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The lack of alternatives, perhaps more than any other single factor, is responsible for an unresponsive and continually obsolete system of public education in this country. This study attempts to provide an alternative to the way people are traditionally used in schools.
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INTRODUCTION

"We look at the present through a rear-view mirror. We march backwards into the future."¹ McLuhan's analysis of this society's approach to change is significant to the thesis of this Dissertation. There is a good deal of backward-looking in the manner public education attempts to move into the future. The 1960's are behind us, an era characterized by Time Magazine as "that slum of a decade," and we are plunging headlong into the 1970's. Our educational institutions did very little to alter the note of pessimism of the period, and to a large extent were probably as much part of the problem as they were a solution.

Making changes in public educating has been compared to moving a graveyard. Once the cemetery has been located in a new setting it is still a graveyard--the corpses themselves have not changed--only their locations.² Providing new settings for dead ideas is often mistaken as innovation but is really nothing more than a game of changing the label


but not the thing.

Public education began the decade with some grand designs, a number of which were published in *Schools for the Sixties* by the National Education Association's Project on Instruction. Ten years later it seems that a few labels and outward appearances have changed—the sign over the library door now reads "Instructional Materials Resource Center"—but internally little different has occurred. In fact, so little change took place during the decade, *Schools for the Sixties*, with a mere change of the title, could appropriately become *Schools for the Seventies*.

The theme of this doctoral study is one of conceptualizing effective educational change and the focus is on an answer to the question posed by NEA's Project on Instruction, "how should the school and the classroom be organized to make the most effective use of the time and talents of students and teachers?"\(^3\) Across the land there is little indication of teacher's and student's time and talent being used more effectively. For the most part, teachers are still found isolated from their colleagues in individual classrooms, dispensing knowledge to twenty or more students who are passively listening to the monologue, responding with the proper information on cue. Only in isolated instances is

there any evidence which demonstrates significant new patterns in the way teachers and students interact. Discovering new and more effective models for staff and student interaction remains a challenge for the 70's.

As the title of the study indicates, one of the main purposes of this dissertation is to conceptualize a model of staff use which will serve as a guide for using human resources differently. No more changing the titles of personnel within the school yet requiring they perform the same tasks; the effort here will be one of developing a staffing model which pays attention to the latest research of organizational theorists, and goes beyond the bureaucratic models of the past. This conceptual model of staffing will dramatically alter the manner in which resources are brought to bear on the learning problems of individual students. It will order the human resources within the broad perimeters of a school program so that they act synergistically with the other elements of that program. The total resources of this model are to be combined cooperatively to achieve the dominant objectives of the organization.

A second purpose of the study is the development of a classification scheme—a developmental continuum of staffing models—which will provide educational leaders with guidelines for organizational change. It will be designed to allow the student of staff-use to objectively compare a
given staffing model to others, using twenty-one different organizational variables, and subsequently position that particular model on the continuum.

In the development of this study the author examined several biases he holds against data being generated by organizational theorists both in education and the Social Sciences. These beliefs are:

(1) A bureaucratic organizational structure is an inappropriate means to accomplish the complex goals of public education.

(2) There is no clear relationship between the stated ends of public education and the selected means for staffing public schools.

(3) Much human potential is being stifled because the present staffing structure fails to recognize the individuality of teaching personnel.

(4) The present staffing pattern makes incorrect assumptions about human behavior.

(5) Staffing structures presently used in schools employ techniques to motivate the teaching professionals which ignore the most recent data generated from studies on human motivation.

(6) Present super-subordinate roles in educational organizations are limiting and systematically ignore much potentially creative talent.

(7) The current staffing arrangement encourages dependency rather than inter-dependency among its teaching and administrative staff.

(8) Operational efficiency has somehow become a higher priority than human growth and development.

(9) Much talent goes unused in schools merely because the mechanics of organization obscures and limits the identification of available
human resources.

(10) Seniority or longevity are the primary determinants of promotion in the present model.

(11) Technical competence, though secondary to seniority, still receives a higher priority than interpersonal competence.

Evidence exists which supports each of the points listed. Although by no means conclusive, this evidence has provided a reasonable basis for the conceptualization found in the body of the study.

In a sense the approach being used in this study is eclectic, and includes a study of past, present and probable staffing patterns of the future. It operates on the conviction that we can modify, when necessary, current discernable organizational trends, and reshape the educational climate to accommodate more appropriate forms of staff use. This study, then becomes more than a descriptive survey of existing innovative staffing models, where the varied attempts at alternative staffing patterns are compared. It also goes beyond filling out someone else's conceptual skeleton and takes on the complexion of a participant-observer study where the author experiences the study as an active observer, as a concept is being developed. It is an account of the author's own philosophical transition during which bits and pieces of ten years of formal higher educa-

---

tion were sorted and arranged to form a theoretical base for conceptualization.

Central to the conceptual framework of this study is the concept of human variability—the postulate that each human being is unique and has a distinct learning style. Attention to this concept requires changes in school staffing patterns to allow for the individual differences of students and teachers. At first glance this may appear to be a simplistic notion; one not sufficiently complex to be the core of a conceptual framework, yet by present and projected standards it is the common denominator of educational innovation. Complimentary to this is a second conceptual key, a provision for alternative means of goal achievement. Most human variability may be accounted for if the range of alternative learning opportunities is wide enough. Any attempt, then, to use the time and talents of teachers and students more effectively must insure that a multiplicity of learning experiences are offered. To help accomplish this, the personality, teaching style, and expertise of the instructional staff must also cover a broad and multi-dimensional spectrum.

Staff use cannot be considered independent of the other components of a school system. In fact, most staffing innovations currently underway are running into trouble and are doomed at least to small successes because they are being carried out in isolation. They are finding it diffi-
cult to make significant gains when other elements of the instructional process remain static. Thus a third part of the framework insists that comprehensive change is necessary before any significant individualization will be realized in the public schools. Schools must be reorganized to form a synergy.\(^5\)

This study attempts to examine in some depth the staffing element of a school synergism. Inventing a workable staffing proposal and pretending that it will provide any real improvement in the educational process is not sufficient; the revision of current staffing patterns will yield very little unless the new model is related to the larger picture of organizational objectives. The reorganization must allow for cooperative interaction of the various elements of an educational system—where the gains of coordinated effort are greater than the sum of independent endeavors of the separate elements. A lack of synergy seriously limits the degree of success an organization achieves, causing a phenomenon which might be called the Short Of Synergy (S.O.S.) effect. This phenomenon states that the degree of educational gain a system might achieve will be in direct proportion to the degree of flexibility and adaptiveness of the least flexible and adaptive component of the system.

\(^5\)The Center for Coordinated Education, Synergetics and the School, University of California at Santa Barbara, California, 1966.
The S.O.S. effect, in its simplest form organizes the concept "school" into three inclusive categories: (1) organization, (2) curriculum, and (3) human behavior.

(1) The category of organization is one of structures, including the structuring of time, space, and staff.

(2) The category of curriculum is a category of content, product and process -- curriculum in its broadest sense.

(3) The human behavior category is one of interpersonal relations such as teacher-student relations, teacher-teacher relations, and teacher-administration interaction.

The S.O.S effect further states that:

* The intent is to move from rigidness and inflexibility to adaptiveness and flexibility in all three categories.

