DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 325 943 EA 022 431

AUTHOR Dunlap, Diane M.; Goldman, Paul
TITLE Power as a "System of Authority" versus Power as a "System of Facilitation".
PUB DATE Apr 90
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Boston, MA, April 16-20, 1990).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Responsibility; Administrator Role; Clinical Supervision (of Teachers); Collegiality; Cooperation; *Educational Administration; Elementary Secondary Education; Instructional Leadership; Models; Needs Assessment; Organizational Climate; *Participative Decision Making; Personnel Management; *Power Structure; Professional Development; Program Evaluation; Resource Allocation; School Restructuring; Shared Resources and Services; Special Education; Vertical Organization

ABSTRACT

An alternative conceptualization of organizational power is proposed. Power as a "system of facilitation," in contrast to power as a "system of authority" is explored and related to educational administration practices. The educational trends of clinical supervision and individualized programming within special education are analyzed to illustrate how the redefinition of power as a facilitative system presents a viable alternative paradigm. Characteristics of facilitative power include increased autonomy and decision making of professional staff, encouragement of innovative problem-solving approaches, and reduction of the centrality of the administrator role. Professional power generated by a system of facilitation, or power through others, is distinguished from formal authority, or power over others. A conclusion is that professional power is most effective in truly professional settings, of which individual autonomy is a primary element. (44 references) (LMI)

POWER AS A "SYSTEM OF AUTHORITY" VERSUS POWER AS A "SYSTEM OF FACILITATION"

Diane Dunlap & Paul Goldman
Department of Educational Policy & Management
College of Education
University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403-1215
(503) 346-5077 FAX 346-5174

Paper Presented at the Annual Meetings of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, April 20, 1990

POWER AS A "SYSTEM OF AUTHORITY" VERSUS POWER AS A "SYSTEM OF FACILITATION"

I. Introduction

The educational reform movement has been changing how power is exercised in schools, yet academic theories about organizational power have not anticipated these changes. We continue to characterize power as a system of authority that depends heavily on formal organizational roles. For example, most research in educational administration describes how leaders (usually principals and superintendents) exercise power from the top down. They simultaneously manage and lead, coach and evaluate. They also mediate environmental pressures, coordinate diverse activities, and try to provide a visible symbol of educational values and virtues. Even where these leaders do not visibly exercise power or influence over others, activities of others are directed <u>towards</u> them as decision-makers, problem solvers, and providers of organizational legitimacy and reward.

The centrality of these formal roles embodies an intellectual thesis about power which argues that authority structures mirror actual influence and that power flows vertically (hierarchical authority). The traditional antitheses to this argument is that power is pervasive and no structure is needed (anarchism) or that power is pervasive and all may have equal vote in decisions (participative democracy). Both of these arguments are extreme stances that seem impractical and do not reflect what occurs in most large complex organizations. Similarly, few argue that top-down hierarchies in schools fully describes how power is actually exercised.

In this paper we propose an alternative conceptualization to traditional interpretations of organizational power. Power as a "system of facilitation" is characterized by mutuality and synergy <u>within</u> the structured organizational setting of public schools. We develop the argument by presenting and critiquing the prevailing authoritative emphasis in writings on power. We then introduce and dismiss the participatory and libertarian

POWER AS A "SYSTEM OF AUTHORITY" VERSUS POWER AS A "SYSTEM OF FACILITATION"

I. Introduction

The educational reform movement has been changing how power is exercised in schools, yet academic theories about organizational power have not anticipated these changes. We continue to characterize power as a system of authority that depends heavily on formal organizational roles. For example, most research in educational administration describes how leaders (usually principals and superintendents) exercise power from the top down. They simultaneously manage and lead, coach and evaluate. They also mediate environmental pressures, coordinate diverse activities, and try to provide a visible symbol of educational values and virtues. Even when these leaders do not visibly exercise power or influence over others, activities of others are directed towards them as decision-makers, problem solvers, and providers of organizational legitimacy and reward.

The centrality of these formal roles embodies an intellectual thesis about power which argues that authority structures mirror actual influence and that power flows vertically (hierarchical authority). The traditional antitheses to this argument is that power is pervasive and no structure is needed (anarchism) or that power is pervasive and all may have equal vote in decisions (participative democracy). Both of these arguments are extreme stances that seem impractical and do not reflect what occurs in most large complex organizations. Similarly, few argue that top-down hierarchies in schools fully describes how power is actually exercised.

In this paper we propose an alternative conceptualization to traditional interpretations of organizational power. Power as a "system of facilitation" is characterized by mutuality and synergy within the structured organizational setting of public schools. We develop the argument by presenting and critiquing the prevailing authoritative emphasis in writings on power. We then introduce and dismiss the participatory and libertarian

approaches to power. We argue that educational reform, with increasing emphasis on collaboration and professionalism, makes a new approach particularly appropriate for interpreting what actually occurs in K-12 districts, schools, and classrooms. Finally, we examine two representative educational trends: clinical supervision and individualized educational programming within special education. These examples illustrate the extent to which a reconceptualization of power as a system of facilitation provides a better explanation of power in educational settings and is a viable alternative paradigm to defining power as a system of authority.

