DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 177 833   EC 121 602

AUTHOR   Carroll, Thomas G.; And Others
TITLE   What Does the School Psychologist Do? An Ethnographic
              Study of Role Transformation During Organizational
              Change. Final Report.
INSTITUTION   Clark Univ., Worcester, Mass. Dept. of Education.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington,
              D.C.
PUB DATE   [78]
GRANT   NIE-G-78-0038
NOTE   72p.

EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   Compliance (Legal); Elementary Secondary Education;
              Exceptional Child Research; *Handicapped Children;
              *Mainstreaming; *Role Perception; *School
              Psychologists; *State Legislation; *Teamwork
IDENTIFIERS   Chapter 766; *Massachusetts

ABSTRACT
        A 1 year ethnographic study was conducted to
investigate the possibility and better understand the process of role
transformation of the school psychologist during organizational
change, specifically regarding the delivery of mainstream services to
special needs children under Chapter 766 (Massachusetts' law which
mandates procedural safeguards and team delivery of educational
services for handicapped students). To collect and analyze data, a
team of investigators trained in ethnographic methods was used. In
response to mainstreaming legislation, school psychologists assumed
one of two roles: child advocate or member of the school's staff.
Child oriented psychologists worked effectively in schools with low
structure, participative organizations where they met with staff on a
one to one basis to develop program changes in response to the
child's needs. School oriented psychologists were found to be
effective in high structure, bureaucratically organized schools where
they work with the staff as a team to serve the child through
existing school programs. Other findings included that despite the
mainstreaming legislative mandate to use collaborative team
organization in special needs cases, many teams continue to function
in accord with bureaucratic principles. (Author/SBH)

WHAT DOES THE SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST DO?
AN ETHNOGRAPHIC STUDY OF ROLE TRANSFORMATION
DURING ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE

Final Report of Research

to

National Institute of Education

for

Grant Number: NIE-G-78-0038

by

Thomas G. Carroll

with

Eleanor Latham, John Madonna, Margaret Foran

Department of Education
Clark University
Worcester Massachusetts

ABSTRACT

Recent state and federal legislation requiring mainstream education for special needs children has created organizational change and problems of role definition for school psychologists. They are currently confronted with a rapidly increasing case load, an ambiguity in the definition of their client, and a debate over whether to function as generalists or specialists. We conducted this study to provide information that could contribute to a resolution of those problems and further our general understanding of role transformation during organizational change.

To collect and analyze data we used a team of investigators trained in ethnographic methods.

We found that, in response to mainstreaming legislation, school psychologists assume one of two roles: child advocate, or member of the school's staff. Child-oriented psychologists work effectively in schools with low structure, participative organizations where they meet with staff on a one-to-one basis to develop program changes in response to the child's needs. School-oriented psychologists are effective in high structure, bureaucratically organized schools where they work with the staff as a team to serve the child through existing school programs.

We also found that despite the mainstreaming legislative mandate to use collaborative team organization in special needs cases, many teams continue to function in accord with bureaucratic principles.

In response to this problem, and to enhance the performance of school psychologists, we recommend that school personnel involved in special education cases should be trained in the principles of organization design.

CONTENTS

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Recent state and federal legislation entitles children with handicaps to a free and appropriate education in the least restrictive environment possible. Essentially, civil rights acts, Massachusetts Chapter 766 and P.L. 94-142 were passed in response to widespread public and professional concern over the effects of a pattern of separate education for special needs children in which the children were often stigmatized while their parents were excluded from the decisions affecting their lives (Kennedy 1978; Boston 1977; Weatherly and Lipsky 1977 and Budoff 1975).

To alter this pattern, Chapter 766 and P.L. 94-142 establish procedural safeguards addressed to the administration of education rather than to educational programs. Under these safeguards, interdisciplinary professional teams are responsible for ensuring that each child recieves a comprehensive diagnosis and an educational plan that meets his or her special needs with the least possible separation from the educational mainstream. The laws mandate the use of teams on the assumption that "...appropriate decisions will be more likely to occur if a team of people, rather than a single individual, makes the decision, and if the parent is involved in the decision"(Kennedy 1978).

This mandate for team delivery of educational services is an attempt to use state and federal law to introduce local

level organizational change in public schools. In a 1977 pilot study of the implementation of Chapter 766 in Worcester Massachusetts, we found that the principal response to the pressure for change appeared to be an adaptive transformation of existing staff roles. This introduced the possibility that there would be considerable variation in implementation of the law, with the actual delivery of services being determined more by these local adaptations than by state and federal policy requirements.

In order to study this possibility and to better understand the process of role transformation during organizational change, we proposed a one year ethnographic study of the delivery of services under Chapter 766. This research was supported by a grant from the National Institute of Education. The major findings of our work are reported in this paper.

CONCEPTUAL ORIENTATION OF THE STUDY

Insight into the adaptation of existing roles to meet the requirements of the new laws is provided by the theory and research of a number of sociologists and anthropoligsts. At the most general level, Goodenough (1971), and Berger and Luckman (1966) have advanced theories that behavior in a social system is based on standards created and maintained by the daily interactions of their members. This concept of a socially constructed reality is in contrast to classical

theories which treat social systems as static structures of objective constraints controlling the members' behavior.

With the application of this symbolic interactionist approach to complex organizations, it has now become common practice to distinguish between prescribed roles and enacted roles. Wolcott (1973), Cicourel (1974), Schlecty (1976), Schmuck et. al. (1979) are a few of the many researchers who have applied the approach to educational organizations. Their work contributes to our general understanding of the way these organizations influence individual behaviors while the individuals reciprocally create the patterns of behavior that define the organization. Using this concept of the staff's influence over the organization's delivery of service, a number of researchers have recently examined the specific problems of implementing Chapter 766 and P.L. 94-142.

In their study of Chapter 766, Weatherly and Lipsky (1977) are particularly concerned about the attempt to introduce innovations into existing and continuing practice. They predict that under 766 the accommodations and coping mechanisms of local professional s... f will shape the service that is actually delivered to the public under government policy, and they call for studies of these people within their work contexts to discover how their decision-making process for clients is modified by the new policies.

In a similar vein, Braddock (1977) demonstrates that change in the delivery of special services within the educational main-

stream will meet strong organizational resistance. Because existing

organizational practices which segregate and concentrate

special education services are easier to administer, he con-

cludes that such practices will continue to prevail over mainstreaming

efforts unless new organizational forms of delivery are

developed.

Milofsky (1974) and Parker (1975) state that a key to

this organizational change will be adjustments in the functions

of special services professionals. They find that, since

special services traditionally have had marginal positions in

educational organizations, the individuals in these professions

will have to learn to mainstream themselves as well as the

children if they are to effectively implement the mandate of

Chapter 766 and P.L. 94-142. They demonstrate that school

psychologists, counselors, and special educators who have been

trained to work with children will now work as consultants

to other professionals on the delivery of services through

teams, and they suggest that until these individuals develop

the skills for their new role, they will continue to be

treated as outsiders by school staff and will be unable to

handle the increased case load created by the new laws.

FOCUS OF THE STUDY - THE SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST

In order to better understand the individual adaptations

that will produce the organizational response of schools to

Chapter 766 we chose to do an ethnographic study of school psychologists operating under the law in the public schools of Worcester Massachusetts. This decision was based on the field work in our pilot study and the conceptual orientation to organizational change outlined above.

Our preliminary observations indicated that school psychologists were responding to four interrelated problems: (1) an expansion of the referral system with a corresponding increase in their case load, (2) ambiguity in the definition of their client (the child or the school?), (3) ambiguity about whether to be specialists or generalists in the delivery of services, and (4) a demand to function in a variety of organizational settings ranging from highly centralized decision-making structures to participative teams with decisions made by consensus.

ETHNOGRAPHIC APPROACH TO THE STUDY

In response to the problems they face, school psychologists are engaged in an adaptive transformation of their roles. To examine this response, we chose ethnographic methodology because of its long tradition of studying organizations from the participant's point of view. It is the ethnographic perspective that allows us to study the social construction of complex organizations outlined in the previous section. This methodology also allows us to treat

the implementation of the law as a naturally occurring ecological experiment. Bronfenbrenner's formulation of this research paradigm (Bronfenbrenner, 1976) emphasizes that the impact of changes in a setting cannot be understood without information on how the setting and its various elements are perceived by the participants.

To organize our data collection and analysis in a way that is consistent with the psychologists' perspectives of the problems they face, we used a force field model based on Lewin's concept of the psychological field (Lewin, 1935). In our model, the forces impinging on the psychologists from the environment are the increased referral case load and the demands of the various organizational settings in which they have to work. The environmental forces are balanced by responses from the psychologists. These are shaped by their orientation to either the school or the child as their client and by their preference for functioning as a specialist or generalist in the delivery of services.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK FOP A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY

Referrals To organize our approach the the study of environmental forces we began with the increase in case loads. Our pilot study indicated that expansion of the referral system was the aspect of mainstreaming having the most immediate and tangible impact on the school's organization.

