

be ready for any step away from familiar practice, all proposals for change may be laid aside. They may even be given an accolade, "It's a good idea but *this* community isn't ready for it." There the matter rests. If not, a school survey may be a last resort.

19. *The Blasé Cynic*. Sees all—knows all, even before it is explained. Proposals are heard in a tolerant, even gently contemptuous, manner. Warily the answer is given, "Yes, it sounds like it might be a good idea, but those things never work." If necessary, the names of a half-dozen communities are cited, implying that this particular idea was tried in all of them with unfortunate results. Naturally, that finishes that.

20. *The Optimist*. Cheery, ebullient members of this variety are superbly confident that everything is going fine.

Great progress has been made in recent years and schools were never better. Few people are vicious enough to puncture this bubble. Those who do are heard with a pained and incredulous expression; and they are then convinced that they exaggerate, need a rest, or have an ulcer.

21. *The Democratic Variety*. Rare, but they can be located after search. They hear all evidence on each suggestion, using an efficient parliamentary procedure. Action may be postponed by interpreting democratic methods to mean allowing each person to report at his own convenience. If group action appears imminent, a proposal may be divided into two parts. A committee may be appointed to study each part. Democratic leadership may announce that when the two committees make mutually favorable reports, it will be safe to go ahead. And it will be!

*The New Look in School Administration*_____

From two and a half years of work with the Citizenship Education Study of the Detroit public schools and Wayne University, Arnold Meier, Alice Davis, and Florence Cleary, all members of the Study staff, make practical suggestions for the extension of the democratic process in school organization and administration.

MR. GRAHAM, the school principal, reads current educational literature which emphasizes the need for and the effectiveness of democratic procedures in school administration. He is aware that democratic living places heavy de-

mands on the schools and requires able leadership on the part of their administrators. When he attends workshops and meetings, he is reminded that the human personality of the teacher must be respected; that teachers should have

a share in making decisions which vitally affect them; that in each faculty there is a real "well of leadership" if it can only be tapped; that schools will more adequately discharge their responsibility if the creative talents of all are released.

He hears, too, about the strides which administrative and supervisory hierarchies in private enterprises are making in employer-employee relationships, in job training, or in cooperative endeavors. He reviews findings which seem to indicate that more pay, more light, more rest periods, more sick leave are neither such potent motivations to better work and good morale nor such serious grievances as they once were thought to be. The investigators and theorizers point out that there is an *esprit de corps*, a morale, a feeling tone, a relationship among workers which is an elusive but important factor in the way workers participate in any cooperative enterprise.

So Mr. Graham accepts the values inherent in these ideas and acts promptly and vigorously in his own school. He finds that as he gains insights he understands the on-the-job behavior of his faculty better. He becomes more human in his relationships with teachers and pupils, and hence does not wear his status leadership so obviously. As he leads faculty meetings he raises problems and invites suggestions. At one time he would have considered such a performance to be an admission of weakness. Soon there are more faculty discussions. Teacher participation is increased. Work groups or committees are organized.

Mr. Graham and his faculty are underway—the first step has been taken.

To say that they will or will not eventually sail to glory is beside the point. There will be difficulties. There will be periods of confusion when there is no apparent progress. There may be evidences of open revolt and a desire on the part of some to return to the security of traditional practices.

Many observers have reported on group case studies or have generalized from their experiences with groups in industry, labor, community, church, and school. The observations available indicate that in activities which attempt to encourage broad permissive participation, certain difficulties arise repeatedly and certain perplexing problems recur. Some of these problems and their implications for the many Mr. Grahams in our schools today are discussed in the remainder of this article.

What are some of the psychological blocks which must be partially removed as teachers begin to identify their real problems? What reactions are typical as administrators begin to change their procedures or ways of working with a faculty?

In general, teachers have lived in a culture which expects them to know the answers. To indicate problems, to consider weaknesses, to admit shortcomings, to ask for help is difficult for many individuals and groups. When an individual identifies his own problem it tends to raise in his mind, in the minds of administrators, and in the minds of other teachers some doubts as to his abilities. Unless the teacher is an exceedingly secure person and unless he has learned from experience that admissions of this kind are safe, he will tend to refrain from indicating his

serious concerns and will often mention minor problems or problems of administrative detail.