* A change in any one of the three categories will likely cause a concomitant but more limited change in the other two.

* Although significant change may be achieved in any two of the three categories, the amount of "educational gain" achieved by the innovation may be limited to the degree of change in the third area. (See figure I, page 9).

* Any one of the three areas may be used as an entry point for system-wide change, but all three must be acted upon before serious innovation will be successful.

The effect, in lay terms, can be applied as follows: If a school system was really serious about individualizing learning, and developed a flexible schedule in a building which had a variety of educational spaces, and a staff that was flexible and adaptive and brought with it a variety
Figure 1

THE SHORT OF SYNERGY EFFECT
of expertise and knowledge, but failed to provide much latitude in curriculum offerings, the program for individualization would be restricted proportionally to the rigidity of the curriculum. If a plethora of alternatives were made available in both curriculum and organization but the interpersonal dimensions were neglected within a school, then the human behavior component of the system would be the unit of resistance.\textsuperscript{6}

A brief description of each chapter of this study provides the reader with an overview of the total study.

Chapter I is an attempt to describe certain conditions the author has experienced as an educator, especially when consulting in a variety of schools across the country. If the analysis seems somewhat severe it is because the author has chosen to view the extent of innovation from a numerical basis. One might consider two hundred schools on a modular schedule to represent wide-scale adoption of the concept, but when considered as a percentage of all schools in operation, the figure becomes something like one in five-hundred. One must then conclude that modular scheduling as a concept has hardly been considered.\textsuperscript{7} Since no more than perhaps

\textsuperscript{6}The S.O.S. effect as explained here is adapted from Dwight W. Allen's views of restraints on innovation and their causes. See Figure I, page 9.

\textsuperscript{7}Donald Mrdjenovich, "Nationally Prominent Schools Using Modular or Flexible Scheduling," Unpublished paper leading to a doctoral degree at the University of North Dakota, May 1969.
one school in a thousand has really attempted staffing innovations on any scale over time, it seems safe to conclude that little serious thought has gone into using school personnel more effectively.

Chapters II, III, and IV contain the body of this study, and provide a rationale for and a description of a model for more effective staff use.

Chapter V contains a spectrum of staffing models and is designed to provide the reader with a means of comparing differing models of staff utilization.
"But--but anyway," [the radical] suggested, "you will have to admit that times have changed. Couldn't you please try these other more up-to-date activities? Maybe they have some educational value after all?"

The wise old men were indignant. Their kindly smiles faded. "If you had any education yourself," they said severely, "you would know that the essence of true education is timelessness. It is something that endures through changing conditions like a solid rock standing squarely and firmly in the middle of a raging torrent. You must know that there are some eternal verities and the sabertooth curriculum is one of them!" 1

It is difficult to discover a person's reasons for opposing innovation in public education, but frequently there is an expressed naive belief that our present system is based on tried and tested carefully developed, educationally sound programs. Thus why risk something novel when there is security in the conventional? Because of this, the first steps in preparing individuals for change are often viewed as destructive. And perhaps they are destructive in their attempt to explode the myth and expose the present system of public schooling for what it really is; a haphazard and illogical mixture of the ancient, tradi-

tional, and modern without a strong theoretical basis nor compelling rationale.

A more objective understanding of how public schooling became what it is can be useful in determining what it may become. In this chapter the author intends to explain his perception of what is currently happening in schools through the lens of historical perspective. Although the reader will find himself considering the larger picture of public schooling, the purpose behind this exercise is to provide a rationale for changing current staffing patterns. The chapter will question some of the assumptions conventional staffing arrangements are based on by examining how they came into being. A critical look at a staffing model—so familiar that it is no longer even considered a variable of the system—should also provide some direction in the conceptualization of different models which will allow the time and talents of students and teachers to be used more effectively.

A PROFESSIONAL IMAGE?

Poor Richard's Almanac with its pithy sayings about health, wealth and wisdom originated about the same time public tax-supported education was getting itself together in the United States. The pithy sayings and public education have had little in common since. Wealth and wisdom
have not been characteristic of public education, nor has the teaching profession been particularly healthy through the years. In fact, the Ichabod Crane caricature probably more aptly describes the image of today's teacher. They are underpaid, underrated and underneath other professional groups, yet they persevere and look forward to better days.

Each school day more than 1,600,000 teachers come together in more than 110,000 buildings with some 42,800,000 elementary and secondary school children and interact according to sometimes vague, sometimes very specific "rules" laid down by convention. Written or unwritten there is a code of teacher behavior which directs their efforts. That code of behavior has been labeled "teaching", separated from the functions of guidance and instructional leadership, and enforced with all the power capable of being mustered through force of tradition, supervision and legal contract.

On the one hand, there is no American School System, only a vast number of local concerns, each with very different organizational setups and operational patterns. Each system has its own problems, its own defined purposes, and its own unique body of students—each is uniquely affected by a complex set of local, state and national pressures which attempt to influence the way the young people are educated. On the other hand, the American School looms a behemoth, huge in proportion, monolithic and im-
movable.

The American School begins in September and ends in June, with days that start at 8:05 a.m. and end at 3:30 p.m. Within the American School Building one may find rectangular rooms containing twenty to thirty pupils sitting at desks; one teacher; a teacher's desk at the front of the room and a chalkboard. There are textbooks, PTA's and report cards. The similarity of schools is staggering, as though some giant power once stalked the land with enormous dies labeled "elementary" and "secondary" schools. Practices for which there is no clear rationale are found nation-wide and yet the American School System grew like a weed, unbred, unnourished, tough, neglected, prickly, but very persistent.

HISTORICAL PRECEDENCE

Historical precedence of our "haphazard system" is easy to trace. For instance, the Massachusetts School Laws of 1642 called for compulsory education yet did not establish schools. There is the law of 1647, written to thwart public enemy number one of the time, "ye oulde deluder, Satan;" or Horace Mann's seventh report to the Massachusetts Board of Education lauding the Prussian graded school system; or the Boston Law of 1827 which made mandatory the teaching of American History, Algebra, Geo-
metry etc. All of these laws were made in response to problems of another day and age, yet their consequences are with us still.\textsuperscript{2} Public schools are still used to thwart Satan, are still stuck with a graded structure despite volumes of evidence which demonstrates its inappropriateness, and are still paying homage to the 1827 curriculum. Just like the nine-month school year which we inherited from a time when the majority of school children helped with the crops during the summer months, or the 3:30 p.m. closing time, enabling chores to be completed before dark, most of our school laws are not educational laws and are relevant to conditions a century past. They do not reflect current or anticipated problems or knowledge about youth and learning. Thus they are often more harmful to education than the evils which they attempted to rectify.

\textbf{CONDITIONED DISSONANCE}

Public tax-supported education got off to a slow start in this country and has somehow never managed to get its priorities straightened out. The following quotation, now nearly a hundred years old provides a timeless analysis of one of the problems.

There is no vocation that calls for such

mental, moral and emotional expenditure as that of the teacher; none which requires longer or more thorough training before ease and mastery can be attained in it; yet there is nothing in the pay or position of the mass of our teachers... to warrant them in bringing any more to it than they do. The drudgery of the profession, only, is freely open to them, not its prizes."

