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CHAPTER I

THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

This study is about educational development: the transformation of educational entities as they adapt to changing environments and to their changing internal states. On one level, this research was designed to discover how development happens in one educational setting where it is evident. This involved the efforts of a single researcher collecting data in the field through direct experience of the phenomenon. On an altogether different plane, the research was conceived and designed to be in synchronized movement with an evolving universe. The press of social environmental circumstances, increasingly demanding the creation of adaptive social institutions, was as real a part of this study as the school setting where it was conducted.

The Significance of the Problem

On either plane, the problem has to do with the design and operation of adaptive, self-balancing systems. In the global terms in which social institutions are written about, Jantsch (1975) asks whether history itself is not "essentially a process of self-organization of human systems in an unfolding dynamic cosmos, posing the challenge of creative action...continuously unsettling systems states in order to create more ideal states" (p. 8). In the practical terms that educators
work with, the question is whether and how the educational entities they create and inhabit can become better than they are, and how they can offer better experiences to learners.

Attempting to relate this study to universal evolutionary forces is not a device for lending the research heroic proportions. Neither is it simply a statement of the context in which the research question was formulated. Rather, it is a way of bridging the space between what is real and profound in the large and abstract, and what is real and profound in the small and concrete.

Development may be followed as a theme of existence from highest to lowest levels of abstraction. All life is caught up through the millennia in adapting to changes in the environment, changing its own forms and finding other niches for those forms so they can survive better. Human life especially expresses itself through time in more effective ways of behaving (e.g. collectively), of reflecting, and of organizing still more effective ways. Human systems arise because they provide new possibilities for dealing with problems that are too large for individuals to handle alone. In doing so, they subsume and juggle into new patterns the capacities of their human members so that creative responses to environmental change become more possible.

Seen in the perspective of thousands of years and millions of people, this phenomenon is named social or cultural evolution. In the perspective of the few people involved in an educational setting like a school, the problem might be called program development. In either case, the basic concern of humanity is finding or creating forms in which it might survive and achieve the goals expressive of its being.
Steering a viable course for mankind might seem somewhat pretentious a goal for educators concerned about the learning experience of their charges. But their choice of how to create and regulate their own, small-scale human system of an educational program can either express or deny recognition of their participation in the larger evolving system of humanity. To the degree that they can manifest their sense of what is happening in the universe around them and in them, they contribute to the realization of universal potential. "The evolution of mankind forms a meaningful and integral part of a universal evolution.... Mankind is an agent of this universal evolution" (Jantsch, 1975, p. xvi).

An assumption underlying the choice of development as the focus of this study is that human evolution has arrived at a point at which man must learn to design and maintain human systems which are adaptive and self-balancing over time if he is to survive. That process by which a system balances itself out over time through an adaptive transformation of its own capacities will be addressed in this study as development.

Social theorists like Deutsch (1963), Galbraith (1967), Calhoun (1970), Churchman (1972), Vickers (1973), and Jantsch (1975) have all drawn attention to the urgent need for social institutions to be adaptive. Complex environmental conditions are changing so rapidly that social institutions and organizational entities can no longer be managed adequately from the outside.

Bennis (1966) makes the same point from the standpoint of the requirements of organizations:

Bureaucracy thrives in a highly competitive, undifferentiated and stable environment, such as the climate of its youth, the Industrial Revolution....However, the environment has changed
in just those ways which make [that] mechanism most problematical. Stability has vanished....It is the requirement of adaptability to the environment which leads to the predicted demise of bureaucracy and to the collapse of management as we know it now. (pp. 9-10)

The alternative to management from the outside is a decision by choice-making human members inside to take in hand their own destinies, to accept responsibility for their own corporate action (Vickers, 1973). Although such an idea is hardly new in political theory, rarely is it manifest in contemporary American education. School buildings are managed by superintendents through principals who manage their staffs. R&D curriculum products of regional educational laboratories are laid upon teachers who resist them despite the design contribution of experts. Sophisticated systems schemes for improving educational operations, often supported by NIE funds, show disappointing results when promising plans hit the fan of local educators with their own ideas of how education should happen.

Few educators believe that educational operations should not be improved. Yet the history of efforts to change educational practice is dismal, in large part because no adequate knowledge base exists (Gaynor, Note 1; Mackett-Frank, 1976). Gradually, however, the analysis of failures of educational change efforts is generating a patterned set of conclusions, too coherent to be lightly regarded as hints and warnings to potential change agents:

1. Most educational innovations require social system changes (in roles, role relationships, and organizational forms) if the intended consequences of the change are to occur -- a fact nearly always neglected in plans for change. (Fullan, 1972, p. 2)
(2) The needed reconstruction of schooling must begin with the adults in the school and the social system they constitute, not with pedagogy, materials and pupil achievement. (Goodlad, 1975b, p. xii)

(3) Development in education refers to a process of adaptation or transformation in individuals or human groupings...rather than in curricula, instructional procedures or methods, or materials. (Sanders, Note 4, p. 29)

(4) Motivation is often seen as purely a function of the person. ...Yet, when similar persons were compared in different environments..., attraction and felt responsibility were found to vary with the outside environment. (Barker & Gump, 1964, p. 134)

(5) Any attempt to introduce change into the school setting requires, among other things, changing the existing regularities in some way. The intended outcomes involve changing an existing regularity, eliminating one or more of them, or producing new ones. (Sarason, 1971, p. 63)

(6) Schools...must become responsive to their own problems and needs and to the rich array of resources, including alternative models, available for dealing effectively with these problems and needs. (Goodlad, 1975a, p. 2)

(7) Experts should be used only in carefully structured ways,... and ultimate responsibility for the change effort should always reside with the target organization, not with outside experts. (Gaynor, Note 1, p. 30)

(8) The school is a complex entity composed of social interactions bounded by regulations and restrictions. If these factors are ignored, even the most intensive change effort is doomed to failure. (Tye & Novotney, 1975, p. 9)

(9) [No] national grand scheme of educational innovation is going to do the job....It's a school-by-school, local kind of business. (Goodlad, 1978, p. 50)

The mounting number of conclusions which point to the nature of the school as a complex social entity with power to undertake or resist change underscores the need for a radical revision in the way educational change is conceptualized: away from emphasis on management by external agents, and toward emphasis upon internal control by educational entities themselves.
Developmental Assumptions

Out of the emerging awareness of the need for this conceptual shift, some educational change efforts have already incorporated elements of a more holistic, developmental stance. Others have explicitly affirmed this approach as a starting point, and gone on to formulate their change efforts inside an entity-centered framework (Williams et al., 1974; Tye & Novotney, 1975; Goodlad, 1975a; Mackett-Frank, 1976; Frymier, 1977; Goodlad, 1978). The reports of these efforts echo the same themes -- on a smaller scale and in an educational context -- which social theorists referred to above have been describing on an institutional level. These will serve as assumptions underlying this study:

1. The fundamental locus of control over the dynamics of an educational entity is internal to the entity.
2. Educational entities can undertake to change themselves through a process of social learning.
3. Educational entities can resist intruded change efforts.
4. Educational entities exert, through the power of their socio-cultural structure, considerable control over the motivation and behavior of their human members.
5. Only through a process of adaptive relating to the environment can educational entities effectively attain the goals for which they are constituted.

That such a set of assumptions can emerge from a collective experience of failure suggests the beginning of a paradigm shift which, as Kuhn (1970) describes it, occurs when the old way of conceptualizing
becomes increasingly inadequate. Yet to state such propositions, however interrelated, still provides only the conceptual parameters for the fundamental question to be faced if educational entities are to become adaptive, self-balancing, self-transforming:

How do educational entities develop, i.e. adapt, balance themselves out over time and through space, and transform themselves?

Unless more adequate knowledge is provided to educators about how educational entities can develop, it is unlikely that they will be able to regulate their own entities from the inside in an adaptive manner.

The State of the Literature

The literature from many fields provides insight into what the nature of development inside an educational entity might be. Early evolutionary theory, despite what are now judged to be considerable inadequacies, still articulates a "sense of a permanent emergence and hence creativity within the scheme of human arrangements" (Naegele, 1961, p. 1209). Functionalist sociological theory emphasizes the structure and functioning of social entities, describing elements of these in abstract terms. The more modern general living systems theory is also concerned with structure and function, but describes elements in terms of concrete subsystems; in addition, this theory emphasizes the organic nature of social entities by linking them structurally with simpler living forms.

Many of the modern critiques of functionalist theory have raised important questions about the basic causes of social action, emphasizing cognitive activity, symbol systems, the experience of meaning, the subjective, and the situated-ness of the experiencing person. Modern
biological theory contributes two major elements to an understanding of the nature of development in an organic entity: it clarifies what it is to be organic, and views the transformation of generations of organisms in the long term perspective of evolution.

Social theorists who today take an evolutionary stance emphasize the global importance of understanding the transformation of social entities inside an evolutionary context, i.e. with recognition of the interdependence of life, of the effect of the environment on the entity and vice versa, of the need for and processes of adaptation, of the distinction between growth and development, and of the power of humans to make intelligent choices as agents of their own evolution. Perhaps most importantly, they articulate a non-deterministic mode of change in social entities, with elements of collective learning, centered (i.e. between rational and mythological) consciousness, and self-regulating mechanisms.

What is often referred to as "the change literature" is less global, and its focus on change in organizations might appear at first glance to be the most relevant to the study under consideration. But its most useful aspects turn out to be the insights emerging from the analysis of many change efforts undertaken out of human relations and management orientations. On the other hand, some contemporary action-reflection studies inside education lend valuable insights into the power of an entity's culture and social structure to further or impede developmental processes.

Finally, the literature of participant observation, especially that dealing with the study of educational settings, illuminates the complexity and yet wholeness of social entities whose purpose is the
conduct of an educational program. In addition to this substantive com-
monality, their methodological approach emphasizes the importance of
existential confrontation with lived social interaction -- a confronta-
tion which demands examining the particular in depth.

Yet as substantial as these bodies of literature are in them-
selves, they provide only fragments of the knowledge needed about how
educational entities do or can develop. These fragments may eventually
be gathered together into a mosaic against which developmental efforts
may be intelligently conducted. But at the present time, too little is
known specifically about the development of the educational entity to
see which fragments of theory are most relevant in the practice-oriented
field of education.

For that reason, this study was undertaken to begin to gather
the empirical data needed specifically on the development of educational
entities. The educational program was chosen as an appropriate entity
to investigate because it is the social entity within education most
clearly expressive of the educational function; and because it is the
entity with greatest "up-close" importance both to those educated and to
those facilitating their education, since it is the operationalization
of their fundamental reason for being together,

Goals of the Research and Methodological Implications

The question which this study undertook to address was How does
the educational program develop? The aims of the research were determined
to be these:
(1) To investigate the structure of development through the gathering of first-hand empirical data about an educational program as it operates in a natural setting;

(2) To analyze these data with the intention of proposing theoretical relationships; and

(3) On the basis of the analysis, to determine how further study might proceed.

Stated in this form, the research aims set up some parameters around the existing methodological options, but do not clearly demand the choice of a single method. Considerations which influenced the choice of participant observation as a methodology involved issues of the type of data to be collected, the nature of the research question, and feasibility.

The kind of data to be collected had to offer the possibility of discovering how the entity operated as a whole, since how development operates was assumed to be a function of the whole entity. Ideally, data should be gathered from both emic and etic perspectives: emic so that what was happening as only insiders could know would be uncovered; etic so that data could be captured in a theoretical framework in which participants were unlikely to interpret their own experience. Finally, since the question to be researched asked how development actually happened rather than how participants interpreted their experience, data needed to be both observational and perceptual, so that one type could be used to check on the other.
If the research question had been understood as one of the order of development across educational programs, a team of researchers studying the structure of development in a variety of programs would have been required. But the question was understood as one of structure, requiring a formulative study oriented toward the generation of theory about the interrelationships among and between structures and processes, and among the real people whose interacting gives rise to those structures. For this reason, the question seemed to require the in-depth investigation of a single entity.

Participant observation offered the possibility of collecting holistic data from both emic and etic perspectives, and of balancing out observational with perceptual data. Since only a single educational setting was to be investigated, the study could be undertaken by a single researcher.

The demands of the methodology were regarded as substantial, but meeting them appeared feasible. Access would have to be gained to a setting where an educational program was operating and developing. A role for the researcher, unobtrusive enough not to interfere with the collection of data, would have to be negotiated over time with participants. The researcher would have to gain the trust of participants and find ways they might be subtly interviewed without interfering with their work. Finally, the time invested would have to be great enough to make possible the accurate interpretation of meanings. Program participants would have to be observed in a variety of situations and intensely enough over time that momentary perturbations could be distinguished from characteristic processes.
Problem Conceptualization

From the beginning of the conceptualization of this research, the problem was to discover how the educational program developed. Basic to the framing of the question in developmental terms was an understanding of the educational program as a sociocultural entity deliberately set up and operated over time to facilitate learning by designated groups of learners (Sanders, Note 3). Because it manifested definite patterning and stability over time in the interrelationships of its participants, the program was considered a social entity. Because its patterns of interaction were governed by symbols and meanings, it was considered a cultural entity.

The intent of the study was to discover how the social structure of the program entity was constituted and developed, and how the structure and its transformation were affected by the meanings which members made of their corporate life. Since social structure and development were both conceptual abstractions, the tangible reality which could be observed were the members of a group gathered together for the purpose of enacting an educational program. It seemed reasonable to assume that through observation of their interaction, the structure of the program and its development might eventually be discerned.

In order to gather observational data, a six-dimensional model of development in social entities was constructed to be used as a guide to observations. This transactional model drew primarily upon the work of Mooney (1963; Note 2) and Parsons (1961). In substantive terms, development was conceived of in terms of entity structure, transaction with the
environment, and transformation of the entity structure through the transaction. Each of these was viewed from the perspective of structural state and of process, resulting in the following aspects, according to which it was presumed that observations could be categorized: entitativity and integration process; adaptive capacity and entity energization process; assimilation and collective learning.

Defined in terms of product, educational development was understood as improvement in educational operations (Sanders, Note 3). But since the problem of product could not be addressed adequately without attention to process (Sarason, 1971), Dunn's (1971) definition of development in process terms -- transformation of the mode of behavior of an activity system -- was adopted as the basis for a process-focused definition of educational program development: adaptive transformation of the mode of behavior of the educational program entity.

Before the researcher even entered the field, the model was further modified to remove as much "content" as possible from the dimensions specified. In this way, the tendency to see reality in terms of a priori assumptions, which Glaser and Strauss (1967) had argued against, might be reduced. The resulting six dimensions were based on minimum definitional requirements: the structural state of the program, the structural process of the program, the structural capacity of the program to engage in transaction, the transactional process itself, the structural and procedural impact of the transaction upon the entity, and the process of impact. Reducing the substantive dimensions of the model to definitional categories was seen as furthering the possibility that data collected might be justified as empirical.
Change in the Conceptualization of the Problem

Difficulties with this transactional conceptualization of program entity development began occurring almost as soon as the researcher entered the field, observational scheme in hand. Major dimensions upon which the model was based turned out to be too elusive to be observed directly: the program itself, program boundaries, the environment, program transactions with the environment.

The failure to find data which could be categorized according to the predetermined scheme prompted a reassessment of the transactional conceptualization of program development. Tentative explanations of the failure to find the expected data included these: the conception of development as a transactional process was wrong; the conception of development as a transactional process was inadequate; the conception of development as a transactional process was sound, but for some reason the phenomenon was being viewed inappropriately to yield the supporting evidence; the conception of the educational program as an entity in itself was inappropriate to the setting where observations were conducted.

The decision to switch to an ethnographic mode of data collection seemed dictated by the failure to gather data effectively with the observational scheme. The educational program could still be observed, but with no attempt to screen out those data which did not fit into predetermined categories. Data collection seemed forced to a more basic level than had originally been intended. Instead of collecting data that would contribute to the beginning verification of theory, the researcher would gather as much data as possible to provide a basis for theory generation.
Despite the shift in conceptualization which prompted the revision in methodological approach, some basic theoretical assumptions persisted. Under whatever label, educational activities were carried on by some social entity. That social entity was an organic whole: actions of members had an impact on the whole, elements were interdependent, it had some perceivable structure and culture, and it was developing. The question remained HOW?

The ethnographic posture in data collecting was maintained throughout the rest of the year of observation in the setting. Only after some months of collecting data did central concepts begin to appear -- or more precisely, phenomena seemed to cluster together in forms which could be named through the use of terminology learned in the setting or already present in the investigator's conceptual repertoire. How the program and its development were to be conceptualized had to be learned in the setting.

Description of the Research

Because the intention was to gather reliable data in a relatively uncharted area, participant observation was used as a method for returning to "direct experience as the most reliable form of knowledge about the social world" (Douglas, 1976, p. 7). The type of data collected was primarily observational, although perceptual data were also gathered, especially as a check upon investigator interpretation of meaning. The scope of information collected covers the interaction of the staff of a single school in the process of operating a single educational program. Almost
all data were gathered in the context of school, although in social as well as task-oriented situations. The study will be presented in this form:

In Chapter II: Review of the Literature, the theoretical background for approaching the development of the educational program as an organic process of a sociocultural entity is provided.

In Chapter III: The Methodology of Participant Observation are presented commonalities in substantive concerns among participant observation studies, as well as epistemological and procedural questions relative to the use of the methodology in general.

In Chapter IV: Design and Procedures are described the elements of order and consistency by which data were collected and their validity determined.

In Chapter V: The School -- Emic and Etic Perspectives, the social entity of the school is presented as the data are reported descriptively, first in the terms in which staff members describe their own operations, then in more abstracted terms of social structure and culture.

In Chapter VI: The Educational Program, the program is analyzed as an operating social entity, according to basic categories of foundation, impetus and operations.

In Chapter VII: The Development of the Educational Program, the specifically developmental operations are focused upon, as the same basic categories of foundation, impetus and operations are used to analyze relevant data.
In Chapter VIII: A Theory of Educational Program Development, theoretical relationships among conceptual categories are proposed. In Chapter IX: Implications for Practice and Research, suggestions are made for application to educational practice and for inquiry into program development.

Significance of the Study

The basic question of professional concern to which this study relates is the design and operation of educational entities which can transform themselves from the inside. Because the phenomenon of development is asserted to be relevant to all social systems, the assertion also stands that the data generated by this study are relevant, in varying degrees, to all educational entities. Those professionals to whom this study is likely to appear most useful, however, are those directly involved in program operations and committed to participation in improvement.

The study was not intended to generate reliable information about how such developing educational programs might be created. It did, however, generate grounded theory about how an educational program develops, as well as empirically grounded recommendations for the further study of educational entity development.

In addition, the study provides descriptive information about development in an educational setting which is different from any that could be found in the existing literature. The methodology used here has been employed in educational settings, but to study other issues (e.g. Rist, 1973); schools have been approached as complex sociocultural
entities, but in the context of action research (e.g. Goodlad, 1975a); development has been addressed in the field of education, but in relation to the individual (e.g. Chickering, 1969) or as the design and production element of R&D (e.g. Clark, 1974).

Limitations of the Research

Both perceptual and observational data were collected, but the emphasis was clearly upon the observational, and the claim to emic data must be judged in terms of the observer's capacity to understand as an insider would understand, rather than in terms of the participants' articulation of their own understanding.

To try to incorporate the advantages of both emic and etic perspectives simultaneously might appear like epistemological fence-straddling to participant observer methodologists at either end of the objective-subjective spectrum. Neither of those extreme positions is adopted here: (1) that absolute objectivity is either possible or desirable, nor (2) that subjective experience is the only "real truth" of a situation. Instead, an intermediate position has been pursued, as the investigator stepped back and forth between the roles of scientific observer and experiencing person, meeting the subjects of the research both as professional educators and as experiencing persons. Whether such a stance is viewed as a limitation or as a proper argument for increased credibility of the data will depend upon the epistemological position of the critic.

The problem of generalizability is usually addressed as a limitation in studies of any single entity, because such studies are regarded
as having "relatively low power for inferencing to larger populations until supported by cumulative data or subjected to empirical test" (Mackett-Frank, 1976, p. 26). Although this study did involve only a single entity, however, the claim is made here for inference to larger populations -- not of the substantive elements of life as expressed in this single developing entity, but of the structure of the phenomenon of development in educational settings. Such inference forms the basis of the theory presented in the concluding chapter.

Generalizability is therefore regarded in one sense as a limitation: it is highly unlikely that any other educational program will develop exactly like this one, since personalities and events are unique. On the other hand, if, by discovering how development happens in real life even in one situation, insight might be gained into the process of development as a general phenomenon, then the data grounded theory might be said to be potentially generalizable.

A limitation of this study which clearly exists is a problem of any research conducted by a single investigator. Theoretical formulations are those which could be generated on the basis of the understanding of a single person in the field, although emerging understandings were checked out periodically with advisers. In addition, the danger of researcher bias is increased when no other investigators are available to challenge the validity of the data or their interpretation. In this study, however, the subjects often performed this function. Other validating procedures will be described in Chapter IV.
Definition of Terms

Specialized terms used in this study are presented here:

**Adaptation**: change in entity structure or behavior in response to changing internal or environmental conditions.

**Culture**: transmitted and created content and patterns of values, ideas, and other symbolic-meaningful systems as factors in the shaping of human behavior. (Kroeber & Parsons, 1958, p. 36)

**Development, entity**: an enlarged or improved capacity for behavior as a result of transformed entity structure.

**Development, program**: the transformation of a program entity so that its capacity to facilitate learning is enhanced; such entity change is manifested in improved educational operations.

**Emic**: An emic [approach] is an attempt to discover and describe the pattern of the particular...culture in reference to the way in which the various elements of that culture are related to each other in the functioning of the particular pattern, rather than an attempt to describe them in reference to a generalized classification derived in advance of the study of that culture. (Pike, 1954, p. 8)

**Entitativity**: the state of being an entity.

**Entity, social**: any collective of human beings which might be identified as real in itself by virtue of the existence of a field of relationships between members.

**Ethnographic research**: a genre of anthropologically based field studies directed at the systematic study of complete sociocultural systems. (Mackett-Frank, 1976, p. 26)
Ethnomethodological research: the study of the processes by which persons make social meaning out of social situations through structuring activities based on common-sense knowledge of culture (Garfinkle, 1974).

Etic: For etic purposes the analyst stands "far enough away" from or "outside" of a particular culture to see its separate events, primarily in relation to their similarities and their differences, as compared to events in other cultures, rather than in reference to the sequences of classes of events within that one particular culture. (Pike, 1954, p. 10)

Function: the interconnection between the social structure and the process of social life; the part the structure plays in accounting for the coherence and persistence of the social whole. (Buckley, 1957, p. 240, after Radcliffe-Brown, 1952)

Goal attainment: the directional change that tends to reduce the discrepancy between the needs of the system, with respect to input-output interchange, and the conditions... that bear upon the "fulfillment" of such needs. (Parsons, 1961, p. 39)

Integration: the mutual adjustment of units of the system from the point of view of their contributions to the effective functioning of the system as a whole (Parsons, 1961).

Intuition: the capacity to apprehend local meanings which inhere in a social context. (Bruyn, 1966, p. 167)

Pattern maintenance: the maintenance of the stability of the patterns of institutionalized culture defining the structure of the system (Parsons, 1961).

Phenomenological: primarily oriented toward description rather than toward the formation of theory; the subjective perspective is of primary importance (Goldstein, 1961).
Positivism: the belief in science's ultimate adequacy as a mode of knowing and as a guide for action; it...perceives the natural and human worlds...as fully amenable to systematic and eventually quantitative exploration and explanation. (Naegele, 1961, p. 1210)

Program, educational: a social entity deliberately established and operated over time to facilitate learning by more than one learner. (Sanders, Note 3, p. 4)

Setting, educational: the physical or situational context for educational activity.

Social learning: sharing in a range of acquired information through communication and social system participation. (Dunn, 1971, p. 239)

Structure: identification of the parts of a single whole, of their relationship to one another, and of their function in relation to the whole and the environment. (Bates & Harvey, 1975, p. 23)

System, social: the specifically relational system of interaction among individuals and collectivities (Kroeber & Parsons, 1958, p. 582). [An entity may be treated as a system] when a set of interdependent phenomena shows sufficiently definite patterning and stability over time. (Parsons, 1961, p. 36)
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Fields of literature which provide background for this study are diverse, but the criterion for relevance rests upon the single question: What base of theoretical literature contributes to the framing of the research problem in developmental terms?

Conceptual Background

Chapter I presented an introduction to the importance of the problem by citing arguments made by social theorists about the design of adaptive systems, and by those reflecting upon the failure of planned change efforts to improve educational operations significantly. In this chapter, a cursory survey of modern social theory will be presented, with emphasis upon theories of social evolution, as background for exploration of the position of contemporary social and political theorists who assume a basically evolutionary posture in their emphasis upon adaptive, self-regulating social entities.

Included will be a review of the functionalist position which arose out of the positivist tradition, especially in reaction to evolutionism. Parsons' (1961) stipulation of functional imperatives for social entities, used in initial stages of this study to guide observations, is squarely situated within the functionalist school.
Following that review will be a look at the contemporary literature of planned change, especially as it applies to the social organization of the school. Although not offering the insight into developmental process provided by the other literature, this deals most directly with transformation in educational entities.

Evolution in Social Thought

Accounts of the origins of organismic formulations in modern social thought often begin with the work of Spencer. Yet "who now reads Spencer?" Crane Brinton (1933) asks....

It is difficult for us to realize how great a stir he made in the world....He was the intimate confidant of a strange and rather unsatisfactory God, whom he called the principle of Evolution. (pp. 226-227)

What Spencer called Evolution, however, was very different from the modern conceptualization of the same phenomenon. Articulating a form of social Darwinism, Spencer approached the study of society and social forms from a historicist position. Today Spencer is commonly interpreted as having understood human society as a biological organism, evolving in a single, unbroken line from earliest times to its approaching culmination in British industrial society. As the mechanism of evolution, "progress" was supposed to carry along social developments on an even keel, since it contained its own self-regulating mechanism (Parsons, 1937). Such a view is in diametric opposition to that held by most contemporary social theorists (see especially Dunn, 1971; Jantsch, 1975 and Vickers, 1970).

Adopted from the philosophers of the Enlightenment was an idea that gave real substance to the paradigm the social Darwinists were
commited to working out: not only were societies natural systems (organisms), but they had a necessary course of development. From this position, it was only a short step to seeing logical connections in ethnographic data as necessary conditions, leading to causal relationships and the articulation of social laws (Evans-Pritchard, 1962).

With such a positivist approach to human history, social theorists like Spencer could proceed rationally to divide up that long spectrum of time from primitive man to civilized British industrial man into logical stages. This set of stages could serve as the framework for ethnographic data already collected, they believed, and so a real, non-speculative social science could begin to develop (Evans-Pritchard, 1962).

Although some dispute still exists over whether Spencer ever intended that society be regarded literally as a living organism, or whether he was simply reasoning analogically from a biological model (Buckley, 1957), the view of society commonly held by those early evolutionists was that of an organism (i.e. a living, integrated whole), composed of organs or structures through which the organism's requirements for survival or effective functioning were met (Cannon, 1932).

By the end of the 19th century, the deficiencies of the historicist approach to social theory were becoming evident. Attacks arose from two fronts: first diffusionist (culture is often borrowed; it does not necessarily arise by a natural process), then functionalist. The attack by functionalists had less to do with substantive errors in the evolutionary position than with the challenge of relevance: proving the origins of social institutions is irrelevant to understanding their workings and social structure in the present (Evans-Pritchard, 1962).
More mechanistic conceptualizations of society (e.g. Durkheim's, 1893/1933) led to increased attention to the structure and function of entities themselves, in contrast to a preoccupation with their origins and the stages of their development into modern times.

In social terms, this emphasis was carried out in the functionalist school, which became the dominant stream in American sociology for the first half of the 20th century. More recently, this same concern with structure and function has undergirded the attempt to draw together bodies of research and theory from many fields into a single, general living systems theory (Miller, 1978). The position of each of these will be presented briefly, and then major reactions to a functionalist position summarized.

The Functionalist Position

Concerned with socially meaningful human activities, functionalism is only now losing ground in American social thought to renewed interest in evolutionary theory (Parsons, 1968) and to the newer critical philosophical sociology: existentialist, phenomenologist, and ethnomethodologist (Douglas & Johnson, 1977).

The work of Parsons has been central to this school of thought. Parsons' notion of a social system focuses on the functional imperatives of any social entity, and on the structures of an entity which enable it to perform its essential functions:

Values take primacy in the pattern maintenance functioning of a social system. Norms are primarily integrative; they regulate the great variety of processes that contribute to the implementation of patterned value commitments. The primary functioning of the collectivity concerns actual goal attainment on behalf
of the social system... The primary function of the role in the social system is adaptive. (Parsons, 1966, p. 19)

Concrete social entities are understood as composed of all four structural components, and must carry on all four functional aspects if they are to survive.

An important criticism of functionalist theory -- that it deals inadequately with the problem of change (Parsons, 1968) -- has recently received more attention within that school. Parsons especially has renewed his earlier interest in Weber's theories of societal evolution. The critical assumption which links an evolutionary perspective to the functionalist position and to the organic perspective with which this study was first approached is stated by Parsons (1966):

Among change processes, the type more important to the evolutionary perspective is the enhancement of adaptive capacity, either within the society originating a new type of structure or, through cultural diffusion and the involvement of other factors in combination with the new type of structure, within other societies and perhaps at later periods. (p. 21)

General Living Systems Theory

Miller (1978), who has worked on a functionalist theory which might apply to all living systems, shares in common with the sociological functionalists a primary concern with structure and function. However, his work differs from theirs in important ways.

Miller focuses on concrete rather than abstracted systems. Much more common in the biological than in the social sciences, such an approach is now not only possible, Miller insists, but essential for significant progress in contemporary social theory. Social entities are concrete: their structures exist in specific locations and the processes
of their subsystems produce changes over time. If social entities are in fact concrete, Miller thinks, they should be studied in concrete terms.

Of interest especially to social theorists who have emphasized the organic functioning of social systems -- often forced to reason by analogy from biological theory -- is Miller's frontal attack on the problem of whether social systems might be considered living in themselves. He asserts that systems on a higher level than the organism can be considered living in themselves, because all seven levels of systems which he identifies as living (cell, organ, organism, group, organization, society, and supranational system) manifest the same characteristics which are not as a set manifested by non-living systems:

(a) They are open systems.

(b) They maintain a steady state of negentropy even though entropic changes occur in them as they do everywhere else.

(c) They have more than a certain minimum degree of complexity.

(d) They either contain genetic material composed of DNA or have a charter, which is the "program" of their structure and process from the moment of their origin.

(e) They are largely composed of an aqueous suspension of macromolecules, and may also contain nonliving components.

(f) They have a decider, the essential critical subsystem, which controls the entire system, causing its subsystems and components to interact.

(g) They also have certain other essential critical subsystems or they have symbiotic or parasitic relationships with other living or non-living systems which carry out the processes of any subsystem they lack.

