

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

AN INVESTIGATION INTO THE USE OF ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT  
PRINCIPLES FOR SCHOOL STAFF DEVELOPMENT - A CASE STUDY

by

JOHN FRANKLIN ORCHARD

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES  
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE  
OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

WINNIPEG, Manitoba

FALL, 1977

AN INVESTIGATION INTO THE USE OF ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT  
PRINCIPLES FOR SCHOOL STAFF DEVELOPMENT - A CASE STUDY

BY

JOHN FRANKLIN ORCHARD

A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of  
the University of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
of the degree of

MASTER OF EDUCATION

©,1977

Permission has been granted to the LIBRARY OF THE UNIVER-  
SITY OF MANITOBA to lend or sell copies of this dissertation, to  
the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this  
dissertation and to lend or sell copies of the film, and UNIVERSITY  
MICROFILMS to publish an abstract of this dissertation.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the  
dissertation nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or other-  
wise reproduced without the author's written permission.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	2
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	
I. THE PURPOSE OF THE STUDY.....	3
II. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY .....	5
III. METHOD.....	7
IV. DEFINITION OF ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT .....	8
V. ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY .....	9
REFERENCES.....	10
II. A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	
I. CURRENT PROBLEMS AND LIMITATIONS .....	11
II. ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND OTHER CHANGE METHODS.....	13
III. ALTERNATIVE DIRECTIONS WITHIN ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT .....	15
IV. CRITERIA FOR THE DESIGN, IMPLEMENTATION AND EVALUATION OF AN ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT INTERVENTION.....	18
-- Design Criteria .....	18
-- Guidelines for Implementing the Design .....	22
-- Consultant Behaviors .....	23
-- Criteria for Evaluation .....	25
CONCLUSION .....	26
REFERENCES .....	27
III. BROOKE SCHOOL - PROBLEMS AND OPPORTUNITIES	
I. INITIAL VIEW OF BROOKE SCHOOL .....	30
-- Some Early Events .....	30
-- The Development of the Interview Guide.....	35
II. THE VIEW FROM THE STAFF .....	37
III. DIAGNOSIS OF THE SCHOOL .....	48
-- The Development of Inter-Group Conflict .....	48
-- Inter-Group Conflict and Other Concerns .....	53
REFERENCES .....	55
IV. THE DESIGN PROCESS	
I. DESIGN OF THE ENTIRE INTERVENTION .....	56
II. DESIGNING THE FIRST TRAINING EVENT .....	57
III. DESIGNING THE SECOND TRAINING EVENT .....	90
IV. COMMENTARY AND REFLECTIONS ON THE DESIGN PROCESS .....	96
REFERENCES .....	99
V. DESCRIPTION OF THE INTERVENTION	
I. DESCRIPTION OF THE INTERVENTION .....	100
-- Entry from My View .....	100
-- The Participant's Perspective of the Contract Meeting .....	106
-- A Description of the Initial Interviews.....	107
-- Aspects of the Design of the Main Training Event.....	109
-- The Main Training Event .....	111
-- Assessment of Effects .....	134
-- The Second Training Event .....	141

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONT'D)

CHAPTER	Page
V. CONT'D	
-- A View of the Workshop by a Participant .....	152
-- Final Interviews .....	154
-- Withdrawal .....	154
II. REFLECTIONS .....	155
REFERENCES .....	157
VI. EVALUATION	
I. FINAL INTERVIEW DATA.....	158
II. SUMMARY .....	168
VII. SUMMARY, DISCUSSIONS AND REFLECTIONS ABOUT FUTURE RECOMMENDATIONS	
I. SUMMARY OF STUDY .....	169
II. RESULTS .....	170
III. DISCUSSION .....	180
IV. REFLECTIONS ABOUT FUTURE INTERVENTIONS .....	187
REFERENCES .....	192
BIBLIOGRAPHY	
APPENDIX	

# LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I.	Concerns About the School	38
II.	Underlying Causes	39
III.	Strengths	40
IV.	Teacher Effectiveness Training	41
V.	Confluent Education	42
VI.	Groups on Staff	44
VII.	Principal's Involvement in Confluent Education	45
VIII.	Parents and Teachers	46
IX.	The Roles of People in the School	47
X.	Expectations of the Participants	59
XI.	Hopes of the Participants	60
XII.	Advice from the Participants	61
XIII.	Theme #1 - How the Staff Works Together	70
XIV.	Theme #2 - The Strengths we Have	72
XV.	Theme #3 - Planned Curricular Sequencing	73
XVI.	Theme #4 - The Role of the Principal	74
XVII.	Theme #5 - Staff Meetings	75
XVIII.	Theme #6 - Relationship with Community and Parents	76
XIX.	Debriefing Summary of Thursday Morning	119
XX.	Debriefing Summary of Thursday Afternoon	124
XXI.	Debriefing Summary of Friday Morning	129
XXII.	Debriefing Summary of Friday Afternoon	133
XXIII.	Results of First Workshop	135
XXIV.	Assessments	137
XXV.	Individual Contributions	140
XXVI.	Debriefing Summary of the Second Workshop	151
XXVII.	October 29, 1975	159
XXVIII.	Effects	160
XXIX.	Negative Effects	162
XXX.	Most Effective Exercise	163
XXXI.	Least Effective Exercise	164
XXXII.	Sense of Power	165
XXXIII.	Confluent Education	166

## LIST OF APPENDICES

	Page
APPENDIX A	
A History of Organizational Development	195
A Participant's Observations	205
APPENDIX B	
Theory of Organization Development - I	214
Test on Inter-Group Conflict	215
Theory of Organization Development - II	216
Theory of Organization Development - III	217
Problem Solving Model	219
Suggestions	220
Your Problem Solving Behavior - A Test	221
APPENDIX C	
Staff Evaluation Form	222
Defining a Workable Problem	224
5 Basic Steps in Problem Solving	225
Example of an Agenda	226
Guide for Role of Chairperson	227
Observing	228
Debriefing Form	229

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to acknowledge:

Dr. Tony Riffel for his cogent thinking and allowing nature.

Dr. Tony Stickel for his gentleness and wisdom.

The staff of the Manitoba Confluent Education program for their encouragement and support.

The staff of Brooke School for the time we worked together.

My wife for her patience and consideration.

My mother for her love and faith.

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

#### I. THE PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to design, implement and assess a strategy for resolving staff concerns of Brooke School using principles and procedures derived from the field of organizational development.

The strategy moved through the following sequence of steps:

1. Gaining entry. On October 29, 1975 a contract was formed for three in-service days of organizational development with the staff of Brooke School at the Oo - za - we - kwun Centre near Rivers, Manitoba.

2. Diagnosing individual interview data. On January 19, 20, 1976, diagnostic interviews were held at Brooke School with the participants in order to obtain preliminary data.

3. Designing the first training event.

4. Conducting the first training event. On January 22, 23, 1976 the first workshop was held.

5. Evaluating the first training event. In February, follow-up interviews by two staff volunteers were held to assess the effects of the workshop and to investigate the basis for the next workshop in March.

6. Designing the second training event.

7. Conducting the second training event. On March 12, 1976 a one-day workshop occurred.

8. Evaluating the intervention. On May 8, 9, 1976, I interviewed the staff individually in order to determine the effects of the intervention.

Three general questions guided the study. The first general question was: What does the literature indicate to be important guidelines necessary to maximize the chances of success in organizational development interventions? A number of more specific questions were derived from this:

1. What general directions are available as alternatives?
2. What directions seem worthwhile in terms of increasing initial participant involvement?
3. What guidelines are available for diagnosing the situation?
4. What principles are available for designing the over-all flow of the intervention?
5. What guidelines are available for designing a training event?
6. What guidelines exist for conducting training sessions?
7. What criteria are available for conducting an effective evaluation?
8. What ethical parameters should be followed by a consultant using principles and practices from the field of organizational development?

The second general question was: How might these guidelines be applied in the case of a specific Manitoba school? A number of

more specific questions were derived from this:

1. What is the situation at the school?
2. What are the concerns of the staff of Brooke School?
3. What design promises to meet the concerns of the staff?
4. Which techniques are likely to be effective and which are not?
5. What are the general and specific results of the intervention?

The third general question was: Is it possible to refine guidelines and develop further principles on the basis of Brooke School?

A number of more specific questions were derived from this:

1. Which general guidelines, drawn from the literature, appear to be refuted by the Brooke School experience? Which ones were reinforced?
2. What further criteria pertaining to staff involvement appear to evolve from Brooke School?
3. What further principles are available for diagnostic work?
4. What principles emerge for improving the workshops?
5. What guidelines emerge for extending the transfer of training?
6. What principles would further the probability of an on-going sequence of data collection, diagnosis, action, and assessment being integrated into the regular organizational life of a school?
7. What guidelines are available to assist schools in preventing specific problems?

## II. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

W. Warner Burke states<sup>1</sup> "O.D. ....is surrounded by mystique.

O.D. is not helped by practitioners who are unclear themselves to resort to 'well, you just have to experience organizational development to understand it'." In this same general area, French and Bell conclude that<sup>2</sup> "the boundaries are not clear entirely... and the field is evolving". This study has, as its first justification the explication and development of the concepts of organizational development.

A further justification for this study is the need to determine what approach to organizational development is practical in schools considering the relatively short training periods that are generally available. There are relatively few days that are uncommitted at any time in most schools for work with the entire staff. The reason for this situation is that demands for in-service time are extensive and include administration days, parent-teacher conferences, divergent interests of different members of the staff, and divisional, regional, and provincial in-services. Therefore, in relation to long range organizational development programs of industry and the typical one day in-services of Manitoba schools, this intervention is in the middle range time period.

Support for this work also comes from there having been few studies of a practical nature dealing with in-service work. Harris and Bessent deal with this concern when they state<sup>3</sup>

there is not much available for the practitioner in his in-service education efforts. Research in this field is meagre. Reports of practices are sketchy and tend to be reported as local "success stories" rather than as objective descriptions. Good case studies are a rarity.

This study might answer this concern to some degree. Again, in a review of the state of organizational development, Burke<sup>4</sup> calls for studies in the use of organizational development methodology that would ascertain its effectiveness. That is, practical data for future organizational development interventions is needed. Further to this point Sarason states<sup>5</sup>

the techniques have come to be viewed as ends in themselves; they place such an emphasis on communication and "interpersonal relations" as to convey the impression that they are the most important source of problems in the school culture, whereas they are, in my opinion, far more symptoms than cause. ....overselling these techniques does a disservice to that which is valid and helpful in their limited use.

This study has attempted to deal with this problem by examining the relevance of the techniques involved.

Since organizational development is an evolving field and since most of the work in the past has consisted of applications to industry, there is a need for more information on the application of organizational development principles and techniques in the field of education. This study has a practical significance in as much as it is an attempt to find a middle-range approach to systematic organizational change.

### III. METHOD

As was stated previously, the basic purpose of this study was to design, implement, and assess an organizational development intervention in a particular school. The report of the research will be presented as a case study. The methods of research included case analysis and participant observation.

The characteristics of a case study include the following:

a) The process of gathering data and the procedures applied are interwoven and shuttlelike. While interviewing to gather information certain treatments could take place or during in-service exercises data collection is happening.

b) As many of the pertinent aspects of the situation as possible are taken into account. The data are related to some phase of the history of the situation. The case study is a careful analysis of the development of a group or institution.

c) Diagnosis, which identifies causal factors, is combined with a prognosis about possible effective treatments.

d) Confidential recording and relationships.

The fundamental rationale for the case study is that there is more likelihood of understanding an individual's behaviour if one examines the institutional, cultural, social matrix for that behaviour.

#### IV. DEFINITION OF ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Organizational development is an attempt to improve an organization's problem-solving and renewal processes, particularly through a more effective and collaborative management of organization culture - with special emphasis on the culture of formal work teams - with the assistance of a change agent, or catalyst, and the use of the theory and technology of applied behavioral science, including action research. It is seen here as having an approximate duration of one year with two or three training events.

## V. ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

This report is divided into seven chapters and appendices. Chapter I has consisted of an introduction to the study. Chapter II is a review of the literature and provides a summary of the main approaches to making changes in schools with particular emphasis on organizational development. Chapter II also includes my criteria for design, implementation and evaluation of the intervention. Chapter III consists of a view of Brooke School as seen by myself after diagnostic data had been gathered and before designing the workshop itself. This deals with the setting of the intervention with its problems and opportunities. Chapter IV outlines the Design Process in a narrative form; the contributions of the volunteers from the teaching staff will be distinguished from those of myself. Chapter V contains a description of the intervention through my eyes along with reflections on the intervention. Chapter VI contains the post-intervention interview data. Chapter VII provides the results of the study and a discussion of those results. To what extent were the goals of the entire intervention realized? Over what period of time? It also includes my recommendations for future interventions using organizational development principles.

REFERENCES

1. W. Warner Burke, Editor, A Look at Organizational Development Today in Contemporary Organization Development: Conceptual Orientations and Interventions, NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science, 1972, p. 4.
2. Wendell L. French and Cecil H. Bell, Organization Development behavioral science intervention for organization improvement, University of Washington, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1973, p. 15.
3. Ben M. Harris and Wailand Bessent, In-Service Education: A guide to Better Practice, Prentice-Hall Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1969, p. 1.
4. Burke, Op cit, p. 4.
5. Seymour B. Sarason, The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change, Allyn and Bacon Inc, Boston, 1971, p. 216.

## CHAPTER II

### A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter is concerned with the development of guidelines for organizational development interventions in schools. These guidelines are derived from the literature. For the reader who is interested in a history of organizational development see Appendix A.

The first section of this chapter is an attempt to outline problems and limitations facing organizational development at the present time as seen by various writers in the field. Following this section is a comparison of organizational development with laboratory method approaches that focus on different depths of intervention. The next section compares two approaches to organizational development as represented by Schmuck and Herman. This is entitled, "Alternative Directions Within Organizational Development". The final section of this chapter relates the criteria for the design, implementation and evaluation for this study to the literature of organizational development.

#### I. CURRENT PROBLEMS AND LIMITATIONS

Firstly, organizational development may be a "fad".<sup>1</sup> It is possible that little or no commitment to the long term use of organizational development exists. In view of the history of change efforts on schools this may be very likely. Burke is one who is concerned that organizational development be integrated into the mainstream of

an organization's life rather than being something used at a particular time for a particular purpose.<sup>2</sup> This same point is made by Sarason when he says that, "the more things change, the more they remain the same"<sup>3</sup> in regard to schools.

Two other current problems were referred to in the "significance of the problem" in this study. There are a clear statement of what is included in organizational development and the lack of research related to measuring results.<sup>4</sup>

One of the criticisms of organizational development is that it has paid too much attention to the human and social dynamics of organizations and too little attention to tasks, technical, and structural aspects and how they are related to each other.<sup>5</sup> In the future, one criterion for judging whether change has occurred may be whether structural changes have been instituted.

A further problem organizational development faces as an interdisciplinary application of the social sciences is lack of balance. On the one hand there is a need for theory to be part and parcel of any organizational development intervention,<sup>6</sup> and on the other hand, there is a need to make certain that interventions are a creative response to a particular client group. According to Peter Vaill, "formal organizational development theories are rigid, inflexible, and based on an objective view of organizational life....the theories don't explain or predict the situation the organizational development practitioner finds himself."<sup>7</sup>

The polarity suggested by those who work solely on an intuitive basis is opposed by the extreme represented by those who "package"

organizational development with little or no tailoring for the particular target group. On another level, the enthusiasm of one extreme smacks of naivety and lack of theoretical underpinnings while the stoics ignore affective data in the way they present their "set-piece" efforts. Balance is exemplified by what some writers call "practice theories" in which success with a treatment corroborates the diagnosis.<sup>8</sup>

## II. ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND OTHER CHANGE METHODS

Bennis indicates six traditional change programs<sup>9</sup> that are distinguishable from organizational development in that they have as their basis the belief that change can occur as the result of sharing an idea without becoming involved in the experiencing of that idea. Thus Bennis believes that organizational development is different in that it intervenes rather than giving recommendations or advice.<sup>10</sup>

According to French and Bell, the basic points made to distinguish organizational development from these change efforts of the past are:

- a) it emphasizes process rather than content;
- b) it emphasizes groups, this implies an emphasis on the work team as the key unit;
- c) it emphasizes the use of resources in a sharing manner within the work team culture;
- d) it emphasizes the relationship of a sub-group to the total organization
- e) it emphasizes the use of the action research model; and
- f) it emphasizes a developmental and long term view of change.<sup>11</sup>

Further to distinguishing organizational development from traditional and current change strategies Harrison<sup>12</sup> has classified interventions on the basis of superficiality. His hierarchy of depth of intervention is:

a) Rational assignment of tasks:

This strategy is to redistribute (by proclamation) the tasks, resources, and power among the jobs in the organization. The consultant can do this without knowing in advance who will be occupying the positions. This is the technique used by most private firms offering consulting services to management (referred to above as traditional counselling). The classic theories underlying this technique are the theories of bureaucracy and time - and - motion, and the classic theorists are Weber and Taylor.

b) Direct influence on performance:

This strategy evaluates the performance of individuals and directly manipulates it. Particular techniques include appraising the skills an employee brings and placing him in an appropriate job, giving promotions, increasing or decreasing salary or wages, transferring employees, and using the techniques of management by objective. The classic theory underlying these techniques is "reinforcement" psychology and its prophet is B.F. Skinner.

c) Direct influence on the interpersonal interactions through which work is accomplished -- for short, interpersonal instrumental rearrangements.

This strategy opens to negotiation those instrumental (task-oriented) acts that individuals direct toward others: delegating authority or reserving decisions to oneself; communicating or withholding information; collaborating or competing with others on work-related issues. The consultant is interested in the organizational member primarily as a doer of work. Much of Douglas McGregor's (1967) theorizing deals with this level.

d) Interpersonal emotional rearrangements:

At this level, the consultant deals with feelings, attitudes, and perceptions and the quality of human relations. "Interventions are directed toward helping trainees to be more comfortable in being authentically themselves with one another, and the degree of mutual

caring and concern is expected to increase", says Harrison. Sensitivity training in the T-group is a typical technique, though not the only one. This kind of intervention has been carried out in numerous industrial organizations; it has been used extensively in the school districts in which Carl Rogers has worked.

e) Therapy:

The deepest level focuses on the individual's relations with himself - and on increasing the range of experiences he can bring into awareness and cope with. This is traditionally the realm of psychological therapy and its patron saint is S. Freud. Religious leaders, historically, have also directed most of their efforts at this level of change.

Schmuck feels that the third level is the one organizational development is centered on but that organizational development can include aspects of the second and fourth levels.<sup>13</sup>

### III. ALTERNATIVE DIRECTIONS WITHIN ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The main thrust of organizational development has evolved into working with intact work groups. Schmuck represents various researchers and practitioners of organizational development when he says, "We reject the strategy of making better organizations by improving the members as individuals."<sup>14</sup> Further to this same point he says that the organizational development specialist "does not seek to change personalities nor is organizational development training aimed at facilitating personal growth."<sup>15</sup> This view has, as its basis, research data that stranger laboratory groups have little impact on home organizations.<sup>16</sup>

At the present time many organizational development practitioners work with the intact work group. However, others disagree with Schmuck. They say that group norms are not the primary target but that the focus

of organizational development's efforts must be on the individual. Certainly ever since Lewin showed that behaviour derived from group norms was easier to change than behaviour rooted in the individual's character structure, attention has been paid to the normative climate. However, people can become aware and act on these new awarenesses and this personal growth is independent of the setting in which the individual finds himself. Herman works with work groups, but using a Gestalt approach to organization development, stresses individual behaviour as the key to organizational change and improvement.<sup>17</sup>

In Gestalt therapy awareness is regarded as being intrinsically therapeutic. The approach is based on a view of man as one who naturally completes finishable unfinished business. Herman's purpose as a facilitator is to encourage people to fully experience their behaviour and thus to grow stronger in their encounters with others. The move is from other-support to self-support. This approach is not the same as changing the environment so that it supports the individual although it is not antagonistic to it.<sup>18</sup>

Herman sees much of the organizational development derived from sensitivity training as producing managers who try to be "nice" to others in a way that violates their own authenticity and power.<sup>19</sup> He sees "feedback" as a subtle way of preaching to other people.<sup>20</sup> This is somewhat in contrast to William G. Dyer's view of feedback as "not just a process of requesting a person to change but the beginning of the process of wider acceptance of each other".<sup>21</sup> The basic thrust of Herman's approach is that only by assisting all people in the organization to realize how they truncate their strength individually will

the organization gain power. He makes the analogy that an organization has "top dogs" and "under dogs" and just as in Perl's individual psychology the underdog is always in control. New Year's resolutions in individuals and self-improvement programs in organizations only heighten the conflict in which, over time, underdog invariably wins. The balanced organization it appears, is one in which a synthesis occurs in which there is less tyranny with less sabotaging.

Herman is not alone in his disagreement with Schmuck. Tannenbaum supports his view in that he sees that organizational change must come from individual change.<sup>22</sup> Oshry says much the same thing when he states that, "most personal growth comes from behavioural coping with action crises, very little from sharing of interpersonal feedback."<sup>23</sup>

Orion White Jr. makes a clear distinction between the sensitivity groups from which most organizational development methodology is derived, with its emphasis on "feedback," and gestalt therapy. He states, "It is unfortunate that gestalt methodology, rather than the encounter group, did not become the main methodological device of the movement....it seems that such an approach would escape most of the dilemmas discussed here."<sup>24</sup> One of the dilemmas he discussed was the transfer problem due to a lack of a supportive atmosphere in the organization.<sup>25</sup>

Both of these positions, Schmuck's and Herman's, are correct to a greater or lesser degree in any situation. People can move toward self-support and as Sarason indicates the dynamics of the situation

are prime determiners of the outcome as well.<sup>26</sup>

From an analysis of the literature just reviewed and in combination with information from other pertinent sources, the following criteria were established to provide guidelines for the intervention.

## V. CRITERIA FOR THE DESIGN, IMPLEMENTATION, AND EVALUATION OF AN ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT INTERVENTION

### Design Criteria

The first criterion is that the staff as a whole make a commitment to the intervention. French and Bell support this criterion when they speak of the importance of organization development being "owned" by subordinates as well as by the formal leader.<sup>27</sup> By ownership French and Bell mean it is the clients' intervention and not the consultants'. The expectation is that ownership will include involvement and investment in the process of organizational development.

The second criterion is that the staff provide volunteers to assist the researcher in designing the workshops. This criterion relates to the first in that it is a further attempt to increase "ownership" on the part of the client group. Harris and Bessent support this guideline when they state, "in-service programs should be planned with the active participation of those who are to be the benefactors."<sup>28</sup> The assistance in this criterion includes active participation in the planning of workshops as well as designing data collection methods and collecting such data. The volunteers may also

provide increased opportunities for the researcher to see the intervention from the view of the participants and thus increase the chances of a relevant intervention.

The next criterion is that the workshops be centered around the organizational concerns of the participants. Beckhard suggests that a necessary condition for a successful organization development intervention is that "Somebody or something in the organization is 'hurting.'" <sup>29</sup> Harris and Bessent distinguish between superficial surveys of teacher interests and the genuine interests of teachers which reflect real needs. They caution that too often the former is the basis for the design of in-service training sessions. <sup>30</sup>

The next criterion for the design is that the action research model be explicitly used in the intervention. The importance of this model as the core of organization development efforts is indicated in "A History of Organizational Development" in Appendix A. <sup>31</sup> This study will use as the basis for its over-all design, the action research model.

The fifth criterion is that the design weave theory and practice together in a balanced fashion. The search for balance in this area has been explored in this chapter. <sup>32</sup> Hall emphasizes the balance required in this criterion when he states, "we have lost touch with the sine qua non of any technology: namely, a basic theory underlying the utility and application of technique." <sup>33</sup>

The sixth criterion is that the intervention foster a long range view of organization development. Burke states that "one of the fundamental differences between organizational development and other approaches in organizational improvement is that organizational development is viewed

as a continuing process and not as an ad hoc time-bound program."<sup>34</sup>  
 The fostering of such a view has been discussed in this chapter.<sup>35</sup>

The seventh criterion is that the intervention recognize the development of group norms and the fostering of each individual's self-support as complementary objectives. This approach recognizes the need to work with normative patterns within the client group as well as the necessity of promoting individual self-reliance.<sup>36</sup> Sergiovanni and Carver underscore this approach by stating "self-concept development, confidence building....in a supportive climate are other contributors to changing attitudes and behaviours".<sup>37</sup>

Organization development aims roughly at improving how people work together. In this chapter the point was made by Schmuck that organization development centered around interest in the organization member "primarily as a doer of work."<sup>38</sup> Thus the eighth criterion is that the focus of the training be related to the roles in the school rather than to life generally. In "Neurotic Organization: Symptoms, Causes and Treatment", Harvey and Albertson state that the "key to the diagnosis of organization neurosis is the fact that outside the organization context members do not either suffer the pain nor demonstrate the irrational behaviour they demonstrate in their day-to-day work."<sup>39</sup> Based on this conclusion, diagnosis and treatment would possibly err if the intervention dealt with how people behaved with each other generally.

The ninth criterion is that the design not aim specifically for classroom use of techniques or exercise introduced during the intervention. This relates to the previous criterion of centering the intervention around the organizational concerns of the participants.

To spend time exploring the use of techniques in the classroom could conceivably deter from the focus on organizational training.

The tenth criterion is that organizational "log-jams" be dealt with first. The basis for this criterion is the distinction between symptoms and underlying causes. The problems of the organization may seem isolated to the organization members but the consultant's function is to determine which of the "problems" are the result of other "problems".<sup>40</sup> Schmuck supports this criterion by stating:

the consultant should give first attention to those processes that seem most to be impeding the proper functioning of other processes - break the log-jams first, so to speak. Another useful rule is to treat early those impaired processes that the people in the organization feel are most painful; success with these processes will produce motivation toward further work.<sup>41</sup>

The eleventh criterion of the design process is that the contract be clear between the staff of Brooke School and the consultant as to the beginning and end points of the contract.<sup>42</sup>

The final criterion of the design process is that no less than two days be devoted to the initial training event and that the second training event be one day in duration. The first reason for two events is that this gives the client group the opportunity to experience more than one cycle of the action research model.<sup>43</sup> The length of time for each of the two events is influenced by Schmuck's experience that;

a great deal of impact is lost....if the initial main event is shorter than two-and-a-half or three days. The chief weakness of short sessions is related to the fact that in the training session itself a period of time is needed to bring new norms into play. The direct experience of these new norms, in turn, is the glue that binds together later training events with earlier events. Later events can be much shorter than the first main event. For many purposes, a few hours can be productive.<sup>44</sup>

### Guidelines for Implementing the Design

The first criterion is that there will be a sense of closure at the end of each training sessions while leaving some open-ended possibilities for transfer to the school setting. The transfer problem is considered in Appendix A - "A History of Organizational Development."<sup>45</sup> Additional justification for this criterion comes from Schmuck in his "Questions to Raise Before Using a Design." Two questions he sees the importance of answering affirmatively are: "Does the design clearly connect the training to the actual work of the target group?" and "Does the design offer a sense of closure while still leaving some tension related to work yet to be accomplished?"<sup>46</sup>

The second criterion for implementing the design is that attention be paid to how concerns are dealt with as well as the content of each session. The hope here is that transfer of learning will improve and that the intervention provide the client group with problem attack skills rather than solutions to specific concerns.

