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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Society is in a period of crisis. No one has stated the dimensions of that crisis more aptly than Northrop:

Ours is a paradoxical world. The achievements which are its glory threaten to destroy it. The nations with the highest standard of living, the greatest capacity to take care of their people economically, the broadest education, and the most enlightened morality and religion exhibit the least capacity to avoid mutual destruction in war. It would seem that the more civilized we become the more incapable of maintaining civilization we are.¹

The primary institutions of our advanced civilization, our cities, our homes, our schools are being severely tested. In the schools, the crisis relates to the purposes and objectives as well as to the principles and techniques utilized in the operations.

Roush, in discussing the content of traditional humanities courses, notes:

The problem is that the typical curriculum in the humanities, no matter what its official rationale may be, has as its organizing objective the presentation of objects with which 'any educated man should be familiar.'²

---


² Jon Roush, "What Will Become of the Past?" *Daedalus* (Summer, 1969), 642.
The fallacy in this basic premise of a traditional curriculum, Roush argues, resides in the three assumptions: "The assumption of identifiable and permanent standards and values, the assumption that those values reside in or are exemplified by specific objects, and the assumption of a continuous, sacrosanct past." While these assumptions have always been debatable, today they are being challenged with special force, the author notes.

McDermott challenges the excessive devotion to technological advancement in the traditional goals of our society and of our schools, and the observation by Emerson concurs:

If religion was formerly the opiate of the masses, then surely technology is the opiate of the educated public today. . . No other single subject is so universally invested with high hopes for the improvement of mankind generally and of Americans in particular.

Things are in the saddle, and ride mankind.

While Newmann and Oliver agree with the need for new dimensions in the objectives of educational institutions, they also focus on the obsolescence of the organizational structure and call for reform.

---

1 Ibid., 643.


They relate five rampant concepts: (1) education is formal schooling, (2) education is preparation for later life (not life in the present), (3) only professional teachers can teach, (4) only the public organization should educate, ethnic cults should not, and (5) education should be organized after corporate bureaucracy.

The critics of the educational institution are not limited to an intellectual elite. The advent of student unrest in our secondary schools, colleges, and universities provides ample evidence that these institutions are not performing to expectations. Moreover, demands imposed by students, teachers and community groups at all levels of our schools present situations with which our institutions are incapable of coping and call for changes, some of which are radical.

While changes to date are not for the most part as radical as those beckoned by Neumann and Oliver, significant changes with regard to both the goals and objectives of the schools and the means for realizing those objectives are in progress. Sand,¹ in discussing the question of what to teach, notes and supports an emerging trend for the 1970's in which the total curriculum for all youth will be the main concern. The trend represents a synthesis of previous emphases on the child, the society, and

¹Ole Sand, "Schools for the 70's," The National Elementary Principal, XLVI (September, 1967), 25.
the disciplines. Frazier\textsuperscript{1} develops the concept of the "lesser learnings" and the "larger learnings" as a means of classifying the objectives of an educational program. The ungraded curriculum which emphasizes continuous progress and individualization is gaining prominence. These are representative of current efforts in the development of new understandings in curriculum.

Alternative plans for organizing the instructional environment to facilitate the realization of these emerging dimensions in curriculum are being developed. Team teaching is one such plan. It focuses on combining the expertise of several teachers in facilitating the learning environment for a larger number of students. Another plan which is increasing in prominence in conjunction with team teaching is AIR (action learning, interaction learning, and reaction learning). The focus of this concept is on organizing the instruction-learning environment on the basis of varying modes of learning. Action learning is characterized by the learner learning by doing. Activities are mostly individualized or in small groups and the teacher serves as an environmental engineer or consultant. Interaction learning is characterized by both learner and instructor being active participants as both listeners and speakers. Reaction

\textsuperscript{1}Alexander Frazier, "Individualized Instruction," \textit{Educational Leadership}, XXV (April, 1968), 616-624.
learning is characterized by activities that are largely teacher centered and learners are primarily listeners or observers.¹

While a number of alternatives to traditional organization exist, they are not being adopted on a broad base. In reporting on the studies of Mort and Cornell, McClelland² notes it took about 50 years for significant adoption of such practical innovations as kindergarten. Moreover, more than 15 years elapsed before as many as three per cent of the nation’s schools adopted the innovation. In a study of a number of schools which supposedly have adopted innovative programs, Goodlad³ discovered that while these schools have made attempts to adopt innovative concepts, they have been unable to make significant changes from traditional programs.

Additional examples of unsuccessful or aborted attempts by individual schools to adopt innovations are numerous. Clearly, educators need more expertise in effecting educational change if they are to meet the challenges facing schools. One aspect of the solution to this problem resides in a more complete understanding of the process of educational change at the individual school level of organization.


Background of the Problem

Writings in sociology and anthropology provide some helpful notions in defining educational change. Gallaher\(^1\) notes the anthropological nature of planned change in education. His ideas are summarized as follows. Every social system, whether large or small, has a developed culture which provides selective guidelines for conducting its affairs. Culture is not static; changes occur from sources internal to the system and from contact with other systems. Changes resulting from contact with other systems occur either by diffusion or by acculturation. The acculturation process is sometimes directed by a structured situation in which an advocate interferes actively and purposefully with a culture of a potential acceptor called a target system. Educational change is directed cultural change within the educational institution.

A number of writers describe the process of educational change. All note several facets of the process but they differ somewhat in terminology and content of the facets. Nevertheless, the basic descriptions are similar. The Guba-Clark model\(^2\) identifies four facets of the process: research, development, diffusion, diffusion, diffusion,


and adoption. These facets do not necessarily occur in the order presented, nor do all four occur in every change situation.

**Variables Affecting Change**

Several studies focused on variables relative to the persons involved in change settings. From his studies, Rogers concluded that the first members of a social system to adopt new ideas are generally young, have relatively high social status with respect to their peers, are above average in education and income, are interested in gathering information from a broad base, and associate both formally and informally with other individuals of their kind. Carlson found that "career-bound superintendents" are more innovative than "place-bound superintendents." Separate studies by Pafford and Stanley led to conclusions contrary to the findings of Rogers and Carlson. Pafford found no significant difference between the tenure of the superintendent's term of office and the number of innovations per pupil in selected school districts in

---


2. Richard O. Carlson, Executive Succession and Organizational Change (Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1962), pp. 41-58.

Kentucky. Stanley\(^1\) found no positive correlation between the relative length of formal education and teaching experience of teachers and the measured change in their attitude toward change as the result of an in-service education program.

Two studies focused primarily on variables relative to teachers in specific institutions. Evans\(^2\) investigated faculty resistance to instructional television (ITV) on several university campuses. He identified prototypes of professors who were both pro-ITV and anti-ITV. Among other things, he found that pro-ITV professors had basically differing patterns of behavior on several counts from anti-ITV professors. Lin and others\(^3\) investigated variables pertaining to teachers in a change situation involving the diffusion of modular scheduling in three high schools. Among the major findings were (1) teachers tended to learn about the innovation from personal sources rather than from printed sources, and (2) the educational and salary levels of teachers were positively correlated with early awareness of the innovation while the age of teachers was negatively correlated with the same.


Focusing on a somewhat different set of variables, the studies of Mort\(^1\) found (1) communities which were slow to adopt one innovation tended to be slow to adopt others as well and (2) the increase in cost of an innovation placed an inhibition on the rate of adoption. Pafford\(^2\) also found a significant positive correlation between local school district expenditures and their degree of innovativeness.

With regard to the organizational climate of an institution as a factor in affecting educational change, Bennis and Miles\(^3\) develop the notion of organizational health. Basically this notion contends that any planned change effort is keenly conditioned by the state of the system in which the change occurs. Successful efforts at planned change must first of all focus on improving the organizational health of the institution, i.e., the ability of a school system to develop into a more fully-functioning system.

---


\(^3\)Warren G. Bennis, Changing Organizations (McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966); and Matthew B. Miles, "Planned Change and Organizational Health: Figure and Ground," in Change Processes in the Public Schools, pp. 11-34.
Wayland\(^1\) cites the structural feature of American education as a basic factor in controlling the process of educational change. He argues that innovation involves changes in the organization of a system. He hypothesizes that innovations which are difficult to institutionalize are likely to encounter greater resistance and shorter life than those which are easy to institutionalize.

Finally, studies of specific procedures which are believed to have an effect on the success of educational innovations led to the following conclusions:

1. Administrators must be convinced of the value of educational innovations if there is to be any hope for success.\(^2\)

2. Staff involvement in the process of planning for the adoption of an innovation in their school system contributes significantly to the success of the adoption.\(^3\)

3. The most persuasive experience in eradicating professional suspicion about the value of innovations in other school

---


systems and about the sincerity of the innovators involved is to have staff members visit a successful innovative program in action.¹

4. The establishment of a bona fide change agent within the organization to the extent that he is able to develop positive formal and informal relationships is a major factor in determining the success of innovations.²

Strategies and Techniques for Effecting Educational Change

The study of educational change situations from the perspective of the strategies and procedures utilized appeals to some writers. Chin³ notes that in the social sciences, the concept of strategy is found in the discussions of inter-relationships between parties. In situations involving a conflict of interest between parties, one party uses a strategy to gain a desired outcome when they know the behavior of an opponent. In this use of the term, a strategy provides the framework for decision-making with regard to each situation that may arise. In speaking to the problem of diffusing


educational innovations, Guba\textsuperscript{1} develops the notion of strategies for educational change in a similar fashion. Both develop classifications of strategies which are somewhat similar. Walton\textsuperscript{2} discusses the dilemmas practitioners face in attempting to utilize two strategies of social change concurrently.

Guba\textsuperscript{3} is among the few writers who thoroughly develops the notion of techniques. He defines a technique as the fundamental means utilized to cause a receiver to adopt an innovation. He identifies six basic diffusion techniques and hypothesizes that given diffusion techniques have a natural affinity for particular strategies, but he does not substantiate this hypothesis. He argues for the necessity of differentiating between strategies and techniques in educational change situations in order to effectively diffuse innovations.

Several characteristics predominate in the sources focusing on strategies and techniques. Almost without exception the


discussion of strategies focuses on the concept at the broad institutional level with little focus on the unit level of school organization. Moreover, there is almost no emphasis on identifying and analyzing the fundamental means (techniques) occurring within the organizational activities, procedures and events utilized in deploying various strategies. Cuba's discussion of techniques provides a basis for study in this regard.

**Educational Change Models**

A subsequent development of the specific aspects of strategies are the efforts pertaining to educational change models. Change models have several foci. One focus relates to identifying the various facets of the educational change process. Some models in this focus deal with the process in a broad sense, others relate more specifically to a given facet of the process, and still others to a more limited institutional sphere. A second focus relates to the development of specific schemata for effecting educational change.

Havelock provides a helpful synthesis of change models. While he focuses primarily on dissemination and utilization, many of the models he reviews are general in nature. The first categorization of models he identifies as the research, development and dissemination perspective. Models in this perspective are

---

1. Ibid.

particularly helpful in approaching the process on a broad base. They emphasize planning as a point of departure. The main spokesmen are Henry M. Brickell, David Clark, and Egon Guba.

The second categorization of change models is the social interaction perspective. The major focuses of models in this perspective are (1) the personal relationships of individuals involved in the change process, (2) the relative position of individuals adopting an innovation with respect to their peers within the institution, (3) the importance of informal relationships, and (4) the personality characteristics and leadership styles of individuals within the organization. The major developers of models in this perspective are Everett Rogers, James Coleman, Richard Carlson, and Paul Mort.

The third categorization of change models is the problem-solver perspective. Models in this category are based on the assumption that innovation utilization is primarily a part of a problem-solving process originating with the user of an innovation. The process begins with the identification of a need, and ends with the satisfaction of that need. It emphasizes self-initiated change as having the most firm motivational basis and the best possibility for long-term maintenance. The major developers of models from this perspective are Goodwin Watson, Ronald Lippitt, Herbert Thelen, Matthew Miles and Charles Jung.
Finally, Havelock concludes that viewed as a whole, the change models identified by these three perspectives provide valuable insights for developing a comprehensive view of the change process, but each leaves much to be desired when viewed separately. He develops a linkage model as a means for bringing the best of these three viewpoints together. The concept of a linkage model begins with the focus on the user as a problem-solver within a system. It stresses the need for the user system to be meaningfully related to the resource system. In order for this to occur something must be happening within the resource system to correspond to the needs in the user system.

The above overview of study and research in educational change indicates that efforts have focused on several aspects of the educational change process. One aspect relates to defining educational change and to identifying the various facets in the process. A second aspect, which includes by far the greatest volume of research, pertains to identifying variables affecting educational change. The search for dependent variables has tended to focus on a rather broad perspective, although some studies have focused on specific innovations and on school district and school building levels of organization. A third aspect relates to strategies and procedures for effecting educational change. Studies in this category focus almost entirely on a broad perspective. Within this aspect is the focus on educational change models.
Needs for Further Research

While it is true that the field of educational change must continue to develop on a broad base, the above overview of literature highlights certain areas which have received insufficient attention. Studies of specific innovations constitute one of these areas. A second area is the inadequate amount of attention given to the application of the general notions of strategies and techniques to the school building level of organization. In the latter regard practitioners have been given little assistance in developing strategies and techniques for effecting educational change at the school building level. Research has done well in identifying the variables that affect educational change but there is also a need for emphasis on developing programs for effecting change from a strategic standpoint.

The Problem

The problem of this dissertation pertains to the strategies and techniques utilized in the early stages of the adoption of team teaching at the individual school level of organization. The specific questions considered are as follows:

(1) What strategies and techniques have been utilized in the adoption of team teaching in individual schools?

(2) Have certain strategies and techniques been utilized more frequently than others?
(3) Has there been a tendency for particular strategies and techniques to be utilized together?

(4) What considerations determine which strategies and techniques have been utilized?

Two purposes are pursued jointly in relation to the problem.
The one is to develop a framework for approaching the problem to serve as a guideline for further research. The other is to apply the framework in a preliminary analysis of selected cases in terms of the questions outlined above.

Rationale

The crux of the issue in effecting educational change is the ability to develop programs to cause change to occur at the unit level of school organization. In order to effect change, procedures need to be developed to apply the knowledge generated on a broader base to specific school situations. Included is the need to develop programs for effecting change at the building level which incorporate the aspect of design.

The above overview of background literature calls attention to the need for additional study of particular innovations in multiple adoption situations. The rationale for selecting team teaching as the innovation to be investigated is that it is developed sufficiently to permit one to locate appropriate cases to study.
Definition of Terms

Terms appearing frequently in this dissertation are defined below. Several of these terms are defined more specifically in later discussions. Additional terms are defined throughout the work in connection with the problems to which they relate.

Team Teaching. Team teaching is an organizational arrangement in which two or more teachers plan together in a significant way, actually teach alongside each other at times, evaluate together regularly and intensely, and discuss all of the children within the team on some regularly scheduled basis.¹

Strategies. A strategy in its original military sense referred to a very broad-gaged plan that depended upon an assessment of one's own and his enemies' intentions, strengths, and deployment. Similarly, for purposes of this investigation, strategies are the general designs utilized in the adoption of team teaching in individual schools.

Techniques. While strategies refer to the general designs of a change situation, techniques are the fundamental means occurring within the organizational activities, procedures, and events utilized for the purpose of causing the adoption of team teaching to occur.

Educational Change. As the term is used in this investigation, educational change refers to those developments in educational

organizations which educators consciously attempt to manipulate. Excluded from the definition are the developments which occur in the educational institution which are not the consequence of direct planned intervention.

The Adoption of Team Teaching. The adoption of team teaching in individual schools refers to situations in which team teaching is a significant mode for organizing teachers. It is a process on a continuum, beginning with the decision to have team teaching, continuing through the processes of preparing for and initially using team teaching, and ending with the institutionalization of the innovation.

Overview of Research Design

The design of this research is an investigation. An investigation is a research design which has neither internal nor external validity, i.e., the results are not so adequately controlled that if one were to repeat the investigation in a different setting, he could expect to replicate them exactly, and one cannot be sure that the results can be generalized. An investigation, however, is a functional form of research if one recognizes it as a pilot study which yields some insights into the kinds of problems that might be encountered, and if he treats the data as heuristic, i.e., furnishing a convenient jumping-off place for more detailed and rigorous research designs.¹

The investigative design is particularly apropos for the problem under consideration because of the limited attention given to the problem up to this point. The researcher recognizes that the strategies and techniques utilized in the adoption of team teaching may differ from those of other innovations of similar types.

**Significance of the Problem**

The problem of this investigation is significant in several regards. First, it deals with a relevant concern in educational change research. That concern is to assist practitioners in developing programs for effecting the changes they desire. Second, it deals with the theoretical aspects of design for adoption situations. The specific theoretical significance is in (a) the development of a framework with which to analyze the strategies and techniques utilized in the adoption of team teaching in individual schools, and (b) the application of the framework to a preliminary analysis of a limited number of cases from which to generate hypotheses for further research. Third, the problem is significant in an ultimate sense. It contributes to some extent to the resolution of the crisis in education in particular and in society as a whole in that the resolution of the crisis demands institutions that are capable of executing planned change.

**Organization of the Report**

In the preceding introduction, the problem of this investigation is delineated and its relationship to the larger
problem of educational change is developed. The purposes of the study are noted and the rationale, significance and limitations are discussed.

Chapter II of this report focuses on a survey of the literature relative to the problem under consideration. In Chapter III, the methodology utilized in the study is detailed. A schema developed for proceeding with the study is presented. In Chapter IV case narratives based on the field investigation are developed. These emphasize the activities, procedures and events utilized in the attempt to cause the adoption of team teaching to occur in the selected cases. In Chapter V a model is developed for analyzing the case narratives in terms of strategies and techniques utilized and is applied to the analysis of the cases. Finally, Chapter VI concludes the report with a summary of the major conclusions and recommendations.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter is devoted to a review of the literature in educational change in terms of three perspectives in order to further develop the setting of the problem under investigation. The first perspective focuses on the parameters and the component facets of the educational change process. The completion of this task is essential to understanding the other perspectives. The second perspective focuses on strategies and techniques in all types of educational change situations. The purpose of this perspective is to further explore the essence of these concepts and to trace their application to both general and specific change situations. The third perspective focuses on specific innovations at the building level of school organization. The purpose of this perspective is to analyze these studies in terms of their relationship to the problem under investigation.

The Educational Change Process

A number of authors have discussed the component facets of the process of educational change. Figure 1 depicts the major facets in the process identified by several of the more prevalent schemata found in the literature. For the most part, the schemata
Figure 1--The component facets of the educational change process
place the change process on a continuum. While in the composite
analysis, movement on the continuum occurs from left to right,
there are many exceptions to this pattern. The general consensus
is that change is the product of the identification, preparation,
delivery, and application of innovations. In part the differences
in the major facets noted by the schemata are the result of
emphasis on different segments of the continuum. Moreover, the
several schemata identify differing sub-facets within each facet.
The concepts appearing as major facets in one schema may appear as
sub-facets in another.

Blanke's schema is particularly helpful in depicting the
origin and flow of planned change from a problem-solving perspective.
Bhola and Williams highlight the facets on the left domains of the
continuum represented by the group as a whole. Gallaher, Hobbs,
Kahn, and Rogers represent the composite continuum quite well
although they differ somewhat in the breakdown of the facets.

1 Virgil E. Blanke, "Planned Change, Public Education, and
the State," in Planning and Effecting Needed Changes in Education,
pp. 291-309.

2 Harbans Singh Bhola, "Categories of Social Change," SEC
Newsletter, I (January, 1966), 1-3; and Thomas Rhys Williams, "The
Study of Change as a Concept in Cultural Anthropology," Theory Into

3 Gallaher, "Directed Change in Formal Organization: The School
System," p. 4; Daryl J. Hobbs, "The Study of Change as a Concept in
Rural Sociology," Theory Into Practice, V (February, 1966), 21; John W.
Education, XLIII (November, 1968), 324-325; and Everett M. Rogers,
Cuba and Clark\(^1\) also reflect the composite continuum and delineate the sub-facets in adoption to a considerable extent.

These schemata of the educational change process indicate the general relationship of the adoption facet to the process as a whole. An understanding of this relationship is important in the further development of the investigation under consideration.

**Strategies and Techniques**

The literature reviewed relative to the concepts of strategies and techniques regarding educational change situations falls in two general categories. The first category pertains to classifications of strategies and techniques. The second category pertains to applications of given strategies and techniques in educational change situations. Some of the more pertinent change models noted in Chapter I relate to the second category.

**Classifications of Strategies**

Miles\(^2\) presents a classification of strategies for educational change on a two-dimensional base, including the point of initiation as one axis and the facets of the change process leading up to adoption as the other. Strategies can be initiated either from inside the system in which the innovation is to become a part (the target system) or from outside, and may utilize either existing

---

\(^1\)Guba, "Methodological Strategies for Educational Change," pp. 9-12.

structures or create new ones. These four categories relative to the point of initiation of a change effort occupy the side slots of a grid. The four facets of the change process leading up to adoption are design, awareness-interest, evaluation, and trial. These occupy the top four slots of the grid. The four-by-four grid has a total of 16 component cells. The author defines "comprehensive strategies" as those focusing on all four stages in the change process leading up to adoption for any one of the four types of initiation. "Partial strategies" are those which focus on less than four cells of the matrix.

In a given change situation, the author argues, there is no reason why all of the facets included in a comprehensive change strategy need to be accomplished by a common system, group, or person. The important thing is that all strategies utilized are comprehensive rather than partial. Partial strategies frequently lead to no change at all. The author cites copying as an excellent example of a partial strategy which frequently ends up in abandonment.

This classification of strategies is helpful but it has one major inadequacy; it focuses on all the facets leading up to adoption but excludes the adoption facet stating: "This is a study of strategy, which presumably concludes at the point when adoption occurs."¹ The frequency of failures of innovations during the adoption facet simply does not permit one to end at

¹Ibid.
the point of initial adoption of innovations in discussing strategies for educational change. Adoption is a much more dynamic facet than Miles recognizes in this discussion.

Chin categorizes current educational change strategies into three groups: empirical-rational, normative-re-educative, and power. In the classification, strategies are neither differentiated according to the size of the target groups of the change effort nor by specific innovations. This is not to deny, he argues, that there may be variables affecting change relative to the target groups (He notes size may very well be one of these.) or to specific innovations. The empirical-rational group includes a number of strategies currently advocated. The fundamental premise of these strategies is the assumption that man is reasonable and acts in a rational manner in changing his mode of behavior. This assumption leads to the development of strategies which utilize the best known methods to communicate to adoption units the benefits of innovations developed by basic research. Some specific strategies in the empirical-rational group which Chin notes are those which emphasize (1) basic research and development, (2) applied research, (3) linking research and development with innovation and diffusion, (4) using expert consultants, and (5) developing prophecies and utopias.

The normative-re-educative group of strategies is based on the premise that change in institutions is primarily the result of change in individuals. The historical roots of the strategies in this group reside in Freud, Dewey, and Lewin. Some common tenets of these strategies are:

1. An emphasis on the client system, the way he sees himself is most important.

2. Change results not from the technological information of members of a group but from their attitudes, values, and inter-personal relationships.

3. Focus on the current situation provides the best impetus for learning (hence change) to occur.

4. Motivation, morale, and productivity, if examined closely, will provide helpful clues for inducing change.

Chin contends that the group of strategies which he designates as power-oriented are probably utilized in effecting change more frequently than acknowledged. These strategies are based on the reality of power allocation in organizations and are categorized into four types: situational alterations, command-structure operations, power redistribution, and conflicts over the allocation of resources.

Guba's categorization of diffusion strategies differs somewhat from Chin's categorization of general change strategies.

---

but the two classifications include many common notions. Cuba's classification includes seven diffusion strategies in current use. The strategies and their perspectives are as follows:

1. **Value strategy**--the adopter is viewed as a professionally oriented entity who can be obligated to adopt an innovation through an appeal to his values.

2. **Rational strategy**--the adopter is viewed as a rational entity who can be convinced of the feasibility, effectiveness, or efficiency of an innovation on the basis of scientific evidence.

3. **Didactic strategy**--the adopter is viewed as an entity who has the appropriate values, motivations, and resources to adopt an innovation but he lacks the knowledge and skill to use the innovation.

4. **Psychological strategy**--the adopter is viewed as a psychological entity whose needs for acceptance, involvement and inclusion can be employed to persuade him to adopt an innovation; he is caused to look at the problem in his realm of responsibility and is involved in seeking unique and novel solutions to those problems.

5. **Economic strategy**--the adopter is seen as an entity who can be compensated for agreeing to adopt an innovation or deprived for failing to adopt.
6. **Political strategy**—the adopter is viewed as an entity who can be caused to adopt an innovation by some advocate (either internal or external to the adopter's institution) by direct or indirect influence.

7. **Authority strategy**—the adopter is viewed as an entity in a bureaucratic system who can be compelled to adopt an innovation by virtue of his status in an authority hierarchy.

Corwin\(^1\) notes several distinct emphases in the literature on social and organizational change. Each represents a different approach to explaining change and suggests alternative strategies for implementing change. The five major approaches the author outlines are the socialization approach; the diffusion approach; the replacement approach; the structural approach—the characteristics of the organizational structure; and the structural approach—the decision-making process. Corwin's discussion of the five major approaches is summarized in the following paragraphs.

The socialization approach assumes that society is largely a product of a socialization process affecting all of its inhabitants. It assumes that institutions are reflections of the people who operate them and can best be changed by changing the people. The emphasis is on reaching these people as early in the socialization process as possible. Human relations approaches and many current

---

\(^1\)Ronald G. Corwin, "Innovation in the Professions: Toward a Theoretical Framework" (unpublished document, Department of Sociology, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio), pp. 15-24. (Undated, typed copy.)
reform movements are examples of this approach. The former focuses on reducing tension in inter-personal relationships as a means of fostering change in organizations.