(h) Their subsystems are integrated together to form actively self-regulating, developing, unitary systems with purposes and goals.
(i) They can exist only in a certain environment. (Miller, 1978, p. 18)

Miller proceeds to identify 19 subsystems by which specific functions are performed: reproducer, boundary, ingestor, distributor, converter, producer, matter-energy storage, extruder, motor, supporter, input transducer, internal transducer, channel and net, decoder, associator, memory, decider, encoder and output transducer.

Parsons had identified the essential functions which systems must perform, if they are to survive. Miller identifies both what the component sub-functions are as well as the concrete subsystems which perform those functions. Most significantly, he then goes on to name, with only seven exceptions out of 133, all the concrete component subsystems which carry out the 19 basic processes in all seven levels of living systems.

Refuting those who would term such a hard science approach to living systems reductionist, Miller protests that, on the contrary, he is attempting to portray "the endless complexity of life (which) is organized into patterns which repeat themselves -- theme and variation -- at each level of system" (p. 1025). Because of the extensive empirical research which he has managed to relate to each of these concrete systems and subsystems, Miller has reason for claiming that general living systems theory is "a specific conceptualization which can be confirmed or disconfirmed by empirical observations" (p. 1026).

Criticism of Functionalism

Functionalists have been criticized by general systems theorists for their closed-system approach, by phenomenologists for their
objectification of feelings and beliefs, and by cognitive theorists for their over-emphasis upon norms and values. Yet their preoccupation with discovering patterns of socially meaningful action has led to what is regarded here as a useful axis (i.e. that of function) for understanding the development of the educational program.

Despite this heuristic value, however, the deficiencies of functionalist theory have been argued convincingly by theorists of other schools. For that reason, the functionalist approach will not be relied upon exclusively in this research. Arguments advanced by symbolic interactionists, phenomenologists and existentialists will also be taken into account in pursuit of the research problem.

In contrast to the functionalists, who emphasized value patterns as the cause of social action, the symbolic interactionists concentrate upon symbols and cognitive symbolic activity. Douglas and Johnson (1977) categorize the work of Becker (e.g. 1968) and Goffman (e.g. 1959) as basically within this framework, since they consistently draw attention to linguistic symbols and their effect on social action,

especially on the ways in which individuals construct and maintain self-images in terms of a shared universe of symbols ...through their interaction with other actors. (Douglas & Johnson, 1977, p. 8)

More recently, phenomenologists (philosophers, sociologists, psychologists), in the same stream as the symbolic interactionists, have focused on the "conscious, cognitive, symbolically meaningful aspects of human experience" (Douglas & Johnson, 1977, p. 9). Rather than objectifying symbols, they concentrate on the human experience of making
meaning. In contrast to the "objective" stance of both functionalists and symbolic interactionists,

the phenomenological approach to social reality emphasizes the primary role meaning plays in the interpretation of social action. In order to be able to perceive the subjective meanings an actor gives his own or his partners' actions, the researcher has to abandon the perspective of an outside, detached observer and adopt the perspective of the actor himself. (Jehenson, 1973, p. 241)

Because of its concern with what Schutz (1967) first termed "typifications," phenomenology not only emphasizes the subjective but calls attention to all in life that is taken for granted:

Mundane existence is structured by typifying schemes that are accepted without being questioned. These typifications are socially derived, being transmitted to the human actor through membership in a social group. (Jehenson, 1973, p. 142)

Reference to the argument presented in Chapter I about the need for the design of adaptive systems because of the rapidity of change in the contemporary world clarifies the importance of such a contribution to knowledge of social life. When "pursuit of life as usual has become problematic" (Wagner, 1973, p. 84), the need is apparent to bring to consciousness existing assumptions which affect collective life, in order consciously to choose to live by those sets of assumptions which are most fitting in a demanding environment.

As different as these two major streams of sociological thought are (i.e. symbolic interactionism and phenomenology), they exhibit in common, Douglas and Johnson (1977) point out, a deterministic view of man. A similar deterministic view is promoted by those who ascribe explanations for human behavior totally to biology or to the power of the unconscious. Existentialists object to such a Weltanschauung because
they see too much evidence for man's freedom:

Man is varied, changeable, uncertain, conflictful, and partially free to choose what he will do and what he will become, because he must do so to exist in a world that is varied, changeable, uncertain, and conflictful....The only way man has been able to survive in his world...is by adapting himself to it....Man is in basic conflict with himself and his world -- determined and free, situational and transsituational. (Douglas & Johnson, 1977, p. 14)

As in philosophy, existentialism in sociology emphasizes the situated-ness of the experiencing person, as well as the problematic nature of his relationship with his environment. In contrast to other sociological approaches which arose in reaction to functionalism, existentialist sociology attempts to probe the "substantive rationality social actors use in their daily lives (Douglas & Johnson, 1977, p. xiii), and therefore highlights feelings as well as cognitive operations.

The Continuation of Social Evolution Theory

Although excesses among some Victorian social theorists by the turn of the century had prompted the rise of functionalism in reaction, the evolutionary tradition within social theory had not died. Harris (1968) mounts a strong defense of the early evolutionists whom he believes have been generally misrepresented and misunderstood. He protests Steward's (1955) characterization of the "classical evolutionary formulation as unilinear, offering evidence from the work of Morgan (1877) and Tylor (1889) that evolutionary stages were not regarded universally as fixed stages through which all cultures had gone.

Although he acknowledges many deficiencies in the work of the early evolutionary theorists, Harris points to the scientific value of
the comparative method they emphasized as they attempted to gather together systematically great masses of ethnographic data.

Sahlins' (1960) work distinguishing "general" from "specific" evolution points to principles of evolutionary theory which have persisted in social theory, primarily through anthropology:

(1) On the one hand, (evolution) creates diversity through adaptive modification: new forms differentiate from old.

(2) On the other side, evolution generates progress: high forms arise from, and surpass, lower. (p. 13)

Another concept crucial to an understanding of evolution which has persisted in social theory is that of adaptation. Harding (1960) explains adaptation as "the securing and conserving of control over environment -- the orienting process of the specific evolution of both life and culture" (p. 45).

This adaptive process has two essential aspects: creative and conservative:

On the one hand there is the evolution of specialized structures and patterns that enable a culture or a population of organisms to achieve a requisite measure of adjustment to its environmental setting. On the other hand, there is a tendency toward stabilization, the conservation of the adaptive structures and modes that have been achieved. (Harding, 1960, p. 45)

Dunn (1971), who terms social transformation "sociogenesis" in order to link it explicitly with the biological process of phylogenesis, is careful to point out that adaptation operates somewhat differently in the social realm than it does in the biological. Instead of always adapting behavior to the environment as in phylogenesis, sociogenesis often "leads to action specifically addressed to modifying or controlling some aspect of the environment...."
In the social process the environmental feedback is so direct that the relationship between behavior and environmental modification may become perceived and made an integral part of the adaptive process....It follows from this that social adaptation has the capacity to anticipate indirect effects of social behavior and make them direct effects through planned behavioral sequences. Sociogenesis can be...active and anticipatory as well as reactive. (Dunn, 1971, p. 85)

Treating social entities as capable of such adaptation is in direct contrast to conventional modes of prediction and planning applied to social systems. Often the design of social entities is treated as an engineering problem, Dunn believes, because of a "logical extension of the efficiency optimum of static state equilibrium systems common to economics" (p. 121). Treating social systems instead as learning systems is not only more accurate a reflection of how they actually behave -- adapting, evolving, adding new channels, reorienting old channels, and modifying channel capacities -- but is, Dunn proposes, potentially far more productive for the future of human society.

Parsons, having passed through what he has termed his structural-functional phase (Parsons, 1968), and more recently concerned with problems of societal evolution, summarizes other important aspects of evolutionary theory relevant to a consideration of social entities:

Man is the only cultural animal, and his culture, being interdependent with his society, makes his social organization different from that of any other species....Distinctively human organic developments are the basis of the capacities which underlie cultural-social life and organization; they are capacities for learning and for organizing learned materials and patterns. They comprise conditions for organizing behavior in terms of symbolic systems, which constitutes action in our terminology. In the realm of action, the gene has been replaced by the symbol as the basic structural element. (Parsons, 1977, pp. 25-26)

Contemporary evolutionary theory is drastically different from that which Spencer attempted to apply to the development of social
institutions. Contemporary social conditions too are drastically changed, and so the way in which evolutionary theory is applied today to society and its subsystems takes a very different form.

The press of social conditions constantly demands more adequate knowledge of how social change does or can happen. How society might be changed becomes a more pressing question in the face of mounting global problems:

1. An exploding population expected to reach seven billion by the year 2000...threatens...to lead to a population density incompatible with life as we know it.

2. Careless and/or ruthless use of technological advances have led to widespread pollution of our environment, as well as of our societies.

3. The widespread expansion of communication systems,...instead of considering and promoting ethical values,...has concentrated on commercial aspects, emphasizing the gap between members of the affluent and the poor societies,...(attracting) large population fractions into metropolitan areas, thus further upsetting the ecological systems of which humans are a part.

4. Evolution is invariably associated with passing from a state of undifferentiated wholeness to differentiation of parts thus leading to progressive mechanization and the confrontation between individual goals and the needs of society....

(Attinger, 1970, pp. XI-XII)

The methods of classical science are increasingly regarded as inadequate for dealing with the complexities of problems in modern society. Analyses of the contemporary social situation often conclude that such needs demand different or expanded conceptual schemes to allow for systems of thought where the classical approaches have not succeeded (Attinger, 1970; Dunn, 1971).

Much of the contemporary interest in evolutionary theory has stemmed from this impetus toward looking elsewhere for ways out of the
evolutionary dead-end which rises like a spector behind population explosions and massive pollution. The distinction between growth and development, basic concepts in evolutionary theory, is suddenly crucial in social terms:

Growth implies that an activity system is increasing the scale of its social structures and the quantitative level of its activities....Development implies that an activity system is transformed in the mode of its behavior. Growth is a scale concept and development a behavioral concept. (Dunn, 1971, p. 9)

Dunn points to the processes of both biological and social development which have been linked to increases in behavioral complexity as the justification for linking development generally with increased complexity. These increases, he emphasizes, have been associated in turn with improvements in system adaptability.

The distinction between growth and development is important first of all because growth and development are not perfectly correlated. The distinction is even more important, however, because it is development rather than growth which is associated with the adaptive capacity. To obscure the distinction between the two interferes with the generation of theory adequate to the design of adaptive systems.

In direct contrast to the theory of Evolution propounded by Spencer, contemporary evolutionary theory is non-deterministic. Of all elements of evolutionary theory which have been applied to the social realm, however, this has proved the most difficult to incorporate well into models of the structure and change of social systems. Most models of social system change in use today are deterministic in that the end state is predetermined by the inherent process of change (Dunn, 1971).
This orientation is reflected in the management literature reviewed later in this chapter. Notable exceptions to that approach are theories of change articulated by Sackman (1967), Dunn (1971), Campbell (1968), Rieken and Boruch (1974), and Bronfenbrenner (1976).

Sackman (1967) addresses the question of the long-term use of computers in an evolving society, and takes a stance for what he terms "evolutionary experimentalism":

> the extension of experimental method to social systems so that the course of social action is experimentally regulated with respect to relatively long-range evolutionary goals determined by changing social requirements. (p. 210)

While acknowledging that such a definition reflects an approach like Dewey's in regard to experimentalism, Sackman points out the crucial difference is his insistence upon evolutionary goals and evolutionary process:

> Experimental method, by itself, is random and chaotic unless guided by a relatively consistent set of goals -- a human plan that builds upon past experience, orients experimental behavior toward the solution of current problems, and aims toward the construction of a desired future. (p. 211)

Working from the same base in evolutionary theory, Dunn (1971) discusses social transformation as a process of social learning, carried forward by the human capacity to change behavior. Contrasting the process with that of phylogenetic evolution, he characterizes human social self-transforming behavior as "consciously practiced; socialized through shared ideas and action; and purposive, directed and goal-oriented" (p. 112).

For Dunn then, the important question is whether there are rules that govern this process which might provide a guide to the practice of
behavior-changing behavior. He proposes that the answer is tied up with a process of evolutionary experimentation, whereby humans might extend tentative hypotheses about the design of the social entities they comprise in harmony with their goals, and then continually work to modify and balance them out in time, adapting to an unfolding universe.

Dunn's proposal for the use of a metaphor of social learning as a non-deterministic, evolutionarily situated model of social change carries with it both heuristic possibilities in terms of social theory more adequate to the pressing problem of adaptability, as well as prospects for pragmatic action within living institutions like education.

Jantsch (1975) articulates a position with many aspects in common with Dunn. He too emphasizes the importance of conceptualizing the design and redesign of human systems within an evolutionary framework. His approach is more abstract than Dunn's in that he deals at length with the centering of consciousness between mythologically-oriented and rationally-oriented tendencies. Jantsch too, however, deals with the mundane business of social planning and policy design, presenting arguments that the way forward for mankind lies in its ability to design a balanced future.

Vickers (1970) explores some of the same themes, stridently challenging the assumption that changing environments demand a passive adaptation on the part of mankind. He calls for creative moves by persons within institutions to act to regulate themselves, not so much out of a sense of oneness with an unfolding universe as in recognition of the sharp mutual demands existing today between societies and groups coexisting in the same social space. Although he does not speak of
evolution, his work evidences concern with the development of human institutions over time, and he emphasizes, as do Dunn and Jantsch, that a viable future is tied to the quality of decisions of design and self-regulation in the present.

If man is truly the agent of his own evolution, then works like that of Riecken and Boruch (1974) and of Campbell (1968) might be regarded as formulated implicitly within an evolutionary context. Both deal with large scale social experimentation. Both emphasize that formulating social programs responsibly means designing structures tentatively, testing hypotheses, and repeatedly modifying elements as evaluation clarifies the need for change. Both point out how difficult it is to maintain such an experimenting posture -- however desirable for the long-term good -- in the face of political exigencies.

Riecken and Boruch (1974) extend these ideas about the use of social experimentation as a method both for planning and for evaluating social intervention. Although they also discuss human values and institutional and political factors, their work is primarily technical, addressing questions of design and measurement in the conduct of large-scale experiments.

Bronfenbrenner's (1976) framework is also that of social experimentation, but he draws out the implications of such a framework explicitly for education. Bronfenbrenner, like Campbell and Riecken and Boruch, advocates controlled experimentation, emphasizing the importance of person-to-environment relationships. But the first requirement of his prescription for progress in the scientific study of educational
processes is the naturalistic assumption, gaining increasing prominence within education:

Our researches cannot be restricted to the laboratory; for the most part they must be carried out in real-life settings.... This does not mean that laboratory experiments cannot serve a useful and, indeed, essential purpose, but they must be carried out with explicit recognition of the delimiting and distorting nature of the laboratory as a setting and deliberately designed to articulate closely with and complement companion researches carried out in real-life situations. (p. 5)

The possibility for social learning is interwoven in the writing of these authors with the possibility of experimenting in order to generate new knowledge and check out the viability of paths towards goals. If human beings are capable of analyzing, evaluating and organizing their own behavior (as Dunn describes social learning processes), then they should be able to formulate their own actions and learn from them, so that following attempts at designing social or educational forms can be progressively refined in relation to emerging goals.

The Literature of Planned Change

Despite the existence, however, of this body of broad social theory which articulates principles about entity development generally, about experimental orientations, about social learning processes and the progressive refinement of behavior in relation to goals, educators continue to base most of their efforts to improve educational operations upon the literature of change and management theory. Perhaps because it appears less abstract, that body of literature continues to be the preferred jumping-off place for educational development.
As experience with change efforts within education begins to accumulate, however, dissatisfaction mounts in relation to the adequacy of the existing theory base (Sarason, 1971; Ravetz, 1971; Averch, 1972; Mackett-Frank, 1976). At the same time, reflection by educators upon their experience often results in conclusions which mirror change principles articulated by organically based evolutionary theorists.

The literature of change on which educators might depend is not extensive. Many have pointed to the dearth of empirical studies within education which might contribute to the building up of a relevant base of theory (e.g. Mackett-Frank, 1976; Goodlad, 1978). Gross et al (1971) conclude after reviewing the literature that there has been little concern for testing theories or generating testable hypotheses about factors influencing implementation.... Data used to isolate conditions having an impact on implementation are typically obtained only from the perspective of those who initiate them,...(and) the method used to assess the degree of implementation of an innovation in many studies is open to question. (p. 36)

Berman and McLaughlin (1974), researchers for the extensive Rand Corporation study of educational innovation (1973-1975), conclude that a major reason why federal projects have failed to have significant impact upon educational operations is that there is no theory or analytical understanding of implementation in the educational literature or in other literature....At best, experts have accumulated wisdom in the form of principles, guidelines, and advice for change agents....(p. 12)

The problem of change in an organization or in a school is most commonly understood as one of implementing a specific innovation, usually through the action of an outside change agent, and generally by way of overcoming member resistance to innovation. This conception of the
problem of change is very different from the one which forms the basis of this study. The inadequacy of the popular conception of educational change will be argued as specific pieces of the literature of change are presented.

Within education, various sets of change strategies have been popularized. Their very formulation as strategies illustrates the outside-in approach: something must be done to an educational entity:

(1) Havelock's (1973) identification of three prevalent models (RD&D, social interaction and problem solving), to which he added his own linkage model;

(2) Chin and Benne's (1969) categorization of change strategies: empirical-rational, power-coercive, and normative-reeducative;

(3) those more clearly manifesting a particular form within education, identified by Fullan (1972) as innovations approaches, systems approaches, problem solving, alternative and free schools, and deschooling.

Sieber (1974) has decried the confusion generated within education by the plethora of taxonomies which have been proposed and argued as if they were in competition with one another. The result has been, he concludes, that the strategies have been reified in their top-down, outside-in form and left to the theorists. Meanwhile school people (those on what Fullan calls the "user" level and therefore in the best position to cause significant change) have been left without workable approaches for themselves.
Gaynor (Note 1) criticizes the existing change literature on the basis of its limited usefulness to the educator interested in change. By emphasizing the individual as the agent and as the adopting unit, most writers mistakenly assume, Gaynor points out, that persons operating as members of educational entities are free to act as independent entrepreneurs. Bentzen's (1974) work illustrates to what a great extent organizational constraints have the power to win over individual motivations.

Another serious deficiency has been related to the emphasis upon adoption rather than implementation or incorporation. Not only are innovations often subverted once they seem to have been satisfactorily adopted by a school, but school people often have too little sense of what the innovation is about to carry it through the processes of adaptation it needs in order to survive (Goodlad & Klein, 1970).

Because of the great impact of the human relations movement upon education, attitudinal changes of individuals have been emphasized, on the assumption -- now increasingly questioned -- that individual change can make a significant impact upon organizations (Baldridge, 1972). Such an emphasis has neglected the enormous importance of structural dimensions of organizations and of the constraints imposed upon organizations by virtue of their interactive relationship with the environment.

In his survey of efforts to introduce innovations into educational entities, Fullan (1972) states that the "process of change whereby innovations are developed external to schools and then transmitted to them has led to no significant change at the user level" (p. 1). Consequently Fullan concludes that to be successful, "innovation must be synonymous with the daily educational processes engaged in by users" (p. 31).
Criticism of the managerial approach which believes in the efficacy of change from the outside-in has not been restricted to advocates of organic conceptualization of entity change. The dominant conceptual style of educational innovation, that of educational RD&D, has generated criticism even from those inside the RD&D establishment.

After surveying the impact of change attempted through the use of the R&D model in the 1960's, Tucker et al. (1973) report to the National Institute of Education that few changes have been realized; future project grants should be awarded, at least in part, to study the process of innovation itself, about which too little is known.

Guba and Clark (1975), proponents of the R&D approach, have acknowledged its limited effectiveness, attributing this to the mistaken assumption that a systematic set of agencies exists within the educational world to which R&D efforts might be applied linearly. They propose that a more realistic plan of implementation might be generated if the educational community were visualized as a loose "configuration" of related entities rather than as a system.

Others are less convinced that an R&D rescue operation would have the desired effect. In an R&D memorandum of the Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, Baldridge (1974) concludes

we must not be in the business of disseminating a particular exciting new product: we must be in the business of creating organizations with built-in capacities for assessing their needs and creating viable alternatives. The adoption of any specific innovation is a sideline activity that must not consume our energies. Our continuing enterprise should be in the building of flexible organizations with reserves of expertise and resources to sustain long-range problem solving. (p. 28)
After surveying the state of the literature of planned change, Gaynor (Note 1) describes the state of available knowledge:

We know more about diffusion and adoption of innovations among individuals than we know about implementation and institutionalization of innovations in complex organizations (and...even an elementary school is a complex organization)....Research on planned change has a history of fragmentation and distortion....The distortion lies in the overemphasis...on...individuals and human relations and the underemphasis on research and theory dealing with organizations and their complex environments. (pp. 26-27)

Berman and McLaughlin (1974) state their belief that implementation has resisted conceptualization because it implies change of an evolutionary character, and social scientists have generally been more successful in describing stable structural states than they have been in analyzing how complex organizations change over time. Moreover, Berman and McLaughlin point out, the kind of change involved in the incorporation of most innovations often results

from the accumulation of many small, undramatic modifications that individually hardly seem worth scientific inquiry...The "decisions" in implementation are mundane and incremental, and often in response to continuing problems coped with daily by many individuals, each of whom only affects the process and outcomes marginally....A theory of implementation...would have to capture how and under what circumstances these sequences of problem solving activities cumulate to produce basic or marked change. (p. 13)

Efforts among educators to act effectively to cause change in their own educational entities are hampered by the absence of a more adequate theoretical basis. Deficiencies in the existing literature of change have become increasingly apparent, yet most efforts are still based largely upon that literature because no well-formulated alternative exists.
Goodlad's (1975a) study, for example, rests on very different, organic assumptions than does the management of change literature. Yet the extensive bibliography which follows his report is solidly management based. Perhaps it is because Goodlad allows the power of his experience to formulate and reformulate his assumptions that his writing reflects an organic synchronization with the dynamics of the educational entities he confronts.

Goodlad structures his action research with the League of Cooperating Schools around a hypothesis that schools are organic entities, responsible for and capable of their own improvement. By the end of his report, Goodlad can restate this same position even more emphatically, for the example of the League refutes the assumption that schools "are incapable of changing themselves, [that] change must come from without, ...more or less forced on passive and only mildly resistant recipients" (p. 211).

Goodlad's position is supported by Sava (1975) who protests the reductionist bias inherent in the majority of contemporary efforts to change schools, ignoring the fact that each school is a natural, not a mechanical system. Consequently, as the ecologist tells us, a school cannot be adequately understood in terms of its isolated components and their separate operation, but only as an integrated whole; a school's operation as an ecosystem differs significantly from that of a mechanical system, whose operation can be broken down into discrete components that function in unvarying, predictable ways. (p. xiv)

Both Sava's and Goodlad's statements echo that put forth earlier by Sarason (1971), who related the problem of change to the culture of the school. Sarason's work emphasizes the function of behavioral and programmatic regularities in reinforcing a characteristic entity way of
acting that is so taken for granted that it is difficult to raise its existence to consciousness much less deliberately change it. In later work, Sarason (1972) treats many of the same themes but from the perspective of the beginnings of a setting, illustrating how assumptions about the developing regularities are woven into the fabric of a social entity from the time its human members begin to create it.

Some of Goodlad's associates in the League of Cooperating Schools project have extended that research into specialized areas. Taken as a whole, they fit together like pieces of a puzzle:

Bentzen and Tye (1973) conclude that unless schools themselves become self-renewing, life within schools will not change.

Bentzen (1974) details the function of dialog, decision making, action and evaluation in building entity capacity to be self-renewing, emphasizing however the power of the social structure of a school to constrain member behavior.

Tye and Novotney (1975) warn that even the most intense change efforts are doomed if change agents ignore the complexity of the school as a social entity. Goodlad (1975b) reinforces that warning: "The needed reconstruction of schooling must begin with the adults in the school and the social systems they constitute, not with pedagogy, materials and pupil achievement" (p. xiii).

In a later study, Goodlad (1978) turns even more directly to the investigation of schools as complex sociocultural entities. Convinced that the changes proposed by reformers in the 1960's were based on unfounded assumptions about what is really happening in the schools, Goodlad undertook to find out for himself. While data from his
stratified sample of 39 schools nation-wide were still being analyzed, Goodlad was willing to risk a "preliminary impression" that he had been correct from the beginning in asserting that schools are complex, unique cultures, and we had better seek to understand them better before we try to change them. Indeed, those in schools should base proposed changes on improved understandings of what they have now. (p. 50)

An interesting methodological footnote is presented in Goodlad's description of that study. Although he had employed a complex set of surveys and observational coding systems in doing the study, he admits that one major change he would make if he were to do the study again (and if he had enough money to make a different approach feasible) would be to conduct a more detailed, ethnographic kind of pilot inquiry in a small sample of schools -- perhaps even smaller than our present sample. Out of such a pilot study, I probably would formulate some hypotheses to be tested with a much larger sample using survey techniques. (p. 50)

Summary of Substantive Assumptions

The following assumptions, arising from this broad base in theory, form the conceptual framework for this study.

(1) Social systems are not merely conceptual constructs based on behavioral phenomena. They are real (Bates & Harvey, 1975), living (Miller, 1978) entities.

(2) Social entities, including educational programs, must perform certain functions for survival: adaptation, goal attainment, integration and pattern maintenance (Parsons, 1961).

(3) Social learning underlies social and cultural organization and development (Dunn, 1971; Parsons, 1977).
(4) Variation and adaptation are crucial factors in evolution, operating at every level of development (Parsons, 1966).

(5) An educational program is a complex sociocultural entity (Sanders, Note 4).

(6) Fundamental control over the nature of the entity and its change processes lies internal to the entity (Berman & McLaughlin, 1976; Goodlad, 1978).

(7) The environment in which the educational program operates has a significant impact upon it (Baldridge, 1972; Miller, 1978).

(8) A viable method for man's intelligent participation in his own evolution is evolutionary experimentation (Dunn, 1971; Riecken & Boruch, 1974).

(9) Investigating holistically the social system comprised by the adults in a school is an important research task, related both to the growth of more adequate knowledge about educational processes (Hughes, 1963) and to the needed reconstruction of schooling (Goodlad, 1975b).
CHAPTER III

THE METHODOLOGY OF PARTICIPANT OBSERVATION

To generate the kind of data needed to achieve the goals of this research, participant observation was chosen as the most appropriate methodology. That choice rested upon a judgment that developmental processes in an educational program entity are reflected in human behaviors which are complex but observable; that through participant observation, data could be collected and defended as empirical; and that from that basis of empirical data, educational theory could be validly generated.

Wax and Wax (1971) have called the vast body of research literature on schools and education both pseudoempirical and pseudotheoretical. Researchers have been administering hundreds of tests to thousands of pupils and intellectual critics have devoted countless pages to the criticism of textbooks and other curricular materials. Yet, the bulk of their efforts contrasts markedly with its quality and its impact, because their vision has been constricted by an interlocking chain of assumptions: that schools are primarily and exclusively agencies of formal education (rather than being social institutions); that pupils are isolated individuals (rather than social beings who participate in the life of peer societies, ethnic groups and the like); that formal education is synonymous with education; and that the principal task of the teacher is to educate. Thus, instead of inquiring what sort of social processes are occurring in -- and in relation to -- the schools, researchers and critics have defined their problem as being one of how to make the schools teach their individual pupils more, better, and faster. Only a few of the many researchers and critics have had the patience, fortified by the faith in ethnographic empiricism, to observe the social processes actually occurring in relation to the schools: among the pupils, among the teachers, within the classrooms, between the pupils and their parental elders, and so on. (p. 3)
Not all research directed toward exploring empirically the internal processes of a social entity employs participant observation as a methodology (see, e.g. Leacock, 1969 on teaching and learning processes, and Mackett-Frank, 1976 on leadership for change within a school, both of which used interviewing as their primary technique). Participant observation, however, was judged most appropriate to the study of the educational program for these reasons:

(1) So many factors were indeterminate (those of the structure and processes of development as a social phenomenon, of the nature of development in an educational setting, and of the specific processes relevant to the operation of an educational program) that to attempt the study in a more controlled way appeared neither feasible nor justifiable scientifically; and

(2) Participant observation would allow for the collection of both "objective" and "subjective" data from both etic and emic perspectives.

The Nature of Participant Observation

Douglas (1976) makes a useful distinction between the two major types of social field research: non-participant, which involves little to no direct interaction with people; and participant, which involves some form of natural social interaction. Since much of field research does involve natural interaction, field research or field work is sometimes equated with participant observation, as in the following definition by Hughes (1960):

Field work refers...to observation of people in situ; finding them where they are, staying with them in some role which,
while acceptable to them, will allow both intimate observations of certain parts of their behavior, and reporting it in ways useful to social science but not harmful to those observed.

(p. v)

It is in the sense that Hughes here refers to field work generally that the term participant observation will be used in this report.

All forms of field research, whether of the participant or non-participant type, involve studying people in natural settings. Defense of a choice to study behavioral phenomena in natural settings is usually built upon evidence of the interrelatedness and interdependence of behavior and environment. Although that consideration is important to this study, the rationale for pursuing a naturalistic methodology rests more squarely upon the requirements of the research question. The phenomenon of development, identified as the focus of the study, is a complex behavioral manifestation of a social entity which could hardly be brought into a laboratory setting. Even forms of more controlled research which could be done in the field (like questionnaires) seemed inappropriate considering the indeterminate state of knowledge about the phenomenon. Needed was a research methodology of a relatively uncontrolled type, which could be used as a net to gather in as many data as possible.

Selected Participant Observation Studies

Reports of actual studies which have been done in the mode of participant observation suggested even more strongly than did the methodology books (e.g. Bruyn, 1966) that participant observation might offer a fitting approach to the problem of the development of the educational program.
The classic study, *Boys in White*, by Becker, Geer, Hughes and Strauss (1961) contains extensive background on the study from the researchers' point of view. They report not only the data they collected but their experience with conceptualizing the problem in the first place, with working through the difficulties that arose, and with pursuing their intuitions with explicitly worked out verification procedures.

The focus of their research was a more abstract idea than might have been adopted had they wanted to do straight ethnographic reporting. Specifically, they wanted to know how a student in medical school acquired his basic perspectives on his future activities as a doctor. They were interested in "analyzing not only the collective forms of social action" of the medical school, but also "the effects on the medical student of living and working" (p. 19) in the institution. In order to collect data, they point out, they were forced to choose among competing social psychological theories -- they chose symbolic interactionism -- within which to structure their work.

Although containing a less extensive description of researcher experiences in the course of research, *Awareness of Dying* (Glaser & Strauss, 1965) still is set in the context of the personal life experiences of the authors. The researchers detail their own experiences with relatives who have died, in an effort to provide the reviewer with sufficient knowledge of themselves and their reactions to make meaning out of the data they report.

Glaser and Strauss also relate, as did Becker *et al.* above, that they were attempting to develop an integrated theory -- in their case, "about awareness contexts as they pertain to dying in hospitals" (p. 286).
Contained is a description of their use of what Glaser has termed the "constant comparative method" which they use to analyze their data. They note that field work is admirably adapted to the development of systematic substantive theory.