II. Traditional Definitions of Power

Educational administration's current authoritative definition of power can be found in the American Educational Research Association's Handbook of Research on Educational Administration (Boyan, 1987). In that handbook, Abbott and Caracheo (1987, p. 117) define power as:

> the most generic and most encompassing term in a conceptualization of domination in social interaction...a force that determines behavioral outcomes in an intended direction in a situation involving human interaction.

They argue that in practice the only two real sources of power in any organization are formal authority or prestige. Both are demonstrated only through dominance of others. Their approach characterizes power as a system of authority.

This definition is consistent with social science traditions of studying power, including those focusing specifically on power in organizations. Pfeffer (1981:3), for instance, urges us to recognize and measure power by "the ability of those who possess power to bring about the outcomes they desire." His discussion incorporates two significant issues: the presumed ability of those with power to overcome the resistance of others and the ability to obtain preferred outcomes where there is uncertainty or dissensus about choices (Pfeffer, 1981: 3-7). Abbott and Caracheo (1987: 242) explicitly exclude personal power, regarding

it as a psychological rather than organizational construct, while Pfeffer tries to integrate both personal and organizational dimensions. Like Abbott and Caracheo, Pfeffer's approach incorporates structure and function, and deals with consensus and conflict. These traditional treatments of power are consistent with both the structural-functionalist normative theories of Durkheim, Weber, and Parsons, and the conflict theories of Hobbes and Marx. Almost all such definitions of organizational power acknowledge power as fundamentally relational and interactive, but find the demonstration of power only in overt acts of domination.

In traditional theory, the primary alternative to power as domination in an authority system has been participatory management, sometimes expressed as classical European anarcho-syndicalism. The purely participative approach advocates employee election of management as well as policy development exercised through direct democracy (Bernstein, 1976; Zwerdling, 1980). This tradition, developed and sustained by employee ownership in the U.S. and Europe is relevant to the current discussions about site-based management of schools, but is difficult to visualize as either an explanation or a prescriptive model for today's public schools. The burden of externally imposed regulations and policies makes fully independent schools virtually impossible. The expectations of parents for a traditional symbol in the principalship also creates public relations issues. Teacher desires for classroom independence for themselves and for their colleagues also militate against full workplace democracy with explicit responsibility for professional peers. Because direct democracy necessarily increases meetings, it increases the time pressure most teachers already feel and increases uncertainty and ambiguity because democratic policy making is usually less stable and consistent than bureaucratic decree. As one teacher put it, "I would never go into a school which had a staffroom where every decision we made had to be by vote and we followed the vote" (Sikes, et al., 1985, p. 144). The same facts of organizational life make anarchic alternatives

infeasible. While definitions of power as a system of authority assume a gestalt of "top-downness," workplace democracy assumes an almost equally restrictive "bottom-upness," and anarchism allows no predictability at all. In practice, bottom-up systems, whether definable as formal or informal organization, serve as counter-balances to, rather than alternatives of, power exercised from the top down.

In practice, we know that principals', teachers', and superintendents' actions and expectations have theories of power built into them. For example, administrators have been described as coordinators, as circulators of information, as boundary spanners, and as conflict resolvers (Pitner, 1982). They do planning and scheduling and some budgeting. They have only limited access to what goes on in classrooms. Their activities are largely facilitative. Hanson (1985) and others argue that specific areas are ceded by teachers and administrators to one another while others are "contested spheres." However, current educational innovations--instructional leadership, site-based management, mainstreaming, clinical supervision--promise changes for teacher and administrator professionalism and for school organization itself in ways that may extend well beyond the shifting of specific contested spheres. These movements use professional knowledge, as a source of internal political power in new, often manipulative ways. The new knowledge and skills, however, may only serve to highlight areas of ignorance, curiously increasing interdependency, the need for trust, and the desirability of facilitative management. Moreover, they threaten the status quo, which had been based on professionally and organizationally defined autonomous spheres, and the organizational symbol structure which Meyer and Rowan (1977) remind us is rooted deeply in the experience and tradition of American schools.