Weatherly and Lipsky (1977), Parker (1975) and Milofsky (1974)
had also expressed concern that the sheer volume of cases would
seriously test the capacity of the schools to respond to
Chapter 766. With this in mind, we asked two questions:
(1) In 1978, with four years of experience under Chapter 766,
was there an increase in the rate of referrals under the law?
and, (2) What was the pattern of referrals - who made them
and what types of problems were being referred?

Organizational Types Developing an analytic framework
for the types of schools we found in the psychologists' environ-
ment was more complex since the principal purpose f Chapter
766 and P.L. 94-142 is to change the organizational process of
schools. Organizations are solutions to problems. They occur
when people use coordinated action to reach a goal. Histori-
cally, we have seen an evolution in the way organizations have
been designed, and a brief review of the educational effects
of these developments is necessary to understand the impact of
mainstreaming legislation and the organizational problems
faced by school psychologists.

Hanson (1979) and Schmuck et. al. (1977) find that,
historically, bureaucracy has been the prevailing organiza-
tional form in American education. Galbraith (1977) demon-
strates that this classical approach to organization is based
on a belief in our ability to pre-plan goal-directed structures
of activity in advance of their execution. It assumes that
organizational outcome can be pre-specified and standardized,

and that the conditions producing the outcomes are known and controllable. For efficiency, this type of organization relies on a specialist division of labor in which the coordination of separate activities is brought about through a hierarchical structure which locates decisions in a central authority.

Bureaucracies are most suited to the execution of uniform repetitive activities that can be handled by a standardized system of operating proceuures. A well-run bureaucracy can process a large volume of uniform events, but it has scarce information processing capacity for novel events, and it is vulnerable to task uncertainty (Galbraith 1977). Unique events in a bureaucracy must be treated as exceptions to the rules. As such, they may be ignored by the workers, who have no response available to them within the organization, or they may be referred to an upper level of the hierarchy for a decision and plan of action requi..., the least disruption of routine organizational activities.

The bureaucratic organization of work in schools was made possible by extensive use of normative tests which were used to place children in a pre-defined curriculum. Through the application of bureaucratic principles and these tests, the organization of the school's staff, curriculum, and physical structure became standardized to meet the needs of the model group of children in the society (Tyack 1974).

Children falling outside the normative group were exceptional children, who presented the schools with an organizational problem.

Their behavior did not conform to the standard rules and normative expectations of the mainstream school. Their unique needs could not be met by teachers trained to work with a curriculum designed to meet the needs of children falling within a pre-defined normative range. Since sound bureaucratic principles dictate that the organization's structure should not be modified to meet the demands of unique individuals, the traditional response was to remove these children from the educational mainstream so that their special needs could be met with the least disruption to the school's activities. These separate placements provided the additional opportunity of categorizing special needs children by their conditions so that specialists and facilities could be efficiently concentrated on their needs.

Chapter 766 and P.L. 94-142 are intended to reverse this classical pattern of segregating special needs children from mainstream educational programs. The laws were enacted because special needs children were stigmatized by the labels they acquired through placement in categorical programs; because the experience of growing up in a peer group of exceptional children often handicapped them for future life in mainstream society; because a disproportionately large number of minority group children were placed in special programs; because those who were institutionalized had little chance of returning to the mainstream and their condition often worsened; and because mainstream children, having been exposed to a

limited range of normal behavior, were being ill-prepared to deal with handicapped people, so that a cycle was created that further separated the two groups and reinforced the isolation of special needs individuals throughout their lives (Boston 1977, Weatherby and Lipsky 1977, Budoff 1975 and the Task Force on Children Out of School Report 1971).

Chapter 766 and P.L. 94-142 attempt to ange the pattern by legislating procedural safeguards designed to limit separate categorical placements. Chief among these safeguards are: (1) the use of "multiple methods of individual assessment" (to limit use of standardized tests), (2) the use of placements which locate the child in the "least restrictive environment commensurate with his or her needs" (to limit separate placements), (3) the creation of "individual educational plans" which recognize the unique needs of each child (to limit categorical placements), and (4) the creation of "due process procedures" to protect the rights of parents and the child (Kennedy 1978).

Each one of these procedural safeguards is in direct conflict with the traditional bureaucratic organization of schools. To implement these safeguards, the law specifies creation of educational teams responsible for designing an individual plan for each special needs child. Such teams include a special education teacher, a school psychologist or counselor, an administrator and the parent or child advocate. They may also include other professionals. The

laws specify that decisions are to be reached by consensus of
the team members and implemented through a collaborative effort
of relevant professionals. To understand why the law specifies
this team approach we must turn from our review of bureaucratic
theory to examine more recent trends in organizational design.

Team organization grew out of the human relations school
of organization design. Likert crystallized the principles of
the team approach in his descriptive model of participative
management (Likert 1967). In contrast to what he calls the
authoritarian pattern of control in hierarchical organizations,
participative management develops an employee-oriented suppor-
tive environment in which work gets done through democratic
collaboration. Studies of this organizational approach have
demonstrated increased productivity and enhanced worker satis-
faction in a wide range of organizational settings, including
educational institutions (Galbraith 1977, Hanson, 1979 and
Schmuck et. al. 1977).

Collaborative teams provide the potential for implementing
the mandate of Chapter 766 and P.L. 94-142 for mainstream
education of special needs children. We have seen that within
mainstream schools these children are unique individuals who
generate staff uncertainty about the appropriate educational
plan to me t their needs. Galbraith (1977) and Lawrence and
Lorsch (1967) have demonstrated that the greater the task
uncertainty, the greater the amount of information that must
be provided to decision makers and the more they are limited

in their ability to pre-plan activities in advance of their
execution. Bureaucracies control this problem by using cate-
gorical placements of exeptional children. This reduces the
information overload that would be associated with processing
each child through the hierarchy, but historically we have
seen that it also reduces the quality of the diagnosis and
plan of action for the child.

Collaborative teams provide an alternative solution to
this problem. Galbraith points out that since it is the
volume of information flowing from the points of action to the
points of decision making that overloads the hierarchy, it is
more efficient to bring the points of decision down to the
points of action where the information exists. This can be
accomplished by increasing the discretion exercised at lower
levels of the organization, but as this is done, the organi-
zation faces a new problem: "How can it be sure that the
en loyees will consistently choose the appropriate response to
the job-related situations with which they will be faced?"
(Galbraith 1977). Galbraith demonstrates that the common
solution to this problem is to staff the organization with a
professionally trained work force.

A professional staff working as a team has more flexi-
bility and capacity for responding to task uncertainty than
a bureaucratic hierarchy. Faced with the unique case of an
exceptional child, an interdisciplinary team has more infor-
mation and resources available to it for diagnosis and

16

planning than the standard channels of a bureaucracy. Through collaborative combinations and recombinations of their resources, teams are better able to create a program meeting each child's needs within existing educational facilities. They have less need for categorical placements which separate special children from the mainstream.

The shift from bureaucratic organization to collaborative teams "represents a shift from control based on supervision and surveillance to control based on selection of responsible workers" (Galbraith 1977). Coordination of team work is done in participative planning meetings in which members set goals and establish the details of their working relationships.

Collaborative teams do have the potential to respond to the mandate for comprehensive diagnosis and individual program planning for the needs of special children, and the mainstreaming laws do require this approach as a replacement for the bureau-cratic delivery of services formerly available. However, changing schools from bureaucratic to participative organization has not been easy to accomplish in practice.

A number of researchers have documented the incompatibilities between bureaucracies and participative organizations. Educational bureaucracies are high-structure work settings in which staff activities and responsibilities are compartmentalized. Inter-actions between leaders and subordinates follow a person-to-person isolative pattern in which the leader (principal or department chair) supervises each subordinate on a one-to-

one basis. In formally structured educational activity there is little task interaction between staff members. The leader makes the majority of organizational decisions and assigns tasks to individuals according to their specialties. The leader does not encourage collaboration on tasks and maintains strong functional boundaries between them. High structure systems work to develop standard procedures for efficiently responding to uniform student needs (Schlechty 1976 and Likert 1972).

In contrast to high structure organizations, participative educational organizations develop collaborative work relationships with a two-way flow of information between leaders and subordinates. Leaders encourage subordinates to become accomplished in their specialties, and they recognize that subordinates may have better information and may be in better positions to act on certain problems (Likert 1972). Often characterized as consultative systems, informal exchanges of task-oriented information and support among staff are common, and educational planning is often a group process with decision by consensus. In response to variability in student backgrounds and abilities, participative organizations develop a set of alternative procedures to be combined and re-combined to meet individual needs (Schlechty 1976).