While both the studies by Becker et al. and by Glaser and Strauss give evidence of the same "literary and humanistic flavor of much anthropological writing" (Manners & Kaplan, 1968, p. 2), they are more clearly oriented toward the generation of theory than are most ethnographic studies: they are less a natural history of the people they study than they are an attempt to arrive at theory through the abstraction of concepts and their systematic organization.

Vidich and Bensman's revised edition of Small Town in Mass Society (1968), published ten years after the study was originally reported, includes numerous essays on the theory they had begun to develop when the study was first published, as well as on the use of participant observation and on ethical implications of the kind of research they had conducted.

Their report centers on themes of politics, institutional realities and integrating symbols. The procedures and many of the concerns are the same as those reflected in studies referred to above, but the focus on meaning and culture is more clearly anthropological. Footnotes throughout their essays cite noted anthropologists, yet references are to articles in sociological journals. The study itself illustrates the intersection of anthropological and sociological substantive concerns and methodological approaches.
Shared among these studies is a substantive concern with socio-cultural complexity, and a commitment to the discovery of knowledge from face-to-face confrontation with lived social interaction. In Filstead's (1970) words, this is a type of research which specifies that it is crucial for validity -- and consequently for reliability -- to try to picture the empirical social world as it actually exists to those under investigation, rather than as the researcher imagines it to be. (p. 4)

Hughes (1963) points to the paucity of studies within the field of education which have dealt holistically with "the most basic of all educational activities -- the goings-on in the classrooms...and in other nuclei of interaction (for example) teacher to teacher" (p. 161). Lamenting their neglect within the field of educational sociology, Hughes insists that these are the phenomena which must be studied if educational processes are to be understood.

A decade later, prominent educators were still calling for a consideration of the use of field methods in education. Pointing to the limited value of much educational research, Lutz and Ramsey (1974) plead, as had Rapoport and Horvath (1968), for heading off impending scientific sterility by acknowledging alternatives to a confining framework of conventional concepts. Of 13 references cited in their article, not one is specific to the use of field work in education, although by that time some important studies had been completed.

The 1968 research by Smith and Geoffry, The Complexities of an Urban Classroom, does use participant observation to explore a specifically educational setting. The purpose of the study was both to describe in considerable detail the real world of an urban classroom,
and to build a model in abstract terms of how a middle class teacher copes with a class of lower class students.

Proceeding on the basis of a conviction that they could make sense out of what was happening in real life if they observed carefully and non-judgmentally, the investigators were nevertheless interested in doing more than an ethnography. They succeeded in shaping numerous events into a conceptual order; from this order, hypotheses arose. The researchers emphasize that they conceived of their study from the beginning as generational rather than verificational. This they claim as a strength rather than as a deficiency, presenting a case for the use of participant observation in the generation of empirically based theory which is sorely needed within education.

Rist's (1973) study of the urban school as "a factory for failure" also utilizes participant observation in an educational setting. Although at first the report seems ethnographic, Rist does more than present a picture of the experience of poor children in a single urban school. As Rainwater points out in the introduction, Rist "shows us in fine-grained detail how teachers shape and direct some of the children toward academic success and others toward failure" (p. ix). The description itself conveys a powerful message; but Rist augments that message with explicit discussion of the need for school reform. An approach which is assumed by the author to be anthropological leads far beyond the natural history report, not so much to a discussion of abstracted categories and theoretical relationships as to a consideration of social policy implications.

Goodlad and Klein's (1974) Looking Behind the Classroom Door is billed as a "useful guide to observing schools in action." But for
purposes of this study, it is the evolution of the observational method they propose that is more interesting than the pragmatics of its application. The authors had never set out to do a descriptive study of what was happening in classrooms. On the basis of work done by Hughes (1959) and Flanders (1965), they had developed a checklist which observers were to use to record classroom behavior. But research assistants they sent out to gather data were frustrated:

They chafed over the fact that what they put on paper during and immediately after a visit reflected neither the dynamics of the classroom nor their own impressions of it. (p. 28)

Eventually, Goodlad and Klein generated a long list of categories embracing every dimension of school life they could think of, so that they could gather the broad-based data they wanted. They sound apologetic for having to sacrifice "research rigor" for the sake of the research question. While not technically a participant observation study, their experience lends credence to the argument that many kinds of educational data lie outside the scope of structured research designs.

Making the Grade (Becker, Geer & Hughes, 1968), the participant observation study of the academic side of college life which followed soon after Boys in White, is aimed, the authors state, not at investigating the attributes of college students, how they are related to one another or how they are correlated with performance, but simply at discovering the ordinary, routine quality of everyday college life.

These researchers say they are interested not so much in "teacher questions" (Are the students learning? Under what conditions?) as in what perspective students have on themselves and their experience.
Sociology is their referent point, they admit: they are interested in collective action rather than in individual formulation. But they are interested in the collective from the inside out. Such a stance appears based not so much upon an epistemological question, as might be posed by a phenomenologist or an ethnomethodologist. Instead, it seems based on a rational choice to gather "objective" data on the perspective of those inside as they interact with one another.

Philip Jackson's *Life in Classrooms* (1968) is, like Rist's study, an explicit attempt to use participant observation to focus on classroom behavior, but is also like that of Becker et al. (1968) in that he tries to "grasp the meaning of what school is like for students and teachers" (p. vii). Jackson believes that

we must not hesitate to use all the ways of knowing at our disposal...[to] read, and look, and listen, and count things, and talk to people, and even muse introspectively over the memories of our own childhood. (p. viii)

Observing in four elementary classrooms over the course of two years, Jackson uses a research design that is more comparative than the others cited, but otherwise his study bears many of the same characteristics. Jackson decides that participant observation can be hard on teachers:

Most teachers can tolerate an occasional visitor without difficulty, but when the visitor returns day after day for a period of two years and when he insists on staying after school and on following the teacher to the teachers' lounge and to the playground, it would be understandable if his welcome began to wear a bit thin. (p. ix)

To state the "results" of all these studies succinctly is impossible. The results are the portrayal of life in educational
settings -- in classrooms, in urban schools, in college. They are as often oriented toward the discovery of policy issues as they are toward the generation of theory. What they share is a methodological stance which emphasizes examining the particular in depth in order to explore the complexity of a phenomenon with broad relevance to educational problems. Such a methodological approach raises questions concerning the credibility of data which are different from those raised in reference to experimental research.

Credibility of the Data

Questions of the credibility of data in social research are conventionally approached by reference to questions of validity and reliability. Before attempting to treat either of these issues or the related problem of generalizability, the researcher will attempt to establish their meaning inside the broad context of qualitative research.

In his statement of the thesis that validity has received too little attention in comparison with that accorded reliability, Deutscher (1970) describes the terms as they will be used in this report:

Following the customary distinction, the concept of validity addresses itself to the truth of an assertion that is made about something in the empirical world. The concept of reliability, on the other hand, concentrates on the degree of consistency in the observations obtained from the devices we employ. (p. 202)

Becker (1970) points out that the most unsettling questions of reliability of qualitative reports arise when field workers arrive at very different characterizations of the same or similar organizations or communities. He warns against expecting identical results in such a
case, for two observers might have very different perspectives (e.g. those of teacher or principal), or they might be studying different subsystems within the same organization.

Schatzman and Strauss (1973) approach the question of reliability more directly, asking whether it is reasonable to expect that independent researchers observing even identical situations would reach the same conclusions.

For the researcher whose view of social reality is one of infinite complexity, the only germane question is, Would an independent observer make conceptual discoveries that empirically or logically invalidate his own?...Perceptual and conceptual selectivity must be taken for granted. Some identical and some different events would become data for other field observers; therefore, all independently developed data and analysis would necessarily be different. One or another analysis may be conceptually superior, but if any fails to contradict the original research, it must be regarded as supplementary or complementary. (p. 134)

If this is a reasonable argument, then importance is shifted away from replicability and toward the issue of the quality of data collection and analysis. In order that reviewers can make responsible judgments about the quality of data collection and analysis in this study, extensive description of the procedures used will be presented. Questions which reviewers should ask in making such judgments should involve not so much whether another investigator would have reached the same conclusions, but whether the conclusions reached are reasonable, considering a systematic view of the data; whether the data themselves are believable, considering the manner of their collection; and whether the way they were treated leads, in some scientifically respectable manner, to the theory generated from them.
Questions of validity are usually accorded more attention in qualitative research reports than are questions of reliability, probably because qualitative researchers are usually too close to the empirical data to forget that "measurement can be consistently in error as well as consistently correct..." (Deutscher, 1970, p. 202). In research that is not observational, the problem of validity is usually reduced to the estimation of the accuracy of instruments designed to measure behavior. If the data consist of direct behavioral observations, questions of validity hardly become "negligible" (Deutscher, 1970, p. 213), but they are changed. Considered broadly, questions of validity involve all the issues underlying whether the data presented are a truthful representation of the empirical world.

Validity-Related Aspects of Participant Observation

Probably the most common criticism leveled against participant observation as a research methodology is the likelihood of researcher bias. Field researchers like Becker (1970), however, protest against raising the question of bias any more often in relation to field work than in relation to more controlled situations. Referring to studies showing how the bias of survey interviewers affects the answers obtained from respondents, and how the bias of laboratory investigators influences even animal responses, he concedes the reasonableness of the question in reference to research of all types. At the same time, however, he presents strong arguments for the view that field work is less likely than more controlled methods to "allow the researcher to bias the results he gets in directions suggested by his own expectations, beliefs or desires"
Becker's arguments follow along the same lines as those presented by Denzen (1970), Schatzman and Strauss (1973), and Bogdan and Taylor (1975).

The immersion of the researcher in the setting is the most basic aspect of participant observation promoting validity. Qualitative researchers often link this immersion to the possibility of verstehen (personal understanding), especially of the subjective elements of collective life (Bruyn, 1966). But even those theorists with a clearly non-phenomenological perspective insist on close-up researcher involvement with what people are doing (Becker, 1970) for the sake of understanding unmediated by any instrumentation other than the researcher's capacity to understand.

Most recognize, however, that involvement can become a liability if, in the process of gaining objectivity through an inside knowledge of how things operate, the researcher "goes native" (Denzen, 1970). The risk here, Denzen points out, is that the researcher will commit the "fallacy of objectivism" -- which qualitative researchers usually identify as a great hazard of quantitative research -- by failing to recognize, record and take into account the real changes in the researcher himself (p. 204).

Rather than exploring the possibilities for researcher bias, Becker (1970) concentrates on setting forth all the reasons why, despite bias, the field researcher's data are likely to be valid:

(1) The people the field worker observes are ordinarily constrained to act as they would in his absence, by the very social constraints whose effects interest him; he therefore has little
chance, compared to practitioners of other methods, to influence what they do, for more potent forces are operating.

(2) The field worker inevitably, by his continuous presence, gathers much more data and...makes and can make many more tests of his hypotheses than researchers who use more formal methods. (pp. 43-44)

The constraints referred to are these: Few subjects of field research can be affected significantly by the researcher and his biases. Complex webs of social relationships hold the behavior of subjects into certain patterns. They care much more about their friends, their job performance, the opinions of co-workers and supervisors, and all the other elements that continue to affect their lives while the observer observes than they could possibly care about the researcher. Even if they try to change their behavior for the sake of the observer, the systematic relationships in which they are involved make such changes impossible, especially over a long period of time.

If people observed perceive the researcher as a threat, they might make great efforts to distort the reality of their situation. But even this reality can hardly be sustained for long, unless the energies of all involved are devoted to the effort systematically.

The many tests of hypotheses to which Becker refers above involve the flexible use of a variety of methods for cross-checking the validity of inferences made on the basis of information gathered. The investigator can ask the same question of different people under different circumstances. He can risk affronting someone with an inappropriate question because, unlike an interviewer, the participant observer has time later to devote to the reestablishment of a relationship. He can consult documents, prompt monologues, sit in a corner and watch
quietly, unobtrusively eavesdrop, make sarcastic comments to provoke a quick emotional reaction. He has time to work himself into a position where he is trusted as an insider, and so can easily maneuver conversations from one topic to another. The options for checking out the facts are endless.

Besides social constraints and the possibility for multiple testing of hypotheses, a strong element working in favor of validity is the mass of data collected. The investigator typically gathers so many data so "thick" and rich in detail that he hardly has to tease out the major dimensions of the social entity studied. The thickness of the data works against his biases. Field workers often have to "sacrifice pet ideas and hypotheses to the recalcitrant facts in their field notes" (Becker, 1970, p. 43). The same thickness of data works against the intentional deception of subjects. "Contradictory evidence appears and it appears not in subtle form but in very gross ways" (Becker, 1970, p. 56).

Most of the concerns relevant to validity presented above have been those suggested most commonly by social researchers in the tradition of classical science, where the dominant question has been one of objective knowledge of human reality. The increasing influence in social research of perspectives which emphasize the importance of the subjective, as do phenomenology and ethnomethodology, prompts some consideration of the epistemological issues they raise.

Critiquing the mismatch of social research methodologies and the types of phenomena studied, Douglas (1976) insists that
the less concrete the phenomena being studied, ... the more the researcher must use natural participation in the group as the basic method to get at the phenomena. ... [Only by observing] carefully and systematically how they manage their everyday lives ... can we hope to see all the complex convolutions of problematic meanings and the complex, often conflicting patterns ... of actions those convolutions give rise to in everyday life. (p. 28)

Only in the natural situation, Douglas believes, can the researcher come to grasp what is happening.

Grasping is a semi-conscious, largely presymbolic perception of the overall nature, interrelatedness, and truth of the setting. ... The ultimate grasp of a setting ... is the Zen ideal of being able to subconsciously or "automatically" react in complex, artistic ways ... (p. 124)

Douglas suggests a variety of ways in which the researcher might know whether he has grasped the situation: having a sense of what fits and what doesn't, being able to joke with members about the setting, being able to pass as a member.

After grasping the situation, Douglas proposes, the researcher must go on to understanding it, to putting it together in "a conscious, symbolic, rational totality" (p. 124). Such requirements are of a different order than those stipulated by the older classic field researchers who

looked at field research as a set of rationalized, or rationalizable, procedures for generating objective truth in the same way other methods of social research such as questionnaires did. (Douglas, 1976, p. 49)

Denzen (1970) stipulates a requirement related to validity of the data which is of the same order as those suggested by Douglas. Although clearly opposed to the researcher's "going native" -- because this inhibits the development of hypotheses as the observer ceases to
think as a scientist -- Denzen also admits that

it is central to the method of participant observation that changes will occur in the observer, but the important point... is to record these changes,... to be sensitive to shifts in one’s own attitudes. (p. 204)

Bruyn (1966) goes even further, to present in lengthy argument the extent to which each of the basic operations of research -- interpretation, conception, description and explanation -- is affected by subjective dimensions of the researcher. Rather than treating subjective elements as deficiencies to be counterbalanced by increased efforts toward objectivity, however, Bruyn lays out six indexes of subjective adequacy: time, place, circumstance, language, intimacy and consensus. Each of these indexes will be addressed in the following chapter, as validating procedures are described.

Although Douglas, Denzen and Bruyn are clearly ranged along a spectrum rather than clustered at one theoretical position, their concerns illustrate the same point about the relevance of the subjective to determinations of the validity of data. Described in the following chapter will be the procedures used to pay attention to both objective and subjective dimensions, under the assumption that greater validity is achieved by recognition of the interplay between the two.

Generalizability of Conclusions

Field researchers involved in the study of a single social entity or single research setting often ignore the problem of applicability of findings to a larger population. Writers who do refer to the problem adopt a variety of very different stances:
(1) In-depth involvement often precludes extensive involvement, which might have made possible more legitimate generalization (Douglas, 1976).

(2) Intuitive generalizations are possible when a human reality is touched and presented deeply enough (Lewis, 1961).

(3) Generalization from a few empirical cases is more valid than speculation (Coles, 1964).

(4) Since many processes of social living are similar for people everywhere, the social process researched can have meaning for those outside the groups studied, especially for those using the same symbol systems (Bruyn, 1966).

(5) Generalization may be done naturally from the single case when it is "epistemologically in harmony with the reader's experience" (Stake, 1978).

Tentative positions such as these are most appropriately explored in relation to the particular study under consideration, and so will be addressed in the following chapter as procedures are described. Central to questions of generalizability as far as this study is concerned are these dimensions:

(1) This research is considered descriptive and formulative, i.e. oriented toward the generation of theory rather than toward its verification; and

(2) The investigation centered on the structure and operations of a social whole, and so was necessarily the study of a single entity.
Summary of Assumptions Underlying the Methodology: Procedural and Epistemological

(1) The investigator participates as intimately as possible in life in the research setting, attempting to "think, see, feel, and sometimes act as a member" (Powdermaker, 1966, p. 9). Both social and symbolic worlds are objects of inquiry.

(2) The investigator works out a role for himself in the setting which is acceptable to members (Denzen, 1970).

(3) The investigator is not bound by rigid data-gathering techniques (Becker, 1970; Denzen, 1970).

(4) The investigator acts intelligently to modify approaches to data collection and to revises hypotheses in the middle of the study, rather than remaining bound to predetermined procedures or theoretical constructs (Denzen, 1970).

(5) Because the investigator is able to pursue questions in the attempt to penetrate obscurities, the necessity to rely upon inference is reduced (Becker, 1970).

(6) Investigator intuition about the nature of the social situation is a legitimate source of hypotheses to be subjected to confrontation with empirical data (Becker, 1968).

(7) A more balanced knowledge of a social situation will accrue to a participant observer who must know it simultaneously by unity and separation, subjectively and objectively, than is likely through either alone (Bruyn, 1966).
Extensive description of the way that participant observation was used to collect data follows in this chapter. As a research methodology, participant observation has a singularly long and diverse background. Over the course of time, it has acquired a variety of connotations as it has been worked out in sociology and anthropology. Further epistemological and procedural subtleties have been attached by phenomenologists and ethnomethodologists, who have gone far to avoid the objectivist fallacy of which they accuse both sociologists and anthropologists who have used the method in the classical scientific tradition. For these reasons, the reviewer interested in the meaning of the research should know not only the procedures that were employed but the underlying epistemological assumptions that made the use of these procedures reasonable.

Design of the Study

Chapter II of Boys in White, the classic study by Becker et al. (1961) of student culture in medical school, opens with a paragraph that might have been written to introduce the design of this study:

In one sense, our study had no design. That is, we had no well-worked-out hypotheses to be tested, no data-gathering instruments
purposely designed to secure information relevant to these hypotheses, no set of analytic procedures specified in advance. Insofar as the term "design" implies these features of elaborate prior planning, our study had none. (p. 17)

Yet if the concept of design is understood in a broader sense, as those authors hasten to point out it might be, it can be used "to identify...elements of order, system and consistency" (p. 17) which the procedures exhibited. In that sense, this study, like Boys in White, did have a design. These elements will be described in the sections that follow: the research setting, the researcher, and the researcher in the setting. Following those sections, validating procedures and analytic procedures will be addressed directly.

The Research Setting

A single elementary school served as the focus of this study. Since the intent of the research was to understand the development of an educational program entity, the choice to study one entity at a time appeared indicated. The question of program entity development seemed to be a question of structure, although structure understood dynamically. Bates and Harvey (1975) point out that

for a thing to be structured, it does not have to be replicated or persist. Structure is a way of describing or perceiving objects; it is not the same as order....The concept of structure can be applied to absolutely unique cases where no similarity exists between them and any other object known....There is no reason to say that the recurrent or virtually universal structures are more important to study scientifically than are those that are unique. (p. 23)

These authors draw a clear distinction between the concepts of structure and order. That distinction is particularly relevant to this study:
For the concept of structure to be applied to an object or a series of events, one needs simply to be able to identify parts, describe their relationship to each other, and indicate their function with respect to one another and towards their environment. (p. 23)

Order amounts to the replication or persistence of the same structural forms. (p. 22)

This study of the structure of development might ultimately contribute to a better understanding of the ordering of development in educational entities. But the immediate concern of this research is at the more basic level of structure, which does not depend upon replication.

Because the research question focused on the structure of development, the single school selected was chosen on the basis of its reputation for development, as manifest in the high quality of its educational program, the high level of performance and job satisfaction among staff members, and the great amount of both human and financial resources which the school had managed to attract in its eight year history.

The school is situated in a middle-class, suburban community with approximately 10,000 students in the school district. Four hundred fifty of those children attend the school studied, which houses kindergarten through fourth grade. Nineteen full-time teachers staff the school; three of these are male, as is the principal. Part-time staff includes six special teachers and two learning disability tutors. In the report to follow, the school will be called "Stanton" and the teachers given fictional names.

The range in age among full-time professional staff members is 25 years, but 14 of the 19 teachers are under 30 years old. Two are in
their 30's, one in her 40's, and two in their 50's. The principal is the oldest person on the staff, with 40 years experience in educational settings.

The principal and eight teachers hold Master's degrees. Of these, six were earned while the teachers were on the Stanton school staff. Among those not holding a Master's, considerable post-baccalaureate credits have been accumulated.

Notable points in the school's history are these: Stanton opened in 1970 as the first open school in a conservative district. Throughout its history, the school has struggled for acceptance in the district. In the third year of its operation, Stanton initiated and established a formal relationship with Ohio State University, about 15 miles away. Under that arrangement, a small group of professors of education began several years of volunteer involvement with the Stanton staff. That same year, the school won a $200,000 per year federal grant under Title III, and so acquired four full-time project staff people for the following three years. Recently, relationships with the other district schools and with the surrounding community have improved. Other open space schools have been built in the district, so Stanton no longer stands out so sharply as an innovative program, although it remains the school most clearly committed to an "open concept" program.

The Researcher

Since in qualitative studies the researcher is the basic research instrument, the perspective the researcher has on the phenomena studied becomes an important consideration for reviewers of the study.
If the qualitative research enterprise depends upon the ability of the researcher to transcend his own perspective (Wilson, 1974), it depends no less on his capacity to make meaning from what he observes, whether by virtue of background, training, experience in the field, or skills in eliciting data. For information on whether the researcher has the required capacity, the reviewer must depend largely upon what is provided to him by the researcher. Nonetheless, knowing the researcher's background can contribute in some degree to the reviewer's basis for judging the validity of the research data.

In this study, the researcher entered the elementary school recognized as a graduate student collecting data, and as a friend of a popular former teacher. The researcher had been a teacher herself, but on junior and senior high school levels and in adult education programs.

Her interest in the problem of development had stemmed from involvement during her teens with women from developing countries. Later, the investigator had done educational work with adults in developing areas of Asia and Africa. Throughout this period of her life, the problem of development had achieved increasing importance, although then it was conceptualized in terms of the social and economic development of nations, or of the human development of individuals.

During the course of graduate education, development became a recurrent theme in her studies, broadening out to include individual psychological development, cultural development, development conceived inside an evolutionary framework, and especially the development of educational entities. The current study was undertaken out of a conviction
that professional attention needs to be paid to the design of adaptive, self-regulating educational entities rather than to the single-minded pursuit of techniques to change them from the outside.

The Researcher in the Setting

Entry into the school setting was relatively easy for the researcher. Association with a former teacher respected by both principal and former teachers resulted in a halo effect. Quickly dubbed "our local spy," and often introduced as such to visitors, the investigator was adopted as part of the current school year scene.

Teachers did not seem to mind an observer hanging around them constantly, although jokes about "what's going into that red notebook" or "watch out or she'll write that down" were common in the beginning. Although some teachers initially expressed pleasure that the researcher would want to spend so much time with them observing and recording, and others indicated mild interest in what she was doing ("How do you know what to write down?"), generally the researcher was simply taken for granted. So many visitors and volunteers, graduate students and experts had flowed through the school in the course of its history that one more was hardly noticed.

Initially, this lack of attention created some awkward moments, because the investigator had to judge for herself whether to intrude in situations: the teachers made little effort to act as hosts. Gradually, however, this being taken for granted became a clear advantage, since information flow appeared unrestricted by the presence of the
observer. Only once during the course of the school year did her presence become an issue. That situation will be described below.

The observer spent more than 200 hours in the school, over the course of an academic year. Generally, observations were conducted for several hours two days each week, and mostly in the mornings. Since teachers would gather in the lounge for an hour before classes began in the morning, this seemed a particularly fruitful time to collect data on their interaction.

Most of the time spent in the school was in the teachers lounge, which was clearly the center of school activities. Although a teachers workroom existed in each of the three large instructional areas, these were used for storage. Teachers would bring papers to correct or construction paper patterns to cut out into the lounge. The principal spent more time in the lounge than in his office. He would sit in his chair in the corner, close enough to jump into any conversations in progress among teachers working at the tables, but far enough away so that teachers who wanted quick conferences with him could corner him privately.

Since the lounge was just off the office, the secretary could easily run in to call the principal or teachers to the phone. The office was connected to the media center, which meant that small group meetings could be shifted conveniently to the media center when the lounge became too noisy.

The pace of interactions in the lounge was usually quick because of the shortness of recess and lunch breaks. Teachers would run in for
a cup of coffee and then run out again, stopping only long enough to report a funny happening of the morning. Meanwhile, other teachers on a longer break because their classes were at music or phys ed would be planning science activities for the next week. Because of the pace and intensity of all these activities, the lounge presented itself as the reasonable location for observational headquarters.

Some time, however, was spent observing teachers in the instructional areas or "clusters," in an effort to learn how they interacted there in contrast to the way they interacted in the lounge, and how they interacted with the children in contrast to the way they talked about them.

Originally, the investigator attached herself to the six members of one cluster group, following them around from a cluster meeting, then into the cluster where they taught, then back into the lounge for recess and later for lunch. Gradually, however, it became apparent how interwoven any small group's life was with that of the whole school staff, so the researcher then intentionally observed the principal and the other teachers in the school, not only as they interacted with the original cluster group but as they interacted with one another.

Toward the beginning of the research, informants came only from the small cluster group originally chosen as the focus. By the end of the year, however, almost all teachers on the staff had at some time acted as informants. The principal especially played this role, often interpreting current happenings for the observer in the light of the school's history.
Some regular visitors, like the professors with long-standing involvement at the school, served as an additional source of information. The difference in perspective evident in these various sources helped greatly to increase researcher confidence in the validity of the data commonly reported.

Other persons who provided information from their various perspectives included occasional parent visitors, parent volunteers, and parents attending meetings; several former teachers; the special teachers, like the speech therapist who spent some time at this school and some time at other schools in the district; the school custodian and the secretary; and the current and former school nurse.

Toward the end of the school year, the investigator began a separate study of the natural history of the school. Although many of the informants for that study were the same as for this one, the additional background information and evidence from archives greatly contributed to knowledge of the historical context within which current realities were to be interpreted.

The degree of openness toward the researcher was much greater than she had expected, but can probably be attributed to a complex of factors. The halo effect referred to above was important especially initially. Also helpful was the fact that the investigator was female, as were the majority of teachers, that she was the same age as most of them, and that she was studying at the same university where many of them were taking or had taken courses. The focus of the research was an abstract phenomenon, in addition, and therefore relatively non-
threatening -- compared, for example, to a study of the quality of teaching in the school. More important than any of these factors, however, was the general tenor of openness at Stanton. The open space of the clusters means that principal or visitors or graduate student researchers can wander around hardly noticed by teachers and student engaged in teaching-learning situations. Teachers are open with one another about their teaching and their problems, and visitors are always welcome in the lounge where open discussion is the norm. The investigator did not have to work her way to the inside; except for those perceived as presenting a threat to the school, everyone seems welcome to the inside.

At one crisis point in the school year, however, the researcher's presence did become an issue. Negotiations between the teachers association and the board of education over questions of salary and benefits had broken down, and the teachers were considering a strike. Tension in the school was apparent, in contrast to the generally easy atmosphere. Teachers seemed especially torn by the conflict they experienced between their loyalty to the teachers association and at the same time to their own principal -- who, however one with them as part of the staff, at the same time remained an administrator.

Secret meetings were conducted in whispered tones in the corner of the lounge, clearly in violation of the norm of openness. Some teachers worried aloud at that point about the observer's presence, but after a quick discussion among teachers on both sides of the issue of her remaining, they agreed she could stay if she didn't take notes.
A few days later, just before the teachers did go out on strike, the principal told the investigator that he would prefer she did not observe during the strike, because of the uncertainty of what would happen during the course of the strike. On the other hand, he told her that he did not mind if she returned to the school as soon as the strike was settled.

Even during the high tension of those days immediately preceding the strike, the investigator was never asked to absent herself from a meeting. Some of the interaction during that period furnished the most revealing data about the nature of the school. Like Gouldner (1955) and Becker et al. (1961), the researcher was impressed with the utility of studying tensions in the attempt to understand expectations of "normal" relating.

Perhaps the most convincing evidence that the researcher was not in the forefront of teachers' minds as an outsider was the report by several of them toward the end of the school year that they had forgotten to report her presence in the school on a form requesting university fee waivers from the district, although to remember would have benefitted them financially.

In the role of participant observer, the investigator participated in the daily life of the school, occasionally helping students, always entering into conversations in the lounge, bringing cookies to share in the morning as the teachers did, screening kindergarten children in the beginning of the year, translating for a third grader just arrived from France, talking over graduate student problems with
teachers enrolled in courses at the university. The principal had introduced her as an observer at a staff meeting early in the year, so all the teachers knew why she was in the school and seemed willing to be observed. In this sense, the investigator's activities were overt.

Despite this openness, the actual focus of her studies seemed to remain a mystery for the staff throughout the course of the investigation. No attempt was made to disguise the point of the study. When explanations were offered, however, they seemed to be interpreted in a variety of ways. The principal told several people in the researcher's presence that she was investigating "climate in the classroom," and even wrote a letter of recommendation for her to that effect, even though she spent far more time in the teachers lounge than in the clusters.

Teachers in the small cluster group generally thought the investigator was observing small group interaction and problem solving processes, as evidenced by their advice occasionally about what she should record. Several teachers assumed that the study was a descriptive portrayal of the operation of the school, and identified with the researcher enough to feel frustrated when nothing they considered exciting was happening. The morning after the strike vote had been taken, two of them told her that now she would have "something really good" to write down.

What should be recorded when acting as a participant observer is a problem all researchers face when engaged in that mode of investigation. In this case, the investigator experienced more of a problem in this regard than she had anticipated. Reasons for this difficulty are
linked to the change in the conceptualization of the problem described in Chapter I. Generally, however, what were recorded were the kinds of activities in which teachers were involved; their interactions with one another, the principal and others on the school staff as well as with parents and outsiders; and "verbatim" conversations overheard or responses to researcher questions. Interwoven in the record of data were notes on issues to be explored later, questions about how one phenomenon related to another, and ideas of how to proceed in order to obtain information on some promising topic.

The investigator recorded observations openly while on the scene. What might have been an intrusive way of operating somewhere else was not in this school setting, since teachers typically sat in the lounge working on a stack of papers or language folders. Notes taken in this way were then transcribed, usually into a slightly more expanded account, and almost always on the same day as they were recorded. Many of the notes taken were recorded with little more than a hope that they were relevant, especially in the ambiguous middle of the study when the conceptualization of the study was shifting.