III. Power and the Problem of Educational Professionalism

Traditional definitions are not adequate to describe and predict activities or relationships between professionals inside increasingly professional educational bureaucracies. The

sociological literature has emphasized conflicts between professional and bureaucratic orientations: professional expertise and ethics clash with bureaucratic needs for standardization and budgetary control. This argument misses the essence of both professionalism and power. Teachers and school administrators are professionals (Friedson, 1986). Their work has a knowledge base, involves coherent and extended training, some public recognition, a client orientation, and limited occupational self-regulation (Ritzer, 1977). More essential to teaching practice, however, is teachers' needs for embedded autonomy and judgmental discretion. Solutions to, or even approaches to, problems of individual and group learning cannot be reduced to standardized formulae. In fact, teachers frequently downgrade in word and deed bureaucratic preferences for standardized definitions of, and solutions to, professional issues they face. Professional requirements for dealing with these problems introduces sources of power and problem solving strategies that do not approximate top-down exercise of authority.

Significantly, teachers and administrators have become more professionalized as the knowledge base of teaching and learning has become larger and more sophisticated. Educational professions have become more specialized and differentiated. Training times have increased for entry programs and continuing education. Professional self-consciousness has grown as the major teacher unions have become, paradoxically, both more entrenched and legitimate, while at the same time becoming visible proponents of reform (Soltis, 1987). Similarly, administrative training has become more formal and rigorous, with added emphases on human relations and leadership skills. Specific knowledge and certification becomes a source of power outside the bureaucratic organization, yet are exercised within it. Note also that teachers historically have been vigilent in protecting the integrity of their own classroom and generally have not been willing to trespass on their colleagues' classrooms.

However, teachers and administrators are interdependent, with individual and collective "success" reflecting mutual dependence on each other. Research on effective, excellent, and exemplary schools and on school improvement has emphasized this relationship (Austin & Garber, 1985). The extent of cooperation and reinforcement between teachers and administrators is reflected in what they present and represent to their publics. Despite similar backgrounds, common experiences and shared workplaces, teachers and administrators often do not collaborate effectively with one another. Frequently they appear to occupy separate cognitive space, misunderstanding each other's actions and to compete in "contested spheres" (Hanson, 1985). This is frequently true as well for relationships between teachers with different specialties (Kerr, 1985). These problems come into sharper focus as schools struggle with increasing student diversity, the intrusion of family and community problems into schools, mainstreaming of handicapped children, and with "site-based management." Exercise of top-down, authoritative power in this setting of cross-cutting interdependencies often exacerbates tensions and makes problem-solving more difficult.

As educational reform creates both more professional tools and more professional interdependencies, instead of formulating policies and mandating compliance, administrators increasingly facilitate and broker interim solutions and subsequent adaptations. They use teachers to effect solutions and are used themselves. In the process, they help teachers use one another's knowledge in the absence of precisely shared expertise, knowledge bases, and assumptions. These activities implicitly recognize the existence of multiple solutions to complex educational problems.

A focus only on formal authority, dominance, and coercion--"power over"--ignores ways in which professionals actually use one another's power even where they may not understand it. They use "power through" one another, where learning and problem-solving are mutual and are negotiated on the basis of collegial, reciprocal norms. According to the rhetoric of school reform,

school leaders should help provide resources--human and material--that make their staffs more effective individually and help their staffs work together more effectively. This is accomplished through thoughtful and sensitive human resource management. In short, leaders are expected to use their expert administrative and teaching knowledge to facilitate through their formal authority position. Kanter (1989) argues that in the interdependent highly networked corporate world, giants must now learn to dance with one another. This is no less true of educators who, by traditional preference, have valued and defended their independence and autonomy. And educators have been learning to dance. The examples of special education and clinical supervision show how practice has preceded theoretical advances and thus leads us to a new definition of power as a system of facilitation.

IV. Illustrative Example 1: Special Education and the I.E.P. Process

What is power in special education and how is it exercised? Special education, in the post-P.L. 94-142 era, provides an illustration of how the context and the reality of power in school settings make it necessary to reconceptualize power. Program design and delivery in special education stress an almost continuous interactive process of assessment and instruction. It frequently requires the integration of interdependent, and sometimes competing, professional expertise and political interests. Typically, regular classroom teachers refer, school psychologists assess, principals facilitate, and teams consisting of several professionals place students and evaluate progress through the I.E.P. process. Specialists then deliver specific programs to individuals or small groups of students inside or outside of the regular classroom.

The I.E.P. process in special education has four singular features which have begun to spread to regular education as well. First, each situation--each child--is by definition special and unique, entitled to individual assessment and an individual program. With vague diagnostic categories, wide variation in

labels from jurisdiction to jurisdiction, and an imperfect fit between problems and available programs, most special needs children become "projects," subject to meetings, negotiations, and decisions (Zeller, 1990).

Second, special education is visibly iterative, in that placement decisions are not final and have to be reviewed and renewed explicitly at least on an annual basis. Moreover, regular and special education teachers and parents monitor progress during each year, and adjustments or changes in placement and program frequently occur in mid-year. Special education has an indeterminate nature, as educators search for programs that will "work" for each individual student.