During times of organizational change, or whenever a person moves from one type of organization to another, the incompatibilities of bureaucracies and participative organi-

zation may lead to role conflicts. Those who are comfortable
with bureaucratic settings often express a great deal of dis-
satisfaction with what they perceive to be the structurally
loose organization of participative systems. Bureaucratic
staff accustomed to high-structure, pre-planned patterns of
action may exhibit a "trained incapacity" to respond to the
open action alternatives of these systems, and bureaucratic
administrators may refuse to seek the counsel of their pro-
fessional staff in decision-making and planning (Hanson 1979).

On the other hand, those oriented to working in partici-
pative settings may consider the efficiently standardized
procedures of a bureaucracy to be a frustrating structure of
constraints. Their lack of willingness to submit to bureau-
cratic imperatives often makes them unpredictable to bureau-
cratic administrators, who come to see them as outsiders
unwilling to conform to role requirements. They, in turn, may
come to accept this position and work as outsiders engaged in
a struggle with the forces of bureaucracy (Schlechty 1976).

Over time these interactions may deteriorate until they
become dysfunctional. The alternative is to develop effective
organizational adaptations. Given our sense of the dynamic
interrelationship of individual actions and organizational
structure, one form of adaptation is for individuals to trans-
form their organization to fit existing role expectations, so
that participative organizations become more bureaucratic under
the influence of dominant bureaucratic staff or leaders, while

bureaucracies become more participative through the actions of those oriented to collaborative work settings.

Since Chapter 766 and P.L. 94-142 mandate the·use of collaborative teams to deliver special education services, a principal factor in their implementation will be the role transformations school staff actually develop in response to the pressure to change from bureaucratic to participative organization.. To take account of this, we studied the adaptive response of school psychologists to organizational variation at three levels: school, team and case. These were combined for a descriptive typology of the adaptive interactions of school psychologists with their organizational environments (see page 17).

Schools in this typology were classified as having bureaucratic or participative organizations. <u>Bureaucratic schools</u> embodied the properties of bureaucracies reviewed above. The mark of these schools is a centralized decision process controlled by the principal. In such schools the principals treat school psychologists as problem-solvers. They call for the school psychologist when they or their staff have a problem working with a child. The principal or teacher is likely to define the problem for the psychologist and request that a particular action be taken.

<u>Participative schools</u> have less centralized decision making, and principals give their staff more functional autonomy. In such schools the school psychologist's role is to deliver

TYPE OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST	BUREAUCRATIC SCHOOLS				PARTICIPATIVE SCHOOLS			
	Bureaucratic Team		Collaborative Team		Bureaucratic Team		Collaborative Team	
	Simple Case	Complex Case	Simple Case	Complex Case	Simple Case	Complex Case	Simple Case	Complex Case
CHILD-ORIENTED SPECIALIST	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
CHILD-ORIENTED GENERALIST	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
SCHOOL-ORIENTED SPECIALIST	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
SCHOOL-ORIENTED GENERALIST	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32

21

17.

service to the child. In making referrals, the staff and principal are more likely to allow school psychologists to develop their own diagnosis and plan of action for the child.

Within a school(at the second level of the typology) the team is the particul, group of staff members working on an individual!s case. For each case in this study, the team was classified as bureaucratic or collaborative in accord with the principals reviewed in this report. We used this classification to give recognition to the fact that it was possible for some groups to be called "teams" under the law while they actually functioned bureaucratically. Because team members were often from outside the school, it was also possible to have bureaucratic teams in participative schools and collaborative teams in bureaucratic schools. Following the requirements of the law, our focus was on the team's diagnosis, decision making, and planning process for each case.

A case (as the third level of the typology) began with the referral of the child to a school psychologist and ended when an educational plan for that child had been implemented. Cases were of two types: simple and complex (Lipsky and Weatherley, 1977, made a similar distinction between routine and complex cases). In a simple case the child's needs are readily diagnosed and make limited demands on the resources of the school. In such cases the psychologist is engaged in relatively few interactions with other staff.

A complex case may require several professionals to

complete the diagnosis. The child's problem, the school's response, or the parent's involvement may disrupt routine activities, and resolution of the case is likely to require program alteration or relocation of the child in another setting. During complex cases, school psychologists work with a large number of other professionals.

In our force field model, the school psychologists response to these organizational variables (i.e.: their response to a bureaucratic or participative school with a bureaucratic or collaborative team working on a simple or complex case) is shaped by their client orientation and degree of specialization. This is displayed in the typology by four categories of school psychologist which cross-cut the organizational categories to form a matrix with thirty-two cells (see page 17). The four types of psychologist are: 1. child-oriented specialist, 2. child-oriented generalist, 3. school-oriented specialist, and 4. school-oriented generalist.

School psychologists serve two clients: the children and the school system. In our pilot study there appeared to be a variation between child-oriented psychologists and school-oriented psychologists which reflected a subtle distinction in the balance between the psychological and educational components of their work. Both kinds of psychologist were clearly interested in serving the child's needs, and both recognized that they were working for the school when they did this. The child-oriented psychologists, however, adopted the role of

child advocate and protector of the individual's interests
within the institution. School-oriented psychologists, on the
other hand, assumed roles as members of the school staff and
worked through the school's programs to respond to the child's
needs.

In addition to differences in client orientation, our
pilot study also revealed differences in degree of speciali-
zation. A body of school psychology theory suggests that the
psychologist should specialize in particular problems and
methodologies (Hohenshil 1974). In practice, school psych-
ologists working under Chapter766 would be called on to
function as specialist-consultants to educational staff. How-
eve , there is also a strong theoretical argument for the
generalist position which allows the psychologist to adapt to
a number of different intervention settings (Bardon 1976, and
Gilmore 1974). In practice, under Chapter 766, the generalist
position would contribute to organizational efficiency by enabling
school psychologists to function as communicative links between
the systems providing service to the child (Bergan et. al. 1976).
The findings of this study indicate that client orientation dominates
the school psychologist's role, while degree of specialization
has little effect on their handling of a case.

To Summarize   Our research is built on
the constructivist assumption that a social structure is not
an objective and constraining social fact. It is, rather, a
pattern of relationships and action that exists only so far as

its members create and maintain it through their daily inter-
actions, and it changes as the members have a need to adaptively
transform their relationships or actions (Mehan 1978, Magoon 1977,
Berger and Luckman 1966).

The attempt to implement Chapter 766 in Massachusetts pro-
vides us with a naturally occurring experiment in which we may
study this process because the requirements of the law call for
an adaptive response from school staff. The study of this re-
sponse can shed light on the social construction of organiza-
tions, and it can help us to understand how state-level policy
is transformed into local level practice.

To focus our research on the response to Chapter 766, we
chose to use ethnographic case study methods to concentrate on
the role of school psychologists in the delivery of service to
special needs children. To organize our data collection and
analysis, and to provide a systematic comparison of the kinds
of school psychologists and organizational settings that we
found in our pilot study and the literature, we used the
descriptive matrix on page 17.

The report of findings in this study is based on a compar-
ison of sixty-four ethnographic case studies; two cases in each
of the thirty-two cells of the matrix. As a descriptive study,
we did not use the variables in our matrix to formulate an
elaborate set of deductive hypotheses. Instead, the matrix was
used to generate a series of empirical questions cast in this
general form: "What happens when...?"

An example of a series of empirical questions is: "What happens when a child-oriented specialist works on a simple case with a bureaucratic team in a bureaucratic school?"; "What happens when a child-oriented specialist works on a complex case with a bureaucratic team in a bureaucratic school?"; "What happens when a child-oriented specialist works on a simple case with a collaborative team in a bureaucratic school?" and so on across the eight cells for a child-oriented psychologist.

As we filled the cells of our matrix with descriptions of cases guided by these questions, we were able to make two kinds of comparison. Holding the kind of psychologist constant, we could look at the performance of a given type of psychologist across organizational type settings, and then in turn, holding the kind of setting constant, we could look at the performance of different kinds of psychologist in the same kind of setting.

The comparison in our matrix was also made at several levels of detail. In some instances we simply compared bureaucratic school performance with participative school performance for a given type of psychologist, and at other times we made a similar comparison between kinds of teams or kinds of cases, but we always had the opportunity to make comparisons that included all three organizational variables.

DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

The Research Team

Our field research was conducted by a team of field workers consisting of Eleanor Latham, a practicing school

psychologist, John Madonna, a practicing school counselor, and Margaret Foran, a program manager in the Bureau of Institutional Schools of the Massachusetts Department of Education. Their work was coordinated by Thomas Carroll, a university based researcher in the field of anthropology and education.

The field workers were doctoral students in Clark University's Department of Education. As such, they had been trained in ethnographic approaches to educational research using methods developed by Gearing and his associates (Gearing et. al. 1975). The combination of this theoretical and methodological background with their experience as practitioners gave the field workers particularly strong insight into the problems of implementing Chapter 766, and their pilot research identified the issues that are the basis of this report.