Data were gathered through informal interview as well as through observation. When the researcher was puzzled about the meaning of a particular phenomenon, she would ask for an explanation at the next appropriate moment. Often a teacher would make a comment about a situation and the researcher would press for details. At other times, a remark by the investigator -- not even a question -- would prompt a whole flood of information voluntarily offered. Making such remarks was a technique
often employed by the researcher when she was not certain whether the person addressed would consider questioning appropriate.

Decisions about how the observer would operate from moment to moment were highly intuitive. So many factors were likely to affect what be judged appropriate behavior or what might elicit the desired information -- the pressures of a particular time of day or of the week or of the year, the current state of negotiations with the board of education, the personal problems of informants, who else was present in the room when a question was raised -- that a constant sensing of the immediate situation was demanded.

Validating Procedures

Since data-gathering techniques in participant observation are in many ways informal, more attention than usual needs to be paid to the process by which data are verified. On the basis of the description of such a process, the reviewer can then make judgments about the credibility of the data, using as criteria for those judgments evidence of logic, order, consistency and completeness.

In Chapter III, the problem of researcher bias was raised, with arguments by Becker (1970) and others that researcher bias is less likely to affect the validity of the data gathered through participant observation than gathered by many other techniques. The reasons given in the abstract there will be addressed now as they apply to the concrete social setting studied in this research.
Social constraints

Reference was made in Chapter IV to the social constraints on the behavior of participants in the research setting. In contrast to the laboratory setting where the intention is to control all the influences except those which the experimenter intends, the natural school setting allowed for none of the usual influences to be controlled. The pressures of getting ready for the opening of school in September, for example, left little time for subjects to worry about how they appeared to the observer. The involving concerns were how to get classes organized in time, whether enough materials were available, whether all the kindergarteners scheduled would turn up for screening, how the new teachers would learn all they needed to know before the first day, at what time lunch periods would be this year. Having a graduate student around taking notes was no problem, as long as she stayed out of the way.

Besides the constraints on behavior existing because of the pressures of the task, teachers were involved in a web of interpersonal relationships they cared about much more than they cared about the esteem of the investigator. For one thing, they hardly knew the researcher, except that she had been introduced (and implicitly recommended) by a friend and colleague. For another, the researcher had no possibility to influence their lives in any significant way. She was not reporting to the district's central administration nor even to the principal. Even if some teachers had wanted to put on a show for the observer, perhaps because of their feeling that the school should be presented in the best light possible, the effort could not have been sustained for long, nor
would it have been effective unless the whole school staff were involved in the duplicity. Clearly, the effort would have been unreasonable, considering that the observer would be around for the whole school year and had been given permission to observe freely in the whole school.

Reduction of threat

Being regarded as of no consequence is important for the field worker, Becker (1970) explains, because it has the opposite effect that it has in a controlled research situation:

There, the more people believe it makes no difference what the observer sees them do or say, the more they are open to being influenced by him; in field work, the more that people believe the researcher is unimportant, the freer they are to respond to the other pressing constraints that surround them. (p. 48)

From only one perspective might the researcher have been considered important, and that was because of her status as a doctoral student. To some teachers, the concept of a doctorate, even if only in a formative stage, was impressive. Linked to this characteristic was the fact that the researcher's field was education -- the school's professional territory -- and therefore that she might have the competence to criticize how they went about the performance of their task. Having received hints that a few teachers were consciously aware of her as a doctoral student in education, the investigator early in the school year took advantage of every opportunity to counterbalance any low-level threat implicit.

Any references teachers made to courses they were taken were related by the observer to her status as student. Problems of being a student, like too much work, complicated bureaucratic procedures, and deadlines provided the chance for expressions of empathy, and therefore
for promoting the feeling among teachers that the investigator was a student in the same way teachers were.

The concern about doctoral status was addressed in two ways: by reference to the similar status of the teacher-colleague who had helped with entry -- and everyone knew she was just a regular person -- and by drawing the teachers into sympathetic worrying over General Examinations, which the investigator took late in autumn.

As the time for exams approached, various teachers offered stories of their own experience with Master's exams, and of friends' experiences with doctoral exams, in an effort to dispel some of the worry. After the researcher was absent from the school for a whole week because of exams, the whole school staff cheered her return. Such incidents were interpreted by the researcher to mean that (a) she was gradually being accepted as "one of us," and that (b) her status as a doctoral student was less a cause for esteem than for personal support.

That the researcher's presumed competence in education might cause her to criticize local efforts harshly was a fear dispelled quickly when the investigator emphasized that she had never taught in an elementary school, and that she had never before seen an open school in operation. In addition, the researcher freely expressed enthusiasm for the efforts and ideas of teachers, rather than sitting soberly in the corner taking notes while everyone else was getting excited. Such a researcher stance was adopted out of a sense that to express emotion in harmony with that of the staff would prompt less of a "researcher effect" than would a non-committal expression likely to be interpreted as a negative judgment.
Intersubjective validation

A major advantage of participant observation is the possibility intelligently to adopt creative strategies for validating data and for checking out the reasonableness of emergent hypotheses. Becker (1970) described how the investigator can compare responses to the same question asked under different circumstances, for example, when a respondent is with colleagues or alone with the investigator.

In this school setting, responses to questions often varied considerably, but they seemed much less influenced by who else was around than by the perspective from which the information was provided. One striking example was the same story told to the researcher by the principal and by a visiting professor when each was alone with the researcher. Characterizations of the behavior of the other (both had been involved in the incident) were widely at variance, and interpretations of the meaning of the event were completely different. When the investigator attempted to checked out the facts with teachers who had also been present -- even though she knew better than to try to approach the "truth" democratically -- she was impressed with how different the third version was from either of the previous two.

Which information was to be treated as valid? On the level of the facts of what had happened, none of the three could be regarded as totally valid, and yet all versions probably contained elements of truth. Sorting through these elements would have been a monumental task, especially since the incident had happened several years before. Such an effort would have been disproportionate to the importance of the
facts. Yet on a higher level of abstraction, all accounts might be regarded as valid representations of present perceptions of the remembered past. For the study in progress, it mattered much less what had really happened than what meanings the actors currently made of the incident, and how those meanings currently affected their behavior. In relation to emerging theoretical constructs, the incident forced the researcher to pay increased attention to the question of how an actor's perspective influences both interpretation of and response to the same situation.

Variety of data

Flexibility of data gathering was reflected in other ways. The researcher roamed around the school often, settling unobtrusively in corners to make certain the data gathered in one location were not contradicted by behavior in evidence elsewhere. She asked regular teachers to contrast their experience in this school with experiences of teaching in other schools, and she asked special teachers how Stanton compared with other schools where they spent some days each week.

The kind of data collected ranged from records of serious professional conferences to verbatim nonsensical interchanges. Teachers were observed in interaction with everyone else in the school, including students, and not only with one another. Perhaps the clearest attempt to collect valid data was the effort to collect so many of them. The mass of data constituted a substantial framework within which individual incidents might be interpreted and hypotheses generated. The researcher never had to depend upon the single response of an informant, as a survey researcher might. Instead, she could pursue responses from different
perspectives, or look for behavioral indications which contradicted or substantiated what she was told. The investigator received reassuring confirmation of the thickness of the data when, after data collection had ended and hypotheses were still emerging, she could find substantial evidence for those new ideas in the data previously collected.

**Subjective knowledge**

Validating procedures of the sort described so far are those suggested most commonly by the classical social researchers concerned about objective knowledge of human reality. Criteria suggested by Douglas (1976), Denzen (1970) and Bruyn (1966) will now be used to structure the presentation of validating procedures related to subjective knowledge.

**Grasping the situation.** Douglas (1976) speaks of the importance of "grasping" the research setting. The researcher sensed very distinctly in the beginning of the data collection process that she did not grasp the situation. She felt she was fumbling around, appearing awkward, missing all the cues which certainly must be present. Gradually, that feeling subsided, but not until she returned to the school after the teacher strike had ended did the investigator realize that she had gained a sense of fit. When she walked in the front door, she heard the sound of the Hillbilly Band -- three teachers who practiced each morning on guitar, banjo and washtub bass. At the sound, she breathed an audible sigh of relief that things were back to normal. Reflecting on that reaction, she realized that she had acquired a sense of what normal meant
in this research setting. She remembered other instances in which she had experienced that same sense of fit: joking with teachers about the principal, joking with the principal about the teachers, being embarrassed herself at an incident that had embarrassed teachers, entering into a discussion of curriculum planning without making a conscious decision to do so. Some of these incidents had raised questions about too closely identifying with the staff and failure to maintain adequate objectivity. She recorded those instances and the feelings which accompanied them but did not try to guard against such feelings, proceeding on the assumption that the interplay between subjective and objective would prove fruitful.

Subjective awareness. Denzen (1970) counsels the researcher to monitor his own behavior sufficiently to be able to take into account shifts in attitude when collecting or analyzing data. The researcher did record such instances of shifts, and did reflect upon how they might be influencing her understanding of the situation. As tension mounted before the strike, for example, the investigator found herself becoming angry over the same points the teachers were. She recorded teacher accounts of what was wrong in the district and why teachers had not been treated fairly. She realized only when she was describing the situation to a friend that there might be another side to the story. The sudden recognition of the depth of her emotional involvement prompted her to review data already collected in the attempt to discover other instances in which she might have accepted as fact the report of a situation from a single perspective.
Criteria for adequacy. Bruyn (1966) is most explicit in detailing criteria by which to judge the adequacy of the researcher's subjective knowledge of the setting, phrasing these as indexes. These closely resemble the criteria Becker (1970) suggests implicitly when he discusses the credibility of data from a much more objective viewpoint:

(1) Time: Other factors being equal, the more time an individual spends with a group, the more likely it is that he will obtain an accurate interpretation of the social meanings its members live by. (Bruyn, 1966, p. 181)

This factor has been reported upon above, but these are the time-related dimensions in summary: The researcher spent more than 200 hours in the school, usually two days a week over the course of one academic year.

(2) Place: The closer the observer works geographically to the people he studies, the more accurate should be his interpretation. (p. 181)

When at the site, the researcher generally sat at the same table with the teachers in the lounge. When not in the lounge, she spent time with the school staff in their classrooms and offices and with them in the media center. Verstehen, Bruyn believes, "depends upon the ability to witness in person the physical setting of the group" (p. 181). Important physical dimensions of this setting which were relevant to motives and attitudes among the staff were the vast openness of the instructional areas, and the proximity of the teachers lounge to the main office and the principal's office.

(3) Social circumstance: The more varied the status opportunities within which the observer can relate to his subjects, and the more varied the activities he witnesses, the more likely the observer's interpretations will be true. (p. 182)

The variety of activities witnesses has been detailed above. Status opportunities in which the researcher could observe teachers included
relating as peers in the lounge, relating as friends in restaurants, relating as observer to teacher in work situations, and relating as newcomer to experienced insider in extended phone conversations.

(4) Language: The more familiar the observer is with the language of his subjects, the more accurate should be his interpretations. (p. 182)

Being in education as a professional field was an advantage to the researcher because she understood most of the terminology and much of the jargon. Some local jargon needed to be learned, however, and she kept a list of such terms from the beginning of the research, asking about their meaning as soon as the opportunity appeared. Most were special usages of conventional phrases; some were locally constructed: "happy-grams," "closure," "Random House," "learning the kids," "specials," "togetherness time," "contract the language stations," etc.

(5) Intimacy of encounter: The greater the degree of intimacy the observer achieves with his subjects, the more accurate his interpretations. (p. 182)

Signs which Bruyn says indicate whether this requirement is being met include being invited to join in group activities which are generally considered private, or being asked to discuss matters which are usually not discussed except among the members themselves. During the course of this research, the investigator was invited to several gatherings which might be termed private -- a going-away party for the school secretary, the Christmas party, the funeral of the husband of a teacher -- but so were a few other people who were not currently teachers. The researcher was involved in many very private conversations, however, for example over the quality of teaching of some of the teachers, over the divorce of one teacher, and over the terminal illness of one teacher's husband.
Probably the single greatest indication of intimacy, however, was her being allowed to attend a "secret" pre-strike meeting held by teachers.

(6) Consensus: The more the observer confirms the expressive meanings of the community, either directly or indirectly, the more accurate will be his interpretation of them. (p. 183)

The researcher constantly sought to confirm the meaning of the events unfolding before her. Generally this meant making an inference about meaning or predicting a future action of participants and then asking teachers whether this interpretation were correct. The six teachers with whom the researcher most closely identified were the ones with whom she most often consulted for help with meaning-making. They were also the ones who most often extended to her signs of intimacy, as Bruyn describes that element (see point 5, above).

Analytic Procedures

The analytic method to be applied to these data clearly had to be one "concerned with generating and plausibly suggesting (not provisionally testing) many properties and hypotheses about [the] general phenomenon" (Glaser, 1969, p. 219) of development in an educational setting. This basic requirement seemed most adequately met by what Glaser (1969) has termed the constant comparative method of qualitative analysis.

Contrasting this approach to several others currently in use, for example, (a) converting qualitative data into quantifiable form in order to test a hypothesis provisionally, by coding "all relevant data [that] can be brought to bear on a point" (Becker & Geer, 1960, p. 279), and (b) not coding data at all, but merely inspecting it for new properties of theoretical categories, Glaser suggests a constant comparative method as a way of combining
the explicit coding procedure of the first approach and the style of theory development of the second. The purpose of the constant comparative method of joint coding and analysis is to generate theory more systematically than allowed by the second approach by using explicit coding and analytic procedures. At the same time, it does not forestall the development of theory by adhering completely to the first approach which is designed for provisional testing, not discovering, of hypotheses. (Glaser, 1969, p. 218)

Although analytic induction also combines elements of both these approaches, Glaser points out that that method

is concerned with generating and proving an integrated, limited, precise, universally applicable theory of causes accounting for a specific phenomenon... [testing] a limited number of hypotheses with all available data, which are numbers of clearly defined and carefully selected cases of the phenomena. (p. 219)

while the constant comparative method of qualitative analysis is concerned with properties which "may be causes; but unlike analytic induction others are conditions, consequences, dimensions, types, processes, etc..." (p. 219).

Four stages of analysis comprise this method as articulated by Glaser. Each of these will be described as it applies to this study: (a) comparing incidents applicable to each category, (b) integrating the categories and their properties, (c) delimiting the theory, and (d) writing the theory.

Comparing incidents applicable to each category. Glaser's first stage starts one step ahead of where the analysis of these data began. First the categories had to be established. Becker and Geer (1960) advise discovering the appropriate categories by looking for "problems and concepts that give promise of yielding the greatest understanding of the organization" (p. 272). Although such advice appeared platitudinous to the investigator, few alternatives presented themselves.
Relying, therefore, upon her understanding of what comprised a social entity and how development operated in general, the researcher gradually began to see incidents recorded as falling into conceptual categories.

Each of these categories was assigned a code number, and then each of the approximately 900 observational entries was labeled with code numbers corresponding to each of the major categories to which it was relevant. All entries, originally sequenced chronologically, were reassembled by code number, so that all data relevant to any one category were gathered in one place.

Deciding how to code each of these entries was done as Glaser advises, comparing each incident coded with the previous incidents coded in the same category. Theoretical ideas generated through this comparative process were recorded as they occurred.

**Integrating categories and their properties.** As this process of comparison proceeded, properties of categories began to emerge. As incidents of teachers talking about children were compared to one another, for example, it became clear that they nearly always talked in terms of individuals rather than in terms of groups. From then on, incidents of their talking about individuals could be compared to other incidents in which an orientation toward individualization was revealed, rather than to other incidents of their talking about children.

At the same time, as Glaser had predicted, "the diverse properties of the category start to become integrated" (p. 222). Recognizing the individuality of the children was clearly related to the more general humanistic orientation revealed, for example, in how teachers related
to one another. As the various categories and their properties gradu-
ally became integrated in this way, the beginnings of theory started to
emerge.

**Delimiting the theory.** As more and more incidents were added to
the same categories, the list of properties in common shortened. In
addition, terminology at a somewhat higher level of abstraction occurred
to the analyst as an appropriate tool for reducing the number of cate-
gories which would then have to be dealt with theoretically. Instances
of teacher posture in relation to one another were described substan-
tively by the abstract term of collegiality. Later, this category of
incidents was grouped with others like socialization and participation
into a broader category of integration.

In the process of seeking to order the mass of data collected,
more details were included in a smaller set of categories. Gradually
the researcher became committed to the set which served to cover the
scope of the data and, at the same time, to hold together theoretically.

**Writing theory.** The foregoing process resulted finally in a pile
of coded data and a collection of theoretical notes. The content of
these notes served as the basis for the discussion of each of the cate-
gories used to organize the data presented in Chapters V, VI and VII,
and for the final set of theoretical concepts presented in Chapter VIII.
CHAPTER V

THE SCHOOL: EMIC AND ETIC PERSPECTIVES

When staff people at Stanton describe how their school operates, they speak of a reality which is difficult to convey in abstracted social science terms. Their descriptions are unsystematic, but they communicate their judgment of what is important about their social entity.

However rich and suggestive of the feel of the educational setting that emic reporting is, however, it leaves open many questions of the organization of elements. An etic approach to the same social reality makes possible a conceptual organization of elements in which the structure of both social relationships and of culture can be more clearly seen. Taken together, emic and etic perspectives provide a more complete understanding of the complexities of the educational program than would be possible with either alone.

In this chapter, therefore, the nature of the school will be presented first from the perspective of those inside, in terms that they use to describe what's happening, then in abstracted terms of social structure and culture. Staff people draw no distinction between the school and its educational program since only one program exists in the school. In chapter V, however, the same social entity presented here will be examined etically along the axis of the educational program, so that the
systematic nature of those activities directed toward the facilitation of learning will be clarified. At the same time, a basis will be laid for exploring the specifically developmental operations of that program in Chapter VI. Each of these three chapters in which the data are presented is intended to provide a conceptual foundation for the one to follow. As a set, they contain the data in which the theory of Chapter VIII is grounded.

Emic Perspective on the School

In this section, the social entity of the school will be described in the kind of terms staff people use when they talk about their own setting. Themes treated all revolve around the identity and operation of the school: Who we are, Who others think we are, How the school operates, How we share the work, and Our framework for work.

Who We Are

Those who know Stanton well recognize that something is different about the school, but they are rarely satisfied with what they can articulate about why it is different.

The speech therapist confided that she had pulled rank to keep Stanton as one of her schools for next year. The other speech therapists in the district had been puzzled about why she was so adamant about it, and she had had difficulty explaining to them why the school was so special.

Regular teachers will sometimes give quick hints of what the school is for them.

"We're more like a family than a group of teachers working."

"Stanton is different from other schools, even in this district. The quality of conversations in the lounge is different. People
talk in an open-minded, caring way about the kids rather than complaining about them."

"I don't mean to say it's like a fairy tale. We do have problems, disagreements....but it's fun."

"Teachers aren't threatened by new things. They decide to take changes on themselves rather than feeling like they're being made to accept them."

Sometimes a clue to the identity of the school can be gained by listening to the way teachers talk about other schools. By telling stories about school realities which contrast so clearly with Stanton's, teachers restate by implication what they understand as they way their own school operates.

Gail talked about a school nearby where teachers put kids down in class and then brag to other teachers at lunch about how witty they are. A friend of hers, Gail said, had finally quit her job there because of the way teachers were expected to treat the kids. "Those teachers are so mean!"

Teachers who respond to such stories affirm, by sighs and gestures and facial expressions, their identification with the same commitments that had prompted the story in the first place. Remarks about the sadness of some other school situations say, in effect, that we are not like that here.

Most of that sense of identity is derived from the day-to-day experience of working out a social reality together, but much is also bound up and carried on in collective consciousness through the school's saga. The recounting of the history of the school provides a patterned background for understanding and creating the present. Such stories from the past often involve elements of the relationship between the school and other schools in the district. Although that relationship has improved significantly in the past few years, the continued telling
of the stories helps to keep clear the distinction between Who We Are and Who They Are.

The Sunday Dispatch had carried a full page article about Stanton and the curriculum system that had been developed there. Yet when Dennis went to a principals meeting only a few days later, not one principal mentioned seeing it. Yet he was sure they had all read it.

But the principals had been resentful of Stanton for a long time, Dennis explained. When Stanton had applied for a federal grant several years ago, they had tried to involve the other schools. Yet later, when Stanton was awarded $200,000, they all wanted their schools to be in on the project. When Dennis told them they couldn't because of the terms of the grant, they were angry. Stanton was always getting unfair advantages.

Without such a cluing in on the saga, new teachers are likely to be at a loss to interpret responses they receive from other schools in the district.

Barbara and Grace were recounting to teachers in the lounge their experiences at early morning meetings with other district teachers. Barbara is on an evaluation committee; Grace on an grading alternatives committee. Both reported somewhat less than enthusiastic responses when they reported on how Stanton approached these problems. Both referred to individuals who "don't like anything that happens at Stanton."

Grace talked about trying to tease one teacher on her committee (everyone groaned when they heard his name) with "Oh, by the end of the year, you'll be using Stanton's report checklist and loving it." His reply? "The hell I will."

On the basis of messages they receive from their environment, teachers construct a common view of the identity of parents, of other schools, of the district as a whole -- of all they are in relation to, of all that is other than Who We Are. But the most important elements of the school's perceived identity arise from the life inside.

Stanton staff people live out in the open, sharing both the functional demands of carrying of educational activities for the
children as well as their deeply held beliefs and expectations of one another. Their openness allows for a high degree of awareness about one another and of realism about themselves.

The physical structure of the school almost necessitates teachers working together closely in small groups. Each of the three big instructional areas, called a "cluster," is run as a cooperative setting. No walls exist between "rooms" so each teacher is teaching in full view of at least two others all day. The capacities and limitations of colleagues are clearly displayed and are therefore generally known. Individual limitations are not seen as shameful, however. They are regarded simply as facts to be taken into consideration when teachers are designing the learning activities for the children. Deficiencies are no less real than are talents or interests. All are variables which must be manipulated skillfully, and which can be manipulated because they are known. Since the work is approached collectively, teachers can avoid allowing individual limitations to become program liabilities.

Learning experiences for the children are planned carefully. Teachers know exactly who will have to implement what they decide upon, and so every relevant known element about the six adults in the cluster is taken into consideration.

Teachers are aware not only of one another but also of themselves, their own limitations, their own needs. They exhibit a sense of realism about themselves and talk openly when they are uncertain about their own capacities.
"I'm going to have a hard time this year without the fifth grade, because I'm so used to using fifth and sixth grade materials."

"Tell me if you hear me being too rough on the third graders -- expecting too much from them."

"I'm going to have a lot of learning to do this year. Teaching full time is different from substituting."

Expressions of hesitancy are nearly always responded to as pleas for support. Responses function not only as interpersonal boosting but as reminders of the validity of experimenting.

"It's true, we're going to have to recognize our limitations. This might not work. We are trying to do something very different for the first time."

"I tried this kind of thing a little last year, and realized it's a whole different kind of teaching. When I taught about feelings, the kids weren't ready to open up until I did."

"We have to take into account our lack of skill in case this whole thing bombs...."

Teachers recognize that as individuals, they are far from perfect. On the other hand, they expect that the experience they collectively provide for the children will be good in the whole because each weakness will be balanced out by someone else's strength. When things do not go well, staff people regard that happening as an exception to the rule. They expect that they will be successful; when they're not, that doesn't change the rule.

Recognizing their limitations allows teachers to maintain a sense of humor about themselves.

Barabara will become principal next year at a small, old school in the district that will be newly reopened. She has been trying to convince the district personnel director that she should be the one to select the teachers. Grace told her that her cohorts in Cluster C should have volunteered as a group to
staff the school. Toni looked shocked at the idea: "Dennis would die!" (at the prospect of losing all six teachers). Grace responded with "Maybe not. Maybe we're overrating ourselves!"

Yet however much confidence teachers have about the quality of their teaching, they are hardly smug about either their individual performance or about the perfection of operations in the school.

A small group of teachers were remembering aloud about all the exciting activities that had been happening in the school in the days of the Title III project. Linda reminded them that things hadn't been all perfect then either: there were so many activities that teachers had all they could do to attend meetings much less understand the meaning of the whole.

Who Others Think We Are

Although Stanton teachers do not live in the community where they teach, they hold in common a view of that community based on their experience of it during the eight years of the school's history.

"In this community, many families are extremely concerned about social mobility. There's lots of competition in the neighborhood, and much of that centers on the kids. One parent will say to a neighbor, 'My kid is doing fourth grade work and he's only in the third grade,' and so the neighbor comes to the teachers and wants to know why her child isn't doing the same."

The teachers' primary experience of the community centers around their relationship with parents. Teachers care about the children a great deal, and when they perceive that parents are ignoring the needs of their own kids, teachers are resentful.

One of the little girls screened for kindergarten looked like a battered child. Doris talked about how well off families in the neighborhood are -- houses start at $60,000 -- and yet how badly some of them treat their children. She talked angrily about how willing some of them are to pay civic association fees for use of the community swimming pool, and yet how unwilling some are to pay attention to their own kids.
Parents have a different perspective on their children and on the processes of education than the teachers have. Even though teachers attempt to work with parents, still teachers regard some parent attitudes as directly interfering with what they believe needs doing.

One boy brought for kindergarten screening could not begin to write his name. Doris went out to talk with his mother about working with him to help him learn. When Doris came back, she reported how indignant the mother had been at the suggestion that her child was behind the others.

Although when pressed, teachers will admit that the majority of parents are supportive of their efforts, still the parents who are discussed most are those who criticize the school. These are vocal enough to cause periodic waves of dissent in the community, with ripples of depression caused within the school. Teachers recognize, however, that being receptive to criticism is a corollary to the openness they have built as a cornerstone of the school's ethos.

"Compared with other schools, Stanton receives lots of criticism from parents. Teachers get much more advice about how they should be teaching." Why? "Because at Stanton, open communication is promoted, so the school is vulnerable. At other schools, effort is put into keeping parents from interfering in what's happening."

Yet parents do respect the teachers for their enthusiasm and commitment.

"It's not the energy level that parents complain about. They rarely even question the commitment of teachers or whether they care about the kids. But lots of them have trouble with the concept of an open school and with individualized instruction."

Teachers respect the parents' right to seek the best for their children, and realize that their criticism of the school is rarely malicious. However, teacher accounts of what parents think make it clear that parents and teachers don't always think alike.
"Parents don't see how their kids can concentrate in an open school. Parents remember how school was for them -- sitting at desks in straight rows, inside four walls. When they come into the cluster for a meeting and see how noisy it can get with a few hundred people together, they begin to think that's how it is when school's in session.

"Parents want to be assured that their child will be at a certain point (like having finished a math book) by a certain time of year. They aren't convinced when we tell them that a child should be allowed to learn at his own rate, especially if that means that their child will be behind."

If Stanton were an alternative school and parents had chosen to send their children there, they might feel differently, teachers believe. But a neighborhood public school that is so different from the one they remember is a little difficult for them to accept, especially when it's so different even from the rest of those in the district.

"When anything goes wrong, it's the fact that Stanton's an open school that's blamed. Not many parents complain when their children are doing well. But if a child is having trouble, they reach the conclusion right away that it's because he's in an open school."

Stanton teachers recognize that many parents simply don't understand how an open school operates. Even though teachers try to approach this problem coolly and to see it as one of communication, they recognize from experience how deep-seated are the feelings parents have.

"Parents always object when they think the kids are having to teach themselves. I told my class it would be better not to take their math books home to work in them, at least for awhile....Parents just don't understand, especially about math. And this is the best math curriculum we've ever had."

"I think we should have the parents in early this year for a meeting where we can explain the math curriculum. I really think that if we explain it to them, they'll be rational about it."

Teachers believe they know more about education than the parents do, and parents believe they have prior rights over their own children.
Inside their own frame of reference (the community of staff people within the school, and colleagues within their own profession), teachers are affirmed in their belief that they know how to create a good educational experience for children. By other parents who equate education with traditional schooling, parents are confirmed in their hesitance about supporting an open school.

The school is always open to parent visitors and volunteers. Teachers always hope that once parents see for themselves what's happening, they'll be converted into school supporters. Often, that's exactly what happens, but sometimes with such vehemence that teachers still infer from the reaction a generalized attitude of low-level disapproval from the community.

A parent volunteer came into the lounge during break, enthusiastic about her first day of seeing the school in operation. She had thought it would be wild, with many kids disruptive. It was not at all what she had expected. Her surprise was evident: "Some of the parents who complain all the time should come in and see what it's really like!"

On the other hand, much evidence of parental support does exist. Parent conferences, scheduled formally with parents, have had a near-100% turn-out for several years. Is it really because parents are supportive of the school?

"It's probably more because of the social pressures in the neighborhood. The kids put pressure on their parents to some, because they know the teachers will only say good things about them. Teachers won't criticize them behind their backs. Then too, it looks bad if a neighbor has gone for a conference and her neighbor says she doesn't have time."

High achievement scores convert some parents; the enthusiasm of teachers is comforting to others. But few parents believe in the concept of an open school with the fervor that the teachers do, and the teachers
know it. Although the school has been in operation for eight years, and
only occasionally do really vocal critics arise, there lingers in the
air a sense that the school is still on trial. The working out of the
identity of the school cannot be done in a utopian vacuum where the
lastest in educational theory might unfold unhampered by opponents with
a legitimate interest in what's happening. What the school is becoming
constantly bumps up against an impinging environment. That encounter
sometimes tempers the dynamic for innovation, but it also challenges
those inside to be sure of what they're doing.

How School Operates

The energy within the school is almost explosive. The air is
charged with the static electricity of people and ideas bouncing off one
another constantly. Teachers charge in and out of the lounge in quick
succession throughout the day, reflecting the circadian rhythm of re­
cesses, lunches, and class sessions with specials teachers.

Before school starts in the morning, nearly every teachers is
in the lounge for at least awhile. Most come for coffee and to see
whether any food has appeared. There's a school-wide interest in good
food and new recipes, so teachers use one another as guinea pigs for
their latest experiments in baking.

Some teachers race back to the cluster, to rearrange furniture
or set out materials they will need early in the day. Most, however,
stay in the lounge for awhile, catching up on all the news since yester­
day. They laugh sometimes to think that so much can happen overnight
that needs immediate sharing the next day.
Teachers crowd onto the wooden benches built against the wall, and pull the few available chairs up to the table. Latecomers have to sit in the lounge chairs, more comfortable, but a little removed from the hubbub of activity around the tables. The noise level is high — much higher than in the instructional areas where teachers and children interact. The lounge is the place where adults can laugh and enjoy one another and talk out problems they're encountering with the kids. Serious and nonsensical are interwoven in a rich pattern reflecting the complexity of the everyday experience in the school. Teachers seem intent on enlivening one another's professional life with a communal sense that the job of educating is important and complicated but also immensely rewarding and fun.

Many teachers work seriously in the lounge, correcting papers, making out dittos, sorting language folders. Fifteen conversations can be happening simultaneously and no one seems bothered by the noise. Most teachers are skilled at working and talking at the same time, so the hour before school is a time to get work accomplished, even though it's invariably with a great deal of laughing.

The excitement of the work itself seems energizing for teachers. Stories of what's happening circulate with communal enjoyment in the experience of the whole.