Blame for the sorry condition of the profession has a way of skipping and lighting in different places. Teachers themselves are frequently put to fault, another culprit is often the school committee or the public they represent, and teacher training institutions also receive their share of the whacks. The truth of the matter shows that the low status of teachers can be attributed to a variety of sources.

Teacher education certainly must take a good share of the blame for it has not provided the profession what could be called brilliant innovative leadership. A very basic problem has been the philosophical stance taken by many teacher trainers.

The selection [training] of new teachers is done by people who are themselves, guardians of the established morality. Teachers and administrators learn to be traditionalists as a result of their involvement in the tradition-preserving activity of schoolwork... It frequently happens, therefore, that in securing a teaching
position, the applicant finds that moral certification is of greater importance than technical competence.\(^4\)

The entire process of teacher education encourages prospective teachers to parrot the behavior of their cooperative teacher, their student teacher supervisor, or a professor in an academic area. Newly trained teachers often view themselves as educational generalists, and tend to view their students collectively—a trait learned from their own mentors. The requirements for certification are time-based, rather than performance based; and teachers from the very beginning of their professional lives learn to equate teaching competence with time spent and courses taken.

Organized teacher-training lagged two-hundred years behind Brother Philemon Pormont’s commission as Boston’s first schoolmaster, but shortly after the establishment of formal teacher training in the 1820’s it became fixated and teacher education is still operating under many of the assumptions that were then current concerning the learning/teaching process and methods of motivating and controlling. Even after the Normal School was established the majority of teachers in those early schools had only slightly more education than their older students. This inadequacy is

reflected in a report on the Massachusetts educational system a century ago.

Not one in seven of all the teachers employed in the State has enjoyed the advantages of a course of training at a normal school. The great majority of the teachers, especially those outside the cities, begin their work with no suitable preparation and leave it before they have had the time to acquire much skill by study and experience. Hence a very large percentage of the people's school money is wasted on imperfectly qualified teachers. There is reason to believe that hundreds and even thousands of the schools in the State are kept by young, inexperienced, and untrained girls, and schools so kept must be comparatively of little value. 5

Today teachers still begin their work in the schools ill-suited for the task because of an often times irrelevant experience in their respective schools of education. Likewise they are also presently leaving the profession before they have time to master the skills of teaching by study and experience. A hundred years ago the answer to the problem was a plan for improving supervision of the schools by establishing superintendents and other "supportive" personnel over the teachers in the schools. Today, the same formula involving a bureaucratic supporting hierarchy is being applied to solve the problem despite the fact that teachers have at least four and often five or six years of college preparation. Even though all teachers have not mastered some of the more important specific skills

of teaching, they are usually as highly educated as their supervisory and administrative superiors who are perhaps equally lacking in teaching competence. This thorny problem will be solved only when the teacher-specialist in given skills or knowledge areas--is dealt with as a competent professional; something possible only in a different arrangement of staff use.

The public must also bear some of the responsibility for the ills of the teaching profession, first for not caring enough and reflecting that care with adequate financial and moral support, and second for not maintaining a constant dialogue with those running the schools.

Since the monetary rewards of a career in education do not exceed a maximum specified amount, and may be attained only by the very small proportion of teachers who leave the classroom to become administrators, material incentives operate only for those with a relatively low level of financial aspiration. Similarly, the role of teacher provides status incentives only for those relatively low on the hierarchy to begin with. Thus a selective recruitment takes place from among those most concerned with the preservation of existing arrangements and from young, single girls--many of whom view teaching as an interval before marriage, or as a companion career to raising a family.

A consequence of this pattern of recruitment is the temporary nature of teachers.... On the average, they remain in their positions less than three years; a small percentage do return, but they do so after an absence of about eight years. They resume teaching, therefore with the
latest classroom techniques (if remembered) of almost a decade past.\textsuperscript{6,7}

Once a teacher has weathered the first three to five years where most of the self-selection and attrition takes place within the ranks, the problems are not all behind; there are few incentives for bearing the cost of further training. Little chance exists for advancement in the role of classroom teacher, so most teachers who are attempting to find a career in the profession begin fighting the battle of watchful waiting and skillful maneuvering so necessary in a system where seniority rather than expertise is the basis for advancement. There are really only three alternatives open to the would-be career teacher; to last the system out by maneuvering into the best possible job and wait to become senior, advance into higher paying more prestigious positions in administration, or leave education for a job with Government or industry. The list of good teachers who have chosen the latter two options is unfortunately a long one.

The indictment against the public for not confronting educators and maintaining a dialogue includes a pretence

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{7}Nasatir, \textit{loc. cit.}, p. 299.
\end{itemize}
of not knowing what is happening. What parent doesn't know that one teacher is far superior to another teacher who obviously is not suited for the job, yet year after year allow the myth to be perpetuated that teachers are identical and interchangeable components of the system? What about the citizen who privately wonders about the rapid turn-over of young teachers in the schools, yet chides teachers when they show signs of dissatisfaction, agitation or increased militancy? This type of benign neglect has added to the ills of the profession.

Teachers themselves must shoulder a large burden of blame for they have immediate access to the levers of change. Overnight they could bring about a revolution in public schooling if they resolve to behave differently the following day in their individual classrooms or in some collective manner. Critics of public schooling since its inception have echoed familiar cries about the irrelevance and inadequacy of the curriculum in the schools yet the teachers, guardians of that sacred curriculum, have turned a deaf ear to those protestations. Among the critics is Adolphe E. Meyer who claims

the daughter of classical renaissance, secondary schooling, had come into being as a refined and liberal creature, eager to cultivate the person, and especially to liberate him from the pedantry of scholasticism. But the idea soon grew arid, and in the end it withered away. What had begun as a high adventure in liberal education descended
into the cant of words and definitions, of grammar and syntax, of rote memory and intellectual surrender. 8

If teachers are to be criticized for resisting changes in the methods and content of their teaching, then administrators must be brought to task for their goal selection. Schools frequently have academic goals inappropriate to the type of student they serve. This may be simply a case of ego involvement on the part of the administrator who wishes "academic excellence", but might also be due to our hanging on to relics of an era past. For example, John I. Goodlad points out that the academy, precursor to today's secondary schools

was intended to prepare boys (girls ultimately were included of course) for college. Preparation for college has remained the prime function of secondary schooling right down to the present, what ever the protestations to the contrary . . . . Some schools with a record of sending ten percent or fewer of their students to college, maintain strictly college preparatory curricula. 9

All too frequently educators allow themselves to believe that drop-outs and failures reflect shortcomings of students rather than irrelevance and inadequacy on the part of the schools. Institutions such as schools are created to fulfill certain needs of an initially clearly defined


population. Ultimately, they come to embrace, for various reasons, a much different population with much more diverse needs to be fulfilled.

Unless the institution is very flexible, or unless it spins off, or society creates essentially new institutions, there will be a growing tension between the institution, its clients, and perhaps even the larger society supporting it. Such is now the condition of the American Secondary School.10

The "haphazard system" administrators find themselves in charge of was at one time more relevant to the needs of the population groups it served. They are now in the awkward position of attempting to educate a diverse and ever-changing student population with problems and expectations much different from those of students a century ago—for that matter even a decade ago! Sadly enough, too few of our educational leaders recognize that the children in their charge will be living most of their adult lives in the first quarter of the twenty-first century.