During the research we found that a researcher-practitioner team can be an effective approach to ethnographic research in schools. The roles of the practitioners simplified entry and rapport problems, and university-based team meetings for data analysis provided a mix of perspectives that disembeded the practitioners from their field sites while they simultaneously brought the researcher into contact with the practical realities of the schools.

The team approach is not without its difficulties, however. The practitioner as an "insider" to the organization has to face the problem of adopting the researcher's "outsider" role. He or she must be prepared for the stress produced by observing and interviewing colleagues without being able to share the infor-

mation obtained. As a team, the members must be able to
tolerate conflicting practitioner philosophies and the tension
that results from the practitioner and researcher holding each
other in check as one tries to rush into the findings while the
other is sailing off into the theoretical clouds. To date, the
difficulty of managing these problems has been outweighted by
the production of this report and two dissertations (Latham 1979
and Madonna in process).

The Sites and the Subjects

The principal site for our study was the Worcester Public
Schools. A manufacturing city located in central Massachusetts,
Worcester is the second largest city in the state (pop. approx.
190,000). The Worcester Public School system has a centralized
administration with departmental specialties. School psychol-
ogists in the system work out of the Child Study Department.
Each psychologist is responsible for working with children in
three to four schools and will move from school to school dur-
ing any given week. To reflect this fact, the sixty-four cases
analyzed in this report were drawn from sixteen schools in the
system: ten elementary schools (65% of the cases), four junior
high schools (25% of the cases), and two high schools (10% of
the cases). To select the school psychologists to be studied
at the Worcester site, a structured interview embodying the
categories of our descriptive matrix was used (see Latham 1979).
Each one of the twenty school psychologists in the Child Study
Department was questioned about his or her procedures for

handling cases. (Actual cases were reviewed.) Each one was

also asked to describe what he or she knew about the way col-

leagues handled cases. Using this information, four psychol-

ogists were chosen as exemplars of the four types of psychol-

ogists in our matrix. By this procedure, the individual clas-

sified as a child-oriented specialist was put in that category

because she identified herself as working with that orientation

and because the information from her colleagues and our analysis

of her cases confirmed that placement. This was true for each

of the other three classifications. All four psychologists had

careers in the schools that began before the implementation of

Chapter 766. The school-oriented specialist in this study was

a man; the other three psychologists were women, and this ratio

is reflective of the number of men and women in the Child Study

Department.

A similar procedure was used to classify the schools and

teams that these four psychologists worked with. A question-

naire and a structured interview provided Likert Scale data

that identified schools as bureaucratic or participative, and

teams as bureaucratic or collaborative. The questionnaire and

interview format appear in Latham (1979).

The cases of these four psychologists were classified as

simple or complex by means of a content analysis. Two cases

were selected for each cell of the matrix, with comparability

of cases across the matrix being a principal criterion for

selection. With regard to the core evaluation process dis-

cussed later in this report, we determined that only forty-two of the sixty-four cases were comparable, so our analysis of core evaluations is based on that smaller number.

Our sixty-four cases, when studied ethnographically, provided us with rich information on the day-to-day process by which services are delivered to special needs children. When this approach is compared to studies which base their findings on statistical inference, however, we have a small, non-random sample of cases. To help us control for the possible effects of the idiosyncracies of the four psychologists we chose, we used two comparison groups.

The first comparison group consisted of school counselors in the Shrewsbury Public School system. Shrewsbury is the largest suburb of Worcester, and its counselors work in roles similar to those of the school psychologists in Worcester. Using structured interview and questionnaire procedures outlined above, four counselors were chosen and their work settings and cases were analyzed in terms of our descriptive matrix.

The second comparison group consisted of Core Evaluation Team Liasons from the Massachusetts Department of Education's Bureau of Institutional Schools. These liason officers are not located within a particular school system, but they have duties similar to those of the counselor and psychologist when they work as members of core evaluation teams, and their cases were examined and compared with those of the four psychologists in our study.

The number of cases in our comparison groups is small, and
they are not used in this report. Comparison of the patterns
in these cases with patterns in the Worcester cases was used,
however, to give us some assurance that when we speak here of
the action of a type of school psychologist we are dealing with
the properties of that type (e.g. the consequences of being a
child-oriented specialist), and not the personality traits of
the particular individual who occupied that position in our
study.

Data Collection and Analysis

Data collection and analysis in this study followed the
principles of indefinite triangulation (Cicourel,1973 and
Cicourel et. al. 1974). This means that multiple methods and
sources of data were used, and that data analysis was based on
constant comparison of information from several methods and sources.
For instance, the classification of school psychologists was
based on data collected by interview, questionnaire, and content
analysis of documents. To place a psychologist in a particular
category, self-descriptive information from that psychologist
was compared to information from his or her colleagues, and the
results of that comparison were in turn compared to what the
field worker concluded from observation and an independent
content analysis of that psychologist's case records.

Observation, interview, questionnaire and document content
analysis were the four procedures used in this study. Their use
assured us that we always had at least three sources of data

against which we could check our findings. We feel that this triangulation of data and the constant comparison of cases in our matrix ensures the validity of findings that is the essence of a qualitative study (Rist 1977).

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

The following discussion of findings will present a summary of the results of our study. No attempt will be made to present tables of our raw data or complete ethnographic descriptions. This information is available in Latham (1979) and Madonna (n.d.).

The Pattern of Referrals

A referral is a request to have a child diagnosed for special educational needs. In response to a referral, a school psychologist does an individual psychological evaluation which involves conferring with parents, teachers or administrators, and observing the child in the classroom, along with analyzing test results to make a recommendation for the child's program.

Traditionally, there were a small number of referrals in which the psychologist became involved in a core evaluation of the child. This process involves a meeting in which an individual educational plan is developed for the child by a team of educational professionals and administrators working with the parents. Cases with core evaluations require much more staff interaction and take considerably more time than those limited to individual psychological evaluations, but as we have seen,

is thought that team evaluations are more comprehensive and
that they best meet the civil rights provisions of Chapter 766
and P.L. 94-142 by providing an institutionalized structure in
which the interests of the child and parent can be represented
in plans for the child.

Beginning with the academic year 1974-1975, Chapter 766
provides that a referral for core evaluation may be made by a
teacher, a school official, a judicial officer, any person
having custody of the child, a social worker, or a family
doctor. Children may ask any of these people to refer them for
a diagnostic evaluation, and between the ages of eighteen and
twenty-one they may refer themselves. In addition to referral
by these agents, there are a number o. conditions involving
records of academic failure or suspension where referral is
automatic. The law specifies that a school psychologist or
counselor must respond to each of these referrals.

Considering the number of people who can make referrals,
and the extensive demands of each referral, a number of prac-
titioners and researchers have expressed concern over the
capacity of the schools to handle the load (Parker 1975,
Weatherly & Lipsky 1977, and Braddock 1977). In response to
this concern, one purpose of our study was to examine the pattern
of referrals under the new law.

Since Chapter 766 took effect, the number of referrals has
increased at a steady rate. Keeping in mind that 1973-1974 was
the year preceeding enactment and 1974-1975 t.. first year under

the law, we can examine the following figures for the Worcester Public Schools (see Table I):

Table I: INCREASE IN REFERRALS AND CORE EVALUATIONS UNDER 766

	Referrals	Core Evaluations
1973-1974	1921	275
1974-1975	2159	649
1975-1976	2220	673
1976-1977	2971	759
1977-1978	3349	1033

We can see that in the first year of the law ('74-'75) there was a 12% increase in referrals, with a 136% increase in core evaluations. Core evaluations jumped from 14% of the cases in '73-'74, to 30% of the cases in '74-'75, the first year of compliance, and this relationship has held constant in succeeding years. Over the four years under the law, referrals show an average rate of increase of 12% per year and core evaluations 17% per year. As of 1977-1978, referrals had increased 74% over the base year, and core evaluations 276% over the base year. A check of the figures for the current year (on April 2, 1979), indicates that this trend is holding and we project 1208 core evaluations for the 1978-1979 academic year.

The Worcester School system was able to respond to this increased load by doubling the number of school psychologists in its Child Study Department, and by creating a new department

of Special Education. This department is staffed by special
education teachers who coordinate the system's response to core
evaluation cases. Althought there is a considerable backlog of
cases, these responses have been adequate to meet the demands
to date. However, the continued increase in the rate of refer-
rals and of core evaluations during a time of declining enrol-
lment and shrinking budgets does not bode well for the future.

Under current conditions the backlog of cases is bound to
increase, but other patterns that may be of equal concern appear
to be developing in these referrals and in the school's response
to them. Clcse analysis of our cases indicates that four trends
may be developing:

1. Parents make more referrals in participative schools
than in bureaucratic schools, while school staff make more
referrals in bureaucratic schools.

2. Referrals by parents are more often directed to
generalist-oriented school psychologists, while referrals
by school staff go more often to specialist-oriented
psychologists.

3. When parents make referrals the school's services are
the problem, when school staff make referrals the
behavior of the child is the problem.