The earlier developments of the diffusion approach viewed the process of organizational change as that of passing on pertinent information about innovations to practitioners who were seen as rational decision makers. Little heed was given to the channels through which the information passed. More recently this approach has been expanded to include the personal characteristics of key persons in the change process and their positions within the social networks, particularly in the receiving institutions.

The replacement approach is closely allied with the diffusion approach. Accepting the importance of key individuals in organizational change, the replacement approach advocates replacing the more conservative members of organizations with those who are more receptive to new ideas. The simplest form of this approach contends that organizational change involves little more than the selection of new personnel. The more sophisticated forms of the approach distinguish between the relative position in the organizational hierarchy of individuals who are replaced. They also focus on the distinct sub-culture or power blocks in which the recruited individuals function.

The socialization, diffusion, and replacement approaches do not take into account the many sources of external pressures which stimulate or retard change. They tend to ignore the organizational
context in which socialization occurs, in which information is
diffused, and in which people are relocated.

The two structural approaches note the necessity of changing
the structure of relationships before change can either occur or
persist. Some strategies in this approach are premised in the
notion that less bureaucratic organizations tend to result in
more conflict and uncertain situations, which in turn foster
innovation. The power equalization theory of educational change,
which emphasizes the reduction of status differentials between
members in the hierarchical structure within the organization as
a means of effecting educational change, is another premise of
strategies in the structural approach.

The author concludes that the essential difference in these
five basic approaches is their view of the unit to be changed.
The first three (socialization, diffusion and replacement) identify
persons as the primary unit to be changed, whereas the last two
focus on the organization as the unit to be changed.

Bennis\(^1\) develops a classification of general approaches to
effecting change. All pertain to various styles of power distribution
within an organization. The seven general approaches discussed are
as follows:

1. Indoctrination--goals are set in terms of a unilateral
   power situation.

\(^1\)Bennis, Changing Organizations, pp. 83-84.
2. Coercive—goals are set unilaterally and tactics of force are used to achieve the goals.

3. Technocratic—goals are set unilaterally; individuals fulfilling the goals are on a somewhat equal base, but they are separated by technological specialization.

4. Interactional—goals are not deliberately set but are the product of a shared power situation.

5. Socialization—goals are somewhat generally accepted and passed on to recipients who receive them as a matter of course.

6. Emulative—individuals exist in an organization at different power levels and the lower echelons emulate the goals of the upper echelons.

7. Natural—unintended events such as accidents set goals.

Barnes\(^1\) conceptualizes and describes organizational change in terms of three perspectives: approaches, human relationships, and change processes. The approaches perspective considers such components as the organizational variables and the power distribution among managers, employees, and outsiders. The human relationships perspective classifies individuals in the organization as either advocates of change or resisters to change who tend to act either rationally or subjectively. The change processes perspective devotes

---

attention to the activities of the crucial parties in a change situation.

This particular categorization is helpful because it attempts to "separate what is being changed and how it is being changed from who the crucial parties are in the change process."\(^1\)

Finally, Walton\(^2\) cites three basic strategies for effecting social change. One change strategy relates to building a power base and strategically manipulating that power base to effect change. This strategy is advocated by game theorists, diplomatic strategists, and students of revolution. A second change strategy involves overtures of love, trust and goodwill which are directed at changing the attitudes and the resultant behavior of individuals. This strategy is advocated by social psychologists and persons involved in human relations laboratory training. A third change strategy involves the use of the problem-solving process.

Applications of Strategies

Arguments supporting the utilization of given strategies in effecting change and discussions tracing the problems associated with utilizing specific strategies or sets of strategies are developed in the literature. Some of these are pertinent to the problem of this investigation. Discussions of various change models are particularly relevant in this regard.

---

\(^{1}\)Ibid., p. 107.

Chin offers some propositions regarding the selection of appropriate strategies for educational change situations. First, strategies seem to be geared for specific users, varying with both the organizational level of the user and the facets in the change process to which his interest relates. Second, preferences for a particular strategy or set of strategies seem to lie in the biases of individuals with regard to their view of the process of educational change, i.e., whether they view the educational change process primarily as a people process, as a technical process, or as a technological process. Guba goes one step beyond this point, hypothesizing that diffusion strategies are determined by the implicit and explicit assumptions made about the nature of the adopter who is to be caused to accept the innovation. Third, certain strategies are compatible for use in a given change situation whereas others are incompatible. For example, the re-educative strategy of attitude-changing is incompatible for use along with a strategy focusing on conflict over the use of resources.

Walton develops Chin's third point quite extensively. Clearly the objectives or goals of the change are the prime determination of the strategy to be employed in any social change.

---


situation, he argues. The power strategy is best suited to situations in which one desires to change the state of the allocation of scarce resources between himself and others when the preferences of the two are incompatible. Moreover, the attitude change strategy is best suited for situations in which one desires to develop a more compatible set of attitudes and behaviors on the part of another toward himself. Finally, the problem-solving strategy is best suited to situations in which potential solutions can be found or created in a manner allowing one party to gain without another sacrificing anything of value to them, i.e., where integrated solutions are logically possible.

Discussing the dilemmas involved in using a power strategy and an attitude change strategy jointly, Walton\textsuperscript{1} states that the employment of a power strategy is detrimental to the employment of an attitude change strategy and vice versa in change settings in which:

1. One group desires to change the allocation of limited resources between themselves and another (the resources may be political power, economic advantage, geographic occupancy, etc.) but the desires of the first are incompatible with the desires of the second.

2. The two groups sincerely want to establish a more cooperative attitude between them.

\textsuperscript{1}Ibid.
There is no law or compulsory arbitration mechanism which can settle the conflict of interests.

The incompatibility is summarized as follows. In utilizing a power strategy the first party needs to increase its power base relative to the second in order to establish a basis for negotiations. Research concludes that in order to accomplish this, the first party should select techniques that will increase the second party's dependence on the first or decrease its own dependence on the second. Furthermore, the first party should bias the second's perception of the first's strengths or needs, overstate its case, and set initial demands beyond what it really believes it can hold out for.

On the other hand, in employing the attitude change strategy the first group needs to establish an arena in which the second's level of attraction and trust for the first will increase. Research concludes that in this regard the first should cause the second to minimize the perceived difference between the goals and characteristics of the two, emphasize the degree of mutual dependence between the two groups, eliminate the second's perception of political threats from the first, and develop a degree of empathy in each group for the motives, expectations, and attitudes of the other.

The author suggests several possible means of resolving the obvious tensions between these two strategies. One is to place
In sequence the emphasis on the two strategies although this is difficult. A second is to have different agents implement the strategies. While this may be feasible in a larger societal change situation it is next to impossible in an individual leadership situation. A third is to accept temporarily the disadvantages created by the predominant application of one strategy in favor of the long-range gains which the initial setbacks may provide.

A model developed by Guba and Clark\(^1\) conceptualizes the process of educational change as that of bridging the theory-practice gap. The model includes a classification of functions that must be accomplished to close the theory-practice gap. The functions are depicted on a theoretical continuum of change, moving from research into action, although the functions need not necessarily occur in that order.

The first function included in the schema is research. The primary object of research is to develop new knowledge. Practical application is not the researcher's concern.

The second major function in the schema is development. The task is to develop applications of basic research to problems.

---

at the school level. There are two sub-activities related to development: invention and design. The object of invention is to formulate solutions to problems. The object of design is to develop the solutions into acceptable, adaptable form. Field testing in order to assess the feasibility of the designed invention is one of the important components of design. The innovation must also be packaged in a form that will be marketable for use in the field.

Once the innovation has been developed, the function of diffusion comes into focus. Another specialist called a diffuser is needed. His job has two dimensions: dissemination and demonstration. The task of dissemination is to cause the potential users of a developed innovation to become sufficiently aware of its potential to enable them to make an intelligent decision about its usefulness for their situation. Dissemination is not intended to effect change in schools but to create widespread awareness of the existence of the innovation. The task of demonstration is to provide the opportunity for the target system to examine and assess the operating qualities of the innovation. Interaction between the demonstrators and members of the target system are an important aspect of demonstration.

The final function in the schema relates to adopting the innovation in a target system. This function has three sub-activities: trial, installation and institutionalization. Trial
does not refer to "trial and error," but to a time during which the target system is able to assess the quality or value of the innovation to its particular setting. The target system must be free to investigate (1) the adaptability of the innovation to the characteristics of the local scene, (2) problems related to the innovation identified in earlier field testing, and (3) potential ill effects on the target system that might result from the adoption of the innovation. Installation relates to operationalizing the innovation in the target system. It involves introducing and accommodating the innovation to a substantial degree in individual institutions within the target system. The specific tasks are (1) preparing the staff of these institutions and (2) providing the necessary support for the proper functioning of the innovation. Institutionalization regularizes the innovation within the target system. The crucial question in determining when institutionalization exists is whether the target system values the innovation sufficiently to expend the time and resources necessary to maintain it.

The primary characteristics of this schema are the emphasis on planning and rational decision making. It is the classic in Chin's categorization of rational perspectives.

One of the early models of educational change was developed by Lewin.¹ It involves essentially the process of unfreezing,

---

moving, refreezing. While this model defines the general pattern of change and includes the notion of movement, the sub-processes of change that occur are not delineated.

In later development Lewin and Crabbe\(^1\) identify the sub-processes as primarily relating to re-education, stating that differences in conduct among individuals are acquired. Moreover, their behavior is conditioned by their perceptions about reality. Since groups are constituted by a number of individuals, the norms established by a group are the result of the individuals in inter-relationship. From these precepts, the authors develop some perspectives on the re-education process. One of the strongest forces for effecting change is the development of an "in-group" which exhibits the type of behavior desired. It is the result of belonging to an "in-group" that causes an individual to change, first his perceptions, and then his behavior.

The essence of Lewin's re-education model is that of unfreezing the individual from a primary relationship with one "in-group," moving him into another with the set of values desired by the designers, and establishing him in it. Since behavior follows from perceptions, this will result in a change of behavior. The problem, however, is in developing an "in-group" with the new set of desired perceptions to use as the resetting arena.

\(^1\)Kurt Lewin and Paul Crabbe, "Conduct, Knowledge, and Acceptance of New Values," *Journal of Social Issues*, 1 (August, 1945), 64.
Blanke discusses an educational improvement model which is based on the premise that (1) problems exist in the teaching-learning situation which impede maximum realization of institutional goals, (2) man has the tools for systematic inquiry necessary for solving these problems, and (3) improvement will occur when men believe these tools ought to be applied to the solution of these problems. The model identifies the components of the process which begins with the input of a problem and ends in the output of a solution. The components of the model are (1) general awareness of concerns and aspirations, (2) problem identification, (3) priority analysis, (4) development, (5) dissemination, (6) demonstration, and (7) utilization. The components of the model are summarized in the following paragraphs.

Three components precede development. The old addage "necessity is the mother of invention," the author notes, is apropos. Problems cannot be identified in institutions without basic concerns and aspirations against which to note shortcomings. Once problems have been articulated educators must proceed with some type of priority analysis and reach the related decisions. One criterion to use in the priority analysis is the importance society places on finding a solution to the articulated problem. Another is the extent to which the required resources can be marshalled to solve the problem. A third criterion is the extent

\[1\text{Blanke, "Planned Change, Public Education, and the State," pp. 291-309.}\]
to which developers have the capability of solving the problem. Regardless of the importance of the problem, if it is not likely that a solution can be found, it would be unwise to place the problem on a high priority basis.

Development is the core of the educational improvement model. In this phase solutions to the articulated problems are sought. Research is used in the process to assist in finding solutions. The major problem faced in the development component is the appalling lack of professional competence in development. Neither states nor localities have sufficient manpower trained in this component.

The three components related to the output of the educational improvement model are dissemination, demonstration, and utilization. Dissemination is the component that focuses on getting the developed solutions out to the potential adopters. Demonstration serves as the medium for disseminating the solutions to the problems. It involves setting up a trial situation on a limited basis from which more knowledge can be acquired relative to the final adoption of the solution on a broader base. Utilization, the final component, focuses on finalizing the use of the invented solution on a broad base in the schools.

The genius of the model, the author appropriately notes, resides in its focuses on the school, i.e., problems are identified in the schools and solutions are developed for use in the schools. Moreover, the model utilizes existing institutions in the quest for educational improvement. Included are local school systems,
intermediate school districts, state departments of education, state associations or unions, and state universities. Finally, experience with the model in other fields, including agriculture, the military, and industry appear to validate the utility of the model.

Havelock\(^1\) depicts the educational change process as a relationship between resource and user systems. He argues that in order for the resource system to have meaningful exchange with the user system there must be a reciprocal relationship between the two. The primary inadequacy of many change models, he argues, is their inability to recognize the reciprocal nature of the relationship between the resource and the user systems. Moreover, he notes, the key to the establishment of such a reciprocal relationship is that something must be occurring in the resource system that corresponds to what is happening in the user system. Simulation of the user situation within the resource system is one way to assure such a correspondence.

The messages flowing from the user system to the resource system are primarily problem messages. In return, the messages flowing from the resource system to the user system are primarily solution messages. Within each of the two systems the process of accomplishing the respective tasks is primarily that of problem

solving. The resource system's problem is primarily to receive problem messages from the user system and to generate solutions to return to the user system. The essential focus of the problem-solving cycle within the user system is to identify problems, send the problems identified to the resource system, and utilize the solutions returned from the resource system.

Departing from the Chin classification, but within the structural approach in Corwin's classification, the strategy defended by Miles is based on the work of Bennis. This strategy focuses on the health of organizations in effecting change. It is based on the precept that any planned change effort is keenly conditioned by the state of the system in which it occurs. Nevertheless, Miles argues, most studies focus on individual innovators, their roles and their actions, and on the properties of a particular innovation to the neglect of an equal emphasis on the dynamics of receiving organizations.

Wayland lends support to Miles' thesis in his discussion of the structural features of American education as a basic factor in controlling the process of educational change. The former argues that the adoption of educational innovations generally has implications for the structural features of the institution. Included

1 Miles, "Planned Change and Organizational Health: Figure and Ground," pp. 11-34.
2 Bennis, Changing Organizations.
in the structural features are both formal organization and informal organization within a system.

Finally, a model developed to study diffusion and dissemination processes in specific institutions is discussed by Lin. The model identifies four basic foci of study. The first is the source of the diffusion and dissemination processes. Attention is centered on those who make the decision to diffuse an innovation in the school.

The second focus of study is the dissemination or diffusion process in the institution. Included are the sequence of offices through which information flows, the behavior of the role incumbents in relation to the flow of information, and the inter-relationships among the role incumbents.

The third focus of study is the receivers of the dissemination and diffusion efforts. The receivers are the members of the institution whose roles are directly affected by the innovation. The three important elements of this focus are how and when the receivers become aware of the innovation, how and when they adopt the innovation, and their attitudinal stance relative to the innovation.

The fourth focus of study is the effect of the dissemination and diffusion process on the school. What are the consequences

of the adoption on the members of the institution, on the products, and on the surrounding society?

To these four basic foci of study of the diffusion model (source, process, receiver, and effect) the model adds a fifth dimension—a control system. The major elements of the control system are a feedback sub-system, a memory (storage) sub-system, and a reinforcement sub-system.

The model is well developed. It is unique among the models reviewed in that it focuses specifically on disseminating a given innovation rather than innovations in general and on disseminating the specific innovation at the building level of school organization rather than on a broader base. The model is pertinent to the problem under investigation because the first and second foci of the model (source and process) are affiliated with the domains of the problem. However, its usefulness is limited since the thrust of the model is on the last two foci (receiver and effect) and the contents of the first two foci are related to the specific questions raised in Chapter 1 in only a very general way.

Classifications of Techniques

While a number of comprehensive classifications of strategies exist in the literature, the same is not true regarding techniques. However, one author does develop a classification of diffusion techniques and several others develop partial classifications.
In discussing the diffusion of innovations, Guba states that the basic variety of diffusion techniques is sharply limited. From the point of the diffuser, every action possible to him in attempting to cause an entity to adopt an innovation falls under one of the following categories: telling, showing, helping, involving, training, intervening. Telling frequently occurs in the use of newsletters, papers, lectures, and individual or small-group conversations. Showing occurs in the form of having the adopter casually observe the phenomenon related to the desired innovation, providing a simulated experience for him, or displaying pictures, slides, films and filmstrips for him to utilize. Helping is the direct involvement of the diffuser with the adopter "on the adopter's terms" and involves such activities as consulting, servicing, and trouble-shooting. Involving takes the form of activities in which the adopter plays an active role in the adoption situation. It includes such activities as being involved in identifying problems needing innovative solutions, assisting with the development of the innovation, or serving as an agent for assisting other adopters. Training includes activities intended to familiarize the adopter with features of the proposed innovation, to increase his skills and competencies, or to alter his attitudes about the innovation. Intervening consists of the direct involvement

---

of the diffuser on his own terms. He may mandate specific actions and utilize means intended to coerce the adopter to cooperate or to replace him.

One set of techniques in the general category of bargaining includes such specific techniques as deception, bluffs, commitment, promises, threats, and threat fulfillment. Another set of techniques generally associated with power strategies consists of boycotts, lie-ins, sit-ins, physical force, and non-violent coercion.¹

Applications of Techniques

Since the notion of techniques as defined for purposes of the investigation under consideration is not well defined in the literature, references to research and authoritative opinion validating the value of specific techniques in effecting change are limited. However, one does find some reference to given procedures. These are reviewed in the following discussion since they embody basic techniques, although a given procedure may consist of several techniques.

Utilizing select personnel as a procedure for effecting educational change is frequently referenced in the literature. One author states that in the development of educational

facilities for innovative programs, it is important to select teachers who can function in these conditions.  

Another contends that innovations are more likely to succeed when administrators initiate them because administrators are in a better position to handle the system problems inevitably associated with innovation in an on-going system and because of the power of their office. The results of a study of educational change in New York state conclude that disseminating new types of instructional programs requires convincing administrators of the value of these programs. Finally, Payne contends that teachers are willing to change when they are given the proper leadership and support by administrators. These arguments support the notion that the use of select personnel is an effective procedure to use in effecting change.

The use of group interaction as a procedure in effecting change is supported by some authors. Research indicates that teachers who share ideas about professional practices are more likely to experiment with educational innovations. One study established two experimental groups and a control group of teachers

---


in each of nine elementary schools and six suburban school
districts near New York City. All three groups were pre-tested.
Both experimental groups spent one hour each for six weeks in guided
discussion exercises prepared by the researcher and led by
teachers trained in advance for the assignment. Procedures for
both experimental groups were identical but the content of the
discussion for group one related to classroom practices whereas
the content for group two related to parent-teacher relationships.

An immediate post-test established several findings. One,
experimental groups tried more innovations than the control group.
Two, the kinds of innovations attempted were positively correlated
with those discussed in the groups. Three, in the experimental
group working with class innovations those teachers whose knowledge
about innovations was above the group mean were also above average
in applying these innovations. As predicted, a post-test
administered two months later indicated all gains disappeared
once the group meetings stopped.¹

Several studies emphasize the value of staff involvement as
a procedure for effecting change. Focusing on the effect of the
adoption of modular scheduling on teachers, one study established
a positive correlation between the extent to which teachers felt

¹Avis Oxhandler Manno, "Group Interaction as a Means of
Inducing Innovative Teaching in Elementary Schools." (unpublished
Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1968), abstracted in
they were generally involved in decision making in the school and the extent to which their attitudes toward modular scheduling were positive. Literature in planning school facilities places a strong emphasis on the importance of involving teachers in the planning process. Herrick states that participation by teachers is essential in planning new facilities because such participation will produce better facilities and will result in more effective use of the facilities when completed. Beauchamp and Beauchamp contend that curriculum planned by the joint efforts of an entire staff will lead to a staff more fully committed to the educational program when finalized.

Visitations as a procedure for effecting educational change are strongly supported in the literature. One study led to several conclusions. One, professional suspicion about the value of innovations in other school systems and about the sincerity of innovators is widespread and seriously inhibits educational change. Two, the most persuasive experience for teachers is for them to visit a successful innovative program in action. Three, anything abnormal or artificial in the circumstances surrounding the observed program in action which gives the effect to the observer

---

that an appreciably different situation exists from the conditions in his own setting will lessen the persuasive effect of the visitation. Four, potential adopters of an innovation should be provided the opportunity to see the innovation in action in schools similar to those in which they will be working.¹

How important is the procedure of disseminating literature? One study found that speeches, literature, research reports and conversation with participants outside the actual instructional setting were relatively unconvincing to teachers.² The study by Lin³ resulted in similar findings. Books, magazines, and journals played a small part in informing teachers about modular scheduling.

Research of Specific Innovations

Of the studies of specific innovations selected for discussion in this review, two utilized the building level of organization as the focus of the study, one utilized several schools in a district, and several utilized multiple school districts. These studies will be reviewed in terms of their purpose, general approach, and findings.

One of the classic studies regarding the personal dimension of variables effecting educational change was the study relating


²Ibid.

to superintendents and the adoption of modern mathematics in school districts in three geographical areas. Twenty-five independent variables and one dependent variable were selected. Relevant data were collected and subjected to multiple regression correlation analysis.

The dependent variable was the rate of adoption of modern mathematics in the school districts. Among the independent variables were the age of the superintendent, the extent to which he sought advice, his sources of advice, the kinds of persons with whom he associated, his professional rating by fellow staff members, his ability to judge accurately his own rate of adoption of innovations, and the length of his term of office.

Of these independent variables, only two were positively correlated to a significant extent with the rate of adoption. In these two instances, the data revealed that innovative superintendents were younger than non-innovative superintendents and more often sought advice from outside their local area. In addition to these areas of conclusive evidence, the data suggest that innovative superintendents tend to be less well known in the locale because of their interests outside the area, receive higher professional ratings from their peers, have greater accuracy in judging their own rate of the adoption of the innovations,
and move from one position to another more rapidly than the average superintendent.¹

An investigation of faculty resistance to instructional television (ITV) focused first on a single university. The research was designed to assess (1) the degree of sympathy and antipathy faculty members expressed toward instructional television, (2) their general beliefs, and (3) their personality organization. The analysis of the basic data led to the development of prototypes of pro-ITV and anti-ITV professors. Compared to the anti-ITV professors, the pro-ITV professors (1) were less traditionally oriented, (2) felt more strongly that the university climate should include some non-curricular or extra-curricular activities, (3) appeared more willing to receive further training, (4) were far more eager to experiment with various instructional methods in addition to ITV, and (5) evaluated student performance along more diverse lines, including such criteria as attitude, answers on objective tests, and promptness in completing assignments.²

To study the extent to which the findings of this research case history of one innovation in one university could be generalized to other universities and other innovations, the researchers visited nine different schools to obtain comparative data. The researchers

¹Richard O. Carlson, "Barriers to Change in the Public Schools," in Change Processes in the Public Schools, pp. 3-8; and Carlson, Executive Succession and Organizational Change, pp. 1-96.

²Evans, Resistance to Innovation in Higher Education, pp. 78-123.
utilized open-ended questions to solicit the reactions of administrators and faculty members to various educational innovations and to gain insight of their conceptions of innovations in general on their campuses. The researchers concluded that the prototypes developed in the first phase of the study were generalizable.¹

An investigation of the process of the diffusion of modular scheduling in three high schools in Michigan focused on innovation awareness, innovation adoption, and innovation internalization among the teachers in the three schools. The dependent variables investigated were: (1) the time of awareness, (2) the time of adoption, (3) the extent of personal acceptance of the innovation, and (4) the individual teacher's self-perceived acceptance of change in general. A number of independent variables pertaining to teachers were selected. These included demographic variables, institutional variables (role perception, perception of one's superiors, perception of one's peers, perception of students, etc.), communication behavior variables (acquaintance with professional journals and periodicals, etc.), attitudes towards modular scheduling, and open-mindedness in general. A questionnaire was administered to the teachers in the three schools and correlations of the dependent and independent variables were established.

There were several major findings. One, regarding innovation awareness, the researchers found that 73 per cent of

¹Ibid., pp. 8-9.
the teachers first heard about modular scheduling from personal sources such as their supervisors, college instructors, fellow teachers or principals. Mass media sources generally regarded as important sources of information about new educational ideas and practices played a small part in informing the teachers about modular scheduling. In addition, early awareness of the innovation among teachers was positively related to (a) their educational level, (b) the extent to which the principal kept them informed of their performance, (c) their general change orientation, and (d) their salary level. The age of teachers was found to be inversely related to early awareness.

Two, regarding innovation adoption, the researchers found that the decision to adopt the modular schedule was not a voluntary decision on the part of the teachers.

Three, regarding innovation internalization (the extent to which teachers believe modular scheduling is a good innovation), the researchers found that more teachers had internalized the innovation than had rejected it. The variables found to be positively related to the extent to which teachers internalized the innovation were (a) their change orientation, (b) their level of knowledge about the innovation, (c) their perceived support for the innovation from administrators, (d) their perceived involvement in the school decision-making process in general and (e) their frequent reading of professional journals.1

---

1Lin, et al., The Diffusion of an Innovation in Three Michigan High Schools, pp. 1-129.
In a sociological analysis of the major problems of team teaching based on a review of the literature and an investigation of two elementary schools, Wylie\(^1\) found major problems in the areas of human relationships, coordination of the social environment, evaluation of students and reports to parents, impersonality in teacher-student relationships, teacher selection (teacher turnover), and team leadership.