Every school, no matter where located, is now educating children who will live somewhere else, and who will share a common culture. All of them will be exposed to the complexity and the moral and social ambiguities of a civilization that denies simple answers, ridicules schoolboy maxims and destroys those who have not learned efficient methods of dealing with its technological and social machinery. This is, in great measure, one world, and children who are educated only for life on a Mississippi cotton farm or a mountain hollow are, in a sense, not educated at all. The products of inadequate education are going to live in this world. Chicago is full of school children

10 Ibid.
--and adults--who started the trail of inadequacy in West Virginia or Arkansas; and Alabama is full of angry white men who are frustrated in their failure to understand the political and social background of the forces now marching through their streets. Thus schools must take children from different backgrounds--black, white, Chinese, Mexican-American, poor, rich, urban and suburban--and with different abilities and attitudes, and prepare them for a common culture and common difficulties. . . . It has always been one of the functions of the schools to generate unity out of social and economic diversity, but never before have the stakes been so high. There are few places left for uneducated men.11

MANDATE FOR CHANGE

All of this adds up to a compelling mandate for schools of education, teachers and administrators, and the citizenry at large to examine this thing, the American Public School, and entertain responsible alternatives to the traditional system. It doesn't require that they immediately come up with the right answers; however, it does demand that they begin asking the proper questions!

SCHOOLS ARE FOR CHILDREN

As educational planners begin to rethink how schools should be managed and begin to redesign their organizational structures, they must not lose sight of the fact that schools exist to serve individual children. They

11Peter Schrag, Voices in the Classroom (Boston: Beacon Press, 1965), p. 3.
must recognize the worth of each individual and hold the growth and happiness of each child as most important. They should adopt a creed concerning the nature of their client, the student, which claims;

(1) each individual is a person worthy in his own right,
(2) each child is unique,
(3) a human self becomes a self through the process of interacting and interrelating rather than through unfolding,
(4) the individual learner must be seen as a total organism--active, ongoing, growing,
(5) creativity and uniqueness, based upon a common heritage rather than blind conformity and stereotype are values appropriate for enhancing process.12

THREE DEGREES OF IRRELATION

At present no single element of the total system violates a commitment to these principles more than the staffing component. Teachers are hired to fill "openings." Teaching slots are identified and filled without any direct concern for the individual needs of children. Only rarely can it be demonstrated that a teaching staff is organized to achieve an educational goal at all; more often the prime consideration is administrative convenience. The actual staffing of a school is often three or four times removed from a consideration of the objectives set

forth for the student to achieve. The first degree of remoteness comes into play when teachers are hired to teach a specific subject matter, or grade level, and this takes precedence over all other concerns. It doesn't matter that a number of people who are "teacher of the year" types are available for employment, if they don't label themselves by a subject matter or grade level that corresponds to the label on the empty slot, it is unlikely they will be offered a position with the system. Students take a given brand of English, Social Studies, Math or Science and are given an opportunity to choose from a scant array of electives, which are scarcely more attractive than the required courses, and those courses--that curriculum--defines the extremes of the learning spectrum offered by the school. There is no room for teacher talent found outside that narrow spectrum.

The second degree of remoteness is visible in the procedure for bringing students and teaching resources together. Students are found in groups of twenty-five or thirty, for periods of time fifty minutes long, five or six times a day, five times a week, thirty-six weeks a year. Any teaching style or subject matter organization or desired group configuration departing from this standard must receive special approval from the administration, or not be considered at all. Teachers are forced by the structure to adopt a very limited repertoire of teaching behaviors.
The third degree of remoteness is realized when one teacher quits her job; before some taxpayer discovers that the school is "understaffed," the director of personnel must fill the vacated spot, all the time pretending that the same style of teaching will occur, in the same quantity, and at the same general qualitative level. The assumption is that American History with Mister Smith is the same as with Miss Yonkers or Mister Dahl. We all know that it just isn't so, but we have failed doing anything about it thus far.

The point being made is not one of ridicule; it is merely an attempt to demonstrate how far we have strayed from our commitment to the individual through an inflexible and thoughtless staffing procedure. Seldom is the first level of remoteness considered. We seldom ask what children should be learning, or who should determine what an individual child learns. Public Schools assume such a secure posture; but what do we really know of the skills and knowledge our students will be required to have to be successful in some future society?

Education takes a long time. At the rate of social and technological change we are now experiencing, the world will be very different by the time those now entering school will have entered the adult world. Thus we must look far enough into the future that our designs for education may be adequately attuned to the adult world of those we are about to educate.... Deep doubts beset us about the extent to which our
parents, teachers and noteworthy forebears provide adequate models for emerging man, or even contemporary man.13

The second level of irrelation is also an unexamined assumption, that children learn best in groups of twenty-five or thirty in a traditional six period a day school week, presided over by a teacher. Already, even though traditional scheduling practices are just beginning to be challenged, there are a number of studies which repudiate that assumption.

Haugo (1968), Gallagher (1965) and Boren (1969) all demonstrate that significant achievement gains can be made when teachers team together for instructional purposes. Boren saw higher scores on nine of ten variables tested. Haugo found that when students were instructed in a school with team teaching, variable grouping, and modular scheduling there was significant growth in their ability to interpret reading materials in Social Science, Natural Science and Literature. 85 percent of the students and 70 percent of the teachers involved in his experimental group reported that they preferred a modular schedule to the traditional schedule they had all previously experienced. Other studies such as Speckherd (1967), Cawelti (1968),

Jefferson County, Colorado (1969), Dade County Public Schools, Florida, (1968) and others, are adding to a growing body of data which tells us that there are better ways to structure time, space, and staff than the traditional way we have in the past.\textsuperscript{14} The final illogical act comes when administrators draw from a vast pool of teachers--all unknown quantities--and employ one to fill an empty teaching slot, and give him possession of a classroom. Once behind the security of the closed door, that teacher, good or bad, bright or uninspired, takes control of the instruction for the children in his charge and there is no mechanism for really questioning the quality of his instruction short of dismissing him as a teacher. The traditional model of teacher use does not lend itself to open and non-threatening means of evaluating teacher behavior. Inservice education on a continuous basis is almost unheard of, and seldom do teachers voluntarily open themselves up to constructive criticism from their teaching peers. The self-contained teacher, the self-contained classroom and the self-contained school are obsolete, but we continue to perpetuate that obsolescence by unsound staffing procedures.

\textsuperscript{14}A complete citation for the studies listed in this paragraph will be found in the bibliography. The emphasis of these studies is on flexible scheduling, team teaching and variable grouping, being considered aspects of that concept.
Any model of staff utilization which hopes to provide more attention to educational goals must address itself to the questions raised above and change a very narrow and self-limiting method of employing staff. It must provide for a much wider spectrum of alternative uses of its human resources.
CHAPTER II
BUREAUCRACIES IN THE SERVICE OF REPRESSION

Most educators are willing to admit that there are fundamental and deep-seated problems in the current model employed to staff most of our public schools across the nation. Many professional organizations, from teacher organizations to administrative or school board associations, have publicly called for sweeping changes in staffing patterns; yet, none are providing viable alternatives. Organizations such as the National Education Association have spent a large amount of money and effort in supporting certain changes in selected facets of the present organizational setup, but few have really taken a close look at the larger picture and come up with a comprehensive blueprint for change.