Confusion May Reign

If teachers have been accustomed to a clear-cut, well-defined, more authoritarian procedure, many of them may have some feelings of confusion as these procedures are changed. When decisions are made and clearly stated by administrators, teachers feel they "know what's what." They know what the decision is and who made it. They know what to do and when to do it; they know where to go for interpretations. They may disagree at times; may feel resentment or irritation with the decision. They may even subtly sabotage it, but at least there is little confusion.

When, on the other hand, the faculty is asked to participate in defining school problems and in working toward their solutions, they find themselves involved in a process which they may not understand or accept. The decisions may not be clear-cut; there is often greater latitude for the teacher's discretion; the limits of acceptable action often are not adequately explored. And confusion and insecurity are apt to result. This is the state of affairs which some people view with extreme alarm and attempt to relieve with emergency measures which negate many of the gains which might have been made. It is patience that is needed at this point.

We Fear Change

If the problems under discussion indicate possible change in traditional, academic areas, there is likely to be considerable concern. Teachers may

question whether the course of study can be covered, whether children will experience loss in academic knowledge or skills, or whether time allotments in basic subjects will be reduced. There has been such a glib barrage of hortatives that this and that should be added, without concern as to what should be deleted or done differently, that some teachers have developed emotional mechanisms in self-defense. If the faculty means business it will spend considerable time on the details of *what*, *how*, and *when*.

Even if the problems are not confined to the strictly academic areas, there may still be doubts. If, for example, the school is considering the possibility of giving increased emphasis to the student council, to clubs, or to service groups, teachers will ask if children will be out of class more frequently, who will sponsor such groups, and how this is to be done. They may question whether the teacher will be expected to give more time, whether schedules will have to be reorganized, and whether there will be criticisms from parents.

If someone suggests that teachers need to have or wish to have a better understanding of children, again in spite of theoretical acceptance of the idea there may be some reservations. Does this mean more or different kinds of school records? Will it mean making more home calls and giving more time to parents? Does all of this business about understanding children mean that there will be less restraint, more activity, more confusion and noise?

Many other questions, expressed or unexpressed, may block teachers as they "begin to work democratically on their

problems." To say that many of these questions are petty does not invalidate them. They must be faced. The principal must take time to examine them patiently with his faculty. Implications of proposed action must be considered and the principal must be willing to wait until teachers have gained security before much progress can be made.

How does a faculty organize itself into working groups?

In a large faculty there are some difficulties involved in setting up working groups. This may be done on the basis of grade lines, subject-matter areas, interest groups, special problems, or random groups. If the school is somewhat compartmentalized or departmentalized, there seems to be considerable value in crossing department, grade, and subject-matter lines. There is greater likelihood that values will change if more than one point of view is represented and teachers know and understand the difficulties and problems of teachers working in other areas.

What Skills Are Necessary?

Assuming that a faculty has organized itself into small working groups, the question immediately arises regarding skills which the group needs in order to operate efficiently in vigorous programs of action. No attempt will be made here to elaborate on these skills. Such aspects of the group process, however, as the role of the chairman and recorder, the role of the participant, the procedural steps to be used in working toward the solution of problems, the mechanics necessary, and the maintenance of good human relationships should be understood.

As a first step each group will need to clarify its function and purpose. Is its function to explore, to investigate, to initiate, to suggest, to recommend, or to carry into action certain specific undertakings?

What is the relationship of the small group to the total faculty group? Where there are a number of work groups, activities need to be coordinated. Shall this be done by the principal?

Who Coordinates?

To have the principal solely responsible for the coordinating function will defeat one of the objectives of the process; namely, that all people need to see the over-all program and be involved in it—in its planning, its execution, and its evaluation. It may be wiser to have the entire faculty set up some form of an over-all planning committee with the principal as a member. This group might include the chairmen and recorders of the small groups or other members from each of these groups.

The over-all planning group, likewise, should have its own elected chairman and recorder. Its function might be to facilitate communication between groups, to help unify the over-all activities, to plan general faculty meetings, to eliminate duplication of activities, to budget time and money, to facilitate the carrying out of decisions, to arrange for periodic reporting and evaluation of on-going activities, and to help identify the problems which must be referred to the whole faculty.

Where and how may suggestions, ideas, and projects be initiated?