Third, the current emphasis on mainstreaming blurs the boundaries between regular and special education. Special educators stress each student's individuality, focussing on specific techniques for identifiable problems. Regular classroom teachers, by contrast, are by necessity group oriented and norm-driven. The consultant model, whereby specialists work with teachers rather than directly with students (West & Idol, 1987) requires teachers to share space and students. Collaboration brings both tensions and opportunities as teachers seek to negotiate latent and manifest differences in pedogogic style and instructional philosophy, and learn for themselves how to work as a team rather than alone with students.

Fourth, special education is explicitly and implicitly a political process to which participants bring special rights and resources not always present in other educational settings. The I.E.P. process requires consensus: each participant must agree with the I.E.P. and affix his or her signature to the final document. While this regulation was designed to protect parents' and children's rights, it also gives teachers and specialists leverage. The ability to participate actively in the process is reinforced by expertise in special education and familiarity with the law. To summarize, special education has become less of a decision structure amenable to authoritative, top-down power, and

more of an open and continual political process that has multi-directional, multi-dimensional inputs and broad based legitimacy.

Authoritative power in these circumstances is not practical. Building administrators have difficulty developing and implementing policies where exception is the rule and where they must defer to staff expertise. Most principals have little training in special education (Davis, 1980; Clarke, 1984). In addition, they are often not knowledgeable abut current programmatic and legal issues that are especially important in special education. While principals assume responsibility for special services in their building, they are limited in their power because specialists are often itinerant, and report both to central office special education administration and to the building principals where their programs are housed (Lietz & Towle, 1979; Sage & Burrello, 1986). Central office staff may not be well informed about specific circumstances in each school building. Building administrators, seldom trained in special education, may not be knowledgeable about current legal and programmatic issues. Neither administration has complete control, and often they are competitive to the detriment of both staff relations on-site and of service to students. Facilitation to build cooperation between building and district headquarters and between specialists and generalists working at the same site is the ideal process for effectively achieving mutually acceptable educational goals.

In effect, no one has power and everyone has power. Successful special education programs have participants who use one another creatively and efficiently. Administrators provide resources, including space and funds for programs and meetings. Specialists provide expertise and, because they are itinerant, networks. Classroom teachers provide a willingness to disrupt routines and to do new learning on behalf of individual students. Parents and advocates provide energy that prods the system into action. Goodwill, trust, reciprocity, and compromise are parts of the process because special education requires constant adjustments and many formal meetings. Arranging combinations of

people who can work effectively with one another is a key component of facilitation in special education, even more than in other types of educational programs. Facilitative power includes garnering external resources; buffering problems coming from central administration, parents, or the public; and providing staff development in collaborative skills. It is particularly appropriate, and perhaps even necessary, for educating special needs children.

To make this imagery more concrete, consider special education as a professional process. It consists of three interrelated activities: needs assessment, resource allocation through assignment of children and professional staff, and program delivery. These activities are implicitly professional and technical, and can operate independently of formal power. Needs assessment is a process that is both knowledge-based and collegial. It brings together those parents and teachers who know individual students intimately with specialists in language, movement, and psychology. The specialists bring different disciplinary and experiential expertise to the discussions of each student's needs. Actual meetings have political overtones in that participants are influenced by administrators' right to accept or veto team decisions and by team members' often competing paradigms. Nevertheless, needs assessment is ideally technical and rational. The process represents collegial professionalism in its generic form: individuals collectively and cooperatively apply their knowledge of general phenomena in their own specialty to an individual student. Whether the supervising administrator is a special education director or the principal, the administrative role is relatively small.

Resource allocation is similarly professionally embedded. Administrators are responsible for staff assignments, but these are incidental to group assessments of individual children. In fact, I.E.P. teams are inclusive and often invite additional participation. It might even be argued that the advocacy potential of special education may increase the extent of professional practice by requiring staff to bring professionally

justifiable evidence to their shared perceptions. Resource allocation may be administered by a hierarchically identified leader, but he or she is to represent the consensus of the I.E.P. team. This responsibility requires skills in both facilitation and negotiation. Agreement may not be complete, the match between available programs and identified needs imperfect, and resources may be short.

As program delivery moves towards the consultant model described by West and Idol (1987), cooperation and coordination become more complicated. Regular classroom teachers must familiarize themselves with the special educator's craft and must learn to work with one or more peer experts as well as with special needs pupils. Special educators reverse the process; they must understand the dynamics of regular classrooms. The learning is mutual and interactive, but it is easy to visualize as much resistance to as acceptance of change (Sarason, 1982). Collaboration is a negotiated process rather than one that can be mandated from above. Effective solutions to problems will reflect individual teacher and student needs more than system needs.