It would be misleading to say that over the past decade no changes have taken place. There have been a number of visible attempts to alter the traditional staffing pattern; in most cases, however, the attempt has been so localized in nature or so insignificant when compared to the staffing pattern of public schools at large, its total impact has scarcely been felt. One such attempt to change traditional staffing patterns which has had massive financial support both through federal funding and
the backing of professional organizations is the use of paraprofessionals and teacher-aides to relieve teachers from many of their non-professional duties and allow them to spend more of their time in instructional roles. The use of these aides has received a good deal of attention in professional journals and popular magazines, and one might be led to believe that implementation of the concept has been accomplished. When one visits a national sample of school districts, however, and enters the classroom where teacher-aides and paraprofessionals might be found, evidence for such a belief is lacking. In fact, a rather careful questioning of teachers in the schools gives the impression that the use of aides is still viewed as a luxury available to only the more affluent school districts. It appears the integration of the teacher-aide or paraprofessional as a standard aspect of a public school staffing pattern still lies a number of years off. Many "innovators" appear on the roster of verbal commitment, but few have been capable of transferring that commitment to the pragmatics of the classroom.¹

A student in search of a functioning staffing model significantly different from the one found in most tradi-

¹Based on observations made in at least 36 schools in 15 states. Some educators make token attempts at innovations, such as adding two or three paraprofessionals to a staff of sixty regular teachers, and then claim to have implemented the concept.
tional schools, (see Figure 5, Page 95), is hard pressed. This traditional staffing pattern, which grew out of educational innovations of the nineteenth century, holds us in a vise-like grip and is dominating our attempts at both conceptualization and development of newer more relevant models. One needs only to list the most recent developments in thinking concerning staffing alternatives: Merit or incentive pay, the use of paraprofessionals, community volunteers, team teaching, teaching internships, differentiated staffing and so on; most of these go no further in imagination than expanding and reinforcing the traditional staffing structure. They are based on the same assumptions about human motivation and human behavior as the traditional staffing pattern, and usually merely expand the pyramidal structure of a bureaucratic model downward. (See Figure 6, Page 97). A line or vertical hierarchy is strengthened, the horizontal or staff differentiation is expanded somewhat and the bureaucratic structure is extended to encompass the non-professionals in the system. The basic structure of educational organization which grew out of the work of classical organizational theorists remains unchallenged!

It is no secret that the traditional model of staff use, so familiar in public education, was derived primarily from the study of models of a much earlier age. The military and the Catholic Church were the models from which
classical theorists drew generalizations and formed theory which is now extant in pyramidal bureaucratic staffing arrangements. Concerning this piece of information, Douglas McGregor says:

It is a plausible idea that there should be universal principles of organization, and that they could be derived from the study of such old and successful institutions. However, if there are universal principles common to all forms of organizations, it is now apparent that they are not the ones derived by classical theorists from the Church and the military.²

The world we live in today only slightly resembles the one in which classical theorists formed their organizational models. The political, social and economic factors which shape and influence managerial practices of social organizations differ from those of a half century ago. The standard of living, the educational level of the citizenry, the explosion of knowledge which has taken place in all fields of technological life, profoundly influence organizational behavior. It is unfortunate that many of the individuals who presently occupy positions of influence as educational leaders fail to recognize that the present staffing structure is based on assumptions about human behavior which more and more are being invalidated.

Knowledge accumulated during recent decades challenges and contradicts assumptions which

---

are still axiomatic in conventional organization theory. Unfortunately, those classical principles of organization—derived from inappropriate models, unrelated to the political, social, economic and technological milieu, and based on erroneous assumptions about behavior—continue to influence our thinking about the management of human resources.  

TRAVELING DOWN A WRONG-WAY STREET

It is ironic that we in education can be so far out of step with contemporary thinking in the area of organizational theory. In an era when leading industrial research organizations are finding a bureaucracy inadequate and inappropriate to the life of those organizations, we are developing a stronger and more rigid bureaucracy. During an era where the watchword of teachers and students is "the individual," we are, according to Warren G. Bennis, adopting a "social instrument in the service of repression [which] treats man's ego and social needs as a constant or as a nonexistent or inert."  

Bennis further says that the nature of the environment determines the degree to which a bureaucratic structure is inappropriate.

Bureaucracy thrives in a highly competitive, undifferentiated, and stable environment, such as the climate of its youth, the Industrial Revolution. A pyramidal structure of authority, with power concentrated in the hands of a few

---

3Ibid., p. 18.

with the knowledge and resources to control an entire enterprise was, and is, an eminently suitable social arrangement for routinized tasks . . . A major shock to bureaucracy has been caused by the predicted demise of bureaucracy and to the collapse of management as we know it now. 5

Although Bennis was writing of the organization of management in industry, his comments are applicable to education since the models of staff utilization are so similar. Adapting to a rapidly changing environment is just as much a requirement of public education as it is of industry. This lack of adaptivity in educational staffing structures, as Bennis predicts, is precipitating a collapse of educational management which at present is not terribly visible, but well under way nevertheless. More will be said about this breakdown later, but first let us examine the major components of a bureaucratic organization.

A bureaucratic organization has been characterized as one having:

1. A division of labor based on functional specialization,
2. a well-defined hierarchy of authority,
3. a system of rules covering the rights and duties of employees,
4. characteristics of impersonality,
5. promotion based on technical competence. 6

Under the traditional bureaucratic hierarchical staffing

5Ibid., p. 9.

organization, there is a clearly defined strategy of power which can be illustrated by the following principles:

1. There must be distinct lines of authority stretching from the base of the organizational pyramid to its zenith.

2. Each individual in the organization knows to whom he is subordinate and over whom he is superordinate—a chain of command is clearly established.

3. Each supervisor has a circumscribed area of responsibility, usually defined in writing.

4. The authority at the top of each organizational structure is one hundred percent accountable for the acts of his subordinates.

5. The degree of dependence increases as one moves downward on the pyramid; and as dependence on the part of subordinates increases, so does control on the part of superiors.\(^7\)

In this traditional staffing configuration the superior controls the actions of those for whom he is responsible, usually this "controlling" is fairly covert, but there nevertheless. It is accomplished by:

1. Continually "sensing" what is going on throughout the organization.

2. Continually collecting data on the activities of his subordinates.

3. Continually issuing directives, (or asking line to do so) to correct any negative conditions.

4. Continually analyzing data and comparing it to predetermined standards defined to judge whether the organization is doing well or not.

\(^7\)L. Reed Tripp (ed.), Industrial Productivity, IRRA Proceedings (December, 1951), pp. 90-91.
5. Sensing the results of the controlling actions, and initiating a controlling cycle over again.  

In the next chapter this writer will attempt to demonstrate that an organization based on the strategies of power listed above and using the controlling devices mentioned there also is unlikely to be very successful in achieving its major objectives efficiently over time. In education where objectives are to a large degree value oriented this is especially the case.

The first attempt at scientific management tended to view organizations as if they existed without people, but through the work of individuals like Emile Durkheim, Max Weber, Frederick Taylor, and Karl Mannheim, a classical theory of organization was developed, in reaction against "the personal subjugation, nepotism, cruelty, emotional vicissitudes and subjective judgment which passed for managerial practices in the early days of the Industrial Revolution." Bureaucracy, a social invention which was based on certain assumptions, generalizations, and hypotheses about human behavior, relied exclusively on the power to influence through reason and law. As a result of these assumptions the use of authority and power as a means of controlling behavior became absolute. Elaborate

---

8 Ibid.

9 Bennis, loc. cit., pp. 4-5.
designs came into being to insure certain behaviors on the part of employees as well as their managers and thus coordination by hierarchy, unity of command, staff and line distinctions, delegation and span of control became characteristics of the bureaucratic organization.