She concluded that team teaching is an excellent example of sociological complexity. The conclusion has several tenets. In contrast to the organizational pattern of the traditional classroom, in team teaching situations as many as four or five teachers are jointly responsible for a large number of students. A highly complex organizational structure emerges to replace the simple structure of the self-contained classroom organization. In this increased instructional complexity, the number of interpersonal relationships increases geometrically.

Wylie also concluded that coordination is the most serious problem. Furthermore, she discussed the primary causes contributing to the lack of coordination in team teaching situations. These are lack of planning time, inefficiency in leadership, and personality conflicts. Lack of coordination results in a degeneration of team teaching into turn teaching, which is essentially no different

\(^{1}\)Virginia L. Wylie, "Implications for Educational Administration From a Sociological Analysis of the Major Problems of Team Teaching in Elementary Schools" (paper prepared for Sociology 523, The Ohio State University, March, 1969), pp. 26-35.
from teaching in self-contained classrooms. Lack of coordination also leads to open conflict among team members which in turn leads to morale problems.

Summary

In this chapter, the literature is reviewed from three perspectives. The first pertains to the component facets of the educational change process, the second to strategies and techniques in multiple change settings, and the third to specific innovations.

A number of works are reviewed in which the authors discuss the component facets of the educational change process. While their notions differ somewhat in the details, these authors generally conclude that the component facets are closely related to each other, but that they are also unique. In focusing on one facet, the researcher must place the others in proper perspective.

The number of basic strategies utilized in change situations is limited. The literature contains a number of classifications of basic strategies. These tend to be quite similar although there are some differences. Research focused on identifying the strategy or strategies utilized in given educational change situations or on validating the value of specific strategies for given change situations are limited. Most discussions of strategies focus on the broad institutional level of organization as opposed to the school building level.
Focus on the techniques utilized in educational change situations is almost the opposite of strategies. There are few comprehensive classifications of techniques. While research pertaining to validating specific techniques is limited, research pertaining to procedures utilized in effecting change does exist and has some relevancy to the problem under consideration since techniques are embodied in procedures.

The primary focus of research in educational change is directed toward identifying variables which affect change. Studies of specific innovations also follow this pattern. Although the processes used by disseminators in an attempt to effect educational change in individual schools are recognized as a valid area of study, the attention they receive in research is considerably less than other dimensions of the change process.

The purpose of this review of literature is to further develop the context of the research problem and to assist the researcher in developing a general framework from which to proceed with the investigation. The review has been helpful in both regards. In subsequent portions of this report, many of the notions reviewed in this chapter will be applied to the analysis under consideration.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

In Chapter I the purpose, background, rationale, and significance of the problem are discussed and the basic questions to be pursued are presented. Chapter II discusses the parameters and process of educational change, traces the development of strategies and techniques in educational change situations of various types and reviews some approaches to studying specific innovations at the school level of organization. The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the procedures and methodologies utilized in the study.

Following a brief discussion of the case study as a research methodology, attention focuses on the general framework developed to direct the research, the criteria and procedures used in selecting the cases, and the procedures followed in completing the study.

The Case Study

In a number of professional areas, including medicine, psychiatry, social work and education, professionals have for some time used the case study effectively in compiling data relative to particular qualities or problems of individuals. The concept of the case study has been expanded from its personal emphasis to
include any relatively detailed description and analysis of a person, event or institution. Based on the descriptive data, researchers have been able to develop useful diagnosis and relate causative characteristics to identified effects. Modification of the technique has enabled researchers to study limited facets of entities in multiple populations.  

In the particular research under consideration, the limited facet is the strategies and techniques utilized, the entity is an event (the adoption of team teaching), and the multiple population is a limited number of schools. Because of the broad and somewhat allusive nature of the problem and the limited attention it has received in educational research, the case study is particularly apropos as a methodology for the investigation.

A Framework for the Investigation

From the discussions in the first chapter and the review of literature in the second, several concepts have emerged which provide the basis of a general framework for approaching the problem under investigation. A synopsis of these concepts follows.

Concept One. The process of educational change consists of identifiable component facets. The particular terminology applied to the facets varies for the most part with the biases of experts regarding how to effect educational change. The conception of

---

educational problems, the development of problem solutions in usable forms, the dissemination of the developed solutions to potential consumers and the adoption of the solutions by the potential consumers are representative of the component facets generally included.

**Concept Two.** The component facets of the change process are a part of the whole, but each is also a unique entity. The dimensions of this interrelatedness and uniqueness are the focus of considerable attention. Some studies, particularly those focusing on the development of models for effecting educational change in broad terms, focus equally on all facets of the change process. Others focus on particular facets such as dissemination or adoption and develop the other facets in relationship to the facet of primary focus.

**Concept Three.** Strategies and techniques receive relatively little emphasis in the literature and the terms are not precisely developed. The strategies and techniques utilized in adopting a particular innovation may be obscured from general observation. Even those directly involved in the adoption situation may not be totally, or even partially, cognizant of the strategies and techniques utilized. Conceivably, those directing the adoption of the innovation may subscribe to particular strategies and techniques and utilize others.
Concept Four. A strategy has a personal dimension, a process dimension, and an organizational dimension. A technique relates to the process dimension. Any attempt to identify and analyze strategies utilized in a given change situation must consider all three dimensions.

Concept Five. In the context of any component facet of the educational change process, strategies and techniques are embodied in the organizational activities, procedures and events occurring for the purpose of causing a change. The distinction between (1) activities, procedures and events, (2) strategies, and (3) techniques is significant to the analysis under consideration. This distinction is not well developed in the literature. Whereas an individual user may not be aware of the particular strategies or techniques utilized to effect a change, he is able to identify the activities, procedures and events used.

A schema employing these basic concepts has been developed to meet the demands of a framework to assist the researcher in identifying those aspects of adoption efforts which appear to be relevant to an analysis of the strategies and techniques embodied in them. The schema is presented in Figure 2.

Along the horizontal axis of the schema are the facets of the educational change process cast in the perspective of the adoption of team teaching in individual schools. Decision refers to the initial facet of the adoption of team teaching in an individual school. Included in this facet are the activities,
Adoption Facets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGY COMPONENTS</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Preparation</th>
<th>Assistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Who</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Whom</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2—A schema for identifying and analyzing strategies and techniques utilized in the adoption of team teaching in individual schools
procedures and events associated with the decision to adopt team teaching in the school and with communicating the decision to the various persons. Preparation refers to the facet of the adoption effort devoted to preparing various persons and groups for actually beginning team teaching. Assistance refers to the facet devoted to assisting various persons and groups following the initial point of installation.

On the vertical axis along the left side of the schema are the essential dimensions to which a strategy must address itself. Regarding the activities, procedures and events occurring in the adoption effort, who and whom address the personal dimension, what addresses the process dimension, and the composite of who, what and whom addresses the organizational dimension. Moreover, what refers to the techniques used to effect change, who refers to those persons applying the techniques, and whom refers to those persons on whom the techniques focus.

The why appearing along the vertical axis at the right side of the schema focuses on each of the cells. It attempts to ascertain the reasons for filling each cell with its particular components. In seeking why the cells were filled with the particular components rather than some other, it provides some insight into the process of selecting strategies and techniques for the particular adoption situation.
The primary task of the schema is to assist the researcher in developing a set of research questions to identify (1) the organizational activities, procedures and events associated with the adoption efforts in individual schools and (2) the components of each cell in the matrix embodied in these activities, procedures and events. These specific research questions appear below. The first set of questions (Set A) pertains to basic data which assist in establishing the cases as valid examples of team teaching as defined for purposes of this research. The remaining sets focus on the cells in the matrix.

A. Basic Data

1. What grade levels are included in the school?
2. What is the total student enrollment in the school?
3. How many certificated teachers are employed in the school?
4. How many of these are members of teaching teams?
5. How many paraprofessionals (teacher-aides, secretaries, clerks) are employed by the school?
6. How many of these paraprofessionals are assigned to teaching teams?
7. How many teaching teams does the school have and what kind and how many of each kind of personnel constitute each team?
8. How many administrative and supervisory personnel are assigned primarily to this school?

9. Under what circumstances do members of the teaching teams actually teach a common group of students together?

10. What is the central focus of team planning sessions? How much time is devoted to team planning?

11. What is the central focus of team evaluation sessions? How much time is devoted to team evaluation?

12. Were outside funds utilized in the adoption of team teaching in the school? If so, what was the source and amount of these funds?

B. The Decision to Adopt Team Teaching in the School

13. What were the circumstances leading to the initial consideration of adopting team teaching in the school?

14. Who were the active persons in the initial consideration?

15. Who made the decision to adopt team teaching in the school, when and how was it made, and why was it made by this person or group in this manner?

C. Communicating the Decision

16. Who communicated the decision to staff members?

17. Why was the decision communicated by this person or group rather than by some other person or group?
18. What means (activities, procedures and events) were used to communicate the decision to staff members?

19. Why was the decision communicated by these means rather than by some other means?

20. What are the answers to questions 16-19 for parents? Students? Others?

D. Between the Decision and the Beginning of Team Teaching

21. What means (activities, procedures and events) were used to select and employ staff members for the school?

22. Why were these means used rather than some other means?

23. Who provided the leadership for preparing staff members for team teaching?

24. Why did this person or group provide the leadership for preparing the staff rather than some other person or group?

25. What means (activities, procedures and events) were used to prepare staff members for team teaching?

26. Why were these particular means used rather than some other means?

27. What are the answers to questions 23-26 for parents? Students? Others?

E. Since the Beginning of Team Teaching

28. What means (activities, procedures and events) have been used to select and employ staff members for the school?
29. Why have these means been used rather than some other means?

30. Who has provided the leadership for assisting staff members in team teaching?

31. Why has this person or group provided the leadership for assisting the staff members rather than some other person or group?

32. What means (activities, procedures and events) have been used to assist staff members in the adoption?

33. Why have these particular means been used rather than some other means?

34. What are the answers to questions 30-33 for parents? Students? Others?

F. Summary

35. What have been the key means that have contributed to the success of the team teaching effort in the school?

36. What mistakes have been made with regard to the adoption? What should be done differently if one were to begin again in the same setting?
Case Selection

The basic criteria used in selecting cases for the investigation follow.

**Criterion One.** The individual schools selected must have adopted team teaching within the last one to four years. The team teaching organization must represent the predominant mode for organizing teachers within the school. Other factors being equal, those schools which have the largest majority of the teaching staff organized in teams should be selected.

**Criterion Two.** Key personnel in planning and executing the adoption of team teaching in the schools must be available for interviews. This should include staff members who were included in the adoption process at the central office level, the building administrative level, and the team organization level.

**Criterion Three.** The availability of written documents related to the adoption is desirable. Included are such documents as reports to funding agencies, agenda and reports of workshops, staff memoranda, special publications regarding the new program, and related news releases and stories.

**Criterion Four.** Cases should be sought from all three levels of school organization, i.e., elementary, intermediate, and senior high.

**Criterion Five.** Cases should be sought in several states in order to eliminate any bias that would tend to result from a focus on a more limited geographical area.
Based on these criteria, several steps were utilized in selecting the cases. The researcher telephoned state department offices in Kentucky, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia to request (1) the names of schools in their states which recently adopted team teaching and (2) the name of the person in each school who could be contacted for further information. The researcher first called the ESEA Title III office in each state. Then he called the division of curriculum and instruction. Approximately 300 potential cases were identified by these means. Some of the state departments were very selective in preparing their responses, while others mailed copies of recently completed surveys of innovations in their states.

A double post card questionnaire was developed. On one half of the double card, the researcher briefly described the problem under investigation and solicited the cooperation of the receiver in completing the questionnaire and returning it promptly. The second half of the double card included questions relative to the selection criteria from which the researcher could make a preliminary analysis of the schools as potential cases for the study. The exact form of the questionnaire appears in Appendix I. The questionnaire was mailed to 273 of the schools or school districts identified by the state departments in the seven states. Because of the large number of schools listed by one of the seven states, the questionnaire was mailed only to the first two of each set of
three names appearing on the list. Approximately 60 per cent
of the questionnaires mailed were returned.

The criteria of selection were applied to the questionnaire
returned and a preliminary order of desirability of potential
cases was established for each level of organization. In arriving
at the final selection, the researcher telephoned the contact
person in four elementary schools, four middle schools, and
three senior high schools. In these telephone conversations the
researcher:

. discussed the questions in Set A of the basic research
  questions relative to the validity of the schools as
  examples of the adoption of team teaching.
. outlined the general dimensions of the study and
  explored the possibility of using the school as one of
  the cases for the study.
. discussed which persons in the school district should
  be interviewed in terms of the criteria noted above.
. outlined the specific requirements of the school and
  made arrangements to forward a written copy of these
  requirements to the contact person. (See Appendix II.)
. scheduled a visit to the school for the purpose of
  collecting the data.

The principal of one of the elementary schools in the
preliminary list did not wish to become involved in the study.
The attitude of the other contact persons was favorable toward the proposed research and the final list of selected cases included three elementary schools, four middle schools, and three senior high schools. Of the cases selected, one is located in Kentucky, one in Illinois, one in Indiana, one in Michigan, three in Ohio, two in Pennsylvania, and one in West Virginia.

Field Investigation

The researcher visited each of the selected schools. Several basic activities were included in these visits. Interviews were conducted with those persons identified in the telephone conversations. An interview protocol was developed from the basic research questions outlined above for use in these interviews. The interviews lasted from 45 minutes to one hour with administrators and approximately 30 minutes with teachers and other school personnel. A cassette tape recorder was used to record the interviews. The protocol used in the interviews appears in Appendix III and the list of persons interviewed in each school appears with the references.

In the interviews with administrators, all questions on the protocol were covered. In interviews with teachers, emphasis on the why questions was minimized since these were primarily prepared for those individuals directing the adoption. In all cases, the researcher used the form during the interview to frame the questions, but the interviewees were not given a copy of the
protocol. The researcher attempted to adhere to the protocol but in some cases this was quite difficult.

A second major activity included in the visits to the schools was the completion of the basic data collection form developed from the basic research questions in Set A. The form was completed during the interview with the school principal or some other administrative person whom he felt could provide the data more accurately. These responses were verified in the interviews with teachers. This basic data collection form appears in Appendix IV.

A third major activity in the visit to the schools was the consultation of written documents to gain additional information relative to the basic research questions. The documents generally available in the schools which were helpful were workshop agenda, teacher memoranda, clippings from newspapers collected by school personnel, and some special publications prepared by the school with regard to the specific innovation. In those schools receiving special funds for the project, reports to the funding organizations were particularly useful.

Finally, the researcher attended classes, team planning sessions, and visited with a number of teachers on an informal basis. The primary purpose of these activities was to develop a general impression of the extent to which the informal team teaching organization was consistent with formal organization described in the interviews.
CHAPTER IV

THE CASE NARRATIVES

The narratives appearing in this chapter relate to the activities, procedures and events utilized in the selected schools for the purpose of causing team teaching to be adopted. These case narratives were developed from the responses to the research questions utilized in the field investigations.

The cases are arranged alphabetically by organizational levels. First are the three elementary schools. These are followed by the four middle schools and three senior high schools. The names of the schools are omitted. They are referenced by case numbers one through ten.
Case One: Elementary School

Elementary schools in the district: 8

School enrollment: 630

Vertical organization: K-6

Support Personnel: Principal, secretary

Teachers: 23

Teachers on functioning teams: 20

Teacher aides: Equivalent of 4 parent volunteers in IMC, plus 1 employed coordinator

Team organization
  . There is 1 team of 6 teachers for each 2 grades.
  . The kindergarten team has two members.
  . Art, music and physical education teachers teach with the teams at times but individually most of the time.

Team processes
  . Teams plan and evaluate approximately 50 minutes daily.
    More time is devoted to planning than evaluating. Teams also plan and evaluate before and after school, but this time is generally for individual work.
  . Teams teach together much of the time.
  . Teaching-learning situations are arranged in multiple-size groups and modes of instruction vary accordingly.
  . Since teams teach together, additional planning and evaluation occur periodically.

Facilities
  . Each team (except kindergarten) has an open space equivalent to 4 classrooms plus 2 classrooms enclosed with glass.
    The kindergarten open space is equivalent to two rooms.
  . Each team has a planning room.
  . The 3 team pods surround the IMC with only partial walls between.
  . The art, music and physical education facilities are isolated from the pods.

Funding
  . A $3,000 grant was received from a private foundation for the summer workshop.
Resulting from crowded conditions in all the elementary schools in the school district, in one of the buildings two teachers were assigned to a large room to teach two sections of kindergarten at the same time during the 1963-64 school year. As the year progressed, the two teachers became aware of the many benefits that could develop from teaching together and they began to do so. One of the teachers is the present principal of the school investigated.

In the same circumstances the following year, the current principal was joined by another teacher and the two began to work as a team from the beginning of the year. The two accepted an assignment to team teach a large group of fifth grade students in the same building the next year. As the school year got underway, the new superintendent found his son placed with this teaching team. While addressing the parent teacher organization of this school, he assured the groups that one of his prime objectives was to alleviate the tremendously overcrowded conditions in the district so that each of the students could again be placed in a self-contained classroom.

The superintendent took several actions to meet the facility needs of the school district. Recognizing the need for an additional elementary school in the eastern portion of the school district and one in the western, he appointed a committee referred to as the East-West Committee. Committee members included administrators, teacher assistants (professional teachers called into the central
office for a term of one year to assist primarily new teachers),
teachers, and citizens. The superintendent gave the committee the
charge to discuss the kinds of schools the district should be
developing.

The superintendent also contracted with a state university to
conduct a school building needs study. The purpose of this study
was to assist in developing a long-range plan for the school district
and to identify the specific building needs that should be included
in the next steps for the school district. Some groundwork was
laid for this study when the superintendent arrived on the scene.

Throughout the school year, general discussions continued
between the superintendent of schools, the East-West Committee, and
a number of administrative staff members. The current principal
of the school investigated recalled the general discussion that
followed the superintendent's presentation to the parent teacher
organization meeting in the building where the team was functioning.
Both team members and their principal went to the superintendent
in defense of team teaching. They argued that given some good
facilities, proper scheduling, and the time for planning, team teaching
would be very superior to a self-contained classroom situation.

In July 1966, the report of the school building needs study
was completed. It substantiated the need to develop a number of
elementary schools in the immediate future. The superintendent
appointed a steering committee to assist in developing these schools.
The committee was chaired by the director of elementary education and, in addition to the director, consisted of the superintendent, the assistant superintendent for instruction, several elementary principals, and the teacher aides.

The committee began with the product of the East-West Committee. They prepared a basic statement of philosophy entitled, "We Believe." This statement became a part of the document the committee prepared which, among other things, focused on team teaching as the basic tenet in the answer to the question of staff organization. The document also included a description of a day in the life of the student and a day in the life of the teacher under the envisioned program. The program in the school investigated is based on this document.

While the planning committee was developing its document, some committee members, the principal, and the superintendent traveled widely. Their interest in seeing innovative programs in action took them to numerous school districts throughout their state as well as to distant states. They attended several workshops on team teaching and read a number of materials concerning exemplary elementary school programs. The superintendent, rather than the chairman of the planning committee, provided the major leadership for these events.

In February 1967, when the steering committee completed the document explaining the program that would be operating in the new schools, they discussed the document with the teachers in the existing
elementary schools in the district. At this meeting, and in several ensuing meetings, staff members were briefed on developments and their interest and support for the new program were solicited. These meetings occurred on an additional time basis rather than on release time.

Although a new building was being planned for the school investigated, it was not scheduled to be completed until September 1968. Nevertheless, the steering committee and the administrators decided to install the program in the old building in September 1967.

Prior to the end of the school year, the principal selected by the superintendent and his assistants for the school was announced. Moreover, notices were sent to all elementary teachers in the district asking them to indicate their preference of the school and grade level in which they wished to serve the next year. Only those individuals who requested and were judged to be competent to become members of teaching teams in the innovative school were selected. Additional persons were recruited for the school as a part of the program of recruiting teachers for the school district. These procedures resulted in the assignment of a better than average staff to the school during the first year of team teaching.

While teachers assigned to the school were given some basic literature to read during the summer, the primary preparation activity
occurred in a one-week workshop in August 1967, just prior to the
beginning of team teaching in the school. The primary emphasis of
the workshop was placed on developing specific lesson plans for the
first week of school. The philosophy of team teaching and the
opportunity for teams to get acquainted with each other were also
emphasized. The workshop was conducted in an open-space building
designed for team teaching.

Following an orientation period led by central office
administrators and the principal, several films relating to team
teaching were shown. Several days were spent in team meetings at
which the teams developed specific lesson plans and brought them to
the entire group for critique and general discussion. On one day
of the workshop consultant stations were set up at various points
throughout the building. Teachers individually and in teams moved
from one station to the next to present their specific and group plans
to the various subject area and general consultants. The consultants
were specialists from a regional educational research council and
several principals from schools throughout the state where team
teaching was occurring.

Beginning with the installation of the program in the school,
the principal assumed almost complete leadership responsibility. The
superintendent, who previous to this point had assumed a major
leadership role in the development of the innovation, focused his
efforts on continued discussion with the principal and on providing
general support. Asked about this specific change in role, the superintendent stated his philosophy on the matter: the principal of the school should be selected with extreme care on the basis of his ability to lead a school program and then be permitted to do just that.

Several means used in assisting the staff in the adoption of team teaching were identified in the interviews. During the first year of operation, visits were scheduled for each of the teachers in at least one other school where team teaching was occurring. In the second and third years, the same kind of experience was again provided for everyone who wished to participate. Most of the teachers saw other programs in operation during the second year, but in the third year only several requested to make visits. Visitations of this type were made possible by hiring substitutes and by other team members covering for the team member who was gone.

The second basic means of assistance to staff members during the course of the three years of operation involved disseminating reading materials on program concepts relative to team teaching. Both the teachers interviewed and the principal noted the general benefit of this means of assistance to staff members.

The third means, probably the most significant, was the personal encounter between the principal and the members of the teaching teams. The principal spent a great deal of time in the building among the students and staff members, providing immediate assistance as needed in a number of circumstances. On many occasions
she met with teachers in planning sessions. These encounters were initiated by the principal at times and by the teaching teams at other times.

In the fall of 1968 after one year of operation in the old building, the school moved into a new facility designed specifically to accommodate team teaching. This was a tremendous boost for the program, the principal recalled. The quality of team teaching increased tremendously as a result.

The principal participated in a workshop in group dynamics in the summer of 1969. Based on this experience, she prepared a staff evaluation form and distributed it to each of the team members. The form included assessing both one's self and other members of the teaching team. The principal asked the teachers to complete these and to discuss them in a team meeting. All the teams had completed the task at the time of the visit of the researcher except for one team which had run into difficulty in facing the assignment.

After the first year, for the most part, only teachers who expressed an interest in team teaching were employed to teach in the school, but school administrators made an effort to insure that the staff in the traditional schools was not inferior in quality to the staff in the innovative school.

In discussing the specific means used to assist teachers in the adoption effort, the principal stated that you simply cannot give
teachers a package developed by someone else and ask them to implement it. They must develop their own program within the broad parameters identified by the steering committee. Teachers vary considerably, as do children, and different expectations must be held for each, she argued.

Throughout the period of initial conception of the program, several specific steps were taken to prepare parents. Brochures were prepared for the general populace and mailed to them during the period from the referendum for the bond issue to build the school through construction. News releases appeared in several papers read locally. The superintendent and members of the planning committee made a number of appearances in local communities during this period of time.

When the program first began, the principal of the school explained it to the parents, using a profile of the Iowa Test of Basic Skills for a given class. She emphasized the fact of individual differences and explained how the new program would better meet individual needs. Additional brochures were sent home periodically to parents in the course of the development of the program.

Parent conferences were used to provide a means of contact between parents and the school. These also assisted parents in accepting the innovative program of the school.

The principal developed a volunteer aide program in which a number of parents served as general aides to teachers and students in the instructional materials center of the school. At the time
of the field investigation, more than a dozen parents were assisting the school on a regularly scheduled basis under the direction of a parent who was employed by the school district to direct the program. While this program was established primarily to assist teachers and students, the principal feels it has been a major factor in promoting the program with parents.

Finally, by means of numerous school bulletins, both from the central office and from the school, parents were invited to visit the school at any time. The open design of the building permits visitors to move through the building freely without distracting students significantly. Visitors are accommodated without prior appointment.

Prior to moving into the new building students were told of the program they would be in. Little was done specifically to prepare them.

Staff members interviewed and the superintendent referred to the principal as the key to the success of the program. The principal noted the general support of the superintendent and his ability to inspire persons as the key to success. All noted the benefit of the August workshop and the visitation program.
Case Two: Elementary School

Elementary schools in the district: 4

School enrollment: 450

Vertical organization: K-6

Support personnel: Principal, secretary, total of 16 student teachers during year

Teachers: 23

Teachers on functioning teams: 23

Team aides: 4

Team organization
  . The entire staff, including specialists, are organized into teams.
  . Teams generally number 3 teachers plus 1 aide half-time and several student teachers.

Team processes
  . Teams teach together from one-third to one-half time although this varies with teams.
  . The specialists do not always teach together although they plan together much of the time.
  . Teams plan and evaluate both students and program 90 minutes per week during school time and 1 hour daily after school. More time is devoted to planning than to evaluating.

Facilities
  . The building is a modified traditional structure.
  . All classrooms are arranged in sets of 2 with movable dividers separating them.
  . There are 2 project rooms next to 2 team planning rooms.
  . The IMC, art storage, music and physical education facilities are centrally located.