The third criterion is that particular attention be paid to sources of opposition. Sarason discusses this aspect of attempting to change schools: "The chances of achieving intended outcomes become near zero when the sources of opposition are not faced, if only because it is tantamount to denial or avoidance of the reality of existing social forces and relationships in the particular setting."<sup>47</sup>

The next criterion is that recognition of the principal as the most influential person in the school be taken into account during the intervention. Harvey and Albertson indicate research that "the role of the superior of the unit is always central to the underlying problems

of an organization".<sup>48</sup> They recommend that cognizance of this fact lead to additional roles for the consultant. Sarason observes that few consultants relate the crucial role of the principal to possible change. He comments:

I cannot refrain from adding that the tendency to oversimplify, and in fact not to understand the role of the principal is characteristic not only of those within the school culture but of those from without who seek to effect change.<sup>49</sup>

The final criterion related to implementation is that unfinished business be completed when possible so as not to get in the way of new learnings. This was pointed out as a guideline in Herman's gestalt approach to organization development earlier in this chapter.<sup>50</sup> Livitsky and Perls define this principle as;

the Gestalt therapy analogue of the perceptual or cognitive incomplete task of Gestalt psychology. Whenever unfinished business (unresolved feelings) is identified, the patient is asked to complete it. Obviously all of us have endless lists of unfinished business in the realm of interpersonal relations, with, for instance, parents, siblings, friends. Perls contends that resentments are the most common and important kinds of unfinished business.<sup>51</sup>

### Consultant Behaviors

The first criterion is that the consultant be cognizant of the need for balance between understanding the situation from the view of the participants and a more objective view.<sup>52</sup>

The second criterion is that the confidentiality and anonymity of the interview data be respected. This assurance will be given the participants of the intervention. This does not mean that data cannot be shared but that it must be done in an anonymous way.

The third criterion is that the rationale and theory behind each exercise of the workshops be shared. Johnson and Johnson share this criterion in their "Ethics of Experiential Learning."<sup>53</sup>

The next two criteria are also set out by Johnson and Johnson.<sup>54</sup> The first is that the consultant not initiate confrontation between participants but attempt to provide leadership in resolving such conflicts constructively should they occur. The second is that the consultant share with the participants specific ways of refusing to do an exercise, and that the consultant respect such refusals.

The sixth criterion is that the consultant models directness with the participants. Herman provides for this criterion by stating "The consultant will also do best in setting an example through his own clear and explicit statement of what he wants and how he feels."<sup>55</sup> Harrison suggests the same guideline when he suggests the consultant be

open with the subjects about ones' intention, interests, and motives.... It means making oneself personally available to participants and showing a genuine interest in the personal growth and enhancement which they are seeking in the laboratory.<sup>56</sup>

This criterion is echoed by Sarason when he speaks of teachers in the public school system. He states "there is a good deal of anecdotal evidence strongly indicating that the more a teacher can make his own thinking public and subject for discussion of....the more interesting and stimulating does the classroom become for students."<sup>57</sup> Thus another criterion is that the consultant share to some degree his thinking processes with the participants.

### Criteria for Evaluation

The first criterion for the evaluative part of the intervention will be that the diagnostic method be used as an evaluative process by comparing interview data on specific concerns prior to and after the training events. Schmuck deals with this criterion when he states "Techniques of diagnosis, of course, are also techniques for assessing change; comparing the results of one diagnosis with the results at another time will tell whether conditions have remained the same or have changed."<sup>58</sup> Without degrading other ways of getting information Schmuck states "...no alternative method of getting information at the early stages of entry promises any greater validity than the information the specialist carefully infers from his face-to-face conversations."<sup>59</sup>

The second criterion will be that the volunteers interview fellow staff members after the first training event and prior to the second training event. Schmuck stresses the need to provide opportunities for the client group to use diagnostic tools. In his assessment of the weaknesses in one of his workshops he indicates that:

the training could have included some diagnostic tools in the form of self-report questionnaires, brief but systematic interview schedules, and categories for observation that staff members could have used during the year to diagnose their own organization.<sup>60</sup>

The third criterion is that the post intervention interviews be held at least one month after the second training event. This will be necessary in order to determine any medium term effects from the intervention. The possibility of this study contributing to an assessment of organizational development's ability to deliver long term results

was given as a justification for this study in the first chapter.

The fourth criterion for evaluation is that data be collected at the end of each session in the workshops, in an anonymous manner, and fed back to the clients prior to the following session. Part of the rationale is that any unfinished business from previous sessions should be dealt with prior to beginning the next session whenever possible. This was one of the criterion for executing the design. The other part of the rationale is that this follows the action research model within each workshop. Harris and Bessent also indicate the need for this criterion when they state, "Careful evaluations of a program in progress and at its termination are rarely undertaken to determine the degree to which needs are being met,"<sup>61</sup>

The final criterion is that attention be paid to any structures or organizational decisions which might be created as a result of the intervention. This point was discussed in this chapter previously.<sup>62</sup>

## CONCLUSION

This chapter has attempted to examine the broad issues that are pertinent to organization development. In addition it has attempted to translate these broad concerns as well as specific research data into criteria that will promote a successful organizational development intervention. These criteria formed the guidelines on which the present study was based.

# REFERENCES

1. W. Warner Burke, Editor, A Look at Organizational Development Today in Contemporary Organization Development: Conceptual Orientations and Interventions, NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science, 1972, p. 4.
2. Ibid. p. 4.
3. Seymour B. Sarason, The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change, Allyn and Bacon Inc., Boston, 1971, p. 2.
4. Refer to Chapter I, p. 2,3.
5. Wendell L. French and Cecil H. Bell, Organization Development behavioral science intervention for organization improvement, University of Washington, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1973, p.194, 195.
6. Jay Hall, Models for Management: An Alternative to Technocentric Atheoretical OD Interventions, in Contemporary Organization Development: Conceptual Orientations and Interventions, Edited by: W. Warner Burke, NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science, 1972, p. 48.
7. Gordon L. Lippitt, Implementing the Organization Renewal Process (ITORP)...A Situational Approach to OD, in Contemporary Organizational Development: Conceptual Orientations and Interventions, Edited by: W. Warner Burke, NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science, 1972, p. 91.
8. Ibid. p. 91.
9. French and Bell: op cit, p. 18, 19.
10. Ibid. p. 19.
11. Ibid. p. 19, 20.
12. Schmuck, Runkel, Saturen, Martell, Derr: op cit, p. 17, 18.
13. Ibid. p. 18.
14. Richard A. Schmuck and Philip J. Runkel, Integrating Organizational Specialists Into School Districts, in Contemporary Organization Development: Conceptual Orientations and Interventions, Edited by W. Warner Burke, NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science, 1972, p. 192.
15. Ibid. p. 190.
16. Richard A. Schmuck, Philip J. Runkel, Organizational Training for a School Faculty, University of Oregon Press, Eugene, Oregon, 1970, p. 3.

17. Stanley M. Herman, A Gestalt Orientation to Organization Development, in Contemporary Organization Development: Conceptual Orientations and Interventions, Edited by: W. Warner Burke, NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science, 1972, p. 69.
18. Ibid. p. 70, 71.
19. Ibid. p. 70.
20. Ibid. p. 76.
21. Schmuck, Runkel, Saturen, Martell, Derr: op cit, p. 89.
22. Burke, op cit, p. 14.
23. Barry Oshry, Power and the Power Lab, in Contemporary Organization Development: Conceptual Orientations and Interventions, Edited by W. Warner Burke, NTL Institute for Applied Behavior Science, 1972, p. 249.
24. White, op cit, p. 23.
25. Ibid. p. 23.
26. Sarason, op cit, p. 11.
27. French and Bell, op cit, p. 17.
28. Ben M. Harris and Wailand Bessent, In-Service Education. A Guide to Better Practice, Prentice-Hall Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1969, p. 5.
29. Burke, op cit. p. 10.
30. Harris and Bessent, op cit, p. 5.
31. Refer to Appendix A - A History of Organization Development, p.204,
32. Refer back to Current Problems and Limitations, p. 12, 13.
33. Hall, op cit. p. 48.
34. Burke, op cit, p. 9.
35. Jerry B. Harvey and D. Richard Albertson, Neurotic Organizations: Symptoms, Causes and Treatment, in Contemporary Organization Development: Conceptual Orientations and Interventions, Edited by W. Warner Burke, NTL Institute of Applied Behavioral Science, 1972, p. 17.
36. Ibid, p. 26.
37. Sergiovanni and Carver, op cit, p. 120.
38. Ibid. p. 22.
39. Harvey and Albertson, op cit, p. 20.

40. Ibid. p. 24.
41. Schmuck, Runkel, Saturen, Martell, Derr, op cit, p. 24.
42. David W. Johnson, Frank P. Johnson, Joining Together: Group Theory and Group Skills. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1975, p. 314.
43. Ibid. p. 16.
44. Schmuck, Runkel, Saturen, Martell, Derr, op cit, p. 28.
45. Refer to Appendix A - A History of Organization Development, p.201, 202.
46. Schmuck, Runkel, Saturen, Martell, Derr, op cit, p. 333.
47. Sarason, op cit, p. 59.
48. Harvey, Albertson, op cit, p. 32.
49. Sarason, op cit, p. 150.
50. Earlier in Chapter II, p. 16.
51. Joen Fagan and Irma Lee Shepherd, Editors, Gestalt Therapy Now, Fitzhenry & Whiteside Limited, Copyright 1970, Toronto, p. 146.
52. Harvey, Albertson, op cit, p. 24.
53. Johnson, Johnson, op cit, p. 315.
54. Ibid. p. 315.
55. Herman, op cit, p. 85.
56. Schumck, Runkel, Saturen, Martell, Derr, op cit, p. 402.
57. Sarason, op cit, p. 185, 186.
58. Schmuck, Runkel, Saturen, Martell, Derr, op cit, p. 335.
59. Ibid, p. 340.
60. Schmuck, Runkel, op cit, p. 22.
61. Harris, Bessent, op cit, p. 5.
62. Refer back to Chapter II to p. 12.

## CHAPTER III

### BROOKE SCHOOL - PROBLEMS AND OPPORTUNITIES

Brooke School is at the Oo-za-we-kwun Centre located four miles from Rivers, Manitoba and twenty-seven miles from Brandon. The thirteen teachers and four teacher-aides serve 220 students from kindergarten to grade eight. Most of the students at the school are at the school for a maximum of two years. Almost all of the students who have been attending the school are Treaty Indians. A Life Skills program is operated by the Centre for the adults in training. The industries located at the Centre produce bicycles, trailers, houses, and furniture. The manager of this enterprise is Frank Price. He is responsible to the Indian Affairs branch of the federal government as well as to the Manitoba Indian Brotherhood.

This chapter is an attempt to examine the school setting with a focus on organizational problems and opportunities. The first section outlines a view of Brooke School as seen by myself. The second section gives data from the interviews with the staff of the school. The interviews are aimed at establishing the pattern of concerns of the staff and were conducted by myself. The third section is my diagnosis of the school prior to the design process.

#### I. INITIAL VIEW OF BROOKE SCHOOL

##### Some Early Events

This section contains my preconceptions of Brooke School and

information upon which they are based. The relationship between these preconceptions and questions from the interview guide will be indicated.

As complete a record as possible is given in this Chapter as well as in Chapters IV and V. Details included in this description may possibly be seen as significant as the total content emerges.

Oo-za-we-kwun Centre had previously been an Air Force Base. One expectation I had was that the town of Rivers would be positive about new industry in the area but negative about Indian people at the Centre. My experience in Frontier School Division and Cranberry Portage led me to this conclusion. I further expected that white teachers would staff the school and that communication between white teachers and Indian parents would be poor. I expected this to occur because white teachers would not become involved in an Indian community.

I knew that Life Skills was the predominant methodology to be used in training the adult participants. I had no confidence in this approach. Previously, I had experienced a workshop in Life Skills, had instituted a similar course at the high school level at Frontier Collegiate in Cranberry Portage, and saw it as too mechanistic to be realistic.

The principal of the school, at the time of the intervention had worked with me at Cranberry Portage. My opinion of him was very positive. Particular strengths I saw him bringing to Brooke School included a knowledge of cross cultural education, his ability as a confluent education facilitator, experience in curriculum construction,

and a sensitivity to the concerns of others. Regardless of who the principal was, I was determined that the role would be explored in the interview guide.

From the summer of 1974 to the fall of 1975, I worked with a number of teachers who were on staff during the intervention period. These experiences indicated that a number of teachers would be very positive about confluent education and that they would be real assets to education at the school.

In September of 1974 I met with the principal, the manager of the Centre, and two other people who I assumed were part of the "management team". The usefulness of the Confluent Education Program of Manitoba to the school was being explored. Information from that meeting suggested: 1) that the group wanted the school to reflect the Centre's philosophy; 2) that this philosophy was a "humanistic" approach to people; 3) that Frank Price had fired the entire staff during a negotiations dispute but had rehired all or almost all of these same people; 4) that an in-service held prior to July of 1974 and led by personnel from the Manitoba Teacher's Society was viewed as a disaster in terms of dealing with the feelings of the staff at the school; 5) that there was confusion in the group regarding ways of making the school "humanistic".

Additional data from the visit to the Centre at this time were that: 1) there was a fairly small staff at the school - about fifteen teachers; 2) the Centre was charging teachers modest rent; 3) the Indian Affairs salary schedule was essentially in effect, and viewed as substantial and; 4) the Treaty Indian children would only be in the school for two years.

These data produced the expectation that Brooke School would be attractive financially to teachers and that the school would have a real challenge in providing programs for students who were only there for two years. Additional data from a staff member at this time indicated the possibility of a split existing within the staff along the dimension of student control. As well, one member of the staff stated that he had unfinished business with the principal but had not approached him.

In late October I was requested to work with the grade seven and eight class. Two half-days were spent working with the teacher and the students. The visit lasted two days. During one evening a Life Skills session was attended by myself and the principal, and led by one of the Centre's Life Skills Coaches, reinforced my view of Life Skills as a "packaged" program that was not designed around the concerns of the participants.

The sessions with the students and their teacher indicated that teachers at this school would need extensive training in group dynamics. The students appeared to have a number of emotional and social problems. They did not appear to see themselves, or others, in a very positive way.

One further observation from this work was the principal's skill in working with the students. He was also active in assisting me plan the sessions.

In the spring of 1975 the following events took place: 1) a workshop at Brooke School in Transactional Analysis with the entire

staff of the school; 2) about five members of the staff went to a workshop in Transactional Analysis. This appeared to me as further evidence that Brooke School was developing a certain amount of expertise in the human relations field.

In July of 1975 the principal informed me that a Teacher Effectiveness leader was available at the Centre. It was his expectation that Teacher Effectiveness Training could be acceptable to more teachers on his staff than Confluent Education. Later in September teachers were involved in a Teacher Effectiveness Training program for eight weeks. The program consisted of evening sessions. The expectation this event triggered was that this could be an effective program.

A further September event was that the principal stated that there was good communication among everybody in the school. Following this event a teacher on staff informed me that there was a definite split on staff, that communication problems with parents were evident, and that the role of the principal was unclear to him.

In late October I was told that the staff would give me a fair chance to be heard in terms of establishing a contract for Organizational Development work.

At this time I had the opportunity to observe a number of lessons taught in the school. Again it was apparent to this observer that considerable patience and skill was required to work with these students.

On October 29 I met with the entire staff of the school. One

impression was that staff meetings were a possible concern.

In November of 1975 two events occurred. I was informed that a "confluent" teacher new to the staff was having difficulty organizing his academic work for the students. Later on in November I was told by a teacher on staff that there was a group of teachers on the staff who were not interested in learning and predicted that I would have difficulty working with them in the Organizational Development workshops.

Early in January of 1976 a previous colleague resigned from Brooke School. The impact this had was wonderment about what was happening at Brooke School.

#### The Development of the Interview Guide

In the middle of January the interview guide was developed for Brooke School. The first three questions are those suggested by Harvey and Albertson in "Neurotic Organizations".<sup>1</sup> The rest are based on the previously described preconceptions. The Interview Schedule is as follows:

- 1) What issues or problems are facing Brooke School as an organization at the present time? Where are your concerns?
- 2) What is causing these problems?
- 3) What strengths are available in the organization to solve the problems?
- 4) As a result of Teacher Effectiveness Training, has there been any spill over into staff relations? Are these skills being used in this area?

- 5) Has the training of a number of teachers in confluent education had any impact on the rest of the staff? How?
- 6) Are there identifiable cliques or groups in this staff?
- 7) Are you aware of the principal's involvement in confluent education? Has this influenced the way you are in this staff?
- 8) How do you see the relationship between white teachers and Indian parents? How do you see the relationship between white teachers and teacher aides of Indian ancestry?
- 9) Do you feel isolated from other schools? What effect has a different school board structure had, if any?
- 10) What effect, if any, do you feel the firing of the entire staff two years ago had?
- 11) How have you described Brooke School to friends away from here?
- 12) Is Brooke School unique? How?
- 13) How is the school program's continuity affected by student only being here for two years?
- 14) Are there any special tensions you have not mentioned?
- 15) Do you feel there is wide agreement on the roles of resource teacher, teacher aide, principal, librarian, and classroom teacher, in your school?
- 16) How did you come to Brooke School originally?
- 17) What had you heard of Brooke School before coming here?
- 18) How do you feel about how staff meetings are functioning? Are there any other kinds of meetings where the staff works together?

- 19) What are your hopes for the workshop? What are your expectations?
- 20) What advice can you give me for working with this staff at the workshop?
- 21) Are there any questions I should have asked you, but didn't?
- 22) Are there any further questions you want to ask me?

## II. THE VIEW FROM THE STAFF

This section gives diagnostic data as obtained from the interviews of the staff at Brooke School. The format used to report the results is a "quantified report" described by Mahler.<sup>2</sup> Often a participant had many responses to the same question. Thus giving a meaningful percentage for each response was not considered possible. Consequently, the format used here differs from Mahler's. The responses to each question have been classified where this is pertinent to understanding the information. Classification involves striking a balance between being too specific and too general. Sarason has indicated the complexity of the school's culture. The responses of the staff reflect that complexity. Consequently, this data is as detailed and as antagonistic to itself as the situation from which it arose. My comments are based on the responses to the interviews in their entirety. They are an attempt to provide clarification as well as to provide my own response to the interviews.

TABLE I  
CONCERNS ABOUT THE SCHOOL

---

Question: What issues or problems are facing Brooke School as an organization at the present time? Where are your concerns?

---

Responses	Number
1. No consensus among staff, students, and parents about the goals of the school	8
2. Inter-group conflict on the staff	11
3. Need for staff development along inter-cultural lines	2
4. Teachers leaving the school	3
5. Discipline too lax in the school	3
6. Lack of leadership in the school	3
7. Lack of curriculum planning	1
8. Staff meetings are not effective	2

---

Comments:

The interviewer was impressed with the candidness of the staff. Many of these spontaneous concerns appeared to be related to the "inter-group conflict" concern in some way.

---

TABLE II  
UNDERLYING CAUSES

---

Question: What is causing these problems?

---

Responses	Number
1. Lack of leadership in the school	3
2. Inter-group conflict on the staff	12
3. Community of transients	1

---

Comments:

The response of "inter-group conflict" was seen as the dominant cause of many other concerns. What to some people was a problem, many others saw as the cause of their problem. Those who saw "inter-group conflict" as a problem saw a) two different philosophies of education b) a win-lose attitude on the part of both groups and c) lack of communication between groups as underlying factors.

The problem of "lack of leadership" was seen as being determined by the personality of the principal.

---

TABLE III

## STRENGTHS

---

Question: What strengths are available in the organization to solve the problems?

---

Responses	Number
1. Open-door policy of the school	1
2. A staff that is capable on an individual basis	3
3. The principal of the school	2
4. The new resource teacher's community contacts	1
5. A few volunteers from the community	1
6. Continuity on staff	1
7. Lots of physical space in the school	1
8. Teachers that care about children	1
9. Confluent education	1

---

## Comments:

No one mentioned any form of collaborative behavior as a strength. However, there was confidence in the resources within other individuals on staff.

There were fewer responses to the question than to the previous two questions. This seems to indicate more awareness of problems as compared to resources. A majority of the staff had no response.

---

TABLE IV  
TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS TRAINING

---

Question: As a result of Teacher Effectiveness Training, has there been any spill-over into staff relations? Are these skills being used in this area?

---

Responses	Number
1. The TET problem solving technique was used once in a staff meeting	3
2. The skills slowly fell into disuse	9
3. They were used to try to "push" people around	2
4. They were used with children but not with the staff	2
5. The use of these skills made one group defensive	1

---

Comments:

It appeared as if the "confluent group" was the group that had tried out listening skills with fellow staff members, whereas to some members of the primary group removal of the TET blocks to communication meant that they felt they could not make the students do their work. At the time of the interviews the staff agreed that the TET skills were not being used.

It is noted that "inter-group conflict" appeared often in conjunction with other responses.

---

TABLE V  
CONFLUENT EDUCATION

---

Question: Has the training of a number of teachers in confluent education had any impact on the rest of the staff? How?

---

Responses	Number
1. It is a big factor in the split on staff	6
2. It sounds good but it isn't practical.	2
3. The confluent education people are out on a tangent	3
4. Confluent education people try to push it down other's throats	6
5. The rest of the staff sees the confluent people having higher "highs" and lower "lows" and this scares them.	2
6. The rest of the staff sees confluent education as licence- freedom without responsibility.	1
7. Confluent education makes people treat children in a more decent way.	2
8. I have either done some reading or tried some techniques from confluent education - some successful - some not - but I never told the confluent people about it.	2
9. The principal never tells people what to do - that's from being a facilitator in confluent education.	1

---

Comments:

All but one of the teachers from grades 4-8 had been involved in confluent education. Many staff members felt that confluent



TABLE V (continued)

education contributed to the split on staff but was not the only cause. It appeared that the negative view by some of the staff toward confluent education was partially due to it not having been translated into planned curricular sequencing. It may also have been due to there having been some confrontation for the "hell of it" by confluent people rather than for constructive use. Additionally, the confluent group was sometimes seen by others as saying one thing and doing another.

The seventh response came from "traditional" teachers.

---

TABLE VI  
GROUPS ON STAFF

---

Question: Are there identifiable cliques or groups on this staff?

---

Responses	Number
1. There are two groups - one is the primary grades group and the other is the upper grades group.	13
2. There are people here who feel pulled towards both groups.	3
3. I don't see any groups.	2
4. We are just a social group.	1
5. There is a need for compromise between the two groups.	1

---

Comments:

While virtually everyone was aware of the split, only few people saw many causal factors to the split on staff.

While rumours about confluent education dealt with emotional responses of people and how that showed how confluent education made people "unstable", the primary grades group was viewed by the upper grades group as people who couldn't or wouldn't change.

Some people saw the other group as a closer group than they saw their own.

The emotional loadings of many responses, as well as what was said, seemed to indicate a considerable amount of pain in this area.

---

TABLE VII  
PRINCIPAL'S INVOLVEMENT IN CONFLUENT EDUCATION

---

Question: Are you aware of the principal's involvement in confluent education? Has this influenced the way you are on this staff?

---

Responses	Number
1. Yes, I am aware.	15
2. No, I was not aware.	2
3. I expect a humanistic approach to education in this school.	1
4. I like the way he approaches kids and that influences me.	1
5. When he was hired people were afraid because he was in confluent education.	1
6. Made me very aware of trying to understand what was going on.	1

---

Comments:

Almost all of the staff are aware of the principal's involvement in confluent education.

The relationship between the principal and confluent education appears to be a historical factor in the split on staff but was not now contributing towards the split.

---

TABLE VIII  
PARENTS AND TEACHERS

---

Question: How do you see the relationship between white teachers and Indian parents? How do you see the relationship between white teacher and teacher aides of Indian ancestry?

---

A survey of the responses indicates the possibility of the following generalizations being valid;

Indian parents are concerned about academic objectives, while many teachers are concerned about affective objectives.

White parents are critical of the school's standards, and there is some fear on the part of the school and the administration of the Centre of white parents transferring their children to Rivers Elementary School. It also seemed apparent that teachers and parents are afraid of each other.

There did not seem to be a teacher-aide group in the school.

---

TABLE IX  
THE ROLES OF PEOPLE IN THE SCHOOL

---

Question: Do you feel there is wide agreement on the roles of  
resource teacher, teacher-aide, principal, librarian,  
and classroom teacher in your school?

---

There is no librarian role and the role of the resource teacher was clear and satisfactory to almost the entire staff. Also, the role of the teacher-aides was being clarified satisfactorily between each teacher-aide and their teachers.

There is considerable confusion regarding the role of the principal. The main dissatisfactions regarding the principal were not receiving more assertive leadership, a punishment mode of response to discipline problems in the school, or advice on what to do. The staff generally felt that the principal expected the staff to make most of the decisions in the school.

---

### III. DIAGNOSIS OF THE SCHOOL

This section contains my diagnosis of the organization prior to the design process. The basic "log-jam" was the conflict between the two groups in the school. The two groups are the primary group and the upper grades group. Not every person who teaches at the primary level is in the primary group nor is every person who teaches from grade five to grade eight in the upper grades group. The grade four teacher had resigned as of January 1, 1976.

#### The Development of Inter-Group Conflict

This is an attempt to delineate causal factors in the formation of the split. The staff has provided the data for this historical perspective.

There were two groups prior to the existence of Oo-za-we-kwun Centre at Brooke School. Two of the reasons for this included the physical proximity of primary grades teachers and upper grades teachers, as well as having similar curricula. At this time there appears to have been more control exerted on primary children than on upper grades children. The principal at this time was autocratic. He largely told teachers what to do and they did it. The teachers worked for the principal.

After the Oo-za-we-kwun Centre was formed, the composition of the student population changed. The pressures on every teacher increased with the difficulty of working with a group of children that was extremely variable throughout the year. This occurred in conjunction with the maximum length of stay being two years. In addition, the Indian children often come from remote schools that

have a high turn-over rate in teachers. Additional problems of the children would centre around adjusting to a somewhat different life style at Oo-za-we-kwun. The emotional and social problems of these children would be reflected in increased pressure on teachers. There is a possibility that the younger children in the primary section were more amenable to control than the children in the upper grades. It is also possible that junior high age students are not as positive about school as primary students. Almost none of these upper grade teachers are present at Brooke School now. Most of the present primary group however, taught the children from the Air Force Base.

The first principal of Brooke School for the first few years of Oo-za-we-kwun expected more decision-making from the staff than the previous principal. The security for the primary group in terms of "back-up" in administering punishment to children, as well as a leader who made almost all of the decisions, was taken away.

It is also likely that the Centre would demand a more open atmosphere in the classrooms as a part of their 'humanistic' philosophy. These factors would provide increased pressure on the primary teachers to work differently with their students and the response to this threat was an increasingly cohesive group.

Just prior to the appointment of the present principal, Frank Price discharged the staff and rehired them. Evidently, this was Frank Price's way of stating his dissatisfaction with the way the school was doing its job. This event is almost certain to have had an effect on this group. The result was lack of trust in the administration of the Centre as well as paranoia - with some reason.

Most members of the primary grades group reside in Rivers. The rumours about confluent education very likely came from the high school in Rivers or the nearby school of Tanner's Crossing in Minnedosa. Both of these schools took part in the Manitoba Confluent Education Demonstration Project from from September of 1971 to August of 1973. These rumours were reinforced by the results of a workshop held at Brooke School and led by personnel of the Manitoba Teachers Society. Some people from the primary group felt "attacked" during the session and left. These outcomes were equated with confluent education.

The appointment of the new principal in the spring of 1974 combined the threat of confluent education with the threat of a new person. In addition, the lack of trust and paranoia experienced toward the manager of the Centre could easily be generalized to the appointee of that same management.

In the fall of 1974 the new principal brought with him a resource teacher who was new on staff and who had attended the 1974 Confluent Summer Program. This prompted speculation that the new principal would only be hiring "confluent" teachers.

In comparison with any principal this staff had know, this principal was non-directive. His objective was to avoid the possibility of the staff forming a dependent relationship with him and thus stifling their individual and collective ownership for what they did or did not do. The staff was expected to be the decision-making group with the principal being just another member of the staff in the process. The staff members were rotated through the chairperson role to lead the

staff meetings. The principal took his turn.

This decentralized approach to school organization demanded new skills in the area of group problem solving and group leadership for the staff. To many people this was no leadership at all from the principal. To others he became a resource for helping them help themselves.

A further distinction from previous principals was the use of Reality Therapy to work with behaviour problems of students. This approach excludes punishment as a response.

I worked with the grade seven and eight class in the fall of 1974. While the primary children were walking in lines down the hallways the grade seven and eight class was just barely under control. This was largely due to the negative limited way in which the junior high aged children interacted with each other. The need to do something different was therefore more pressing at the upper grade level. This may have been a factor in the increasing involvement of the upper grade teachers in confluent education.