Authority as a means of controlling behavior is effective only when there is the ability to enforce it through the use of punishment. Military organizations have the court martial to enforce the authority of the line command—backed up by a possible ultimate death sentence. The Church has its equivalent in the ecclesiastical courts which may suffer an offender to be excommunicated from membership—a spiritual form of the ultimate sentence of death. Both have been highly effective in the use of authority. The industrial bureaucratic structure of a half a century ago, had in the threat of dismissal—the specter of unemployment—a form of punishment which made the authoritative control extremely effective. As will be shown in another chapter, the loss of authority as an absolute means of controlling behavior has rendered the bureaucratic organization relatively ineffective in current industrial conditions and is requiring the development of other organizational patterns.

Just as Weber designed bureaucracy to guarantee certain workable conditions to combat the evils of industrialism, his contemporaries in public education adopted a
standard staffing, advancement and reward system, with controls and communication processes copied from the industrial model, to insure certain types of behavior from individuals working in the public schools. It is now becoming apparent that the work of organizational behavioralists, such as Kurt Lewin, Chester Bernard, Herbert Simon, Chrys Argyris, Rensis Likert, Douglas McGregor and others, while having a major impact on industrial models of staff use, have not yet made much of a dent in the classical organizational thinking of educators.

Referring back to the characteristics of a bureaucracy listed on page 36, it is interesting to note that several of the staffing innovations presently being attempted in a few places around the country are really only just now bringing the educational bureaucratic structure into full flower. Of the 69 school districts which submitted a prospectus to the U. S. Office of Education's Leadership Training Institute for More Effective School Personnel Utilization in October, 1969, none developed a proposal which departed to any marked degree from those characteristics of a standard bureaucratic model. All districts had a well defined hierarchy of authority and a system of rules and procedures which demonstrated classical controlling strategies, but only the more avant-garde proposers defined any significant functional specialism in their role descriptions. Only a few of the districts represented at
that institute submitted plans of an organizational structure where promotion was based on technical competence. During the institute it became obvious to this writer that staffing innovations in public education during the next decade will be limited to those creating a stronger more rigid bureaucratic structure, based on assumptions about human behavior which are no longer valid, unless creative alternatives can soon be developed. For that reason it is essential that the hegemony of classical organizational thinking be broken if more relevant models, based on valid assumptions about human nature, are to be forthcoming.

10 The author served as a reader for the prospecti submitted to the MESPU Leadership Training Institute.
CHAPTER III

AN ORGANIC-ADAPTIVE STAFFING MODEL

Since the turn of this century, social scientists have been developing a body of knowledge concerning the nature of organizations. From their studies a growing number of organizational theories are emerging. Educators interested in applying this information to the organization of schools have tended to view the work of these social scientists chronologically. The earliest period of work done by the German, Max Weber, the American, Frederick Taylor, and the Frenchman, Henri Fayol is often labeled "The Era of Scientific Management." These scholars developed principles of organization grounded in a desire for technological efficiency. In their organization the worker was viewed as "a passive instrument capable of performing work."¹

The "Human Relations Movement" began in the late 1920's with the work of Elton Mayo, Fritz Roethlisberger and others; from their efforts came the famous Western Electric Studies at the Hawthorn plant in Chicago. During this period much more emphasis was placed on the human element. Variables such as satisfaction, worker participation, cooperation, group cohesiveness and morale became more important to the

¹James G. March and Herbert A. Simon, Organizations (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1958) p. 6
studies. Whereas the preceding era might be characterized as "structuralist", the "Human Relations Movement" was in a sense, "antistructuralist."²

Beginning in the 1950's the present "New Administration Era" emerged, wedding the work of the two earlier periods. One of the goals of organizational theorists of present is to systemize and integrate what we now know about various types of administration. The "New Era" has a behavioral viewpoint, and is concerned about the behavior of people in organizational settings.

The objective of this chapter is to draw a theoretical framework from the latest organizational studies to guide the development of a model of staff use. An effort will be made to present the framework in a light which is meaningful to the educational practitioner. This framework should also be an important reference point for the skeptic and critic of the model being developed; until the model is implemented and tested the only sources of validation are intuitive judgments and the theory upon which the model is based.

From the theoretical framework a model will be developed which is relevant to current and anticipated needs of the schools. Hopefully this model will satisfy the demands made of it by the rationale developed in the previous

BASIC ASSUMPTIONS

The theory behind an Organic-Adaptive staffing pattern represents a dramatic shift from the theoretical framework of a traditional bureaucratic staffing model. "The shift... is from the individual to cooperative group effort, from delegated to shared responsibility, from antagonistic arbitration to problem solving."³ Perhaps most significant in the characteristics of an Organic-Adaptive model are the assumptions upon which the model is based. Chris Argyris claims that these assumptions are the controlling factors of the future growth and development of an institution adopting a new organizational pattern.

All formal organizations are 'born' with a particular 'heredity' or strategy implanted by their creators. This strategy is characterized by the 'genes' of intellective rationality, specialization, centralization of power, control, and information. As each of these 'genes' influences the growth of the organization, it tends to create a social system that operates by holding some fundamental assumptions...⁴


The genotype of the Organic-Adaptive staffing model can best be described by listing the assumptions in McGregor's Theory Y; these are to become the 'genes' which influence the growth of the staffing model, and control the operation of the resulting social system. Theory Y is based on the following assumptions about people's behavior:

- The expenditure of physical and mental effort in work is as natural as play or rest.
- External control and threat of punishment are not the only means for bringing about effort toward organizational objectives. Man will exercise self-direction and self-control in the service of objectives to which he is committed.
- Commitment to objectives is a function of the rewards associated with their achievement.
- The average human being learns, under proper conditions, not only to accept but to seek responsibility.
- The capacity to exercise a relatively high degree of imagination, ingenuity and creativity in the solution of organizational problems is widely, not narrowly, distributed in the population.
- Under the conditions of modern industrial life, the intellectual potentialities of the average human being are only partially utilized.5

To this list of assumptions about human behavior a number of assumptions about the factors which motivate man must be added. Here Maslow has been influential.6 Man is

5McGregor, loc. cit., p. 35
a peculiar animal, with an unique inherent structure of need-fulfillment. As soon as one of the needs on his hierarchy of needs is satisfied, another appears in its place. This process is continuous—unending from birth to death. Man's life-space is spent in a continual effort of need-fulfillment. Assuming the following hierarchy of human needs, taken from McGregor, it is possible to make some considered decisions about human motivation:

SELF-FULFILMENT NEEDS

EGOISTIC NEEDS

SOCIAL NEEDS

SAFETY NEEDS

PHYSIOLOGICAL NEEDS

According to McGregor's Theory Y, if a need lower down on the hierarchy is unfulfilled, all other needs become inoperative. As an example, when one is without food and shelter, the necessities for maintaining life, he will risk danger, social castigation and disregard the other needs higher on the hierarchy to fulfill those more immediate for physiological well being. However, once that lower need is sufficiently satisfied it will become inoperable as a factor of motivation for that particular organism. A man who has satisfied his physiological and security needs is motivated to act by opportunities to fulfill social or egoistic or other needs of a higher order. This
basic tenet of a theory of motivation carries significant implications for the structuring of a staffing model.\footnote{McGregor, \textit{loc. cit.}, pp. 39-41.}

These assumptions about human behavior represent a very large philosophical difference between an Organic-Adaptive and classical model of staff use. An understanding of this philosophical difference is essential if the reader is to understand this model, for this crucial difference becomes invisible as we begin to define and represent the model schematically.

