical influence style and behave consistently with the theoretical construct. However, the methodology employed in the experiment was extremely loose, and the results have not been, and probably cannot be, assessed. (PEB)

SELF-IDENTIFICATION AS A TOOL FOR TEMPORARY SYSTEM EVALUATION*

Glenn H. Crumb
Western Kentucky University

In the management of a temporary system designed to develop leadership-resource personnel to conduct programs for in-service teachers, a problem always arises as the terminus of the training approaches. The concept of the leader-resource person as a stimulator for adoption of a new program is sound only insofar as those new trainees become active and remain active. Anything that serves as a stimulus for termination therefore tends to defeat the program. The solution to this problem is obviously clear but exceedingly difficult to implement.

Havelock[1] refers to the disengagement problem of the innovator but provides little help in terms of a specific set of activities. In the NSF sponsored leadership training sessions conducted by Lake, Matthews, Bernoff, and Rowe, attention was focused upon the re-entry problem of the trainee involved in a resource personnel leadership training program and to one terminal activity, namely the exit interview.[2] But this type of interview, whether conducted by the staff for trainees or the reverse (both of which can be a highly emotional experience) still fails to avoid the closure concept.

The premise of the author is that upon re-entry the trainee should behave differently, furthermore, the thoughts of the trainee should be upon beginning activity not terminating it. Disruption at the peak of activity does not facilitate the kind of continued liaison with the trainees that is desired to accomplish the intended goal; in this case, the training of elementary teachers to introduce new science or mathematics programs in their schools. McClelland[3] and Fiedler[4] have indicated that leadership styles of individuals can be classified. Fiedler further states that the lack of understanding of style and/or its relationship to task frequently is a reason for failure of leadership training to bear fruit.

---

[1]Havelock, Ronald G., A Guide to Innovation In Education, Center for Research on Utilization of Scientific Knowledge, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1969, p. 135.

[2]Miles, Matthew B., Dale Lake, Robert Bernoff, and Mary Budd Rowe, "A Micro-Design," The Daily Plan for a Temporary Systems Management Laboratory, Center for Humanistic Education, State University of New York, Albany, New York, Spring, 1971.

[3]McClelland, David C., Motivational Trends In Society, New York: General Learning Press, 1971, p. 6.

[4]Fiedler, Fred E., "The Trouble With Leadership Training Is That It Doesn't Train Leaders" Psychology Today, February, 1973, p. 26.

*The activities described were supported in part by funds from the National Science Foundation.

It is possible, according to Goodson, to better understand and deal with various types of people if personal influence style is understood.[5,6]

Casting about for something, indeed anything, to avoid closure yet manage a smooth transition from on-campus training of RPW participants to field application of learnings and to force examination of personal influence style a common solution was found.

Having been asked to provide a College-wide Seminar for faculty and graduates at the same time the RPW was closing, the following strategy was employed. The RPW participants, after having been together for four weeks, had developed strategies (after Miles[7]) for conducting SCIS workshops for in-service teachers in the schools "back home." On the final day of the training period the participants were presented Goodson's behavior model for classifying personnel in a system.

(Insert Figure 1)
Goodson's Model

No mention was made initially by the presenter that any of the participants could be classed according to the model; yet, they quickly grasped this thought and sought additional ramifications and details which were then provided.

In order to better understand the nature of the group behavior in this setting, the composition of the group is presented in Table I.

TABLE I

Classification of 1972 RPW Participants

School Administrator		Teacher Leader		College Faculty	
Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
8	3	2	16	1	1

At this point the clear numerical domination of females within the group has not been assessed in terms of the individual and group behavior. If the influence was present, it was not obvious to the discussion leader or the observers.

Questions and responses by individuals ranged widely from, "Which do you think I am?" to "What if you think you are in one category because of your position at work, but feel that you do not fit the influence style characteristics listed?" Some leading questions from the trainer, like "Can you use this to help you in dealing with people back home?" and "Can you apply it to members of this group without telling anyone?" led the group to express the desire to classify themselves.

---

[5]Goodson, Max. "A Model for Classification of Individuals by Influence Style," Paper presented at the ESEA Title III Leadership Training Program, Shocker Towers, Wichita State University, Wichita, Kansas, Summer 1969.

[6]Goodson, Max and Warren O. Hagstrom, "Changing Schools" Case Studies of Change Agent Teams in Three School Systems," Technical Report No. 177. Wisconsin Research and Development Center for Cognitive Learning. The University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin, August, 1971.

[7]Miles, Matthew B., Innovation In Education, New York: Teachers College Press, 1964.