New members of any growth group have a tendency to be very positive about the group and its methods. The upper grade teachers experienced some success with a confluent approach. These factors produced a "preachy" and "pushy" attitude towards the primary group, and to the in-betweens as well. The result was some overt but mostly covert conflict. The harder one group pushed, the harder the other group pushed back.

These behaviours were occurring at the time of this organizational

development intervention. There also appeared to be some confrontations on the part of the "confluent" teachers for the sake of confrontations. This could be the result of interpreting the Gestalt prayer line "I am not in this world to live up to your expectations" as more important than the line "and you are not in this world to live up to mine."<sup>3</sup>

The Teacher Effectiveness Training skills came more easily to the teachers in the upper grades. The result of the use of these skills was that the upper grades were further categorized as "know it alls". No one would bend. These two groups developed a win-lose attitude toward each other where the other group was described in terms of negative personality characteristics. Neither group saw the lack of confidence in the other group's ranks. They also assumed a degree of cohesion in the other group that was not realistic. The strength of the primary group was in its planned curricular sequencing which was lacking in the upper grades. The primary group could also have used the strength of the upper grades in the way they built confidence in children. However, each group usually saw what the other group doesn't have - namely their own sterling qualities.

The rest of the staff felt they were being pulled or pushed two ways at once. They were asked to choose sides. Many didn't - they then felt they had to watch what they said to both groups.

The two specific behaviours that caused the most difficulty were blaming, which led to almost everyone disclaiming responsibility for the situation, and having catastrophic expectations of openly dealing with built-up resentments, which led to being indirect.

One interesting aspect was that all of the primary grades teachers agreed with the goals of confluent education, some had privately tried out some methods and yet the conflict was intense. I did not have the feeling that these groups were very different in terms of how they viewed people. The conflict seems to be an understandable outcome of the dynamics of the situation - little can be explained solely in terms of the personalities at the school.

#### Inter-Group Conflict and other Concerns

Each of the other concerns of the staff has a part of its basis in this conflict. It affected the staff meetings in that they became the legitimized forum for each inter-group confrontation. Thus decision-making by the staff was stifled. There also appeared to be a lack of focus on the tasks as a contributing factor to their lack of effectiveness. Further to this there were some staff members who were not contributing to the resources of the staff at staff meetings. There were also a few "high talkers" who dominated the scene.

The principal's role was also a focus for the struggle. Both sides attempted to influence him into living up to their expectations of how a principal should work. There was agreement from almost the entire staff that the role required clarification. The staff was not clear on what the principal wanted from them. And what they wanted from the principal was more of a stance on the issues in the school.

Community-staff relations needed work. However, I saw this concern being dealt with after the school staff had developed some

degree of cohesion. Once the school staff was working together satisfactorily there would be a greater chance for dealing with this concern constructively.

This completes the diagnosis of the school prior to the design process. This diagnosis was confirmed by the principal of the school as well as the staff volunteers. The school setting was not simple.

REFERENCES

1. Jerry B. Harvey and D. Richard Albertson, Neurotic Organizations: Symptoms, Causes and Treatment, in Contemporary Organization Development: Conceptual Orientations and Interventions, Edited by W. Warner Burke, NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science, 1972, p. 24.
2. Walter R. Mahler, Diagnostic Studies, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Don Mills, Ontario, 1974, p. 45.
3. John O. Stevens, Awareness: exploring, experimenting, experiencing, Real People Press, Moab, Utah, 1971, p. 199.

## CHAPTER IV

### THE DESIGN PROCESS

This chapter will examine the overall design of the intervention as well as the design of the workshops embedded in that overall pattern. The section on the design of the second training event will include the diagnosis of the school immediately prior to that event. The commentary will contain observations on the degree to which design criteria were followed. It will also contain reflections by me on the design process.

#### 1. DESIGN OF THE ENTIRE INTERVENTION

The overall design of the intervention consists of two cycles of the action research model. The first phases of the model are preliminary diagnosis and data gathering. This was the substance of the third chapter of this study. The next step was feeding the data back to the staff of the school. This was done at the beginning of each of the training events. The sequence of events for the entire intervention was as follows:

- a) Constructing the Interview Guide based on the preliminary information
- b) Holding individual interviews of the staff
- c) Diagnosing the situation prior to the first training event
- d) Formulating a design for the first workshop
- e) Modifying the design as a result of consulting with the two volunteers
- f) Conducting the first training event

- g) Interviewing the staff by two volunteers to obtain data for the design of the second workshop
- h) Designing the second workshop
- i) Formulating the final design
- j) Implementing the second training event
- k) Holding individual interviews of the staff

The interviews have more purposes than providing diagnostic information about Brooke School. They have the additional functions of: a) building rapport with the participants; b) reducing fears of a workshop that is far from the readiness of the group; c) dealing with the expectations of the staff generally; d) obtaining advice for leading and designing the workshop; e) providing an opportunity for me to model communication skills and directness; f) increasing awareness of the situation through the nature of the questions asked as well as through the inter-action of the "inter-view".<sup>1</sup>

## II. DESIGNING THE FIRST TRAINING EVENT

The original proposal to the staff on October 29, 1975 described a design that included individual interviews. The way the data would be fed back had also been described to the staff. This was for me to take verbatim statements from the taped interviews and arrange these in themes. The staff would thus have their own statements fed back to them anonymously. The rationale for this process is that ownership of the situation by the staff is seen as a prerequisite for a successful intervention. The only other information the staff was given regarding training events was that they would be built around the concerns of the staff.

This data feedback session was not originally seen as part of the first two days of training. A session to do this was originally scheduled for Wednesday at 3:30 p.m. on January 21, 1976. The first workshop was held on January 22 and 23.

The reason for separating this session was to increase the time available for working on staff concerns during the two days. From the number and complexity of problems surfacing from the first interviews as well as Schmuck's experience that a good initial training event is five days, I felt short of time. However, in spite of this concern, it was decided to include the data feedback session in the two days.

One reason for including data feedback in the first training event was that the staff looked tired. In addition, it had been my experience that teachers in general do not have much energy at the end of a demanding day. Further evidence on this situation came from comments during the interviews related to the Teacher Effectiveness Training which indicated that it would have been more effective if the sessions had not been held in the evening. The reason given was low energy on the part of the staff.

There is another reason and perhaps the most influential one. In spite of the fact that the staff had voted unanimously for the intervention, this did not guarantee energy for the first workshop.

The following tables gives data on how the staff viewed the coming workshop using organizational development principles.

TABLE X  
EXPECTATIONS OF THE PARTICIPANTS

Responses	Number
I don't know what to expect	2
The primary group won't change	3
I don't expect very much to happen	6
I expect there will be some improvement in how we work together	3

TABLE XI  
HOPES OF THE PARTICIPANTS

Responses	Number
That staff meetings will improve	2
That there will be increased communication between the groups	7
That the role of the principal will be clarified	1
An improved atmosphere among the staff	2
That we don't work on aims and objectives	2
That the principal be more assertive	1
That something good happens	5

TABLE XII  
ADVICE FROM THE PARTICIPANTS

---

---

Do it in a nourishing way because people are suspicious.

Make it practical - no philosophizing (being talked down to).

Don't use far out language or you will turn people off.

Don't have any extreme ideas or you will turn people off.

That would be really worth trying - finding out how others see me.

It could be valuable but it could be damaging.

I don't know where to start even.

Some people need more loving - they need to feel needed.

Don't let people sway you onto the other side.

Exercises similar to Transactional Analysis and TET because we do

them with the whole group - so we can see how each other operates.

I am sick of philosophizing.

I don't know - keep things moving. Let's get something accomplished -

not necessarily my way - but you could say "I have seen evidence

that such and such a way will produce results".

That you have faith that everyone is doing their best.

I don't know.

Listen - and let the people know you are listening.

Don't take too much for granted. Seek for clarification - be specific

in any instructions - not general.

Watch what track the staff is on - some tracks are blind alleys.

Model the behavior you want the staff to try - and talk about it.

Watch your vocabulary - include your definitions.

Don't explain things away before we do something.

Make your directions explicit.

TABLE XII (continued)

Be systematic - 5 minutes for this, so many minutes for that.

That you "call" appropriate or inappropriate behaviour.

---

The statements on what the staff expected were essentially negative. They had been used to well-led workshops in the past, the medium range results had been disappointing to them and they had no reason to expect the effects to be more positive from this intervention.

There seemed to be a need to surprise the staff and get some energy flowing. Therefore, the feeding back of the themes and the public statement of anonymous quotes could be sufficiently different from anything they had encountered in past training sessions so that people could begin to be surprised by themselves and each other. There was a suspicion that each staff member had little idea of how much the other staff members had shared. The expectation was that many staff members would be jolted by the directness of the statements.

The final reason for not working on 3:30 Wednesday was that I had no faith that everyone would show up. In addition to my impression that most teachers hate after-school meetings, people are busy and at least one teacher told me on Tuesday that she hadn't heard of my meeting on Wednesday.

Thus, Thursday morning would be spent on ownership of the situation in Brooke School by the staff. This procedure is outlined by Harvey and Albertson in "Neurotic Organizations: Symptoms, Causes, and Treatment."<sup>2</sup> The chief purpose of this approach is to impress upon the staff the fact that they are the ones, individually and collectively, who are responsible for the current situation in Brooke School. They are the ones who either leave things the way they are or change them. The aim is to have each member understand that each

of them has contributed to the existing situation either by what he did or did not do. Further to this point, its purpose is to point out the futility of blaming others or oneself. Recognizing how one contributes to a bad situation is not necessarily equivalent to feeling guilty.

An additional reason for this initial procedure was the often uncomfortable feeling on my part that even though each interviewee was cautioned that nodding or other positive responses did not mean agreement but simply understanding, they still took these responses to mean agreement. In some cases the staff members tried to convince me that their view was the correct view. Thus the quotes from the interviews could reduce any expectations that I was on their "side" by the observation that statements from every participant's perspective were included. Another reason for choosing this methodology was that Harvey and Albertson indicated that neurotic organizations have the characteristic of everybody knowing what the situation is, but that each person feels he is the only person who knows.<sup>3</sup> This widespread agreement existed in Brooke School and this procedure would make it difficult for organization members to avoid recognizing that this agreement was there. The recognition of widely dispersed information makes the avoidance based on, "Well, I know that the problems are, but the rest of the staff doesn't - so how can I do anything?" more difficult.

The expectation was that the participants would be curious about their colleague's statements. This would provide some energy in terms of a beginning point for the workshop. The hopes and expectations of the staff seemed to indicate the desire for a more productive state of affairs while seriously doubting their own ability to make changes.

Evidence re their feeling of lack of control is the emphasis on outside facilitators being people who were responsible for what happens at a workshop. The oblique message the researcher heard was "Somehow if we just get the right training program with the right consultant we will make pain-free progress." This seemed to indicate that their hopes were in the hands of others.

Thus an overall goal was to increase the participants' sense of control over their working environment. To do this, the workshop could be evidence that the staff could really work in a positive way together. A major concern throughout the planning then, will be constructing activities that the staff can do with a high possibility of success. An analogy to the situation appeared to be "In order to get a child interested in reading, he has to experience some reading, but I can't get him to experience reading because he isn't interested." The hope is to design a workshop in which the staff works together so that they can learn to work together.

One cause for optimism was the high level of sharing evidenced in the interviews. However, this could simply be the ventilation of cooped up feelings without the faith that the conditions which caused those feelings could be removed.

At this point the following had been decided:

a) That the supporting statements would be listed with each of the related themes. These statements were transcribed from the audio tape of the interviews. In order to avoid responses from leading questions, the only statements made public were those from the first three questions of the Interview Guide. This was completed by Wednesday morning.

- b) That the staff would work on developing summary statements for each theme. The exact process for accomplishing this task had not been decided upon.
- c) That the development of summary statements would be followed by a focus on individual responsibility for the current state of the organization of the school.

The approach described by Harvey and Albertson appeared to assume consensus skills on the part of the staff.<sup>4</sup> From the data provided by the participants, these skills did not exist to any appreciable extent. This staff was not working well together, and in order for a true consensus to be realized it would have to work well. The fear on my part was that the effort to achieve consensus would result in destructive win-lose confrontations. Consequently, I was determined to find an alternative method of achieving a relatively high degree of agreement on the situation while paying attention to the capacity of the group to respond. The result of this search was to direct the participants to treat the exercise as intellectual. Thus the staff would be asked to determine summary statements for each of the themes using the supporting statements as raw data and to avoid discussing the correctness or incorrectness of the supporting statements themselves. The staff's purpose then would be to find agreement on generalizations from the data. Changing Harvey and Albertson's method in this way was essentially equivalent to restricting the data used in developing the generalizations. The price paid in terms of reduced ownership and accuracy would be compensated for by beginning the workshop with a task that is relatively risk-free as well as being within the ability parameters of the staff.

Another expectation was that some participants would ignore or forget the instructions and use additional information. This would be an asset so long as the number was not large and thus the opportunities for destructive conflicts would be limited. It also appeared unlikely that the losses of reduced accuracy in the summary statements could be very great considering the homogeneity of the data.

The instructions for this activity would be as follows: "For each theme and using the supporting statements as data, you are to come to an agreement on one generalization for each theme."

The next step was to decide a possible way for the activity to be accomplished. I was aware of the time even a limited form of consensus takes with seventeen people. With the knowledge that staff meetings rarely got to the "punch line" and with the fear that the staff might take an extremely long time to do this exercise, I decided to limit the work on staff ownership to one-half day. Thus the participants would be split into two groups. This decision was based on past experience in working out consensus in groups. It was also based on the time factor which allowed a little over an hour to achieve agreement in the group.

The morning had three hours of time. It would take approximately twenty minutes for a person to read the data sheets carefully and thoughtfully. Introductory and explanatory activities would take about fifteen minutes. The last activity of the morning would be debriefing and this was estimated to be about twenty minutes with another ten minutes available for sharing personal ownership. To do an adequate job of assessing one's own contributions to the organizational situation

in Brooke School was estimated to be a half-hour of individual work. This left slightly more than an hour available for each group to come to a consensus with about twenty minutes to reduce the twelve summary statements to six.

A further concern was that the groups would get off track. This had been a major complaint of staff meetings. Thus the directions would have to include task and maintenance functions. One maintenance function is that of "gatekeeping" in which a deliberate effort is made to open the gate for people to speak while closing the gate on "high talkers" at times. The groups would have the need for balance between maintenance and task stressed.

The way the two groups would be formed was also a concern. The hope was that the two groups would not be the two groups in conflict in the school. If there was any sincere desire for improved relations and collaboration between the two groups and if people were to believe better things were possible, this would be encouraged by an initial activity in which summary statements are agreed upon and in which the two working groups were heterogeneous in grade level taught. I could not find a satisfying way to form the two groups. The only idea considered to achieve the intended result was some sort of "choosing up sides" using the two volunteers as starting points.

Although it would detract from the possibility of a true consensus, the final six summary statements could be negotiated by the two volunteers publicly as representatives of the two groups. There was the awareness that one of the volunteers was a "high talker", a member of the "confluent group", and an upper grades teacher; that

the second volunteer was a primary teacher, had expressed the belief that she did not belong to any group, and was a low to medium talker. Again, the homogeneity of the statements seemed to indicate a high possibility of determining six statements by this method. This concluded the planning of the ownership exercise prior to meeting with the two volunteers from the staff.

The themes chosen and the verbatim supporting statements used in this session are shown in the following tables:

## TABLE XIII

## THEME #1 HOW THE STAFF WORKS TOGETHER

---

---

Supportive Statements

1. I feel I need to share my confusion - to get support from each other, and that isn't happening.
2. I don't feel comfortable with really sharing.
3. The school is a very lonely place to be.
4. I found that there is a split in the staff.
5. There is one side for the principal and one side against the principal.
6. I feel indifferent now.
7. If they could work together, at least meet each other half-way other things would fall in nicely.
8. I'm not aware of any groups on this staff.
9. As a staff we agree on anything, but to do it is different.
10. We should try and harmonize.
11. Last year we felt we had confluent education pushed down our throats and we just rebelled.
12. I'm not sure everybody in this school are working towards the same thing.
13. We have not found a method of operation in our school - nothing jells.
14. I see the staff as two groups.
15. We don't have - "I understand why you did that - I wouldn't do it that way, but I understand why you do it."
16. I shudder every time I hear preaching on the part of "confluent teachers."

TABLE XIII (continued)

17. It's sort of the washed and unwashed on both sides of the fence in this school.
  18. It's hard to get together on it where everybody understands what everybody else is trying to do.
  19. There are two different schools of thought in this school.
  20. The upper grades don't associate much with the lower grades.
  21. I think we should all get together on the staff.
  22. They are a bunch of frustrated teachers as I see it. (entire staff)
  23. I didn't want to get involved this year with the staff because it's just heartache.
  24. It's taking a long time to see people as they are.
  25. I don't like to sit in the staffroom and gossip.
  26. I know we all don't pull together too well.
  27. We started it but we never finished. (Consensus on personal goals)
  28. I think we have young people coming in (teachers) and what they find is a division - I think they find a lot of distress and the first couple of weeks they are expected to pick sides. Whether they do or not, they are classed as pro or con.
  29. I think lack of communication is the basic problem.
  30. As soon as I hear the word "confluent" - then that just throws me off.
  31. I don't really see a team effort.
  32. The split in the way things are done, between grades 1-4 and grades 5-8 was here before confluent education.
-

## TABLE XIV

## THEME #2 THE STRENGTHS WE HAVE

---

---

Supportive Statements

1. We are not pressured to get a certain amount done.
  2. I must admit I think it's a little better this year.
  3. I am more open this year than I usually am.
  4. I think the principal has a lot of patience right now.
  5. There is all the strengths in this school you would need if we could just get together on it.
  6. Everybody here has particular strengths.
  7. From the people who have lived in the community a long time - a knowledge of the community.
  8. I could get help from people who have taught a long time - from their experiences.
  9. There is a positive feeling for the children that is very definite.
  10. A freedom to experiment without feeling there is a sword over your head.
  11. Physically we have plenty of space.
  12. We have some continuity on staff.
  13. Parents like to see Science Fair and Christmas concerts and we have them.
  14. Teachers are becoming more willing to meet parents.
  15. I could learn from some of the teachers what reading series are good.
  16. A principal you can go to and say "I fell right on my face on this - do you have any suggestions?"
  17. We do have some parents who came to the school to offer what they have.
  18. An open-door policy at the school.
- 
-

TABLE XV

## THEME #3 PLANNED CURRICULAR SEQUENCING

---

Supportive Statements

---

1. I think every class should have a continuing program following up what has been done previously. I don't think that is the case now.
  2. I'm wondering if there shouldn't be a gradual process getting to the unlocked.
  3. They think they can just go here and have fun.
  4. We know what we don't want but not much on what we do want.
  5. I think the teachers here are in a situation where they are off balance and their expertise isn't being used to the fullest.
  6. Brooke School, as a place of learning, has to go out and sell that credibility that we can deliver a quality learning.
  7. Academic progress is important and it has to be made.
  8. Confluent teachers haven't extended their training into planned curricular sequence.
  9. My way of doing things would be to give them more responsibility as they have shown a certain amount.
  10. I want to get children prepared for the next grade.
  11. I know where I want to end up - I don't know how to get there.
  12. We should have a fundamental program in Language Arts and Arithmetic that go right up through the school.
  13. The goals have to fit together in order to work.
-

TABLE XVI

## THEME #4 THE ROLE OF THE PRINCIPAL

---

---

Supportive Statements

1. The principal has never defined his role.
  2. I can't find out the guidelines for my job.
  3. A more eclectic approach needs to be taken.
  4. I don't think we are clear on what the principal's role is.
  5. There are some responsibilities they should take but they feel  
it is up to the principal.
  6. I think the staff wants the principal to solve their problems  
for them.
  7. I'd like the principal to be more assertive
  8. I can't get an answer out of him.
  9. There is a lack of an administrative head here.
  10. I figure there should be a little bit of punishment from the  
principal.
  11. There is a lack of a dynamic leadership element in the centre  
and in the school.
- 
-

TABLE XVII

## THEME #5 STAFF MEETINGS

---

---

Supportive Statements

1. I hate staff meetings.
  2. Most of the time we get nowhere in our staff meeting.
  3. The staff meetings are too long.
  4. There is always the thing about the staff meeting must end at 4:30 or I'm leaving.
  5. We never seem to get to the "punch line".
- 
-

## TABLE XVIII

## THEME #6 RELATIONSHIP WITH COMMUNITY AND PARENTS

---

---

Supportive Statements

1. My feeling has gone from concern to anger for some of our strongest critics.
  2. There is no feeling on the part of the community that this is our school. It's got weaknesses but it's our school.
  3. The parents complain a lot about the school. They don't really know what's going on.
  4. Parents and teachers have fear of each other.
  5. Teachers are sometimes paternalistic toward parents.
  6. The whole idea of "special" is really confused.
  7. There is not enough parent and teacher involvement in the school.
  8. The school is part of the centre's total philosophy.
  9. I also see a lot of fear in some of the teachers of the community.
- 
-

The numbering of the themes came from my conclusion that the first theme represented the basic "log-jam" for the other concerns. "How we work together" is essentially negative in tone and thus "The Strengths We Have" was described as theme #2 in order to portray a realistic possibilities and opportunities picture as well as the problem. The rest of the themes were numbered for no particular reason that I was aware.

Part of the introduction to the workshop had been planned by this time. This was the sharing of the theory under which Harvey and Albertson had proposed this initial "owning" activity. Thus there was determination to share the following and work with it in some way with the staff as a prelude to the previously described exercises.

The following is the summary of my planning for Thursday morning as it was presented to the two staff volunteers.

9:00 - 9:15      Introductory work

- a) Hand out agenda for the two days
- b) Give overall reasons for the agenda without overexplaining
- c) Make a personal statement as to my hopes for the workshop and invite others to do the same.
- d) Make a statement regarding expectations about participants working hard.

9:15 - 9:35      Participants to read themes and supporting statements which are on large sheets hung around the room. People are not to speak to each other but may ask for clarification as to what a particular word is supposed to be. I will not interpret statements.

- 9:35 - 10:35 a) Handout copies of "Theory of Organization Development - I"<sup>5</sup> I will read to the group. The staff to go into dyads to talk for a few minutes about whether the hand-out has anything to say to this staff. (See Appendix B)
- b) Breaking up into two groups by choosing up sides using the two volunteers as beginning places.
- c) Give instructions for developing summary statements. Also introduce concepts of "task", "maintenance", and "gatekeeping".
- d) Each group decides on six summary statements.
- 10:45 - 11:00 Representatives of the two groups publically negotiate six final summary statements.
- 11:00 - 11:30 Each participant is to write down how he or she contributes to the way things are in Brooke School as represented by the final six summary statements. This work to be done privately. I will make a statement regarding the ease of seeing how others contribute to a bad situation but not seeing how oneself is responsible.
- 11:30 - 11:40 With the group in a circle participants are asked to share what they have written.
- 11:40 - 12:00 Staff members are to fill out a "Debriefing Form" individually. I will invite the staff to hand in the completed forms to be read anonymously back to the group either at the end of the morning or at the beginning of the afternoon session.

Besides largely confirming the diagnosis, the volunteers agreed to represent each group and negotiate with each other. They appeared to have a considerable amount of energy for the work. The meeting with the volunteers consisted of my presenting the plans for the sessions in detail, requesting comments and suggestions, and making additions or deletions as the planning group decided. The suggestions from the volunteers and agreed to by this group were:

- a) That the two volunteers be prepared to express their hopes for the results of the workshop with the hope that this would encourage others to express themselves.
- b) That we not use my suggestion of "choosing up sides" as this would be too threatening to those left near the end. Instead the volunteers suggested that the staff be told to divide into two groups but choosing to be with one of the volunteers.
- c) That I again state to the staff that the interviews were confidential and that I will not discuss their contents with anyone. This I agreed to do reluctantly as it seemed this was over-stating the case.

In view of the diagnosis described in the previous chapter and the criterion of design suggesting that the underlying problem be dealt with first, "Inter-Group conflict" would be the topic for the afternoon session. There had been only one alternative that had been fleetingly considered - goals and objectives for the school. This was rejected because; a) I felt that the staff couldn't work together well enough to achieve any sort of meaningful consensus about goals and objectives; b) this entire staff agreed on teaching the whole child but appeared to disagree on the methods used to teach the children; and c) several staff members had given the advice to stay away from goals and objectives. This stemmed from goals and philosophy being classed together and "philosophizing" being equated to trying to

push others around. The only reason it was considered was some sort of loyalty to the sequence of chapters in "Handbook of Organization Development in Schools" as well as the high number of responses categorized under. "No consensus among staff, students, and parents about the goals of the school" from the previous chapter.<sup>6</sup>

In deciding to work on this topic I was forced to consider my objectives. To reduce the conflict so that people could see each other as individuals rather than as a member of a group was a goal of high priority. Thus there needed to be some work on being aware of how win-lose confrontations reduces the ability to see others as they are, and thus preventing the staff from working together in a collaborative manner. It appeared obvious to me that the two groups had strengths to offer each other. One further hope then was that each group could begin to communicate so that utilization of the curricular planning ability of the primary group and the innovativeness and increased faith in children of the upper grades group could begin in both sectors of the school. The major reason for dealing with this concern however was that two groups in conflict on such a small staff could not each go their own way. There also appeared to be a yearning to move towards the qualities of the antagonistic group on the part of many individuals from both groups. The positive personal qualities were not being perceived as a result of the "blindness" of the inter-group conflict. One more specific goal was for the "confluent group" to get in the shoes of the primary group in becoming aware of their a) possible fear of not being able to do what could be asked of them, b) their pride in their methods of teaching, and c) their feelings of being "pushed around". The primary people needed to know that the upper

grades group and the "confluent teachers" were not as cohesive nor as confident as they imagined.

There were two alternatives in inter-group conflict work in my experience. The first alternative was a form of "mirroring" in which different groups within the Department of Education were attempting to amalgamate. The exercise involved each group making the lists; "How we see ourselves" and "How we see \_\_\_\_\_" for each of the other groups. These were posted for all to see and a clarification discussion followed. This was rejected because it was not direct enough. The paper and pencil aspect could possibly reduce the impact. There seemed to be a need to discharge feelings about the current situation without getting into another win-lose effort. The results of that experience did not appear particularly positive. A similar exercise had been experienced in which rural and urban high school students made lists of words that described themselves and the other group. The results had been positive but it was felt that the Brooke School situation required something more direct.

The second alternative was a role reversal. This had been experienced with a group of students from Frontier Collegiate and a group of students from Winnipeg. It appeared to be successful in breaking down barriers that came from seeing others only as a member of a strange group. Although these high school groups had not been in an overt conflict situation - the fear that the other group would dominate joint group efforts, the misunderstandings seen as the result of negative personality factors in people, and the assumption that the other group doesn't like us and thus we should take the offence first

appeared to be present in both the high school students and the staff at Brooke School.

This technique was appealing in that it had a sufficient balance between a structure that would reduce the possibilities of destructive win-lose conflicts and allowing the freedom for people to begin to express themselves. The biggest point in its favour was research that indicated that role reversing really does allow you to see the situation from the other person's perspective.<sup>7</sup> This was the main hope in reducing the destructive uses of conflict that had been occurring in Brooke School.

There was a further objective for this afternoon session that dealt not only with collaboration but with the healthy use of conflict in a school. This was the aim that staff members would be able to see energizing uses for conflict and not view conflict as inherently bad but to see its possible contributions to staff effectiveness. The main objective of the afternoon, however, was that individuals really begin to listen and see each other without assuming beforehand what they are going to say and do.

The detailed plan for the Thursday afternoon session was as follows:

1:00 - 1:20      The tests on "Inter-Group conflict"<sup>8</sup> will be distributed to each participant. When these have been completed I will read the entire test giving the correct responses.  
  