Strange as it may seem, this question

causes some difficulties upon occasion. If a school traditionally expects suggestions regarding the total school to come from the larger school administration or the local administrator, teachers understand the formal chain of command and the conventional lines of communication.

If the administration proposes to solicit suggestions from all sources, it is possible that ideas may be initiated by a teacher, administrators, small work groups, the total faculty, the steering committee, pupils, parents, or by non-teaching personnel. While this has advantages in that it releases the creative thinking of many, there may be some confusion as to the flow of ideas. Once initiated, what happens to the suggestions? This raises a question regarding procedures to be used in securing effective communication.

How can effective communication be facilitated?

When a faculty attempts to solicit ideas from individual teachers, administrators, small groups, the central coordinating committee, pupils, parents, and non-teaching school personnel, the problem of communicating these ideas is difficult and complex. For purposes of illustration it will be helpful to distinguish roughly two kinds of communication: spreading the facts when "everybody wants to know what's happening"; and conveying assumptions, values, and philosophy which provide the basis for new insights and new procedures.

Who, What, and Where Sharing

The first type of communication deals with information for which there

is ready acceptance. In fact, there is likely to be criticism if this kind of communication is not maintained. People feel "left out" when they do not share in it. It is not too difficult to provide information about such things as time and places of meetings, who went where and why, procedures for health inspections, and the like.

The informal communication systems in which A meets B in the hall and says, "Have you heard that . . ." or B has lunch with C and repeats the information with or without embellishment, can be relied upon to carry a heavy load of those details which it is inadvisable to print or report formally. Notices on the bulletin board, regular weekly notes, copies of minutes, and oral summaries in meetings facilitate the communication of factual information. If there is not sufficient interest in events to guarantee the reading of notices or bulletins, it may be advisable to supplement them with *brief* oral summaries in meetings. The assumption that the mere issuance of a bulletin or report is communication is not tenable. Communication does not exist until the facts or ideas reach the *consciousness*, not just the *hands* of the proposed recipient. No system is effective or efficient which does not achieve this objective.

Communication to Effect Change

The second type of communication involves ideas, values, beliefs, and proposed long-term action. It attempts to do several things at once. It seeks to produce readiness for, interest in, and commitment to new ideas. It implies action and change in behavior. To be really effective this communication

must carry some authoritativeness for the individual. It has this authoritativeness only when the individual is ready to act on the ideas.

For certain individuals and for certain situations it may be sufficient to communicate new ideas by a letter, a bulletin, a book, or a speaker. Films are also used on the assumption that the film carries a heavier emotional charge than the plain spoken or written word. Films are effective, but there are few people who would agree that the film is enough. In all too many cases the effectiveness of such communication is in doubt. Books have been written, speeches have been made, films have been shown, educational periodicals have multiplied. Yet the majority of schools have not been materially changed.

People do not change their values or beliefs by being told that they should. The analysis of the time required for complete understanding is not accurately judged. The full implications of vague proposals do not enter the perception of people until they are identified in specific situations.

When extended time is needed for planning and for setting up programs of action, one- or two-day workshop sessions, the weekend workshop, or after-school dinner meetings are effective procedures for communicating ideas, values, and plans for the small group. Occasionally field workshops may be used in which the small group, after visiting a school, makes use of on-the-spot resource people to interpret observed practices and to assist the group in clarifying their own beliefs and values. These procedures have been valuable in communicating and clarifying

ideas for members of a small group.

Some New Techniques

The problem which remains, however, is the communication of the suggestions, ideas, and plans formulated by this group to the larger faculty group. The traditional faculty meeting which relies upon announcements and reports does not effectively serve this purpose. Such techniques as the sociodrama, the use of role playing, panel discussions, demonstrations, and group reporting help to secure effective communication and to promote acceptance of school policies and programs of action. The final decisions which crystallize this acceptance should be clear cut.

Who participates in the making of decisions?

Some schools have answered this question by stating the general principle that those who are directly affected by a decision need to share in the making of it. If a proposed plan of action concerns only one teacher, she, in cooperation with the administration, may make the decision. If the decision concerns a small group of teachers, this group, in cooperation with the administration, may make a final decision. If the decision concerns the total faculty, the decision making, in general, should involve the entire faculty group or at least the coordinating committee representing the total faculty.

In schools where there is lack of understanding regarding decision making, frustration will result. As one older man who had worked for years in the inner circle of an educational organization expressed it, "Just once before I die I'd like to know *who* makes

decisions around here and *how* they are made."