These three aspects of special education are never independent of one another. While program delivery in special education, including actual instruction and associated services, is most significant in terms of elapsed time, identification and allocation are ongoing as professional staff monitor the child's progress and, less frequently, consider the program options for the next academic year. Similarly, assessment and identification of handicapping conditions takes place with resources and program delivery in mind because of the tendency for solutions--in this case staff expertise and training--to seek out most appropriate problems.

Our argument that "power as facilitation" describes both what is occurring and what probably should occur in special education is relatively new. However, the prescriptive literature and several research studies on special education administration support the facilitative approach to power. In

the NASSP Bulletin, Margaret Leibfried (1984) stressed the principal's role in fostering and facilitating staff acceptance of mainstreaming. More recently, Brennan and Brennan (1988) in the same journal urged principals to develop a deeper understanding of the goals, needs, and motivations of those involved in special education and to be guided by "situational ethics." By this they appear to recommend recognition of the uniqueness of virtually every special education situation, and to prefer making judgments by broad principles rather than by bureaucratic formulae. McCoy (1981) emphasizes the interface between student needs and staff abilities and needs. Similarly Conoley (1982) argues that small schools are especially appropriate for special education placements because principal leadership can facilitate staff interaction, team teaching, and shared leadership.

Research reports support these prescriptions. Lietz and Kaiser (1979) found that faculty-administration relationships and delivery of services to educationally handicapped children were correlated. Reporting on two studies in Ontario, Trider and Leithwood (1988) found that "empowered" patterns of school administration were related to implementation of special education policy. Finally, in studying two schools for severely retarded children, Cherniss (1988) reported that staff burnout was less frequent in a building where the principal spent less time in classroom observations, more time planning and coordinating activities, interacted more with her own superior, and discussed work-related problems more than administrative issues. The research would seem to support the view that special education involves staff who are active, reactive, and hands-on in matching policies to individual student situations and programs.

This brings us back to the question with which we began this section: what is power in special education and how is it exercised? Power is clearly not the ability to enforce policies or even to "get results." Rather, it is the ability to help a group of professionals to integrate their respective expertise to

> patterns of instruction which encourage teachers to plan and work together. Team teaching, schools within the schoo', and family grouping are examples of arrangements which naturally stimulate informal staff-development activities (Sergiovanni and Starratt, 1979: 296).

These models of voluntary "participatory supervision" echo the antithesis of nonauthoritarian, participatory acts described in the first section of this paper. Attempts to establish peer supervision have largely been written off as less powerful in improving teaching in desired directions than clinical supervision of teachers performed by capable administrator supervisors. The devaluing of voluntary efforts is primarily due to the informal and unpredictable nature of these voluntary activities. However, peer consultation oriented towards teacher-directed professional development has been more successful (Smith, 1989).

The relationship between less valued informal process and the continuing embedded concept of power-through-authority can be seen when compared to Abbott and Caracheo's (1987: 242) limiting of their definition of power displayed in organizations:

> It is important to make clear that we are discussing power in an institutional setting. We are not talking about power in informal groups, nor are we considering power as a psychological phenomenon. The meaning of power in reference to a dyadic relationship would not be the same as its meaning in a formal organization or in society as a whole.

In developing their definition of power, Abbott and Caracheo (1987: 243) collapse French and Raven's oft-cited categorization of power (legitimate, reward, punishment, referent and expert) to the two bases of authority and prestige. They argue that reward and punishment are an exercise of power rather than a base of power, and therefore are of a different order than the other definitions given. They agree with French and Raven that

and tested a five step supervision cycle: pre-observation conference, observation of teaching, analysis and strategy development, supervision conference, and postconference analysis. They argued that building principals who wanted to be called "instructional leaders" would need to spend at least half of their time engaged in activities related to curriculum, supervision, and general teacher development. Research on common practice at that time indicated most principals spent only 10-12 percent of their time on curricular interactions with teachers. Most interactions were in groups and did not include direct supervision in the classroom. While Goldhammer argued that clinical supervision methods could include group supervision between several supervisors and a teacher, he also argued that most supervision actually occurred at a distance without development of trust, mutual goals, or opportunities for interactions between respectful professionals. Goldhammer, Cogan, Acheson and Gall, and others argued that the only way to move to improved classroom performance was through a prescribed cycle that was predictable for both the supervisor and the supervisee, and that included opportunities for input from both parties.

The primary difficulty with the clinical supervision approach in practice is that it leaves the judgment and "coaching" of classroom performance in the hands of (1) a person who is not necessarily familiar with good classroom strategies and (2) the person who also makes summary judgments about merit, including decisions about tenure for probationary teachers. Principals, whose most recent training is necessarily in administration and whose administrative duties are fulltime, typically spend limited time teaching in classrooms. While supervision was improved by codification into programs, procedures, and strategies, it continued to embrace the at least dual role of coach and judge in the same person. The fact that the principal might or might not be a capable teacher added to the problem of establishing an atmosphere that fulfilled the dual charges of assisting development and judging competency.