(See Appendix B)

- 1:20 - 1:40 A paper entitled "Theory of Organization Development - II"<sup>9</sup> will be handed to each participant. I will read it aloud. The staff will then be asked to go into dyads and discuss the paper around the question "Does this paper say anything about what has been happening here at Brooke School?" (See Appendix B)
- 1:40 - 2:10 The grade five to eight teachers will be asked to form a circle in the middle of the room. The rest of the staff will position themselves so they can hear well. The upper grades' first task will be to discuss theme #1 "How we work together" as they imagine the grades 1-4 staff would view the situation. Theme #1 and its supportive statements will be on the wall and near this group. Thus there should be plenty of statements available that they had imagined the other group had made, for take-off points. The rest of the staff will not be permitted to ask questions. They will be requested to listen only.
- 2:10 - 2:30 The upper grades group will discuss theme #1 as themselves. After this the rest of the staff could ask for clarification of what was meant by what was said by the upper grades group. The staff would be warned that I will be very pushy about cutting off questions that I feel have "hooks" in them.
- 2:30 - 3:20 The entire process will be repeated with the grades 1-4 staff.

3:20 - 3:30 The same debriefing process will be used as in the morning session. The reason for having the upper grades' group go through the process first was that there were many high talkers in this group and they appeared less fearful of new situations than the primary group.

There were no specific changes made as a result of sharing the foregoing plans with the volunteers. Their discussions centered around the possibilities for the afternoon session to produce real effects - they appeared to be positive about the planning. The statement was made that some people on staff would have a hard time doing this exercise. This appeared to stem from lack of confidence in speaking up in front of groups generally.

There had been unanimous agreement that staff meetings were not effective. I had diagnosed and this had been corroborated by several staff members, that the inter-group conflict was the major stumbling block to improving the staff meetings. Ineffective staff meetings appeared to be a major effect of the conflict on staff. I suspected that this was the focus for deciding whether an improvement in inter-group relations occurred. Staff meetings had been an arena for inter-group conflict.

There were other bases for poor staff meetings as well. These were; a) the staff meetings were dominated by high talkers, b) this reduced the participation by others and thus the group was deprived of the ideas of the low participators, c) there was little commitment on the part of the low and medium participators to carry out decisions made in staff meetings, d) low participators did not feel part of the

staff - there was a lack of cohesiveness and thus the energy to work in the future was reduced. These expectations came from interview data as well as from research on the effects of a low level of maintenance behaviors in decision making groups.

One part of the dynamics of the situation is that all of the other concerns, as represented by the themes, were fairly easily avoided but staff meetings were going to be held regularly and attendance was compulsory. This was one of the deciding factors in choosing to move to this concern for Friday morning. Another reason for choosing staff meetings was that this was an opportunity to improve the staff's skills at problem solving. To do this other concerns would be used as content while attempting to improve the problem solving processes of the group.

In diagnosing the staff meeting difficulties it appeared that the only problem solving sequence that had been attempted in a formal way had been Method III of Teacher Effectiveness Training. To me Method III, although it is described as a problem-solving method, is not an organizational problem solving method. It is a way of approaching inter-personal conflict. It begins with the needs of the individuals and thus is suited to resolving differences of opinion. It also attempts to be as non-emotional as possible and thus can be very non-involving to boot. To solve organizational problems there must be some sort of description of the present situation and this must be seen as different from the ideal situation. The basic difficulty in motivating people is not that they don't want a better situation, but that they do not see it as achievable.

A good beginning place for this session appeared to be some introspection regarding past individual problem solving behaviors. Staying on the topic as a "task" behavior would be stressed by myself as appropriate throughout the morning.

The design for this session is based on Theory of Organization Development III.<sup>10</sup> (See Appendix B)

The detailed plan for Friday morning is as follows: The following is to be posted on large sheets in the workroom; Problem Solving Model<sup>11</sup> and Suggestions.<sup>12</sup> (See Appendix B)

9:00 - 9:20 Each staff member to receive a copy of "Theory of Organization Development - III". I will read Theory III aloud. I will then explain the problem solving Model. As well, I will suggest the following topics to be worked on with the problem solving model. These are: a) planned curricular sequencing, b) use of materials in the school, c) relationship with community and parents and d) discipline problems. It was left as to which topic would be worked on by each of the three groups.

Prior to the three problem solving efforts by the three groups each participant is asked to look at his own behavior during group problem solving. A copy of Your Problem Solving Behavior - A Test<sup>13</sup> will be distributed to each staff member and time will be given to indicate their own behavior on each continuum. (See Appendix B)

9:20 - 11:45 There will be about 35 minutes for each of the three groups to work on their topic. Approximately fifteen minutes for discussing each group's work will be allowed.

11:45 - 12:00 The same method for debriefing will be used as previously described.

There was some concern by the volunteers that the low talkers would not say anything at all. Regardless, the volunteers approved of the plans for this session.

The possibility of working on the role of the principal was recognized by Monday, January 19. Thus, the principal was asked to prepare the following at that time: a) to be able to state the rationale for the role of principal in Brooke School as he saw it, b) state what his understanding is of the expectations that Frank Price has of him, c) specify a number of functions that are a part of his job and d) be prepared to list specific behaviors that describe his day's work.

At this same time the principal was given the entire Role Analysis Technique to be followed. The steps of the Role Analysis Technique are:<sup>14</sup>

- a) The principal to state to the staff the foregoing. This is essentially a statement about how the principal sees his job as well as his perception of what he is doing. This should not be a description of what he would like to do.
- b) The staff is to give feedback to the principal on what they see the principal doing.

Again, the staff will be directed to keep their statements confined to what they see as the principal's behaviors. They are to make statements about the specific behaviors the principal has listed. They may make statements to the principal that they do not see behaviors that the principal sees, or that they see behaviors that the principal does not see.

This step is to possibly give the principal data on his own behavior and/or to see how he is seen by the staff.

c) The principal is to make demands on the staff as a whole or on particular individuals. "In order for me to \_\_\_\_\_, I need \_\_\_\_\_ from you", is the format. The principal is asked to be as specific as possible in relating his functions to behaviors he needs from the staff. For each demand from the principal, the person or persons to whom the demand is directed is asked to respond. The responses may be "yes" or "no" or there may be further negotiations set up for the future.

d) The process is reversed. This step is to give staff members opportunities to make demands on the principal. The principal is to respond to the demands of the participants.

This ends the description of the Role Analysis Technique. I had not used it previously. Its main advantage over other approaches to role clarification and role negotiation is that it encourages directness. Demands and responses are directly given verbally. A further apparent benefit is that it seems to allow for different levels of risk for the participants.

Deciding on the role of the principal partially comes from data from the theme but it also stems from the design criterion related to the importance of the principal's role in the school. It also appeared that clarification and negotiation of the principal's role would involve a more direct kind of communication than any of the other themes.

The volunteers gave their approval to the topic and the approach to be used. The possibility of open conflict was discussed but no change in plans resulted.

The following is the agenda for the first training event. A copy of this agenda was distributed to each participant at the beginning of this event.

ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT IN-SERVICE

AT BROOKE SCHOOL

<u>TOPIC</u>	<u>TIME</u>
Developing summary statements of concerns	9 - 12 a.m. Thursday, January 22
Inter-Group Conflict	1 - 3:30 p.m. Thursday, January 22
*****	
Improvement of Problem Solving at Staff Meetings	9 - 12 a.m. Friday, January 23
The Role of Principal in this school	1 - 3:30 p.m. Friday, January 23
*****	
Tools for deciding the results of the In-service - 15 min. from 3:30 - 3:45 p.m.	

### III. DESIGNING THE SECOND TRAINING EVENT

Data from the interviews held by the staff volunteers will be described in detail in chapter six. The second training event was to be held on March 12, 1976.

The interview data gave commitment and inter-personal relationships as two areas where work was required. One of the areas that everyone had agreed had improved appreciably was staff meetings. In addition, I was informed the afternoon before the workshop that there was a high probability that many participants would have concerns in two areas, a) teacher evaluation, and b) the use of the resource teacher.

The first concern appeared to centre around a "Staff Evaluation Form".<sup>15</sup> (See Appendix C). Some items in the form contained vocabulary that was special to both Transactional Analysis and Teacher Effectiveness Training. The principal stated that the form would be used as a basis for classroom visitations by the principal. The principal expected that many people on staff would see this evaluation as threatening their job. There was no way of knowing the extent of this concern prior to the workshop with the time available. Thus it was decided to determine the extent as well as deal with it during the workshop.

The second concern was around the use of the resource teacher to teach Life Skills to students at the grade seven and eight level in the school. This evidently was going to cut into the time available to work with other students on a remedial basis. This appeared to me as another issue in which the staff was split along previous lines. However, a meeting had been scheduled to work on this concern the following

Monday. Consequently, I decided that working on this issue during the workshop would not further the aim of the staff dealing with their own problems - people would be told at the workshop that this issue would not be included in the day's sessions.

To further develop ability within the staff to handle their own problems, I wished to build on the successes of the first training event. The objective then was to build in as much structure as possible for improving meetings and problem solving. This appeared to be the route to increased success in dealing with issues. In spite of data that indicated an appreciable improvement in attitudes between the two groups, I had no illusions as to its fragility. There still appeared to be the need to work on inter-personal relationships as the staff had indicated, deal with current school issues, and improve the capacity of the staff for dealing with future concerns. It appeared that the largest blocks to improved relationships were; a) resentments from the past that are still being carried around; b) a pattern of response that emphasized negative data rather than a positive point of view; c) lack of faith in oneself on the part of many staff members, and d) an idealistic and unrealistic view of "commitment". Lesser blocks were the skill and procedural aspects related to communications and meetings.

The plan for the morning session was as follows:

9:00 - 9:15     The two volunteers are to give their summary of the interview data in terms of effects of the first training event as well as the suggestions for the workshop topics.

- 9:15 - 9:25 With the staff seated in a circle, each person is to give a short "success story" related to one's work from the recent past. The staff may "pass" if they wish.
- 9:20 - 10:15 Determination of Concerns
- Each person is asked to take one piece of paper. They are to write one general concern and one specific concern about Brooke School. The staff will be told that a high degree of agreement on any concerns will be worked on in the afternoon session. After the concerns have been written, and not signed, the papers are folded up and placed in the middle of the circle. After they have been mixed up by myself, each participant receives a piece of paper. The concerns are then read aloud as each person feels ready. There will be time allowed for the person who wrote the concerns to "own" them by saying, "That was mine" right after each statement is read. There is an opportunity to clarify the concern by the writer as well. At the end of the exercise, I will pick three concerns to be worked on in the afternoon session.
- 10:15 - 11:45 This part of the workshop is designed to allow participants to work on "unfinished business" of both a positive and negative nature. As has been stated previously, the usual "unfinished business" of a negative nature are "resentments". According to Gestalt therapy resentments not only reduce the person's ability to

"see" others, they also result in physical tensions in the body. The therapy required is for the person to thoroughly discharge his feelings related to the resentment and thus "clear the way" for new perceptions. The old adage "getting it off your chest" is another description of the same process. To do this adequately, the group should not be afraid of feelings or of their expression. The indicator, from my experience, of a group that is not comfortable in this area, is the degree to which individuals feel responsible for others' actions and feelings. This kind of group has no understanding of the difference between "sympathy" and "support" and its consequent effects on people. Thus, "concern for others" is the cloak to hide their own uncomfortableness with feelings being expressed. For the large majority of the staff at Brooke School working through resentments in an emotional way would be difficult or impossible in a peer setting. Thus, I decided not to encourage such efforts by explicitly planning for such occurrences. The question for me is how much harboured resentments would interfere with commitments for the future. Reality Therapy, for example, sees no problem here at all. Unresolved feelings are simply ignored. Reality Therapy does have the advantage over conventional wisdom in that "blaming" is seen as destructive but it does not see feelings as having wisdom.

To allow for a balance between expressed feelings and future commitment seemed to be the key in dealing with resentments at this point with the group. Consequently, in view of Gestalt therapy's definition of a resentment as an "unspoken demand that somebody feel guilty" and that working through a resentment is helpful but does not give assistance in preventing circumstances that give rise to future identical resentments, I was determined to devise an exercise based on demands arising out of current resentments. The demand that somebody feel guilty is not seen as helpful but a demand that is specific and behavioural in content is seen as exceedingly worthwhile. With all of this in mind, and more, the following exercise was derived.

The staff is to be seated in a circle on chairs. Each participant is given slips of paper. Each staff member is to write as many demands and appreciations as they wish with each demand or appreciation on a separate piece of paper. Demands and appreciations are to be directed towards someone or to a particular group. Participants will be directed to be specific in their statements. As in the previous exercise each piece of paper is folded and placed in the middle of the circle. Each "round" consists of every person taking one piece of paper, reading them as they feel ready, allowing time for ownership and further edification, as well as giving time for a response from the person or persons to whom

it was directed. Participants will be told that a simple "thank you" is an appropriate response to an appreciation but not to give acceptance speeches and that possible responses to a demand is "I will", "I won't", or no response at all. At the end of this exercise, I will point out different ways that commitments can be viewed as well as suggesting that commitments be made public.

11:45 - 12:00 Debriefing session

The first contribution of the volunteers, during the planning was of giving the data feedback to the staff as well as describing their own views of the effects of the first training event. The second was a thorough discussion of the demands and appreciations exercise. There was some fear on the part of the volunteers that people would not participate in this exercise. There existed a definite fear that more harm than good would come out of it. This was basically around the possibility that someone might take a hard "shot" at someone and then not "own" it. The planning group did, however, decide to stick to my proposal.

The afternoon session was to begin by hanging large sheets on the walls; Defining a Workable Problem,<sup>16</sup> 5 Basic Steps in Problem Solving,<sup>17</sup> Example of an Agenda,<sup>18</sup> Guide for the Role of Chairperson,<sup>19</sup> Observing,<sup>20</sup> and Debriefing Form (see Appendix C).

1:00 - 1:20 Explanation of the plan for the afternoon which includes reading the materials posted with clarifications.

- 1:20 - 3:15 Each of the three concerns to be dealt with in an open fishbowl with two vacant chairs. This allowed about thirty minutes for each topic. Ten minutes is allowed for feedback and discussion. Volunteers from the staff will be requested for chairperson, secretary, observer for eye contact, and an observer for talking.
- 3:15 - 3:30 Debriefing exercise.

Aside from general approval there were no specific changes made in the plans resulting from meeting with the volunteers.

#### IV. COMMENTARY AND REFLECTIONS ON THE DESIGN PROCESS

The design followed the criteria set out in Chapter Two of this study. I was aware of the impact that the use of volunteers to assist in the design process had on the design. There was no expectation on my part that the volunteers had the experience, information, or the time to plan the design from the diagnosis. However, giving feedback to my proposals appeared to be satisfactory both in terms of results as well as being within the time constraints for planning time. The major contributions from the volunteers were a) providing a solid footing for predicting group responses to particular exercises, b) providing leadership within the workshops and c) imparting confidence to the staff by virtue of the staff believing that they would not approve inappropriate training sessions.

One specific area which I considered neglected somewhat in the planning was Theory of Organization Development - I. The design does not appear to provide opportunities for recognizing and owning the neurotic patterns indicated in Theory of Organization Development - I.

Another area similarly viewed is on a theory of expectations. However, with the time available I saw no way of excluding present plans for these concerns.

There were other concerns prior to completing the designs for each training session. The first concern was the primary teachers group. They appeared to need confidence building. From the interviews I had expected that fears had been somewhat reduced. I was not certain however, that I would not be identified as part of the confluent group. To further reduce this possibility, I spent no informal time with the principal nor any other staff members aside from the volunteers before the first training event. To reduce any fears that I would divulge any confidences from the interviews I did not stay at the principal's house as I had in the past, but resided in a motel in Rivers. This information was passed to the staff by a prominent memo on the staff room of the school in conjunction with an invitation for any staff members to visit and discuss Brooke School at the motel room. It further appeared that the advice from an interview that "Some people need more loving - they need to feel needed" applied to the primary teachers group. I was determined to view statements from this group in as positive a manner as possible and to share my thinking.

Another concern dealt with paying attention to the principal as the key person in any change process. The first way of dealing with this concern is by requesting feedback from the principal on the overall design of the workshop. He essentially was included in the planning on an informal basis. He did not offer specific suggestions but many of his procedural pieces of advice were used. The second element in working with the principal was to introduce to him privately

the "myth of omnipotence" concept. This is the idea that managers hold themselves back from expressing themselves openly for fear that the staff would not be able to "take it" and thus grow weak. Thus I was determined to encourage the principal to be more direct and assertive with the staff. I was not absolutely convinced that this advice was entirely appropriate, but there definitely appeared to be an imbalance in his being direct with staff members. There needed to be more leadership at the risk of increasing dependencies in my view. Too often the staff hears "double messages".

Throughout the planning I attempted to achieve a proper balance between, "Don't explain things away before we do something" and sharing the theory with the participants.

Generally throughout the training event, I was interested in modelling good communication skills as well as teaching them on an incidental basis. These would include a) distinguishing between statements and questions, b) making demands explicit, c) personalizing statements, d) saying "you" instead of "he" when referring to a person in the group - being more direct overall, e) paying attention to feelings of individuals in the group as well as the atmosphere of the group in an on-going way, and f) watching for cancellation statements or gestures.

# REFERENCES

1. John Lofland, Analyzing Social Settings: A Guide to Qualitative Observation and Analysis, Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., Belmont, California, 1971, p. 75.
2. Jerry B. Harvey and D. Richard Albertson, Neurotic Organizations: Symptoms, Causes and Treatment, in Contemporary Organization Development: Conceptual Orientations and Interventions, Edited by W. Warner Burke, NTL Institute for Applied Behavior Science, 1972, p. 26, 27.
3. Ibid. p. 19.
4. Ibid. p. 26.
5. Harvey, Albertson, op cit. p. 27, 28.
6. Refer to previous Chapter III, Table 1, p. 38.
7. David W. Johnson, Frank P. Johnson, Joining Together: Group Theory and Group Skills, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1975, p. 185.
8. Ibid, p. 193, 194.
9. Ibid. p. 195, 196.
10. Schmuck, Runkel, Saturen, Martell, Derr, Handbook of Organization Development in Schools, National Press Books, 1972, p. 286, 287.
11. Johnson, Johnson, op cit, p. 257.
12. Ibid. p. 260.
13. Ibid. p. 258, 259.
14. Wendell L. French and Cecil H. Bell, Organization Development Behavioral Science Intervention for Organization Improvement, University of Washington, Prentice-Hall Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1973, p. 117-119.
15. Staff Evaluation Form: Appendix C.
16. Johnson, Johnson, op cit, p. 260.
17. Ibid. p. 259.
18. Schmuck, Runkel, Saturen, Martell, Derr, op cit, p. 197.
19. Ibid. p. 193, 194.
20. Ibid. p. 182.

## CHAPTER V

## DESCRIPTION OF THE INTERVENTION

As was stated previously, the intervention consists of entry, diagnosis, initial training design, first training event, assessment of effects of first training event, design of the follow-up training, second training event, final evaluation, and withdrawal. This chapter consists of a description of the intervention. It is an account of what happened.

## I. DESCRIPTION OF THE INTERVENTION

Entry From My View

I approached the principal of Brooke School in July of 1975. The principal was told of my interest in doing a theses in the organization development area. The reason for approaching Brooke School was the feeling of credibility with several staff members through work in confluent education. The principal did not appear enthusiastic about the prospect. He stated that he expected the staff to be involved in Teacher Effectiveness Training in the fall. A very brief description or organizational development was given to the principal. No agreement of any sort was reached.

During the first week of September, the principal was 'phoned and the desire of doing some work was again indicated to him. The principal stated that communications between teachers was satisfactory at this point and that his understanding of the conversation in July

was that organizational development work wasn't needed if the communications level was high. The response was that a high communications level was just a beginning and that problem solving skills, improving meetings, and the decision making process of a school were other areas of organization development's domain. The principal was told that at least three days of in-service time would be required. If there weren't at least three days available at Brooke School, the principal was told, then there was no interest in any. The principal replied that all of the in-service days for 1975 had been used up. The reason for approaching Brooke School was again stated to the principal. His response was that there was credibility with four staff members. He then stated that it was up to the staff and that there were in-service days available in January 1976. The principal was then requested to approach the staff for permission to allow the proposal to be given in person. He said he would.

The principal met with the staff on September 17. A few days later he telephoned. He stated that the meeting would take place on October 29 at the regular staff meeting, at 3:00 p.m. The principal stated that there would be about an hour available and that my proposal was the only agenda item.

On October 28 I arrived at the Oo-za-we-kwun centre. In the evening, the principal, myself, and two other staff members were part of a party during which I gave my perception of the usefulness of organizational development and how it compared to other current approaches to staff development. The staff members, including the principal, stated that they didn't believe the staff would accept the proposal but that they would be fair and give the proposal a fair

hearing. This did not assist my confidence that the response would be positive.

The meeting did not begin at the scheduled time of 3:00 p.m. It began at 3:20 p.m. At this time a teacher, a teacher-aide and the principal were missing. There were eleven teachers, three teacher-aides, and a guest from the Youth Secretariat. The atmosphere appeared to be one of indifference.

There was no introduction made. At least four teachers appeared to be correcting papers around the staffroom table. Some people were getting coffee. The space seemed cramped. The mood at this point appeared to be expectant and yet a great deal of weariness was apparent. A little after 3:20 I said, "I am beginning my presentation now." "How is that with you?" There were nods and people appeared to pay attention. The correction of papers stopped.

I began by stating, "I have a proposition for you. I want to work with you for three days of your in-service time on organization development." It was then indicated that I would give a short presentation and then ask for questions.

The presentation, which lasted about ten minutes, covered the following points:

1. A definition of an organizational problem as the difference between how the staff saw a situation and how they imagined it could be.
2. A statement about organizational development being an attempt to make the school more effective organizationally.
3. Areas included in the domain of organization development:

- a) Clarifying expectations of professional roles in the school
- b) Working on basic communication among staff members
- c) Goal clarification involving the clarifying of the philosophy of the school and the goals of the overall program of the school. How do the goals of different teachers fit together?
- d) Improving problem solving processes - this could be part of staff meetings or conferences on specific problems by staff members
- e) Becoming aware of the decision-making processes in the school and the pros and cons of making decisions in different ways
- f) Uncovering and working with conflict. Conflict can be used in constructive ways
- g) Improving meetings - making them more efficient.

"At the same time as you work on improving how you work together, we would be dealing with real problems in the school as you perceive them." The staff was also told that the workshops would be basically experiential - that is, doing activities rather than lectures. They were told that the workshops would be built around the concerns of the staff. They were also given details concerning the use of taped interviews and supporting statements at this time. The following was written on the chalkboard:

Interviews before January

summary statements

involvement of two volunteers in planning a two-day in-service

assessment of the effects of the in-service and a further one-day in-service as a follow-up

The staff was then told that the basic purpose of the research was to determine the effectiveness of the use of organizational development principles in schools. Thus, there would be a careful evaluation of the training sessions to an extent not usually seen in Manitoba training efforts. The staff was also told that the second training event would be about a month after the first training event. The staff was told that I was not interested in less than three days of in-service time to attempt to test out the use of organizational development but that I would be available should the staff request further work beyond the three days. The staff was asked to decide at the end of this meeting, and to provide two volunteers should the response be positive.

The staff was then given an example of a specific procedure called "debriefing" from organizational development readings. The purpose of debriefing is to call attention to how meetings proceeded rather than just dealing with the content. Its purpose was to bring out factors that contribute to the effectiveness of meetings. To give an example, the staff was told that we would do a debriefing of this meeting at the end.

The principal then asked if I had explained the difference between organizational development and Teacher Effectiveness Training. The reply was that organizational development was not student-teacher oriented but dealt primarily with staff to staff relationships.

The atmosphere had changed considerably by this time with a large number of people appearing to be attentive to what was happening.

When the opportunity for questions was given, one lady said that I spoke too quickly. I thanked her and said I would pay attention to the speed with which I spoke. Another person wanted to know how the thesis tied into my academic program. This was answered. Another asked a question of clarification, "Would the staff get the printed results?" The answer given was affirmative.

At this point I gave my reasons for approaching Brooke School. The staff was also told of my experience in facilitating organizational development workshops, which was limited to work with the staff of which I was a member.

The titles Benefit and Price were then placed on the chalkboard. The decision from my perspective included the following:

I was a principal for five years but I have not been an elementary classroom teacher.

There was no cost to the school in financial terms but the three days couldn't be used for something else.

I then stated that the staff could finish off the list after I left. I then left the school. While away from the school, I felt that the possibilities for acceptance were higher at the end of the meeting than at the beginning.

The view of one staff member of the rest of the meeting gave the following information. The chairperson designated for this staff meeting asked "How do we decide?" The principal then provided some leadership and led a discussion which added some points to the Benefit and Price lists. The benefits were: using ourselves in the learning; might learn to solve some of our problems; find commonality and build on that, and; meeting other staff members in a professional way. The prices were that it might not work and it would take time and energy.

While I was there five people spoke. After I left, many more people expressed themselves. The decision was made by a limited discussion and then holding a vote. Almost everyone voted in favor. One statement by a teacher during the discussion was that I appeared well organized and that if I was as well organized in the future, good things might happen.

#### The Participant's Perspective of the Contract Meeting

These are the verbatim accounts of the participant's responses to the question, "If you voted for the proposal at the October 29 meeting, why did you?" This was part of the post-intervention interviews conducted on May 8 and 9 of 1976.

"I thought it could be beneficial. I thought it could help the people in it - including myself."

"Just in a very general sense - because anything like that is beneficial - anything that gets you looking at how things are working is good. I guess from a personal level because I felt that things were not working as well as they could in terms of teachers working together."

"We obviously had a great need at this school for the staff to work together for a common purpose and I didn't see that happening and I hoped that some outside agency would facilitate that."

"I voted for it because, I felt, first of all we should try to help a student who is trying to do something that is very important and I really felt that we needed it. Sort of a mutual benefit."

"Just for the staff, I guess, I wanted better organization - with staff relations."

"No, I didn't vote for it. I would go along but I really couldn't see what it was going to give to us and I didn't know what it was going to give to you - it was a long way from the city and unless we are really going to accomplish something I saw an enormous amount for problems for us."

"I voted for it naturally, in hopes that things would improve."

"I'm not sure that I didn't just feel that anything that is different is kind of good for us - we can learn from it. As people have helped me a lot to get going, I would do anything I could to help someone else."

"I like sitting around and discussing things. I like meetings - and I did it because we have done some TA and TET and O.D. was another. I like to be exposed to every damn one of them. There may be only a point in each one - I may hate a whole bunch of it - but I'm not going to pick it apart because I hate it - I'll take the ones that are good for me."

"Very simply, that I was looking for some kind of mobilizing energy to get us to hell off our stuck point as a staff - to get us working together in one direction rather than fifteen thousand directions. You were the only game in town at that point."

### A Description of the Initial Interviews

Before beginning any questions, permission to tape the interviews was requested and how quotes would be used was described generally to each staff member. Assurance was also given that each respondent will remain anonymous in any written reports growing out of the study. It was also indicated that the respondents may find some questions far-fetched, silly or difficult to answer. Each interviewee was told that he is free to interrupt, to ask for clarification, or to criticize the questioning. Finally, each person who was interviewed was cautioned that when I nodded it doesn't necessarily mean I agree with the statements being made, merely that I believe I understand what is being said.

There were two people who decided not to have their interviews taped. I saw this as indicating a lack of trust in myself and/or the administration of the school. The interview schedule was not followed in a rigid fashion; pertinent or impertinent questions were frequently introduced spontaneously. The major focus was on the interviewee and on gaining as much of the interviewee's perspective as possible. However, myths were challenged when it seemed appropriate.

Thus the interviews were the beginning of an attempt to influence the staff in addition to obtaining diagnostic data. These efforts dealt with providing additional perspectives as possibilities to individuals being interviewed. Many of these additional perspectives came from previous interviews. As well, the testing out of catastrophic expectations was speculated on by myself where the person being interviewed seemed to want to deal with their concerns in a more direct manner. In addition to the use of the interview as an intervention technique, the following occurred: a) active listening in the Teacher Effectiveness Training sense by showing people that I really was listening, b) this was not done in any stereotyped way such as "What I hear you saying is...." as a consistent pattern. The main way the participants knew they were being listened to was by my asking questions and making comments that were pertinent to what was being said. Although they professed considerable antagonism towards active listening from staff members, no one accused me of using this technique "on them" or objected to my behaviours at any time during the interviews.