4. Parent referrals are more often simple cases, while
school referrals are more often complex cases.

With regard to the first trend, a statistical breakdown of
our cases shows that parents made eight referrals in bureau-

cratic schools and eighteen in participative schools, while
school staff made twenty-four referrals in bureaucratic schools
and fourteen in participative schools. A simple Chi Square test
shows this difference to be significant at the .05 level:

Table II: PARENT AND STAFF REFERRALS IN BUREAUCRATIC AND
PARTICIPATIVE SCHOOLS

	Parents	Staff	
Bureaucratic	8	24	$x^2 = 5.6$
			p .05
Participative	18	14	

This pattern is in accord with what we know theoretically
about the two organizational types, and it is consistent with
the intent of mainstreaming legislation. From our cases, it
appears that bureaucratic school staff make more referrals than
participative school staff because special needs children have a more
disruptive effect on their programs. Parents make more than
twice as many referrals in participative schools than in bureau-
cratic schools because the decentralized collaborative nature of
those settings provides more access to the decision-making
process. Mainstreaming laws assume participative settings will
be more responsive to inputs from parents, and on this point
our findings provide evidence that the law's mandate for
collaborative organization in special needs cases is well-
founded. However, to date, the intent of the law has only been
realized with organizations that were participative to begin
with.

A second theoretical premise and intent of Chapter 766 is also affected by patterns revealed in our cases. For the sixty-four cases on this study, generalist-oriented school psychologists received thirteen referrals from school staff, while specialists received twenty-five (almost twice as many). This trend is reversed for parent referrals, where generalists received seventeen referrals and specialists received nine. The difference is significant at the .05 level in a Chi Square test.

Table III: PARENT AND STAFF REFERRALS TO SPECIALISTS AND GENERALISTS

	Parent	School	
Specialist	9	25	$x^2 = 4.88$
Generalist	17	13	p .05

These statistics reflect a pattern in which school staff attempt to identify the problem before making the referral, and then refer to the person they feel is the specialist in that area. Parent referrals are usually not pre-defined in terms of the school's specialties, so these cases are most often directed to a generalist. This conforms to what organizational theory leads us to expect in a centralized system with department specialties. However, it is not consistent with the intent of the new laws. Chapter 766 and P.L. 94-142 are designed to promote comprehensive evaluation of each child's case, and the process can be weakened when pre-referral decisions are made by the staff.

The pattern of referrals to specialists vs. generalists raises a second concern that is perhaps more subtle. In a close examination of the cases, it becomes apparent that it is the specialist-generalist orientation of the psychologists, and not their child or school-orientation that is most salient to staff and parents; there is virtually no difference in the rate of referrals by parents and staff to child-vs. school-oriented psychologists. The significance of this will become clearer in later sections of this report where we demonstrate that it is the client orientation of the psychologists that most affects their handling of a case, and not their degree of specialization.

The third pattern in the referrals does not have statistical significance, but its strength and educational significance does bear comment. In a close analysis of staff referrals, we find that they consistently identified the problem as being in the child or in the home. Children are referred because their poor social behavior disrupts the class, or because academically or developmentally they are falling behind and sometimes holding back their classmates. We can characterize staff referrals as statements that, try as he or she might, the child is not learning, or is stopping others from learning. The staff referral is usually a call for help or for relief from the problem child. In such cases, the parents are confronted with a message that the behavior of their child is the problem to be corrected.

In contrast to this, we find in parent referrals a

consistent message that the school is not meeting the needs of the child. Parents refer their children because they are dissatisfied with the academic progress of their child, or because they believe the child has a physical handicap or developmental problem that the school is not responding to. We can characterize a parent referral as a statement or belief that the child has a problem that is not being resolved by the school. In such cases the staff are confronted by a message that their services are the problem. Parent referrals are requests for more services from the school.

The implicit confrontation in staff and parent referrals often puts one party or the other on the defensive. It creates an adversarial atmosphere that can cause cases to be extremely time-consuming, and it defeats the collaborative intent of the legislation.

The fourth referral pattern that we found to be affecting implementation of Chapter 766 is that a majority of staff-referred cases are complex (63%) while the majority of parent-referred cases are simple (61%). Since most staff referrals are in bureaucratic setting, this means that most complex cases are being handled in the organizational settings least prepared to handle them, while the participative schools with the capacity to handle complex cases as the law intended are receiving the majority of simple cases. This diminishes the effectiveness of the legislation, and it amplifies the burden of the growing case load in the bureaucratic schools.

As a final note on the pattern of referrals, we found that, despite the wide range of individuals who can now make referrals under the law, the referrals in our cases came from either the school staff or parents.

Summary of Referral Patterns

An analysis of our cases provides support for the theoretical underpinnings and legislative intent of Chapter 766 and P.L. 94-142. However, our data also shows that the number of referrals and core evaluations under the law is increasing at a constant rate and may soon exceed the capacity of the schools to respond. Close examination of our cases also reveals that, organization-ally, the schools have been little changed by implementation of the legislation, and that the increased case load ¬ d adversarial nature of the referral system has produced a stressful environment in the schools.

To examine the school psychologist's adaptive response to these conditions, we will now review patterns in the cases of the four types of psychologist in our matrix.

THE RESPONSE OF THE SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST

Using our review of the literature and preliminary observations we identified client orientation and degree of specialization as two important dimensions of the school psychologist's role. In a systematic comparison of the sixty-four cases in our matrix, we found that the client orientation of the psychol-

ogists has the greatest influence on their day-to-day functions.

We suggest that client orientation is dominant in the school psychologist's activity because the referral system casts school psychologists as mediators between the interests of the school and the needs and demands of the children and their parents. This situation creates a double bind that is a source of considerable role conflict. Since school psychologists are employed by the school, there is an expectation that they will serve its interests in a case; if the outcome of a case makes heavy demands on school resources, they provoke administrative disapproval. However, they are also child psychologists who are expected to meet the needs of the child; if the outcome of a case does not fully meet the child's needs, they experience a sense of professional failure.

The school psychologist faces a classical no-win situation in which the totally neutral ground is untenable. To resolve this dilemma, each individual adopts an explicit stance as either a school-oriented or child-oriented psychologist. Each stance is supported by a rationale and a sense of compromise.

School-oriented psychologists function as members of the school's staff. While they know children may have a wide range of developmental, personal and family problems, they feel that they can best meet their needs by working through the school's organization and the resources it has to offer. They recognize that this compromise position falls short of meeting all the child's needs, but they say "...we have to be realistic in a

public school situation. We have to pick up at the door and
end at the door...We have the kid from eight to three, so we're
going to work with him from eight to three...We know about
curriculum, and that's what we have to offer in schools, so
let's gear the curriculum to the child's needs."

Child-oriented psychologists take an explicit stance as
child advocates: "One of the best things going for us is that
the Child Study Department is outside the school structure.
This allows us to be an advocate for the child and family from
outside the school...Schools are academic environments that help
kids learn to read and do math---but we're not very good at that
---our skills are finding out why kids don't read and do math
because of the social and environmental influences on them."
Working consciously as outsiders, child-oriented psychologists
go into the school to find out what has gone wrong, and suggest
ways that the school could make things better for that child.
Recognizing that there are limits on the school's ability to
respond as an organization to each child, they compromise by
helping individual staff members adjust to the child's needs
while they work to develop the child's ability to cope with the
school's program.

Child Orientation Vs. School Orientation in a Case

Latham found that the cases of school psychologists exhibit
a sequence of four phases: entry, differentiation, integration,
and synthesis (Latham 1979). Each phase serves a definite pur-
pose in the resolution of a case. Several different methods are

available to accomplish the tasks associated with each phase, and it is the variation in preferred methods that provides the clearest distinction between child-oriented and school-oriented psychologists.

Entry Phase

Entry is an exploratory phase in which the psychologist gets oriented to the case and organizes procedures for gathering data. Child-oriented psychologists most often use child interviews and tests during this phase, while school-oriented psychologists use case histories and staff interviews.

When child-oriented psychologists enter a case, they focus on the child as the client, and use interviews to find out who the child is and how he or she percieves the problem. The interview is the opening of a working relationship between the psychologist and the child. Individual tests, focused on the developmental level of the child, are also used. These may include Raven's, Leiter, Vineland, Fairview, Developmental Tests of Visual Perception, and use of the Family Drawing Projective Test. They prefer these tests because they reveal individual differences and abilities.

School-oriented psychologists enter a case by reviewing records to learn what services the child has received in the past and to understand the history of his or her academic needs. Their procedures are to use all the resources within the child's school before turning to special services available in the wider system. A review of records lets them know about what has been

tried with the child in that school. During this phase, they consistently administer achievement tests in addition to developmental ability tests. These always include a reading diagnos. test (WRAT, Spache, or Botel), and a math diagnostic test (Key Math or WRAT). This attention to achievement level reflects their view of the school as the orienting framework for working with the child; the emphasis is on the school's standards, and whether the child is having trouble meeting them.