"Bill's getting a real skeleton to bring to school! Can you imagine? It'll gross some kids out!"

"Have you seen the Iowa test scores yet? They're so high this year that Dennis is having them checked again to see if there's a mistake."

Teachers in each cluster meet as small groups to plan the activities in their cluster area. Many activities involve all the children
in the same cluster, even though at least two grade levels are present in the same area. Sharing the resources of six adults on major activities almost guarantees that someone will have a specialized competency or background in the area under consideration. That person is likely to be especially enthusiastic, and so can stimulate the energies of others. Teachers recognize the importance of being stimulated themselves.

Toni brought up the idea of doing a program on values in January. "January is so boring!"

As teachers sorted through who would teach which science areas, Linda said she wanted ponds: "I'm sick of rocks!"

One visible expression of the energy rampant in the school is the occurrence of "calendar" every morning. Each cluster holds a mini-assembly, drawing together teachers and children for half an hour of activities. Standard elements include the pledge of allegiance, a discussion of the date and anything famous which ever happened on it, and talk about the local weather. (A child checks outside to make sure the weather report is current.) Despite these standard elements, however, calendar differs considerably from day to day, depending upon the personality of the teacher leading it.

Calendar seems like a lot of work for the teacher who organizes it. But teachers don't make excuses for the time that's consumed. They explain calendar positively in terms of fun and energy. Calendar puts teachers in a good mood for the day, teachers say, and it's fun for the kids. Calendar serves as a kind of centering time, so that teachers find the children more ready to begin work once calendar has happened.

The enthusiasm of teachers is apparent as they create ways to express themselves -- their talents, their interests, their values --
in the program they work out. All the activity of the school is carried out under the clear assumption that the teachers are in charge of working out the learning experience for the children and responsible for the consequences of their decisions.

Staff people rarely remark upon the hectic pace of life, and yet the whirl of activities is almost constant. Teachers and children seem to have accepted the pace as given. They are reminded of how different they are only when visitors come from other schools, or when they visit in other schools.

Behind the scenes, the principal works to urge things on, with an emphasis so preponderately on the positive that the negative, teachers say, is simply squashed out of existence.

On Friday of the first week of school, Dennis strode through the building early in the morning calling out "Staff meeting in five minutes!" Teachers gathered in the lounge, filling up all the chairs quickly, and then sitting on the floor or on stacks of pop cases in the corner. Thus assembled, the teachers listened to Dennis give his first pep talk of the year: it had been "an excellent three days" with an "especially good climate" (everyone laughed at the catchword), and he was "trusting we'll have many more good weeks like this one."

Dennis's manner of speaking to teachers conveys such respect for them as persons that simple words are understood as a meaningful sign of appreciation for their caring and competence. Stanton teachers have confidence in their own competency. They recognize it from their own experience of the work and from the simple and unabashed human response from their principal.

How We Share the Work

Staff people define their task as collectively educating the children inside the educational program which they create. The school's
raison d'etre is always being expressed simultaneously through the twin prongs of direct instruction and of program development.

The picture of school which staff people seem to carry around in their minds is that of a social entity in which they and the children all participate. The responsibility of the staff therefore is not only to instruct, but to create the social setting for learning inside which specific activities can happen. Absolutely foreign is an image of school as a set of discrete classrooms presided over by individual teachers who work with separate groups of children.

Staff people see their task as necessarily a collective one. Teachers cannot disappear into their own classrooms to carry off their own show. The physical openness alone necessitates cooperation. Teachers hardly ever work alone. Dittos are run off by volunteers for all the teachers in the cluster at the same time. Decisions about where to keep books and other learning materials are made together because the materials of any are available to all.

Concerns about territoriality are strikingly absent from teacher interactions. Ideas are shared, materials are shared, concerns about the children are shared. Since so many of the activities in the cluster involve children crossing over from one class to another, each teacher has to accept responsibility for the operation of the program in the cluster or the whole cluster would be in trouble. New teachers have to be helped to teach well because the success of the program in the cluster depends upon the competent functioning of each adult member.

The words teachers use to refer to their task and performance reflect their sense of the endeavor as collective.
"We have to recognize our limitations...."
"We have to figure out how...."
"We're probably going to have trouble with...."

The intensity and quickness of information exchange is another indication of the sense of collectivity. Everytime teachers encounter one another -- no matter for how short a time -- they take the opportunity to exchange information. They seem to function under the assumption that everyone needs to know what's happening if they are to carry out a collective effort effectively.

Factors which, in many other schools, interfere with the sense of the collective do not even have a basis for developing at Stanton. In this sense, the absence of concern with territoriality does not reveal a problem successfully overcome so much as a natural outgrowth of the structuring of everyday life. Selfishness about materials or space is meaningless in this setting because it could only lead to failure for everyone. The corporate enterprise demands the sharing of anything valuable among members -- physical resources, interpersonal skills, promising ideas, suggestions about how to deal with children. Succeeding in isolation is impossible, and the attempt to do so would hardly be respected by other staff members.

Both teachers and principal recognize how crucial to the operation of the program this sense of the collective is. No new teachers are hired until the teachers in the cluster where the new person is to settle have the chance to interview the candidate. The principal might be favorably impressed with a teacher's qualifications, but if the other
teachers do not believe the person could work well with them, that
teacher is not hired.

Candidates for all staff positions -- not only teachers -- are
considered with an eye toward their sense of responsibility for the
whole. A child might appear at the office at lunchtime, saying he's
sick and wanting to go home. Then it's the secretary and teacher who
will confer: Is the child sick? Did something on the playground upset
him? Is he behind in his work and trying to avoid being discovered?

When it comes to making coffee in the morning, it's the custodian
who is responsible, since he's the first one to arrive. He's the one
who must be hospitable to an early morning visitor wandering around
looking for the office. He might offer them a cup of coffee and the
sports page, or talk to them about the school until the principal
appears. Attending to simple human needs is considered part of the task
in which everyone shares.

Staff people function out of a broad framework of shared under-
standing about what they are doing together -- what kind of experience
they are trying to create for themselves and for the children, who they
are in the midst of that creation, and how they need to work to focus
their energies toward the accomplishment of their goals.

The vision staff people share about what the school should be is
reflected in the statement of the school's goals, written communally in
the first years of the school's operation.

1. To develop in students an understanding of how they should
interact with one another in a positive way, showing true con-
sideration and understanding for each other as well as deve-
loping their own self discipline.
2. To assure that each individual child is meeting with success and is developing a feeling of importance within himself reaching towards his maximum potential in his mental abilities.

3. To provide a valuable and worthwhile education for each student by providing for all individuals a solid foundation in the basics of education and by meeting each individual's needs.

4. To assure that each child has achieved to the best of his ability the material which was covered during that time period of education.

5. As a school to become familiar with and to utilize the vast amount of academic resources both within the school and those in our surrounding communities.

6. To provide a variety of means by which teachers can meet the needs of the parents in communicating with them their child's progress along with the objectives of the school and the events taking place.

7. To provide a healthy, positive atmosphere in which staff would work and interact together so as to capitalize on the individual talents of each teacher.

This statement of goals, it should be noted, addresses other issues besides the education of the children. Although the children are clearly the most important, they are not the only consideration. Bringing resources into the school, communicating with parents, providing a positive atmosphere for the staff, and utilizing the individual talents of teachers are all important enough to be stated explicitly.

In contrast to the practice in many schools, where such a statement of philosophy is generated early in the school's history and then filed away forever, the Stanton expression is printed each year and distributed to parents along with a map of the school and a list of all the staff, including secretary and custodians as well as principal and teachers.

This statement of the philosophy of Stanton does not guide life at the school. Rather, it articulates what staff people understand as
the way of life already pursued. The statement of philosophy does far
less to remind teachers how they are to live than do the daily inter­
actions in which they are involved.

The distinctiveness of that life is apparent in their approach
to problems. Problems are regarded as facts of life, to be dealt with
as they arise rather than to be hidden as if they were shameful. When
problems arise, they indicate what needs working at next.

If problems are small, they tend to be approached lightly, in
tune with the staff tendency to enjoy school life.

As usual, the teacher with playground duty came into the lounge
afterwards to report news of the outdoors. Today it was Diane
who recited a list of everything that had gone wrong. Her
biggest problem had been the third grade boy, newly arrived
from France, who was pulling girls around the playground by
their ponytails. Teachers all laughed, trying to top one an­
other with jokes about French men.

In this setting where openness is valued, petty annoyances are
never allowed to simmer. If teachers are having a hard time seeing the
funny side to a situation, the principal will help.

Joan was telling Dennis about the problem of the older kids
throwing snowballs against the outside cluster walls, so that
she and the little kids inside received a constant barrage of
thuds during Cluster C recess. Dennis laughed and reminded her
how much fun it was to improve your aim by knocking down the
icicles hanging from the gutters. Joan's expression of an­
noyance changed, and she agreed to talk to the Cluster C
teachers about encouraging the kids to aim at the gym instead.

Stanton teachers believe that they are tenacious about solving
problems. Since problems are regarded as part of the natural fabric of
life, they are neither intimidating nor debilitating. For this reason,
problems are unlikely to be avoided or to be abandoned after early ex­
periences of failure.
Parents often approach the problem of problems differently. Teachers assess the attitudes of parents in various ways: Parents don't really want to know about problems; parents have difficulty facing up to them when their kids have problems; parents don't want their kids to have problems, and have difficulty admitting it when they do. To teachers, the parent behaviors which result from such attitudes are often frustrating. Teachers cannot understand how parents can ignore problems when it's their child who is involved. Most evident to teachers are the needs of the child, who they believe suffers most when his parents can't admit he has a problem. To the teachers, problems indicate what needs attention. To the parents, teachers believe, problems are often indictments of failure.

Our Framework for Work

An intuitive sense of the dynamics of development seems to guide teachers and principal as they respond to the demands of their situation. Their professional awareness of the meaning of human development is seen as relevant not only to the children but to themselves. Attention to the problems of development of the adults is validated, in the certainty they have about the relationship between their own development and their competent performance as professionals.

Special attention is given to the problems of first year teachers. They must be taught how to teach by the other teachers in the cluster so that all the children in the cluster will have a successful learning experience. Two experienced teachers usually set up their "rooms" on either side of a new teacher. In this way, the neophyte can learn from
observing out of the corner of her eye while she is teaching her own class. Experienced teachers are always near in case of crisis, but are usually simply consulted for advice or information.

The principal spends considerable time with new teachers, discussing with them what they consider important in their on-going experience. Such sessions turn out to be supportive times for the new teachers, as Dennis emphasizes to them the strengths he sees in their teaching and in them personally. Dennis recognizes the difficulties new teachers have to face. Clearly, his communicated expectation is that they will become excellent teachers, so even in the midst of first year difficulties the new teacher is made to feel like a respected colleague.

A young student teacher was sitting in the lounge criticizing one of the first year Stanton teachers, which prompted a discourse on development from Dennis, clearly aimed in her direction:

"Carrie still has a teaching voice which is different from her talking voice, but she's going to be an excellent teacher. She has learned lots about group management techniques since she's been here. They don't teach them enough about that while they're in college. New teachers have to learn about things gradually. It's interesting to see new teachers change, to see them learn how to teach."

Other teachers in the school, even those not directly working with them in the cluster, keep an eye out for new teachers, offering materials and ideas, background information on children in their classes, stories of their own experiences as a first year teacher, or especially funny stories of spectacular failures that teachers have been involved in at the school. In this way, the new teacher gets little chance to see himself as a failure, unique in all the world. His successes are
notices, his failures do not engender criticism. He, rather than the teachers around him or the principal, is the one who brings up problems that need solving. His self-concept does not suffer irreparably through the experience of the first year, because he knows everyone recognizes how difficult the first year is.

The development of new teachers is regarded as especially crucial to the success of the program, but the development of all teachers is considered important.

When the school first began, Martha recounted, staff people thought the major things they had to worry about were curriculum, instruction and evaluation. Only gradually did they learn how important staff development was. Partly, this awareness came about because of the efforts of some of the OSU professors who became involved with the school early in its history. But partly too, this realization had emerged from their recognition of the complexity of working out a whole new educational program for their setting. Finding materials and putting them together coherently, working with the children in an open space, dealing cooperatively with one another when the working together was so intense and constant, figuring out how to organize the learning of the children on an individual basis in such a way that it did not become totally unmanageable -- all these demands of their situation required high level skills which needed to be developed.

The impetus toward development is structured into the way life is pursued in the school. Teachers want to improve at what they are doing, not only for the sake of the children but for their own sense of self esteem among their colleagues. Development always has both individual and communal aspects. New teachers often emphasize the individual.

Bill talked about how things were in the school his first year of teaching, while the Title III project was still in progress. He would have the staff developer observe his teaching and give him feedback. He would consult with the school psychologist and with the experienced teachers. He would spend hours talking with the principal. The efforts of so many people had made an enormous difference in his teaching life, Bill believes.
More experienced teachers sometimes talk of the corporate experience in ways which suggest they visualize the school as an entity engaged in a process of development of its own.

One of the professors from OSU came out to the school wearing a bright red jacket. Staff people teased him about his flashy clothes, and talked about how much weight he had lost. Grace explained later that staff people would never have talked in such personal terms to the professors when they first began coming to the school. But now people were much more comfortable with relating to the professors as peers, since teachers began realizing they knew more about education than they thought they had.

She gave an example in terms of her own experience: When J.H. first came out to the school (he was an expert on evaluation), she was embarrassed to tell him how she did evaluation in her class. But now her attitude is completely changed. If J.H. were to tell her about some sophisticated new approach which sounded too time-consuming to her, she would tell him so. She has much more confidence now in her belief that good ideas have to be workable.

The individual experience is always interwoven with the corporate. What is seen as a generalized experience of social learning among the body of teachers is simultaneously related to the experience of the individual experiencing person. Staff people have a sense of development which is profound enough to carry over into all phases of school life. They understand that the program is developing, that they are developing as persons, and especially that the children are developing. Often, they will reflect aloud about problems they perceive children are having in coping with new situations, talking together about how they can be supportive or how they can challenge a child to a new level of development.

Their sense of development is incorporated into what Sarason (1971) has called behavioral regularities. Teachers relate almost
nonchalantly to minor crises like misbehavior, handling them calmly as perturbations to be expected in the course of development. Contributing to their calm is the knowledge that the strength of the school's formidable sociocultural system is behind them.

Polly came into the lounge with her arm around a second grade boy. She brought him over to Dennis and said matter-of-factly, "I'm having David do his work in the office because he hasn't been able to do it well in the room."

Dennis said "Okay" with no tone or look of disapproval, as if accepting this action as perfectly reasonable, and took the boy with him to get settled in the office.

Later Polly explained why she was so matter-of-fact. She had talked with the boy the day before, so that he could tell his mother after school that he would be spending the following day in the principal's office. David had had time overnight to think about what was happening to him, and so was prepared to work when he finally arrived. Dennis had not been warned ahead of time, but he can be counted on to support teachers' efforts to work with the kids.

The orientation toward human development is so clearly shared among staff people that their actions seem synchronized with little conscious effort.

Etic Perspective on the School

In this section, the social entity of the school will be described in abstracted terms of social structure and culture. Elements of the social structure to be addressed are these: the principal's stance, communication, member identification, collegiality, humanity, socialization, and participation. Substantive elements of the culture to be described are these: organic lifestyle, holism, meaning in identity, meaning in work, shared commitment, and authenticity.
The Social Structure

The principal's stance

Many of the teachers as well as the professors who have had long association with the school believe that the principal is the key to understanding why the staff functions as such a close-knit group. Dennis relates to staff people with enormous respect. Teachers respond to his attitude by feeling free to operate as colleagues, both with him and with the other teachers.

Dennis operates in a deceptively simple manner, asking teachers what they think, how things are going, whether they are accomplishing what they want, how he can help. In his spare time, Dennis appreciates the teachers, often telling visitors about how Kathy tells stories so well that the little kids sit wide-eyed, or about how Grace's style of teaching has delighted even a visiting expert on instruction.

Dennis often asks teachers how specific children in their classes are getting along. He seems to enjoy most some of the boys who are always in trouble. When they seriously misbehave, they get sent to the office -- not to get yelled at by the principal, but to do their work there for awhile in full view of all the adults who pass by. Dennis will sometimes take the opportunity to have long talks with them while they are in the office, thinking aloud with them somewhat as he does with a teacher, puzzling over what's going wrong and what might improve the situation.

Through this kind of behavior, teachers learn they can count on Dennis to support them when they are having a problem with a child. They know they can trust him to reinforce the child's sense of expectations all the adults have for him.
In the same way, teachers trust Dennis to back them up if they encounter problems with parents, although his mode of operating tends to be more conciliatory than defensive. Teachers say that Dennis is on their side; on the other hand, they point out, "he's no push-over."

**Communication**

Staff people talk with one another constantly, before school in the lounge, during breaks, after school, in quick exchanges in the cluster while the children are working on their own. They worry together over problems, brainstorm about solutions, and joke endlessly about their life together.

Individuals give and receive feedback on behavior, give and receive help with problems, give and receive encouragement. In this atmosphere of honesty and support, channels of communication are open on a deeply personal level. Feelings about personal problems find a release in the concern that others express, and so come to interfere minimally with the professional functioning of teachers and the operation of the program. Such openness contributes to the stability of the program by according legitimacy to its emotional base.

The time just before the teachers' strike was a time of high emotion in the school, but both principal and teachers talked with one another about feeling wobbly, being mad, and finding it scary to go into court. Reports kept filtering back to Stanton that teachers in other schools were not talking so openly, and that emotions were seething undercover.

After the strike, teachers came back to school bringing food to celebrate their return. The principal brought huge amounts of fudge. Staff people felt that things were back to normal within two days after the strike was over. In other schools, rumor had it, resentments lingered throughout the school year.
Member identification: belonging

Positive feelings that teachers express to one another about the value of their school situation contribute to their sense that they are identified with a setting that is good.

At the end of the year, Dennis asked teachers at a staff meeting to let him know what grade level they wanted to teach next year, and also to tell him whether they wanted to be transferred out of the building. Everyone laughed aloud at such a silly suggestion.

Teachers belong at Stanton, in a community which offers a framework for creative interaction and basic understanding about the meaning of their work together. Who they are in this community focuses around the function they perform, but they are persons first, in interaction with other persons, adults and children.

Responsibility for the shared task of educating the children is demanded of every adult as a requirement for membership on the staff. The demand for responsibility, however, is not a heavy burden, however, because the quality of interpersonal relationships serves to support individuals through the experience of contributing responsibly out of the resources of their own person.

The intimate working together seems to legitimize a high degree of interpersonal informality. People come to know one another so well that the appropriate style of relating seems to be like that in a big family.

A phone call in the lounge was for Carol. As soon as she answered it, the other teachers started making funny remarks about who might be phoning her, trying to upset her composure while she talked. When she covered her ears, they all eavesdropped so that they would have ammunition to tease her with when she was finished. Carol is new this year, and gets her share of teasing.
Concerned support among teachers is often expressed also by way of teasing in this same familial style. At other times, it is very serious, as staff people help one another think over problems. Teachers respect and solicit one another's opinions, and are concerned about the needs of any teachers who are not present when decisions are made.

**Collegiality**

Since they have structured their educational task in a way which demands collaboration, teachers do not need much more encouragement to interact over professional matters. However, the quality of that interaction surpasses that required by the constraints of the educational program.

A typical day begins with the lounge packed with teachers, all of them talking, trading ideas for the next few days, and eating coffee-cake. Dennis races in and out every few minutes with an update on latest happenings. By lunch time, things have calmed down somewhat, and Dennis is touring the lounge asking teachers individually how the morning has gone.

The primacy of human values is clear in the pursuit of collegial relationships along all levels of the "hierarchy" of the school staff. The fundamentally egalitarian nature of community life is lived out with easy grace within the school. Dennis says he could leave the building for a month and never be missed, as long as the secretary stayed behind to run the school. Teachers delight in telling the story of their custodian who risked the wrath of his supervisors (and incurred some of it) by bringing coffee out to them on the picket line. The secretary reminds
teachers that the bell has rung if they stay too late in the lounge in
the morning, and she teases Dennis about needing tranquilizers during a
particularly difficult week. Teachers continue joking while they con­
duct planning meetings, even if the principal has wandered in and quietly
joined their group.

The lack of concern with hierarchy parallels the lack of concern
over individual territory. Both are subsumed into the much more important
issue of the collective task. In a community where members are so consis­
tently supportive, defensive behaviors hardly make sense. People do not
have to protect what they have -- either status or materials -- for fear
of losing it. On the contrary, they are likely to be offered what they
need by others who want all members of the school to operate as well as
possible.

More energy is available for productivity in this setting be­
cause less has to be devoted to self-preservation. Teachers are not
drained emotionally, and so they notice quickly when others need help.
Meaning and security are found in the group in relation to the capacity
to give to the others rather than to hoard. "Barbara's storeroom" -- so
full of materials she has made and collected over many years of
teaching -- is a source of some embarrassment because younger teachers
have so much less. The teasing which her teammates in the cluster engage
in is clearly goodnatured, because all are glad for the resources she can
share with them. But the teasing also serves to remind everyone that
sharing is the norm.
The way staff people relate to one another in the course of performing their task spills over into other aspects of their lives together.

Teasing is almost a way of life at the school.

Dennis was at a principals meeting when Toni made her announcement that she was pregnant. All the teachers know how Dennis reacts to news of pregnancy, because of the prospect of losing one of his teachers. Everyone decided they should leave him clues that someone was pregnant, but to make him guess who it was. Anne left the lounge to look for baby pictures to hang on his door.

While most of the informal interactions in which staff people engage are spontaneous, some have been ritualized.

Early in the morning, still an hour before classes were to begin, an announcement came over the PA: "Will all the teachers please come to the lounge?" Toni whispered, "It must be somebody's birthday," as she led a parade of teachers down the hall. Martha stood at the door of the lounge, holding one of her famous Mississippi Mud cakes covered with lighted candles.

When Suzanne appeared, Mary, the secretary, began the singing and everyone joined in, laughing to see how appropriately surprised Suzanne was. This is her first year at Stanton, and she hadn't known that celebrating teachers' birthdays was a tradition.

Sometime early each school year, experienced teachers arrange an appreciation breakfast for new teachers. Keeping it a secret until the last minute heightens the fun with a feel of conspiracy. Planning the Christmas party is a serious undertaking, and every autumn one cluster of teachers volunteers, knowing that they must begin work at least two months ahead of time.

Pot-luck luncheons are arranged for special occasions, and special occasions happen fairly often: on conference day, when all the parents come to talk with the teachers; when a long-time secretary leaves
the staff; or at the end of the year when the school board comes to visit. Teachers bring in trays of their latest culinary creations, spreading out food in the workroom as well as in the lounge. Extra tables are set up and extra chairs brought in, until the usually crowded room is overflowing with people bumping into one another on their way back for second helpings. The excellence of the shared food emphasizes the enjoyment that people find in one another's company.

Food is an important concern at the school, whether the occasion is formal or informal. Teachers talk often about their favorite recipes and favorite restaurants, as well as about diets. Several times each week, food to be shared will appear in the lounge, brought in by a teacher or a volunteer or the principal. The simple act of sharing something everyone so thoroughly enjoys seems in complete harmony with how they experience the rest of their life together.

Socialization

The richness of interactions on many different levels simultaneously ensures the quick socialization of newcomers. A new teacher whose birthday is the first to be celebrated in the year does not forget that teacher birthdays are to be celebrated. A first year teacher supported through what he feels is a traumatic experience of trying to learn how to teach values the help he receives enough to offer it to his neighbor in the cluster the following year.

Norms for honesty, for sharing, for openness, for hard work, for attention to the needs of the children, are strictly enforced. The rare teacher who complains about another staff member is ignored. Since quick
response is the usual way of interaction, being ignored communicates an
unmistakeable message of disapproval. Any staff person who persists in
selfishness or competitiveness is soon asked to leave the staff.

The structuring of community life demands an openness which
leaves staff people vulnerable to one another. Yet at the same time,
such openness leads to the establishment of strong interpersonal bonds.
Through clear enforcement of norms which dictate how people are to treat
one another, an atmosphere is established in which the risks inherent in
the vulnerability are reduced.

**Participation**

Despite the press toward conformity to the norms for acceptable
behavior, teachers do not act as if they were passive recipients of a
constraining social order. On the contrary, participation in the crea-
tion of the common life is intense.

The quick and constant communication so characteristic of the
mode of operation of the school forms the foundation for a home-based
social consciousness. Everyone knows what's going on and cares about
outcomes. Teachers believe they have control over their own lives, and
act out that belief by cornering Dennis in the lounge and telling him
what they think he should do, by calling small cluster meetings every
other day, by lobbying among the teachers for support for ideas about
which the principal might not be enthusiastic.

Since most decision making is by consensus and the total school
staff is not very large, the importance of each person in the community
of teachers is apparent. Teachers conceptualize their corporate life
as their own creation and therefore under their control. Questions
about whether the individual can effect change never even arise. Who
else would effect change? Participation is not an outgrowth of a sense
of duty. It is, instead, an irrepressible expression of a first-order
belief that the staff is in charge of their own life. Morale is high
in such a setting, as might be expected. Even in adversity, the sense
of creative control is sustaining.

The Culture

Organic lifestyle

The community of Stanton teachers is organized organically
around the promotion of human well-being. Since the adults as well as
the children are counted as human, this well-being has to include theirs
as well as that of the children. The pursuit of ways to contribute to
human development demands a continuing creative response from the adults,
which contributes to their own development as they contribute to that of
the children.

Individualism is transcended through the demands of participa-
tion in the common enterprise. Yet strong regard for the needs of the
whole exists side by side with a definite adherence to individuality.
The integration of persons into a coherent whole does not smother the
personalities of the individuals. On the contrary, the differences of
personalities are gracefully taken up into a single, unified community
which celebrates the existence of those differences.

In reference to the children, the commitment to individuality is
expressed through individualized instruction. As for the teachers --
although they plant a part of themselves in the center of the common enterprise, they very clearly maintain discrete personalities. They have minds of their own, and are not easily talked into what they oppose, even by the principal. Individual and group are rarely in conflict, despite the existence of strength on both sides. Instead, the diversity which individuals represent is seen as a valuable resource both for program operation and for diversified insight.

**Holism**

Life is approached holistically. Staff people make few distinctions between what are professional and what are personal concerns. To care about what is happening in a child's life: is that professional or personal? To worry about becoming the best teacher possible, to work to help children learn, to offer support to a faltering newcomer—how are these separated with clear lines into what is professional and what emanates from simple humanity? Those on the staff understand themselves as integrated persons, and they make few attempts to separate themselves and their work roles.

The setting of the school is packed tightly with adults living from the wholeness of their personalities. The resulting density of meaningful interaction has created an environment where personal motivation and security are nearly guaranteed.

**Meaning in identity**

Inside this environment, the identity of the school is clear. It is an identity distinct from other schools in the district. The saga
of the school's relationship with those other schools not only keeps alive a remembered past but nourishes the present sense of independence. Stanton has earned the right to define its own life, having successfully survived what staff people consider the harrowing experiences of the past. Although a public school in a conservative school district, it has never lost control over its own independence of action. The stories retold of highlights promote the possibility for continuing independence, as they reaffirm what staff people experience as crucial to their identity.

Identity, however, is tied up not only with who they are in relation but with who they are inside themselves. In that regard, the school is perceived by members as good, allowing for the exercise of human creativity and playfulness. Much of the abounding energy resides not in the many mundane activities, but in the recognition by teachers that they can be at their best in this setting. Teachers are free to make decisions, to take initiative, to care as deeply as they can, to reach into themselves for their own resources. From such freedom proceeds simple joy in their participation in the community of the school.

Meaning in work

Efficiency is a profoundly qualitative measure in this setting. Enjoyment does not detract from work but stimulates it. In the process, much of the work is changed intentionally from boring routine into more interesting forms so that teachers will have more fun at it. As a consequence, the children benefit both from the enrichment of curriculum and from their teachers' enthusiasm.
Human factors are never ignored in the course of the work. A teacher depressed over divorce proceedings is not ignored in favor of report cards which need to be filled out. A new teacher in need of advice is rarely passed by because other teachers have too little time. Efficiency is conceived of in terms of a social system which works with the grain of human needs rather than against it.

Because of the context of meaning in which the work is undertaken, what might seem like routine tasks are approached with a certain amount of joy, even if teachers do not delude themselves about the effort they take.

Gail sat at the table cutting out ladybugs for the first graders. "I was up half the night cutting these out. Do you know how long it takes to cut out 30 bugs?" But she was smiling as she rearranged them in various patterns on the table, talking about how she would use them with her class.

Much of the work is approached intuitively rather than strictly rationally. The first graders, after all, could have lived without a personal ladybug for each. But life is never defined in totally rational terms.

Rarely is it suggested by teachers that work is unpleasant or a burden. Teachers might complain to one another in hyperbole about how much work needs accomplishing, but they keep at it steadily. Working together is the natural way of being together at the school, embodying the whole purpose for why the staff people have come together in the first place.

Shared commitment

The quality of commitment with which work is pursued betrays, however, an affective dimension not suggested by simple reference to the school's raison d'etre. Work is understood as an expression of personal
identification with the commitment shared among staff members. That commitment serves as a culturally integrating force, as a personally motivating force, and as an impetus toward individual development. Work done well expresses who each member is as part of this group of people, believing as the others do that human development is to be valued highly.

This very clearly affective dimension of integration draws people together into a single living organism. Through the pursuit of a life so integrated on both social and cultural levels, staff people develop a sense of harmony in their own lives and in the life of the school. Problems exist and are acknowledged, but they rarely upset the underlying rhythms of community life. Teachers are supported by the strength and quality of this commitment, as if functioning inside a tangible, life-giving matrix.

Authenticity

Forces combine within that matrix to promote a high degree of authenticity, not only in relationships but in judgments of what is appropriate to their setting. Staff people develop an almost aesthetic sense of what is fitting. Teachers appreciate fine work by their colleagues because it is fine and because it is in harmony with the communal life they all participate in creating.

This subtle sense of what is right and fitting, what is an appropriate way of being, what are appropriate resources, is at the essence of life at Stanton. It is a way of being aware, of understanding, of taking action, which is guided by purpose and founded on a clear commitment to the quality of the shared life.
CHAPTER VI

THE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

Stanton's educational program is the school's whole reason for being. To examine the program as a social entity is to see the identity of the school in operation. Because only one educational program exists in the school, the socio-cultural structure at the base of the program is the same as that already described in Chapter V.

In this chapter, many of those same dimensions will be re-examined, but this time specifically as they relate to the task of providing a social setting facilitative of the children's learning. At Stanton, staff people have defined that task as fundamentally communal.

The structural conditions in the social entity which form the basis for programmatic action as it happens at Stanton will be presented as the program's foundation: information flow, processing of information internally, full-functioning persons, task function of culture, personal respect, and joy.

Those factors which seem to stimulate task-oriented behavior within the school will be presented as the program's impetus: meaning of work, function of play, energy for productivity, growth motives, locus of control, stimulation of creativity, and intuitive directionality.
Finally, various types of corporate action will be presented as program operations: coordination, monitoring, participation, communal reflectiveness, corporate decision making, collective input, and experimentation.