Funding
  . Approximately $75,000 in ESEA Title III funds were received over a three-year period.
What now constitutes the district in which the school is located consisted of a township school district and a city school district. In 1965, when the two districts were consolidated, plans were well underway for a new elementary school in the township district. An architect had been employed and preliminary drawings accepted by the board of education. The principal of the township school had expressed some interest in team teaching to the architect, and the architect had proceeded to plan a building to accommodate either a traditional program or a team teaching program.

The current director of elementary education was director of federal projects for the city school district at the time of consolidation. He recalled being intrigued with the concept of team teaching for the school. Having had little contact with the concept prior to this point, he read the notes the architect had accumulated on team teaching. With the generous support of the superintendent, who had been appointed with the openly expressed charge of moving the school district ahead, and the board of education who employed the superintendent, the current director of elementary education proceeded to develop the concept into what he believed would be a working program for the school. In January 1967, he applied for a three-year staff development project under ESEA Title III and was successful. The first year of the grant began in June 1967, several months prior to the opening of the new building.

During the development of the program for the federal proposal, the dean of the college of education and several faculty members
from a state university located in the city were actively involved with the current director of elementary education and the superintendent in developing the specifics of the program and in preparing the proposal. The superintendent, the current director of elementary education, and board members visited several schools with team teaching programs.

No well-defined program of informing staff members or the community of the interest in the development of a team teaching program for the new elementary school existed until about the time the federal proposal was submitted. Before this, school administrative personnel at various levels from the superintendent to the building principals discussed some of the developments with staff members and the community. Near the time when the federal proposal was submitted, teachers and the community were informed of the general plans by means of a staff bulletin and a general news release in the local paper. According to the director of elementary education, the reason for this procedure of informing staff members and community was that the program evolved over a considerable period of time and was not very well formulated before this time.

The plan for installing team teaching in the school as noted in the proposal consisted of several phases. For the school year 1967-68, two teams of six teachers each would be functioning in the second and fifth grades, respectively. During the 1968-69 school year team programs would be expanded to include the first and third grades, based on the success of the second grade team;
and the fourth and sixth grades, based on the success of the fifth grade team.

The school district advertised for a director of the project to work half time for the school district and half time as a child psychologist at the university. He was employed beginning in June 1967, and provided the basic leadership from the central building level while the director of federal projects (the current director of elementary education) became principal of the school.

Teachers were selected for the two teams by several means: (1) teachers in the entire district were asked to indicate if they were interested in teaching with one of these teams, (2) certain teachers were specifically approached about an assignment with one of the teams, and (3) teachers who were interested in team teaching and were believed to have the competencies necessary were recruited from outside the district. The emphasis placed on securing a well-qualified staff arose from the administrators' desire to see the program succeed since it would be something of a pilot test for the entire district.

The two teams of teachers were given basic reading materials for the summer months. A workshop was conducted during the second and third weeks in August 1967, just prior to the actual beginning of team teaching. The initial week of the workshop was conducted by consultants of various types employed by the federal grant. Included were personnel from the state university in the city, who remained actively involved in the general direction of the team teaching
effort for the next three-year period, and principals and team leaders from schools who had adopted team teaching. The emphasis during this week was placed on the planning aspect of team teaching. Some attention was also focused on sensitivity training activities. The emphasis of the second week of the workshop was on preparing the teams for the opening of school. They were assisted in preparing work packets in the various skills areas, in organizing their schedule for working as a team, and in grouping students. Emphasis on evaluating students was also included. The workshop was held in the new building, which added additional impetus.

Prior to the opening of school the superintendent, the director and the principal conducted a vigorous program of appearances in local clubs and other social organizations. They explained the school's program and answered questions. They felt personal contacts of this type were very essential to the acceptance of the program by the community. Several newspaper releases gave good coverage of the program to be developed.

Activities related to assisting the team teaching effort after its initiation in September 1967, took a variety of forms. All teachers of the two functioning teams visited two different schools where team teaching was being conducted. The ten in-service training days for the school district as a whole were devoted to the general topic of team teaching in the elementary school. During these in-service training programs, consultants of considerable repute were
again brought into the training sessions. A consultant from a regional research council made a significant impact in further developing the program, both in the teams that were already functioning and in the preparation for broadening the program to include other teams in the school. Also during the first year the district held a conference for principals and selected members from both functioning teams and teams selected for the next school year to discuss problems of team teaching and to talk about program development within team teaching. Finally, faculty members from the local university were used extensively to assist in day-to-day problem situations.

Although the original plan was to expand the team teaching program at the school to include additional teams for the 1968-69 school year, additional teachers began team planning during the first year. They had had considerable opportunity to talk with and observe the two teams in action and were anxious to move ahead. By the end of the year, the principal and teachers had organized the entire school into cross-level teams for the next year. Approximately one-fourth of the teachers in addition to those already on teams visited other schools with team teaching programs during the latter part of the 1967-68 and the early part of the 1968-69 school years.

As a result of installing team teaching in the entire school beginning with the 1968-69 school year, several significant
developments occurred. The teams no longer consisted of a select group of teachers. The teams included a number of teachers who were not convinced of the value of the program and were not competent to serve in this capacity. Moreover, community resistance increased sharply, partly because many more students became involved in the innovation. By mid-year a very critical situation had developed.

Plans to combat community resistance were implemented. In November parent conferences were held in an attempt to inform the community of the progress of students in lieu of the traditional report card. Rather than improving the situation this tended to worsen it. Teachers had not developed the competencies necessary for reporting in parent conferences. The school principal, the project director, and the superintendent continued their pace of presentations to service organizations and community groups in seeking support for the school's program. They developed and used a slide presentation to assist in communicating what was happening in the school. Parents were encouraged to visit the school. The parent conference held later in the school year and during the next year proved to be much more successful, and by the end of 1969-70 school year it appeared as though these efforts had been successful in breaking down the community resistance against the program.
The problem that began during the first year of installation (1968-69) relative to a lack of interest and competency in team teaching among some staff members has not been solved. In November 1968, the principal was appointed director of elementary education for the district in an attempt to provide more leadership to the program district-wide. His replacement was unable to provide equal quality leadership with respect to team teaching. The in-service training meetings continued throughout the 1968-69 and 1969-70 school years, but the use of consultants decreased considerably. For the most part visitation of other team teaching programs ended during the last part of the 1968-69 school year.

The events contributing most to the success of the program noted by those interviewed were (1) the visits to other schools to see team teaching in action, (2) the construction of a new building with rooms with operable walls and project rooms to facilitate the team teaching process, and (3) the use of many consultants during the three-year period. In addition, the director of elementary education noted the securing of the Title III project grant.
Case Three: Elementary School

Elementary schools in the district: 53

School enrollment: 499

Vertical organization: K-6

Support personnel: Principal, secretary

Teachers: 16

Teachers on functioning teams: 16

Team aides: 2 plus 1 recess aide

Team organization

- There are five teams, ranging in size from 2-6 members.
  - The kindergarten team has the equivalent of 2 classrooms; the rest have four.
  - Teams have children in the equivalent of 2-3 grade levels.
  - Both aides are members of the same team.

Team processes

- Teams teach together most of the time.
- Teaching-learning situations are arranged in multiple size groups and modes of instruction vary accordingly.
- Teams plan and evaluate for thirty minutes daily before the students arrive; they have an additional hour per week when art, music and physical education specialists work with the students.
- Additional planning and evaluating occur at intervals in the process of teaching together.
- Time is divided about equally between planning on the one hand and program and student evaluation on the other.

Facilities

- Each team and the students assigned to them are in an open space sufficiently large to house the entire group.
- Instructional materials centers are provided in each of the team pods.
- Several team planning centers are provided in the building.
- Facilities for art, music, and physical education are traditional.

Funding

- The program was funded entirely through regular means.
During the school year 1966-67, central office personnel finalized the decision to build an additional elementary school to meet the needs of a growing area of the city. They established a seven-member planning committee, which consisted of the director of educational facility planning, three additional central office and elementary administrators, and three teachers from the school district at large. The major task of the planning committee was to develop the broad components of the educational program for the school and to assist in developing educational specifications from which a building to fit the program would be developed. Since the current director of educational facility planning was appointed, he followed basically this procedure for planning new schools in the district.

Several years prior to this date, the school district began making significant strides toward developing a continuous progress program in the elementary schools. The planning committee explored program developments in other cities and the organizational implications of a continuous progress program, which was scheduled to be expanded to include all elementary schools in the district. The program seemed to logically develop to include team teaching as one of its components.

While the planning committee continued its efforts to develop the school, an open space facility to house a single primary unit with team teaching began operations in January 1968. The apparent success of the team teaching program in this facility and the
commitment of the planning committee and the department of elementary schools to continue to improve their schools were major inputs to the emerging plans for the new school.

The general program plans and the specific building plans for the school were completed during the 1967-68 school year, and the building was constructed during the following year. The plans called for a number of large open spaces in the building to accommodate team teaching and continuous progress.

As construction progressed the planning committee and the department of elementary schools prepared for opening the school in September 1969. Through a standing committee on school organization in the elementary principals' association of the city, the planning committee communicated the plans for the school to all elementary principals, who in turn shared the plans with teachers in their buildings. Several news releases appeared concurrently, explaining some of the components of the school's program and the new facility. No specific attempt was made to inform teachers other than in a rather general way.

The first specific action to involve other staff members came when the personnel department provided teachers the opportunity to indicate a preference for teaching in the new school when it would open the following year. This effort was included as a part of the general procedure for transfers in the school district. In addition to receiving requests for transfer to the school, personnel in the departments of elementary schools and personnel also approached certain individuals about positions of team leaders.
The principal was selected for the school also by the joint efforts of the departments of elementary schools and personnel during the same time other staff members were being selected. The director of elementary schools indicated that a conscious effort was made to select a capable principal because the principal would be a key person in the success of the program.

In selecting the staff a definite attempt was made to isolate individuals who were interested in team teaching. Since only the small primary unit involving one teaching team was operating in the city at the time, few teachers had any previous experience with team teaching. Additional selection criteria were basically those generally observed in selecting staff members for the schools of the district. The director of elementary schools specifically stated, "We did not skim off the top in selecting teachers for the school," but indicated more time was spent in selecting personnel than is normally the case.

The task for preparing staff members for the team teaching experience at the school did not take final form until after the end of the 1968-69 school year. Teachers who were selected were given general materials on team teaching and continuous progress reports to read during the summer months. During the first week of August a workshop was held for staff members in the district's single primary unit since the new building had not been completed. The workshop, developed primarily by the assistant director of elementary schools and led by
the school principal, consisted of general orientation and specific work sessions. Resource persons included a consultant from one of the basal reading programs adopted by the schools and the supervisory personnel of the school district. Most of the time was spent in team planning and organization. Periodically, teams met in larger groups and shared some of their insights with each other. During this workshop the specific program for the school first took form. Teachers were paid for participating in the workshop.

Later in August team leaders were paid to check in the new materials and set up the teaching stations for their teams. Many additional team members also appeared, taking this opportunity to become better acquainted with other team members, with the instructional materials, and with the building. The school board later decided to pay these persons for their efforts. "This was a good week; we got to know each other much better," the principal of the school reported.

Several weeks prior to the opening of school, parents of children who would be attending the school (The students attending this school were taken from several other elementary schools.) were invited to the school for an orientation session. The meeting was led by the school principal assisted by the director of educational facility planning and the assistant director of elementary schools. Following the presentation in which the general program of the school was explained by the leaders of the orientation
session, a general question and answer period was held. The school principal recalled that at this meeting questions were answered as candidly as possible and a number of fears of parents were quieted.

While there was a specific attempt to orientate teachers and parents to the new school program, no specific effort was made to prepare the students who were to be in the building. The reason given was that the students were in a number of different schools and could not be easily assembled.

Following the opening of the building in September 1969, several specific steps were undertaken to assist the staff in the adoption effort. The principal stated her general attitude about assisting staff members in adopting team teaching: "You can't throw people into team teaching; you have to help them grow into it." She saw her task as that of developing a cohesiveness among the entire staff. To develop this, she became involved in the discussions of specific teams concerning curriculum, schedules, schedule coordination and inter-personal problems. These sessions were initiated by both teachers and the principal as the occasion arose. In addition, a weekly staff meeting was held in which total group concerns were shared in an attempt to coordinate the entire program of the school.

The principal was assisted in these efforts by central office personnel at her request. The principal reported that the director of elementary schools and particularly the assistant director of elementary schools were helpful to her in directing the program.
The primary relationship established with parents at the orientation meeting during the summer led to considerable dialogue between parents and the school principal. Many of these conversations occurred by telephone. One specific means used to assist parents in accepting the adoption of team teaching was the parent conferences held in the fall and in the spring. Both teachers and administrators interviewed regarded these as very helpful. The principal reported that following the fall conference in November, the number of parental telephone calls dropped off sharply. A second means was an open-door policy toward parent visitation during the school day. A number of parents took advantage of the opportunity.

When asked to identify the major successes and failures regarding the means used in the adoption, the principal noted the good judgment of central office personnel in selecting staff members for the school and in supporting her at times when she needed it most. She also mentioned the excellent equipment which was placed in the building for their use.

In responding to the same question, the teachers interviewed noted the support they had received from the school principal. They particularly mentioned the open atmosphere which the principal maintained in which they felt like they really could go to her for any kind of help they needed.

Regarding major shortcomings, the school principal and the teachers called attention to the limited amount of time for in-service
training prior to opening the building in September. They felt they simply were not ready, either in terms of an understanding of the basic components of team teaching or of a familiarity with the day-to-day operations involved. Moreover, the teachers felt they were severely limited in the amount of time they could spend in team planning and evaluation.
Case Four: Middle School

Middle schools in the district: 2

School enrollment: 640

Vertical organization: 6-8

Administrators: Principal, assistant principal-counselor, secretary

Additional support personnel: IMC specialist, nurse

Teachers: 31

Teachers on functioning teams: 24

Teacher aides: 3

Team organization

. All teachers are members of organized teams but not all function as such.
. There are live inter-disciplinary teams of three members each.
. There is a team of three physical education and growth and development teachers.
. There are several functioning teams in the expressive arts area.

Team processes

. The five inter-disciplinary teams teach together in large-group instruction and some in regular-size groups.
. Members of several inter-disciplinary teams also teach their discipline together at times in large groups and in rooms side by side, although this occurs less than designed.
. Teams plan and evaluate together two, forty-minute periods per week. Some evaluation of students occurs but more time is devoted to planning.

Facilities

. Most of the rooms in the school are regular size classrooms.
. Approximately half of the classrooms have movable partitions between two rooms.
. Several classrooms can be subdivided by movable walls.
. There is one large-group instruction space.
. An IMC and several planning areas are located near the center of the complex.
. The remaining instructional spaces are built in a traditional manner.

Funding

. A state grant of $10,000 was received for the summer workshop.
Team teaching at this middle school is an outgrowth of a developing middle school program in the school district which began as early as 1959 when the superintendent requested and received permission from the state department of public instruction to establish a middle school for grades six through eight. The first middle school was opened in 1962 with the present assistant superintendent for instruction as principal.

The middle school program went through many alterations and evaluations during the next four-year period. Alterations thought to be desirable from these years of experience and the general discussion of administrators and faculty were inputs to the revision of the middle school model during the first half of the 1966-67 school year. This revision was in preparation for the development of a second middle school in the district, which was urgently needed because of enrollment increases. Team teaching was an integral component of the revised model. Both the model in operation and the revised model were primarily the product of the assistant superintendent for instruction, who is a reputable authority on the middle school.

The revised middle school model served as the basis for specific planning for the new middle school. This planning activity got underway during the last half of the 1967-68 school year under the leadership of the assistant superintendent and district-wide, standing curriculum committees. The following summer (1968) the assistant superintendent assisted by other administrators appointed a curriculum steering committee to direct the planning for the new school
during the next school year. The committee was coordinated by a teacher and chaired by the principal of the existing middle school. Eleven middle school teachers were appointed to the committee. In turn, these teachers were appointed chairmen of faculty committees organized under major elements of the program identified in the middle school model. The steering committee met for several summer work sessions and laid the plans for working with teachers the next year.

During the 1968-69 school year, the steering committee met once each week on after-school time. Additional meetings with the committees of which the steering committee members were chairmen were scheduled after school and Saturdays throughout the school year. Steering committee meetings focused on developing the parameters of the middle school program and providing direction to the specific committees chaired by the members of the steering committee.

During the 1968-69 school year, while the steering committee and the sub-committees were focusing attention on developing the specific aspects of the program of the middle school, most of the steering committee members and administrators visited middle schools with team teaching programs. Several additional teachers were included in the visitation so that approximately one-fourth of the current staff visited other schools. Some persons visited several schools. The school district employed substitutes and covered all expenses of these visits.

The selection of staff for the new middle school involved several procedures. Members of the existing middle school were asked
to volunteer to teach in the new middle school. For several reasons, there were few volunteers. The teachers interviewed noted the general attitude among teachers: "We don't want to be in a fishbowl." This attitude reflected their earlier experiences in an exemplary middle school. When few volunteered, the administration approached specific teachers about the possibility of their teaching at the new middle school. Most of those contacted did accept the request but those who did not wish to comply were permitted to remain at the existing school.

A number of additional teachers were needed because of the expanded enrollment and the opening of the second middle school. Approximately half of the teachers in the new school were recruited from outside the school district. The basic criterion for selection was at least some desire to be involved in team teaching.

During the 1968-69 school year, the principal of the old middle school was appointed principal of the new school. The assistant principal of the old school, a member of the steering committee, was assigned the principalship of the old school. At the end of the school year, the appointed principal of the new school decided to take a position with another district, and the appointed principal of the old school was assigned the principalship of the new school. He did not particularly desire this appointment but agreed to accept it.

Staff selection was not completed until summer. During August a seven-day workshop was conducted in the new middle school for all
teachers assigned to the school. The workshop focused on preparing specific lesson plans. The assistant superintendent noted that it was very much "nuts and bolts" in orientation. The conference was directed by the middle school principal and the assistant superintendent. The services of several consultants from a nearby university were utilized.

The assistant superintendent noted several reasons for following this approach to selecting and preparing staff for the new school. In the first place he felt staff involvement in developing the specifics of a program is most essential for the success of the program. The intent of staff involvement was to develop both a sense of need for team teaching and the expertise to function successfully. Although the temptation was there to load the new middle school with the top-quality teachers in the district in order to improve the chances of success in the innovative program, school administrators chose instead to balance the qualities of the two middle school staffs.

Several means were used to inform the parents of the decision to have team teaching in the new school. In the spring of 1969 the assistant superintendent presented the middle school model to an open meeting for parents of the school district and reacted to the questions they raised. Several newspaper articles were released concurrently in the public press. Additional information was released to parents through school prepared materials prior to the opening of the building in September 1969.
Two specific means were used to prepare students for the new school. Before the end of the school year preceding the opening of the new middle school, students were given an outline of the program they would be entering the next fall. During the summer workshop, 15 students were involved in a two-hour discussion with teachers concerning the specific objectives of the school's program and their reactions were solicited. The assistant superintendent recalled this was a very valuable experience which should have been explored much further.

Following opening of the new building in September 1969, the principal assumed the leadership for providing assistance to staff members in team teaching. The assistant superintendent did attend some department meetings and team-level meetings to assist when called upon, but he did not play a very major role during the course of the school year. No well-developed program for assisting staff members with the adoption has existed. The few existing activities consisted primarily of informal gestures of approval and limited assistance on the part of the principal to teams in group planning, teaching, and evaluating, and in individual performances. Several days of in-service training were included in the school calendar. These were devoted to team planning and preparing specific lesson packets for students.

The primary reason given by the assistant superintendent for little emphasis on continued staff development during the first year of operation was his belief that teams need a certain degree of
independence to work out their own difficulties in an innovative program. He feels the benefit of the halo effect supported by the general impetus received from visitors to the program contributes significantly to the first year's success, provided proper preparation occurs prior to the initiation of the innovation. He noted that during the second year an additional selling job would need to be undertaken much like that prior to the beginning of the program.

The program for assisting parents in accepting team teaching did take on a significant form following the opening of school. In addition to general newsletters released by the public relations department of the school district and news releases appearing in the local press, several specific activities were undertaken. In September and October, seminars were held for interested parents and patrons of the school. At these seminars the assistant superintendent, the superintendent, and the building principal were available for answering the questions of the seminar participants. The assistant superintendent recalled the tenuous position of the panel during these sessions, but he felt these meetings were necessary for the program to succeed. These seminars followed a general meeting held at the school in early September in which the school program was explained.

In October a sample of parents' opinions was taken to find out the areas of concern to the parents and to ascertain their general level of support for the program. The results were quite positive and plans were made to administer the survey mechanism again at the end of the school year.
In spite of the generally good reception of the program by the community, by mid-year a local element succeeded in gaining the attention of the local press and was successful in having a series of serious reprisals published. This led to an open board meeting in January at which the opposition expressed its views. The general attitude of some 800 persons attending the meeting was overwhelmingly in support of the program of the middle school and the opposition was dealt a serious blow.

When asked why these particular procedures were followed in preparing parents, the assistant superintendent noted that one is caught either way he goes in the process of informing parents. If a rigorous program is launched prior to opening the building, there tends to be little interest and meetings are not well supported. On the other hand, if one does not develop such a program he lays the seedbed for a reactionary movement following implementation which focuses its criticism on not having been informed of the major move to be undertaken.

Those interviewed noted several shortcomings in the means and procedures followed. First, the program was plagued by the need to recruit half of the staff from outside the district. The only preparation these persons had for team teaching was the seven-day workshop prior to the opening of the school. Second, because of the limited number of teachers in the school district, no use of a select group of individuals could be undertaken without a detrimental effect on the other middle school in the district. Third, the
teachers interviewed indicated a large number of teachers felt the program was forced on them. While they were involved in developing the details of the program, the teachers felt they were given little latitude on the major issues, which were decided by the assistant superintendent and given to them.
Case Five: Middle School

Middle schools in the district: 3

School enrollment: 561

Vertical organization: 6-8

Support personnel: Principal, 2 counselors, secretary

Teachers: 33

Teachers on functioning teams: 33

Team aides: 9

Team organization
- The sixth grade interdisciplinary team of 8 teachers is sub-divided into 2 teams of 4 each.
- The seventh and eighth grade teams include 4 disciplinary teams of 4 teachers each.
- The unified arts team has 3 teachers.
- There are additional specialists in physical education, music, typing, and foreign language work.

Team processes
- The teams have approximately 40 minutes during the school day for planning and evaluating. The time is divided between planning and evaluating both students and program.
- Teams are assigned students for a block of time and teach together in multiple size groups using appropriate modes of instruction.
- Specialists work with the teams at times and individually at times.

Facilities
- There are 3 large open spaces approximately equivalent to 9 regular classrooms.
- The unified arts team has an open space approximately half the size of the learning centers.
- The learning centers surround an IMC with unrestricted access.
- A commons area with stage can be enclosed with a movable divided curtain.
- There is a large team planning area.
- Other specialized learning centers are isolated.

Funding
- Approximately $100,000 from an ESEA Title III grant were utilized.
In the late 1950's and early 1960's, the superintendent of schools was discussing innovative ideas for schools in the district with a number of staff members on an informal basis. The current director of special services recalled that when he first came to the district as high school principal in September 1962, the superintendent was talking specifically about innovations for junior high school students and the possibility of meeting the district's future space needs by developing middle schools. Included in the general discussion was the concept of team teaching.

In the period of the next several years, the board of education submitted a bond issue for the construction of several schools for the middle grades to a referendum of the voters. The concept of the middle school was not delineated at the time of the referendum. The superintendent convinced the board of education to use the consultant services of Educational Facilities Laboratories in planning the school buildings. The progressive nature of the facility concepts expoused by this institution coupled with the rather general innovative program ideas of the superintendent emerged in the development of open space building for team teaching in the school investigated.

In the summer of 1965, a conference was held on team teaching for all teachers in the school district. The current director of special services, who was high school principal at the time, planned and directed the conference. Resource persons brought in for the conference were from districts which had developed the Trump Plan of
school organization. They included principals and team leaders. Following general lectures presented by the resource persons, they organized small discussion groups. The consultants also provided information regarding resource materials for general reading.

During the conference the superintendent and the architect presented to the teachers the plans for the school investigated and expressed their desire to have the building ready by September 1966. The superintendent solicited the support of the teachers in the development of the specific aspects of the program. Some teachers reacted very favorably while others immediately began to resist the idea.

Although prior to this the superintendent freely discussed team teaching with his administrative assistants, the high school principal, and the junior high school principals, he made no particular effort to include teachers in the discussions. The presentation of the building plans at the workshop was the first substantial effort to inform the teachers of the emerging plans.

Neither did the superintendent make any specific effort to involve the community in the decision or to inform them of the development of the middle school, but he talked about general school developments with a number of community residents. From these associations the word began to spread throughout the community. News articles began to appear shortly after the 1965 summer workshop and increased as the actual construction of the building got underway.
A number of significant events in the development of team teaching in the middle school followed the summer workshop. Beginning with the 1965-66 school year, the district employed a director of curriculum, who had just completed studies toward a Ph.D. degree. At the same time the current director of special services was promoted from high school principal to director of research and development. These two persons, along with the director of business affairs, completed the central office assistance staff for the superintendent.

In October of that year the superintendent suffered a heart attack. He was unable to return to work until December. He suffered a second heart attack approximately a month after his return and was forced to resign from his position. This left the central office staff without the person who had been the major developer of the middle school, and the school was scheduled to open the following September. Many of the routine administrative responsibilities assumed by the superintendent had to be taken over by his assistants, giving them even less time to devote to preparing for the innovative middle school.