The interview time schedule was set up by the two volunteers from the school. They took place from 10:00 a.m. to 11:30 p.m. on Monday January 19, 1976 and from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. on Tuesday, January 20, 1976. The length of the interviews varied from 25 minutes to two and a half hours. The modal time was one hour. The interviews took place in an isolated seminar room in Brooke School, and in the homes of three of the staff members.

Many staff members appeared to approach the interviews in a fearful way. This seemed to be reduced to a large degree by the end of each interview. A typical comment by many staff members was "well,

that wasn't so bad".

The seeming candidness and energy of the participants was an encouragement to me. I felt I had gained the confidence of all, or almost all of the staff. This increased the energy I had available to design appropriate training sessions. There appeared to be no attempts to label me as part of the "confluent group" on staff.

#### Aspects of the Design of the Main Training Event

My planning for the initial training event was completed by Wednesday noon, January 21. The planning team then met for a few hours that evening to finalize plans for the workshop. It was further agreed that the planning group meet at 4 p.m. on Thursday to assess the first day and to check if our plans for the second day still seemed to be worthwhile.

At 4 p.m. on Thursday the planning group met briefly and decided that the plans for Friday were still appropriate.

At about 6 p.m. Thursday evening, I was at the principal's home when the principal answered the phone. A staff member had phoned the principal and told him of over-hearing some statements between staff members that seemed to indicate that they believed I had given the principal information from the interviews. The staff member had phoned to ask the principal if he thought he/she should talk to me about it. The principal said "Yes". The staff member then told me what he/she had said to the principal. The staff member had heard these statements the day before, had ignored it, and then had heard it again on Thursday.

I then went to the home of one of the volunteers to relate what I had heard. The volunteer had known about the rumours since Tuesday. This was the reason he/she had insisted on my repeating that the confidentiality of the interviews would be adhered to on Thursday morning at the beginning of the workshop. This situation appeared to threaten the credibility of myself as well as reducing the workshop's potential.

By combining the volunteer's information with my memories of the interviews, an accurate picture of the misunderstanding emerged. On Tuesday morning, during a particular interview, I learned that the interviewee was unaware of the meeting with staff at 3:30 on Wednesday. This meeting had originally been scheduled to work on ownership. At noon on Tuesday, I was speaking to the principal in his office. The door was open. I said, "Bryan, did you know that \_\_\_\_\_ said,..... This was all that was heard by a teacher passing by the open door. The conclusion of the sentence was, "that she didn't know about any meeting tomorrow at 3:30".

The person passing by had gone to the person he/she thought was being referred to, but went to another staff member with the same name. The rumour then began to move around.

Without knowing, or caring, how many staff members had heard the "gossip", I requested the volunteer to ask permission from the person who had overheard me, to bring the entire situation out in the open. It was proposed that this be done at the beginning of the workshop Friday morning. This was done.

### The Main Training Event

The plans for this session are contained in Chapter IV. Prior to the session the themes and the supportive statements were hung up on large sheets. The room was of adequate size. The room was cleaned up so as to promote a business like atmosphere. All of the materials were laid out neatly on a table. The room contained tables and chairs - enough for three or four people to a table.

The mood of the participants seemed to be one of a combination of excitement and nervousness. The workshop was begun by my stating my code of ethics in working with groups. The first was that the staff would be given the rationale for any exercise suggested in a workshop, the second was that refusal to do an exercise would be respected, the third was that I would not initiate confrontations but would attempt to work with such confrontations as might occur in a constructive way.

The agenda for the next two days was then handed out. The diagnosis of the school was shared in a general way, with the "log-jam" being perceived as the split on staff and its consequent effects. This was given as the reason for the sequencing of topics on the agenda.

The next point mentioned was a verbal reassurance by myself that the information from the interviews was confidential and that it would be used in an anonymous way.

A statement about sticking to the time was then made. I stated that I expected myself and the participants to work hard during the workshop. There was a further expectation that we would stick to the times indicated.

The statement was then made that I hoped the workshop would make some progress towards a more effectively working staff. I then asked if anyone else wanted to state their hopes. The only person who did so was one of the volunteers, even though the second volunteer had stated he would do this in the planning. Staff members were still seated at tables and everyone was quiet. I then asked the staff to move around the room and read the posted sheets. They were further requested to do this non-verbally. If a word was not clear, I would tell them the word but I would not interpret. The staff was directed to read the statements with the purpose of understanding what was being said. I asked the group to avoid a blaming set of mind as much as they could. They were told they had twenty minutes to read the statements. The staff then read the statement - there appeared to be no talking.

When the staff had seated themselves, I stated that the choice of themes was somewhat arbitrary, and that some of the supportive statements could have been placed under different themes. Regardless, I stated that I believed the themes and statements gave a fairly accurate picture of the state of affairs at Brooke School. No questions, statements, reactions, or responses came from the group.

Copies of "Theory of Organization Development - I" were then handed out. This was read aloud to the group. I then asked the staff to move into dyads to discuss the hand-out on the basis of whether it said anything about the current situation in Brooke School. No restriction on who was to go with whom was given. There was one staff member missing at the time - a teacher aide. Otherwise, everyone had been on time.

The mood during the dyads seemed to be both cautious and serious. The time allowed for this was ten minutes. At the end of this time, I stated that I wanted their attention.

The staff was then told of the dilemma I felt in attempting to do a workshop that required them to work together to a fair degree when the main objective for the workshop was to get them to work together. Regardless, I said we would move on.

The staff was then asked to move into two roughly equivalent groups in terms of number. The two volunteers were seated at opposite ends of the room. Each participant was asked to choose which volunteer's group he/she wanted to be with, and to move there. The staff did this - the primary and upper grades groups were mixed in both groups. They happened to be evenly split in both volunteer groups.

The task was then given with the approximate time available for completing it. The task was to achieve agreement among the group on six summary statements - one for each theme. It was stressed that this was an intellectual exercise - the summary statement is a generalization of the data contained in the supporting statements. Each group was to write their summary statements on a large sheet.

Each group sat in a circle. While the groups were working, the missing staff member showed up and I explained what had happened. She requested one of the groups to join them.

The groups appeared to work hard. They seemed cautious but they seemed to listen to each other.

After about ten minutes I interrupted the work to explain the concepts of "task", "maintenance", and "gatekeeping". "Gatekeeping" was explained as an example of a maintenance function. At this time they were requested to work on getting some sort of consensus for each summary statement. They were to try using the "gatekeeping" as a way of including as many people as possible in the discussion. I gave some examples of "gatekeeping" to open the door for someone to speak and to shut people off as well. The groups were cautioned not to use trade offs to achieve consensus and the difference between "cooperation" as getting along with each other and "collaboration" as using each other's resources was stated.

The staff listened and the principal asked for a further clarification of the difference between the use of the words "cooperation" and "collaboration". This was given.

Each group tackled one theme at a time. The groups often moved physically closer to where a particular theme's supportive statements were hung in the room in order to read them again. During the discussions there were emotionally laden statements, that is, many people did not stick to an intellectual assessment level but there appeared to be a willingness to compromise in reaching decisions. The appearance during the discussions was not congruent with a staff at war with itself. They appeared almost "too polite". People seemed willing to work but I still had the impression that at the first real controversy the staff would seek to avoid the conflict by blaming first and withdrawing second.

The groups finished in about an hour. They appeared to have gained some energy. They had made an effort to include others in the discussions.

The summary statements agreed upon were as follows:

Group A

1. The staff works poorly together.
2. There are many strengths in school and community to draw from and we have the freedom to use them.
3. We don't have planned curricular sequencing as an ongoing process.
4. The role of the principal is unclear.
5. Yuk! Staff meetings are useless.
6. There is a division between school and community.

Group B

1. No real communication causing isolation and loneliness.
2. We have all the strengths we need but don't utilize them.
3. Need for more planning of what goes on in classrooms, and need for sharing of this planning with others.
4. Principal's role needs to be defined more clearly - more explanation from principal is needed. People should also state their expectations.
5. Staff meetings are indecisive and unproductive.
6. Appears parents and teachers do not have much contact - don't regard it as "our school".

The principal was in B group. While A group gave generalizations from the data, B group went beyond the task to not only give their view of the implicated "needs" but also to include a few "shoulds".

The sixth summary statement of B group appears tenuous.

The next step was the two volunteers demonstrating "collaboration" skills by publicly negotiating a single set of summary statements from the two sets. The rest of the staff was to observe but not to verbally participate. Thus the two volunteers posted their sheets on the chalkboard for the staff to see and then faced each other in chairs in the middle of the room.

One of the volunteers talked much more than the other. However, they appeared to listen to each other and after twenty minutes came to an agreement. Neither one seemed to be "pushed" around by the other. The staff seemed attentive.

The agreed upon summary statements were as follows:

- 1) The staff works poorly together because of isolation and a lack of real communication.
- 2) There are many strengths in the school and community but we don't utilize them.
- 3) We need a more definite planning of curriculum involving other teachers.
- 4) The role of the principal is unclear.
- 5) Staff meetings are undecisive and unproductive.
- 6) There is a division between school and community and we need more contact between parents and teachers to heal that division.

The task of the two volunteers did not appear difficult to me. The "chicken or the egg" question in terms of cause and effect is confused in the first generalization. Aside from this and giving a "need" in number three, the list largely describes what existed.

The list was posted on the front chalkboard. I then thanked the volunteers for their work and handed out sheets of foolscap. A mini-speech followed by myself which stated, "The Department of Education of Manitoba did not ordain that Brooke School will have the state of affairs as represented by these summary statements. There is no reason why things must be this way. It could be a very different situation. You have decided it will be this way by what you have done or not done. Each of you has contributed to the truth of these six summary statements".

"Your task is now to write down how you have contributed to the truth of these statements - by what you have not done as well as by what you have done."

It was then pointed out that it is usually easier to blame others for the situation than to look at one's own behavior. The staff was told they had a half hour to do this work and that if they chose they could share what they had written with the entire staff. The staff was told, "You do not have to share if you do not want to and I would like to hear what you wrote". I suggested that they be by themselves - leave the room or whatever, but find a comfortable spot to do the writing. They were also asked not to speak to each other.

Some people then got coffee from the staff room. About six people stayed in the workshop room to write, the rest went to other rooms in the school. There was one clarification question asked, otherwise they were silent. They appeared to apply themselves diligently. I got coffee and wandered around the halls until 11:30 a.m.

At this time the participants were asked to return to the workroom. The group sat in a circle in chairs. I then invited whoever wanted, to share what he/she had written. Three people read their papers. Everyone had a sheet and everyone appeared to have written something down. In spite of a feeling of disappointment, I was pleased with the energy they seemed to have put into the task. The staff seemed to be in a reflective mood. They also appeared involved.

After some silence I handed out the "Debriefing Forms" and stated that with the limited time available statements from these forms would be read back anonymously at the beginning of the afternoon session.

The statements were read back at the beginning of the afternoon session at 1:00 p.m. Each person had four responses. There were sixteen sheets collected. They were in no particular order. They are as summarized in the following table:

TABLE XIX  
DEBRIEFING SUMMARY OF THURSDAY MORNING

Responses	Number
1. I can speak up in this group without being "put down".	2
2. We have common problems.	5
3. The fear of being "shot down" is very real for some people. It is hard to communicate.	9
4. There are a lot of problems I didn't know about.	3
5. Some teachers don't realize how overpowering they are.	2
6. A lot of people don't say what they are thinking.	1
7. We have made progress and we want to work together.	15
8. I have been blaming others and absolving myself.	4

No comments came from the staff after the comments on the debriefing sheets were read. The first task for the afternoon was for the staff to work through the test on Inter-Group conflict individually. After they had finished, I read the test aloud indicating the correct answers. Each participant was to correct his own. The staff members were then directed to think about the possibility of the correct responses describing events in Brooke School.

A summary of the scores from the test is as follows: There were sixteen tests collected. The average score was 4.6. The maximum possible is 7. A chance score is 1.6. It seems that this staff was not cognitively acquainted with the effects of inter-group conflict but neither was it really ignorant as well. There were no statements or questions from the staff during this exercise.

The sheets entitled "Theory of Organization - II" were then distributed. I read it aloud. The staff was then asked to get in groups of two to discuss the paper. They were to do it in terms of seeing if it had any relevancy, in their opinion, to inter-action between staff members in Brooke School. This lasted about ten minutes.

The grade five to eight teachers were then asked to sit in a circle in the middle of the room. There were five teachers in the group including the principal. There were no teacher aides in this group. The resource teacher had left at noon due to another commitment.

The five people were instructed to pretend they were the grades one to four staff. They were to discuss theme #1, How We Work Together

as they imagined the staff from 1 - 4 would see the situation. They were further instructed to look over the supportive statements listed under theme #1 for possible starting points.

Everyone in this group spoke frequently. The discussion seemed to indicate an awareness that the primary staff felt confluent education was being forced on them. Statements were made such as "What is confluent education anyway?" with the response being, "Gee, I don't know, every time I asked I got a different answer." "It sure sounds good but I can't see how they do it in practice."

Not all of the comments about the "upper grades" involved criticism. There were statements regarding attempts by the "confluent group" to increase the responsibility of students by giving them more freedom that were positive. The inconsistency between the philosophy of confluent education and the behavior of the upper grade teachers was noted in the role-playing.

The primary teachers appeared to be greatly amused during this exercise. They were also very attentive. The upper grades group appeared comfortable during this exercise.

The only interruption to the discussion was my asking the upper grades group what they, as the primary group, saw as possible contributions they could make to the educational process at Brooke School. The responses included a caring for children, and having a planned curriculum.

This discussion lasted about twenty minutes. The upper grades group was then asked to discuss the theme as themselves. This discussion became a processing of their previous discussion while role-playing. Humour was present without cancelling serious statements that were made. Comments were made that indicated an awareness of the defensive position of the primary group as a reaction to their own behaviours.

The primary staff was then allowed to ask questions of clarification. There were few questions asked and no one pushed for an extra point in any way.

The primary staff was then asked to become the upper grades group and go through the same process. This group was quite large. About half the people spoke from this group during the entire exercise. There were a number of extended silences. Its members did not generally appear as comfortable as the upper grades had. During their discussion people seemed to be aware of being seen by the upper grades as being overly concerned with disciplining children. At least one comment in this direction concerned the "lines" that primary children were forced to adhere to while walking in the hallways. However, comments made by this group seemed more critical of the upper grades group than the upper grades group had been of them. There was at least one teacher who seemed to be unaware of moving from a role-playing to just being herself. The basic contribution they saw coming from the upper grades group was a willingness to try new things. There was little response in terms of processing the role playing. They seemed to have said what they wanted. Most of what was said was a rehash.

Each of the groups had people who did not privately agree with the general stance of their group. That is, there were "traditional" teachers in the upper grades group and "confluent group" members in the primary group. These people were in a perfect position, while role playing, to give blunt criticism of their own group without risk of retaliation - and they did.

The general atmosphere seemed to be one of interest and participation. At about 3:15 the debriefing sheets were handed out, completed by 3:25 and then read by myself back to the group. The information from the debriefing sheets is contained in the following table. There were fifteen sheets collected.

TABLE XX

## DEBRIEFING SUMMARY OF THURSDAY AFTERNOON

Response	Number
1. We should respect opinions of others more and thus staff will cooperate more.	6
2. Others are aware of their shortcomings as well as I.	2
3. People really expressed themselves.	9
4. We can do something about the split.	2
5. Others knew me better than I thought.	2
6. Both groups have strengths and weaknesses.	3
7. There are no easy answers.	8
8. We were confused about confluent education.	1
9. We are at a stalemate - as usual.	1
10. Just as we are not together, neither are they.	1
11. The upper grades teachers now know they were overselling.	1
12. We have generalized too much about sides and get into win-lose conflicts.	1

At 9:00 a.m. on Friday, the staff was seated in a circle. The first item on the agenda was dealing with the rumour of the evening before. The people involved in the situation had been approached by the volunteer just prior to the session and they had agreed to a full public disclosure. This was done. This situation also provided an opportunity for myself to comment on how a suspicious atmosphere within a staff will lead to serious misinterpretations. I asked them to think back over the last few months and wondered how many times a similar event had occurred without ever being straightened out.

I then discussed the possibility of attempting to take other's values and attitudes into account. That is, being sensitive to other people in addition to being straight. The example given was the change in my vocabulary around my mother as opposed to being around my brother. I swear less and differently around my mother.

The comment was then made of how I enjoyed the laughter of a particular person from the primary group while the upper grade teachers were role-playing. I then stated that both groups seemed to be aware of many attitudes and behaviors within the other group. Based on some non-verbal behavior of the previous session, I indicated that people within the staff might unwittingly regard the role-playing itself as a win-lose situation by attempting to do a better job than the other group. I next indicated that the upper grades group appeared to have more high talkers and naturally that group would have fewer silences. There were nods after this statement and one participant stated that the upper grades teachers had more of an opportunity to observe primary people than the reverse. People appeared to agree with this statement as well.

I then made a statement of being aware during the role-playing that some individuals had used the exercise to take "shots" at others from a safe position. I stated that I just wanted those who did so that I was aware of it. There was some laughter at this comment.

The topic for the morning's session was then repeated, Improvement of Problem-Solving at Staff Meetings.

I first stated my bias against the "Method III" approach to problem solving contained within the TET program. To me, it appeared to be a way of resolving differences of opinion rather than moving an organization from one state of affairs to another.

Each staff member then received a copy of "Theory of Organization Development - III". The paper was then read aloud to the group. This contained the plan for the morning.

The possible topics were then listed on the chalkboard. After some discussion, it appeared to be agreed that the high talkers would discuss curricular sequencing, the medium talkers would work on community-school relations and the low talkers would have "Use of Materials" as their focus. This discussion included some controversy. One of the medium talkers felt that the high talkers got the "easiest" topic with the low talkers getting the "hardest". The charge seemed to come from old resentments against the "philosophisers" combined with an over protectiveness of the teacher aides or low talkers. This same person, after the discussion appeared to be going in two or three directions stated, "See, here we are again, we can never come to a decision". This resulted in my being moderately "pushy" and the staff agreeing to stick to the original decision.

While the staff was dividing itself into three groups, a primary teacher approached me to tell me that she was really a medium talker but was going with the low talker group to even things out numerically. Again, there seemed to be some element of "protectiveness" in this action.

Each group had five people. One teacher aide and the principal were in the high talker group. Almost all of the "confluent" group were in the high talkers.

The test on individual problem solving behaviors was then administered. The responses were not shared. The problem solving model and the "suggestions" were then read and explained by myself. The groups were encouraged to try the model but the main focus was on following the plan of Theory - III. The groups were asked to stick to the topic.

As expected by myself, the high talkers talked a lot, the medium talkers less, and the low talkers less still. However, it appeared that each group made some progress toward clarifying the factors in each topic. The low talkers were not devoid of ideas on the issue of the use of materials, did express themselves, and in fact, was the only group to get to an implementation level in the time allowed. The groups did stay on topic, and did seem to "encourage" others to speak out.

At the end of each discussion, the rest of the staff was asked to state what they had seen with the focus group remaining silent. This was followed by the focus group being given the opportunity to process how their meeting had gone, by relating their feelings and

thoughts, and by responding to the comments from the "audience". The climate appeared to be business-like. The participants seemed more relaxed than they had at the beginning of the day. The debriefing sheets were then handed out and returned. However, because of wanting to end the session promptly, it was decided to read the responses at the beginning of the afternoon session. There were thirteen sheets collected and there were forty-seven responses. The following table contains a summary of the responses.

TABLE XXI

## DEBRIEFING SUMMARY OF FRIDAY MORNING

---

---

Responses	Number
1. I realize it's hard for some people to speak out.	5
2. I noticed that all members of our staff have something to offer.	7
3. I am becoming more aware of myself in particular ways.	7
4. I learned that I have been "pushy" and not listened to others.	14
5. These sessions are really worthwhile.	6
6. We still have a long way to go in problem-solving.	2

---

---

The flow of the workshop was then reviewed as it related to the role of the principal. The design for this session was essentially followed.

The principal stood in front of the chalkboard with the rest of the staff in a loose semi-circle around him. The principal began by giving his rationale for the existence of the principal's role in Brooke School. This was basically set out in terms of the principal being hired by the manager of the center to get certain things done. The expectations of the manager were explicated by the principal at the time. This presentation was brief.

The atmosphere at this time appeared to be intense. The principal then listed the functions he saw embedded in the role. For each function he gave his meaning as well as his specific behaviours that were a part of that function. The functions he listed were: 1. change agent, 2. manager, 3. educator, 4. initiator, 5. transmitter, 6. connector, 7. public relations, 8. supportive, 9, protective, 10. facilitator, 11. mediator. He indicated that the functions were not prioritized. The principal appeared to be well acquainted with each of these functions and their concomitant behaviours.

The feedback section from the staff was not an extensive response, it did however, include adding a policy maker to the above.

The principal was next asked to state clearly what he wanted from the staff that would enable him to do his job - namely the functions he had just described. He responded with the following expectations. After each point he gave clarification.

My Expectations of Others (And Myself)

1. Direct expression of satisfactory and unsatisfactory situations.
2. Willingness to explore and experiment within the range of tolerance of each person.
3. Say what we mean - sense of commitment.
4. I expect response - no response is to me, a response.
5. I expect people to respond despite any blocks.
6. I expect people to be responsible for what they do or don't do and to seek help when they need it and to offer help.
7. I believe that each person is doing his/her best at all times.

At the end of this explication I asked the principal to relate each of the functions to his "wants" from the staff. This was done. The majority of staff members responded positively to the demands. I pointed out that assent to a demand was a commitment as I saw it, and gave my view of a commitment as an honest intention rather than as a "promise".

The staff was then invited to make demands of the principal. There were a large number of demands - about one per person, although not everyone spoke. The principal frequently sought clarification of the demand before responding. One demand involved the principal keeping the staff on topic at staff meetings. This was responded to affirmatively but he pointed out that all had the opportunity to do this as well.

As the demands were emerging, the principal listed them on the chalkboard. They were as follows:

OTHERS EXPECTATIONS OF MEWHAT DO YOU EXPECT FROM ME?

1. Direct expression of satisfactory and unsatisfactory situations.
2. My feelings expressed.
3. Straight answers - no jokes.
4. Policy statement.
5. Be a facilitator at staff meetings - Even though not chairperson.
6. Make home contact.
7. Information back to teacher about work with students.
8. Give suggestions when asked.
9. Checking up on commitments made.

The principal in particular and the staff in general seemed to be very direct during this exchange. At the end of this activity, the principal wrote the following on the chalkboard. "I use confusion, anxiety, polarities, to help others find the energy to see what is possible". When he was finished I added "and myself" within the sentence. I stated that the original sentence appeared arrogant to me and I said I believed I knew the principal did not mean it that way.

The debriefing sheets were then distributed, completed and read back to the staff. There were forty-four responses and thirteen sheets collected. A summary of the responses is contained in the following table.

TABLE XXII

## DEBRIEFING SUMMARY OF FRIDAY AFTERNOON

---

---

Responses	Number
1. The people have become more responsive with each other	17
2. I appreciate and understand Bryan and his role better.	12
3. It is very hard to express true feelings and say where you are at.	3
4. I have learned more about other staff members' concerns	4
5. I learned that separation of "we" and "they" is going to be a tough nut to crack	2

---

---

At this time a number of appreciations were given to myself from the staff. The staff was also informed that in about three weeks the volunteers would be interviewing them with the purpose of assessing the results of the first workshop and determining what would be the foci for the second. Copies of "A Definition of Organization Development"<sup>1</sup> were left for staff members at this time.

#### The Assessment of Effects

The two volunteers designed an interview guide and carried out fifteen to twenty minute interviews with the staff.

#### Questionnaire

1. What effects of the workshop have you noticed in the past three weeks?
2. How have you contributed to these effects?
3. Are the staff concerns still the same?
4. Ideas for the next workshop.

The two volunteers neglected to interview each other. They interviewed thirteen staff members. The following table contains a summary of the Results of First Workshop.

TABLE XXIII

## RESULTS OF FIRST WORKSHOP

Responses	Number
1. Less swearing	2
2. More extensive and friendly contact within staff	7
3. More done in staff meetings	4
4. No change	2
5. Improvement in community involvement	1
6. Less pressure by big talkers	2
7. A start on the materials room	1
8. A curriculum meeting planned	2
9. Intention by staff to make O.D. commitment worthwhile	
10. Split between 1-4 and 5-8 is less	1
11. Policy is more defined	1
12. I don't feel as defensive as before	1
13. Principal has contact with more of the staff	2

The third question also relates directly to the effects from the first training event. The volunteers asked what the concerns were by using the theme categorization from the first workshop. There were twelve sheets with this data. A summary of these sheets is contained in the following table:

TABLE XXIV

## ASSESSMENTS

	Improved	Same	Deteriorated
How the staff works together	7	5	0
Strengths we have	2	7	0
Planned curricular sequencing	0	7	1
Role of the principal	3	7	0
Staff meetings	10	1	0
Relationship with community and parents	1	8	0

## Comments:

The biggest area of improvement was getting to the "punch line" at staff meetings. There had been three staff meetings since the workshop. One reason for the improvement in staff meetings was seen as high talkers talking less.

There was an improvement seen in communications among staff. This related directly to inter-group communications.

There was a curriculum planning meeting scheduled, but no meeting had taken place as yet.

Staff members evidently made no connection between improved staff meetings, better communication and "strengths we have".

TABLE XXIV (continued)

The principal had made more contact with the primary staff.

There were frequent comments that stated their expectations at the end of the workshop had been too high. There had been results but not at a level that prevented disappointment.

---

The question dealing with individual contributions to the results of the first training event gave the following summarized responses:

TABLE XXV

## INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTIONS

---

Question: How have you contributed to these effects?

---

Responses	Number
1. Invited Life Skills groups to the school	2
2. Got supply room wall removed	2
3. Talked less at meetings	2
4. Led a staff meeting	1
5. I don't know	1
6. I haven't	1
7. Made more of an effort to make contact with other people	2
8. Made the suggestion about the "frustration club"	1
9. I have tried to be more aware of what I think and say	2
10. I talked more at staff meetings	1

---

## Comments:

Only three people had more than one response. Two had three responses, the other had two. There were ten respondents to this question.

---

One minor frustration occurred just prior to the second workshop. The volunteers had mailed the questionnaire results to the wrong address. Thus the information from the interviews was only available in a general way.

#### The Second Training Event

This workshop consisted of one day. The date was March 12, 1976.

Prior to this session, "Defining a Workable Problem", "5 Basic Steps in Problem Solving", and "Guide for the role of the Chairperson" were placed on sheets and hung in the workroom. The session began with the two volunteers each giving an oral summary of the interview results. This was fairly brief, and involved a statement that there had been a definite improvement seen in the quality of staff meetings, progress had been made in inter-personal relationships and that the staff saw "commitment" and "inter-personal relations" as needing further work.

At this time, I stated where I saw the state of the contract between myself and the staff. Once the results of the three days had been given to the staff, I felt they could decide whether to continue with further workshops.

I then gave my suggestions for the day with the morning session being devoted to determining concerns, and working on inter-personal relations, with the afternoon being spent on dealing with raised concerns through an effort to improve the staff meetings further.

To begin the session I stated that too often we focus unduly on negative aspects of school life and neither see nor communicate our

positive experiences. Thus I suggested that we go around the circle and give a recent "success story" involving education at Brooke School. I began, and more than half the staff responded as well. The staff looked bored.

Before beginning the writing out of concerns, I discussed the meeting with the principal of the day before. It was indicated that we had talked of teacher evaluation as a natural teacher concern as well as the concern by some staff members about the resource teacher arrangement. I stated that I would not work on the resource teacher issue as there had already been a meeting set up to deal with it.

The following are the written concerns of the first exercise:

#### General and Specific Concerns

##### Person #1

"I feel little growth or development from this workshop (in the group sense) I think I shall attempt to solve 'work' problems by myself as sharing them creates too much hassel and is too energy sapping. I believe legitimate change has occurred but not enough to unify personal, professional, and philosophic differences."