STRUCTURAL CHARACTERISTICS

The Organic-Adaptive model of staff use has two structural characteristics, taken from a description of the organization Bennis predicts for the future. These are Reciprocity and Adaptability. Reciprocity is a process of mutual compliance which mediates the conflicts arising between the goals of individual workers and the goals of the organization. Peter Drucker\footnote{Peter F. Drucker, "Integration of People and Planning," \textit{Harvard Business Review}, Vol. XXXIII, No. 6 (November-December, 1955).} and Douglas McGregor\footnote{McGregor, \textit{loc. cit.}, pp. 50-57.} deal with these conflicts through a concept they call Integration. Integration carries the implication that an organization will, over time, be more effective in achieving
its economic objectives if significant attention is given to each individual in the organization to see that his personal needs and goals are met. McGregor claims that to achieve integration in an organization is to create a situation in which the individual can achieve his goals best by directing his attention and personal efforts toward the objectives of the enterprise.

It is interesting to note that managers in industrial firms which do not value reciprocity (integration) as part of the social structure are spending millions of dollars to convince employees that their welfare is intimately tied up with the success and welfare of the company. In fact, they are admonishing workers to follow orders, and work hard in order to protect their jobs. Behind this admonishment lies the expectation that the objectives of the organization have priority over the objectives of the individual employees of the organization. Perhaps the effort and money could be better used to determine exactly what the personal needs of the employees are and then to negotiate existing conflicts between the personal goals of the individual and the institutional goals of the organization.

The Organic-Adaptive model defines reciprocity (integration) as a basic part of the social structure of the organization. The second part of Bennis' definition of the organization of the future, adaptability, includes the organization's ability to adapt to, and shape the external environ-
ment. Later in the chapter a good deal of attention will be given to the requirement that an organization be adaptive. Perhaps here it would suffice to point out the nature of governance of an organization—the means for arriving at decisions—determines the degree to which, and the speed with which, an organization can indeed adapt to and shape an ever-changing environment. Bennis argues that characteristic of a bureaucracy is an authoritarian decision-making structure, and that this authoritarian structure is highly non-adaptive. He believes that a bureaucracy seems most likely to flounder on its inability to adapt to rapid changes in the environment, and that

for simple tasks under static conditions, an autocratic centralized structure, such as has characterized most industrial organizations in the past, is quicker, neater, and more efficient. But for adaptability to changing conditions, for rapid acceptance of a new idea, for flexibility in dealing with novel problems, generally high morale and loyalty ... the more egalitarian or decentralized type seems to work better.10

Thus adaptability becomes a critical requirement of the organization which wishes to survive in a complex and ever-changing environment; it is thus an integral part of the social organization of the Organic-Adaptive staffing model.

As "division of labor, specialization, well defined rules, procedures, and authority hierarchies" characterize

a bureaucracy, "reciprocity and adaptability" characterize the Organic-Adaptive staff.

The social structure in organizations of the future will have some unique characteristics. The key word will be 'temporary'; there will be adaptive, rapidly changing temporary systems. These will be organized around problems to be solved. The problems will be solved by groups of relative strangers who represent a set of diverse professional skills. The groups will evolve in response to the problem rather than programmed role expectations. The function of the 'executive' thus becomes coordinator or 'linking pin' between various project groups. He must be a man who can speak the diverse languages of research and who can relay information and mediate among the groups. People will be differentiated not vertically according to rank and role but flexibly according to skill and professional training.

Adaptive, temporary systems of diverse specialists, solving problems, linked together by coordinating and task evaluative specialists in organic flux, will gradually replace bureaucracy as we know it.\[10\]

"A temporary system of diverse specialists" represents a rather radical departure from the traditional structure of educational organizations. Educators have developed a habit of linear thinking. They have learned to think of units, courses, grade levels, and role definitions which are linear in nature—stretching across a sixteen week semester or over an academic year. They have also developed an operational pattern which might be described as parallel unilateral movement, where each individual is, for all intents and purposes, autonomous from the others in the or-

---

ganization once the classroom door is closed. What we have then is a staff of basically independent teaching units, supposedly seeking similar externally prescribed goals, yet acting without concert. Because of the parallel behavior and unilateral decision-making characteristics of a traditional staffing setup, it has been necessary for the administrator to perform a coordinating function, correlating the independent actions of each autonomous teacher. As a result, decision-making and problem solving at the organizational level tends also to be a unilateral function carried out by the chief administrator. Obviously the requirements of a synergy have not been met!

A 'temporary system of diverse specialists' breaks across the parallel autonomy of the traditional structure, and eliminates a linear conception of role definition. Problem solving and goal achievement become the constant, and staffing patterns the variable—exactly opposite the traditional arrangement.

The superiority of group-problem-solving over individual attempts might be demonstrated by quoting statements ranging from "two heads are better than one," to statements made by Piaget which indicate that it is precisely by constant inter-change of thought with others that we are able to see ourselves in perspective and to conserve the per-
manent meaning of concepts. Stanley Cobb points out that the mechanism of thinking can be understood if one conceives of two nervous systems in relation to each other. And Clovis R. Shepherd, who defines a group as "two or more people interacting," considers the small group as "an essential mechanism of socialization and a primary source of social order . . . and the major source of the values and attitudes people have. . . ." It seems unnecessary to further point out the variety of ways group problem-solving lends itself to better and more creative choices in the decision-making process; however, there are studies which demonstrate that certain types of group structures are more effective than others in terms of the products they may arrive at. In an experiment made at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the effects were studied of certain differing organizational patterns on problem solving by groups. One of the two organizational structures investigated was described as being wheel-like, where communication was directed along the spokes interaction was traced from the rim, across the radius to the hub,

---


and then again out to the rim. Situated at the hub was the leader of the group. The other group was structured like a circle. There was no central person in the hub, and communication proceeded around the circumference, never being mediated by a group "leader". (See figure 2, page 54.) The results of these experiments demonstrated that for simple tasks, the wheel-like structure, where problem solving was directed by the person in the hub, was clearly superior to the circle. (Conventional evaluation criteria were used to evaluate the performance of the two groups—such as speed, clarity of organization, parsimonious use of paper, etc.) When a different set of criteria was used to evaluate the experiment, (which was deemed by the experimenting group to be more relevant to organizations in a dynamic fluid environment), such as degree of flexibility or creativeness, two interesting phenomena were observed: First, the rapid acceptance of a new idea occurred more frequently in the circle structure than in the wheel-like arrangement; second, when another task was adopted, different than the original task required of both groups, the circle-like structure adapted more quickly in developing a "new code" for solving the new problem.15

It is not certain that the controls in the experiment

GROUP STRUCTURES

Figure 2

Wheel-like

Circle
were sophisticated enough to hold constant a specific type of leadership style—somewhat authoritarian—in the wheel-like structure, or whether it was possible to keep an authority figure from emerging in the circle-like configuration; however, from this and other studies it is possible to make some generalizations about decentralized decision-making.