To prepare the teachers for their responsibilities, the central office and junior high administrators began to meet after school to develop the program with those teachers who were interested in becoming a part of the teaching teams. From this point teacher involvement in preparing for team teaching became rather extensive,
somewhat by default rather than by design. During this period central office administrators were unsuccessful on several attempts to secure federal funds for training personnel for the new school.

News articles appeared more frequently as the middle school began to take on physical form. These were the main source of information for the community concerning the new program that was soon to begin.

In selecting staff members for the new school, only those teachers in the existing junior high school and upper elementary grades who were interested in team teaching were assigned to the school. Those who had no interest at all were assigned to either the high school, remained as teachers in the elementary schools, or left the district. After the 1966-67 school year, the central office and building-level administrators encouraged (if not forced) teachers who did not appear to be working out successfully on a team to transfer either to another team or to another position in the school district. A number were transferred. In recruiting additional teachers, an effort was made to employ only those who were interested in team teaching and were judged to be competent or potentially so.

The new building was not completed by September 1966, and team teaching was begun in the old junior high school building. The entire staff was organized in teams but only the team who had been functioning for several years in the old junior high school experienced any degree of success. In November the school was moved into the new facility. Throughout the 1966-67 school year meetings with teachers
continued, led by both central office and school administra-

tors.

In December a proposal for Title III funds for training
staff for the innovative school was again submitted. This time
the effort succeeded and the project was funded, effective May 1,
1967. A Ph.D. candidate from a university in the state was hired
as project coordinator. As outlined in the proposal a steering
committee consisting of the project coordinator, middle school
administrators, and six middle school teachers began functioning
before the end of the school year. This committee assumed the
major responsibility for organizing a staff assistance program to
be undertaken during the next three years. The project coordinator
and the building administrators provided the specific leadership.
The general guidelines were outlined in the funded proposal developed
by the director of curriculum.

Workshops were a major component of the developed staff
training program. They were conducted for the next three summers
beginning with a four-week workshop in the summer of 1967, continuing
with a three-week workshop in the summer of 1968, and culminating
with a two-week workshop in the summer of 1969. Called upon to assist
in the summer workshops were a number of consultants of considerable
repute. In addition to speaking in general terms about team teaching
and other innovations during the first summer workshop, these
consultants were available for consultation with each of the teams,
who met in planning sessions to develop the program for the coming year.
Emphasis was placed on developing individual learning packets for students. The workshops maintained this general format throughout the three summers but toward the end of the period more time was devoted to team planning and less to stimulation by consultants.

A second means used to develop staff competencies was the program of visitation to other schools with similar innovative programs. Visitation began during the 1965-66 school year when the middle school was being constructed. A limited number of teachers visited programs and attended conferences that year. These visitations continued on a limited basis during 1966-67. With the addition of federal funds in 1967-68, every teacher visited several schools. The visitation program continued as a major activity through 1968-69 and diminished somewhat during 1969-70. Visits to other schools were supplemented with an exchange program in which the teachers exchanged assignments with teachers in other schools for a week at a time. These visitations and exchange programs occurred on a wide geographical base and included many of the nation's reputable schools.

A third means used to assist the teachers in adopting team teaching was the emphasis placed on supporting activities during the school year. The project coordinator and the principal of the school spent many hours with the teams. The project coordinator, particularly, was available to assist teams in solving their problems and to serve as a disseminator of information to them. Each year several days were devoted to in-service activities during the regular year. Quality consultants were secured for some of these sessions. Other sessions were devoted to team planning.
A final means used in the effort to assist teachers in the adoption of team teaching was the high degree of involvement of teachers after the initial decision to have team teaching. This evolved partly as a result of the predicament of school administrators when the superintendent became ill during the 1965-66 school year. It was also a part of the design of the Title III project. The project called for the appointment of six teachers to the nine-member steering committee. The two principals of the middle school have also given considerable autonomy to the teaching teams. Teams have decided such things as the priorities for curriculum development, the schedule of students assigned to them, and the particular means of evaluation used. When the current principal took office beginning with the 1969-70 school year, he organized a school building steering committee consisting of the heads of teams, the counselor, and himself. This building-level committee played a major role in decisions relative to how the Title III funds were spent in the building.

While the activities pertaining to preparing students and parents for the initial opening of the new school were rather limited, soon after the program got underway school administrators and the project coordinator recognized the need for disseminating information to parents in order to combat the mounting resistance to the innovative program. They used several means. Newspaper coverage continued and remained quite favorable. The principal and counselor established daytime seminars for small groups of parents. The seminars consisted of a series of meetings, the first of which focused on the general
philosophy and program of the school. At other meetings the group discussed the particular problems of students and parents regarding the program and observed the school program in action.

The project staff prepared a number of handouts for parents. One of these dealt with answers to questions parents frequently ask. Finally, parents were invited to visit the school by appointment. The parent education program developed during the early years of the federal grant has lessened considerably. The more recent focus has been on parents of fifth graders and newcomers to the school district.

Since the opening of the school, the primary emphasis on student preparation was focused on fifth graders in the feeder schools. During the latter part of their fifth grade year, students were taken in small groups to the middle school for a day where a teacher and selected students helped them to become acquainted with the program. This procedure continued for about a week until all the fifth graders had the opportunity to visit, and culminated with an open house the following Sunday for students and their parents. At the open house, teachers explained the general program of the school, became acquainted with parents, and interacted with them on a rather informal basis.

Those interviewed noted two means as the major contributors to success of the program. The first was the ambitious visitation program made possible through federal funds. The second was the
degree of involvement and autonomy of teaching teams after the decision to adopt team teaching was made by administrators in a rather arbitrary fashion.

A major shortcoming noted by those interviewed was that not enough emphasis was given to the development of community support early in the adoption effort. Also noted was the lack of preparation of staff members for the first year of operation prior to receipt of the federal grant.
Case Six: Intermediate School

Intermediate schools in the district: 1

School enrollment: 525

Vertical organization: 6-8

Support personnel: Principal, counselor, 2 secretaries

Teachers: 22

Teachers on functioning teams: 15

Team aides: 5

Team organization

- There are 2 interdisciplinary and 4 disciplinary teams.
- The interdisciplinary teams have 4 teachers and 1 aide each.
- The four disciplinary teams have 2 teachers and 1 aide half-time.
- The art, music, and physical education teachers are not functioning members of teams.

Team functions

- Each team has 48 minutes during the school day for planning and evaluating.
- Approximately half of the teachers actually teach together most of the time. An additional fourth teach together periodically. The rest seldom do.
- The extent to which team planning and evaluating time is devoted to team efforts corresponds to their teaching patterns.
- Evaluation focuses about equally on program and students, but together they amount to less than the planning time.

Facilities

- There are 2 pods of classrooms each with a planning center in the middle. The rooms are separated by walls.
- The science teaching stations are in a cluster with laboratories and lecture rooms next to each other. The lecture rooms revolve to become part of the auditorium.
- Each team has its own planning area.
- There are 2 large-group instruction spaces.
- The IMC is located in the center and is open.
- The remaining teaching spaces are traditional.

Funding

- The program has been funded entirely through local means.
Conditions in the district's two elementary schools had become impossibly crowded. Three bond issues for a new intermediate unit had failed. After the third defeat at the polls, the board finally agreed to the superintendent's suggestion to appoint a citizens' advisory committee to study the problems associated with the referendum failure. The committee numbered approximately twenty members.

During the 1966-67 school year, while the advisory committee was studying the problem, under the direction of the superintendent the board began thinking about the possibility of developing a new type school building for a considerably different educational program. At the time, one of the current teachers in the school, who was originally a resident of the school district, was attending a college in a city nearby. In the course of his studies he came in contact with a school space consultant who had formerly been with Educational Facilities Laboratories. The young man was extremely impressed with this consultant. Fully aware of the facility problems in his home district, he wrote a letter to the superintendent and the board, recommending they contact the school space consultant. The superintendent and the board accepted the suggestion and were so impressed with the consultant they hired him to assist them in their school building problem.

The superintendent and the consultant met a number of times to discuss the intermediate school facility needs of the school district. The consultant also met with the citizens' advisory
committee and the teachers of the upper grades in the elementary schools. In the meetings with the consultant, the superintendent recalled that he expressed an educational philosophy to the consultant and the consultant came up with the general building design.

The same year at an AASA convention, the superintendent met in several study groups on middle schools and collected ideas about middle school programs. Upon his return he wrote to a number of individuals he had met at the convention and asked for materials relative to their middle school programs.

In these early stages of development, the notion of team teaching began to take form as a major component of the educational program for the new school. Interested teachers in the upper grades of the elementary schools in the district also played a major role in the development of the notion. Several meetings were held for these teachers. The most significant recalled by the teachers interviewed were the stimulating meetings led by the consultant in which he used audio visual aids to present a number of innovations. Others were devoted to general discussions regarding developments in the building program led by the superintendent.

After a year of study the citizens' advisory committee recommended that the board submit a fourth bond issue to the voters for constructing a school building to house a new type of program for the intermediate age students. This concurred with the thinking of the board, the superintendent, and the teachers. The issue was
submitted in December 1967. It passed by a 66 per cent majority and plans for the building began to take final form.

During the remainder of the 1967-68 and 1968-69 school years, additional consultants were employed to lead in-service training workshop meetings. One was the principal of a middle school in a neighboring state, and another was the assistant superintendent for instruction in a school district with an innovative middle school program. These meetings were held for all teachers on released time from school responsibilities.

A number of meetings were also held after school for all those teachers who were interested in assisting in the development of the specifics of the program. One of the principals of the elementary schools chaired this committee of interested teachers. The superintendent and the chairman of the committee visited several schools with team teaching and other innovations to explore the dimensions of their programs. Interested teachers also visited at least one school to observe team teaching in progress. Many teachers visited more than one school. These schools were generally located close enough to the district to limit the visit to one day of school time. Substitutes were hired to replace the teachers while they were gone on visitations.

Another means used to prepare teachers for team teaching was the opportunity for several teachers to function as a team. The sixth grade teachers in one of the elementary schools developed a team teaching operation during the 1968-69 school year. Teachers in the building and in the district had the opportunity to see this pilot project in operation.
As the school neared completion and final assignments for staff members were being prepared, the principal who chaired the committee of interested teachers and was to become principal of the new school resigned. The superintendent of schools and representatives of the committee selected the staff for the new building and organized the teams. All teachers interested in teaching in the new building were invited to become members of the staff. Several chose to remain in the elementary school and several left the district. The superintendent selected a candidate from outside the school district, a recent graduate from a doctoral program, as the new principal.

When the new principal took office in July, several vacant positions remained to be filled. Candidates with interest and competence in team teaching were sought but the supply of such was limited.

The principal requested and was granted two days of workshops in addition to the two days for all teachers in the school district scheduled during the week before the opening of school. Teachers were paid for the extra days. The principal used the four days to become acquainted with teachers, discuss the purpose of team teaching, and develop behavioral objectives for the particular assignments of each team. He also explained the school schedule and the team teaching assignments which he had altered considerably from those prepared by the committee during the preceding school year. He noted that to have followed through on their plans without considerably more pretraining would have been disastrous.
Preparation activities for parents and the community were not nearly as organized as those for teachers. The use of the citizens' advisory committee, which endorsed the plan of the innovative building from the beginning, seems to also have been a major contributing factor in preparing the community. The superintendent felt these committee members did much to win the support of the community in general. Moreover, the school building made a favorable impression on the correspondents for the two newspapers read locally. The superintendent noted: "We got the ear of the press and coverage was favorable whereas previously, the coverage of the press had been detrimental to us."

The only activity occurring to prepare students was the general explanation given to them in the old elementary schools concerning their assignments for the next year. This was by default rather than by design, the superintendent noted.

Leadership for the program to assist staff members in the adoption of team teaching after installation in September 1969 came from the principal. He made appointments to meet with the teams during their planning sessions and provided direction in developing the educational program. At other times the teams called on him to assist them. He made a major effort to keep dialogue moving among the team members. As he had anticipated, inter-personal relationships among team members became a major problem, and he frequently visited teams with the single intention of keeping
communication flowing even though he did not expect to accomplish anything by way of program development with these teams.

In April and May two half-day workshop sessions on team teaching were scheduled. These workshops focused on evaluating the progress made in team teaching and discussing the organizational problems of grouping students and teachers.

The program to assist parents and community in accepting team teaching in the school consisted of two types of activities. Beginning one week prior to the opening of school and continuing for six consecutive weeks, the principal and staff prepared news releases concerning the educational program of the school. These appeared in both newspapers read in the local community. In September a meeting was held for parents at which the principal explained the basic philosophy and the underlying principles of the program. A second meeting was held in October at which time parents met with the teachers of their children. During this particular meeting, the teachers focused on the particular objectives and methodologies used for instruction. In January an open house was held for displaying the building to both parents and the community.

Two types of activities were conducted to assist students in adjusting to the educational program. An assembly was held early in September in which the principal and several teachers explained the program to the students. Later in the year a second assembly was held in which students were given the opportunity to share their
grievances. A panel of teachers and the principal responded to these grievances before the student body. When asked why these particular means were used to assist parents, community, and students to adjust to the team teaching program, the principal responded: "I don't know."

Those interviewed agreed that the means used which was most important in the success of the program was teachers' involvement in the initial considerations for the new school. On several occasions the principal referred to the tremendous enthusiasm for team teaching this involvement created among the teachers. A second item frequently mentioned was the new facility, particularly the arrangement of several of the teaching stations which surround teacher work areas.

On the contrary, the efforts to prepare staff prior to installing team teaching were not sufficiently extensive, most of those interviewed noted. The principal felt he should have spent more time planning with the teams. He stated that there was a lack of administrative leadership during the 18 months preceding the installation of team teaching. Finally, he cited the lack of emphasis devoted to preparing teachers for inter-personal conflicts that are characteristic of team organizations.
Middle schools in the district: 1
School enrollment: 497
Vertical organization: 5-7
Support personnel: Principal, secretary
Teachers: 18
Teachers on functioning teams: 18
Team aides: Three with teams and 2 in the IMC

Team organization
- There are 4 interdisciplinary teams with 4-5 teachers each plus at least 1 aide.
- Three are grade level teams.
- The fourth is the unified arts team.

Team processes
- The three grade level teams teach together much of the time, although their skills in functioning as a team vary.
- The unified arts team consists of several sub-teams; some function more frequently as a team than others.
- Each team has approximately 80 minutes during the school day for planning and evaluating.
- More time is devoted to planning than to evaluating both students and program.

Facilities
- The building has 3 open-space areas equivalent to 4-5 classrooms each.
- The fine and practical arts area is equivalent to 2 classrooms.
- These areas surround the IMC and are separated by partial walls and furniture arrangement.
- The music and physical education stations are isolated.

Funding
- A $4,000 grant was received from a private foundation to assist in staff development.
A bond issue for the construction of an elementary school was submitted to the voters of the school district and approved in November 1967. Even before the referendum, the superintendent began to consider an alternative way of meeting the school building needs. General discussions with the board of education and several members of the administrative staff led to seriously considering the development of a middle school. One principal was on leave of absence for a year of study at a nearby university. On several occasions the superintendent and he discussed the pros and cons of the middle school and an innovative type facility to house the program. The superintendent also discussed the possibility of an innovative type facility with members of an architectural firm.

At the January 1968 meeting of the board of education, the board selected the architectural firm, directed the superintendent to investigate building plans for a middle school, and asked him to present a plan to them for consideration at the March meeting. Pursuant to this request the superintendent decided to also involve members of the elementary and junior high teaching staffs and the high school guidance counselor in the planning for the new building.

The superintendent called a meeting of these persons and the elementary and junior high school principals. At this meeting he informed the teachers of the developments to date and briefed them on the financial limitations that had been placed on the building project by the amount of the bond issue. He then presented a sketch of an
open space building which he had developed and a period of
discussion followed. Finally, the superintendent invited all
interested persons to join the administrators in forming a planning
committee to continue developing the new middle school.

Members of the architectural firm assigned to the project
became quite excited with the possibility of developing an innovative
type building. Near the end of January 1968 two members of the
architectural firm, the superintendent, the chairman of the planning
committee (who was the principal on leave of absence) and the
guidance counselor visited two open space middle schools in a
school district elsewhere in the state. The next afternoon, a seminar
was held in the office of the architects to further consider program
development for the middle school and to critique some general
drawings prepared by the architects. The seminar was attended by
members of the planning committee, who were released from their
school assignments to attend the seminar, and six members of the
architectural firm. The first hour of the seminar consisted of a panel
discussion involving four area educators: two were superintendents
of the schools with innovative middle school programs and two professors
of educational administration in a nearby university. The panel
discussed possible program elements for the middle school and how the
district might proceed to prepare its staff for these innovations.
A general discussion followed during the second hour.
At the February 1968 meeting of the board of education, the superintendent presented plans for an open space middle school which included three learning centers surrounding a large instructional materials center. The proposal recommended the entire area be carpeted, air-conditioned, and without windows in the learning centers. At this point several members of the board questioned the advisability of carpeting and air-conditioning. To allay these doubts and arguments, arrangements were made for the board to visit the two innovative middle schools in the state previously visited by the architects and the administrators. As a result several members became ardent backers of these innovations and all members supported the notions. Most helpful also was the AASA convention at Atlantic City where the board members were able to acquire even more information about innovations in school facilities.

The task of developing the details of the educational program for the new facility within the broad parameters of an innovative middle school fell to the planning committee under the general leadership of the former elementary principal who was appointed principal of the middle school. While on leave of absence until the end of the 1967-68 school year, the appointed principal focused part of his study time on the elements of a middle school program. He attended several conferences on the middle school and began a collection of materials for dissemination to the staff. The committee began regular meetings which continued primarily on an after-school
basis throughout the next school year. The development of the program and the preparation of faculty members to staff that program occurred concurrently during the remainder of the 1967-68 school year and throughout the 1968-69 school year.

One of the primary means used to fulfill both these ends was a rather extensive visitation program undertaken by members of the committee. The visitations began in the spring of 1968 and continued throughout the next school year. All members of the committee visited at least one school and most of them visited several. Substitutes were employed out of general school funds and expenses were reimbursed.

Workshops and after-school work sessions were a major part of the means to prepare the staff for the new school. The appointed principal attended a number of seminars on various phases of middle school programs. After-school work sessions consisted of such activities as viewing films and filmstrips, and discussing potential components of the emerging program identified in the visual aids, the literature and visits to other schools. Team teaching emerged as a major component of the program during the course of these activities.

In selecting the staff to teach in the middle school, members of the planning committee and the appointed principal administered questionnaires to all teachers in the district whose teaching positions would be affected by the development of the middle school. The teachers were asked whether they were interested in becoming
members of teaching teams in the new middle school. They were also asked to indicate their interest and expertise in subject matter areas, their preference regarding the age level of students, and the names of persons they might have difficulty working with on a team. A number of teachers unfortunately did not answer the latter question, and personality incompatibility among appointed team members proved to be a problem the next year.

Using the responses to the questionnaires, the principal and superintendent made the team appointments. Persons who did not wish to teach in the middle school and those judged to lack the necessary competencies for team teaching were assigned to the high school or to elementary schools. Several teachers left the district and several additional persons were recruited.

In June 1969 approximately a dozen of the appointed middle school teachers attended a curriculum development seminar at a nearby university. Their expenses were covered by a small grant received from a private foundation.

The following August a one-week workshop was held in the new building prior to the opening of school. During the workshop, final plans were made for the teams' responsibilities. Outside consultants assisted team members in becoming acquainted with the equipment and facilities of the new building. Other consultants discussed the specific process involved in setting up educational
objectives and in preparing learning packets for individual students. The additional insight acquired by several members of the faculty who had been on leave of absence for advanced study during the previous school year also were utilized.

During the early phases of the development of the middle school, the local newspaper took a very negative position. In an editorial the superintendent was referred to as a "dreamer." Several groups of parents were taken to visit the two innovative buildings referred to earlier. The superintendent, the principal, and selected teachers formed a panel to address various groups in the community throughout the 1968-69 school year. Through these appearances they attempted to keep the community abreast of the developments as they emerged. In the summer of 1969, just prior to the opening of the school, the principal met with approximately 30 groups of 10-15 parents each. The meetings, held in the junior high school, consisted primarily of dialogue between the parents and the principal in which the principal attempted to answer the questions raised by parents. The meetings culminated by a tour of the incompleted facilities at the middle school.

Assistance to staff members following the installation of team teaching in the fall of 1969 included a number of the same types of activities utilized in the preparation program previous to September. Attendance at conferences continued, particularly for those new teachers who had been selected for appointment to the
teams but whose only preparation was the August workshop. The new persons also visited schools. The principal succeeded in developing and maintaining a non-threatening atmosphere to encourage teachers to step out in new directions as they developed curriculum in their teaching teams.

In January 1970, a three-day seminar on the middle school was conducted in the new facility. A national authority on the middle school led the seminar for the district's teachers in grades 4-8. School districts from the surrounding area were invited to send participants. Several such individuals did attend on a fee basis. The seminar focused primarily on program development within a team organization. Students were dismissed for the duration of the seminar.

Community criticism of the new program did not develop to any great extent. The school principal maintained a rather open atmosphere in his relationships with parents. Both the principal and the teachers gave considerable time to concerned parents, on the telephone as well as in conference situations. A number of parents visited the school, which they were encouraged to do. The local newspaper changed its earlier position and printed rather favorable articles in behalf of the school.

Basic means used in preparing staff members were defended by both the superintendent and the principal in the interviews
based on their belief that teachers must be involved in the development of an innovative educational program if the program is to succeed. The teachers interviewed responded very positively relative to their involvement in the development of the program. Both administrators and the teachers noted the benefits received from the numerous consultants, seminars, and visits to other buildings. Finally, the teachers also referred to the benefits they have received from the open-minded attitude of the principal toward further curriculum development and program refinement.
Case Eight: Senior High School

Senior high schools in the district: 1

School enrollment: 1,227

Vertical organization: 9-12

Support personnel: Principal, assistant principal, 3 counselors, 3 secretaries

Teachers: 58

Teachers on functioning teams: 31 regularly; others partially

Team aides: Six assigned to resource centers and study areas; 1 assists English teacher

Team organization

- Set A: Ten two-member teams in English, social studies, chemistry and agriculture.
- Set B: Additional two-member team in English--1 teacher and one aide.
- Set C: Three additional teams in physical education and health (3 members), physical education and safety (3 members), bookkeeping (5 members), and biology (2 members).

Team processes

- Teachers in Set A and B teach together regularly in large-group instruction. They plan together for all their teaching and evaluate students together some.
- Teachers in Set C teach together less frequently. They plan together for additional activities and do some common evaluating of program and students. They do this before and after school.
- Many of the remaining teachers plan together to some extent but teach together only occasionally.

Facilities

- All large and most small-group instruction occurs in appropriate spaces in the new addition to the building.
- The new addition also includes a large IMC and teacher planning stations.
- The rest of the facility is arranged in a traditional manner.

Funding

- The program has been funded entirely through regular means.
When the present superintendent took office in the school district in the summer of 1966, the district was faced with an expanding high school enrollment and the need to build additional facilities. He began working on the problem and concluded that a flexible type facility should be provided to enable program development in the subsequent years. He was successful in convincing the board of education to explore some new ideas. He took them to visit several schools in the area with facilities designed for innovative program concepts.

The principal of the high school at the time had one year remaining until retirement. The board of education, upon recommendation of the superintendent, employed an assistant principal with the intention of having that person work on curriculum development for a year and then take over the principalship of the school. One of the criteria used in selecting the assistant principal was his interest in and appraised competency for developing the educational program in conjunction with the facility expansion under consideration.

Beginning with the 1966-67 school year the superintendent, the assistant superintendent, the assistant principal and the director of guidance were involved in a number of discussions relative to educational program development and the new facility. During the next 18 months this leadership team read widely about innovative practices, traveled to a number of innovative schools, and discussed procedures that should be followed in developing the facility and the educational program to be housed in it.
Teachers were not directly involved in the deliberations up to this point. Their involvement began during January 1968. In a written memorandum, the superintendent informed the teachers of the decision to construct an addition to the high school and to have a series of workshops led by a consultant from a state university to assist teachers and administrators in curriculum development to accompany the building addition. The workshops were conducted on four afternoons in February, March, April and May. The first of these four sessions dealt with the establishment of the need for change in American secondary schools. The consultant used audio-visual aids in presenting this need. The elementary and junior high school teachers also attended this meeting. The second, third and fourth meetings focused on particular innovations that might be applicable to the high school and only the high school teachers attended. Among the innovations discussed were flexible modular scheduling, team teaching, independent study, and individualized instruction.

Beginning with these workshops, primary leadership for the development of the program for the new facility was assumed by the former assistant principal who had taken over the principalship of the school the previous September. The director of counseling played a major assistantship role to the principal while the superintendent and assistant superintendent remained in the background.
Several other developments occurred during the course of these workshops. One, departments met after school on numerous occasions to talk about the specific needs of their departments and how these needs could be met in light of the innovations presented. Two, reading materials were collected and disseminated to staff members. The director of counseling played a major role in collecting and disseminating these materials. Three, teachers were encouraged to visit other schools with team teaching since team teaching had emerged as one of the major program developments by the end of the school year. Some teachers visited several schools while others were not interested in visiting at all. The principal and director of guidance selected the schools for these visitations based on the knowledge acquired in general reading and visitations and the advice of the consultant. Four, plans for the building addition were shown to the teachers. These plans called for an air-conditioned, open-space facility with large-group and small-group instruction spaces, faculty work areas, an instructional materials center, and some additional teaching stations for medium-size groups. Five, two United States history teachers and two English teachers began to cooperate in their teaching efforts and developed two functioning teams who continued to expand their competencies in team teaching throughout the following year.