Differentiation Phase

Differentiation is a diagnostic phase in which the psychologist identifies needs to be worked on in the case. Both child-oriented and school-oriented psychologists use testing and class visits during this phase, but there are important differences in the way they use these techniques.

Child-oriented psychologists continue to use developmental tests, but during this phase they select tests designed to reveal the strengths and problems of the particular child they are working with. In this way, they may use a slightly different combination or sequence of tests with each child.

To supplement test information, child-oriented psychologists will make several classroom visits to observe the child's behavior. Their purpose is to discover how the child is coping with the social interaction and academic demands of the class. They will also consult with the teacher for background on the case during their visits.

In contrast to the child-oriented psychologist's varied

use of testing, school-oriented psychologists use a consistent battery of tests during the differentiation phase. Their battery of tests provides a normative standard that allows them to predict the kinds of difficulties and successes a child will have in the school environment. The tests provide a framework within which they can categorize the child's needs for special education services. School-oriented psychologists also make class visits during the differentiation phase. Their principal purpose is to consult with the teacher to find out "what we have tried with the child." During their visits, they will observe the child to gain information on particular strengths or weaknesses identified by the teacher. At this time, they may suggest alternative techniques for the teacher to try, and they will discuss the outcome of these efforts during the next class visit.

Integration Phase

The integration phase is used to bring together people and resources that will be part of a plan to meet the needs diagnosed during differentiation. Conferences are consistently used by both types of psychologist, but again, there are important differences in child-oriented and school-oriented conferences.

Child-oriented psychologists consistently prefer to confer with one person at a time. On some occasions they meet with a guidance counselor and teacher together, or with the teacher and a parent, but overall, they prefer to have separate meetings with parents before and after testing, and they meet separately

with parents and school personnel in preparation for core team evaluations. Their conferences are a time of advocacy for the child, in which they promote personal involvement and under- standing of the child's needs among staff members. During the integration phase, they build an alliance of individuals who will work on the child's case.

School-oriented psychologists prefer team conferences. They use the conference as an opportunity for other school per- sonnel to consult with them for information and suggestions on a child's case. They plan a schedule of visits to a school around the availability of conference time with classroom tea- chers and other visiting specialists. Whenever possible, weekly conferences are scheduled with enough time to discuss several cases. Conferences are an opportunity to get to know the school's staff and resources so that they can be organized to meet the child's needs.

Synthesis Phase

The purpose of the synthesis phase is to define and im- plement the plan that best meets the child's needs within the school's resources. Conferences and Core Evaluation Team meetings are used during this phase. (A "core" is a meeting of an evaluation team brought together by a chairperson designated by the Special Education Depatrment. Its purpose is to write an individualized educationa. plan for the child's special needs as required by Chapter 766.)

A core meeting is controlled by the team's members and

chair. It runs contrary to the child-oriented psychologist's preference for working with people individually, and they will hold conferences with core team members prior to the meeting in order to review the case. They will also counsel the parents and the child in preparation for the meeting. During the meeting they assume their positions as advocates for the child's interests and draw on the alliances they have built during the earlier phases of the case. Their goal is to have the school organize or reorganize its staff and resources to meet the individual needs of the child.

Prior to a core evaluation, school-oriented psychologists have usually been working with the core team members as an informal team. During a core team meeting, they simply continue this relationship. They serve as consultants and information resources to the team, and work as facilitators to help the team make the best use of the staff and resources available.

When the team agrees on a plan for the child, child-oriented psychologists consistently assume responsibility for following up on the child's placement, working again to help the staff understand the child's needs and the new plan. School-oriented psychologists consistently relinquish that responsibility to a special education teacher, or any other person delegated in the written educational plan.

Child Orientation Vs. School Orientation in Bureaucratic Vs. Participative Schools

With a basic understanding of how child-oriented and school-

oriented psychologists handle their cases, we can now gain fur-
ther insight into their approaches by contrasting their work in
bureaucratic and participative schools.

Length of Cases

The most tangible difference between the two types of psy-
chologist is the variation in the length of their cases in the
two types of school. The length of a case is measured by the
number of contact units it has. In this study, a contact unit
is a behavioral unit of analysis. A contact unit occurs any-
time the psychologist undertakes and completes a task used to
resolve the case. Examples of contact units are: an interview
with the child, a test session, a parent conference, a class
visit, and a team meeting.

Table IV displays the average number of units per case for
child-oriented and school-oriented psychologists in bureaucratic
and participative schools:

Table IV: AVERAGE LENGTH OF CASE BY TYPE OF PSYCHOLOGIST
AND SCHOOL

	Child-Oriented	School-Oriented
Bureaucratic	12.5 units (SD 3.34)	6.25 units (SD 2.41)
Participative	23.6 units (SD 5.87)	6.75 units (SD 2.43)

Two things are apparent from this table: Child-oriented
cases are much longer than school-oriented cases, and child-

oriented cases in participative schools are twice as long as
cases in bureaucratic schools, while the length of school-
oriented cases is virtually the same in both settings.

Child-oriented cases are longer than school-oriented cases
because they have a greater number of conference units and units
of direct service to the child. Child-oriented psychologists
gather information in their case through direct contact with
the child, and they prefer to work out educational plans through
one-to-one contact with the parents and staff involve. School-
oriented psychologists, on the other hand, use fewer direct con-
tact units with the child, and their use of team meetings to
develop educational plans greatly reduces the number of one-to-
one conference units in their cases.

This pattern is amplified when we compare the work of the
two types of psychologists in the two kinds of school. Child-
oriented psychologists prefer to work in participative schools.
These schools provide an opportunity to reach out to a wide
range of individuals who may influence the child's behavior -
including anyone on the school staff, family members, and com-
munity service agencies. Under these conditions, their cases
are twice as long as the cases of school-oriented psychologists.

The cases of school-oriented psychologists are relatively
short in both types of school. They use a standard set of pro-
cedures in both schools, and they work with the staff as a team
in both settings, so there is little variation in case length
from one school to the other. School-oriented psychologists

prefer to work in the high structure settings of bureaucratic schools, which provide them with a consistent organization of staff and resources with which to work.

This discussion of the distribution of units in a case can be used to clarify an important distinction between the two types of psychologist. In absolute numbers, child-oriented psychologists have more units of contact with children and staff than school-oriented psychologists, but conference units represent 61% of the units in child-oriented cases, while child contact units account for 30% of the units. For school-oriented cases, conference units represent 34% of the units and child contact units constitute 48% of the units. This means that child-oriented psychologists spend twice as much of their time working with school staff and other adults as they do with children, while school-oriented psychologists spend more of their time in contact with children than with staff. While this may seem contradictory at first glance, this distribution reinforces our sense of the advocacy role of child-oriented psychologists. They work with the staff to get them to adjust to the child's needs. It is also consistent with the functioning of school-oriented psychologists, who work to locate children in existing programs, and thus need less contact time with the staff.

A review of the four phases of a case as they are handled in bureaucratic and participative schools will help to understand the nature of those settings and provide further insight into the functioning of the two types of psychologist.

Entry Phase

Child-oriented psychologists prefer to enter a case through direct contact with the child in interviews. However, in bureaucratic schools they frequently modify this approach by discussing the case with teachers first. In participative schools they consistently work with the child first.

In contrast to the child-oriented psychologists, school-oriented psychologists do not vary their entry approach. They prefer a review of records and a teacher conference, and they are able to use these procedures consistently in both schools.

Differentiation

We have seen that child-oriented cases in participative schools are much longer than other cases. Much of this is attributable to a large number of child contact units and conferences during the differentiation phase. Child-oriented psychologists use the participative setting to thorougly explore the child's needs through interviews, tests and classroom observations. They also use conferences with parents to share information and to encourage their participation in planning for the child's needs in the school. Conferences with staff are used to gain information and to advocate for the child's needs during this phase.

School-oriented psychologists don't vary from their use of a standard battery of tests and staff interviews, and generate very few contact units during this phase.

Conferences with school principals also occur during this

phase, and provide a marked contrast between the two types of psychologist.

Child-oriented psychologists had principal conferences in all of their participative schools. They view these occasions as two-way information exchanges in which they can begin to negotiate the details of a new educational plan for the child. In bureaucratic schools, they had principal conferences in less than 18% of their cases, and these were at the request of the principal. Child-oriented psychologists avoid principals in bureaucratic settings to escape their directives on how a case should be handled. Their role as advocate for the child creates a tension between them and bureaucratic school administrators, and it is in these settings that they display the strongest tendency to function as outsiders to the school, turning to other outside professionals to corroborate their diagnosis and plan for the child.

School-oriented psychologists consistently work with principals, in conferences (most often in bureaucratic schools), or by their inclusion on staff teams. The goal of these psychologists is to make effective use of the school's staff and resources to meet the child's needs, and they consider the principal to be an important ally in this effort. They build strong relationships with the principals of bureaucratic schools because they recognize their ability to control decisions affecting the child.