Figure 1

A Model for Classification of Individuals by Influence Style
Max R. Goodson

Influence Style	Emotions	Goals	Judges Others By	Influences Others By	Role in Group	Over-Uses	Becomes (under stress)	Fears (afraid of)	Needs to Learn
Tough Battler	Accepts Aggression Rejects Affection	Dominance	Strength Power	Direction; Intimidation; control of rewards	Initiates demands disciplines	Fight	Pugnacious	Being "soft" or dependent	Warmth; consideration; objectivity; humility
Friendly Helper	Accepts Affection Rejects Aggression	Acceptance	Warmth	Offering understanding; praise favors friendship	Supports, harmonizes relieves tension	kindness	Sentimental	Desertion conflict	Strength, integrity, firmness, self-assertion
Logical Thinker	Rejects Affection and interpersonal aggression both	Correctness	Cognitive Ability	Factual data, logical arguments	Defines, clarifies, gets information criticizes	Analysis	Pedantic	Emotions, irrational acts	Awareness of feeling ability to love and to fight

At this point, a new element was injected. A second trainer posed the problem of having to design an all-college seminar to review what had taken place in the RPW. The second trainer asked the participants to self-select membership into one of the three groups according to the model presented. After having done so, each group was then asked to conduct a brainstorming session to develop program content for the seminar to be presented the following week. The three groups (self-selected) were then isolated one from the other, and a secretary recorded each group's output during the brain-storming session.

The behavior of the three groups can be briefly described as follows. The "Thinkers" immediately developed an exhaustive list of content items, then reduced it by elimination of duplication and ambiguity (Figure 2). The "Helpers" produced a less comprehensive list centering upon a few themes (Figure 3). The "Fighters" production (Figure 4) and behavior were reactionary as indicated by the statements, "Let's not do it!"; "Why should we do his work for him?"; and finally, "If the others can do it, so can we!" The content of the lists generated are also indicative of the composition of the three groups.

One is immediately struck by three things regarding the lists. First, the obviously high correlation between the content of the lists compiled by a subgroup and the characteristics of "Influence Style" used by Goodson to classify people. (Point out influence styles and items on lists that have high correlation.) It should be noted that none of the RPW participants had the model available for reference during that period.

A second observation concerning the lists is the exceedingly high incidence of the use of a specialized language related to the temporary system management model of Matthew Miles.[8] (Point out TSML terms used.) This language was employed by the trainers during the course of conducting the RPW and taught to the participants as a technique for planning the "back home" workshops they were obligated to conduct as part of the SCIS-RPW.

A final observation relates to the extreme lack of overlap of topics generated by the three subgroups. (Point out duplicates among lists as well as similarities of content topics.) This is particularly important as all statements were accepted during the brainstorming session so if any participant chose to self-select into a group which was not consistent with their influence style, the inconsistent behavior did not evidence itself although essentially all members actively participated.

At the end of the brainstorming session (lapse of twenty minutes) the total group was reassembled to discuss the sessions held and to compare lists and to summarize.

To determine whether or not the lists generated were different they were classified by source into three categories which parallel the models of Fiedler,[9] Goodson[10] and McClelland.[11]

TABLE 2

Classification of Participant Lists of Topics
by Self Selected Group and Influence Style

	Relationship or Affiliation	Evaluation or Achievement	Power or Authority	Totals
Fighters	5	4	18	27
Helpers	10	1	8	19
Thinkers	6	8	6	20
Totals	21	13	32	66

[8]Miles, Matthew. Innovation in Education, New York: Teachers College Press, 1964.

[9]Fiedler, op. cit.

[10]Goodson, op. cit.

[11]McClelland, op. cit.

The results of calculating X^2 for the three independent samples (Non-Parametric Statistics, Siegel, 1956, p. 175ff) yielded $X^2=15.01$ with $0.001 \leq p \leq 0.01$.

Hypotheses. H_0: the lists of items categorized as indicated in Table 2 are the same for all groups when classified by these models. H_1: the lists of items differ from group to group when classified by these models.

The rejection region consists of all values of X^2 which are so large that p associated with their occurence under H_0 is equal to or greater than 0.01. The results from calculation of X^2 indicates that rejection of H_0 and acceptance of H_1 is appropriate in this case.

The obvious differences in the lists (the high correlations between the lists generated and the influence styles used for self-selection into a group) and the exceedingly high and effective use of the temporary systems management concepts provided an immediate evaluation of the progress of the RPW participants. This conclusion is predicated upon the fact that a major part of the workshop was designed to help the RPW participants know who they were, how they worked most effectively with others (their influence style), and how to use the concepts of temporary system management to conduct (and typify) a SCIS workshop.

But what effect did this have upon the group in terms of attitude toward termination of the workshop? First of all, it directed the attention of the participants primarily upon others, not themselves. So instead of "Gee, I'll miss you." and "You will write, won't you?", the conversations were, "I'll let you know how my group comes out!" and "How do you think your group will stack up?" "What about your principal, is he a "Fighter?" The verbal evidence collected all pointed to promises of active involvement with teachers back home, not closure or inactivity. A second effect was that a new tool with a set of "catchy headings" was introduced and became the center of conversation as the participants departed the workshop, arguing whether this or that staff member was a "Fighter," "Thinker," or "Helper."