What is the role of the principal in this process of democratic administration?

Some school administrators project dire consequences as a result of any attempt to encourage shared planning, executing, and evaluating. They assume that if they relinquish any of their authority it is equivalent to inviting the faculty and students "to take over."

A faculty of mature people is not likely to feel that a principal who is delegated certain authority from the elected board of education through the superintendent can be divested of that responsibility. The principal cannot abdicate. It is helpful if everyone understands that the principal has responsibilities and that if in discharging these he differs with the majority opinion of the group, he will openly explain the reason for his decision.

The Principal Withdraws

If the faculty members are to be expected to recognize their responsibility in group action, the principal may be in a dilemma as to how forceful his leadership should be. In some situations principals, in their eagerness to encourage faculty participation, have almost completely withdrawn from positions of leadership. They have delegated authority to individuals, to small work groups, or to the total faculty.

On the surface this appears to have merit. Teachers may more fully realize that the administrator is truly sincere in his desire to share responsibilities for planning and decision making with his faculty. On the other hand, this prac-

tice may be resented by certain individuals and groups holding quite different values and beliefs. One teacher aptly stated such resentment when he said that the principal was paid to direct, that he was selected because of his ability to do so, and that he was, therefore, neglecting his duty when he turned over his responsibilities to others.

The Principal Takes Over

In other situations principals have assumed rather direct, forceful roles of leadership. This, too, has advantages in that teachers, if accustomed to this pattern, feel more secure. It has some disadvantages in that teachers may feel that while the principal has encouraged them to participate in planning, he really retains and uses his right to veto decisions and, as a result, the process becomes a meaningless form without reality. As one group of teachers expressed it, "We don't care to waste time in discussion and exploration unless we can also recommend and move toward action." They wanted to see more clearly the purposes of small work groups or committees and the subsequent follow-up in terms of an action program.

The Principal Is a Group Member

Perhaps the most satisfactory role for the principal is to recognize his peculiar responsibilities of leadership and to be willing to share these responsibilities without abdicating his position as a leader. One administrator with over fifteen years' experience in democratic school administration discusses his role: "I have a vote and an important one, but only one. I suggest. I recommend. I try to persuade. I vigorously defend.

But if my faculty doesn't understand, doesn't believe in, doesn't agree with my ideas, regardless of merit, my ideas haven't much chance of really being carried out effectively—and so I wait. I continue to work vigorously for those things which I believe—those things which seem to me to be best for the young people with whom I work.”

* * * * *

Without elaboration several other questions about time, complexity, conflicts, and skills might be listed: How does a school faculty find time to work on problems? How are new teachers inducted into a process which has been underway for some time? How are parents involved in or at least informed regarding the school's purposes and plans while these are in the process of change? How are conflicts in value and differences of opinion resolved if

action is demanded? How does a faculty summarize, report, and evaluate its efforts? What kinds of group skills are desirable or necessary so that the process is effective and efficient?

The need for effective skills in the group process increases as schools travel farther along the path previously indicated. The skill patterns seem complex, but so are the behavior patterns of a football team as it tries to reach the opponent's goal. If the school faculty would spend the same amount of time analyzing and practicing individual and group skills in making school changes as the football coach and the team do in preparing for the season's schedule, much would be gained. Goals would be clarified, difficulties would be anticipated, morale would be considered, skills would be practiced, cooperative effort would be rewarded, and discouragement would be reduced.

Stereotypes and the Growth of Groups

HERBERT THELEN and WATSON DICKERMAN

Individuals concerned with productive group discussion and action have been interested in the activities of the First and Second National Training Laboratories in Group Development, held during the summers of 1947 and 1948. Those concerned with research in this vital area of group processes will be interested in this article growing out of the Second Laboratory and its implications for leadership. The authors are Herbert Thelen, associate professor of educational psychology, University of Chicago, and Watson Dickerman, assistant professor of education, University of California, Berkeley. Both were Laboratory staff members in 1948.

VARIED SOCIAL MECHANISMS differ in the explicitness of their policies of operation. In an association which operates according to a constitution,

by-laws, and parliamentary procedure, policies of operation are comparatively explicit. In an informal group, such as a club or discussion group, policies of

Copyright © 1949 by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. All rights reserved.