This role complexity is mirrored in Sergiovanni and Starratt's (1979, p. 305) definition of clinical supervision.

> [Clinical supervision] refers to face-to-face encounters with teachers about teaching, usually in classrooms, with the double-barreled intent of professional development and improvement of instruction.

"Encounters" that are "double-barreled" do not give supervisees "safe" environment in which they may expose weaknesses in teaching and seek assistance. Instead, the language mirrors the "power over" aspects of judgment and would seem to lead teachers to perform to expectations and to conceal any weaknesses. This behavior would satisfy the need for top down judgment at the sacrifice of a collegial atmosphere conducive to further development of teaching skills.

The clinical supervision movement made progress in distinguishing direct supervision of teaching from the broader issue of general supervision. None of its proponents, however, were successful in removing the power-as-authority aspect of the summary judgments that inevitably reside in the superordinate position. Even where a curriculum director or other administrator is directed to do the actual supervision, direction comes typically from the principal and combines both formative and summative functions within the purview of a single actor.

Even less successful in actual practice than the clinical supervision models were efforts to encourage informal teacher sharing in order to improve teaching. Team teaching, "schools within the school," "family grouping," etc. were all tried, but were then typically relegated to the category of "nice but generally ineffectual" informal approaches. The way these approaches to collegial, or participatory supervision, are generally dismissed is typified by Sergiovanni and Starratt:

> Informal staff-development approaches should be encouraged and supported. Indeed, the benefits derived from such approaches are a good reason for supervisors and administrators to advocate

> patterns of instruction which encourage teachers to plan and work together. Team teaching, schools within the schoo', and family grouping are examples of arrangements which naturally stimulate informal staff-development activities (Sergiovanni and Starratt, 1979: 296).

These models of voluntary "participatory supervision" echo the antithesis of nonauthoritarian, participatory acts described in the first section of this paper. Attempts to establish peer supervision have largely been written off as less powerful in improving teaching in desired directions than clinical supervision of teachers performed by capable administrator supervisors. The devaluing of voluntary efforts is primarily due to the informal and unpredictable nature of these voluntary activities. However, peer consultation oriented towards teacher-directed professional development has been more successful (Smith, 1989).

The relationship between less valued informal process and the continuing embedded concept of power-through-authority can be seen when compared to Abbott and Caracheo's (1987: 242) limiting of their definition of power displayed in organizations:

> It is important to make clear that we are discussing power in an institutional setting. We are not talking about power in informal groups, nor are we considering power as a psychological phenomenon. The meaning of power in reference to a dyadic relationship would not be the same as its meaning in a formal organization or in society as a whole.

In developing their definition of power, Abbott and Caracheo (1987: 243) collapse French and Raven's oft-cited categorization of power (legitimate, reward, punishment, referent and expert) to the two bases of authority and prestige. They argue that reward and punishment are an exercise of power rather than a base of power, and therefore are of a different order than the other definitions given. They agree with French and Raven that

legitimate power is authority. Referent power and expert power are seen as types of prestige, defined by Abbott and Caracheo as individual power through personal attributes. These might include, for instance, identification, expertness, intelligence, ability to lead, and p •t service record. They conclude that the only two bases of power, therefore, are formal authority and prestige within the organization.

This type of definition limits our ability to describe want can occur in collegial supervision. Power is defined as relational and interactive, yet it is demonstrable only through force and coercion. This categorization of power is categorically bureaucratic, making it difficult to define, describe, or predict acts between professionals within bureaucracies. Problems observed in clinical supervision have been defined as resulting from inadequate process or poorly prepared supervisors. Many commentators have argued that teachers not only do not mind supervision of their teaching, but will seek evaluation, if "effective and useful methods are available" (Good and Brophy, 1973). However, no amount of improved process or better prepared supervisors can get around the problem of including a final summary judgment in the same act of supervision as an attempt to coach to improved practice. The problem is in not separating the power of authority from the intent to improve practice.

When teachers and principals are defined as professionals, peculiar things begin to happen to authority systems (Ogawa and Bossert, 1989). If we think of supervision as primarily a counseling and support act, authoritative imagery is inimical instead of helpful. Many of today's arguments about "instructional leadership" focus on the need for the school leader to support instructional excellence. This new school leader is preferably a master teacher in his/her own right. Meanwhile, the demand for professional school administrators to be good managers has not decreased in the face of increased demands for teaching and supervisory skills. Instead, it is argued that educational leaders must have (and support within

their staff) professional-level knowledge of teaching as well as of administration. Rather than one group of professionals (administrators) controlling the behavior of another group of professionals (teachers), Acheson (1990), Joyce and Showers (1987), Schön (1987), and others are now arguing for reflective and peer supervisory models that separate acts of evaluative judgment for merit and promotion, from supervision for improvement of teaching or for teacher motivation and support. Both tasks must be performed, but each must be achieved and perceived as separate acts so that "power over" does not preclude "power through." When separate, the professional power of the administrator to help with teaching is exercised through the professional power of the teacher. The latter can accept that assistance only when there is little or no fear of subsequent negative evaluation resulting from expressing an area of teaching weakness. Improvement of teaching occurs only when the authority encourages improvement of teaching. Power in this instance lies in professional knowledge and expert counseling skills, not in coercion or prestige as contained within traditional definitions of power.