Foundation

Described in this section will be the elements of the program which combine to form a firm basis for the enactment of the task-oriented behavior undertaken by the adults in the school.

Information flow

Staff people at Stanton communicate with one another constantly. Because so much information is shared, every teacher acquires a fairly accurate picture of what is happening in the school as a whole. Each person on the staff can, on the basis of that sense of the whole, act to monitor program activities, so that problems never remain undetected long enough to precipitate crises.

Teachers know what's going on because they see one another in action. What they can't see, they tell one another about. The principal is included in this information network, so any information signaling a problem faces a second line of detection. Secretaries, custodians, speech therapist, nurse -- everyone spends time in the lounge, giving out and picking up information, so no one is outside the inner circle. Program plans can be solidly based on available information. Decisions about the wisdom of courses of action to take with the children can rest on real knowledge about the kids in the setting.
The verbal exchanges that take place in the school, however, embody more than daily news. Teachers give and receive information on an interpersonal level, sharing feelings, ideas and values. Since the level of trust existing among staff members is high, teachers are not afraid to be open with one another about tentative ideas, fears, or their sense of their own limitations. Such interpersonal openness allows for the common availability of affective information in addition to the more strictly functional.

Because the sharing of such information is considered not only legitimate but valuable, staff people do not create boundaries around themselves which might be created in a less supportive setting. Individuals are free to express what they feel, knowing that their feelings will be honored. Each free expression contributes to the shared knowledge that free expression is possible. Through this process, a dimension of the school's culture is created which validates the tendency to activate all capacities of the person for the enhancement of the program.

**Processing information internally**

The major types of information to be processed within the school are that which is brought into the school from the outside or because of interaction between the school and the environment, and that which is generated within the school through the lived experience.

The on-going experience of relationship with the environment provides the school both with information about its identity and with demands that impinge upon the operation of the program. All such
messages are reflected upon within the school so that some communal meaning can be made of them, and the outcomes of that meaning-making process incorporated into the program functioning.

Dennis might come back from a principals' meeting and talk over what happened with teachers in the lounge. Barbara's daughter might tell her how people in her school were acting in the aftermath of the strike, and teachers might discuss the contrast with their own reality. Two teachers back from a district meeting might draw the cluster teachers into a communal sense-making process. Toni's experience at a State Department-sponsored workshop might provide information and materials which the Stanton teachers can use to set up their own affective education project.

All this information from outside is discussed within the school, shared as a resource material until it becomes communal property and part of the shared basis out of which the educational program is created.

The lived experience inside the school is processed in much the same way. Dennis might talk over with teachers in the lounge the fact of so many visitors in the school: maybe they should start training volunteers as tour guides. A teacher who has received a note from a mother describing her child's religious conversion might spend considerable time sorting out with principal and other teachers the possible meaning of the experience for the child. Barbara's adventures as a candidate for a principal's position might be reviewed in the effort to understand the implications for all schools in the district.
Problems, more than anything else, prompt these talking-over sessions.

What will we do if Grace quits this year?
What are we going to do about Kevin?
Has anyone talked with Terry's mother yet?
Could the superintendent be putting pressure on Dennis?
What should we do about Cathy writing about explicit sexual activity in spelling assignments?

The raising of such questions seems to be an attempt to probe a deeper level of understanding about the communal experience. Solutions may be found as a result, but the explicit search for solutions usually belongs to a later stage of processing. For now, the point of things is to make what is experienced by individual members as a question part of the shared search for understanding.

**Fully functioning persons**

The enhancement of the program and of the individual persons who are its members happens as a transactional process. The program has no way to function except by virtue of the energy and capacities of its members. Yet the same program also serves as a source of life for its members. Staff people know themselves as part of a living, aspiring, striving, corporate entity, working out its being over time. To be part of such an entity is both fulfilling and challenging. Teachers are pushed forward by the dynamic in which they are embroiled -- a dynamic which is simply the forward movement of the whole to which they contribute. New teachers are given courage to attempt what they would never attempt on their own; experienced teachers are sustained by the knowledge that everyone knows and cares about what is happening with everyone else. Within the total life of the program which surrounds
them, individuals extend themselves, develop and mature to a degree unlik­ely in a less intrusive social reality.

**Task function of culture**

The wholeness of life together holds the adults in the setting in a single pattern of meaning. Relationships are open and authentic, free from dissention and hurt feelings. All of life is centered around the educational program. Contributing to the development of the children through creating a setting in which their learning is facilitated is a work which teachers consider meaningful personally. Communally, the norms lived by, the quality of processes pursued, the values expressed, the criteria used for decision making, all proceed from the same central, meaningful concern.

Work is integrated into life. Work is the source of satisfaction, is the vehicle for sharing experiences, and is understood as the basic expression of the school's identity. Work also furnishes the material for jokes which so constantly enliven interactions. The burden of what must be accomplished is lightened because work is regarded simply as the way to be present and fully alive within the setting.

The identity of the school as staff people experience it corresponds to a great degree to their idea of what a good place for learning should be. Although the ideal always pulls at the present, the current reality of on-going life is good enough to furnish them with satisfaction. The principal himself says that the best thing about an open school is that it allows him to walk quickly around the building, so he can be encouraged by all the creative activities teachers are engaged in with the children.
Personal respect

The style of relating within the school establishes a base of confidence in all the members of the program. The principal relates respectfully to the teachers; the teachers relate respectfully to the children. Personhood alone is sufficient cause for respect.

Knowing that one is living within a matrix of relationships in which one is considered competent and creative is freeing for staff members. Teachers admit that being treated as if they were performing well, even as new teachers, allows them to perform as well as they possibly can. Since new teachers do not have to prove that they are worthy of respect, they can devote their energies to recognizing and dealing with their problems, just as the experienced teachers do.

Because of that unconditional regard, asking for help is never an admission of failure as a person. New teachers learn quickly that to recognize one's problems is regarded as a sign of professional maturity, and so are encouraged to be open about their experience of themselves. Through this mechanism, not only is the foundation laid in the person to be aware of problems and open to their solution, but the capacity to confront problems easily is built in the group.

Participation in the common enterprise pulls teachers out of an exaggerated concern with their own failings. They become free to discover what might be their unique contribution to the communal task. What people can do, teachers say, is so much more important than what they can't. Throughout the process of becoming more fully functioning, teachers are supported by the intensity of interpersonal relationships.
Joy

Throughout the Stanton school life runs a thread of joy. Staff people joke and tease one another with little provocation. Funny stories of latest happenings spread quickly through the information clearinghouse of the teachers lounge. Whenever the day can be enlivened, someone will think up a way -- to start new projects with the children that would be fun for the teachers; to play a practical joke on the principal because he has been nagging the teachers about straightening their classrooms; to concoct a surprise party to celebrate some good news.

It is difficult to determine whether joy is more a cause or an effect: Does it motivate teachers to involve themselves in their work because they enjoy themselves? Or is it simply an irrepressible expression of the fun of working together? More important than that determination is the mere fact of its presence. Teachers and students like to be at school: school is a good place to be.

Impetus

Scattered among all the assorted dimensions of Stanton's social life are elements which appear to relate directly to the stimulation of task-oriented behavior among staff people.

Meaning of work

Staff people at Stanton are organized into a community of believers. The educational substance of the task of facilitating learning serves to call up a spirit of dedication in humanistically
oriented educators that the production of widgets could not. Working
to promote human development would be a meaningful task for these
teachers even if they were working as individuals. To be working so
closely with others who value and believe as they do serves simply to
reinforce their commitment.

Teachers are affectively involved in their work. Their own
identity as persons and the identity of their social grouping as a
school are both tied up intimately with their work. The quality of that
work expresses for them the quality of their own being. Their ability
to sustain a high level of commitment to the welfare of the children is
a measure of their caring, personally and communally.

All these meanings, then, combine to impell teachers toward
their task: Working together is a way to express communal commitment.
The focus on human well-being is inherently meaningful because of the
internalized values of those who become members of the staff. Finally,
the communal context itself creates more energy by expressing in social
form the importance of the undertaking.

The function of play

The usual way for staff people to talk to one another is with
humor. Some humor serves to maintain patterns of behavior, as when
Dennis teases Rich about putting scotch tape on classroom walls. Some
humor serves to maintain patterns of belief, as when other teachers
tease Barbara about hoarding materials. Much humor works as an inclu­sion factor, as when the youngest person on the staff is teased like a
little sister by big brothers. Still more is used to maintain a
realistic perspective on life in the program, as when teachers tease one another about how badly they are operating.

It is unlikely that teachers are attending to these functions as they tease one another. What they do seem aware of is that humor lightens the work. A teacher exasperated by his failures with a group of kids can talk in hyperbole with his peers, entertaining them freely with no hint of negative regard for the children. Planning meetings might continue for hours without becoming oppressive: serious work is interrupted every few minutes with puns or joking self-deprecation.

The continuing respectibility of humor in the work context seems to affect the way thought processes are pursued. Problem solving sessions rarely get bogged down with the reluctant acceptance of an obvious but distasteful solution. Instead, the attitude toward play seems to allow for the batting around of ideas -- sensible and silly mixed in together -- until alternatives emerge.

Energy for productivity

Within the program, the human inclination to play is affirmed and legitimized, both among the teachers and the children. Such a touching of bases with simple humanity seems to create more energy for work. The freedom to act, to choose, to decide, to shape one's context in line with deeply held personal values contributes even further toward the releasing of personal energy. Efforts to establish and maintain a field of liberty within which that energy can be channeled productively are apparent as the principal works proactively to find released time and supplemental pay for teachers to work on projects.
Complementary to these factors which allow for the expansion of human energy is the absence of debilitating factors common in other schools. No energy needs to be wasted in this setting because of competition for approbation. Teachers do not have to compete for status because the stable social structure of the school guarantees them a secure place by virtue of their membership. Neither time nor psychic energy is consumed by worry over acceptance, and therefore that energy is available for productivity, where it is channeled quickly because of the cultural press.

Another factor strikingly absent is debilitating fractionalized work. Program business is a single whole, and staff people are responsible for the whole of it. The importance of the undertaking demands the contribution of all members to the extent of their capacity.

**Growth motives**

In a style characteristic of traditional community life, the way of operating in the school is a movement in harmony with the natural organic movement of human existence. The already present motive in persons to participate in experiences which contribute to their own development is synchronized with the movement toward a more completely human social reality. The push toward personal fulfillment is harnessed and yet given free rein in the creation of the educational program.

Teachers accord a great deal of importance to the quality of their own daily life. They recognize that the school's whole reason for being lies in the possibilities the educational program can provide
for the children. At the same time, however, they consider that their own capacity for providing that experience lies to a great degree within the on-going exploration and expansion of their own capacities as persons.

The achievement of a high quality of life for themselves and the provision of a high quality program for the children are seen as linked intimately. At any one moment both might be happening, although attention might also be devoted to each separately.

Locus of control

Because staff members so constantly shape the social reality in which they live, they have little doubt about where the locus of control is situated. The possibility to maintain or change their own educational entity resides within them, individually and collectively.

This sense of control is tangible. Teachers work together daily to determine what actions they will undertake to further them along the path they have specified in reference to their goals. Theirs are the ideas they try out. What goes wrong is theirs to understand and correct. The system of their activities with the children and with one another is approached as an experimental field.

The capacity for self-direction and independence of thought in the individual grows at the same time as thought and energy are focused toward the common goal. The social reality is owned to such a degree that the locus of control in the individual is generalized to the corporate functioning without any displacement in the person. Teachers refer to their sense of being in charge of their own destiny: individually and collectively responsible for the corporate reality.
Stimulation of creativity

The resources of members are regarded as substantial. Although teachers and principal alike insist that those resources are probably not significantly greater than those available in most groupings of teachers, here the resources are known, appreciated and utilized.

The intense information exchange makes possible a constant juggling of concerns, ideas and interests into different patterns. Although the teachers work most in small teams corresponding to their groupings in cluster areas, the physical and social circumstance of the lounge guarantees much crossing over of interests and concerns from cluster to cluster.

Here again, the individual and the social are interwoven. The constant stimulation of other persons searching for new options pushes the individual toward a self-awareness and confidence that allow that person's own resources to come forward, for that person's own potential to be explored. Focusing creative action toward expression in the program is the clear awareness of the goals of the corporate undertaking. Acting to provide the basic conditions for the release of creative potential in persons are the foundations of community life present in the setting: psychological safety, openness to experience, and freedom with responsibility.

Intuitive directionality

Finally, there exists among the staff at Stanton an almost mythological orientation which acts to push the group in a particular direction. Outsiders have sometimes said of the Stanton people that
they live with one foot in the ideal. Certainly, what should be is always present in considerations of the inadequacies of the present. But the possibility of a better future does not hang over the teachers' heads as an indictment for the failings of the present. Rather, it presents a vision of a desirable goal, only dimly envisioned but nevertheless deeply sensed.

As an entity, the staff manifests the kind of centered self-awareness associated with the meditative individual. Even in the highly active school situation, they are able to maintain corporately a certain stability and calm, anchored in the certain sense of identity and purpose. That stability is experienced as a dynamic equilibrium. The program is rooted in a forward movement in which work is accomplished, children learn, and teachers develop, all in a characteristic Stanton style.

Operations

Described here will be the major corporate processes pursued in the effort to provide for the learners a social setting facilitative of their learning.

Coordination

Management of activities so that they mesh in physical space, in time, in goals, is undertaken without reductionism. Planning is treated less as a technological requirement than as operationalized respect for the interrelatedness of all elements of program life.
No administrator shuffles people around as if they were pieces on a Monopoly board. Staff people instead experience the need themselves to work out their activities inside the same space and time, so coordination emerges from the organic, fluid reality.

**Monitoring**

Formative evaluation happens both constantly and systematically. Each staff person is attuned to the educational operations happening throughout the program. Each small educational setting can be seen by the individual against the backdrop of the program as a whole and assessed accordingly. Individual behaviors can be changed incrementally in the right direction. Bits of information, emerging insights, worries that something is going wrong, can all be brought for consideration quickly to other teachers in the cluster, to the loose configuration of teachers in the lounge, or more formally to a staff meeting. Problems can be sorted out and adjustments made long before molehills become mountains.

The principal plays three roles in the monitoring process: as roving evaluator, as supportive colleague, and as keeper of the vision of the whole. Since he walks around the whole school every day, he can catch at a glance all the teachers in operation. He himself can observe some behavioral manifestations of problems, like a young teacher still speaking in a stilted teacher voice.

More often, however, he stays at his post in the corner of the teachers lounge, where he can hear what problems teachers talk about with one another and enter into their resolution. From that position too he
can act as promoter of the sense of the whole, as teachers from each small setting relay the up-close information emerging from teaching-learning interactions.

Although superficially informal, the monitoring system is nonetheless highly sophisticated in its capacity to pick up the real experience of teachers and children, and in its capacity to deal quickly with perturbations or capitalize upon emergent possibilities.

**Participation**

Persons are rooted affectively in the corporate enterprise. They have to care about what happens or they would never survive on the staff. The amount of work demanded, the psychic energy required for the intensity of professional and interpersonal interaction is too high to be furnished without a more than rational investment of the self.

Individuals understand themselves as responsible for the direction of their common life. Such an understanding is a bedrock assumption emerging from their concept of the program as a social entity which arises from their interaction. To say that school people are responsible for their program is almost tautological: who else but members would be responsible for what does not even exist except as they call it into being?

Such a conceptual approach provides the staff with a gestalt decreeing that the people inside the program are sovereign. The answers to questions about how much responsibility teachers are allowed, about whether the children have any say in the determination of their own experience, about what role the principal should play are all foregone conclusions.
Communal reflectiveness

Treating problems as a normal part of the program process pursued together depends upon a great deal of mulling things over aloud. Teachers reflect on what's happening in school, how their teaching is coming, whether the children are responding as they had hoped. They talk over their experiences with the children -- not just problems, but funny stories, successes as well as frustrations. Through the intensity of this sharing, the experience of each is made available to all in the attempt to make meaning of the communal experience.

Usually the processes of reflection revolve around the current experience. Sometimes immediate circumstances, however, prompt them to take a step backward and reflect about the meaning of their lives in relation to the children.

A 14-year-old boy from the community was picked up by the police for killing a local resident and sniping at others from his bedroom window. Both Grace and Linda had taught him while he was a student at Stanton. They talked quietly about him with the other teachers. They were obviously depressed. Teachers in the lounge were drawn into a long discussion of how hard it was to predict what would happen to the kids, of how scary to realize that you had so little control over their lives. They wondered whether they would be talking someday like this over kids who were in school now.

Teachers question themselves and one another often about how well they are doing as teachers. Underlying the joking manner which they often use to do it is a sensitivity to the needs of the children and to their own capacity to respond to those needs. Through jokes, teachers feed information back to one another about their teaching behavior, just as they make jokes about their own.

Diane, a fourth grade teacher, remarked about how much less confidence in themselves fourth graders seemed to have than fifth graders did. Toni and Grace, both third grade teachers who had
been teasing each other about how strict they had been with
their classes lately, told Diane that the reason was probably
that their third grade teachers had been so hard on them.

Any situation out of the ordinary is a cause for reflectiveness
on the meaning of the situation.

Test scores on the Iowa achievement tests were so spectacu­
larly high this year that the principal is having them rechecked in
case there's been a mistake. Teachers have wondered aloud
whether they are pushing the kids too hard. Grace offered an
anecdote as evidence that they might be enculturating the stu­
dents to excess. She had asked her class what a satellite was:
"What makes a satellite a satellite?" One little boy had told
her confidently, "Study and hard work!" -- A star maybe, but a
satellite?!

The principal joins in this communal reflectiveness from his
chair in the corner of the lounge, interjecting comments and questions.
Teachers who want to talk with him privately go to sit next to him in
the corner. Concerns are shared, understanding obtained.

The daily process of reflecting about meaning is much the same
as what happens at staff meetings, although the sharing process there is
somewhat more formal. The purpose, however, is the same: to figure out
what's happening, understand what that means, and decide whether new
behaviors should be undertaken.

Corporate decision making

Most decisions which directly affect the operation of the pro­
gram are made in the small groups of six teachers in each cluster. Those
decisions with broad implications are typically made by the whole staff.
Rarely does the principal make decisions on his own if they are to
affect the program.

To say that decision making is usually by consensus would be
accurate in itself, but would fall short of communicating how different
the process of making decisions is from majority vote. A more precise phrasing might be "corporate direction taking." Problems are rarely posed so that teachers have to position themselves on one side of an issue or the other. Instead, issues are worked through until a solution everyone can live with is found.

Since the vision of the school is strong, and since staff people believe they own their corporate reality, communality is apparent in decision making. Decisions made by the whole body are sometimes slow in arriving, but when they do they are free from dissention and are implemented actively.

Decision making in such a style might be criticized for its lack of efficiency. But efficiency is regarded as linked to effectiveness rather than to speed. What is sometimes lost in delay is more than compensated for in commitment to the decision outcome.

Collective in-put

The press toward sharing information means not only that a communal awareness results, but that the contribution of individuals is demanded. Changes in the way the program operates, even small changes, rely upon the input of persons with various competencies.

After much discussion, teachers in Cluster C decided to try to initiate a unit on affective education. Some had had some experience with it; two had been to a State Department workshop on it. They weren't all confident that they would be able to do it well, but they agreed to try. Since all six teachers were involved, they knew they would be able to separate the children into groups and each work on the topics they felt they could handle most competently. As problems arose, they would be able to check out whether the others were having the same difficulties and then decide what to do about them.
The individual teacher is regarded as the most valuable resource for the children's learning. Cooperating to make individual competencies available seems merely the sensible way to approach the structuring of experiences. In the process, weaknesses in one teacher are compensated for by someone else's strengths.

Experimentation

Perhaps most basic of all processes pursued in the program are those which might be characterized as experimental. Principal and teacher alike seem suspicious of perfect solutions to problems. Difficulties are approached frontally but without hysteria. Solutions might emerge and be affirmed communally, but just because they have been adopted does not mean that they are necessarily permanent. Many solutions eventually become problems themselves and need to be discarded. Other solutions are gradually revealed as containing weak aspects and so need to be modified.

Because this experimental approach is taken for granted by staff people, the risk of trying new ideas is greatly reduced. If what seems like a good idea at first turns out not to work, then it can be dumped without recrimination. If, on the other hand, a new idea works, then staff people share in the rejoicing over success. New experiences are entered into willingly. Staff people know they will be supported rather than criticized for experimenting.

All the process factors described above contribute to the chances of success of the experimental process. Information is shared so quickly that new behaviors and their effects can be monitored.
effectively. The clear humanistic orientation, grounded in the vision of the school, provides the criteria by which the success of experiments might be judged. Finally, affirmation of the validity of incremental improvements in preference to spectacular but unsettling changes provides a basis which is simultaneously fluid and stable.
CHAPTER VII

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

Program development is conventionally understood as the improvement of educational operations within the specific teaching-learning situations which the program embraces. As the data in this chapter unfold, however, the basis for a theoretical assumption of Chapter VIII will emerge: that to be effective, program development activities must be directed not only at the improvement of the teaching-learning situations but at the maintenance and improvement of the social structure which supports them. Both are essential for the expansion of the program's capacity to provide learning experiences for learners.

For that reason, the data will be presented in terms parallel to those in Chapter VI where the program was addressed as a social entity. To be described first will be those structural conditions within the program (and, in this case, within the school) which provide a solid foundation for development: integration, information flow, clarity of purpose, sense of time and direction, transcendence of reactivity, intuition, freedom and risk, openness to change, and openness to the environment.

Elements which appear to contribute toward the stimulation of developmental action will be presented as the developmental impetus:
environmental pull, press for adaptation, self-direction, human presence, creative milieu, individual development, program challenge to members, and in-built dialectic.

Finally, various types of program entity processes will be presented as developmental operations: exploration, the establishment of genetic insurance, play, adaptive processes, exploiting the environment, social learning, experimentation, and the search for fittingness.

Foundation

As with the performance of the task of providing the educational setting, certain conditions existing within the program entity act as factors to establish a solid structure within which development can happen.

Integration

The fact that the educational program at Stanton school is highly integrated and that it has a clearly defined and ascribed to goal means that it will sink or swim, stagnate or develop, as a whole. Although clearly not a sufficient condition for development, integration appears most basic as a prerequisite. Without such integration, it is possible that members might be developing as persons even though they lack support and challenge from the program. It is even possible that, for a time, at least, individuals might be creating positive educational experiences for learners. But the program as a whole -- that which gives a structure of meaning and focus to these settings as related to one another -- cannot be developing without some sufficient level of integration.
Information flow

Primary among those dimensions contributing to the integration of the educational program is that of the fluidity of information exchange. The placement of the teachers lounge in the center of the building, next door to the main offices and mail boxes, provides a physical possibility for information exchange not only among teachers in the same cluster but among staff people throughout the school.

In itself, the placement of the lounge does not guarantee that information will be exchanged or even that teachers will gather. But supplemental conditions have been created which encourage teachers to do so. Simple human needs can be attended to there because of the coffee pot, the refrigerator, and comfortable chairs. The space is declared off-limits to the children, so staff people know they can relax among friends without worrying about being professional in front of the children. Energies can be mustered there, frustrations released, problems shared, encouragement obtained.

Little quiet is available in the lounge, but teachers would never go there expecting it. If quiet is what they need, they can stay at their desks in the classroom, and such an occasional choice is considered legitimate. If a teacher begins coming to the lounge only rarely, however, that person is teased or questioned jokingly, in a clear, if pre-conscious, attempt to ensure the information flow so closely allied to integration of the program.

The unmistakeable rejection of the teacher workrooms, built in the center of each of the three clusters, appears clearly related to
the press toward fluidity of information. Although designed with built-in desks and private cupboards for each teacher, these theoretically convenient rooms are used for storage of materials and equipment. Teachers prefer to carry their work halfway across the school to the lounge where they can work together.

Clarity of purpose

The major ideational factor underlying the possibilities for development in the program appears to be the clarity of focus on the long-term purpose of the school.

The daily goals around which plans for activities are shaped range in abstraction from the learning of long division to the development of emotional sensitivities. However much they range in substance, however, goals are still formulated inside the context of a single purpose understood and adhered to by all the staff. Quite apart from the actual content of that purpose is the fact that it is known and can be relied upon by the staff people who are in face-to-face interaction making it operational.

Just as the intensity of information exchange serves to promote social integration by making possible the operation of the program as a whole, clarity of purpose serves to integrate the efforts of staff by providing the basis for focusing work in a common direction. Because the purpose is known and communicated effectively internally, it can provide a thick matrix for the wide diversity of activities. At the same time, the purpose can be used as a reference point for decisions about how to deal with a child's disruptive behavior, about how time
should be structured in the cluster, about what kinds of curriculum materials need to be found.

In addition to the simple utility which clarity of purpose serves, however, is its function in mythological terms, allowing for the expression of a personal sense of purpose in life. Teachers do not simply hear and then try to remember what the purpose of the program is so that they can design educational activities in a coordinated fashion. Instead, they relate to the communal purpose as it resonates inside themselves, in harmony with what they believe their own life purposes to be. The impact of such clarity is therefore doubly strong: it pulls at staff people on both rational and mythological levels.

Sense of time and direction

Stanton people have a collective sense of themselves in process. Changes are not Innovations, but the natural way that life proceeds. The present moment is intense, packed with the demands of the real small persons around whom life is organized. But just as the past is salient because the saga is retold, so is the future salient as the ideal state reflected in the vision acts like a magnet pulling at current program operations.

The sense of time and of change over time is manifested in the concern they show for the development of new teachers, never pressuring them to act as if they have been teachers forever, and yet demonstrating confidence that their skills are improving. In social terms, their sense of movement is revealed in the way they speak of trying techniques and then Moving On. Grouping children, departmentalizing, behavior
modification, all have been tried, but then the staff has moved on to other modes of operation more congruent with their identity. Experiments with techniques they thought might work but didn't are not regarded as failures but as part of a process in which they are always consciously engaged -- moving forward incrementally, along paths they hypothesize will bring them closer to their goals.

Linked to their sense of movement over time is a corporate sense of where that movement is headed. Founded upon clarity of purpose, this intuitive sense of direction makes possible movement along a single path at a time, as members simultaneously affirm the path chosen and shape it according to their internalized sense of its fundamental orientation.

Transcendence of reactivity

Since staff people are able to avoid becoming bounded by the present, they can transcend, to a great degree, mere reactivity in response to immediate conditions, either internal or external. Stanton people know they are engaged in bringing something new into being. That process continues even when nothing seems to be going wrong. The real task is always larger than the demands of the moment, and has to do with the program as a whole developing over time.

Understood in this context, simple processes achieve importance. Play becomes more than an outlet for tension or an expression of work satisfaction. Instead, it is a useful way to explore a multi-faceted environment without making a commitment. The encouragement of teachers by the principal to explore their interests becomes something other than evidence of an indulgent and humanistically oriented administrator. This
encouragement is instead a pragmatic decision to provide a way to monitor changing environmental conditions, and to establish genetic insurance as a resource for adaptation.

**Intuition**

The depth and subtlety of Stanton actions and interactions suggests reliance upon intuitive processes in many phases of program life, simply because so much synchronized movement happens in the program with so little verbalization. People appear in tune with their setting. Their own development as individuals seems in harmony with the development they share corporately as participants in the educational entity.

Experienced teachers do not dominate inexperienced ones; they manage to offer help and challenge at a level which new teachers perceive as congruent with their needs. The principal combines skills acquired from years of practice with a sensitivity to subtle indications by teachers that they need encouragement, need administrative support, need recognition for a job done well, need to talk with someone about personal matters.

Teachers seem to process their experience with other living persons in almost a mythological way, being in relation to, being quiet with and understanding life in themselves and in the others. However esoteric such a description sounds, nothing about it is esoteric in the way it is lived out in the school. People go on laughing and making jokes with one another, worrying about the problems of children or communication with their parents, sorting out relationships with the other schools in the district or with their constant stream of visitors.
But underneath it all is a sense that something more is going on really, and that there needs to be a continuing effort to understand it more deeply.

Freedom and risk

The social conditions of the program form a framework within which individual members can give free rein to tendencies within themselves to self-actualize. Members can take risks which eventually lead to greater maturity without the fear that they will be criticized for weakness. Teachers explore new program ideas because they experience the urge for stimulation and expansion themselves. As individual capacities are extended, so are the resources of the program as a whole. Newly discovered capacities or new learnings of any member are seized upon as communal riches.

Openness to change

The interpersonal security of membership means that teachers have little need to be resistant to change in their ways of operating. Most significant changes, in any case, are those which they generate themselves. Those which arise because of action of some element in their environment -- like directives from the Central Office -- are dealt with proactively and integrated intelligently, in a way which avoids a negative impact on the inherent creative dynamic.

Openness to the environment

Stanton teachers are tuned to a particular way of confronting their environment which sensitizes them to perceiving what it might
offer them for the improvement of program operations. They recognize that they exist within a complex environment, providing them with the possibility for beneficial interaction. Since they are sure about the identity of the school, teachers know what kind of resources might be useful. They approach the environment with a mental sieve, sifting out the potentially fitting from the clearly rejectable.

Impetus

No single variable can be identified as clearly that which acts to stimulate the program entity toward development. Several factors can, however, be identified as contributing toward that push or pull, either in themselves or as they interact with one another. These represent various types of social and cultural elements of the entity itself, as well as socio-psychological processes which center around the development of individual members.

Environmental pull

However intensely life is lived within the school, it hardly exists in a vacuum. The environment provides enticements toward development as possibilities for program capacity expansions are perceived by members.

Participation on district committees brings teachers into contact with the social realities of other schools, and so with ideas that they might use at Stanton. Such contacts lay the basis for interaction among teachers across school boundaries, as they gather around interest affinities like elementary counseling. Workshops draw Stanton teachers
whose participation is facilitated by a principal who encourages the
development of teacher competencies. Perhaps most significant of all
developmentally oriented contacts the school has maintained has been
the continuing involvement with professors from the Ohio State Univer-
sity. Established early in the school's history, that link between
school and university has continued into the present as a healthy,
symbiotic relationship.

The press for adaptation

At other times, the relationship with the environment is less
clearly under the control of staff people within the school. Sometimes
the environment begins pressing against the school in a way that
teachers regard as negative.

At a staff meeting, teachers discussed the problem of grading
alternatives. The Stanton staff had worked for several years
to design report forms which offered an alternative to a tradi­
tional report card, and to have them accepted by parents. These
forms are important, teachers believe, in communicating to
parents something of the difference between the Stanton program
and that in other schools, because teachers reported on social
development and emotional maturity as well as academic progress.
Now other schools in the district wanted to change to a Stanton-
type form. If they did, the Central Office was insisting that
that one card be standardized. Teachers spent some time stra­
tegizing about fighting the move toward standardization.

Adaptation in Stanton terms might be either an adjustment to environ-
mental demands or a thrust toward making the environment adjust to the
Stanton reality. Often, it is a combination of the two.