##### Person #2

"More involvement from the community"

##### Person #3

"I am concerned as to how the staff evaluation forms are going to be used, and the use that is going to be made of them"

##### Person #4

"I hope the children who need help at the reading lab do not have to be shoved aside because of Life Skills in Grades 7 & 8."

"Possibly the teacher evaluation forms. I feel we should get down to the basics of teaching and forget a lot of the extras."

Person #5

"Specific concern - The school is a drab building. Attitudes of students and teachers would change immediately, if the school were brightly painted and brightly lit."

Person #6

"General - discipline - in the halls and in the gym. This has improved a bit but not enough."

"Specific - lack of communication between teachers - re: what their program and projects are. Our 'esprit de corps' is not developing. (Wish there was more appreciation of what is being done)

Person #7

"My concern is that our critical public misses what we are doing here and keeps concentrating on what we are not doing. I talked with a parent yesterday who said he would take his children out of Brooke School because we haven't got what he considers to be a 'real' phys. ed. program and that the school appearance is psychologically depressing. My specific concern is how to turn the attitude from critical detraction to one of critical support."

Person #8

"Some people discover materials which have been up until now relatively unused and finding that others are accusing them of hogging the materials. Put downs are the result."

"Two definite sides of the fence - not enough middle of the road and readiness to listen."

Person #9

"I am concerned now because I do not feel that I have the energy to cope with both the needs (as I see them) of the children and the staff (needs/demands) at the same time."

Person #10

"My concerns are: 1. Concerns are just that concerns Totally Non Negotiable"

Person #11

"I can't think of anything right now."

Person #12

"\_\_\_\_\_ still doesn't listen when you try to tell him something. All you hear is his ideas and theories."

Person #13

"Gathering information before making value statements on ideas introduced."

"Respecting a teacher's interaction with a student or students at any time and any place."

Person #14

"Need more improvement in communications - specifically listening and hearing what I am saying, not necessarily agreeing - but please hear."

"Very concerned that the majority of students appear to be lost - do not know what is expected of them - pandemonium at recess, etc."

Person #15

"The first thing that comes to my mind is a seeming inflexibility in working out a problem. This situation exists right now and was also a problem some months earlier. I feel problem-solving is a two-way effort."

"Another concern is 'complaining'. It gets so depressing to hear each other always 'bitching' while taking little or no action ourselves. Yes, I'm guilty too."

Just before the statements were read, I spoke about the advantages of "owning" your statement - you could add to what you had written, clarify, or whatever. Almost all of the concerns were owned. There was a great deal of clarification along with questions from others. The rule from me was that we would stick to asking and clarifying - not debating.

After hearing the concerns I wrote Concerns for the P.M. on the chalkboard. 1. Teacher Evaluation; 2. Discipline; 3. Lack of positive - Stress on Negative; 4. Who has the power? Under this list I wrote, "it

may be that working on our concerns is futile in some cases because we don't have any power." I then made a comment to the effect that "you may want to explore what areas are the staff's areas and which are not. My experience has been that school staffs have more power than they think - sometimes its a question of getting together to use it."

There was considerable discussion around painting the school. Many people looked at the principal. The principal said he saw it as a question of priority within the centre - otherwise he made no comment.

The most individualistic attack was "\_\_\_\_\_ still doesn't listen when you try to tell him something. All you hear is his ideas and theories." The person to whom the statement was directed wrote a response - in effect it said "You haven't been seeing me - I have been listening in the recent past - I feel good about myself." This appeared to me as about a positive response as one might expect.

The group was told that we would deal with the four concerns listed in the afternoon. They were also asked if they fairly represented what they had heard. No one voiced a disagreement with the summary.

The appreciations and demands exercise was then introduced. People were told that demands could be phrased "I want you to...", "I demand that you...", or "I wish you would...", depending on how intensely they wanted to word the demand. People were told that responses could be "yes", "no", I don't know, or anything else they wanted to say. The group was told that demands don't imply that others

must comply. The group was also told to direct demands and appreciations and to indicate this on the paper. The target could be an individual, a sub-group of the staff, or the entire staff.

The participants were also asked to watch for "cancellations" where you give with one hand and take away with the other. The example given was, "I really like the way you led that meeting Harry, its the only thing you have done right all year." There was some laughter after this remark but the group atmosphere appeared nervous.

The group was also told to remember any commitments they made from this exercise. Commitments would arise as they agreed to demands. Appreciations were to be responded to by "Thank you", or "How discerning of you to notice", but not to give extensive responses or to give an appreciation "back".

Almost three complete rounds took place - at least thirty-five demands and appreciations were stated. Almost all were owned. At times there were negotiations, often there was clarification of a demand.

The pieces of paper found later contained the following:

I appreciate \_\_\_\_\_ for saying that I was missed when I was sick one time.

I wish that people would not talk, without listening to the "other" so that real communication could take place.

I wish Bryan would come to the classroom and observe what I do, cause he has to send a report, (I want to get it over with)

Bryan, I demand that you get that crackling PA fixed or buy a new one. I demand it.

\_\_\_\_\_ I like your constant smile, your comfortable conversation and your readiness to share and help.

\_\_\_\_\_, I connect with you because I see a part of myself in you - after the frustrations, minor blow-ups, and differences of opinion, you put "emotions" aside and start each relationship anew as if nothing had happened.

I appreciate the way \_\_\_\_\_ takes over my class so cheerfully anytime.

\_\_\_\_\_ I would like you to feel free to walk into my classroom to talk to me instead of waiting for a "knock-knock" open invitation, as I do yours. The shut door is to keep our commotion in, not people out.

\_\_\_\_\_ I appreciate your telling me of my students escapades in your class.

\_\_\_\_\_ - I wish you would try to be a bit more flexible. At least look into the possibilities.

Humor in the staff room - \_\_\_\_\_'s - More is needed

I appreciate \_\_\_\_\_'s humour in the staff room.

I don't feel comfortable enough to ask someone to meet a personal demand of mine in public, I prefer to do it on a one to one basis.

I wish people would listen with their ears and minds open.

\_\_\_\_\_ I appreciate you for being so easy to get along with, and for your jokes, that people sometimes don't get.

\_\_\_\_\_ I love your jokes. I demand another one.

\_\_\_\_\_ - I appreciate you because, despite my many apparent failings, you accept me for what I am and this is great.

I appreciate the way all the primary teachers and aides work together to make our reading program workable.

I appreciate the way Bryan clarifies me about the things which I am confused about.

I would like to express an appreciation for people who say things openly and honestly. \_\_\_\_\_ told me that my kids were misbehaving in the hall. Shocked me, but helped me. Thanks.

I appreciate the help I have gotten from staff members in the past and hope others feel free to ask me for help or support of any kind at any time.

\_\_\_\_\_ I demand that you stop using "guilty party" when around staff and students.

Bouquet. I appreciate my aide in my classroom. She is always so nice and pleasant with the children.

\_\_\_\_\_ I like the way you consider all possibilities, your supportive statements, and your suggestions. They really help.

I appreciate the help that has been given to me by the teachers and teachers in training in my area and their thoughtfulness in not complaining because I have been sluffing off on curriculum meetings.

I appreciate \_\_\_\_\_ for being open to try new approaches in education in the school.

\_\_\_\_\_ - I appreciate the public relations work you are doing with coaches and intake groups.

There is positive and negative in all of us, and I appreciate the goodness in us all, even if people are irritating at times.

I like it when people say they are scared of something new, not "I don't see why I have to so I won't try" I guess I prize honesty and willingness to discuss.

#### Requests

1. I would like to have a complete and functioning aquarium in my room.
2. I would like a signed voucher for a specific amount so that when I attend an in-service, or visit an Educational Book Store I could purchase suitable books for my room. (Ordering from catalogues can be misleading)
3. Wish there was a more definite program throughout the school. (-this is vague but I don't know how to be more specific.)

#### Bouquet

I appreciate what \_\_\_\_\_ is doing with her 2 boys. Now they are polite and friendly in the halls. Always nice to meet and talk to. Seem better with other children too.

I appreciate it when someone gives me a compliment rather than a complaint.

To whom it may concern

I appreciate your not blasting me for letting kids in the caretaker's door. I have my reasons for letting them in when I came in. Thank you again.

I appreciate Bryan for listening to my frustrations about teaching and especially appreciate him helping me to straighten things out in my head.

\_\_\_\_\_ I demand that you open your classroom before the bulk of your class congregates at your doors.

I demand that when there is something someone wants to know from me, wants me to do, or is concerned about, then I want to know directly.

At the end of this exercise the group was asked to make a private list of commitments they had made or wanted to make. I suggested that a part of the bulletin board in the staff room be set aside as a commitment corner. I stated that making a public commitment sometimes increases your chance of keeping it.

There was no debriefing of the morning session. The group was told this would be done for the entire day at the end of the afternoon session. The session ended very close to 12:00 a.m. The group appeared to have increased their energy during the morning.

The afternoon session began by my discussing "Advantages of Conflict". This included conflict as an energizing force on a staff, as well as it possibly contributing to a person's awareness by causing you to examine your own position thoroughly. I then discussed appreciations in that they can be patronizing at times and that some people have said they dislike appreciations because they fear the appreciator will think he has the right to give negative feedback as well. The distinction between "trusting" and "trustworthy" was also drawn. A short statement regarding commitment toward organization goals described the essential ingredients for being motivated as valuing the goal as well as believing the goal is achievable.

The structure for the afternoon was then described. An open fishbowl was to be used with two empty chairs. The first topic was "Teacher Evaluation". The sheets hung up in the room were gone over and the Observing and Debriefing Form was written out on large sheets. There would be four observers for each discussion. One would watch the chairperson, be familiar with the "Role of the Chairperson", and

check to see how well it was followed. The second was to keep a record of who looked at whom, who scans, who doesn't look at anybody. The third observer was to record who talks, for how long, how often. The last observer would watch for "gatekeeping".

At the end of each topic the observers would give feedback to the participants.

The groups did "gatekeep" - however, every chairperson neglected to use the debriefing form. Summary statements were developed for each topic. The principal was in the group discussing teacher evaluation - in fact he was the first to volunteer. This topic did not generate the "heat" I had expected, it consisted largely of clarifications by the principal. The discipline meeting was critical of the "Reality Therapy" approach used in the school. It appeared to view discipline in very narrow terms. The Positive and Negative patterns topic was used to brainstorm suggestions for promoting a more appreciative and constructive atmosphere among the staff. No group determined a program of action where individuals committed themselves to specific actions. In terms of exploring the topics, and expressing themselves on these topics, it appeared to be a progressive response.

The fourth topic was not discussed as we were short of time and the group voted to do the third one instead.

The group was then asked to make up and complete debriefing statements. These were collected and read back to the group. There were thirty-five responses. There were fourteen papers collected. Seven of the responses were signed. The following table contains a summary of the responses.

TABLE XXVI

## DEBRIEFING SUMMARY OF THE SECOND WORKSHOP

---

---

Responses	Number
1. People were really open in this discussion.	6
2. I appreciate a particular person more.	4
3. We have made considerable progress.	13
4. I am going to make more of an effort to communicate with others on staff.	3
5. I have doubts about what the effects will be later on.	2

---

---

### A View of the Workshop by a Participant

"People were conscious of where they were sitting. I think MOST want to not sit or split into primary and confluent and outsiders. Where we are now - summary of sheets - \_\_\_\_\_ and I forgot to say that we didn't fill out a form or have an interview ourselves - a couple of clarifications after we were finished. I spoke first and was really nervous about talking.

Success story - Many gave one. Five or six did not give one. I did not think there was any boasting or bragging done by anyone if there was, so what? That's good.

Concerns - general and specific - People were willing to let Jack have their concerns to take with him.

Sharing appreciations and demands - Lots of appreciations - not many demands. At least one demand was not read. I didn't want to read 1 demand I got because so many appreciations were going on and not many demands. I put it back; the demandee got it and read it last. Many owned their appreciations and demands openly and as soon as it was read.

Commitments - 4 long, 7 short, some dated (1), some not (10) I see 10 commitments posted, now 11.

Fishbowl meetings - Staff evaluation - Open chair was really inviting to some and 4 took advantage of it to make a point or pose a question and then leave. Discipline - \_\_\_\_\_ is a rigid chairman, very businesslike, get the job over and done with.

Negs and Pos's - \_\_\_\_\_ is still a rigid chairman with definite ideas. Maybe tried to steer the members in a certain direction.

People are more positive to, receptive to, understanding of, and tolerant of others. I really believe teachers don't know how to ask the right questions, because they were never shown how to do that. I also really believe that we don't like bragging or boasting because we were taught not to do it when we were growing up. Most or all people trusted Jack very much. At times, I had a very good feeling toward all group members and said to myself - "There's nothing really wrong with her, and our differences are small compared with what we could do together."

I remember that when one member began to state her understanding, I felt it was a hopeless situation to expect such a "miracle" as us working together.

I saw something that may be a result of the workshop. A class was viewing a film in the filmroom. Another teacher came down to the filmroom with her class and peeked in. Then they left and NOTHING was mentioned about it. It has happened that teachers have been blamed for putting the time on the sign up sheet the same day, or even after or just prior to going.

At our Life Skills meeting, I realized near the end of the meeting that there was no one taking notes. So I made a summary and listed the outcomes and posted it in the staffroom. I hope this is done with the discipline meeting tomorrow too so we can see some progress rather than repititious views from members. (It was)

### Final Interviews

The interviews took place on May 8 and 9. They had been scheduled for the first part of April but had been postponed at my request. There were fifteen interviews. They took place in the school with one exception. One person refused to have his/her interview taped.

The interview guide is as follows:

1. If you voted for the intervention on October 29, 1975, why did you?
2. Would you vote for it again if you could go back knowing what you know now?
3. What effects have you seen from the two workshops?
4. Were there any negative effects from the intervention?
5. What was the most effective exercise of the workshops?
6. What was the least effective exercise?
7. Do you feel more, or less, powerful as a result of the intervention? The same?
8. Did the intervention have any impact on your attitude towards confluent education?

### Withdrawal

The staff was told at the end of the March 12 workshop that the data from the final interviews would be made available to them. They could then decide if they wanted me back to do further work. As far as the original contract was concerned, it ended with the post-intervention interviews. The data has not been given to the staff at this date.

There has not been a clear demand from the staff for further work. After the March 12 workshop the principal told me that the staff appeared to be interested in Life Skills work. Another staff member stated that interest had waned because of the long time between the March 12 workshop and the interviews on May 8 and 9. At the time of the final interviews the staff seemed occupied with teacher evaluation. Several staff members did express interest in further work but no collective request resulted.

During the summer of 1976 a volunteer asked if I was still interested in doing more organization development work at Brooke School. He imagined that some staff members might feel that I got what I wanted and was not interested in the school anymore. I told him I certainly was interested. He said he would approach the staff in the fall. No one has contacted me.

## II. REFLECTIONS

This section contains an appraisal of the extent to which implementation criteria were observed. In addition, it contains my post intervention thoughts and feelings related to the execution of the design. The criterion followed most poorly was that of having a sense of closure to each of the training sessions while promoting some open ended possibilities for transfer to the school setting. There was not much leadership from me in providing such specific connections. These were left for the staff to discover. This was partially due to my wanting the participants to make their own connections and partially because the criterion was ignored.

The other criteria for implementation were followed extensively. The more specific guidelines were observed while the general guidelines manifested themselves throughout the training.

The designs generally seemed suited to the concerns of the participants. This may have been due to my attempt to be thorough in diagnosing the situation at Brooke School. Regardless, no exercise was modified or abandoned to any extent. The only major change in plans occurred around my desire to deal quickly and explicitly with the "rumour" that I had violated my word regarding the confidentiality of the initial interviews.

Rapport with the two volunteers seemed to grow as we worked with each other. Without being co-opted, and without abandoning their individual participation in the sessions, I observed leadership acts on their part.

In terms of consultant behavior, I felt particularly confident in my ability to provide solid leadership. I had a great deal of respect for many of the staff members prior to the intervention and I was committed to providing opportunities for all staff members.

The staff and I worked hard. The sessions began and ended promptly. A businesslike atmosphere pervaded almost all of our training time. A desire to participate and a sense of purpose appeared quickly in the sessions. The debriefing sections of each sessions seemed to be attended to carefully by all participants and I viewed them as crucial indicators of our progress and willingness to further explore the topics chosen.

REFERENCES

1. Wendell L. French and Cecil H. Bell, Organization Development Behavioral Science Intervention for Organization Improvement, University of Washington, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1973, p. 15-20.

## CHAPTER VI

### EVALUATION

This chapter contains data on the effects of the intervention. This information is derived from the post-intervention interviews.

#### I. FINAL INTERVIEW DATA

The following tables summarize the responses of the participants:

## TABLE XXVII

OCTOBER 29, 1975

---

---

Question:

Knowing what you know now, if you could go back to the initial contract meeting, would you vote for the intervention?

---

Responses	Number
1. Yes	9
2. I'm not sure	2
3. I wasn't here at that time	3

---

## Comments:

There were 14 interviews that took place. The two people who weren't sure stated that they had expected better results than occurred. The three people who were not at the meeting, were generally positive regarding the intervention.

---

---

TABLE XXVIII

## EFFECTS

## Question:

What effects have you seen from the two workshops?

---

Responses	Number
1. Improved staff meetings	13
2. Discipline committee	4
3. Improved inter-personal relations among staff	5
4. Teachers willing to experiment	2
5. Low talkers contribute more	4
6. More volunteers	2
7. Staff members are more open and direct with each other	6
8. The principal is more approachable	2
9. People kept their commitments	2
10. There has been a reduction in swearing	2
11. I have gained confidence in myself	4
12. Ongoing curriculum meetings	1
13. There seems to be less "gossiping"	1
14. The principal's role is clear and he is making an effort to make it clear	1

---

## Comments:

Many of the effects listed are inter-related. A number of people stated a cause and effect relationship between a decrease in talking by high talkers and an increase in participation from previous low talkers.

TABLE XXVIII (continued)

No one stated that the split on staff had been eradicated and no one mentioned the use of the fishbowl as a discussion technique.

Some of the apparent improvement in meetings was due to paying attention to task, improving maintenance, the use of debriefing sessions, and the use of summary statements.

---

TABLE XXIX

## NEGATIVE EFFECTS

## Question:

Were there any negative effects from the workshop?

---

Responses	Number
1. None	10
2. All I heard were good comments about it	1
3. People came out with a sense of power - so much they wouldn't listen to others	1
4. Some suspiciousness of who took that shot at _____ during "demands" and "resentments"	1
5. Yeah, sounds good - but what do we do? How can I be like that if I haven't been like that all of my life?	1
6. Our situation never worsened as a result of the workshops.	1
7. A few staff relationships with the principal worsened.	1

---

## Comments:

The fifth response was said to apply to all training events with which the staff had been involved.

No one came out directly and said that when the results aren't all you hope for, you lost energy for further training. I believe this occurred however.

---

TABLE XXX

## MOST EFFECTIVE EXERCISE

## Question:

What was the most effective exercise of the workshops?

---

Responses	Number
1. The choice to own up to a statement - risk taking with demands and appreciations	3
2. The low, medium and high talkers exercise	5
3. They were all beneficial	2
4. The role-reversal with the two groups	3
5. I don't think any part was more important than the others	2
6. An impressive thing was the way the "rumour mill" was dealt with	1

---

## Comments:

No one mentioned the "ownership" exercises using the data from the initial interviews or the Role Analysis Technique in examining the relationship between the principal and the rest of the staff.

No one mentioned "theory" or understandings of a cognitive nature. All major effects appeared to necessitate an emotional impact.

---

TABLE XXXI

## LEAST EFFECTIVE EXERCISE

## Question:

What was the least effective exercise of the workshop?

---

Responses	Number
1. No, I think everything was good for me	9
2. I can't remember	1
3. Posting commitments in the staffroom - useless	1
4. The demands and appreciations exercise	2
5. The "ownership" process using the data from the initial interviews	1

---

## Comments:

The two people who didn't feel the demands and appreciations exercise was as effective as it might have been thought so for opposite reasons; one thought it was too threatening and the other because people read appreciations readily but not all demands were read - too "wishy-washy".

The fifth response came from an observation that as the generalizations became broader, the less individual ownership occurred. He felt that the summary statements describing Brooke School "stayed out there on sheets", - that each individual did not see the statements as describing the results of his/her actions.

---

TABLE XXXII

## SENSE OF POWER

---



---

Question:

Do you feel more, or less powerful as a result of the intervention? The same?

---

Responses	Number
1. More powerful	8
2. I feel the same	2
3. More frustrated and a little more powerful	1
4. I don't have any control at all, before or after	1
5. I'm not sure how I feel	1

---

Comments:

The question was frequently restated as "How much control do you feel you have regarding what happens around you in Brooke School?"

People attributed a more powerful feeling to improved self-confidence generally, increased confidence in speaking out, the staff being more direct, or improved communications within the staff.

---



---

TABLE XXXIII  
CONFLUENT EDUCATION

---

Question:

Did the intervention have any impact on your attitude towards  
confluent education?

---

Responses	Number
1. I did not see the workshops connected to confluent education - to me it was Life Skills	1
2. There are some things I agree with in confluent education and others I disagree with	1
3. The only part that was the same between this intervention and confluent education was that you could take part but you didn't have to	1
4. People aren't saying "those confluent people"	1
5. I found the workshops to be mostly confluent - even the area that was probably more mechanical	2
6. I now see people that are very confluent that I didn't realize before	1
7. No change in my attitude - I don't see the connection	3
8. I wouldn't mind going to a confluent education course if you were in charge of it, but there are other people I wouldn't want anything to do with	1
9. Yes, it is more positive	1
10. I imagine that as time goes on the things people will remember about you is your affiliation with	

TABLE XXXIII (continued)

confluent more than your affiliation with yourself or with organizational development	1
11. Organizational development is more of a cerebral activity than confluent education. I include organizational development however under the umbrella of confluent education.	1
12. Some people on staff appear freer towards confluent education than they did before.	1

---

## Comments:

There appeared to be a limited positive change in the image of confluent education. However, as many people did not see any connection between what they imagined confluent to be and their experiences during the intervention, as those who did. The personal impact of myself was a decisive influence in any change in perceptions of confluent education.

The responses appeared somewhat scattered.

---

## II. SUMMARY

This chapter has presented data about the feelings and thoughts of the staff concerning the intervention. As in the initial stages of the intervention, the concerns of the participants are the core of the analysis.

There are many inter-relationships among the observed effects. In the same way that the antecedent conditions at Brooke School were inter-dependent, so were the results. The presentation and discussion of these results are contained in the following chapter.

## CHAPTER VII

### SUMMARY, DISCUSSION AND REFLECTIONS ABOUT FUTURE RECOMMENDATIONS

#### I. SUMMARY OF STUDY

This study was concerned with the design, implementation and assessment of an intervention into a Manitoba school.

The school which provided the context for this study was Brooke School at the Oo-za-we-kwun Centre near Rivers, Manitoba. The school had a staff of thirteen teachers and four teacher aides.

The study was constructed in such a way as to deal with the concerns of the staff. During the first encounters with the staff it became apparent that the staff was split.

The initial diagnosis was that the split on staff was the cause of: a) unproductive personal exchanges among staff members; b) ineffective staff meetings; c) lack of role clarity in the principalship. This split on staff was seen around the issue of confluent education. However, it was not the issue of confluent education per se that accentuated the natural division between primary and elementary groups but the actions of the confluent group towards the primary group that are relevant. The proselitizing that occurred produced the destructive climate in Brooke School. As in physics where every action causes a reaction, a force field perspective would see the increases in tension as due to a win-lose situation between these two groups.

This staff agreed with the philosophy of confluent education and they stated this agreement in the interviews. Confluent education as an issue was artificial, but the dynamics of having an "in" and "out" group around that label was real. These dynamics have already been described.

As a result the intervention was designed to deal with the split per se, rather than to deal with issues around confluent education.

The study moved through the following stages:

1. Diagnosis of interview data
2. Design and execution of two training events
3. Diagnosis of final interview data.

## II. RESULTS

The split on staff was not eradicated due to this intervention. However, the tension and mistrust between the groups was reduced. It was reduced to the point of this staff believing they could work effectively together. The key to this occurrence was the confluent

group. The verbatim statements from the rest of the staff, the role reversal exercise, and the high, medium and low talkers exercise increased this groups' awareness of the situation and they decided to change their behaviour. They stopped preaching about confluent education. They inter-acted with the primary group more. The high talkers of the staff, who were largely within this group, listened more, and they became willing to compromise during staff meetings.

The groups still existed at the end of the intervention. The suspicions undoubtedly remained to some extent but a large part of the improvement in staff meetings can be attributed to this change in climate.

An individual behaviour change on the part of some primary teachers, and "in-betweens" was increased assertiveness generally. This was attributed to increased confidence as well as the low profile attempted by the high talkers. This had an immediate impact on staff meetings in particular.

In addition to the change in climate, and broader participation, there were two procedures that were used during staff meetings. These were the debriefing of each staff meeting and the use of summary statements, which described the position of the staff in problem solving a particular issue. However, I see the use of these procedures as having minimal effect in comparison with the other factors mentioned.

The change in norms from the pre-intervention period to the post-first training event period appears pertinent. One change was from the

informal rule: "Our only contact will be arguments, or no contact at all", to the rule: "Conflict is bad, we want things to be better, so be ultra-careful that you don't ruffle anyone's feathers". This new norm allowed people to take a stand provided some compromise possibilities went with it. A true collaborative norm never emerged. This norm might say "Conflict is useful, let us look for points of difference so that we can improve our awareness of each other and ourselves and solve problems more effectively". The fear that blocked this occurrence was the fear of the more positive climate being destroyed. What occurred from the intervention was a cooperative norm rather than a collaborative one. My observations are that the staff moved to a norm they could possibly maintain. From the "hooks in questions" I observed in their inter-personal exchanges, and from the previous position of newly found trust, a really open examination of feelings, underlying values, and old resentments could move the group back where they started.

Another norm change was from "Go to staff meetings, don't say what your concerns are, and then later complain within your own clique" to "Let's give it a try at staff meetings, be careful about "hurting" other's feelings, and don't complain later - at least in the staffroom where you may be overheard".

As a result of the "gossip incident" during the first training event, gossip reduced considerably. There seemed to be an understanding on the part of all of the staff of the destructive effects of unsubstantiated rumour.

The change in norms seemed to apply throughout the school's culture as well as within staff meetings. There was an additional norm change which was specific to staff meetings and perhaps meetings in general. "Stick to the topic" was the new rule. This seemingly simple task norm, was, I believe, this staff's way of avoiding win-lose occurrences which they felt they could not work with constructively.

There is some data that indicated the principal becoming more assertive as well. There was more of an effort on his part to work with the primary group and to resolve "blocks" between himself and "in-between" staff members. The reduction in tension between the groups within the staff would seem to contribute to this behaviour. My estimation is that there were fewer vectors attempting to pull the principal onto a side, thus leaving the principal freer to respond naturally.

The foregoing differentiation among climate, norms, and individual responses, is intended to give some sort of structure to a discussion of extremely complex events. To be very precise in terms of the intervention's impact on any particular event would seem arrogant.

In addition, the previous training of the staff in confluent education, Teacher Effectiveness Training, Transactional Analysis, and Life Skills, makes it difficult to assess the exclusiveness of the organization development intervention's impact.

The objective of implanting the processes of the action research model was not reached. The action of the two volunteers in initiating a data collection process after the first training event appeared

promising in this regard, but there is no evidence that data collection would become an integral part of the staff's overall problem solving method. The basic orientation of the staff still appeared to be toward solving immediate problems. Perhaps this accounts for the staff not using much of the vocabulary indigenous to the principles and practices of organizational development.