Development of the innovative program continued throughout the 1968-69 school year. By mid-year specific plans for the 1969-70
school year were beginning to emerge. Department chairmen played a major role in the development of these plans. The administrators had decided to encourage all teachers to function in teaching teams but not to force anyone into team teaching. The only exception to the principle of individual choice occurred in the English department where the department decided to be organized entirely on a team basis. The administrators made their decision based on the advice and general insight gathered from visiting other schools and from reading materials.

Selection of staff for the 1969-70 school year did not require the addition of many teachers. The few additional teachers employed were selected on the basis of their interest in team teaching and their appraised competency for the same. Several teachers decided to leave the district.

The administration began to inform the community of the developments that were occurring at the time of the scheduled in-service training program midway through the 1967-68 school year. Local newspaper coverage of the development was quite extensive. Releases prepared almost entirely by the school administration appeared on numerous occasions. In January 1968, the in-service training program scheduled for the next several months and related dismissal of students for the afternoon meetings was reported in the newspaper.
Concurrently, the administration also launched a rigorous community relations program. Requests for appearances at local clubs and civic groups of many kinds began to increase as news releases appeared. The superintendent, the assistant superintendent, the current principal, and the director of guidance all played a major role in the program. The director of guidance recalled, "We talked to anyone who would listen to us." The administration felt the community relations activities were very necessary if the program was to succeed since the community had not experienced any major changes for a number of years.

The efforts to prepare students were quite extensive. The appearance of several teaching teams during the 1967-68 and 1968-69 school years were helpful in preparing students for the change. Toward the end of the 1968-69 school year, the principal and the director of guidance spoke to students in study hall about the general dimensions of the program and how they would be affected, and took them on tours of the new facilities, which were still in the process of being completed. By this time, the director of guidance recalled, students were becoming quite enthusiastic about the program.

A pre-registration was held in August 1969 at which students were given their schedules and the director of guidance explained them. She also gave the students several rather elaborate handouts which she had prepared. These detailed the various aspects
of the innovative program, focusing on team teaching among other things. Also included in the handouts were rather specific directions on what was expected of students within the new school environment.

Following installation of team teaching in September 1969, several specific activities occurred to assist teachers in the adoption of the innovation. Several teacher committees met throughout the year. One committee consisting of representatives of each department met to improve the coordination of the program development efforts occurring in each of the departments. Another focused on evaluating the program from the perspective of students. A third dealt with evaluating the program from the teachers' perspective. The latter committee was in the process of finalizing a report at the time of the field investigation. The principal and the director of counseling provided assistance to teams when requested to do so. Department chairmen also played a major role in assisting members of their departments. Program development within each department continued in after-school meetings throughout the year.

The committee working with evaluating the program from the students' perspective conducted the evaluation at a point approximately midway through the school year. As a result of this evaluation and of feedback on a less formal basis, modifications of the program occurred. One of the modifications related to the development of additional independent study activities for students assigned to teams.
Soon after the opening of school in September, an open house was held for parents. They were given tours of the new facility. Additional news releases appeared throughout the year and some requests for speakers at various clubs continued.

The interviewees identified several specific means utilized in the adoption which they believe made a significant contribution to the success of the program. The general enthusiasm of certain teachers who were very successful in team teaching served as an impetus to others to further develop their team efforts, the principal noted. Both teachers and administrators noted the generally positive attitude toward the approach of providing a situation where individuals could team teach if they so desired rather than forcing them into team teaching against their will.

The interviewees also spoke freely of what they believed to be shortcomings in the means used in implementing the innovation. Among the specific items mentioned was the lack of attention paid to the development of specific curricular content for the teaching teams. Teachers felt they simply did not have sufficient time to prepare for the major changes required of them. Administrators concurred. Both administrators and teachers felt teachers should have been involved earlier in the general planning for the innovation, and consultants should have been used more during the trial facet. Finally, the principal felt more specific direction should have been given to teachers to encourage them to develop their competencies in team teaching even further.
Case Nine: Senior High School

Senior high schools in the district: 12

School enrollment: 1,300

Vertical organization: 10-12

Support personnel: Principal, vice-principal, 3 counselors, 2 secretaries

Teachers: 50

Teachers on functioning teams: 35

Team aides: 0

Team organization
  . Teams exist in the major academic disciplines.
  . Teams vary in size; 2-4 members per team is common.
  . The teams inter-relate on a department level basis primarily.

Team processes
  . Teams teach together in large-group instruction generally for 2, 30-minute periods per week.
  . Teams teach together occasionally in laboratories.
  . Teams have scheduled planning and evaluation time for 30-45 minutes after school each day, but it is doubtful that many use it regularly.
  . Most of the time is devoted to planning but some is devoted to student and program evaluation.
  . Groups of teams plan and evaluate together in department meetings to a minor extent.

Facilities
  . The building is arranged into large-group instruction spaces, small-group instruction spaces, and labs for groups and individuals.
  . There is an instructional materials center with various types of study spaces and seminar rooms.
  . Team planning spaces and a student commons are included.

Funding
  . The program has been funded entirely through regular means.
Interest in team teaching began in the school district in the late 1950's and early 1960's. The continued efforts in curriculum development of a group of school district personnel and faculty members from a university in an adjoining state led to a new high school with many innovations including team teaching. The school opened in the fall of 1964.

In 1965 the district began its second major building program of the decade. In shaping the specifics of the high school phase of the building program, a number of committees consisting of central office administrators, directors, and supervisors; principals; and teachers began a series of meetings. The final products of the committees' efforts were submitted to the executive curriculum council for the school district, which is chaired by the associate superintendent for instruction. In essence, these efforts recommended that the better aspects of the innovative high school in the district plus additional curriculum developments should be developed in all high schools in the district, particularly those built as a part of the building program. The executive curriculum council established the recommendations as general policy.

A new building of the school investigated was the first of the new buildings to be developed under the building program. Having decided at the central office level to include team teaching in the program of the school the decision was relayed to the principal early in 1968. The principal recalled being called into the central office along with another principal in a similar situation
and informed of the plans that had been made for the new school. The decision was not entirely news to him. Soon after the bond issue was passed, he had begun to hear rumors about the type of program and building that was being considered for the new high schools, but he insisted he had no part in making the decision. The principal relayed the contents of the decision to his staff.

As central office personnel continued to plan for the new school, the principal and the chairmen of the departments were consulted. Both contended their opinions had very little impact on the continued decisions of the central administration. After the department of secondary education, assisted by many other central office personnel, had finalized the basic program elements to be included, the primary responsibility for developing the program in detail was placed in the hands of the principal and the department heads. They received some assistance from various persons on the central office staff. The extent of the assistance from central office personnel and the general quality of that assistance was viewed differently by the two groups. The associate superintendent for instruction felt the central office staff had acquired considerable competency from their experiences with team teaching in the existing innovative school in the district and were able to lend valuable assistance to the departments as they developed their programs. The principal and the teachers interviewed felt they received little significant assistance from the central office staff.
Several specific means were used in preparing the staff for team teaching. For the school year 1968-69, the five days of in-service training for all teachers in the district were used by the school staff to develop the specifics of the program. Additional meetings occurred almost weekly on an after-school basis. An educational consultant from a university in a neighboring state, who had assisted with the development of the new facility, presented a general overview of the educational program to the staff. Both the consultant and the principal and assistant principal used audio visual aids to assist in introducing faculty members to specific concepts related to team teaching in the course of these meetings.

The assistant principal led in developing a collection of literature for circulation among the staff members during the course of the year. Consultants from the central office staff assisted the various departments and teams within departments as they developed the specific details of the program at the department level. Several staff members from the innovative high school in the district provided some assistance to the staff during this time. The staff also participated in some of the school district's in-service training programs through this year.

As the school year drew to a close, it became apparent that the new facility would not be ready for occupancy by September 1969. This provided some additional time for preparation which the staff welcomed.
Another major component of the staff preparation program included visitation to other schools who had embarked on similar programs. These visitations began soon after the announcement of the new school was given to the teachers and continued through the 1968-69 school year. The department heads all visited at least one school and several visited more than one. A limited number of teachers within the departments visited other schools. In all, less than 25 per cent of the current staff made visitations outside the school district.

In selecting the staff for the new program, teachers who did not wish to team teach had the option to request transfers to other schools in the district. Requests for transfer to the new school were also open to other teachers in the district, but there was very little shift of personnel. The principal felt the few additional persons secured for the school by the central office staff were not selected on the basis of an appraisement of their ability to work in a team teaching situation. The associate superintendent for instruction noted they made no attempt to provide a staff at the school that was in any way superior to the staffs in other high schools in the district.

In August 1969 a one-day workshop was held to develop specific plans for the new program. The staff used the day primarily in department level and team planning. Continuing through the first half of the 1969-70 school year, the in-service training days
included in the school calendar were again given to the school staff to develop as they felt necessary in preparing for the opening of the building. Most of the work during this period also focused on department level and team planning and curriculum development. Central office personnel continued to work with department chairmen and teachers in developing the specifics of the program. After-school meetings continued. As the schedule became finalized, some time was spent with the teachers in acquainting them with the details of the schedule which they had helped to develop throughout the previous academic year.

The general decision of the executive curriculum council to move in the direction of team teaching was communicated to the parents and the public by two primary means. Newspaper articles discussed the components of the program in a general way. The school's parent advisory committee was informed of the program and their support to the general public was solicited and granted. The principal spent many additional hours in conversation with parents during the development stages of the program.

In November, schedules were given to students. Counselors, administrators and teachers spent some time with them to explain the general aspect of the new program.

The new program was installed in January 1970. The assistance provided for staff members after the building opened was similar to that provided prior to the opening of the new facility. These
activities were led by the principal and the assistant principal. The department chairmen assumed much of the responsibility for specific assistance to staff members. Meetings of the entire faculty as well as department meetings continued. The faculty attended the district-wide, in-service program focusing on individualized instruction.

As the new program began its first days of operation, the principal, the assistant principal and some additional staff members made a specific attempt to explain the purpose of the program to parents and residents of the community. For the most part these discussions occurred informally. The school building was dedicated in April 1970. An open house followed the dedication program.

In noting the elements in the general approach and specific means he believed contributed most to the success of the program, the associate superintendent for instruction mentioned the involvement of the staff in the development of the specific details of the program. Moreover, he cited the usefulness of the experiences with the innovative school in the district on which many program elements in the school investigation were based in providing assistance for developing the program in the new school and in preparing the staff. Finally, he noted the importance of daily planning time for teams to meet, referring to the time provided at the end of the school day for this purpose.
The viewpoints of the associate superintendent were contradicted to some extent by staff members. When asked to enumerate the major shortcomings of the preparation program, staff members interviewed indicated they were given a general package by central office personnel and told to develop the specifics of the program without receiving adequate assistance. Some felt they should have had an entire summer of work sessions to help them prepare for their responsibilities. They felt they should have had considerably more opportunity to visit schools with successful team teaching programs, and all teachers should have been included in a visitation program rather than a select few. Finally, they believed the planning time at the end of each school day did not give them sufficient time for conducting all of the planning and evaluation activities necessary to operate a successful team teaching program.
Case Ten: Senior High School

Senior high schools in the district: 1
School enrollment: 650
Vertical organization: 9-12
Support personnel: Principal, assistant principal, counselor, secretary
Teachers: 33
Teachers on functioning teams: 20
Team aides: 1

Team organization
- There are 10 disciplinary teams of 2 members each.
- Since the curriculum is organized on a traditional disciplinary basis, teams exist only in those areas with more than 1 teacher.

Team processes
- Teams teach together primarily in large group instruction from 2-3 times per week.
- Teams have 80 minutes per week to plan and evaluate during the school day.
- The teams spend considerably more time planning than evaluating both students and program.
- Teachers plan together for the entire program, not just for the large-group meetings.

Facilities
- The building is mostly traditional but relatively new.
- Several large-group instruction spaces were constructed to accommodate the new program.
- The school has a modest instructional materials center.

Funding
- Approximately $40,000 of ESEA Title III funds were received over a two-year period.
For purposes of ESEA Title III the state in which this school is located has eight regions. In November 1966, the superintendents of the school districts in this particular region met to explore the possibility of participating in the program. Meeting with the superintendents was the director of the Title III program for the state department of education and a member of the faculty of one of the state universities. The superintendents decided to apply for a regional project. Based on the needs determined by a questionnaire survey circulated among school districts in the region, the group submitted a proposal for a planning grant to determine the needs more specifically. The proposal was funded beginning in July 1967. As an outgrowth of the planning project the superintendents applied for a project to establish an in-service innovation center for the district. The project was again approved and the Title III center became operational in September 1968. Superintendents in the region became the directors of the center and they employed a staff to operate it.

The general consensus among the directors and the staff of the Title III Center was that the development of a more productive in-service educational program for professional personnel in the schools in the region should have first priority. To accomplish this basic goal they chose to develop three model schools in the region to use as learning laboratories for the other schools. The school investigated was selected as the laboratory
high school. Upon the general recommendation of the superintendent and the school principal, the board of education agreed to permit the school to accept the appointment but committed no extra funds to the program.

In accepting the appointment, the principal and his staff were committed to undertake a rigorous examination of their educational program to identify the basic shortcomings and to commit themselves to improving the program by whatever means they deemed desirable. The benefit of their efforts were then to be shared with other high schools in the region.

The school staff entered into the first phase of the project development in October 1968. During the first phase the faculty focused on identifying problems. They met after school once each week for several months. After the first several meetings, the school staff was joined by staff representatives from other schools in the Title III district. After several months, attention focused on solutions to the identified problems. At one meeting, discussion focused on the use of consultants in identifying the solutions to the problems. At another meeting the group viewed a film on team teaching and heard progress reports by the chairman of various small groups which had been organized to study particular topics. In November a professor at a major university who was the former superintendent of a high school where team teaching had been developed, met with the school staff for a two-day workshop. They
were joined in the second afternoon session by the satellite school representatives. The consultant made a tremendous impact on the staff and built up their confidence in their ability to solve their problems.

Three Saturday clinics were held in January at which representatives from the satellite schools and the school staff further explored potential solutions to the problems they had identified. Additional consultants assisted them. The staff followed with additional after-school meetings in which they began to outline specific actions to be taken.

During the year, Title III funds were available for faculty members to visit schools who had found answers to these problems. The funds were used to employ substitutes and to pay travel expenses. The project coordinator from the regional Title III staff played a major role in locating the schools for visitation. Most of the teachers went on visitation at least once and some of them went twice. Several chose not to go at all and were not forced to do so.

Throughout the school year the project director and the principal furnished numerous reading materials dealing with the problems under discussion. They used many films and filmstrips in the various weekly staff meetings. They secured a number of additional consultants for these meetings.
At the November workshop the former superintendent of the high school with team teaching suggested the potential of team teaching as one facet of the solution to some of the problems the staff had identified. By late spring many staff members and the principal were convinced team teaching would be good for the school. Believing that it was time for a specific decision to be made, the principal and the staff decided to place the issue to a vote of the staff. They decided in advance to require a two-thirds majority vote to undertake the innovation. The vote turned out to be exactly two-thirds.

Having some second thoughts about the adequacy of this degree of support and about the availability of funds to schedule the school on a modular basis, the principal dropped the matter for the time being and proceeded to find out if funds could be secured to assist in developing such a schedule. By the end of the school year no final decision had been reached. When the Title III office agreed to pay for scheduling the school, the principal called back those teachers who lived in the area to reconsider their earlier decision. After reconsideration many of those teachers who previously had voted not to go into the program decided they would be willing to try it. The group reached consensus to proceed with the plans to install the program the next school year.

The number of teachers leaving the district was quite small and the staff for the next school year was nearly complete. The
several teachers employed to fill vacancies were informed of the staff's decision to move into the program and were selected accordingly. The principal arranged the teachers in teams. He attempted to base the appointments on what the teachers would like to teach and who might best function as a team.

In August a five-day workshop was held to prepare the staff for the new program. The first three days of the workshop included focus on general concepts related to team teaching. A film which dealt with some of the concepts was shown. The principal led a general discussion related to the various types of teaching situations involved in team teaching, e.g., large-group instruction, small-group instruction, independent study. During the last two days of the workshop, two consultants from the firm who prepared the schedule worked with teachers to help them understand the components of the schedule. On the last day of the conference two teacher consultants from a high school in a neighboring state who had been operating a similar program for several years held work sessions with each of the teaching teams. They focused on developing specific plans for their initial teaching assignment, including the development of behavioral objectives.

In August, even prior to the workshop, the principal decided to delay the installation of the program for several months after the beginning of the 1969-70 school year. The primary reasons for this delay was the fact that several additional large-group and
small-group instruction spaces were being added to the building and would not be completed by September. The staff welcomed this opportunity for more time to make specific plans before going into the program, which was initiated in November.

When asked why these particular means were used to prepare his staff, the principal of the school stated that a variety of specific means ought to be used in the development of a major change. Moreover, the proper approach to developing change is to focus on identifying the major shortcomings of the program and then to take the necessary steps to solve these inadequacies.

Preparation of students for the new program began during the spring of 1968-69 while the decision to adopt team teaching was being seriously considered. The principal encouraged the teachers to discuss the components of the program with students and solicit their reaction. Many complied. Students generally reacted quite favorably to the program. The principal also met with several different groups of students. Prior to the November initiation of the innovative program, the principal met with all the students in classroom-size groups, presented their schedules to them, and discussed the ramifications for the students' daily routine.

The program to prepare parents and the community was not very elaborate. Beginning with initial involvement of the school in the Title III project, notices were sent home to parents and news releases were provided for the local paper. A more specific
preparation activity occurred two weeks prior to the initiation of the program in November. The principal conducted a meeting for parents. The format of the meeting consisted of a presentation of the major ideas involved in team teaching followed by a question and answer period. Asked why more was done to prepare students than parents for the innovation, the principal replied that parental acceptance of a change is not a major problem if students accept it readily since students will sell their parents.

Following the actual beginning of the program in November, the primary means followed for assisting staff members and students consisted of general classroom visitation by the principal. He also worked with teams in developing their programs and tried to be sensitive to emerging conflicts between team members. Several of the team members gained additional impetus from being asked to help direct a workshop on team teaching at the state capital several months after they began team teaching. An evaluation form was prepared and administered to teachers at the end of the school year. They were asked to evaluate the program and indicate the major shortcomings. Finally, the students' point of view concerning the new program was also solicited by means of a questionnaire.

The philosophy of the principal toward the adoption of team teaching in the school led him to focus on the preparation aspect. Following proper orientation, one needs to permit the teachers to play the ball game for which they have prepared, he noted; teachers learn best by doing.
In referring to the basic shortcomings in the means used in the adoption, the principal mentioned that educational consultants should also have been used during the first year of operation. Teachers referred to the workshop with the former superintendent, the visits to other schools, and the assistance of the two teacher consultants in the August workshop as the most helpful aspects of the preparation program.
CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS OF THE CASES

This chapter has two primary purposes. The first is to develop a systematic approach to the problem of analyzing strategies and techniques utilized in the adoption of team teaching in the individual schools investigated. The second is to test its potential utility in a preliminary manner in answering the basic questions of the investigation stated in Chapter I.

A Model for the Analysis

The schema which appears in Figure 3 identifies the basic components of design for effecting change in individual schools. This schema extends some of the notions appearing in Chapter III. In the schema in Figure 3 individual components are designers who utilize means to achieve ends. Means consist of strategies; activities, procedures and events; and goals.

Activities, procedures and events in turn consist of conductors, techniques and recipients. Conductors are individuals or groups who are responsible for conducting or operationalizing these activities, procedures and events. Techniques are the fundamental means conductors utilize in these pursuits. Recipients are the individuals or groups on whom the activities and events focus.
Figure 3—A schema of the components of design for effecting change in schools
The goals to which the activities and events relate are a second component of the means. They vary and each consists of a number of objectives.

Strategies are a third component of the means. A strategy is the design of the components of activities, procedures and events utilized for the purpose of achieving a goal or set of goals related to the desired ends. Since conductors, techniques and recipients are the components of the activities, procedures and events, the former are also the primary components of a strategy.

Each of the primary components of a strategy has a number of secondary components. A strategy element relates to these secondary components. It consists of a single conductor, technique and recipient which are utilized to achieve a specific objective. A given organizational activity or event may include several strategy elements. A strategy compound consists of a group of strategy elements, i.e., a group of conductors, techniques and recipients, which are utilized to achieve a specific objective or set of objectives.

A number of organizational activities, procedures and events in which strategies and techniques were imbedded were identified in the investigation of the selected schools. These are reported in detail in the case narratives appearing in Chapter IV. The research design utilized does not permit one to be absolutely certain that these represent an exhaustive list of those occurring in the schools.
No doubt some of significance were overlooked, but a sufficient number were identified to fulfill the needs of the investigation.

The immediate task of this analysis is to further develop the secondary components of the strategies. From the field investigations the researcher has developed general classifications of the secondary components with regard to conductors and recipients. Also developed were a classification of goals and a list of discrete techniques utilized in the cases. The review of the literature provided some input to the development of the classification of goals and the list of techniques.

The goals have been classified according to the facets of the adoption process which are relevant to the case studies in general. The first of these facets is initiation. Included in this goal are those objectives which focus on causing the process of adopting team teaching to get underway. The facet begins with the point at which the specific persons currently in the institution became involved. This may be before or after the decision was made. The second category of goals is the trial facet. Included in this category are those objectives which relate to the effort in some schools to begin team teaching on a limited basis, from which later to develop the innovation in the entire school. The trial facet relates only to those schools which did not move totally into a team teaching organization at a given point in time. The third category in the classification of goals is installation. Included
In this category are those objectives which related to the effort of installing team teaching on an entire organizational basis. In some schools this followed the initiation facet, while in others, initiation and installation were intermitted with a trial facet. For purposes of this analysis the primary focus is on the broader facet and not on the particular sequence of objectives within the facet.

The classification of conductors includes four categories: consultants, district administrators, building administrators and staff. Consultants are those individuals who are not primarily assigned to responsibilities in the school district. They may or may not live in the community, and no attempt is made to classify them on the basis of either their local or national prominence. District administrators are those individuals who are responsible for the affairs of the particular school in general but who are not primarily assigned to a particular school. Included in addition to administrators are supervisors and consultants. No attempt is made to distinguish between the various levels in the hierarchy in this category. Building administrators are principals, assistant principals, and guidance personnel. The final category in the classification, staff, includes teachers primarily, but paraprofessional personnel who are assigned primarily to teaching responsibilities or to assisting teachers are also included.
In the classification of recipients, four basic categories are included. The categories of building administrators and staff include the same persons as those listed in the classification of conductors. Parents include other community citizens even though they may not have children in the school. The classification of students is self-explanatory.

While it is probable that the total number of techniques available for conductors to utilize is limited, developing a list of individual techniques which are mutually exclusive is difficult. Techniques should not be equated with basic means of communication. Obviously communication means are involved since by definition techniques involve a conductor and a recipient in relationship, but the distinction is significant in understanding the following list of techniques. Several techniques may rely on essentially the same media of communication but the particular manner in which the communication is used is the essential consideration in distinguishing between them. The techniques identified are discussed below.

Telling generally involves verbal or written communication from conductor to recipient. It may or may not involve personal contact between communicator and recipient. The tenor may relate to an elaborate idea, a basic bit of information, an appeal to a certain type of behavior, or a coercive threat. One distinguishing factor is that the recipient may dispose of what he is told in any way he wishes.
Simulating has many of the characteristics of telling except that the particular conductor utilizes some simulated form of reality in attempting to have the recipient reach the objective. Films, models, and other visual means of reproducing reality are common activities using this technique.

Showing pertains to recipients actually observing the innovation in operation. Showing differs from simulating in that in the former an attempt is made to bring reality to the recipient, whereas in the latter the recipient is taken to observe reality first-hand.

Discussing involves the conductor and the recipient in interrelationship. It is a two-way process. It may occur on a one-to-one basis, on a one-to-many basis, or on a few-to-few basis. The first is not a very frequent use of the technique but it does occur. The recipient is again free to respond to the content of the discussion in any way he wishes.

Involving exists when the conductor arranges for the recipient to engage in some activity pertinent to the objective to which the strategy element relates. Whereas telling, simulating, and showing are basically input or conductor centered, discussing and involving are output or recipient centered. The recipient does something with the input he has received.

Supporting includes things which recipients would generally tend to see as favorable or supportive for their responsibilities
in the organization. The conductor caters specifically to the believed wishes of the recipients without any direct solicitation.

Assisting occurs when a conductor enters into the affairs of a recipient on the recipient's own terms. What the recipient does with the particular outcome of the involvement is primarily in his domain.

Selecting refers to situations in which the conductor intervenes with the receiver by filling role vacancies in the organization with select candidates, eliminating those individuals whom he does not believe will lend support to the innovation.

Excluding occurs when the conductor moves to release from the institution, role incumbents whose performance is believed to be incongruent with the basic tenets of the innovation.

Relocating is when role incumbents are relocated within the organization on a unilateral basis in such a manner as the conductor feels to the best interest of the innovation.

Imposing refers to numerous requirements a conductor may establish unilaterally which directly involve recipients, and the only recourse open to recipients is rebelling or leaving.

The four categories of persons in each of the classifications of conductors and recipients and the eleven techniques make a total of 176 potential strategy compounds. These are depicted in the model in Figure 4. Along the X axis are the four categories of conductors. The four categories of recipients are listed along the Y axis and the list of techniques appears on the Z axis. Each cell in the model
Figure 4--A model for analyzing strategies and techniques utilized in the adoption of team teaching in individual schools
represents a strategy compound. Not all of the potential strategy compounds noted by this model are relevant. For example, it would be impossible for a staff member to relocate or release a building administrator as the techniques are defined above. Moreover, the researcher found no evidence of consultants serving as conductors with students as recipients.