Integration Phase

During the integration phase, psychologists use parent and staff conferences to bring together t e people who will plan and implement a program for the child. This is done differently by the two types of psychologist in bureaucratic and participative schools.

In their work with parents, child-oriented psychologists continue to encourage participation. They explain the details of the case, and they help parents to articulate their concerns to the school's staff. They avoid team meetings with school staff at this time because, in such meetings, they would have to confront the school's staff as an organized unit, and they prefer to negotiate on an individual basis for adjustments to the child's needs.

School-oriented psychologists use parent conferences to inform the parents about the academic needs of the child. They believe that the school is a provider of sound educational services, and that they, as educational professionals, should assume a leaders ip role in educating parents about ways of meeting the needs of their children. They assume this role more often in bureaucratic schools where it is administratively delegated to them. During the integration phase of a case they rely heavily on the team conferences they have had with staff to plan a program for the child. They do not differ in this pattern between bureaucratic and participative schools.

Synthesis Phase

The synthesis phase is the time when all the parties to a case agree on the educational plan for the child. It is during this phase that the core evaluation teams provided for under Chapter 766 may meet. Since "cores" have a powerful influence over the direction of a case, school psychologists ally themselves with these teams in their preferred school settings, and they avoid them in the opposite settings.

In our study, child-oriented psychologists had sixteen cases in participative schools, and thirteen of them (81%) had core team evaluations. They also had sixteen cases in bureaucratic schools, but only six of those cases (37%) had core evaluations. Of the school-oriented psychologists' sixteen cases in participative schools, nine (56%) had cores, while fourteen of their sixteen cases (87%) had cores in bureaucratic schools. A Chi Square test of these differences is significant at the .05 level (Table V).

Table V: NUMBER OF CORE EVALUATIONS FOR SCHOOL-ORIENTED VS. CHILD-ORIENTED PSYCHOLOGISTS IN BUREAUCRATIC AND PARTICIPATIVE SCHOOLS

	School-Oriented	Child-Oriented
Bureaucratic Schools	14	6
Participative Schools	9	13

During a core evaluation the school psychologist's role is

to provide expert information to the team members and to assist parents in their participation on the team.

Child-oriented psychologists provide information as out- siders. On collaborative teams they provide their diagnosis and negotiate for the best plan to meet the child's needs. On bureaucratic teams it is not uncommon for them to bring in the opinions of other outside professionals (such as M.D.'s, psy- chiatrists, or other specialists in the school system) to sup- port their plan. On both kinds of team they work as interpreters for the parents, helping them to understand what is happening in the meeting and helping them to articulate their concerns.

School-oriented psychologists act as consultants to the team members in all cases. They provide expert information on how the team can best achieve its objective with the child. In working with the parents they believe that the team will develop a professional plan that is best for the child, and that it is their responsibility to explain it to the parents so they can work effectively with it.

Child-Oriented Vs. School-Oriented Core Evaluations

The use of core evaluation teams is one of the principal provisions of Chapter766, and a majority of our cases (42 out of 64) had cores. An analysis of the decisions resulting from these cases contributes to our understanding of the interactions of child- and school-oriented psychologists with bureaucratic and participative settings.

The intent of the law is to have the teams develop an

individual educational plan that meets the child's needs in the least restrictive setting possible. In our study we considered regular classroom placements to be the least restrictive settings, and resource room placements to be restrictive settings because they separate children from the educational mainstream. In the following analysis, the kind of placement (resource room or regular classroom) will be used as an indicator of the team's decision process.

The first point we must make is that there was no difference in the pattern of resource room and regular room placements when we compared bureaucratic with participative schools. This means that the decision-making process of the teams was independent of the organizational structure in which they worked. The principals of both kinds of school have often expressed concern that, faced with the use of teams of outside specialists to formulate educational plans, they would lose control over the educational process in their schools. Our sixty-four case studies indicate that their concerns are well-founded. But we must also note that it was the intent of Chapter 766 to break the influence of traditional school structures over special education cases, and from that point of view, the use of core evaluation teams would appear to be effective.

In our study we classified the organizational dynamics of teams as bureaucratic or collaborative. It appears that the type of team has a strong effect on the kind of placement for the child.

Autocratic core evaluation teams account for the outcome
of twenty of our cases. Of that number, seventeen cases resulted
in a resource room placement for the child, while three cases
had regular room placements. Collaborative core evaluation
teams handled twenty-two of our cases. Six of these cases had
resource room placements and sixteen had regular room placements.
A Chi Square test of these differences is significant at the .01
level (see table VI).

Table VI: KIND OF PLACEMENT BY KIND OF TEAM

	Resource Room	Regular Room
Bureaucratic Team	17	3
Collaborative Team	6	16

Mainstreaming legislation such as Chapter 766 and P.L. 94-
142 assumes that all teams will function in accord with the
principles of participative management, making non-standardized
decisions that are sensitive to individual needs. We find,
however, that some teams function in accord with bureaucratic
principles. They often use non-consensual procedures in which
one or two individuals use the administrative authority of the
team chair to control the decision, and when faced with the
unique needs of exceptional children, they follow the bureau-
cratic principle of using separate placements that minimize
disruption of mainstream activities and efficiently concentrate

special services in one setting. In so doing, they uninten-
tionally defeat the intent of the legislation.

The outcomes of collaborative team decisions, on the other
hand, support the law's assumption that when an interdisciplinary
team operates in a collaborative manner it will be able to find
or make a high rate of special needs placements in mainstream
settings.

The effect of a team's organization on a case becomes even
stronger if we distinguish between complex and simple cases.
Complex cases make heavy demands for school resources and staff
collaboration. Simple cases require minimal resources and little
staff interaction. From the point of view of bureaucratic theory,
complex cases have the greatest potential of disrupting the
school's organization, while simple cases pose less threat to
mainstream activities.

Table VII shows that, in our study, bureaucratic teams never
placed a complex case in the mainstream; they used separate
resource room placements without exception for these cases In
contrast, collaborative teams again placed about two-thirds of
their complex cases in mainstream settings. This difference is
significant in a Chi Square test at the .01 level.

Table VII: KIND OF PLACEMENT BY TYPE OF TEAM, CONTROLLING
FOR KIND OF CASE

| | Complex | | | Simple | |
	Regular Room	Resource Room		Regular Room	Resource Room
Bureaucratic Team	12	0	$x^2 = 9.19$ p .01	5	3
Collaborative Team	4	8		2	8

Table VII also shows that for simple cases the rate of separate placements by bureaucratic teams is lower, reflecting the willingness of the team to deal with the minimal demands of some of these cases in the mainstream.

The organizational dynamics of a team strongly affect the outcome of a case, but the effect is not independent of the kind of school psychologist in the case. Table VIII (page 57) reveals that there is a significant interaction between the client orientation of the psychologist and the way that bureaucratic and collaborative teams handle complex and simple cases.

Table VIII shows that when we control for the client orientation of the psychologist, the effect of the kind of team on a case is stronger for school-oriented psychologists, but weaker for child-oriented psychologists. A Fisher's Exact Test shows the outcome for school-oriented psychologists on complex cases to be significant beyond the .01 level (P = .0046).

This finding is consistent with what we have learned about the working styles of the two types of psychologist. School-oriented psychologists work with their teams as facilitators. Their actions tend to amplify the tendency of a bureaucratic team to use separate placements, while they support the colla-borative team's efforts to respond to a case with mainstream placement. This interaction of school-oriented psychologists with the two kinds of team is strong enough to even affect the placement of simple cases. Simple cases have a higher rate of separate placements when school-oriented psychologists work

Table VIII

A Comparison of Kind of Team and Kind of Individualized Educational Plan with Simultaneous Control for Kind of Case and Client Orientation of Psychologist

	COMPLEX CASE				SIMPLE CASE			
	School-Oriented		Child-Oriented		School-Oriented		Child-Oriented	
	Resource Room	Regular	Resource Room	Regular	Resource Room	Regular	Resource Room	Regular
Bureaucratic Team	7	0	5	0	3	1	2	2
Collaborative Team	1	5	3	3	1	5	1	3

$P = .0046$

61

62

with bureaucratic teams.

If we compare these outcomes to the outcomes of complex and simple cases with child-oriented psychologists, we see that the effect of the kind of team is much weaker. They work as outsiders to the team, using pre-team conferences to develop a plan for the child, and this activity, in conjunction with their child advocate stance, tends to dampen the placement patterns of the teams.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS ON THE RESPONSE OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS

Organizations are social entities constructed by the adaptive interactions of their members. In the referral system created by mainstreaming legislation, school psychologists find themselves in a double bind between two potential clients. Their response to this dilemma is to choose either the child or the school as the principal client to serve.

Child-oriented psychologists assume the role of child advocates, working as outsiders to the school. Their goal is to have the school be as responsive as possible to the individual needs of each child, and to this end they prefer to help staff members adjust their educational approach to the child on a one-to-one basis.