Changing conditions internally prompt adaptation too. More
children enrolled in the lower grades might necessitate the loss of the
sixth grade and then the fifth, changing the tenor of the program to
one centered on younger children. The loss of several experienced teachers all in one year, the addition of a formal Pupil Personnel Unit for the learning disabled, pregnancies prompting several teachers to leave halfway through the year, all might have significant impact upon the operation of the program. All prompt adaptive behaviors, as already existing capacities are reexamined to see what new arrangements might help compensate for losses, and new conditions are examined in the light of possible resources in the environment.

Such adaptive changes are necessarily linked to particular environmental pressures. During years in which parents are vehement about "fundamentals," teachers are more likely to emphasize, at least in their communication with parents, all the ways in which children are learning fundamentals. When demographic shifts prompt the reincorporation of the upper grades, teachers will take out of storage upper level materials and texts, and start remembering all the activities they have missed because the older kids haven't been around.

Elements are rearranged to adapt to changing environmental circumstances, but such arrangements are themselves likely to change again when environmental conditions change. The constancy of change apparently contributes to the ease with which staff people deal with it.

**Self-direction**

Stanton people will say themselves that they are Masters of their Own Destiny. Just as they understand program operations to be under their control, so do they consider the developmental dynamic to be theirs. Development is not so much a moral imperative as it is a
simple outgrowth of their conceptualization of the program entity as their own creation.

Stanton staff members accept responsibility for the direction of the program because they know that someone else is likely to take control if they don't direct themselves. In the early years of the school, when the Central Office was unwilling to send them the kinds of materials they wanted, they bought discarded books from the public library and made as many of their own materials as they could. Today, that same proactive behavior is evident in the frontal approach to the education of parents opposed to the new math curriculum.

**Human presence**

The children and their needs are intensely present in the consciousness of the Stanton people. The living presence of other (although smaller) human beings seems to call out to the teachers for response.

Humanistically oriented as persons before they ever became members of the staff, teachers are trained through their interaction to be particularly sensitive to developmental needs, to sense intuitively when a child needs more than the usual support given by others in the program, to probe more deeply into the meaning of individuality.

Work defined in such a way, corresponding so deeply to values held by the teachers, seems to touch an inherent personal motivation to care and help, as well as a professional motivation toward the promotion of student development. Something of the reality of the children as persons reaches out to something deep within the teachers as persons, and teachers tuned to their own inner callings respond naturally.
Creative milieu

The simplicity and directness of that response is characteristic of the whole authentic life of the program. Aware on an unusually profound level of what they are about, staff people are intolerant of rather than intrigued with most educational fads. What is authentic to them emerges creatively from their sense of themselves and their capacity to cope with problems.

Such a common everyday variety of creativity is taken for granted and is dispersed throughout the group. The demands of the program and the needs of the children pull creative acts from the adults who are to facilitate their learning. It seems less accurate to say that people are creative than that they act creatively, in a continuing process of relating themselves to their world. This milieu of the assumption of creativity provides a stimulus for creative behavior in teachers, just as the assumption by teachers that children will be able to operate well in this somewhat untraditional setting provides a stimulus toward coping behavior in the children.

Individual development

Through this process of being challenged continually by the up-close social environment of the program, teachers are engaged in a process of individually becoming more authentically themselves, more intensely human, more highly sophisticated in interpreting their own experience. To survive happily in an environment which is so complex even on a run-of-the-mill day, teachers must make individual sense of themselves in relation to the program. Unique needs have to be under-
stood and related meaningfully to the environment so that hard work which would otherwise be debilitating becomes creative and sustaining.

In the course of this process of integrating needs and values and attitudes into the coherent pattern required by the environment, staff people are themselves extended and deepened. Their sense of their own development, and of the importance of that development for the sake of the program, is reflected in the concrete efforts which staff people have made over the years to attend to that process in themselves.

At Stanton, staff development is treated as a continuing personal process in which all staff members engage -- not only on days officially set aside by the district for in-service education, and not only for the inexperienced teachers. Such a perception of the meaning of staff development is held not only by the principal but increasingly by the teachers as they become more experienced at teaching.

Program challenge to members

In countless ways, the program is the source of power for its members. Although they offer their energy to it, the program provides them with stimulus and challenge, with support and affirmation, to a degree more common in an intentional community than in a public school. One professor who knows the Stanton situation well says that its teachers, however committed, would not be able to operate the way they do at Stanton were they to move individually to other schools. They would try for awhile, he believes, but they would never be able to sustain the strength of commitment without the supporting social structure.
The social and cultural structure of the program at Stanton provides the conditions by which the best in persons can be freed for the fulfillment of the person and for the sake of the program at the same time. Members are authentically part of a consciously striving entity, and become caught up themselves in the striving.

**In-built dialectic**

Woven into the life fabric of the Stanton program is an almost mystical sense of the ideal educational program. Like true idealists, Stanton people seem to regard their vision of what the program should be as more real than how it is in the present moment. They seem to fit more comfortably as persons into how they would like things to be than how things are in the present.

On the one hand, staff people live in the present, full of the inadequacies of the moment: their sense of their own limitations, their awareness of too few materials, too little time, too little sensitivity to subtleties, too little insight about bothersome problems. On the other hand, they live at the same time in the ideal, experiencing themselves as insightful people who care deeply about the children, aware of the resources they already have, aware of their skill in facilitating learning.

Some aspects of the present correspond to their sense of an ideal educational program, but others clearly do not. Those which do not are sources of discomfort. They are like ill-fitting pieces of a jigsaw puzzle, the outlines of which are more felt than seen.

At any moment in time, the person and the program belong both to the present and the future, the existential and the ideal. Both
are experienced as real and are internalized in the collective consciousness as important. Probably more than any other single dimension of their corporate life, it is the tension of the discrepancy between the existential and the ideal which serves to motivate program members toward program development.

Operations

The processes of the development of the Stanton program, like the elements of its socio-cultural structure, are complex and diverse. No single model of process seems to capture the developmental dynamic. Instead, the processes form a dense set, shooting out and drawing back without colliding, and resulting in the expansion and refinement of the capacity of the program to facilitate learning.

Exploration

Stanton people continually create new capacities for future adaptation by exploring in many directions at the same time. Tentative feelers are sent out into the environment, like the pseudopods of an amoeba reaching out into liquid for bits of nourishment. The diverse interests of teachers are not affirmed merely out of a belief in the emotional importance of being affirmed, but as a rational attempt to capitalize upon natural tendencies which will enhance adaptive capacity.

In the person of individual teachers, the potential of alternative courses is explored, usually before specific problems have indicated the need for specific solutions. Analogous to the process in biological evolution, adaptive radiants are extended into different habitats and different ways of exploiting similar habitats.
Early in the school's history, the staff very consciously engaged in such a process together. Feeling somewhat insecure about the theoretical basis of the program's organization, they explored individually guided instruction, British infant schools, and open education. Individually, they took graduate courses in education with an eye to searching for ideas that they could use somehow, someday. Eventually, they connected with a professor who had worked on many of the ideas they considered their own and, over time, the staff managed to establish a satisfactory basis for their work.

**Establishment of genetic insurance**

Since the staff has a clear sense of themselves in process over time, the solution of problems is far from their only developmental concern. The environment does change often, and so do internal conditions. But because of their strong sense of a future ideal state, the staff avoids becoming bogged down in the present. The fact that environmental conditions are changing constantly in the present means to them that those conditions will change in the future. Immediate adaptive responses are needed in the present, but the establishment of an adaptive capacity is needed for the future.

Since no one knows exactly what future conditions will be, it seems reasonable to provide for a kind of genetic insurance: capabilities within the entity that are there to fall back upon when needed. Such a conceptualization seems present in the operationalized attitudes toward the development of members. Individual uniqueness is prized not only because of its contribution to the immediate task, but because of the potential contribution to a task which is not yet known.
Staff people are serious about their work but they are not somber. Their attitude toward enjoyment serves as a foundational element for the school climate, provides an impetus toward development by decreeing that teachers should never be bored, and underlies the subtle processes of curiosity which uncover intriguing possibilities for program improvement.

Free from many of the conventional expectations of teacher sobriety (sometimes called Professional Behavior), Stanton teachers can develop a style of thinking and acting which emerges authentically from the wholeness of their personalities.

Teachers tease one another with witticisms that depend for their humor on originality of perception of a situation or of the personality of a colleague. Such originality is encouraged by the gales of laughter from appreciative audiences of other teachers gathered in the lounge. Legitimized in the interpersonal realm, and founded on unconditional regard, that originality spills over into work situations.

Collectively and individually, members of the Stanton school staff pursue a particular process of dealing with problems, with "hitches," with sensed incongruities. Something uncomfortable about the way operations are proceeding is felt by group members. They focus attention on that feeling and clarify its source. They spend much time reflecting on it together, in an effort to understand what is happening adequately enough to take effective action. Once some meaning emerges
from the patterning of elements of experience, possible solutions are explored and their consequences are predicted.

On the basis of the data generated, they choose a new behavior to be pursued experimentally. After a change in behavior is adopted, the situation is monitored by members in a continuous process of evaluation. If the new behavior has only limited success, that in itself is taken up as a new hitch to which attention must be directed.

Essentially, these are the same processes which program members pursue in the achievement of their task goals. Simply for the sake of the dynamic maintenance of the program, adaptation is demanded when problems arise. Viewed here from the perspective of development, however, it is the resulting change in entity capacity which needs to be emphasized rather than simply the processes themselves.

The practice of nurturing a hitch until it is ready to rise to collective consciousness as a real problem to be faced validates the use of intuition to accomplish professional goals. Each time such a process is used, the ability to use it is refined. In the same way, practice in reaching collective decisions about new behaviors to be affirmed by all members has the same effect of strengthening the capacity of the entity to engage in corporate action.

New behaviors exist only potentially before they are enacted, but once members gain experience with them they are part of the behavioral repertoire. Further development is thereby provided with a new jumping-off point.
Exploiting the environment

Only two years after opening, Stanton was awarded a $200,000 federal grant under Title III. Receiving the grant apparently prompted a certain amount of envy in surrounding schools: Stanton always seemed to be receiving the attention. But that grant had not landed by chance in the school; it had been sought actively by staff people who saw in it the possibility to get resources they wanted for improving the educational program.

Taking the lead in such a proactive orientation is the principal. He acts as principal maintainer of the boundary between school and environment. In the best structural position to maintain an overview of program operations and problems, he carries out the role of surveyor of the landscape, drawing to the school any resources which look potentially useful. These have ranged from human resources like hundreds of volunteers and several professors of education to physical resources like curriculum materials.

A significant aspect of that intentional drawing into the program of resources from the outside is its anti-mechanistic artfulness. Sometimes resources are attracted because the staff has gone through a careful process of problem solving, and so search the environment for specific solutions. Often, however, resources are simply gathered into the program as they appear on the landscape, without clear planning about exactly what they are to accomplish. The intention of staff people in reference to such resources seems to be that of transacting with them once they are brought within the confines of the program and
given a fair chance to provide some valuable addition to or modification to the program.

"I don't think Dennis knew how it was going to work out when he asked the Ohio State professors out to the school. He just had a feeling that it would be good for the program so he started, knowing that the school was already strong enough to maintain its sense of itself."

Each time a new set of resources is brought into the school, the risk exists that they may not turn out to be appropriate. Despite many failures over the years, however, teachers and principal rarely hesitate to try new ideas when they look like they might improve operations. Good ideas are not exaggerated into Innovations which must be permanently Adopted. They are simply something interesting someone has discovered, fun to play around with for awhile to see it could work, and easily disposed of if it doesn't. For this reason, the boundaries of the school do not have to be guarded against intruders. They are manned by lookouts, watching for what might be usefully captured.

Social learning

The adult members of the Stanton program learn as constantly as do the children. Most of what they learn relevant to the program is learned together. The interpersonal relationships are so tight that new knowings are communicated as a matter of course, as quickly as gossip over a back fence. Problems are admitted so openly that teachers engage again and again in finding solutions for one another. Solutions which cannot be found through informal channels are faced together at staff meetings where the collective intelligence is mustered.
Through all these processes, a more sophisticated level of collective awareness is built, incorporating more refined skills at conceptualizing problems and finding solutions. Such a process of social learning seems to be a sine qua non for the development of a program. But the particular strength of that process as it is conducted in this setting is that it embraces all members of the staff. No teacher is allowed to stagnate in isolation. No one is allowed to become out of touch with new ideas in education. No one is allowed to remain ignorant of developing problems. Everyone in the school is involved in the process of becoming aware and helping the others become aware, of sorting through problems, of experimenting with new forms, of re-creating the community life.

Because of this universal involvement of staff members, the program can respond as an entity when the need arises, without being hampered by staff members who drag their feet or remember The Good Old Days. Teachers are not threatened by or resistant to innovations because the innovations are their own. In this way, the collective consciousness serves as the reservoir for knowings, the corporate holding place for new capacities.

**Experimentation**

Experimental attitudes and processes have been described above in reference to the operation of the program. Those same attitudes and processes serve to promote development, as exciting ideas are explored, problems encountered and new behaviors tried. But considered broadly, the significance of the pursuit of experimental processes extends far beyond the immediate solution to problems.
Viewed from a developmental perspective, the importance of the experimenting processes lies in the impact they have upon the program's capacity to solve future problems, to adapt more appropriately, to serve the needs of the learners and of its adult members more effectively. Each time a new behavior within the program emerges out of the sorting through to a new level of functioning, a new capacity begins to be stabilized. Each such new capacity then serves as a possible basis for a new set of behaviors within the program.

Even more broadly, the experimental process provides a necessary framework for pursuing goals in an emergent form. Staff people keep one eye on the vision, maintaining their basic orientation. At the same time, they choose incremental changes to take them nearer their goal. Where they really want to go is only partly known in the present. It will be more fully known as it is discovered and created incrementally.

What seems on the surface to be a loose, playful approach to program improvement actually operates as a sophisticated type of social experimentation, replete with tentative hypotheses extended toward envisioned goals. The commitment within the Stanton staff, and especially in its principal, seems to be to a process of working progressively toward desired ends rather than to a well-thought-out management plan.

Because of this commitment, real "failures" hardly ever happen. The staff simply does not conceptualize what they are doing as open to failure. They think in the long-term, so they maintain a perspective which allows for the interpretation of difficulties as necessary engagements along the road to program improvement.
The press toward fittingness

The working through of new ideas brought from the outside is guided by a clear sense among staff people of what is appropriate to their school. Some ideas fit easily into who they understand themselves to be; others can fit after they are adapted. But some never quite fit, even after they are pulled into new shapes by staff people who feel they aren't quite right.

The same search for the fitting is pursued in relation to the internal experience. The children, the adults, interactions of teachers with parents are so complex and dynamic that reflection on behaviors and goals is constantly demanded. Woven through reflective conversations are phrases like "That sounds good....", "That seems like enough....", "That looks all right...." The implicit criterion for such judgments of appropriateness seems to remain constant: Does what we're doing correspond to what we're trying to be?

Possibilities for making such a judgment rest on a clear sense of the identity of the school -- both as it exists now and in the ideal. The vision of the school, passed down through generations of teachers, still has power to tug at what exists in the present. The lack of correspondence gives rise to cognitive dissonance, uncomfortable enough for the staff to move them continuously toward the ideal, even if along a sometimes bumpy road.
Field work methods deliver data to concepts. Theory is grounded in the return trip, with concepts validated by the efficiency with which they apprehend and give meaning to the data of field technique. (Habenstein, 1970, p. 6)

Chapters V-VII delivered the data to concepts, presenting observational data in terms of what Glaser and Strauss (1967) call "conceptual categories" and their "conceptual properties." This chapter will be the return trip: generalized relationships among those categories and their properties will be proposed, in the attempt to generate theory grounded in the data.

To establish the context for interpretation of this theory, ideas presented more extensively in Chapters III and IV will be reviewed here. Issues to be highlighted center around the process of the generation of theory from empirical data and the question of theory credibility.

**Generation of Grounded Theory**

Since the clearest description of the process by which grounded theory might be "discovered" is contained in the work of Glaser and Strauss (1967), it seems pertinent to address in relation to this study
the issues they raise for the generation of grounded theory generally. These issues involve not only systematic procedures but a conceptual approach to theory which emphasizes distinguishing theory generation from theory verification.

If the intent behind the research is to generate theory rather than to verify it, a particular set of guiding assumptions comes into play, e.g. "a single case can indicate a general conceptual category or property; a few more cases can confirm the indication" (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). The point of the analysis here, where the intent is to generate theory, is to derive a credible way of explaining the data. The way of explaining derived cannot be defended as the only way possible, but it can be defended as reasonable if it seems to account for the behavior observed.

Criticizing such theory according to a criterion of verified hypotheses is inappropriate, according to Glaser and Strauss. No claim is made to having tested grounded theory: the theory is a tentative explanation proposed to fit the evidence.

Theory here will be presented in discusional rather than in propositional form. Glaser and Strauss emphasize that such a form expresses the nature of the theory as "ever developing" -- as in need of continued refinement. That emphasis is especially important in relation to the theory proposed here because it has been constructed in a field of considerable indeterminacy.

How believable can such a tentative theory be? What claims might be advanced in its favor?
Reference should be made here to issues presented in Chapter III, where the credibility of participant observation data was discussed, and where credibility was linked to the systematic process by which data were gathered and to the capacity of the investigator to understand the social reality from which they were derived. Reference should be made as well to Chapter IV where the procedures pursued in gathering data and analyzing them systematically were described. Still, establishing the credibility of the field data does not guarantee the credibility of the theory whose basis they form. Whether this theory seems plausible is a function of the analyst's ability to convey her belief that the theory does fit what she has learned in the intimate experiencing of the program -- that it is truly grounded theory.

But even if the theory were only superficially grounded, there would still be value in the attempt to present elements of educational program functioning in a systematic manner. Such a systematic formulation provides a potentially useful framework within which the testing of elements might proceed coherently. It suggests answers to the question of what is important to be known about educational program development. At the same time, it situates issue areas in some relationship to one another, allowing them to be addressed as they occur and have impact upon one another in real life, rather than as issues which can be isolated and investigated only under laboratory conditions. Through the use of such a framework, the potential value of educational program research is increased by enhancing the likelihood of its applicability in real, operating program entities. The search for and
application of more reliable knowledge to the practice of facilitating program development responds to the need for educational programs to take control of their own change processes, as presented in Chapter I.

The object of this inquiry has been a single educational entity in the process of maintaining and transforming itself. That process of transformation was seen as parallel in many ways to the process of organic entity development, and so phrases like "genetic insurance" and "the search for ecological niches" were borrowed from evolutionary theory and used heuristically to probe program entity functioning. Where the analogy with the development of non-human living systems seemed inadequate, appropriate concepts were borrowed from social theory; others were simply suggested by the configuration of data themselves.

As concepts gradually emerged from the data and were named in these various ways, the holistic assumption with which this study began was strengthened: in this human entity, a characteristic wholeness became apparent. The educational program observed operated as a unified system of activity in which members and educational operations were interwoven. Because of this wholeness, it was impossible to study program development as a process in itself, as had been originally intended. How the program transforms itself from the inside is linked too tightly to how it is organized and how it maintains itself and achieves its goals.

As the importance of whole entity functioning became more apparent, the capacity of the entity to function began to overshadow
the specific processes of functioning. These processes were gradually
discovered to be complex and of enormous variety with numerous subtle
aspects, but underlying them all remained the fundamental issue of the
program's capacity to engage in these functions, including that of self-
transformation or development. By the time that the analysis of the
data had been concluded, the decision had been reached to concentrate
on the nature of developmental capacity in response to the question
raised when this study began: How does an educational program develop?

Developmental capacity therefore forms the cornerstone of the
theoretical propositions to follow. Facilitating and investigating
developmental capacity will be issues pursued in Chapter IX.

**Developmental Capacity**

An educational program's capacity to develop centers around
three basic issues: whether the program is and has the capacity to act
as an entity, whether it has the capacity to adapt, and whether it has
the capacity to act creatively. Each of these capacities is seen in
hierarchical relationship to the one preceding it: that is, a program
cannot adapt unless it has at least a minimal degree of entitativity;
it cannot act creatively to transform itself unless it can already act
to adapt in relation to changing internal and environmental conditions.

But what relationship does each of these capacities have to
program development? If program development is the transformation of
the program entity from the inside in ways that the operations it per-
forms for learners are improved, one might be tempted to take a rigorous
position in regard to the question of what can actually be named program
development and so stipulate that only those entity functions which can ultimately be traced to outcomes in improved teaching-learning operations might be called developmental. But to make such a stipulation would be to ignore the systematic complexity of an educational program.

Educational operations are embodied in the social entity of the program. Whether these operations are performed well, and whether they have the possibility to be improved from the inside, depends not only on the dynamics of the specific setting in which they are conducted but upon myriad dimensions of the activity system which supports them. For this reason, the question of improving operations cannot be raised as an isolated issue. Whether operations can be improved depends upon the program's capacity to conduct them adequately in the first place, as well as upon its capacity to improve them by transforming itself.

The theory to follow will center around these basic conclusions derived from the preceding data. Entitativity will be described as a basic component of development because it is a *sine qua non* of entity operation at any level. The capacity to adapt and the capacity to act creatively will be presented as different facets of the developmental capacity. A program which is adapting will be presumed to be developing (Sanders & Sofianos, Note 5), but acting creatively will be considered a higher level developmental functioning.

**Entitativity**

At the base of an educational program's developmental capacity is its entitativity (Dunn, 1971): the state of its being a thing in
itself. Since development is here considered a function of a single entity, it is apparent that an educational program which lacks sufficient integration to be addressed as an entity is also incapable of development. Broadly considered, the issue of a program's entitativity rests upon two major dimensions: that of its purpose and identity, and that of its social and cultural integration.

**Purpose and identity**

As with other intentional social groupings, the issue of a program's identity is fundamentally tied up with its purpose. Although members might agree in general that the purpose of an educational program is to facilitate the learning of a particular group of learners, different underlying perceptions and interpretations might become acutely apparent as they try to make incarnate that general purpose in specific educational operations. The identity of the program emerges not only from their intentions and generalized sense of purpose but from their social expressions of that understanding. The congruency of their perceptions and expressions of purpose is a significant indication of the entitativity of the program.

In contrast to the situation of a single person, who, however complex is still a single organism, an educational program is simultaneously a single body and many single bodies interacting. Each of the members of a program has his own set of purposes, as well as his individual perceptions of the program's purpose. If the program is to move coherently in a single direction, these individual perceptions of purpose must be woven together in a fabric strong enough to support
members' sense that theirs is a single educational entity with an identifiable purpose that they know and affirm.

Sociocultural integration

As important as its identity in the determination of a program's entitativity is its integration, manifesting both social and cultural dimensions in the same social entity.

By social structure is meant all the specifically relational elements of program life: how persons communicate with one another or whether they communicate at all; what affective overtones the messages they exchange carry; whether people work closely together or whether they work behind closed doors; whether members are formally or informally arranged in a hierarchy to which members pay attention, according more respect to some members than to others; whether some have more power than others or whether some have none at all; whether members vie for status or whether life is arranged in a clearly communal pattern where status concerns are absent; who makes decisions; who can influence those in power; who can make a difference in how program operations are carried out; how persons are treated by one another; whether members cooperate or compete.

The patterns of social structure worked out in some programs as people interact to carry out program functions are such that people are drawn together and the program is tightly integrated. In other programs, these same dimensions of social life keep members alienated from one another. Whether a program is integrated or not hinges primarily upon whether social patterns are clearly an outgrowth of the
demands of the goals of the program, and whether those social patterns so constructed serve to support persons in ways they need to enable them to contribute to the effort of the whole.

Cut along another axis, the same social entity of an educational program might be described in terms of its cultural integration. The content of a program's culture involves all dimensions of values, goals, norms, expectations, understandings, assumptions, commitments, motivations, and perceptions of members about the program. Whether these are shared or not determines to a great extent the degree of program integration, and therefore the extent to which member action is likely to constitute coherent program action. Not only is it important that members concur to a significant degree in their understanding of the ideational elements of the program, but it is vital as well that these components form a coherent pattern.

If members hear expectations articulated which seem to be in contradiction to values also articulated, actions are likely to be short-circuited. If staff members are expected to cope with what they perceive as an unworkably high pupil-teacher ratio, all the while the principal speaks of the importance of taking time with students individually, frustration and resentment are guaranteed. In a program, however, where cultural elements form a harmonious, coherent pattern, a frame of reference is provided to members within which action can be undertaken with confidence. The cultural dimensions of the program can serve not only to weave elements of member efforts into a single whole, but they can focus those efforts in a common direction.
Social structural elements. For any program to exist and to be maintained as a social entity means that its structure must be attended to and patterned in such a way that its integration is assured. This is a minimal definitional requirement of a program as a sociocultural entity; such integration is required even if the program is to be effectively changed in its operations by an outside change agent.

If, however, an educational program is to have the capacity to change itself from the inside, then not only must it be integrated as an entity, but it must have the kind of sociocultural structure that supports that possibility. Elements of social structure and culture must be organized in such a way that the program has the structural basis for attaining its goals, for adapting in relation to the environment and its own changing internal conditions, and perhaps even for acting creating creatively.

Intensity of information exchange is directly related to the possibility for accuracy of information throughout the system, and therefore to the strength of its social and cultural structure. The dispersion and availability of accurate information is, at the same time, vital for the conduct of operations the program needs to perform if it is to adapt to changing conditions -- operations like the analysis and reorganization of whole entity behavior.

Much information can be available to members, however, and yet involve only a few levels of their personal or corporate life. Information that reflects the density of their human reality includes not only information on educational operations within the program but information on members' perceptions of themselves and their functioning, on
their interpretation of the meaning of their operations; information on their feelings, their hopes and disappointments, their relationships with one another, their sense of power and participation. To the extent that the availability of such information is validated, the tendency to activate all capacities of the human persons within the program is encouraged. Such an activation of capacities releases energy needed for adaptive and creative behavior.

In addition to the release of needed energy, the exchange of information on these various levels of individual and program functioning contributes to the structural stability of the program. Legitimacy is accorded to acknowledging what really exists in the social realm. Such an acknowledgement is essential for routine confrontation with problems as well as for dealing with the subtlety of interpersonal variables.

As essential as effective communication to the establishment of a structural basis for development within the program is individual participation in the task of the whole. The kind of entitativity at the base of developmental capacity entails not a mechanical fulfillment of member roles, but rather a personal investment in the survival of the whole: a personal sense of responsibility for the success of the whole, a personal adherence to the corporate purpose. Indications that this type of participation exists within a program include the taking of initiative by members with confidence that they can effect positive change, and without fear of reprisal; a lack of concern with territory and status; and caring evidenced by members about the quality of their
own work and about the quality of interpersonal relationships within the program.

Cultural elements. The infrastructure supporting the possibility for such participation and communication must include norms that allow (or better still, promote) the particular kind of relating they entail. Such norms are minimally those for honesty, openness, hard work and cooperation, and revolve around a fundamental adherence to the value of positive regard for the personhood of members. The kind of interdependence required for developmental behavior demands a quality of reliance not met by a mechanical recognition of the interrelatedness of parts within a system.

Cultural elements in an integrated program, however, might be strong and coherent, acting as a powerful integrative force, and yet still be oppressive to members. In a program with the kind of entitativity at the base of developmental capacity, however, the culture makes room for surges of action from members. The culture is a kind that provides a framework for channeling and supporting member initiatives in the direction of goals, rather than constraining member behavior so that it does not go beyond the boundaries of what has been established as permissable. When a principal is preoccupied with "who's rocking the boat," the program's culture is likely being viewed more as a way to keep members in line than as a way to focus their energies productively. Within such a program, the possibilities for development are limited.
Adaptive Capacity

Whether a program is capable of adaptation depends upon its capacity to act not only as an entity but as an organic entity. For this reason, what has been said above about entitativity will be presumed to hold for adaptive capacity. Here, however, elements will be explored which relate specifically to the structure and functioning of an organic entity.

Organic sensing

Adaptation is a transitive concept: it implies the existence of a relationship between an entity and something to which it adapts or something whose force or presence prompts it to adapt. For an educational program entity, the need to adapt presents itself on two fronts: the changing environment and changing internal program conditions.

Whichever the program is facing, the basic dimensions of its capacity to adapt remain the same. Most fundamental is the program's ability to sense what is happening, inside itself and outside in its environment. Entity sensing by a program depends upon a collective sensing by members who then share what they discover, learn or understand. Since the members of a program are the closest to it, they hardly need to be told what is happening within it. What they do need, however, is some measure of critical distance so that they can see their own behavior. In addition, they need some mechanism for sharing what they sense individually, so that information can become available to the collective consciousness. What must be validated in a program that is to be adaptive, therefore, is a sense of awareness among members...
about themselves and their functioning, as well as a sense of the impor­tance of collecting and sharing information.

Such an awareness presumes intelligent human action. As with entitativity, the possibilities for adaptation are enhanced when that awareness covers as many dimensions of human functioning as could be relevant to program operations. Besides variation in the kind of information gathered, the modes of consciousness of what is happening internally or in the environment might be fruitfully varied as well, broadening to include not only rational-critical perceptions but also subjective-feeling sensing of what is happening. If these different kinds of consciousness are to be used for the benefit of the program, however, subjective as well as objective knowledge must be acknowledged as valuable and relevant to the unfolding of program life.

Adaptation in relation to the environment demands that a program have mechanisms for finding out what is changing before the change is so great that it precipitates a crisis. If a program is to adapt gracefully to environmental changes, the majority of program changes must be incremental so that stability can be maintained even while program structure and functioning are changing.

How a program adapts at any one minute depends upon the conditions existing both within the entity and outside in the environment. The decision to attempt the maintenance of adaptive behavior implies that the entity considers a satisfactory relationship with the environment desirable -- ultimately, because the survival of the program depends upon it. Programs that cannot or refuse to adapt can survive
only so long as the environment does not change too much to make their continued survival impossible.

Sensing of the environment is important for program adaptation not only because of the monitoring of potentially salient environmental conditions but because of the necessity of exploring potential environmental niches. Changing circumstances, either inside or outside the program, might demand program change without alternatives being immediately apparent to program members. Searching for possibilities in the environment can turn up alternatives, just as might explicit problem solving within the program. Alternatives might take the form of changes in operations or changes to be made in the environment. In either case, a more satisfactory fit between the program and the environment is the ultimate aim of such adaptation.

**Structural variation**

The existence of a variety of capacities among program members provides a greater possibility of adaptation than if member capacities were identical. Problems may arise internal to the program for which the capacities of some members are more suited than are those of others. As long as enough flexibility exists within the program so that rearrangements can be made to utilize those resources, the program has a chance of adapting satisfactorily. Other demands may come from the environment. Once again, the greater variation that exists among member capabilities, the greater likelihood that the resources needed for coping will exist within the program. Such variation-related adaptiveness becomes increasingly important in periods of rapid change.
At still other times, no pressing need for adaptation might exist, but an organic program sensitive to the probability of future demands for adaptation might engage in exploring the environment on the lookout for resources, with an eye open to potential problems, or in a generalized search for a more satisfactory ecological niche. In the conduct of this exploration, members with differing interests and talents are likely to be attracted to and gather different kinds of information, providing the program with a variety of alternatives for changes in behavior.