Even with the irrelevant strategy compounds excluded, the number remaining is too large to examine thoroughly in this investigation. Additional groupings will be necessary in order for the analysis under consideration to be meaningful. The researcher is forced to pursue those classifications which in his judgment appear to be most relevant to the problem under consideration. In the final analysis, all classifications are more or less arbitrary and their particular value lies in the benefit they are to the user in interpreting a situation meaningfully. The classification developed by the researcher is no different in its limitations.

The additional groupings of strategy compounds form strategy characteristics. The procedure is to identify the strategy characteristics by developing broader classifications of conductors, techniques, and recipients. The analysis of the strategy utilized in each goal facet and the adoption effort as a whole focuses on the composite emphasis of the distribution of strategy compounds among the strategy characteristics. For the investigation under consideration, 12 potential strategy characteristics are developed from the 176 potential compounds. These are developed in the following manner.
Conductor Component. The categories of conductor components of strategy characteristics are internal and external. The internal category includes staff and building administrators while the external category includes district administrators and consultants.

Technique Component. The categories of technique components in strategy characteristics are informative, re-educative, and coercive. The informative category includes telling, simulating, and showing; the re-educative category includes discussing, involving, supporting, and assisting; and the coercive category includes selecting, relocating, releasing, and imposing.

While each of these categories is unique, the informative and re-educative categories are both directed toward changing personnel by techniques which are not coercive. They differ in that the informative category primarily involves the reaction learning phase of the Conrad model of learning phases and the re-educative category of techniques primarily involves the interaction and action learning phases of the same model.¹

Recipient Component. The categories of recipient components in strategy characteristics are personnel and clientele. The personnel category includes building administrators and staff while the clientele category includes parents and students.

The characteristics of a strategy thus defined are visualized in Figure 5, where the model appearing in Figure 4 is rezoned to

¹Conrad, Toward Self-Direction, pp. 14-17.
Figure 5--The strategy characteristics
depict the 12 strategy characteristics. The cube facing the reader at the top corner of the model represents a strategy characteristic with internal conductors, informative techniques and clientele recipients. This characteristic includes all of the strategy elements relating to building administrators and staff conductors, telling, simulating, and showing techniques; and parent and student recipients.

The twelve potential strategy characteristics are listed below:

Type 1: External-informative-personnel
Type 2: External-informative-clientele
Type 3: Internal-informative-personnel
Type 4: Internal-informative-clientele
Type 5: External-re-educative-personnel
Type 6: External-re-educative-clientele
Type 7: Internal-re-educative-personnel
Type 8: Internal-re-educative-clientele
Type 9: External-coercive-personnel
Type 10: External-coercive-clientele
Type 11: Internal-coercive-personnel
Type 12: Internal-coercive-clientele

The model as it now stands embodies the following concepts: the strategy of a given goal facet or of the goal facets collectively is the composite of the strategy characteristics, which is the composite of the strategy compounds included in the domain of each. The model permits one to engage in comparative study of strategy components at various levels of detail. In the cases under investigation, the nature of the data is such that the analysis can represent only gross approximations relative to compounds and elements associated with each of the twelve characteristics.
The emphasis in the analysis is not on identifying one single characteristic as predominant, but rather on exploring the various inter-relationships among the characteristics present. The former would be a useful extension of the model but it is not within the capability of the data collected.

Analysis of the Cases

The particular procedure to be followed in the analysis of the cases is to direct attention to the following points which relate to the basic questions of the investigation stated in Chapter I:

1. The distribution of strategy elements among strategy compounds
2. The distribution of strategy compounds among strategy characteristics
3. The strategies utilized in each goal facet and in the adoption as a whole

The first task in the analysis is to discuss the strategy elements contained in the various activities, procedures and events utilized in each case for the purpose of causing the adoption of team teaching to occur. The definitions and classifications developed above for each of the strategy components (conductors, techniques, recipients) are the basis for identifying the strategy elements to apply to the strategy compound cells which relate to each strategy characteristic.
A particular organizational activity, procedure, or event may contain more than one strategy element. For example, the events associated with showing a film may involve several strategy elements: (1) a principal (conductor) simulating an actual team teaching situation (technique) for teachers (recipients), assuming the principal selected the film and arranged to have it shown; (2) a consultant telling teachers about the innovation, assuming someone from outside the school district developed the film; (3) a consultant simulating situations for teachers, assuming the film contained scenes of an actual team teaching situation; etc. Another example is the workshops conducted in a number of cases to prepare teachers prior to the actual beginning of team teaching. Several strategy elements frequently found in this organizational activity were (1) a consultant telling staff members, (2) a consultant telling a principal, (3) a consultant discussing with staff members, (4) a guidance counselor involving staff members, (5) a teacher discussing with other staff members, (6) a principal simulating situations for staff members, etc. A third example is the procedures related to reaching the decision to have team teaching. Potential strategy elements include a superintendent discussing with a principal, a superintendent involving teachers, a superintendent imposing the decision on teachers (making the decision without the input of teachers), etc.
The procedure followed in identifying the particular strategy elements in each case was to make a judgment relative to the significance of (1) the activities, procedures or events in terms of the others occurring in the adoption effort and (2) each strategy element within an activity, procedure or event in terms of the other strategy elements included in that specific activity, procedure or event. The activities, procedures and events considered in these judgments are those appearing in the case narratives. For each case the numerous judgments required in this procedure were coded on a chart representing the model and the subsequent analysis of the cases was developed from these charts. Because the data were collected by means of open-ended questions, in order to both develop the parameters of the problem and conduct a preliminary analysis, the results of this procedure represent gross approximations and must be interpreted as such.

The second task in the analysis is to summarize the findings of the analysis of the individual cases relative to the three points stated above. Some generalizations on which to base further research will be sought.

Case One

Table 1 notes the strategy compounds appearing in the activities, procedures and events utilized to cause team teaching to be adopted in Case One. This table is a two-dimensional form
TABLE 1

FOCUS OF STRATEGY COMPOUNDS IN CASE ONE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Techniques</th>
<th>Initiation</th>
<th>Trial</th>
<th>Installation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A - Telling</td>
<td>D - Discussing</td>
<td>G - Assisting</td>
<td>J - Releasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B - Simulating</td>
<td>E - Involving</td>
<td>H - Selecting</td>
<td>K - Imposing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C - Showing</td>
<td>F - Supporting</td>
<td>I - Relocating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicates most significant use of strategy elements occurred in these compounds.
Letter only indicates use of strategy elements in these compounds to some extent.
Blank indicates use of strategy elements in these compounds were relatively insignificant.
of the model in Figure 4 for each of the three adoption facets. The third dimension of the model is portrayed in the table by using letters to represent each of the techniques along the Z axis of the model. This enables the reader to identify the researcher's summary of the existence and relative significance of the strategy compounds relating to the activities, procedures, and events reported in the case narratives. Underlined letters indicate the more significant categories of strategy compounds determined by the procedure noted above. For example, the letters C, D, and E indicate the existence of strategy elements in three compounds: consultants-showing-building administrators; consultants-discussing-building administrators, etc. The line under the letter (C) indicates a more significant strategy compound comparatively speaking for the case. In interpreting this table, one needs to consider the fact that the contents are gross approximations.

In Case One building administrators were the most prominent conductors, but consultants and district administrators also played major roles. In the initiation facet, consultants and district administrators shared the major role. The staff played a minor role as conductors. While staff members were the primary recipients in both goal facets, building administrators and parents were also involved.

Telling, discussing and involving were the prominent techniques used in initiation. During installation, discussing and involving became most prominent but most of the techniques were utilized.
In terms of the strategy characteristics in initiation, the emphasis was on external conductors and personnel recipients. Informative and re-educative techniques were emphasized and coercive techniques existed to a certain extent. In installation, internal conductors appeared to be the most important and personnel were the major recipients, although external conductors and clientele recipients also were registered to some extent. The predominant techniques were re-educative and coercive although informative also played a role.

In the composite strategy for the adoption effort, approximately equal emphasis existed on initiation and installation. No trial facet existed. The facet strategies tended to compliment each other. In initiation, external conductors dominated whereas in installation internal conductors were most important. The emphasis on informative and re-educative techniques during initiation changed to emphasis on re-educative and coercive techniques during installation.

Of the 12 types of strategy characteristics listed on page 176, those which appeared to be most predominate were Types 1 and 5 in initiation; 7, 8, and 11 in installation; and 1, 5, 7 in the composite. Almost all types were used to some extent in the total effort.
Case Two

Table 2 indicates that the most prominent conductors of initiation and trial were administrators and consultants. Building administrators became the conductors during installation. In all three facets, staff members were clearly the prominent recipients. However, parents received some attention during initiation and installation.

Telling, discussing, and involving were the most prominent techniques utilized in initiation. The emphasis was distributed among the techniques in the trial facet. Telling, showing, visiting, discussing, supporting, assisting, and selecting all received nearly equal emphasis. This balanced pattern continued in installation where assisting, discussing and telling were among the most important. In the overall analysis of the case, discussing and telling were the most prominent but there was considerable balance in the techniques utilized.

External conductors predominated during initiation and trial and also played a secondary role in installation. In the total adoption effort, external conductors appeared to be somewhat more important than internal, although the difference may not be great. Personnel recipients also predominated in each of the three facets. In the initiation and installation facets, the relative emphasis placed on clientele recipients was greater than the same during trial. The technique components were quite equally
### TABLE 2

**FOCUS OF STRATEGY COMPOUNDS IN CASE TWO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conductors</th>
<th>Recipients</th>
<th>Initiation</th>
<th>Trial</th>
<th>Installation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Administrators</strong></td>
<td><strong>District Administrators</strong></td>
<td><strong>Staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conductors</td>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>Building Administrators</td>
<td>District Administrators</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Techniques</strong></td>
<td><strong>Goals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A - Telling</td>
<td>D - Discussing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B - Simulating</td>
<td>E - Involving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C - Showing</td>
<td>F - Supporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G - Assisting</td>
<td>H - Selecting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J - Releasing</td>
<td>K - Imposing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I - Relocating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicates most significant use of strategy elements occurred in these compounds.
Letter only indicates use of strategy elements in these compounds to some extent.
Blank indicates use of strategy elements in these compounds were relatively insignificant.
balanced in all three facets. Informative and re-educative techniques may have had slightly more emphasis than coercive during initiation and trial but not in installation.

Emphasis on the three goal facets was quite equal. On the whole, the emphasis in initiation was placed on characteristic Types 1, 5, 7, and 9. In the trial facet the emphasis was placed on characteristic Types 1, 5, and 9 and in installation the predominant characteristic Types were 7, 9, and 11. These resulted in primary strategy characteristic Types 1, 5, 7 and 9 in the adoption effort as a whole. Only Types 10 and 12 appeared to be relatively unimportant.

Case Three

Table 3 notes that the most prominent conductors in this case were district administrators and building administrators. Their prominence was relatively balanced in both initiation and installation. Consultants played a very minor role as conductors and staff members were not involved. While in the initiation facet staff members received the predominant attention as recipients, in installation the emphasis was approximately divided between staff members and the combination of building administrators and parents.

The more significant techniques utilized in initiation were telling, discussing, selecting, involving, and imposing.
### TABLE 3

**FOCUS OF STRATEGY COMPOUNDS IN CASE THREE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conductors</th>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Recipients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initiation</td>
<td>Trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Techniques</th>
<th>Initiation</th>
<th>Trial</th>
<th>Installation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A - Telling</td>
<td>D - Discussing</td>
<td>G - Assisting</td>
<td>J - Releasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B - Simulating</td>
<td>E - Involving</td>
<td>H - Selecting</td>
<td>K - Imposing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C - Showing</td>
<td>F - Supporting</td>
<td>I - Relocating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates most significant use of strategy elements occurred in these compounds.*

*Letter only indicates use of strategy elements in these compounds to some extent.*

*Blank indicates use of strategy elements in these compounds were relatively insignificant.*
During installation, discussing, involving, assisting, selecting, and imposing all were significant. In the overall analysis, discussing and telling were most prominent and relocating and releasing were not identified.

In terms of the strategy characteristics present, outside conductors were most prevalent during the initiation facet but in installation external and internal conductors were about equal. For the adoption effort as a whole, the two nearly balanced. Personnel recipients far outweighed clientele recipients in each of the adoption facets, although during installation clientele recipients received relatively more attention than during initiation.

In initiation, informative, re-educative and coercive techniques all received nearly equal attention. During installation re-educative techniques clearly became dominant and coercive tended to outweigh informative. In the overall adoption effort, re-educative techniques appeared to be most important while informative and coercive were nearly equal. The emphases on initiation and installation were relatively equal in the adoption effort as a whole.

The strategy characteristics highlighted in each facet were Types 1, 5, and 9 in initiation and Types 5, 7, and 9 in installation. Approximately half of the strategy characteristics were occupied during initiation while the number increased during installation.
In the adoption effort as a whole, characteristic Types 5, 7, and 9 appeared to contribute most to the strategy.

Case Four

Table 4 indicates that district administrators were by far the most prominent conductors of strategy compounds in this case. Consultants, building administrators, and staff were also involved during the initiation facet, but consultants were not utilized to any significant extent during the installation facet. Building administrators and parents received about equal emphasis as recipients with staff members. Students received some attention but comparatively little. Parents received more emphasis in installation than in initiation while staff members received less. Little emphasis was placed on students in installation.

The predominate techniques utilized during the initiation were telling, discussing, and involving. Some additional emphasis was placed on showing, supporting, and imposing. Discussing, involving, assisting and imposing were the most important techniques during installation.

In terms of the strategy characteristics, external conductors dominated the adoption effort and internal conductors played a relatively insignificant role in both initiation and installation. Most of the compounds appeared in strategy characteristics with personnel recipients. Clientele recipients received more attention during initiation than installation. The same is true for personnel recipients.
TABLE 4

FOCUS OF STRATEGY COMPOUNDS IN CASE FOUR

| Conductors | Recipients | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | Building Administrators | Staff | Parents | Students | Building Administrators | Staff | Parents | Students |
| Consultants | C | A | C | DE | | | | |
| District Administrators | A | C | DE | K | A | D | D | G | F | K | A | DE |
| Building Administrators | | | A | DE | | | | | G | D | | |
| Staff | | | | DE | | | | E | | | | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Techniques</th>
<th>Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A - Telling</td>
<td>D - Discussing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B - Simulating</td>
<td>E - Involving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C - Showing</td>
<td>F - Supporting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicates most significant use of strategy elements occurred in these compounds.
Letter only indicates use of strategy elements in these compounds to some extent.
Blank indicates use of strategy elements in these compounds were relatively insignificant.
The predominant technique component in both facets was re-educative. Some emphasis was placed on informative and coercive techniques but the combined significance of informative and coercive techniques probably did not equal the re-educative.

With these factors prevailing, the predominate strategy characteristics in initiation appeared to be Types 1, 5, and 7. During installation, the compounds were spread quite evenly among half of the strategy characteristics and none seemed to precipitate as most dominant. In the composite effort, Types 1, 5, and 7 appeared to remain predominate and approximately half of the total characteristics were represented.

Case Five

In Table 5, one can see that district administrators, building administrators, and consultants shared conductor responsibilities on a nearly equal basis in all three facets. Staff were involved to some extent as conductors with other staff members. Attention focused primarily on staff recipients but building administrators, parents and students all received some attention. During the initiation facet, district administrators were the predominant conductors while consultants and building administrators were involved to a limited extent. Parent recipients received some attention but students were ignored altogether.
### TABLE 5

**FOCUS OF STRATEGY COMPOUNDS IN CASE FIVE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conductors</th>
<th>Recipients</th>
<th>Techniques</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building Administrators</td>
<td>A - Telling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>B - Simulating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>C - Showing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>District Administrators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building Administrators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Indicates most significant use of strategy elements occurred in these compounds.
- Letter only indicates use of strategy elements in these compounds to some extent.
- Blank indicates use of strategy elements in these compounds were relatively insignificant.
The significant techniques most frequently utilized were telling, discussing, supporting, and imposing in initiation and trial. The unique design of the building was a definite attempt to impose team teaching as a method of instruction. All techniques were utilized during the installation facet. In the composite analysis, the techniques in order of relative importance were telling, discussing, involving, selecting, and imposing.

A balance existed between internal and external conductors throughout the trial and installation facets. During initiation, external conductors appeared to be most important. Personnel recipients were most dominant in all three facets. During installation considerably more attention was given to clientele recipients than during initiation and trial. While re-educative techniques appeared to dominate the effort as a whole, informative and coercive techniques were also very significant. The three were in more nearly equal balance in installation but coercive tended to rule during trial. In initiation the three were nearly balanced. The effort as a whole was clearly focused on installation. The trial facet was really an attempt to install the program as a whole, but the effort failed until such time as a staff training program was developed.

The adoption effort as a whole included strategy compounds is most of the strategy characteristics. The primary emphasis, however, is Type 5 in initiation; Types 5, 7, 9, and 11 in trial; Types 5 and 7 in installation; and Types 5, 7, 9, and 11 in the composite.
Case Six

Table 6 indicates that the relative emphasis on initiation and installation were nearly equal. However, a number of differences did occur in the strategy compound patterns. In the initiation facets, all four classes of conductors were involved to a nearly equal extent. A unique emphasis among the cases exists in this facet in that in relation to other conductors, staff members played a relatively significant role. Most of the efforts of conductors focused on staff members, but parents and building administrators were involved as recipients to some extent. No significant attention was directed to students. During the installation facet, teachers again played a relatively significant role as conductors but building administrators played a more significant role.

The primary techniques utilized in the relative order of significance were discussing, involving, telling, simulating and showing. During the installation facet the emphasis was spread among the various techniques. Included in those receiving nearly equal emphasis were telling, discussing, involving, supporting assisting, and selecting.

The location of these compounds identifies the characteristics of the strategy. A balance of internal and external conductors clearly became most prominent. Personnel received the bulk of
TABLE 6

FOCUS OF STRATEGY COMPOUNDS IN CASE SIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conductors</th>
<th>Building Administrators</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Building Administrators</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Administrators</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>ABE</td>
<td>AB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Administrators</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Techniques

A - Telling
B - Simulating
C - Showing
D - Discussing
E - Involving
F - Supporting
G - Assisting
H - Selecting
I - Relocating
J - Releasing
K - Imposing

Indicates most significant use of strategy elements occurred in these compounds.
Letter only indicates use of strategy elements in these compounds to some extent.
Blank indicates use of strategy elements in these compounds were relatively insignificant.
the recipient attention during the adoption as a whole, but in installation clientele received considerably more attention than in initiation.

Techniques utilized were spread among the three categories. On the whole, coercive techniques were not very significant in initiation but informative and re-educative techniques were registered in approximately equal proportions. Re-educative techniques predominated in the installation facet. The primary use of coercion techniques occurred during installation, relating to selecting the staff and administrator and to designing the new building. For the adoption effort as a whole, the emphasis was nearly equally placed on initiation and installation.

In terms of all the strategy characteristics in the model, this case emphasized Types 1, 5, and 7 for initiation; Types 4, 7, and 9 for installation; and Types 1, 5, and 7 for the effort as a whole. In all, the strategy included most of the potential characteristics to some extent.

Case Seven

Table 7 indicates that the emphasis of strategy compounds in Case Seven was placed to a slightly greater extent on initiation than on installation. In initiation, consultants, district administrators, building administrators, and staff all played relatively significant roles as conductors. Staff members comprised
TABLE 7

FOCUS OF STRATEGY COMPOUNDS IN CASE SEVEN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recipients</th>
<th>Building Administrators</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Building Administrators</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conductors</td>
<td>A C</td>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Administrators</td>
<td>A C</td>
<td>A C</td>
<td>A C</td>
<td></td>
<td>FG</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>A D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Administrators</td>
<td>D F</td>
<td>D D</td>
<td>D K</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>A D</td>
<td>C D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>A C</td>
<td>A C</td>
<td>A C</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>DEFG</td>
<td>H K</td>
<td>A C D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiation</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Techniques
A - Telling
B - Simulating
C - Showing
D - Discussing
E - Involving
F - Supporting
G - Assisting
H - Selecting
I - Relocating
J - Releasing
K - Imposing

- Indicates most significant use of strategy elements occurred in these compounds.
- Letter only indicates use of strategy elements in these compounds to some extent.
- Blank indicates use of strategy elements in these compounds were relatively insignificant.
the most significant group of recipients, but building administrators and parents were also included. Students represented the only recipient group that was not involved during this facet. Staff members played a relatively significant role as conductors, utilizing discussing and involving techniques with staff members as recipients.

During installation by far the most significant group of conductors was building administrators. Their efforts exceeded the combined efforts of the other conductors. Again the primary emphasis of strategy compounds focused on staff members during installation. Minor emphasis was placed on building administrators and parents as recipients.

Most of the techniques were utilized to some extent during initiation. The major emphasis was placed on discussing, telling, showing, and involving. During installation, the emphasis on simulating and showing was almost completely discontinued and the emphasis on supporting, assisting, and selecting was increased. Discussing maintained its relative importance in this period and imposing was also registered. In the overall analysis, discussing became the most prominent technique. Relocating and releasing were not registered as significant techniques. This may be because these techniques tend to be utilized more toward the end of the school year and this was only in its first year of installation at the time of the interview.
Regarding strategy characteristics represented in the case, external and internal conductors each played significant roles. In installation internal conductors appeared to be slightly predominant. Clientele recipients received attention during both facets but the predominant recipients were personnel.

The technique component of strategy characteristics focused on all three types. Informative and re-educative techniques predominated in initiation. The coercive technique during initiation was in the decision to move ahead with an innovative program. During installation, coercive techniques played a significantly greater role than they did in initiation. Nevertheless, re-educative techniques still predominated in this facet and informative techniques played a less significant role than in initiation.

The strategy characteristics most dominant were Types 1, 5, and 7 in initiation; Types 5, 7, and 9 in installation; and Types 1, 5, 7, and 9 for the adoption effort as a whole. The strategy included most characteristics.

Case Eight

Table 8 indicates that Case Eight was in the trial facet of the adoption of team teaching at the time of the field investigation. This placement is based on the definitions
### TABLE 8

**FOCUS OF STRATEGY COMPOUNDS IN CASE EIGHT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conductor</th>
<th>Recipients</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building Administrators</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>ABC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Administrators</td>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Administrators</td>
<td>EF</td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiation</td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>Installation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>Goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A - Telling</td>
<td>D - Discussing</td>
<td>G - Assisting</td>
<td>J - Releasing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B - Simulating</td>
<td>E - Involving</td>
<td>H - Selecting</td>
<td>K - Imposing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C - Showing</td>
<td>F - Supporting</td>
<td>I - Relocating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates most significant use of strategy elements occurred in these compounds.*

*Letter only indicates use of strategy elements in these compounds to some extent.*

*Blank indicates use of strategy elements in these compounds were relatively insignificant.*
developed in the first part of this chapter. From the table it is also evident that slightly more emphasis was placed on the initiation facet than on the trial facet although the two were nearly balanced. District administrators and building administrators were the predominant conductors, but consultants and staff members were also involved during initiation. The efforts of these conductors focused primarily on building administrators and staff, and on parents and students to a lesser extent. Building administrators, parents, and students as recipients appeared to have equaled or exceeded the efforts directed to staff.

In the trial facet, staff members equaled or exceeded building administrators as conductors, which is quite unique. District administrators played a minor role and consultants were not registered as significant conductors. The emphasis was overwhelmingly on staff members as recipients. This created a somewhat unusual situation in that staff members worked very closely with staff members in conductor-recipient relationships. Parents and students also received some attention as recipients during this facet.

Considering the distribution of techniques during the initiation facet, one notes a relatively equal emphasis on telling, showing, and discussing. The techniques of involving and selecting were also registered as significant. During the trial facet the
emphasis on telling diminished and the emphasis on involving became predominant. Emphasis on discussing and supporting was also prevalent during this facet. In the total analysis, emphasis was quite equally distributed among telling, showing, discussing and involving. Relocating and releasing were not registered as significant techniques. This may again be related to the fact that the school was in the first year of the trial facet.

There were several distinct areas of concentration of strategy compounds within strategy characteristics. During initiation, external and internal conductors shared responsibilities nearly equally. In the trial facet the excessive involvement of teachers as conductors accounted for the shift to internal conductors. Clientele received a substantial degree of attention as recipients during initiation. This continued in the trial facet, but it was comparatively less. Personnel remained the predominant recipient.

The pattern of the technique components is interesting. Informative techniques were utilized during initiation but became almost nil during trial. Re-educative techniques remained relatively constant as the predominant technique category throughout the adoption period. Coercive techniques were present in both facets. They related to the selection of the principal, the origin of the program, and the design of the facility.

Two strategy characteristics seem to be involved quite heavily in the initiation strategy. These are Types 1 and 7.
In installation, Type 7 appeared to be as important as all of the other characteristics combined. The pattern of these two strategies resulted in a combined strategy which emphasized characteristics Types 1 and 7 and involved most of the characteristic types.

Case Nine

While in this case the school leaders organized the school entirely on a team teaching basis, a number of teams did not appear to be functioning as such. The case was considered to be in the trial facet of adoption. Table 9 indicates that the emphasis of the adoption effort was slightly on the initiation facet, although the two facets were nearly balanced. In the initiation facet, building administrators were the most significant single class of conductors but all categories were represented to some extent. The primary emphasis was on staff members as recipients. Again the combined emphasis on building administrators, parents, and students as recipients provided a significant parallel with staff members in this facet.