School-oriented psychologists prefer to work as members of the educational staff. Their goal is to find a way to serve the child through whatever programs and resources the school

has available. To this end, they prefer to work as facili-
tators, enhancing the existing approach of the organization to
the child.

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Massachusetts Chapter 766 and P.L. 94-142 are state and
federal attempts to bring about local-level change in schools.
They mandate new forms of organization as a way of altering a
history of separate education for special needs children. Their
use of collaborative team concepts is well-grounded in current
social theory, however, the attempt to use a state-level mandate
to blue-print local level change is not.

Social organizations are not objects that can be designed
and put into place without influence from the people who will
work in them. In response to a new set of organizational re-
quirements, individuals will adaptively transform existing roles
and organizational procedures. The consequence is that legis-
lation can take a wide variety of forms when it is implemented
through the local schools (Weatherly & Lipsky 1977). We have
found this to be the case in our study, but do not conclude
from this that the laws should be abandoned or that local-level
school personnel have not been well-intentioned. We conclude that
a natural social process is at work, and that we should find a
way to work with it to make the intent of the law a reality.

School psychologists must work with a referral system that

creates an adversarial relationship between parents and the
school. They must also work with teams that do not always fun-
ction in the collaborative fashion the law intended. To cope
with these conditions some psychologists have become child
advocates, while others have become members of the school's
staff. These responses resolve the school psychologist's
double bind by providing an unambiguous role to work in, but
we suggest that the overall effect of these roles limits the
ability of school psychologists to serve their clients.

The child-oriented psychologist's advocacy role is essential
in staff-referrals that pre-diagnose the behavior of the child
as the problem, but when these cases are handled by school-
oriented psychologists the advocacy role is not filled.

On the other hand, when cases grow out of a parent referral
the parents assume the role of child adovcate by demanding that
more of the school's services be directed to meeting their child's
needs. School-oriented psychologists with their preference for
working with the school to "gear the curriculum to the child"
may have a more effective response to these cases than the
child-oriented psychologists.

Child-oriented psychologists prefer to work through one-
to-one contact with school staff. This approach is effective
in participative schools, but it limits their ability to work
in bureaucratic schools, and it consumes sixty percent of their
time on a case; leaving less time for direct service contact
with the child.

School-oriented psychologists prefer to work in the high structure settings of bureaucratic schools, but with this orientation it is difficult for them to make effective use of the staff and resources available in participative schools.

The outsider's role of child-oriented psychologists and their preference for one-to-one interactions make it difficult for them to work with core evaluation teams. These are potentially high-conflict, tension-laden situations that make advocacy for the child a stressful process. They prefer to avoid the use of these teams when possible; especially when the teams are bureaucratic in bureaucratic settings.

School-oriented psychologists attempt to work with the teams to reach their objectives, but their tendency of reenforcing a core evaluation team's decision-making pattern reduces the impact of their own imput on the outcome of a case.

These findings indicate that school psychologists have generated role transformations in response to Chapter 766 that weaken their effectiveness as psychologists and limit their ability to implement the law. To work with this problem we suggest that school psychologists be trained in strategies of organization development. Organization design strategy assumes that: "It is the dynamics of the group, not the skills of its individual members, that is both the major source of problems and the primary determiner of the quality of soulutions. Although group process and procedures often obstruct the full use of

of human potential, they can, if coordinated smoothly,
allow the release of latent energy needed for responsiveness
and creativity" (Schmuck, et. al. 1977).

The role of school psychologists as "middlemen" between
the child's needs and the school's interests provides an
ideal position for the use of organization development
strategies.

With a sound understanding of organization design, child-
oriented psychologists could more effectively work with
bureaucratic schools and core evaluation teams. Adopting
strategies developed by school-oriented psychologists, they
could also shorten their cases by reducing the amount of
one-to-one staff contact time, and to further their child
advocacy role, they could pick up techniques for gearing the
curriculum to the child's needs.

School-oriented psychologists could use principles of
organization design to make better use of the staff and
resources in participative schools. Picking up the child
advocacy strategies of child-oriented psychologists, they
could also develop techniques that would give them greater
ability to influence the decisions of bureaucratic and
collaborative teams.

In response to passage of Chapter 766 and P.L. 94-142
the Massachusetts Department of Education, universities,
colleges, and local school systems have all made massive
investments in staff training and development. By far, the

largest proportion of these investments have been in skills

training (i.e.: the skills needed to diagnose and serve the

needs of special children). But, Chapter 766 and P.L. 94-142

explicitly mandate organizational change in schools, and

the implementation of these laws is a problem of organization

design. This report is not intended to diminsh the value of

skills train'ng. We simply mean to identify the need to train

staff in principles of organizational behavior, if we want

to see. any change in the way educational services are delivered

to special needs children in public schools.

REFERENCES CITED

Bardon, J.I.
    1976   "The State of the Art (and Science) of School Psych-
            ology." American Psychologist 42:4.

Bergan, J.R., Tombari, P., and Martin, L.
    1976   "Consultant Skill and Efficiency in the Implementation
            and Outcomes of Consultation." Journal of School
            Psychology 14:1.

Berger, P. and Luckmann, T.
    1966   Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the
            Sociology of Knowledge. New York: Doubleday.

Boston, B.O.
    1977   'Education Policy and the Education for All Handi-
            capped Children Act (P.L. 94-142). Washington, D.C.:
            Institute for Educational Leadership, George Wash-
            ington University.

Braddock, D.
    1977   Opening Closed Doors: The Deinstitutionalization
            of Disabled Individuals. Reston, VA: Council for
            Exceptional Children.

Bronfenbrenner, U.
    1976   "The Experimental Ecology of Education." Educational
            Researcher 5:9.

Budoff, M.
    1975   "Engendering Change in Special Education Practices."
            Harvard Educational Review 45:4.

Ciccurel, A.
    1973   Cognitive Sociology. London: Penguin.

Cicourel, A., Jennings, K., Jennings, S., Leiter, K., MacKay, R.,
    1974   Mehan, H., and Roth, D.
            Language Use and School Performance. New York:
            Academic Press.

Galbraith, J.R.
    1977   Organization ◼sign.   Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Gearing, F., and Hughes,W. with Carroll, T., Precourt, W., and
    1975   Smith, A.
            On Observing Well. Project in Ethnography in Education
            Final Report OEG-0-70-2052.

Gilmore, G.
    1974   "Models for School Psychology: Dimensions, Barriers
            and Implications." Journal of School Psychology 12:2

Goodenough, W.
    1971   Description and Comparison. Chicago: Aldine.

Hanson, M.E.
    1979   Educational Administration and Organizational Behavior.
            Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Hohenshill, T. "The Vocational School Psychologist." The
    1974   School Psychologist Digest 3:3.

Kennedy, M.M.
    1978   "Developing an Evaluation Plan for Public Law 94-142."
            New Directions for Program Evaluation No. 2. San Fran-
            cisco: Jossey-Bass.

Latham, E. F.
    1978   "Perception of Self and Client: An Ethnographic Study
            of the School Psychologist." Ann Arbor: University
            Microfilms.

Laurence, P.R. and Lorsch, J.W.
    1967   Organization and Environment. Boston: Division of
            Research, Harvard Business School.

  Lewin, K.
    1935   A Dynamic Theory of Personality. New York: McGraw-
            Hill.

Likert, R.
    1972   The Likert Profile of a School. Ann Arbor: Rensis
            Likert Associates.

Madonna, J.
    (n.d.) Dissertation in process.

Magoon, A.J.
    1977   "Constructivist Approaches in Educational Research."
            Review of Educational Research 47:4.

Mehan, H.
    1978   "Structuring School Structure." Harvard Educational
            Review 48:1.

Milofsky, C.O.
    1974   "Why Special Education Isn't Special." Harvard Edu-
            cational Review 44:4.

Parker, C.A.
    1975.   Psychological Consultation: Helping Teachers Meet
            Special Needs. Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional
            Children.

Rist, R.
    1977   "On the Relations among Educational Research Paradigms:
            From Disdain to Detente." Anthropology and Education
            Quarterly 8:2.

Schlecty, P.C.
    1976   Teaching and Social Behavior. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Schmuck, R.A., Runkel, P.J., Arends, J.H. and Arends, R.
    1977   The Second Handbook of Organization Development in
            Schools. Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield Publishing Co.

Task Force on Children Out of School
    1971   The Way We Go to School: The Exclusion of Children
            In Boston. Boston: Beacon Press.

Tyack, D.
    1974   The One Best System: A History of American Urban
            Education. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

Weatherly, R. and Lipsky, M.
    1977   "Street-Level Bureaucrats and Institutional Inno-
            vation: Implementing Special Education Reform."
            Harvard Educational Review 47:2.

Wolcott, H.
    1973   The Man in the Principal's Office: an Ethnography.
            New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.