If leaders are to manage, lead, coach, evaluate, mediate, and coordinate as well as continue to provide the visible symbol of value and virtue demanded today, then those leaders must be able to sort through issues of authority and power with those they wish to lead. Instead of a top-down authority structure with activities of those on the bottom directed to those on the top, new organizational and symbolic structures must afford opportunity for power-as-facilitation where whatever structures will best work in a particular setting can be mutually put into place. As in the example of special education, roles must be negotiated to meet a mutually desirable end goal.

VI. Conclusions

Professional power in schools is primarily exercised and actualized <u>through</u> others who may or may not understand what we are doing or why. Current trends in instructional leadership, site-based management, clinical supervision, and special

education increase interactions between professionals in schools. Reforms will fail, and collective and individual professional power will not grow, if these professionals do not find effective ways to exercise reciprocity, using one another's professional expertise without expecting to understand it completely.

Power exercised between professionals conforms to the model we have described as facilitative rather than as authoritative, democratic, or anarchic. Power as a system of facilitation appears to have three characteristics. First, apparently both decentralizes and enlarges the decision-making process by incorporating more active involvement by more actors. Facilitative systems generally include efforts to increase the autonomy and decision-making capability of professional staff. Facilitative systems also assume that decisions can be improved by bringing the decision-making process closer to the problem and to the professionals who will actually implement decisions in the classroom. Decisions are still negotiated and ratified by those who have legal authority to do so, but negotiations are conducted through facilitative processes rather than as reaffirmations of domination. What occurs is a negotiated order with multiple leadership comparable to that which Strauss, et al. (1963) found in their research on hospitals.

Second, facilitative systems would appear to encourage non-standardized approaches and solutions to problems. Solutions are a function of actors, individually and collectively, rather than a function of a bureaucratic system or even of the problem itself. Individuals or teams rely on their knowledge, skills, and experience to define specific educational problems and propose solutions rather than giving priority to precedent or aligning themselves to what others are doing. This also is relative, and may vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. We suggest that professional solutions (that is, outcomes utilizing the expertise of specific professionals) may be more effective in educational settings where there may be several professionally appropriate courses of action for any student, classroom, or school building. Needless to say, professionals must be

accountable for what they do end up doing, but superiors' reliance on professional autonomy appears to improve motivation and performance (Raelin, 1986).

Third, a system of facilitation may reduce the degree to which administrators are perceived to be at the visible center of schools. They will be less able to intervene in professional process and less directly responsible for either success or failure. Given that both motivation and reward systems for school administrators emphasize centrality, school leaders may come to redefine the type of ego rewards they can expect to experience.

The key difference between power as a system of authority and power as a system of facilitation rests in the exercise of personal and professional autonomy. Descriptions of organizational power that omit autonomy in organizational settings employing professionals have only limited utility because one of the primary aspects of professionalism is individual autonomy. Because "professional power" and "formal authority" are so often used interchangeably, these delimitations are not always readily apparent. Formal authority, where power is a system of authority, is specifically power over others. Professional power, by contrast, is "power through self and others." Specifically, it is power as a system of facilitation. Administrators are good administrators through teachers and other administrators; teachers are good teachers through students, other teachers, and administrators. In a truly professional setting, goals and directives are not simply passed down by principals through teachers to students; rather, they may come from anyone in the school, and are both processed and transformed by others as they become part of agreed upon practice. Professional knowledge, ideally, is applied and exercised through others, not as a dominant act of coercion or authority, but as a realized act of shared values that involves both specialized knowledge and personal influence.

References

Abbott, M. G. & Caracheo, F. (1987). Power, Authority, and Bureaucracy. Pp. 239-58 in Boyan, N., ed. (1987). Handbook of Research on Educational Administration. NY: Longman.

Acheson, K. (1990). Evaluating, Supervising and Analyzing Teaching. Eugene: Oregon School Study Council Report.

Acheson, K. & Gall, M. M. (1987). Techniques in the Clinical Supervision of Teachers: Preservice and Inservice Applications, 2nd Edition. New York: Longman.

Austin, G. R. & Garber, I. I. (1985). Research on Exemplary Schools. NY: Academic Press.

Bernstein, Paul (1976). Workplace Democratization: Its Internal Dynamics. Kent, OH: Kent State University Press.