During the trial facet, the relative significance of building administrators as conductors increased while that of consultants and district administrators decreased. Staff members retained their relative role in the conductor category. The role of staff members as recipients relative to building administrators, parents, and students increased in the trial facet over the initiation facet.

In the initiation facet, telling, discussing and imposing were the most predominant techniques utilized. Some emphasis was
TABLE 9
FOCUS OF STRATEGY COMPOUNDS IN CASE NINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conductors</th>
<th>Recipients</th>
<th>Techniques</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>Building Administrators</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiation</td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>Installation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Techniques
A - Telling
B - Simulating
C - Showing
D - Discussing
E - Involving
F - Supporting
G - Assisting
H - Selecting
I - Relocating
J - Releasing
K - Imposing

Indicates most significant use of strategy elements occurred in these compounds.
Letter only indicates use of strategy elements in these compounds to some extent.
Blank indicates use of strategy elements in these compounds were relatively insignificant.
placed on simulating, showing, and involving. For the trial face, the emphasis was quite equally distributed among discussing, involving and imposing. In the composite of the two facets, telling, discussing, involving and imposing were the predominant techniques. Selecting, relocating and releasing were not identified as significant.

The compounds were spread quite evenly among a number of strategy characteristics in each of the facets. No single group of strategy characteristics seemed to be outstanding. Those receiving no attention or little attention were the ones relating to clientele recipients. However, clientele served as recipients to a greater extent during initiation than during trial. The techniques utilized were also spread quite evenly among the informative, re-educative and coercive categories. Re-educative and informative appeared to be slightly more important. The composite emphasis may have been slightly on initiation.

**Case Ten**

Table 10 quite vividly portrays the fact that the emphasis of strategy compounds in this case was on the initiation facet. Consultants as conductors were not excelled by any other single category. The efforts of conductors were primarily focused on staff recipients but some attention was given to building administrators, parents and students. One of the unique
**TABLE 10**

**FOCUS OF STRATEGY COMPOUNDS IN CASE TEN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recipients</th>
<th>Building Administrators</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conductors</strong></td>
<td>A C DE</td>
<td>ABC DE G</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>A D</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Administrators</td>
<td>ABC DE G</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>DEFG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Administrators</td>
<td>A DE</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Techniques</th>
<th>Initiation</th>
<th>Trial</th>
<th>Installation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A - Telling</td>
<td>D - Discussing</td>
<td>G - Assisting</td>
<td>J - Releasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B - Simulating</td>
<td>E - Involving</td>
<td>H - Selecting</td>
<td>K - Imposing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C - Showing</td>
<td>F - Supporting</td>
<td>I - Relocating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates most significant use of strategy elements occurred in these compounds.*  
*Letter only indicates use of strategy elements in these compounds to some extent.*  
*Blank indicates use of strategy elements in these compounds were relatively insignificant.*
characteristics of this case is the lack of involvement of district administrators as conductors.

Telling, discussing and involving were the most significant techniques utilized during the initiation facet. Some additional emphasis was placed on simulating, showing, involving and supporting. During the trial facet the major techniques were discussing, involving and assisting. The emphasis on telling during initiation became almost nil during trial. Imposing was used as a minor technique during this facet. Selecting was used only with a few new teachers.

Internal and external conductors were nearly balanced during initiation but during trial almost no external conductors were active. Personnel were the predominant recipients in the case as a whole. Clientele received emphasis as recipients during initiation but there appeared to be no trace of clientele as recipients during the trial facet. Informative techniques were utilized during initiation but became almost nil during trial. On the other hand, re-educative techniques retained their relative superiority in importance during the trial facet. There appeared to be very little trace of coercive techniques in this entire adoption effort. The only evidence of coercion was in the appointment of teams by the school principal. The absence of coercion must be interpreted in relative terms, i.e., other techniques far outweighed coercive techniques.
In the final analysis, the strategy appeared to have involved characteristic Types 1, 5, and 7 mostly in initiation. Type 7 was most significant by far in the trial facet. In the composite analysis, Type 7 appeared to be quite predominant while Types 1 and 5 were also present to a considerable degree.

**Summary**

From the cases as a whole several generalizations can be drawn. In making these observations it is important to remember that the sample is biased in favor of schools that have had a considerable degree of success. These generalizations should therefore be useful in developing hypotheses relative to the components which appear to be related to the success of a strategy in effecting change in individual schools.

The first set of generalizations relates to goal facets. In relative terms, the emphasis appeared to be placed on the initiation facet. However, most of the cases which had a trial facet tended to still be in it at the time of the interviews and therefore were without an installation facet. If the emphases placed on the trial and installation facets were combined, the total emphasis of the two would tend to equal initiation. However, a number of exceptions existed and these were noted.

The cases which designed a trial facet appeared to be utilizing it to good advantage. Approximately half of the cases
utilized a trial facet. No final judgment can be made about the relative success of a design that does not utilize each of the facets, but the cases which did not, appeared to be succeeding with the adoption effort.

The second set of generalizations relates to the clusters of strategy compounds and strategy characteristics found in the cases as a whole. In the initiation facet, consultants, building administrators, and district administrators shared the conductor responsibilities nearly equally. Staff also played a significant role as conductors and they were the major recipients. Next in prominence as recipients were building administrators, parents and students. Telling, discussing and involving were the most frequently occurring techniques. Simulating, showing, involving, supporting and imposing followed in prominence.

Several major changes existed in the trial and installation facets. One, consultants and district administrators continued as conductors but their relative significance was exceeded considerably by building administrators. Two, teachers were less involved as conductors. Three, the telling technique diminished in prominence and assisting and selecting increased considerably. Relocating and releasing techniques were utilized primarily during these facets.

The third set of generalizations focuses on the strategy characteristics. Of the 12 potential strategy characteristics identified in the model in Figure 5, 10 were occupied by strategy
compounds in the cases collectively. Most strategies consisted of three or four main characteristics and about the same number of secondary characteristics.

In initiation, the characteristics which consistently constituted a major proportion of the strategies were external-informative-personnel, external-re-educative-personnel and internal-re-educative-personnel. Several other characteristics tended to be present in most cases. They were external-informative-clientele, external-re-educative-clientele, and internal-informative-personnel. The only characteristics not detected were those involving coercive techniques with clientele.

In the trial and installation facets, the pattern changed somewhat. External-coercive-personnel replaced external-informative-personnel in the list of most dominate characteristics. The rest remained relatively the same.

The fourth and final set of generalizations relates to one of the basic questions of the investigation, i.e., the considerations which determine the particular strategies and techniques included in the adoption efforts of the selected schools. A number of questions relating to this point were included in the interviews with administrators and the responses of the interviewees are reported in the case narratives. The essence of the predominant response to these specific questions can be stated briefly: those
interviewed were hard pressed to explain the rationale of their actions. Following are some summary statements which typify the responses of the interviewees:

1. If you involve teachers from the beginning they will be ready to make the program work.

2. From what others told us, we concluded that we should let each teacher decide for himself whether he would be a member of a team.

3. The principal should be carefully selected in the first place and then permitted to do what he was employed to do.

4. This seemed to us to be the proper thing to do; is there a better way?

5. We really do not know why we did this.
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The Problem

The problem of this investigation relates to the strategies and techniques utilized in the adoption of team teaching at the individual school level of organization. In the introduction, a brief statement of the immensity and nature of the problems facing educational institutions as a whole leads to the development of the proposition that change is necessary if relevancy is to be maintained. The overview of the literature in educational change calls attention to the potential value of additional focus on the design element in educational change situations at the individual school level of organization. The investigation focuses on four major questions:

1. What strategies and techniques have been utilized in the adoption of team teaching in individual schools?
2. Have certain strategies and techniques been utilized more frequently than others?
3. Has there been a tendency for particular strategies and techniques to be utilized together?
4. What considerations determine which strategies and techniques have been utilized?

Because the problem had not been well defined previously, the purpose of this investigation contains two major facets: (1) the development of a framework for approaching the problem, and (2) the application of the framework to a preliminary analysis of the problem relative to the selected cases.

Procedure

From the literature pertaining to strategies and techniques, studies of specific innovations, and studies of change in individual schools, the researcher developed a schema for identifying the basic components of a strategy for adopting innovations at the unit level of school organization. The schema was used to prepare a series of basic research questions to investigate the specific components utilized for the purpose of causing the adoption of team teaching to occur in individual schools. The basic components of a strategy in this context are (1) the individuals who were primarily responsible for planning and conducting the activities, procedures and events, (2) the individuals on whom they focused, and (3) the specific techniques utilized.

Ten schools were selected for the investigation. They included three elementary, four middle, and three senior high
schools in an seven-state area. The initial step in locating these schools was to contact state departments of education. The researcher developed a post card questionnaire to secure preliminary data from these schools regarding their team teaching efforts in an attempt to identify potential cases. Schools which were in the early stages of the adoption of team teaching and which were experiencing a relative degree of success were selected.

A field investigation was conducted in the selected schools. The researcher interviewed central office personnel, principals and other building support personnel, and staff members. Some written records were available. They consisted primarily of workshop agenda, teacher memoranda, newspaper clippings and special publications.

From the responses of the interviewees and the information collected from the written sources, cases narratives were prepared for the ten cases investigated. The results of the investigations were then analyzed in terms of the strategies and techniques utilized in the specific attempts to cause team teaching to occur. Additional insights from the field investigation were utilized in extending the earlier framework into a model for the analysis of the adoption efforts.

Activities, Procedures and Events

A number of specific activities, procedures and events utilized for the specific purpose of causing the adoption to
occur were identified in the field investigation. Those identified by the interviewees as being most important to the success of their programs were extended workshops prior to the initial installation of the team teaching programs and visitations to other schools. Additional activities, procedures, and events frequently mentioned were shorter workshops, conferences, seminars, after-school work sessions and committee meetings, meetings with consultants, planning new facilities to house the innovative programs, staff selection, use of audio visual aids, newspaper releases, and daily assistance to staff members, parents and community by various members of the school staff.

Strategies

The model developed for the purpose of analyzing these activities, procedures and events in terms of the strategies and techniques utilized identified two components of a strategy in addition to techniques. These are conductors and recipients. This model enables the researcher to define strategies much more specifically. A strategy is the design of the components of the activities, procedures and events utilized for the purpose of achieving a goal or set of goals related to the adoption effort. Several additional concepts pertinent to the analysis were developed. A strategy element is a single conductor, technique, and recipient which is utilized to achieve a specific objective.
A strategy compound consists of a group of strategy elements. A strategy characteristic consists of a group of strategy compounds. Finally, a strategy consists of a group of strategy characteristics.

Four classifications of conductors and four classifications of recipients who were involved to a significant extent in the adoption efforts were identified. The four categories of conductors were consultants, district administrators, building administrators and staff. The four categories of recipients were building administrators, staff, parents, and students. The relative importance of these conductors and recipients in the adoption efforts investigated varied from case to case and from goal to goal within each case.

The most predominant recipients were staff members. In only one instance did the total of the other three recipients outweigh the staff members in significance. Building administrators were second in relative significance as recipients, parents were third, and students were last.

Emphasis on conductors tended to be spread among the individual categories more than was true for recipients. Conductors from outside the school (consultants and district level personnel) played a relatively equal role with conductors inside the school (building administrators and staff) on an overall basis. However, external conductors tended to be most
involved during the initiation facet and internal conductors
during the trial and installation facets. Staff members were
actively involved as conductors in a number of cases. In several
cases they played relatively significant roles.

For purposes of this analysis strategy compounds identified
in the cases were classified in terms of 12 strategy characteristics.
The strategies utilized in the adoption facets and in the effort
as a whole were identified on the basis of the dominant
characteristics in each case. The 12 characteristics are listed
below.

Type 1: External-informative-personnel
Type 2: External-informative-clientele
Type 3: Internal-informative-personnel
Type 4: Internal-informative-clientele
Type 5: External-re-educative-personnel
Type 6: External-re-educative-clientele
Type 7: Internal-re-educative-personnel
Type 8: Internal-re-educative-clientele
Type 9: External-coercive-personnel
Type 10: External-coercive-clientele
Type 11: Internal-coercive-personnel
Type 12: Internal-coercive-clientele

The most important strategy characteristics found in the
cases as a whole were (a) external-informative-personnel (Type 1),
(b) external-re-educative-personnel (Type 5), (c) internal-
re-educative-personnel (Type 7), and (d) external-coercive-personnel
(Type 9). In the trial and installation facets, the external-
informative-personnel characteristic (Type 1) was important but
not as important as it was during the initiation facet. Ten of
the 12 characteristics contributed to the strategies as a whole. Those involving coercive techniques with clientele (Types 10 and 12) were not detected to any significant extent. The characteristics involving re-educative techniques appeared to be most dominant, while the emphasis on characteristics involving informative and coercive techniques appeared to be nearly equal.

**Techniques**

A total of 11 techniques were identified. Some were much more prominent than others, but all appear to have contributed to the adoption efforts to some extent. The techniques identified were telling, simulating, showing, discussing, involving, supporting, assisting, selecting, relocating, releasing, and imposing. In the composite analysis it appears that telling, discussing, involving and selecting were the four most prominent techniques. Next in apparent significance were simulating, visiting, involving, assisting, and imposing. The two techniques least frequently identified were relocating and releasing.

**Conclusions and Recommendations**

Several conclusions can be drawn from the investigation as a whole. These are discussed below and a number of recommendations are noted in relation to these conclusions.
First, the design utilized in the adoption of team teaching in individual schools is a significant problem for study in educational change. To date the problem of design has received little emphasis in educational research. The attention devoted to the problem in the literature focuses on the broad institutional setting and the elements of design are not well defined. The problem of design for change efforts in individual schools needs to receive considerably more emphasis in further research.

Second, the preliminary findings led to several conclusions with respect to questions one, two and three of the four basic questions of the investigation. These are as follows:

a. The strategies and techniques utilized in the adoption of team teaching in individual schools have distinguishable characteristics and a number were identified in the cases investigated.

b. Some strategies and techniques utilized in the adoption situations of these cases were more prominent than others.

c. Certain strategies tended to be used together and certain techniques tended to be used together.

These three basic questions appear to be relevant to the issue and should be the focus of further research utilizing a more elaborate research design.
Third, while the investigation produced few specific findings in relation to the fourth question in the set of basic questions of the investigation, several generalizations are in order. One, designers of adoption programs do not appear to be fully aware of why they act as they do. Two, the designers' styles of leadership and their perception of those on whom the adoption efforts focus appear to be major considerations related to the particular strategies and techniques selected. This basic question also needs further research, utilizing a more elaborate research design.

Fourth, the model developed in Chapter V contributed significantly to the identification and analysis of strategies and techniques utilized in individual schools for the purpose of causing the adoption of team teaching to occur. The model portrays the relationship of techniques to strategies and permits one to speak more definitively about both terms to an extent that exceeds what appears in the general literature on strategies and techniques. Moreover, the model recognizes the persons in an organization as significant components of a strategy and includes these components on an equal basis with techniques. Discussions of strategies in the literature tend to place little emphasis on the personal dimension. The model is unique in this regard.

Moreover, the model is versatile. It identifies the basic components of a strategy in relationship and the user may group the component cells (strategy compounds) in any way that is useful
for the particular scope of his problem. While the particular application of the model in this investigation was general in nature, given adequate data, one could profitably focus on relationships among strategy elements and among strategy compounds. Research in this regard should be undertaken.

Fifth, if adoption efforts are to succeed in effecting change, practitioners will need to consider the dimension of design in developing these programs. While the primary emphasis of this dissertation relates to the development of a framework for identifying and analyzing adoption strategies and techniques, there are several elements of immediate value to the practitioner. One, the narratives in Chapter IV identify the more significant activities, procedures and events utilized in the cases. This collection should be beneficial to the school administrator who wishes to become familiar with a number of available organizational means for effecting change. Two, the discussion of the model also contains some notions that should assist the administrator in developing a design for an adoption program. The discussion of the major concepts of design and the classifications of strategy components are probably the most beneficial in this regard.

**Hypotheses for Further Research**

Based on the model developed, the findings of the investigation of the individual cases, and the above conclusions
and recommendations, a number of specific hypotheses have been identified which should be the focus of further research. Each hypothesis and its corollaries pertain primarily to the adoption of team teaching in individual schools although there is some reason to believe they would be worth testing with similar innovations.

1. Strategies which utilize a comprehensive set of conductors, recipients and techniques are more successful in effecting change than those which are less comprehensive.

Corollary A: Re-educative techniques are the most important single category in effecting change.

Corollary B: Re-educative techniques are relatively ineffective if they are not either proceeded or accompanied by informative techniques.

Corollary C: Re-educative techniques are more effective if accompanied by coercive techniques.

Corollary D: The change effort is more successful if consultants are among the more significant conductors during the initiation facet.

Corollary E: Internal conductors must be significantly involved in the trial and installation facets in order for the adoption to succeed.

2. Who makes the decision to adopt team teaching and how it is made is not an important consideration in the potential success of
the adoption effort. (What happens after the decision is important.)

Corollary A: Involvement in the decision-making process is a significant activity in which re-education techniques can be applied.

Corollary B: The need for new educational facilities is a significant impetus in initiating the adoption process.

3. Designers tend to be unaware of the particular strategies and techniques they are utilizing.

4. The leadership styles of strategy designers are a significant variable in the selection of the components of strategies.

5. The designers' perceptions of the recipients are a significant variable in the strategy components selected for use.

The above summary of the problem, the procedure and the findings and the discussion of the conclusions, recommendations and hypotheses develop relevant implications of the investigation. In the final analysis, the investigation contributes to the solution of the problem of design for effecting the adoption of team teaching in individual schools. In so far as the investigation contributes to one aspect of the solution of the problem of educational change, it contributes to the resolution of the current crisis facing educational institutions.
Dear School Administrator:

I am studying the process of educational change as it relates to developing team teaching in schools. Personnel in the State Department of Education have indicated that team teaching is occurring in your school or in one of the schools in your district. Would you assist me in my research effort by taking several minutes to complete the short questionnaire on the attached card and returning it to me? If you are a central office administrator and several schools in your district have team teaching, please complete the questionnaire for the school with the most significant team teaching effort. I will greatly appreciate your assistance.

Sincerely yours,
Orville L. Yoder, Research Associate
Name of school ___________________________________________
Principal ____________________________________________
Address ________________________________________________ Phone ____________________

How many teachers does the school have? ____________________
How many are members of teaching teams? ____________________
Do team members teach alongside each other at times? ________
Do they plan together in a significant way? ____________________
Do they evaluate together on a regular basis? ________
Do they discuss all their students on a regular basis? ________
How long has the school had team teaching? 
Are the key persons who directed the development of team teaching still with the school district? Supt. ______ Curr. director ______, Principal ______, Other (specify) ______
Were outside funds utilized in the development? ______
Person completing questionnaire _____________________________
Position __________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX II

May 23, 1970

Dr. Donald A. McCoy, Superintendent
Eastmore City Schools
1936 West First Street
Eastmore, Michigan 42201

Dear Dr. McCoy:

I appreciate very much your willingness to assist me in learning about how you have proceeded to adopt team teaching at Towncrest Middle School.

In our telephone conversation last week, I indicated I would like to interview the key persons involved in planning and directing the adoption of team teaching in the school.

My primary task in the research regarding your team teaching program is to find out what general approach and what specific means you have used in getting your team teaching program underway.

Specifically, my research design calls for:

1. Interviews of approximately 45 minutes in length with each of the key administrators involved at the building and central office levels (this may include supervisors and guidance persons also).

2. Interviews of approximately 30 minutes in length with several key members of teaching teams.

3. General observation of the teams in action.
4. Consulting written sources which relate to the adoption of team teaching in the school. They may include such documents as school board minutes, reports of funding agencies, agendas and reports of workshops, staff memoranda, special publications regarding the new program, and related news releases and stories.

I will plan to see you at 9:00 a.m. at your office on Wednesday, May 27, 1970.

Sincerely,

Orville L. Yoder
Research Associate
Educational Administration
and Facilities Unit

OLY:ly
APPENDIX III

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Regarding the Decision to Adopt Team Teaching in the School:

1. What were the circumstances leading to the initial consideration of adopting team teaching in the school?

2. Who were the active persons in the initial consideration?

3. Who made the decision to adopt team teaching in the school? How and when was the decision made? Why was the decision made in this particular manner rather than in some other manner?

Regarding the Communication of the Decision:

4. Who communicated the decision to staff members and why was the decision communicated by this person or group rather than some other person or group?

5. What means (that is what activities, procedures and events) were used to communicate the decision to staff members and why were these means used rather than some other means?

Regarding the Time Between the Decision and the Beginning of Team Teaching in the School:

6. How were staff members selected for the teaching teams and why were these means of selection used rather than some other means?

7. Who provided the leadership for preparing staff members and why did this person or group provide the leadership rather than some other person or group?

8. What means (that is what activities, procedures and events) were used in preparing staff members for team teaching and why were these particular means used rather than some other means?
Regarding the Time Since the Beginning of Team Teaching:

9. How have staff members been selected for the teaching teams and why have these means of selection been used rather than some other means?

10. Who has provided the leadership for assisting staff members in team teaching and why has this particular person or group provided the leadership rather than some other person or group?

11. What means (that is what activities, procedures and events) have been used in assisting staff members in team teaching and why have these particular means been used rather than some other means?

12. What are the answers to questions 4 through 11 regarding parents?

13. What are the answers to questions 4 through 11 regarding students?

14. What are the answers to questions 4 through 11 regarding others?

Summary:

15. What have been the key means that have contributed to the success of the team teaching effort in the school?

16. What mistakes have been made with regard to this adoption? What should be done differently if one were to begin again in the same setting?
APPENDIX IV

BASIC DATA COLLECTION FORM

School__________________________________________________________

1. What grade levels were included in the school? ________________

2. What is the total student enrollment in the school? _____________

3. How many certificated teachers are employed in the school? ______

4. How many of these are members of teaching teams? ______________

5. How many paraprofessionals (teacher-aides, secretaries, clerks) are employed by the school? ______________

6. How many of these paraprofessionals are assigned to teaching teams? ________________________________

7. How many teaching teams does the school have and what kind and how many of each kind of personnel constitute each team? ________________________________

8. How many administrative and supervisory personnel are assigned primarily to this school? ____________
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9. Under what circumstances do members of the teaching teams actually teach a common group of students together? 


10. What is the central focus of team planning sessions? How much time is devoted to team planning? 


11. What is the central focus of team evaluation sessions? How much time is devoted to team evaluation? 


12. Were outside funds utilized in the adoption of team teaching in the school? If so, what was the source and amount of these funds?
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INTERVIEWEES

Boyce Middle School
   Dr. Donald Eichhorn, assistant superintendent for instruction
   Mr. James Welsh, principal
   Mr. Dennis Eklund, team member
   Mr. William Tomey, team member
   Mrs. Caryl Walker, chairman, steering committee
   Mr. Larry Wiltzrout, team member

Butternut Elementary School
   Dr. Robert VanAuken, superintendent
   Mrs. Jean Bartoo, principal, Spruce School
   Miss Laurie Landreth, principal, Birch School
   Miss Nancy TrueIson, principal, Butternut School
   Mrs. Jean Barnard, team member
   Mrs. Jean Scrivens, coordinator of parent volunteers
   Mrs. Marty Stevenson, team member

Columbia City Joint High School
   Mr. Ralph Bailey, superintendent
   Mr. Donald Weeks, principal
   Mrs. Carolyn Bennet, director of guidance
   Mrs. Roberta Berry, team member
   Mr. Eudolph Holycross, team member
   Mr. Laurel McGee, team member
   Mrs. Joan Steil, chairman, English department and team member
   Mr. James Thompson, team member

East Bank High School
   Mr. John Santrock, associate superintendent for instruction
   Mr. Ralph Hixenbaugh, principal
   Mr. Dave Adkins, assistant principal
   Mrs. Pauline Caudill, social studies department head
   Mrs. Joyce Kellenbarger, English department head

East Pike Elementary School
   Mr. David Laird, director of elementary education
   Mr. Harry McFarland, principal
   Mr. Leslie Gottardt, instructional materials specialist
   Miss Patricia Bankosky, team member
   Miss Betty Hunter, team member
Hithergreen Middle School
  Mr. John Corwin, director, special services
  Mr. Don West, principal
  Mrs. Betty Jane Harris, team member
  Mrs. Margaret Moody, director of dissemination

Lake Villa Intermediate School
  Mr. Melvin Colbert, superintendent
  Dr. Richard Hupper, principal
  Mrs. Sarah Bazata, team member
  Mr. Henry Schmidt, team member
  Mrs. Helen Wolfinger, team member

Pendleton High School
  Mr. Ray Brock, superintendent
  Mr. Terry Cummins, principal
  Mr. Edward Ball, director of the Northern Kentucky In-Service Innovation Center
  Mrs. Sandra Sullivan, team member
  Mr. Ralph McDermott, team member

Sherwood Park Elementary School
  Mr. Milton Miller, director of educational facility planning
  Miss Ina Lovell, director of elementary schools
  Miss Mary Larmy, assistant director of elementary schools
  Mrs. Hazel VanZanten, principal
  Mrs. Pauline Vanderleest, team leader
  Mrs. LaVonne Vandewerf, team leader
  Mrs. Elizabeth Kehr, team member

Sunbury Middle School
  Mr. Hylen Souders, superintendent
  Mr. Stephen Churchill, principal
  Mrs. Marleen Clayton, team member
  Mr. Don Kolodgy, team member