In summary, the limited observational evidence collected tends to be supportive of the statement that either this group of adult educators were able to "play the game" by a set of rules to which they were briefly introduced or self-select into a group with a theoretical influence style and behave consistently with the theoretical construct. In addition, one can surmise that because of the use of "standard rules" for brainstorming sessions, the participants felt that they were able to communicate effectively with peers by use of a technical termonology developed during the period of the RPW. Finally, the sudden release of the anxieties and emotions related to terminal activities of a training program which developed exceedingly strong personal relationships did not occur, rather the emotional energy was directed toward future activity not memories of the past or self-consolation.

A few words in closing regarding the conditions and limitations placed upon this "experiment." It should be obvious to all that there was an exceedingly high incidence of cuing offered by the model presented to the participants. The number of individuals involved, the complexity of the task oriented activity and logistical problems of moving people from room to room made observation difficult and hectic. As for most educators in training, the desire to "please the teacher" must have had some influence upon the behavior of the participants during the experiment.

The methodology employed in the experiment was extremely loose. The results of this type of experience upon the participants in the long run has not and probably cannot be assessed. There was some evidence of internal conflict surfacing during the sessions; thus some attention should be given to the danger of premature re-entry into the permanent system with such emotions surfacing. There is at least one other consideration too: perhaps the trained resource persons will behave as they perceive a resource person should and thus remain an active leader.

FIGURE 2. THINKERS CONTENT LIST

1. HOW THEY VIEWED PARTICIPANTS AT FIRST.
2. CHANGES IN PARTICIPANT BEHAVIOR OVER TIME.
3. AMOUNT OF COOPERATION DISPLAYED BY PARTICIPANTS.
4. OUTCOMES AS THEY SEE THEM.
5. FOCUSING ON INDIVIDUALS.
6. SUCCESS OF BACK-HOME WORKSHOP DEVELOPMENTS.
7. RAPPORT DEVELOPED IN 4-WEEK WORKSHOP.
8. WHAT TRAINERS VALUE FROM WORKSHOP.
9. DEVELOPMENT OF SCIENTIFIC CONCEPTS.
10. DEVELOPMENT OF MANAGEMENT CONCEPTS.
11. IDENTIFICATION OF ROLES.
12. PREDICTIONS OF FUTURE WORKSHOPS.
13. LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT OF PARTICIPANTS
14. IMPORTANCE OF INTERACTION.
15. ABILITIES TO IMPROVE-TECHNIQUES VERSUS MATERIALS.
16. COMPARISON OF THIS PROGRAM W/OVER OTHER SCIENCE PROGRAMS.
17. COMMUNICATIONS CONCERNING SCIS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENTAL SCIENCE PROGRAMS.
18. OPPORTUNITY TO TRY OUT SCIS PROGRAM.
19. EXPLAIN PROGRAM-GIVE OVERVIEW.
20. COOPERATION WITH OTHER BACKHOME ADMINISTRATIVE TEAMS.

FIGURE 3. HELPERS CONTENT LIST

1. PARTIES-TENSION BREAKERS
2. GETTING ACQUAINTED QUICKLY-FIRST NAME
3. INFORMAL ATMOSPHERE
4. ENCOURAGEMENT
5. QUICK INVOLVEMENT
6. "HANDS ON"
7. NATURE OF CONTENT (SCIS)
8. FITTED PROGRAM TO OUR NEEDS-MONITORING
9. EFFECTS ON CHILDREN (LAB SCHOOL)
10. SHARED OWNERSHIP
11. RESPECT FOR INDIVIDUAL PEERS
12. SHARED RESPONSIBILITY (ACQ.-MATERIALS)
13. PSYCHOLOGICAL BIASES (PIAGET)
14. SAW NEEDS WERE MET
15. CONCEPTUAL OVERVIEW
16. PLAN FOR BACK-HOME WORKSHOP
17. DISCOVERY--TEXTBOOK
18. COFFEE--DONUTS EVERY DAY
19. PLANNING

FIGURE 4. FIGHTERS CONTENT LIST

1. ORIGIN
2. PHILOSOPHY
3. PARTICIPANTS
4. IMPLEMENTATION
5. SCIS PHILOSOPHY
6. EXPERIMENTAL METHODS WITH LIVING THINGS
7. CHANGE FROM TRADITION
8. DIFFERENT APPROACH TO TEACHING SCIENCE
9. COMMON BOND
10. GROUP DYNAMICS
11. SOCIAL LIFE
12. METHOD OF INITIATION
13. IMPLEMENTATION IN OTHER SUBJECT AREAS
14. RELATION WITH OTHER SUBJECT AREAS
15. DEVELOP LEADERSHIP
16. READING READINESS
17. EVALUATION IN SCIENCE
18. RESPECT FOR OTHERS
19. INDIVIDUALS POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
20. FOLLOW-UP
21. RELEVANCY TO STUDENT
22. DEMONSTRATION LESSON
23. SHARING
24. N.S.F.
25. SUPPORT SYSTEMS
26. COST OF IMPLEMENTATION
27. WHY CHANGE?