Boyan, N., ed. (1987). Handbook of Research on Educational Administration. NY: Longman.

Brennan, A. D. H. & Brennan, R. J. (1988). The Principal, Ethics, and Special Education Decisions. NASSP Bulletin 72 (Dec.): 16-19.

Cherniss, C. (1988). Observed Supervisory Behavior and Teacher Burnout in Special Education. Exceptional Children 54: 449-54.

Clarke, B. R. (1984). The Role of the Principal in Mainstreaming. British Columbia Journal of Special Education 8: 247-55.

Cogan, M. (1973). Clinical Supervision. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Conoley, J. (1982). Small Schools Have Great Potential For Effective Mainstreaming. Small School Forum 4 (Fall): 3-5.

Davis, W. E. (1980). An Analysis of Principal's Formal Training in Special Education. Education 101 (Fall): 89-94.

Friedson, E. (1986). Professional Powers: A Study of the Institutionalization of Formal Knowledge. Chicago: University of Chicago.

Glickman, C. D. (1990). Supervision of Instruction: A Developmental Approach, 2nd Edition. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Goldhammer, R. (1969). Clinical Supervision. Special Methods for the Supervision of Teachers. NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Goldhammer, R., Anderson, R. H. & Krajewski, R. J. (1980). Clinical Supervision: Special Methods for the Supervision of Teachers, 2nd Edition. NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Good, T. L. & Brophy, J. (1973). Looking in Classrooms. NY: Harper & Row.

Hanson, E. M. (1985). Educational Administration and Organizational Behavior, 2nd ed. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Joyce, B. & Showers, B. (1987). Student Achievement Through Staff Development. White Plains, NY: Longman.

Kanter, R. M. (1989). When Giants Learn to Dance: Mastering the Challenges of Strategy, Management, and Careers in the 1990's. NY: Simon & Shuster.

Kerr, S. T. (1985). Referral in Education and Medicine. Work and Occupations 12: 416-36.

Leibfried, M. (1984). Improving One's Attitudes toward Special Education Programs: The Principal's Role Is Instrumental. NASSP Bulletin 68 (November): 110-13.

Lietz, J. & Kaiser, J. S. (1979). The Principal's Role in Administering Programs for Exceptional Children. Education 100 (Fall): 31-40.

Lietz, J.J. & Towle, M. (1979). The Principal's Role in Special Education Services. Educational Research Quarterly 4 (Fall): 12-20.

McCoy, K. M. (1981). The Role of the Mainstream Principal. Education 102 (Winter): 165-69.

Meyer, J. & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony. American Journal of Sociology 83: 440-63.

Ogawa, R. T. & Bossert, S. T. (1989). Leadership: A Quality of Organization, Not Individuals. Paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the AERA, San Francisco.

Pitner, N. B. (1982). Training of the School Administrator: State of the Art: Eugene, OR: Center for Educational Policy & Management.

Pfeffer, J. (1981). Power in Organizations. Marshfield, MA: Pitman Publishing Co.

Raelin, J. A. (1986). The Clash of Culture: Managers and Professionals. Cambridge: Harvard Business School Press.

Ritzer, G. (1977). Working: Conflict and Change. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Sage, D. D. & Burrello, L. C. (1986). Policy and Management in Special Education. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Sarason, S. B. (1982). The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change, 2nd Edition. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Schön, D. (1987). Educating the Reflective Practitioner. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sergiovanni, T. J. & Starratt, R. J. (1979). Supervision: Human Perspectives, 2nd Edition. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sikes, P. J., Measor, L. & Woods, P. (1985). Teacher Careers: Crises and Commitments. London: Falmer Press.

Smith, N. S. (1989). Peer Consultation as Staff Development. A Study in British Columbia Schools. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Oregon.

Soltis, J. (ed.) (1987). Reforming Teacher Education. New York: Teachers' College Press.

Strauss, A., Schatzman, L., Ehrlich, D., Bucher, R., & Sabshin, M. (1963). The Hospital and its Negotiated Order. Pp. 147-69 of E. Friedson (ed.), The Hospital in Modern Society. NY: Free Press.

Trider, D. M. & Leithwood, K. A. (1988). Exploring the Influences on Principal Behavior. Curriculum Inquiry 18: 289-311.

West, J. F. & Idol, L. (1987). School consultation (Part I): An interdisciplinary perspective on theory, models, and research. Journal of Learning Disabilities 20: 388-408.

Will, M. (1988). Educating Students with Learning Problems and the Changing Role of the School Psychologist. School Psychology Review 17: 476-78.

Zeller, R. (1990). An Investigation of Influences on the Patterns of Special Education Placement for Culturally and Ethnically Different Students. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Oregon.

Zwerdling, D. (1980). Workplace Democracy. NY: Harper Colophon.