The staff felt they had more power at the end of the intervention. This was a stated objective in the design of the training events. The responses in the post-intervention interviews showed individual feelings that they had increased their control over the school environment. They felt they were less of a pawn in their working roles, and that they not only have contributed to dissatisfying conditions within the school but can change them. This result, was in parallel, I believe with the stated increase in confidence by some staff members. This increased sense of power was generally confined to the normal parameters of jurisdiction of a school staff. However, there was one collective action directed toward the manager of Oo-za-we-kwun which had as its target the painting of the school. To date, this painting has not occurred. Indication of this same sense of power was the establishment of curriculum and discipline committee. These concerns were explicated during the theme formation of the initial training event.

There were few negative effects stated by the staff. As well, there was a positive response by virtually all participants to the most effective and least effective sections of the interviews. This seemed to indicate that in general, the choice of exercises was well received. There was no general criticism offered for whatever reason.

Perhaps because they didn't have any. There is some research that indicates participants do not respond positively in assessment situations to please the consultant.

The exercise perceived as the most effective was the one where participants divided themselves into low, medium, and high talkers. The next exercises mentioned as being effective, were the role-reversal and "demands" and appreciations exercises. These three exercises were related to inter-group conflict or inter-personal exchanges. They had high emotional impact with greater risk potential and thus greater opportunities.

This observation is not consistent with the fact that no one mentioned the Role Analysis Technique as most effective. It did have some emotional impact, and did include direct inter-personal exchanges. One explanation might be that people had begun to see the principal-staff relationships independently of the split on staff. Another possibility is that the mechanical tendency of this process reduced the personal or the emotional impact.

The explanation for the three mentioned exercises being perceived as most effective is however consonant with the fact that no one mentioned "theory" or understandings of a cognitive nature. This may have been due to the respondents not being asked about this area specifically.

In examining the responses, and the behaviour of the participants during the exercises, it appears that as in Maslow's hierarchy of needs, immediate needs are paramount. This view sees the removal of organization pain as a pre-requisite for establishing guiding cognitive learnings.

A "doing" was required for change, and was more personally involving.

The "demands and appreciations" exercise was one of the most appreciated and was also seen as one of the most fearful. This was the view of many people during the design process. The view of one volunteer, and others, as expressed in the debriefing sheets for this exercise, was that it would end in win-lose destructive exchanges. There were many expectations of catastrophies resulting.

Protectiveness as a concern for others was the rationale given for being afraid of the exercise. Not for one moment did I believe these statements. I believed it was due to a fear of being attacked personally in the front of the group and thus presenting a poor image. The other unexpressed fear was of openly expressed feelings generally. The people who were most afraid of this exercise were those who seemed to express their feelings the least. Almost all were positive about the exercise after the fact.

Just as the key to improving the staff's ability to working more effectively together, was reducing the inter-group conflict, the "key" within this "key" was the exposing of "confluent education" as an artificial issue. Once the "in" and "out" behaviours were reduced, the issue was largely dropped. The issue of whether confluent education is practical had dissipated energy in the past and this block was largely removed. In addition, the attitude of some members toward confluent education as a global concept moved in a positive direction.

Although every staff member saw positive results from the intervention, there was a wide variance in the degree of enthusiasm for the results. This seemed to be related directly to the individual's

expectations and hopes. The people who had the most disappointment were those who had high hopes. Those who didn't expect much more than the usual in-service work were pleasantly surprised.

Of the fourteen people who participated in post-intervention interviews there were three people who had no disappointments at all. These people were not attached to either the primary group or the confluent group. One explanation of this occurrence is that there was still some win-lose points of view at the end of the intervention. Thus members of the conflicting groups may have had some disappointment in that the intervention did not allow them to "win". In inter-group conflict I take "winning" to mean "they" were exposed as the "bad guys" and "we" were shown to be the "good guys". It may also mean control over decisions within the school.

There were two people whose overall assessment of the results could only be described as low. The basis for their disappointment was not entirely clear. It seemed to revolve around the atmosphere of the workshops not carrying over into everyday work. "There is something lacking when you leave" is the way one of these respondents stated her/his concern. "The effects weren't what they should have been" was a comment from the other.

There were two people who were disappointed to a fair degree. One stated that people did not remain as direct with each other after the workshops as they were during the workshops. The other was disappointed in the progress of the curriculum committee. He saw "dismal" meetings. Further to this point he saw a gradual disuse of the skills and procedures that had seemed to have assisted in the improvement of

staff meetings. No other specific disappointments were stated by the staff.

It appears that these four people saw a gradual reduction in the effects of the intervention. All of these people belonged to either the "confluent group" or primary group. However, some disappointment in this area was expressed by all but three staff members.

Most of the impact of the intervention came from the first training event. The data after this event agrees closely with the data of the post-intervention interviews. This intermediate data collecting also indicated a reduction in the effects. This result is to be expected. A workshop climate is not the same as the climate within the school setting. There are no students and the tasks are different. As is documented by Philip Jackson, the demands of students on elementary teachers are high.<sup>1</sup> Hence, "How we work together" gets less attention and concern. The surprise is not that the effects deteriorated but that we had effects to the degree observed four months after the first training event and two months after the second.

Nevertheless, the fear that the effects will be largely eradicated some time in the future is understandable. Unless some specific work is done by this staff, this is a real possibility. The second training session was largely used to strengthen norms and encourage individual behavior that had begun during the first training session. Thus, not only new directions and new levels should be sought, but maintenance and conservation will understandably be a concern in the future.

The remaining respondents could be classified as "fairly high"

in both general and specific effects.

Some respondents indicated areas of work for the staff to pursue. A few indicated that the two opposing "philosophies" still blocked progress. Others advised specific work in inter-personal resolution of conflicts to be a possible thrust. Some were aware of the continuing need to improve articulation between the K-4 and 5-8 curricula. These would have to be possible take-off points for additional work.

All of the criteria for evaluative procedures were followed.

In summary, at the group level, staff meetings contained salient improvements; at the individual level, confidence in speaking directly was the most noticeable result.

The overall question might be "Was it worth the effort?" Everyone stated they would vote for the intervention again, knowing what they knew at the end. This might indicate it was worth it to the staff.

Another response to the question might be "In comparison to what?" In comparison to many in-services that have taken place in Manitoba where results are not assessed and where in-services are held for the sake of holding in-services, these three days produced fantastic results.

Another response to this question is: "Yes, you do what you can." The choice of the staff will always be, either attempt to reach new levels of effectiveness in working and living or give themselves up to patterns they feel are destructive.

### III. DISCUSSION

The approach to change was a combination of increasing self-support within individuals and attempting to influence group norms. The critical effects of group norms is reviewed in Appendix A - A History of Organizational Development.<sup>2</sup> The interaction between the norms and the individual behaviors has also been examined.<sup>3</sup> Certainly, a series of individual actions can change the group's expectations in a particular area and this influence can be instrumental in other individual decisions. The interaction appears cyclical in nature. There are times when a norm exists, not because people see its merits, but because no other alternative patterns of behavior are perceived. "What we are doing is the only way to do things." Another possibility for influencing norms is to make present norms explicit and to propose alternative ones.

It seems equally apparent that change means risk. The risk taking of individuals may be the cellular change that results in organizational change. This nuclear response can be influenced but not predicted.

In the case of Brooke School, the most apparent change in norms occurred during staff meetings. However it is equally true that risk taking by individuals at those same staff meetings in speaking while afraid, was a large contributing factor. This seemed to be a partial result of people being more willing to confront situations. The staff seemed to become more cognizant of realistic expectations rather than catastrophic ones. One piece of evidence for this observation is that immediately prior to the intervention, each staff member had been asked to develop a personal objectives list with the intention of holding meetings to work on a consensus for the school. The meetings were dropped shortly after they began, with no one being explicit about it. And no one brought the topic up again. Everyone seemed to know they weren't doing what they

said they were going to do and apparently no one said anything. Some people wanted it finished, others didn't want it finished - and no one confronted the situation. By contrast, at the end of the intervention, the resource teacher usage issue was being worked on, people were more direct in stating how they saw teacher evaluation and several staff members supported each other to increase pressure to paint the school. The effects do not appear to be dramatic, however, they seem substantial. One contributing factor may have been the lack of catastrophic results from exercises in the training sessions. Perhaps this was an "encouraging" result.

My assumption is that if you can alter norms and if people are willing to take risks then many more resources are available to work on the staff's concerns, and in addition, new resources or strengths are created. This would occur both at the individual and the collective level. School then could move toward being a reality tester of what is possible in human development.

One specific outcome that would be predictable is the renegotiating of roles continually as circumstances and people changed. On reflection, one possibility is that group interviews would have been a valuable adjunct to the individual diagnostic interviews. Their purpose would be to observe the patterns of inter-action within the groups and between the groups and thus improve the initial diagnosis of the school. They could be used to alter norms as well. This appears reasonable to me provided the ethics of stating both purposes prior to the meeting is observed. A possible approach would have been to interview the primary group, the upper grades group, and the confluent group; all within the context of observing the school in its day to day operation. This would also include attending staff meetings, discipline committee meetings, curricula meetings, and any other regular interactions, both as

an observer and as an attempt to improve group processes. This more extensive diagnosis and evaluation would have allowed the additional intervention technique of "calling" neurotic behavior patterns as they occurred. The "neurotic" behavior patterns<sup>4</sup> described by Harvey and Albertson in *Neurotic Organizations* are those that are detrimental to the interest of the group. They give a number of examples of people following patterns that they know do not work.<sup>5</sup>

Sarason refers to much the same process when he confronts school staffs with data that constricts the myths of the school.<sup>6</sup>

It is possible that a similar approach could have been built into the training sessions. The thought occurs, however, that this approach would be more effective once the level of organizational pain was reduced. Since the "theory" during the Brooke School intervention made little impact, it might be that a high level of emotional tension blocks rational approaches such as Sarason describes. That is, the awareness or objectivity necessary to see the patterns may be missing. This would point to the use of cognitive understandings being developed at a later date in considering intervention designs.

An important question is whether I fitted into the staff's problem solving processes as a resource; or whether, in fact, the staff was simply having in-services in which they were "taught". The suspicion here is that the failure of the action research model to be integrated into Brooke School is an indication of considerable introjection.

Introjection is used here as a process where learnings are accepted as valid without experiencing and examining those learnings. That is, the staff did not chew up and restructure the input. Although the design seemed appropriate, the intervention was essentially a "spoonfeeding" situation rather than a process that would increase the staff's ability to get appropriate nourishment in the future. This would account

for the seeming inability of the staff, in the "ownership" exercise of the first morning, to really see their situation as one of their own creation. One further speculation in this area is that the staff approaching me during entry, would have reduced the amount of introjection, as opposed to my having approached the staff. The thought occurs that ownership of the situation includes, but is distinct from, "ownership" of the intervention. Considerable time was spent in attempting to increase ownership for the situation without including the intervention in the situation. A possibility would be to include questions in the interview guide that would deal with this issue.

A further reflection is that little effort was made to put "personal growth", confluent education, Teacher Effectiveness Training, Transactional Analysis, Life Skills, and organizational development in perspective. Doing so, may have promoted a process by which the results of one training program are used extensively in the design of the following training program. The volunteers at Brooke School were capable of providing leadership in assessing the over-all situation and in determining future training directions.

One area of speculation deals with the inter-group conflict antecedents. The supposedly "in" or progressive group was the confluent education group with the primary group largely feeling "out". As has been previously described, this result is partially due to a sub-group of a staff taking specialized training. I doubt if this phenomenon is confined to the human relations field training programs but it may be accentuated by its character.

The awarenesses that may be important in reducing artificial

conflict between "in" and "outs" could possibly be included as objectives within training programs within and without the school. Areas for the "in" group to pay attention to include: a) sharing rather than attempting to convince; b) sharing confusions as well as insights with the entire staff; c) dropping specialized vocabulary when describing new learnings and experiences; d) letting fellow staff members in on efforts to try out new skills and e) translating their position into viable curricula.

The apparent dilemma for the "traditional" staff members is being used to the security of a principal who gives clear orders and directions while the "in" principal is devoted to decentralized decision making. The feeling within this group may be one of being "pushed" to try out new ways they do not feel competent in being able to do. This applies to staff decision making in particular. On the other hand, perhaps their view of the teaching role was one which precluded such involvement. They may have felt it was not part of their job.

The overview then, is that the use of specialized training as an opportunity to proselytize, results in others feeling "put-down". The "holier than thou" attitude from which this stems, appears particularly possible when the training involves "personal growth".

One realization is the need to include some training in dealing with broken expectations in the design of interventions. This would be a part of the workshops that would deal with "re-entry". In the case of Brooke School this could have included paying attention to making expectations explicit. Certainly, different staff members had

different levels of expectations in terms of future inter-personal relationships. Such a "re-entry" process might expose such unrealistic expectations as everyone becoming true friends, or everyone being open and honest, or everyone doing what they said they were going to do. Thus, the tolerance level could be raised. This could be done in a balanced way so that friendship, honesty, and kept commitments are not deprecated.

In working on such issues, the "Renegotiation model" of Sherwood and Glidewell<sup>7</sup> seems somewhat applicable. Sherwood and Glidewell recommend that this model be taught explicitly, to the point of its vocabulary being a part of the everyday life of the school. On the possible benefit side of introducing this model, there might be a lessening of disappointment or rejection feelings within the staff. On the other hand, it might involve a long term effort of its own to become a part of the norms of the group. This model is aimed at promoting constructive ways of working with broken expectations. It aims to increase the tolerance level for oneself and others. The model describes people not doing what they started out to do, or said they would do, as perfectly legitimate and predictable responses. It essentially promotes dealing with broken expectations directly rather than avoiding them. The usual destructive ones are "blaming", or "I can't expect anything from you from now on". One necessary addition to this approach, as I see it, is a more confluent orientation, in that this model appears to be "correct" cognitively but does not explicitly incorporate the feelings of people; particularly with regard to distinguishing between the feelings of disappointment and rejection. It might be that people would have to work on their awareness of these feelings prior to the model being introduced.

The school culture is complex.<sup>8</sup> The community within which Brooke School is found, appears equally complex. The proposition of waiting for a considerable amount of cohesion or tolerance to be developed before working with school community relationships still appears valid to me. Until the staff has a high level of cohesion, there is not enough consistency to carry a program.

The staff at Brooke School appeared to have gained some personal "power".<sup>9</sup> That is, they could utilize their internal resources more extensively; however, the staff never dealt with the issue of "Who has the power?" raised during the second training event. "My concern is that concerns are totally non-negotiable." My wonderings lead to Etzioni<sup>4</sup> and whether organization development interventions would receive much approval or funding should the staff demand, as a result, a greatly increased sphere of influence.

As was indicated by Burke, organization development does not deal with power relations very well. An organizer who sought to increase the parameters of a group's influence quickly might well focus on leaders and goals.

Confrontation, threats, and coercion could be the tools for achieving such effects.

The staff at Brooke School appeared willing to work within the usual expectations of teachers. One hypothetical possibility is that the staff would see the need for local control at Oo-za-we-kwun and use their potentially powerful influence on students and parents to achieve such a result. My suspicion is that an organizational development effort that assisted the staff in such a purpose would be stopped.

The staff would be removed from their positions.

On the other hand, a staff that was resourceful and politically aware might just achieve such a result.

The concern of Etzioni that Human Relations training serves only management could be valid. If the intervention focuses primarily on being "nice" or being accommodating to others, this could well keep a staff in line. However, if its purpose is to gain and create individual and collective strengths, its specific outcomes are unpredictable and could well include confrontation tactics.

The staff at Brooke School, to my knowledge, never had enough cohesion to consider much beyond the usual responsibilities of teachers in Manitoba. That is, to do their work as defined by the school board.

This concludes the reflections section. As was stated earlier the first category of questions were the guidelines considered from a review of the literature. The second category on the application of these guidelines has already been described. This next section deals with the specific questions of the final category. "Is it possible to refine guidelines and develop further principles on the basis of Brooke School?"

#### IV. REFLECTIONS ABOUT FUTURE INTERVENTIONS

This section is based on the discussion of results as well as reflections following the intervention.

It follows the series of questions under the category "Is it possible to refine guidelines and develop further principles on the

basis of Brooke School?

The guidelines on which this study was based still appear appropriate. These criteria have to do with ownership, diagnosis, use of theory, transfer of training, consultant ethics and behaviors, and evaluation.

- a) That efforts be made to pay attention to the sense of ownership by the staff for the intervention. Possibilities in this area include:
  - 1) Having the staff approach the consultant rather than the consultant approach the staff.
  - 2) Taking considerable time to discuss the processes involved with the staff prior to the staff making a commitment.
  - 3) Using questions in the interview guide that ask the participants for ways they can help or sabotage their workshop.
  - 4) Processing sessions for each day of the workshop. These would be open to all participants.
- b) That the following guidelines be considered for improving the diagnostic processes used in this study:
  - 1) Using group interviews as part of the diagnostic and evaluative processes.
  - 2) Spending time in the school as an observer prior to workshops and after workshops.
- c) Principles for improving the workshops are as follows:
  - 1) That a minimal use of theory at the beginning occurs, followed by its use as asked for by the participants.
  - 2) That when using debriefing sheets, gradually allow openings for participants to read their sheets themselves in order to increase risk-taking.

- 3) That the "posting of commitments" not be encouraged as it may be a self-improvement program that is self-defeating.
  - 4) That the "demands and appreciations" exercise be re-designed so that opportunities for taking "shots" without owning them are eliminated.
  - 5) That direct feedback be "dampened" so that it is seen in a more balanced fashion.
  - 6) That workshop processes stay close to the concerns of the participants.
- d) Possibilities for extending the transfer of training include the following:
- 1) That the workshops leave open-ended possibilities for transfer but that they also include commitments by the staff for specific follow-up activities.
  - 2) That the consultant act as a processor at meetings following the workshop. This function would include providing leadership in events dealing with role clarification, staff meetings or collaborative units. It would also involve the examination of patterns of behavior.
  - 3) That a "Renegotiation Model", that is "confluent" be integrated into future interventions. This would assist in developing realistic expectations, as well as constructive ways of working with conflict based on broken commitments.
- e) A guideline for increasing the probability for action research being integrated into a staff developmental model is:
- 1) That efforts be made to encourage the setting up of permanent processing units within school staffs. These units would be responsible for implementing an overall organization pro-

blem solving sequence. The use of volunteers could be one way of training and promoting such a unit.

- f) The problem of splits on school staffs and community/school relations may be prevented to some degree by the following:
- 1) That programs such as confluent education pay particular attention to how they contribute to inter-group conflict situations on school staffs.
  - 2) That school staffs learn to recognize in-service group vs. out-service group dynamics that result in artificial conflicts. The staff may also be made aware prior to such an occurrence of inter-group conflict and its effects on the collaborative resources within the school. The staff could then be conceivably taught to recognize destructive patterns and consistently "describe", "challenge" or "call" such patterns as they occur.
  - 3) That the issue of community/school relations not be addressed until there is a high degree of cohesion within the teaching staff. Otherwise, situations such as inter-group conflict will simply have another arena to express itself.

This concludes this chapter. Its purpose was to share realizations, based on the study, that could have an important effect in the success of developing strengths within school staffs. The importance of the organizational climate of the school in relation to the confidence of teachers to implement innovative and creative teaching strategies appears to be an avenue by which organizational development efforts

will result in worthwhile educational opportunities for children. This relationship might be worthwhile examining in more detail both from the point of view of training programs such as confluent education, which seeks to maximize its training effects in schools, and from the school's perspective in its attempts to utilize the resources of all teachers regardless of their orientation.

## REFERENCES

1. Philip W. Jackson, Life in Classrooms, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., New York, 1968, p 11.
2. Refer to Appendix A - A History of Organizational Development. P.203.
3. Refer to previous Chapter II, p. 17, 18.
4. W. Warner Burke, Editor, Contemporary Organization Development: Conceptual Orientations and Interventions, NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science, 1972, p. 19, 20.
5. Ibid. p. 21, 22.
6. Seymour B. Sarason, The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change, Allyn and Bacon Inc., Boston, 1971, p. 67, 68.
7. Burke, Op cit, p. 35.
8. Sarason, op cit, p. 149.
9. Gerald Weinstein and Mario D. Fantini, Toward Humanistic Education: A Curriculum of Affect, Praeger Publishers, New York, 1970, p. 68, 69.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brown, George Isaac: Human Teaching for Human Learning: an introduction to Confluent Education. The Viking Press, Inc., New York, 1971.
- Burke, W. Warner: Contemporary Organization Development: Conceptual Orientations and Interventions. NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science, Washington, D.C. 1972.
- Carver, Fred D., Sergiovanni, Thomas J.: Organizations and Human Behavior: Focus on Schools. McGraw Hill Book Co., New York 1969.
- Etzioni, Amitai: Modern Organizations, Columbia University. Copyright 1964 by Prentice-Hall Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.
- Fagan, Joen and Shepherd, Irma Lee: Gestalt Therapy Now. Copyright 1970, Fitzhenry & Whiteside Limited, Toronto.
- Fordyce, Jack K., Weil, Raymond: Managing with People: A Manager's Handbook of Organization Development Methods. Addison-Wesley Publishers, Reading, Mass, 1971.
- Fox, David J.: The Research Process in Education. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969.
- French, Wendell L. and Bell, Cecil H.: Organization Development, behavioral science intervention for organization improvement. University of Washington: Prentice-Hall Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1973.
- Good, Carter V.: Introduction to Educational Research. 2nd Edition Meredith Publishing Co., New York, 1963.
- Harris, Ben M. and Bessent, Wailand: In-Service Education. A guide to Better Practice. Prentice-Hall Inc. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1969.
- Hill, Winfred F.: Learning: A survey of Psychological Interpretation. Chandler Publishing Company, San Francisco, 1963.
- Jackson, Philip W.: Life in Classrooms. Holt, Rinehart and Winston Inc., New York, 1968.
- Johnson, David W., and Johnson, Frank P.: Joining Together. Group Theory and Group Skills. Prentice-Hall Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1975.
- Krech, Crutchfield and Ballachey: Individual in Society: A textbook of Social Psychology. McGraw-Hill Book Company Inc., New York, 1962.

- Lofland, John: Analyzing Social Settings: A guide to Qualitative Observation and Analysis. Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc. Belmont, California, 1971.
- Mahler, Walter R: Diagnostic Studies. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company. Don Mills, Ontario 1974.
- Pugh, D. S., Hickson, D.J. and Hinings, C.R.: Writers on Organizations. Second Edition: Penguin Education 1971.
- Sarason, Seymour B.: The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change. Allyn and Bacon Inc., Boston, 1971.
- Schmuck, Richard A., Runkel, Philip J.: Organizational Training for a School Faculty. University of Oregon Press, Eugene, Oregon, 1970.
- Schmuck, Runkel, Saturen, Martell, Derr: Handbook of Organization Development in Schools, National Press Books, 1972.
- Sergiovanni, Thomas J., and Carver, Fred D.: The New School Executive - A Theory of Administration. Harper & Row, New York, 1973.
- Stevens, John O.: Awareness: exploring, experimenting, experiencing. Real People Press, Moab, Utah, 1971.
- Warr, Peter and Wall, Toby: Work and Well Being. Penguin Books Ltd. 1975.
- Weinstein, Gerald and Fantini, Mario D.: Toward Humanistic Education: A Curriculum of Affect. Praeger Publishers, New York, 1970.
- White, Orion Jr.: Psychic Energy and Organizational Change; Series Number 03-007 Sage Professional Papers in Administrative and Policy Studies, Edited by H. George Frederickson. Sage Publications, 1973, Beverley Hills, California.

APPENDIX A

## APPENDIX A

## A HISTORY OF ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The First Thrust - Increasing the Ability of the Organization to Reach its Goals

The first thrust had, in its beginnings, the aim of improving the ability of the organization to reach its goals. F. W. Taylor, the founder of "scientific management" was one of the first interveners who began to take into account the specifics of how people functioned as these related to production. The work done here dealt with "time and motion" studies which attempted to determine the methods by which the most work could be done in the least time.<sup>1</sup> One criticism of Taylor was that his work had the effect of reducing people to the level of a machine.<sup>2</sup> A clearer limitation to his work was that it focused on the worker as an individual and did not see a person's relationship to his work group.

One of the first indicators that the work group was a powerful influence on the productivity of the individual came from the Hawthorn Studies. The Hawthorn Studies led to the conclusion that the increased production was due to the changed social situation of the workers. This new social situation was increased psychological satisfaction due to putting them into the experiment room and the special attentions involved.<sup>3</sup>

Previous to this, attention was on the formal system of communication; now it appeared that an informal system of communication deserved to be studied as it affected the goals of the organization.

Elton Mayo, the man behind the Hawthorn Studies<sup>4</sup> provided one

of the bases for what was later known as Industrial Sociology.<sup>5</sup> That is in contrast to the parallel development which stemmed from Taylor's work known as Industrial Psychology. Mayo followed up his surprise from the initial Hawthorn Studies with a study called the Bank Wiring Room experiment. These results indicated that the work group's effect on each of its members was more extensive than had previously been thought. The specific norms of the work group were found to be a prime motivator in the production of the individual.<sup>6</sup> This indicated that the cohesion of the work group was a factor to be examined.

The results of these and other experiments led to the formation of the Human Relations movement of which Mayo was the founder.<sup>7</sup> The Human Relations movement used the insights of the social sciences to secure the commitment of individuals to the ends and activities of the organization.<sup>8</sup>

A usual intervention at this time would be one that Jaques used;<sup>9</sup> that of sitting in on meetings and explaining factors at work so as to increase insight.

The belief of the Human Relations movement was that man was not motivated solely by the "carrot and stick" theory but that interpersonal factors were important as well. The question this information evoked was, is the "logic of sentiment" of the workers compatible with the rationality of the organizations?

Another social psychologist who made a contribution in this area was Kurt Lewin. His field theory<sup>10</sup> was built around the idea that an individual's motivation is very complex - that there are large numbers of forces pushing us toward or away from a particular direction. His research supported Mayo's in which he demonstrated<sup>11</sup> that group discussions were more effective than two-person discussions or lectures in promoting specific actions. Lewin's work was paramount in this stream.

He was likely the founder of experimental group dynamics.<sup>12</sup> In addition, he was one of the first to apply the action research model to inter-group relations.<sup>13</sup>

The Human Relations movement and the Scientific Management Thrust had one element in common. This element was made explicit by Etzioni when he stated, "Neither saw any basic contradiction or insoluble dilemma in the relationship between the organization's quest for 'rationality' and the human search for 'happiness'."<sup>14</sup> Scientific Management said that what is best for the organization is best for the individual whereas the Human Relations movement said that the most satisfying organization from the point of view of the worker would be the most efficient.

Thus the Human Relations movement had its thrust in the direction of relating work and the organizational structure to the social needs of the employees. The expectation was that the employees would be happy and thus cooperate and work hard and as a result the efficiency of the organization would improve.<sup>15</sup>

The idealistic hope was that it is possible to construct the ideal relationship between the organization and its members through the use of social sciences.

One noticeable feature of the "movement" was the capitalistic overtone that is similar to that referred to by Orion White Jr. when he discusses Maslow's "self-actualization" as it relates to organizations.<sup>16</sup> The basis for this contention is likely the similarity between Maslow's efforts to explain "self-actualization" and the "calling" of Weber's "protestant ethic". The "protestant ethic" has been described as the backbone of capitalism.

Etzioni had two basic criticisms of the Human Relations Movement. The first was its naivety and the second was its bias in favour of management.

The "love and trust" model of the Human Relations movement, according to Etzioni, does not recognize the inevitability and at times desirability of alienation and conflict.<sup>17</sup> To refer to work teams as "families" and to portray foremen as "warm and understanding" fathers was incredulous to him. Under the banner of Structuralism, Etzioni stressed the basic conflict between management and workers, between organizational needs and personal needs, and between rationality and emotionality. It is likely that both Karl Marx and Saul Alinsky would agree with his statement that differences in economic interests and power positions cannot be communicated away.<sup>18</sup>

Etzioni's criticism may very well apply to the organizational development movement of the present time. This issue is still here today. W. Warner Burke considers this situation when he states,

Organizational Development does not deal with power dynamics very effectively. In fact, it seldom deals with power at all. Since organizational development practitioners seek outcomes such as collaboration, high interpersonal trust, openness, honesty, decentralization of decision making and a sharing of authority, the technology<sup>19</sup> for coping with the realities of power is rather limited.