**Internal locus of control**

Such adaptive action by the program presumes that the locus of control exists internal to the entity. A mechanical system can be -- in fact, must be -- controlled from the outside. An organic system has a motive for control over its own existence and can powerfully resist intruded change efforts. Only a program entity that is operating with the locus of control inside can adapt quickly enough, in incremental bits, to maintain its balance effectively inside a constantly changing environment.

A program entity that operates organically is self-directed, not only avoiding being controlled but finding positive satisfaction in control of its own action. Like a toddler with inklings that it can control its own destiny, an organic program struggles for autonomy out of an inherent motive for growth. For a program entity, that urge toward expansion is expressed in its attempts to evaluate its own behavior, solve its own problems, take action decided upon internally, and reorganize on the basis of an internal judgment of value.
Addressed in relation to program entitativity, member participation when addressed in relation to adaptation is closely allied with the program's internal locus of control. Members in an organic program do not define themselves as filling slots of required functions -- "That's not in my job description" -- but rather take charge of program operations because they own them. Individuals are not invited to participate; instead, their participation is demanded by the task they have accepted communally. Whether individuals can change program operations is hardly a question. Who else but members would change their own operations?

Goals in an adaptive program are clear, making possible coherent action in relation to them. Member actions are harmonized with one another along a single trajectory at a time. Such a requirement is a carry-over from those stipulated for entitativity: goals must be concrete and clearly envisioned so that members have a basis for making decisions about their own actions.

At the same time, however, outcomes of processes are not rigidly controlled. Adaptive programs are in touch with themselves as part of a flow of life in which unpredicted outcomes may be the most valuable, in which unforeseen opportunities might be usefully exploited. In order to maintain openness to the possibilities presented by the unpredictable, the adaptive entity resists rigidification of its structure, even if operations at the moment seem almost perfect. Perfection is always regarded as an illusion.

Adaptive changes happen in an organic entity not because of fiat by a manager, but because attention is paid to the momentum for
change. Each adaptive change in the program's structure provides a different basis for change possibilities than existed before. As program capacities are refined, the likelihood that the program will be able to cope better in the future is increased.

The content of norms

As with entitativity, the norms that exist within a program that is adaptive -- in contrast to one that can only be changed from the outside -- are those that support the inherent motive toward organic operation. Central to any patterning of norms within an adaptive program is a recognition of life processes. Norms within an adaptive program legitimize the natural flow of human persons acting responsibly on the basis of their awareness of their social and environmental realities.

Basic to such a set of norms is interpersonal respect, out of which emerges the confidence individuals need to undertake responsible and responsive action. Fear is absent altogether, and the purpose of the entity is valued above the individual aims of members. Yet individuals are not regarded as objects to be manipulated, but rather as unique persons whose differences are to be celebrated.

The adaptive capacity of an educational program fundamentally depends upon its ability to become synchronized as an entity with the life processes flowing through it and around it, channeling the life processes of its members in ways that contribute over time to the attainment of its goals.
Capacity for Creativity

To be able to act creatively, an educational program must be able to do more than act adaptively. All that has been said above about the program as an adaptive entity is to be subsumed into a description of a creative program: unless a program is an entity, and unless it is already actively adapting, it cannot act creatively. Yet some programs are able to do more: to transcend reactivity and actually generate what is authentically new.

Human resources

An adaptive educational program might manifest something approaching creative behavior when it explores the environment even when no environmental demands are pressing it for change. But in a creative program, exploration is limited not by the environment but only by the imagination of members. Because the educational program is a human system, it has potential access to all the resources of its members individually and in interaction -- resources those persons may hardly know exist within themselves.

Like an adaptive program, a creative program works with the natural movement of human motivation. Here, however, emphasis is placed on sensitivity to the inherent human motive for fulfillment -- not only to expand and exert control, but to create what has not existed before.

Creative action within a program is not simply a flurry of disparate "artistic" energy, but rather a purposeful, conscious release of focused effort in the attempt to build new possibilities. A program
Non-linear thinking

Other specifically human dimensions emphasized within a creative program are capacities for reflection, for sensitive evaluation, and for acting on the basis of what seems fitting. Playful, "non-rational," "mythological" elements of those operations are acknowledged and affirmed. New ideas are recognized as legitimate even if they emerge from joking, from memories, from dreams, from nowhere. The operation of intuition is promoted. People are not forced to defend their ideas in a linear, analytic way before other members will consider listening to them, although a rational basis may be worked out after the fact.

Intuition in a creative program does not remain a personalistic subjective experience, but rather is diffused throughout the group. Individual intuitions are caught up into the functioning of the entity where they can be harmonized and brought into consciousness on social and physical levels. In this way, the gestalt of program functioning is changed from a situation of the subjective person and the objective program entity to that of a subjective program entity relating to the world.

Community of spirit

The community emerging in a creative program is more than an esprit de corps, although it includes team spirit from its base in the program's adaptive capacity. Community instead becomes a relationship in spirit -- a groping together to express human meaning in the midst of social matters like relationships with the children and physical matters like instructional systems.
acts creatively when its members act coherently in creative ways. Whether a program is acting creatively can be seen less from the number of innovations present at any one moment than from whether the fruits of creative action are helping the program toward the attainment of program goals.

Conducive program conditions

As with entitativity and adaptation, particular factors seem less important to the possibility of creative program operation than does their patterning into a framework within which members are enabled to act in a particular way. Certain conditions, however, do seem to be associated with creative program entities. Programs in which members are able to act creatively seem especially in touch with the human nature of their members and allow that human nature to suffuse the social entity they comprise. The program becomes an educational setting expressive of the best in its members, and so members experience satisfaction in the congruence between themselves and their social surroundings.

Information exchange is dense -- not only quick and complex but touching many levels in persons, thereby validating the activation of personal capacities for the sake of the program. Members are open to the ideas and successes of one another. As in an adaptive program, concerns about territoriality are subsumed into program goals. But here members are particularly committed to improvement through the creation of the new, so that successes of members are celebrated because of the possibilities for improvement they bring to the whole program.
The belief in the value of the vision they pursue sustains members individually and draws them together in the creation of their social reality. The quality of the program becomes a measure of the power of the human spirit as experienced and expressed by members. Like American pioneers rallying around the proposition that all men are created equal, members of a creative educational program connect with one another through their shared personal commitment to the same deeply held values.

The desire to do what is good can be pursued unabashedly. In a creative community, a sense of what is right and fitting exists and is relied upon, and members promoting the good are protected from the ridicule of a cynical outside world.

Because the shared understanding of what is good acts as a stabilizing force for the collective consciousness, members acquire the sense that their options for contributing to the program lie not only in the realms of work and interpersonal relations but in the realm of human imagination. A kind of energy similar to love propels members toward the fulfillment of their own personalities and toward the creation of a satisfying social order.

Very little awareness of spiritual communion is possible for members unless they have the freedom to share deeply held beliefs, and to search openly for ways to express them in the program. That freedom rests upon a foundation of personal security greater than that demanded even for an adaptive educational program. Members must know not only that their participation is valued and experience it as important for
the sake of the program, but they must know that their wholeness as persons is recognized and valued, both for their sake and for the prospective contribution to the whole. That recognition of wholeness has to include not only acknowledgement of the complexities of their personalities and of the diversity of their backgrounds, but of their on-going participation in the human search to create meaning in their lives through the generation of social forms expressive of their beings.
The theoretical notions proposed in the preceding chapter suggest that implications might be drawn for practice and research. If those notions appear at least "epistemologically in harmony with the reader's experience" (Stake, 1978), then tentative application by "readers" who experience that harmony seems justified. At the same time, if those notions and the relationships proposed among them offer the promise of heuristic possibilities for the acquisition of reliable knowledge about educational program development, then further inquiry related to those concepts appears desirable.

On this basis then, suggestions will be presented in this chapter for the application of these ideas to the practice of building developmental capacity in an educational program, and for further inquiry into the nature of developmental capacity and processes. Practice and research will first be addressed as separate issues, and then together in the context of developmental research.

Implications for Practice

The theory presented in the preceding chapter presumes that educational program development is desirable and that its facilitation is approached most directly through the promotion of the program's
developmental capacity. In this section, approaches to the promotion of general developmental capacity will be proposed first; then, directions to be pursued in the effort to establish or enhance the specific dimensions of entitativity, adaptive capacity and creative capacity.

Promoting General Developmental Capacity

Adapting and operating creatively can happen only in program entities that have the capacity to do so. As aspects of development, neither adaptation nor creative action can be decreed by fiat nor engineered by an outside agent. Both must, by their nature, emerge from the inherent capacity of the program. Neither can these modes of program functioning be installed permanently, without continued attention to the maintenance of the program's structural dimensions within which they are encased.

Insistence upon such attention is meant to be not hortatory rhetoric but a straightforward statement of fact: time and energy need to be allocated if a program's capacity to transform itself is to be maintained.

Importance of dimensions

The importance of those dimensions of developmental capacity described in the preceding chapter is easy to discount. They are clearly of a different and more nebulous order than elements of daily program life like scheduling, funding, teacher strikes and achievement test scores. They are more like elements that humanistically inclined critics of public schools romanticize about, alienating in the process
educators who know how important for improving program operations is a realistic picture of the educating process.

From one perspective, the similarity with romantic themes is accidental. Elements identified here as crucial have emerged from an analysis of empirical data rather than from a philosophical commitment to the fulfillment of human potential. From another perspective, however, any similarity these elements have to romantic themes might be traced to a common reference to the nature of the human system. Attention to the human needs of members of an educational program, and especially as these relate to the potential of members to contribute out of their own resources to the functioning of the program, is fundamental to any lasting developmental capacity, because the program has no life except that expressed by its human members as they create a system of activity. The program's potential for life -- for activity, for transformation -- is therefore limited or expanded in proportion to the freedom members have to contribute to it.

Attention to the human needs of members demands concrete action rather than romantic philosophizing. Teachers will hardly believe for long that their participation is valued, even if the principal continues to tell them it is, if no possibilities for effective participation exist within their social setting.

*Subtlety of dimensions*

Effective attention to building program developmental capacity entails recognition of the subtlety of elements and their relationships within a program entity. Elements that program members may refer to as "small things" are often those which they perceive as having the
greatest impact upon their motivation, their feelings of security, their openness and willingness to communicate with one another. Whether the principal even notices what a teacher is doing with his class, whether opinions on the solutions to problems are sought, whether adults talk to one another in respectful tones, whether decisions are routinely handed down from above on the assumption that they will be implemented without question -- all these are small things out of which program members create the matrix of interpreted meaning within which they live. Far from being marginal elements in program life, they are the basic stuff of which the climate is created. A simplistic presumption that such subtleties are trivial and unworthy of professional attention can impede a program's attainment of the minimal entitativity that it needs for adaptive -- much less creative -- action.

Quality of staff life

Acknowledgement of the systematic complexity of program life draws attention to a major dimension that is commonly ignored even by those seeking to improve program operations -- that of the quality of life of the program staff members. Often the program's orientation toward the provision of educational experiences for learners overshadows in the consciousness of adult program members the fact of the program's existence as a social entity, and the impact of the character of that social entity on their own behavior.

Why teachers "take things out on kids" is often explained by teachers as a reaction to being treated badly themselves by a principal. (The principal, they point out, is probably being treated badly by a
superintendent, in a classical educational pecking order.) But such carry-over is much more satisfactorily explained in terms of the nature of the program as a system than in a model of a linear progression down a ladder of power.

Members of a program physically and psychically live within a social entity whose every dimension affects them to some degree, constraining and curtailing behavior or releasing surges of energy within them; discouraging the generation of anything that deviates from expectations established years ago, or challenging them to allow for the free interplay of their imaginations. Idealistic hopes obtained in teacher training can be broken down effectively within a short time after the real work of teaching begins, or possibilities not even imagined can become part of a vision shared by colleagues.

Empowerment

The particular kind of social structure needed if the program is to act adaptively or creatively is one in which members have enough security to risk action. An atmosphere must exist within the program in which initiative is legitimated, in which members are secure not because of their attainment of status but because of their membership in the entity and their commitment to its goals. Fear must be removed as much as possible -- fear of being criticized, fear of being found out, fear of being rejected because of failing to perform competently. When such fear does exist within a program, it acts as a powerful regulator of behavior. As members internalize its presence, little overt action is needed to constrain action: the specter of reprisal attains power of its own.
The absence of such fear is crucial for the kind of member action which underlies developmental action of the program. But its mere absence is hardly enough to ensure that members will be able to act to attain their goals. Members must be empowered to act through the positive support and challenge of the social order. That social order must not only "contain" certain elements, but incorporate as well the mechanisms for creating and maintaining those elements.

Members in a program capable of transforming its own operations have to experience their setting as one in which they believe, with which they can identify. That setting has to pull at them personally, on enough levels of their being so that they are willing to invest something of themselves in it for the sake of the survival and development of the whole. Such an investment implies their abandoning to a large degree individualistic concerns which do not contribute to the commonweal. That investment is not likely to be made, however, unless members sense that what they are giving up is more than compensated for by what they receive. The rewards of participating have to be experienced personally, even if the goal pursued is communal.

The investment individual members make in a developing program cannot take the form of a suppression of their individuality, however. As a human system, a program with a capacity for development depends upon the activated human capacities of its human members.

Participation and control

Active participation to the point of emotional investment in the program leads inexorably to the establishment of a sense of
internal control. Program members believe that their actions are effective because they see the impact of their efforts in the social system that surrounds them. Participation that is frustrated or kept to a superficial level, away from where the crucial decisions are made, cannot form a stable basis for the internalized locus of control by which a program entity is enabled to take coherent action.

Participation which authentically enables participants to take charge of their social reality enables them to transform it, if they share an internalized sense of direction and goal. The salience of that goal needs to be promoted and the vision nurtured if intensity of activity is to be productive. Participation, however intense, is no guarantee of development. Energies of participants need to be channeled or they will dissipate, as members become discouraged from the lack of results. With skillful leadership, cognitive dissonance can be a constant goad to effective action. Without an artful sensing of the needs of the situation and of the program members, however, repeated reference to program goals can become counterproductive, degenerating into what is perceived as harping about the inadequacies of members' efforts.

Awareness capability

Underlying all possibilities for program development is the program's ability to be aware of what is happening. Mechanisms need to be established in a program by which a collective consciousness is maintained, by which members learn, in order to process later, what is happening as conditions change internally and in the environment.

Like the small things of interpersonal relating which yet turn out to have such an impact upon member behavior, the importance of
awareness capability is likely to be underrated, and therefore ignored in efforts to stimulate development. Yet it is through awareness that the basic "idea pool" (Dunn, 1971) for the transformation of operations is gathered. Unless program members know collectively how operations are proceeding, they can hardly make a collective decision about improving them. Unless they understand what the various capabilities of members are, they have no idea of the resources available for improvement efforts. Unless members know how the environment is encroaching upon them, they will hardly be able to take adaptive action before a crisis hits. At the same time, without a way to sense the environment, they can remain oblivious to the potential resources it has to offer.

Closely allied to an awareness capability is an attitude of openness, essential to be maintained in a developing program. If a stable enough base exists within the program entity, awareness of what is happening outside the program does not have to prompt defensive action. A program can be sensitively approaching its environment instead of defending itself against it, thereby making possible a delicate balancing out of program needs and environmental demands over time. Unless either concessions are made to the environment or changes are made in the environment, the press for adaptation will eventually be too much for the program to withstand. A fierce adherence to a static equilibrium is much less likely to preserve program equilibrium in the long run than is a tentative openness, a selective fitting of environmental elements or a rearrangement of entity dimensions, so that time and form can unfold together.
Such awareness and openness on the part of the program is possible only if members have a way to engage collectively in these functions. Individual members of a program may be aware, and yet the program as a whole might have little corporate awareness because members have no way to share what they know, much less come to a shared understanding of what they can affirm. Means to facilitate the needed communication may range from the purely physical (like a place to be together that offers enticements by which people are attracted), through the more clearly social (structured times like meetings in which the exchange of information and ideas is affirmed), to the even more abstract (like the establishment of interpersonal bonds strong enough to support the sharing of very personal experiences).

Social learning

Through the existence of mechanisms by which program members are empowered to act, by which the program entity remains aware of happenings internally and externally, and by which members build a collective consciousness through the sharing of information, the program is provided with the possibility of its members engaging in a process of social learning, a process at the heart of development in a social entity. If members can acquire information so that the program possesses it corporately, then program behavior can be monitored, assessed and evaluated, and decisions can be made to undertake action for improvement.

Decisions that arise from such processes under control of members are more likely to be implemented willingly than are those handed
down from above or intruded by a well-meaning change agent. Rather than being approached resentfully or subtly subverted instead of being incorporated, innovations based on internally owned decisions are conceptualized as useful solutions to bothersome problems, and therefore much better implemented than resisted.

Through those same mechanisms for participation, awareness and communication, what really exists within the program can be utilized. The variety of resources potentially available within any group of persons is wide; but without some way for those resources to be brought to the fore, program members may never recognize their richest source for transformation of their own social reality.

Building Entitativity

Establishing and maintaining the structural basis for development in a program entails consciously attending to the nature of person-to-person relating, and devising a pattern for those relationships that both feels comfortable for members and facilitates the movement toward goals. Mechanisms must be installed for maintaining the pattern of a satisfactory relating of members inside the entity: new members must be led to understand and conform to acceptable ways of behaving, and norms must be strong enough within the program to guide as well the behaviors of experienced members.

Such socialization is tied up with the program's culture, which can be created as intentionally as its social structure. If members are to be socialized to act in certain ways, they must subscribe to the reasons for behaving in those certain ways; otherwise, social patterns become mere means of oppression.
Both social and cultural elements must be oriented toward integration if a base for development is to exist. In a program where "the principal keeps the teachers apart" through the exercise of favoritism and other control devices, members may appear to cause leaders fewer problems, but they will also be incapable of intelligently and responsibly handling their corporate reality. In such a situation, in fact, the corporate may have reality only in a physical sense: the psychic sense vital to integration of humans may be missing entirely.

Within the territory described above, a wide range of options is available to programs committed to the kind of entitativity conducive to development. Whatever the specific nature of the program, however, cultural and social elements must be patterned in such a way that they are simultaneously coherent and yet fluid. Too loose a structuring prevents the program's acting as an entity. Too tight a structuring interferes with the internal flexibility needed for developmental action. However important sufficient integration is for effective performance of program operations, a program that is not at the same time fluid is likely to remain adapted to a certain set of environmental circumstances long after those circumstances change. The entitativity demanded for development is a delicate balance between the two poles, repeatedly worked out over time.

Building Adaptive Capacity

Central to the adaptive capacity is the attitude of openness described in Chapter VIII. If an educational program is to be able to act adaptively, some means for attaining a positive openness must be
established within a program. A principal might act to survey the horizon for resources; other program members might actively participate in activities outside the program and then systematically bring back the information they gather; all members might be attuned to the potential riches of the environment so that forays in search of resources are actively promoted.

The openness required for adaptation must be more than mere passive receptivity. The environmental resources brought back inside the program boundaries need to be experimented with so that they can be selectively fitted into program operations. An air of constant watchfulness needs to be maintained so that useful transactions might be engaged in with the environment when opportunities present themselves.

**Goal clarity**

Attention to the environment and its resources has no point except that dictated by program goals. Unless goals are kept in the collective mind, and periodically re-envisioned in the light of changing conditions and changing membership, all action is potentially fruitless. Awareness of goals can be used to guide the direction of movement of the program entity through time, and so can serve as the anchor in the process of balancing out changes in the organic system. At the same time, it can act as a positive motivating force for member action, as the focal point in the search for congruence between what is and what might be.

**Variation**

The greater variation that exists within a program, the greater possibility there is that the required resources for adaptive change
will exist within it. Too high a level of variation places strains on program integration; but the program is in a stronger position in the face of environmental press for adaptation if integration and variation can exist at the same time. Promoting adaptive capacity entails resisting all efforts toward conformity within the program that do not contribute to the improvement of program operations. Instruments like teacher checklists, based on the presumption that teachers are interchangeable and their behaviors able to be tallied, represent an obvious example of means by which internal program variation is dysfunctionally suppressed.

**Attention to life processes**

Since the fundamental characteristic distinguishing an adaptive system from a mechanical system is the nature of the organic processes by which it operates itself from the inside, ignoring the possibilities for and the demands of life processes within a program tends to reduce its capacities to that of a mechanical system, capable of being changed only from the outside, and only so long as the outside agent is there to maintain control.

Attending to life processes implies recognition of both the needs of the program as a living system and of the needs of its living members. These include the need to transact (to be nourished and to eliminate what is not useful), to explore and learn, to communicate internally, to maintain a sense of itself as an organism (as whole, as living, as changing), and to achieve its goals of survival and regeneration.
Building Creative Capacity

At the core of creative capacity in an educational program is the possibility for each member to exercise his own capacities for creative action to the extent that he can for the sake of the program. In order for such a possibility to exist, the social situation must be one in which the free exercise of a wide range of human capabilities is validated, under the assumption that the attainment of the program goal requires it. That validation must involve concrete actions (e.g. by administrators) in supporting and facilitating individual members' contributions to program functioning.

Stimulation

In their efforts to contribute, members need to be stimulated to create what is new. The stimulation of staff member energy toward creative activity needs to be routinely and consciously engaged in inside a program that expects to be able to act creatively. Adults cannot be expected to function mechanically to stimulate creativity in their charges if they are not stimulated themselves. Unless the personal resources of members are not maintained and replenished, those resources will not be available to the program.

Playfulness

Creative acting on the part of members in ways that are productive for the program demands an involvement of the person on various levels of his being: on affective-interpersonal and spiritual-ideational levels as well as on the rational-physical level minimally required for membership. Such complex involvement tends to be promoted when
communication within the program entity is spontaneous and dense; that is, when information is exchanged on these various levels and includes the element of humor. The ability to play is apparently a requirement for creative behavior; a program without room for play leaves little room for creativity.

The kind of exploration and experimentation demanded of a program if it is to act creatively involves not only the shifting of behaviors as dictated by changing internal and environmental presses, but the playful involvement with new ideas, the open expression of feelings and intuitive sense of appropriateness, and the willingness to try something seriously without making a permanent commitment.

To operate playfully in the realm of ideas and not only in relation to other members requires a firm sense of interpersonal security. Without the sense of their being accepted and accorded unconditional regard, members are likely to regard original behavior as not worth the risk. Unless that base of security is maintained, members will not be attuned to the possibilities in unforeseen happenings; instead, they will concentrate on hanging tightly to the remnants of safety. They will not be able to rise with the current of unpredictability and maintain their balance within the movement that inexorably carries them on.

**Freedom**

Members' confidence in their ability to deal intelligently with new ideas and to transform their own social reality in creative ways is strengthened in proportion to the "spiritual" dimensions of their lives together — their acknowledgement of the importance of the vision of the
program they share, of their commitment to orient their behavior toward the goals of the program, toward its possibilities of becoming better and more expressive of the best in their beings. Through such acknowledgment, an intuitive base to program functioning is implicitly affirmed, as members are called upon to exercise their powers of sensing the appropriateness of directions and opportunities in terms of their internalized sense of where the program should be headed.

Security on these combined levels of functional responsibility and participation, of social caring and involvement, and of commitment to the program's meaning, is the kind of freeing experience for members that makes possible their functioning in the realm of the creative.

Inquiry into Educational Program Development

Arriving at a deeper understanding of the phenomenon of educational program operation and development is a critical task for educators because of the up-close importance of the program in the experience of learners. Without more reliable knowledge than now exists, efforts at improving educational operations have to depend upon exhortations to change agents or common-sense generalizations from individual experience. With a more adequate knowledge base, efforts to improve operations might be conducted and refined more coherently inside a framework of questions identified as important.

In the study described in Chapters I-VII, several concepts surfaced as central to a study of educational program development:

ENTITATIVITY: A program's keeping itself together enough to be able to operate as an entity is basic to its possibilities for development as an entity.
ADAPTIVE CAPACITY: This major type of developmental capacity hinges on the program's capacity to act organically -- to change its environment or itself in response to the press of changing internal or external circumstances.

CREATIVE CAPACITY: This major type of developmental capacity presumes that the program can already act adaptively as an organic entity, and centers on the specifically human operations of members (e.g. imagining, believing, deciding).

Around these central concepts, a variety of questions might be posed, but basically they rest on a question at least one step ahead of the How-does-an-educational-program-develop question with which this study began. The basic question has now become How is the capacity for developmental behavior (adaptive and creative) established within an educational program?

Pushing that question further entails confronting the issue of the systematic exercise of adaptive and creative capacity, the components of those capacities, and the processes of the behaviors by which they are evidenced. Gathering the information needed to provide an adequate basis for the generation of theory about educational program development should be done under holistic assumptions, at least in the present state of indeterminacy about program functioning. Needed are the kind of "pattern explanations characteristic of participant observations" (Diesing, 1971, p. 204), rich with the complexity of a purposeful human system. Tentative suggestions for the conduct of such studies follow, on the assumption that even those studies that aim to
probe certain dimensions of the program entity rather than the matter of its total functioning must still be conducted inside a context of awareness about the entity that gives meaning to those dimensions.

**Entitativity**

Although much theoretical work has been done on the nature of social and cultural integration in a variety of social entities, what is known about other entities in most cases can be applied to the educational program only at a level of abstraction too high to be readily accessible to application to educational practice. What is needed are

* descriptive studies of the particular kinds of entitativity evidenced in a variety of educational programs;

* comparative observational studies of behaviors of members in entities which exhibit a high degree of entitativity, and those which exhibit a low degree of entitativity;

* studies of member perceptions in those entities exhibiting various degrees of entitativity about what factors contribute to or impede the establishment of entitativity, probably employing intensive interviewing as a research methodology;

* further observational studies of programs as whole systems of activity, so that relevant variables can be described in the context of their systematic interrelatedness.

**Adaptive Capacity**

Since, at its base, adaptive capacity revolves around the possibilities for a program operating as an organic entity, studies on the
adaptive capacity of educational programs might fruitfully employ the concepts of synthetic biology to explore the issue of program entity adaptiveness through a variety of approaches:

* comparative studies resting on a descriptive base, relating particular types of environments and particular types of adaptive behaviors in educational programs, to discover whether similarities exist among programs that continue to adapt successfully over time;

* studies with hypotheses about human functioning derived from literature, as Bruyn (1966) suggests, attempting to relate particular sociocultural configurations inside an educational program to the satisfaction of human needs;

* studies with hypotheses drawn from the policy sciences (Jantsch, 1975) that focus on the balancing out of internal and external change, and the maintenance of a dynamic equilibrium over time;

* studies that attempt to relate the coping capacities of members to the coping behavior of the program as an entity.

Creative Capacity

Although considerable work has been done in the field of creative behavior as it relates to individuals, and even to the stimulation of individual creative behavior in an educational setting, little attention has been directed toward the collection of data on the creative operations of social entities like an educational program. Studies in this area would have to be exploratory at this point, aimed at describing the nature of creative behavior of and inside an educational program, and identifying more specifically the questions that need exploring. Once
the field were more defined, later studies might use those results to explore issues further:

* studies with hypotheses formulated by analogy from the literature of the creative behavior of individuals, that attempt to compare the creative functioning of individuals to that of educational programs;

* studies of programs recognized as creative, which would gather perceptual data about the social and cultural factors of the program entity that members think relate to the stimulation of creative behavior or the release of creative energy in individual members;

* studies in which the emphasis is upon the analysis of thick ethnographic data covering a variety of educational programs (data which still need to be gathered), with the intention of finding tentative correlations between creative program behavior and certain patterns of sociocultural elements;

* ethnomethodological studies that attempt to uncover the process by which members make sense of messages sent from member to member about their capacities for program-oriented creative behavior and their permission to engage in it to the extent of their capacities;

* studies which attempt to probe the complex of subtle indications program members give when they are attending to "spiritual" dimensions of their lives, in an effort to relate these to program functioning.

Combining Research and Practice

The original justification for the research reported in the preceding chapters rested on a claim that educational program operations
needed improving. Descriptive research offers distinct possibilities for contributing to the needed accumulation of data about the functioning and development of the educational program; but because of the nature of education as based in practice and of the nature of the educating process as one of transformation, "developmental" research may provide a means of inquiry into educational phenomenon which is even more appropriate.

Elements of a developmental conceptualization of research have been articulated by Bronfenbrenner (1976), Dunn (1971), Sackman (1967) and Riecken and Boruch (1974). Basic to that conceptualization is the attempt to use scientific means, including experimentation, to enable entities to transform themselves from the inside in the direction of goals they determine.

Sometimes situated conceptually in the broad context of an evolving universe, and sometimes described more narrowly in the context of social space shared with other social entities, developmental research nevertheless is consistently envisioned as a type of inquiry conducted by an entity and its members for the sake of the attainment of its own goals over time. In this type of research, the establishment of universal relationships is not so important as in classical scientific experimentation because the entity is presumed to be unique and the patterning of its structure and functioning temporary (Dunn, 1971). Validity, therefore, is determined according to whether the entity's efforts are taking it in the direction of goal convergence.

Developmental research which would follow up on this study could draw implications both for practice and for research, basing actions on
a developmental hypothesis that if the program's structure or behavior were changed in certain ways, the goals of the program would be more fully realized (Dunn, 1971).

If the goal of such a program entity, for example, were to become more adaptive on the presumption that through the building of adaptive capacity the program might be more adequately able to maintain a valued equilibrium in the face of environmental presses, that program entity might try to pay attention to the demands of its own functioning as an organic entity, attending to the particular elements of an organic system named above, e.g. the need for openness to and transaction with the environment.

"Paying attention to" would imply not only recognition of the need but some decided-upon action for creating or improving mechanisms for accomplishing the function of supporting program entity openness in the face of the environment. The kind of openness appropriate to the program and its goals would have to be agreed upon; behavior within the entity reorganized in ways members predict would improve adaptiveness; the results of such changed behavior would have to be monitored, analyzed and evaluated in relation to desired outcomes, and then modified as needed adjustments became apparent. "Hypothesis formulation and testing" would have to continue over time, so that the program could gradually move toward its goals.

Such a conceptualization of an entity-based research seems supported by the study reported here: it is congruent with the nature of the program entity as a constantly changing, unique, human system,
repeatedly faced by the demands of a changing environment, comprised of meaning-making members capable of intelligent envisioning of goals and of organizing their own behavior in pursuit of those goals.

For the direct testing out of hypotheses about entitativity, adaptive capacity and creative capacity, a program entity involved in developmental research would approach the results of this or any study tentatively, experimenting with ideas to see whether they fit into the unique configuration of personalities, operations and aspirations of that particular program, adopting only those that seemed appropriate and likely to help in the attainment of goals.

Because such a developmental attitude would be oriented toward the transformation of particular program entities in ways that members consider valuable, no explicit prescription for needed developmental research can be made here. What is needed in specific cases is always dictated by the nature of the entity and its circumstances. What is apparently common to every program entity, however, is a generalized need for development if it is to survive. On that level of abstraction, a prescription for developmental research seems clearly justified.
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