On a broader scale organization development has not been instrumental in such social issues as helping disenfranchised groups gain equal promotion opportunities.<sup>20</sup>

The second major criticism Etzioni had of the Human Relations movement is that it is biased towards management and misleads the workers. He states that their efforts are often directed to creating a "false sense of participation and autonomy which has been deliberately induced in order to elicit the workers' co-operation in the commitment to organizational enterprise".<sup>21</sup>

A possible example of this is the use of "gripe sessions" with workers where catharsis is the goal of the "facilitator" while the workers felt their complaints were really listened to by management.<sup>22</sup>

The basic conflict between the Structuralists and the Human Relations movement centres around their view of what motivates people to work. Etzioni claims that the Human Relations people underplay the importance of material rewards. His view is that most workers "spend much of their working day, in a semi-conscious delirium, dreaming about their major source of satisfaction, the post-work day."<sup>23</sup>

George Strauss supports this view when he says,

Although many individuals find relatively little satisfaction in their work, this may not be as much of a deprivation as the hypothesis (personality vs organization) would suggest, since many of these same individuals centre their lives off the job and find most of their satisfactions in the community and the home. With these individuals power-equalization may not liberate much energy.<sup>24</sup>

Orion White Jr. makes much the same statement but attributes different reasons for the situation when he says that

apparently the black community itself rejected the opportunity to decentralize police power and gain control over the sector of the police that affects the black community. Neighbourhood control, especially of the police function, has been a main ideological objective of the left - a premise with which it was assumed with certainty that the oppressed classes, like the blacks agreed. Apparently the left underestimated the power of our technological system to instill the principles of professionalism and rational administration into even those sectors of the population at the bottom of the system, the sectors supposedly opposed by just these principles."<sup>25</sup>

Further to this same point Warr and Wall state that "there is a proportion of the work force to whom a job offering greater variety, challenge, and responsibility may not be an attractive prospect."<sup>26</sup>

McGregor made these differences in how people saw others being motivated more explicit with his Theory X and Theory Y comparison. In the book, The Human Side of Enterprise, published in 1957, Theory X had as its basis, a view that people are lazy; lack ambition; are self-centered and indifferent to organizational needs; and can be easily manipulated.<sup>27</sup> Theory Y agrees that many people exhibit these characteristics in organizations but disagrees as to its cause. Y states that people are that way as a result of how organizations are run rather than as being inherited characteristics of people.<sup>28</sup> McGregor largely draws on the hierarchy of needs that Maslow developed as the basis for Theory Y. As well, he includes in his essay a number of developments which he saw as steps in a Y orientation. He viewed "management by objectives" as a move toward increasing the individual's freedom to direct his own activities. He also saw "job enlargement" as consistent with Theory Y. "Job enlargement" in this context is seen by this writer as the forerunner of the Herzberg "job enrichment" concept which stresses opportunities for achievement, responsibility, recognition, growth and learning.<sup>29</sup>

Douglas McGregor could easily be called one of the fathers of organizational development due to his clear enunciation of the direction he hoped organizations would take. One of his distinct

contributions was the use of the laboratory method in furthering these aims.

Coincident with these developments was the use of Training Groups as a basis for providing individuals with the opportunity to examine and practice inter-personal competencies. These were applied to the organizational settings. In the beginning stages of organizational development, sensitivity groups were considered one of the key tools to move toward a "Y" theory.

The enthusiasm of early practitioners for such a highly dynamic technique waned as the transfer problem from encounter group setting to the work setting was realized. In speaking of this methodology Orion White Jr. states,

In spite of the emphasis on physical touching in the humanistic movements' methodology, the most important and powerful part of the methodology probably is self-disclosure in verbal communication. This after all is the classic device of the religious conversion where one asserts his sinfulness (weakness and guilt) before the world and stands alone to take the consequences that the world might work on him because of what he is... The fallacy of humanistic methodology is that it sets the individual in the context of a highly supportive atmosphere for the revelation of the pathogenic secret. The result is that the effect is often vastly watered down, and the resulting conversion is rendered temporary - lasting hopefully until one can get back into such a supportive atmosphere.<sup>30</sup>

Studies such as the Asch<sup>31</sup> and Crutchfield<sup>32</sup> experiments demonstrated the powerful effects of group norms on the individual. Thus it is hardly surprising that the transfer effects from stranger-type laboratory sessions were meagre. This resulted in organizational development efforts that paid much more attention to the intact work group. Two of the seven characteristics listed by French and Bell which distinguishes organizational development from more traditional interventions are:

- a) An emphasis on the work team as the key unit for learning more effective modes of organizational behaviour.
- b) An emphasis on the collaborative management of work team culture.<sup>33</sup>

French and Bell also indicate that present day organizational development interventions minimize the transfer problem through the use of the intact work group and through the use of real organizational problems in the training sessions, not hypothetical ones. They further state that the use of several learning models is more likely to increase transfer of learnings.<sup>34</sup>

#### The Second Stream - The Use of Feedback to the System

The second major developmental stream from the past is the deliberate use of feedback from survey data. The confluence of this stream with the laboratory training stream is organizational development.<sup>35</sup> Development of survey research methods enabled studies such as the following to occur. This study is Herzberg's motivational study in which he distinguishes between "motivators" or "satisfiers" and those factors known as "hygienic" or "dissatisfiers". Satisfiers were seen as belonging to the upper levels of Maslow's hierarchy of needs whereas dissatisfiers were roughly equated to the lower levels of the same hierarchy. The idea behind the research is that the absence of dissatisfiers does not bring satisfaction - only satisfiers can do this.<sup>36</sup>

Thomas J. Sergiovanni replicated Herzberg's study using teachers as participants. He claims that satisfiers are found generally in the

work itself. Such factors as achievement, recognition, and responsibility are included in this category. The dissatisfiers for the teachers are found in the environment of their work.<sup>37</sup> Interpersonal relations (subordinates) was the largest dissatisfier found in this study. The work itself could be found in either category. There is evidence that this data applies to teachers regardless of their sex, teaching level, or tenure status.<sup>38</sup>

Two conclusions for organizational development efforts from this study might be:

- a) That interpersonal relations, effective communication, and group effectiveness are important factors but their elimination as problems do not contribute directly to teacher satisfaction.
- b) Organizing and planning work, implementing goal achievement are factors that contribute directly to teacher satisfaction.

From this, Sergiovanni recommends encouragement to teachers to: 1) intensify collaborative efforts and consultative management, 2) increase personal responsibility in developing and implementing teaching programs and 3) develop professional skills.<sup>39</sup>

Along with the development of attitude surveys came methods for getting data from people for diagnostic and evaluative work. An example of this was the Delphi method.<sup>40</sup> These developments enabled organizational development to utilize an action research model in its interventions.

The action research model consists of 1) a preliminary diagnosis, 2) data gathering, 3) data feedback to the group, 4) data exploration by the group, 5) action planning and 6) action.<sup>41</sup> French and Bell state that this model is so central to organizational development efforts that one definition of organizational development could be "organization improvement through action research."<sup>42</sup>

Organizational development is action oriented at present. It is certainly not an inter-disciplinary activity of long standing. Organizational development takes the form of an applied behavioral science. Organizational development programs use principles from several behavioral sciences: social psychology, social anthropology, sociology, psychiatry, economics, and political science. Further contributions to the practice of organizational development come from lawful patterns of personality theory, social psychology, group dynamics, organization theory, the theory and practice of adult education, planned change systems theory and operations research.<sup>43</sup>

The organizational development practitioner is one who takes the theoretical data from these areas and combines it in an appropriate fashion with data from the client group to determine a program of action.

## A PARTICIPANT'S OBSERVATIONS

Jack's Introduction to O.D. in October

We didn't get started until 4:10 or so. Jack introduced organizational development and I noticed that there were some enthused people and some unenthused people. I enjoyed hearing Jack's introduction to O.D. I will attend any workshop or evening class or whatever at which I can hear and talk about teaching and learning. I also want to say that I have some things that I imagine are true but may or may not be in fact, true. I imagine that several staff members do not enjoy meetings, good or bad, productive or non-productive, they just dislike any meetings.

Anyway, Jack was honest with us in telling us that his purpose for having this O.D. workshop was twofold, the reasons being, he wanted to help us (he knows that ALL staffs can improve) and he wanted to help himself- write his thesis.

The staff agreed to three days, two days in January and one day a month after the first two days.

Another imagining I had was that some teachers linked Jack to Bryan through confluent education. I am glad that Jack said nothing against that belief at his introduction. Had he done so there would have been some doubts about working with Jack, I imagine.

Jack needed two volunteers to help him a) set up a schedule for interviewing staff members and b) plan the workshop. I am a person who likes to talk and do not enjoy silence for very long so I

volunteered and said, "Because I have been on this staff for about 100 years, I'll volunteer." Perhaps five years or four years, I guess, felt like 100. Angela then volunteered, she said jokingly, as I had said jokingly, "Because I am a new staff member," or words to that effect, I didn't know Angela very well at all and her volunteering made me glad because it was her especially and because it wasn't some others.

Here goes another "I imagine". Here is another possibility re the volunteers. I just thought of it right now. Bryan is classed as confluent by several staff members; Fred is classed as confluent by some, so when Angela volunteered it was good that at least one, Angela, was not confluent. I only imagined that.

Let me get going. In January, I think, Jack got in contact with either Bryan or Angela or me and asked us to set up a schedule of interviews with Jack and individual teachers. That we did and Jack interviewed each one of us and using a tape recording of the interviews, made a group of five or six concerns of this staff as he saw them. He worked at them in his motel room and when Angela and I went there for a meeting to plan the workshop, he had the concerns titled and posted around the room. The concerns were: 1) how the staff works together; 2) the role of the principal; 3) school and community; 4) staff meetings and two others I can't label right now. Oh! was Use of Materials also one? The three of us collaborated, (I think that is the word) on a plan for the two day workshop. The sixth one was the strengths we have. Planned curricula sequencing was another.

The next day, the first day of the workshop, Jack had the concerns posted around the meeting room. People sat in the circle and I

took mental note of where they sat. I think people did not want to sit with the group that they are labelled as belonging to in the school.

Jack outlined the day and Angela said what she thought she might learn from the workshop. Jack, Angela and I were under the impression that both Angela and I would do that but after Angela said it, I felt that it would look fixed if I had been the only other one who stated his expectations. So I didn't.

I remember that I thought about who wrote the concerns as the staff read them. I would read one and say, "Oh, I know who must have said that one." I asked Jack about it and he said it was perfectly natural to do that. I found out I was wrong on both the ones I questioned others about. ("Did you say that?" "No, I didn't.")

We then in two groups developed summary statements of the six concerns. We called them Fred's group - Angela's group. After the summary statements were made, Angela and I collaborated on a single summary statement for the entire group. I felt pushy with Angela and felt she felt on the spot as I did and that interfered with our bargaining and progress. What was good for me was that I could talk - bargain with another person without having others interrupt and get off track. I am good at doing that (getting off track) as it is and do not need others to help me do it.

That first afternoon was great for me. I could be a member of my group without fear of interruption from others and could also be a member of the other group and say how I saw things as I imagined them to see those things, e.g., I remember saying something about getting the raw end of the stick in having to do outside duty while others got

the warm gym but it wasn't really that bad because the gym was like hell anyway.

I learned that sometimes I am like other people imagine me to be, and other times they haven't got a clue as to how I think about a certain topic. I am me and nobody else can be me.

In the morning session we looked at staff meetings and how to improve them as problem-solving meetings or how to make them productive. The problem-solving model made sense to me and it is a workable method if we do not spend too much time on each step. I think we must stay on topic.

- 1) Present state of affairs
- 2) What do we want?
- 3) Explore as many alternatives as possible about how to get from 1) to 2). Select what seems to be the best alternative.
- 4) Who will do it and when?
- 5) How do we know they did it?
- 6) Did it work?

I think that the way we have been having staff meetings is the way I see things happening to me in the class work as well. That is, "we start it but we never finish - there is no follow-through."

I felt very good about the general good feeling of the group re improved staff meetings and the first staff meeting went well. We found some difficulty in debriefing and a summary statement. We have continued to have difficulty with it and have almost ceased to bother with it. I wonder if it's too difficult a thing to do for us or is it that we don't see immediate results or even try to see immediate results. I think there are immediate results - one being a good feeling

of bringing the meeting to a close, a sense of completion and a chance to say exactly what we thought about the meeting.

I want to say right now and I don't know whether it fits right now or not but I am going to say it anyway. I understand that change is painful. I know that change is painful. If the present state of affairs is painful, which it is for me, and change is also painful, then it becomes a comparison of which is more painful, by how much, and whether the effort necessary plus the change pain is worth more or is it necessary at all. What I have done after I thought about that is to look at the possible future state of affairs, the amount of pain and effort involved there and whether I am prepared to go ahead with the change. My answer for working in Brooke School with staff and students is that I am prepared and willing to accept the pain of the change. I have begun to do that. At the risk of a continuance at the high talker level, I will let the staff know my thoughts about continuing our O.D. commitments. My thoughts are that we still have to look at the present state of affairs as well as what we'd like it to be and decide individually if you want to change the state of affairs. If your answer is "yes, I do want to change the present state of affairs," then I am perfectly willing to pool our ignorances and knowledge and work from there.

The last thing I have to talk about for the two day workshop is Bryan's idea of role of the principal.

Bryan appeared to be very clear in understanding what is his role as a principal. I was very unclear of the principal's role. I did not know he had that many responsibilities. The responsibilities that

he stated are: change agent; manager; educator; initiator; transmitter; connector; P.R. person; supportive; protective; facilitator; mediator and policy maker. I remember that the staff suggested the last one. I used to give him some of my responsibilities as a teacher. Before I did any or very much research into a method of presenting, or the best or a good way of presenting something to my class, I would ask him how to do it. He'd say, "I don't know", in a tone of voice that suggested to one that he was willing to help me find out. But he wasn't going to tell me how to do it. And now I understand that I would not learn my way of doing something if he told me his way. I cannot do it his way as well as he can and he cannot do it my way as well as I can. Bryan's role as principal, in being a manager, an educator and a facilitator is not to teach us his way but to have us learn our way of doing our job. I see that my role as a teacher is the same in working with my class. To have the kids answer their own questions is far more worthwhile than for me to answer them. Do you agree?

Bryan's expectations of others are attainable for me. I can reach those expectations. I like the expression, "to seek help when you need it." I have sought help when I wanted it, not necessarily when I needed it. "To seek help when I want it is showing a lack of responsibility; to seek help when I need it shows responsibility."

I think sometimes there is a very fine line between "need" and "want". The distinction has been and still is very cloudy for me much of the time.

I have learned some things from the workshop. I learned that working with people is a very difficult job when it is compared with

working with things. I am learning that it is a rewarding job and rewards do not come easily. I learned that I can become a medium or low talker and that when I do become something other than a high talker, I learn more. I learned that I can go easily with other people's ideas and that my ideas are not the best ones. I know I have some good ideas and so do other people.

I have learned some things since the workshops that may or may not be a result of the workshop. I have learned that it is VERY easy to say what is wrong with this or that. It is more difficult to say what is right with it. What I need in my life is for the right things to be talked about more than the wrong things - to be talked about by me and others.

## REFERENCES

1. Peter Warr and Toby Wall, Work and Well Being, Penguin Books Ltd. 1975, p. 25.
2. Ibid, p. 27.
3. Ibid, p. 30.
4. Ibid, p. 32.
5. D. S. Pugh, D. J. Hickson and C. R. Hinings, Writers on Organizations, Penguin Education, 1971, p. 126.
6. Warr and Wall, op cit. p. 31.
7. Pugh, Hickson and Hinings, op cit., p. 126.
8. Ibid, p. 129.
9. Ibid, p. 132.
10. Winfred F. Hill, Learning: A Survey of Psychological Interpretation Changler Publishing Company, San Francisco, 1963, p. 111.
11. Individual in Society: A testbook of Social Psychology, Krech, Crutchfield and Ballachey, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1962, p. 228.
12. Ibid, p. 7.
13. Wendell L. French, Cecil H. Bell, Organization Development Behavioral Science Intervention for Organization Improvement, University of Washington, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1973, p. 92.
14. Amitai Etzioni, Modern Organizations, Columbia University Copyright 1964 by Prentice-Hall Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, p. 39.
15. Ibid. p. 39.
16. Orion White, Jr. Psychic Energy and Organizational Change, Series/Number 03-007, Sage Professional Papers in Administrative and Policy Studies, Edited by H. George Frederickson Sage Publications 1973, Beverley Hills, California, p. 14.
17. Etzioni, op cit., p. 40.
18. Ibid. p. 44.
19. W. Warner Burke, A Look at Organizational Development Today in Contemporary Organization Development: Conceptual Orientations and Interventions, NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science, 1972, p. 6.

20. Ibid. p. 6.
21. Etzioni, op cit, p. 45.
22. Ibid. p. 45.
23. Ibid. p. 42.
24. Fred D. Carver, Thomas J. Sergiovanni, Some Notes on Power Equilization: George Strauss in Organizations and Human Behavior: Focus on Schools
25. White, op cit, p. 11, 12.
26. Warr and Wall, op cit, p. 126.
27. Douglas McGregor, The Human Side of Enterprise, in Organizations and Human Behavior, Focus on Schools, Fred D. Carver, Thomas J. Sergiovanni, McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, 1969, p. 150.
28. Ibid. p. 151.
29. Ibid. p. 155.
30. White, op cit, p. 22, 23.
31. Krech, Crutchfield and Ballachey, op cit, p. 507.
32. Ibid, p. 507 or 509.
33. French and Bell, op cit, p. 19, 20.
34. Ibid. p. 42.
35. Ibid. p. 21.
36. Thomas J. Sergiovanni, Fred D. Carver, The New School Executive - A Theory of Administration, Harper & Row, New York, 1973, p. 70, 71.
37. Thomas J. Sergiovanni, Factors Which Affect Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of Teachers, in Organizations and Human Behavior: Focus on Schools, Fred D. Carver, Thomas J. Sergiovanni, McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, 1969, p. 259.
38. Ibid. p. 256, 257.
39. Ibid. p. 258.
40. Sergiovanni, Carver, op cit, p. 236, 238, 239.
41. French and Bell, op cit, p. 18.
42. Ibid. p. 18.
43. Ibid. p. 47.

APPENDIX B

## APPENDIX B

## THEORY OF ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT - I

When organization members:

1. Experience pain and frustration
2. Agree with one another as to the problems and causes, and
3. Act in ways contrary to their own thoughts, feelings and information,

The following assumptions should be tested:

1. Organization members are implicitly or explicitly collaborating with one another to maintain the status quo
2. Organization members have fantasies about the disastrous consequences of confronting those issues and concerns they know and agree cause the pain and frustration.

## APPENDIX B

## TEST ON INTER-GROUP CONFLICT

1. In a win-lose situation between groups, members become (choose two):
  - C a. More closely knit
  - b. More upset about the group
  - c. Less interested in the group
  - d. Less loyal to the group
  - C e. More loyal to the group
2. In a win-lose situation, groups:
  - a. Present their side fairly
  - b. Listen carefully to the other side
  - C c. See only their best and the other group's worst
  - d. Feel that the other group has authoritarian leadership
  - e. Tell their negotiator to win or they'll beat him up
3. In win-lose negotiations, groups:
  - a. See the points of agreement between the groups
  - C b. See the points of disagreement between the groups
  - c. Look for how the other group thinks about the problem
  - d. Work for a mutual agreement
  - e. Cry if they lose
4. In a win-lose situation, when a third party decides the winner:
  - C a. The winner sees the decision as fair
  - b. The loser sees that the decision is fair
  - c. They both agree that the decision is fair
  - d. They both agree that the decision is unfair
  - e. They attack the third party who then becomes the loser
5. The group most likely to become more cohesive and effective after the decision is:
  - C a. The winning group
  - b. The losing group
  - c. Both groups
  - d. Neither group
  - e. All three groups
6. The best way to solve a win-lose situation is to:
  - a. Let one group win and go on to another problem
  - b. Let both groups win part of the decision
  - c. Let neither group win
  - C d. Keep it from happening in the first place

## APPENDIX B

## THEORY OF ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT - II

Blake and Mouton emphasize avoiding three basic traps that lead to increased, rather than decreased conflict. The first to avoid is the win-lose dynamic in which every action of the other group is seen as a move to dominate. The participants must learn to recognize win-lose attitudes and behaviors and be able to set norms that stress their avoidance. The second trap to avoid is the psychodynamic fallacy in which the motivation for the other group's behavior is seen in terms of personality factors rather than resulting from the dynamics of inter-group conflict. Finally, they emphasize the avoidance of self-fulfilling prophecies in which, for example, one group assumes that the other is belligerent and then proceeds to engage in hostile behavior in an attempt to defend itself through a good offense - thereby provoking belligerence on the part of the other group, which confirms the original assumption.

## APPENDIX B

## THEORY OF ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT - III

An alternative design may be used at a staff meeting to encourage increased influence among the low participants. Ask staff members to categorize themselves according to how much they believe they usually talk at staff meetings. The three categories are high talkers, moderate talkers and low talkers. The staff must divide itself into three groups of more or less equal size, each containing only one of these categories. Often different perceptions exist about who belongs in the three groups. Members discuss what persons should be in the three groups whenever differences of opinion arise. Then each group discusses regular items on the meeting agenda in the presence of the other two groups; a convenient arrangement is the theatre-in-the-round (fishbowl). In this way, persons have the opportunity to see how persons of high, middle and low talkativeness deal with issues and what the problems of communication are in these three groups. Evidence from Knutson (1960) shows that the highly talkative persons typically get the lion's share of attention from others, including their own kind. Knutson's research also shows that worthwhile contributions from low talkers often get buried or inhibited by the profusion of talk from the high talkers, and that not only the high talkers but the low talkers themselves come to believe that the low talkers have little to offer. Asking high talkers to be quiet while the low talkers talk can expand the possibilities for listening and for interaction.

After every sub-group has had its turn in the centre, give the entire group time to discuss what has happened. The points we have made above will usually emerge from discussion.

## APPENDIX B

## PROBLEM SOLVING MODEL

1. What is the present state of affairs? (Who and What behaviors)
2. What do we want? (Who and What behaviors)
3. Explore as many alternatives as possible about how to get from one to two. Select what seems to be the best alternative.
4. Who will do it and when?
5. How will we know that they did it?
6. Did it work?

## APPENDIX B

## SUGGESTIONS

1. List a series of statements about the problem. Put on black-board.
2. Series of statements of the desired state of affairs.

## APPENDIX B

## YOUR PROBLEM SOLVING BEHAVIOR - A TEST

1. When a problem comes up in a meeting, I try to make sure it is thoroughly explored until everyone understands what the problem is.  

NEVER
ALWAYS
2. I ask why the problem exists and what the causes are.  

NEVER
ALWAYS
3. I tend to accept the first solution that is proposed by a group member.  

NEVER
ALWAYS
4. When a group decides which solution to adopt and implement, I make certain it is clear what the decision is, who should carry it out, and when.  

NEVER
ALWAYS
5. I do not take the time to really study or define the problems the group is working on.  

NEVER
ALWAYS
6. I have a tendency to propose answers without really having thought the problem and its causes through carefully.  

NEVER
ALWAYS
7. I make sure that the group discusses the pros and cons of several different solutions to a problem.  

NEVER
ALWAYS
8. I tend to let decisions remain vague - as to what they are and who will carry them out.  

NEVER
ALWAYS
9. I push to definite follow-ups on how decisions, reached at earlier meetings, work out in practice.  

NEVER
ALWAYS
10. I know if the results of the group's work are worth the effort.  

NEVER
ALWAYS

## APPENDIX C

## APPENDIX C

## STAFF EVALUATION FORM

The only purpose of this form is to help strengthen the quality of education in Brooke School. There are many characteristics of teaching. Rather than try to include most of them and end with a form too long to be of use, I have selected characteristics that are agreed upon in educational research to be fundamental to establishing quality education. I have further selected those that would most directly affect the actual implementation of the Brooke School philosophy into classrooms and the school.

For each category, there are a number of related items. For each item, I have listed teacher attitudes, skill, and behaviors on a scale of one to five. At the one level, are those that are unacceptable. They are working against good education and the accomplishment of the objectives of the school. Level three is the minimum acceptable level. Performance at this level is the beginning of growth, nourishment and the achievement of objectives. Level five is certainly not as far as a teacher can go, but it is a long way toward it. There is room on the line after five for further development. The level three criteria, of course, are developed and refined to a higher level as part of level five.

No one is 100% consistent. We do have ranges of behaviors that fit within our attitudes and skills. So we can use a word like usually rather than always and achieve an acceptable level of reliability and validity in education.

In addition to the scale is room for comments which are specific and anecdotal observation with reference to the category.

The form is divided into these sections: climate; teaching; curriculum; school and staff; community; and professional development. Under each category a number of items are listed. Each item is a continuum. This form was developed by the principal of the school. Example of an item under "climate:" -

1	2	3
Uses the "dirty dozen" and "critical parent" as language with children. Uses words like should, good child, bad child.	Models open and honest communication in class	Open communication is a learning objective and practice in class. Establishes trust as a basic element in the class.

## APPENDIX C

## DEFINING A WORKABLE PROBLEM

1. List a series of statements about the problem. Describe it as concretely as possible by mentioning people, places, and resources. There should be as many different statements of the problem as the members are willing to give. Write them on a blackboard where everyone can see them. Avoid arguing about whether the problem is perfectly stated.
2. Restate each problem statement so that it includes a description of both the desired and actual state of affairs. Take out alternative definitions that are beyond the resources of the group to resolve, and choose the definition that the group members agree is most correct. The problem should be important, solvable and urgent.

## APPENDIX C

## 5 BASIC STEPS IN PROBLEM SOLVING

1. Defining the problem
2. Diagnosing how big it is and what is causing it
3. Formulating alternative strategies or plans for solving it
4. Deciding upon and implementing the most desirable strategies
5. Evaluating the success of the strategies used

## APPENDIX C

## EXAMPLE OF AN AGENDA

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>PERSON PRESENTING</u>	<u>TYPE OF ITEM</u>	<u>ESTIMATED TIME</u>
1. Using our para- professionals	July	Info only	10 min.
2. Parents' night	Sallie	Action required	15 min.
3. Record keeping	Carl	Participation (sharing required)	15 min.
4. Evaluation of teachers	Jack	Sharing	20 min.
5. Evening session	Bill	—	—

## APPENDIX C

## GUIDE FOR ROLE OF CHAIRPERSON

1. Before the meeting:
  - a) Review the agenda
  - b) Make sure you have a secretary
2. During the meeting:
  - a) Call it to order promptly
  - b) Lead the group to establish priorities in the agenda and to specify the time to be spent on each agenda item
  - c) Keep the group at the task
  - d) Keep the group to its time commitments for each agenda item
  - e) Be attuned to feelings of confusion and try to clarify them
  - f) At the end of each agenda item:
    1. check to be sure that everyone who wanted to has had a chance to contribute to the discussion
    2. check whether anyone is not clear about where the matter now stands
    3. summarize or ask someone else to summarize. Be sure that the secretary has recorded the summary.
  - g) Take checks whenever they seem appropriate:
    1. regarding satisfaction of group members with their participation
    2. regarding the decision-making being done
  - h) Conduct or ask someone to conduct a debriefing session during the last ten minutes of the meeting
  - i) Call the meeting to a close promptly
3. After the meeting:
  - a) Check with secretary to see that he is clear about minutes
  - b) Transfer left-over agenda items to the agenda for the next meeting

## APPENDIX C

## OBSERVING

1. Who talks? For how long? How often?
2. Whom do people look at when they talk?
  - a) Single person (possibly potential supporters?)
  - b) The group as a whole (scanning)
  - c) No one
3. Who talks after whom? Or who interrupts whom?
4. What style of communication is used? Gestures? Questions?

## APPENDIX C

## DEBRIEFING FORM

1 \_\_\_\_\_ 10

Least effective

Most effective

1 \_\_\_\_\_ 10

Low involvement

High involvement  
of myself

1 \_\_\_\_\_ 10

Involvement of others

1 \_\_\_\_\_ 10

I was treated with respect