DECISION MAKING CHARACTERISTICS

One apparent generalization from Leavitt's study attests that the immediate purpose of the organization, the objective at hand, should determine the nature of the decision-making process employed.

The purpose of organization is to clarify and distribute responsibility and authority among individuals and groups in an orderly fashion consistent with the purposes of the institution. The structure of the institution is determined by the nature of its decision-making process and the organization of the institution should be established to provide for the most effective operation of this process.17

Adding to these ideas, the institution must not only be adaptable to external pressures in the environment, it must also contain the flexibility to change internal operations as the goals of the institution change.

16 See p. 49

An Organic-Adaptive staff allows many different formats of decision-making to take place. Occasionally even the most authoritarian form might be manifest—if the particular objective at hand called for that form—however, the mode would likely be one of decentralized, democratic problem solving through temporarily constructed groups of specialists.

Decentralized decision-making has long been a goal of even the most traditional school administrator, but the actual diffusion of authority has always run into some tough problems inherent in the conventional staffing arrangement. Undoubtedly many administrators have given lip service to the democratization of leadership, or even made attempts to diffuse decision-making on a limited scale because they recognized the inherent inconsistency in governing the Public School—an institution which is dedicated to perpetuating the American ideals of democracy, egalitarianism, and development of human potential—in an autocratic manner. Others could probably find other academic reasons for attempting a more democratic operation. Their operation might take on the rationale that "potential leaders must learn to assume responsibilities," or "those closer to the situation can make the best decisions." For whatever reasons the administrator would like to decentralize decision-making, two characteristics of the bureaucratic organization always seems to destroy his
otherwise good intentions. The first and most pervasive of these is the underlying assumption concerning human behavior on which a bureaucracy is constructed. This assumption McGregor calls Theory X. The second is an equation found in bureaucracies which states authority must equal responsibility.

Theory X, as McGregor reduces it to its major assumptions of human nature, looks like this:

* The average human being has an inherent dislike of work and will avoid it if he can.

* Because of this human characteristic . . . ., most people must be coerced, controlled, directed, threatened with punishment to get them to put forth effort toward the achievement of organizational objectives.

* The average human being prefers to be directed, wishes to avoid responsibility, has relatively little ambition, and wants security above all.18

According to McGregor, "the principles of organization which comprise the bulk of the literature of management could only have been derived from assumptions such as those of Theory X."19

A Philosophy of management based on these assumptions, cannot long tolerate a situation where authority is truly decentralized before "controls" in the form of a constant flow of detailed information received, and "second guessing"


19 Ibid.
the decisions of subordinates are implemented.

When the administrator is asked why he reacts to decentralization in this manner the response is often, "I am held responsible, so I have to know what is going on." In most cases he would not recognize the inconsistency of his actions or examine the assumptions about human behavior which are implicit in the actions. With the one hand he delegates; with the other, he acts to nullify the delegation. This brings us to the second classical principle of organization which restricts the decentralizing tendencies of administrators—that authority must equal responsibility.

The upper-level manager who holds to Theory X can usually accept the idea of delegation, but when he puts it into action he is faced with a loss of the control on which his whole conception of management is based. He is helpless before the possibility that poor decisions may be made; productivity may drop, things may get out of hand. Since he lacks genuine confidence in his subordinates, these fears are real.

Fortunately, as he usually discovers, there is a way out of the dilemma. He can delegate and yet keep control. He need not rely on authority in the direct sense if he can assign to someone else the responsibility (1) for making sure his subordinates stay within policy limits and (2) for collecting and providing him with data which will enable him to know what is happening in time to step in before serious trouble arises.

Accordingly, he begins to use staff groups ... to develop and administer a system of managerial controls... The staff have now become policemen, exercising by proxy the direct authority which was "relinquished" by the line.20

---

20 Ibid., p. 149
The Organic-Adaptive concept of staff use rejects the classical principle of authority equaling responsibility. First of all, as indicated in the previous chapter, controlling human behavior through authority is no longer a realistic premise, because in our present society absolute authority is no longer attainable. With the growth of protective legislation, unemployment compensation, mobility of the working force, and collective bargaining, the means for enforcing authority—punishment by termination of employment—has become rather ineffective. Secondly, and of equal importance, since control through authority is no longer possible, it is time we faced reality and recognize that it is impossible to hold an administrator responsible for the accomplishment of objectives when he does not control the relevant factors of the situation.

The Organic-Adaptive model of organization, assuming certain characteristics of human behavior, equates responsibility with self-control within the group problem-solving structure. McGregor points out that when individuals are operating in an organization which is based on the principle of reciprocity, where the achievement of the institution's goals best helps the individual worker to achieve his own personal goals, and coercion is no longer a motivating factor, it is possible to diffuse both authority for decision-making and the responsibility or accountability for the subsequent action on the decision. The Organic-
Adaptive model which has a clustered rather than a pyramidal hierarchal structure, places authority and responsibility with the cluster of specialists who have temporarily been brought together for a specific purpose. Since the cluster in typical situations would have the internal structure similar to the circle in figure 2, (page 54), the participants of the cluster would share jointly in the decision-making process, and collectively assume accountability for the actions of the group. No other person or groups of persons in the organization would share in those responsibilities. Concerning this rather unique arrangement, McGregor says,

the requirement that authority must equal responsibility is not only impossible to fulfill; it is logically unnecessary except within a system which makes authority the exclusive means of influence.\textsuperscript{21}

He also comments on the new relationship of "superiors" and "subordinates" once this debilitating equation of responsibility and authority is removed. He paints a picture of collegial-interaction among professionals once the hierarchical structure has been replaced, and calls the new association a professional-client relationship.

The professional-client relationship is an interdependent one in which neither typically exercises authority over the other although there is influence

\textsuperscript{21}Ibid., p. 159
in both directions. The managerial client is dependent on the specialized knowledge and skill of the professional, but if he attempts to get the help he needs by authoritative methods he will defeat his purposes. It is not possible to obtain by command the imaginative, creative effort which distinguishes the competent professional from the glorified clerk.\(^2\)

**RESOURCE UTILIZATION**

When an environment is established which allows ideas to be fully and honestly considered without regard to the status of the author of the idea, a whole new world of available resources opens up to the organization. The individual who was formerly valuable to the institution only because of particular physical skill he lent to the operation of his particular function suddenly becomes a valuable additional conceptualizer and planner. His ingenuity and creativity are liberated from the shackles of subordination, to put it rather melodramatically. A good deal more psychic energy will thus be brought to the solving of problems by all members of a problem solving group. This was one of the striking points William F. Whyte saw in the studies of Joseph Scanlon.\(^3\) The Scanlon Plan which grew from his studies deemphasizes the subordinate/superior relationships in an enterprise and as part of the formal

---

\(^2\)Ibid., p. 173

organization of the institution provides an opportunity for every member to contribute his brains and ingenuity as well as his physical effort to the improvement of organizational effectiveness. Coupled with an unique form of cost-reduction-sharing, this plan incorporates motivational factors which appeal to the egoistic and self-fulfillment needs of an individual as well as those lower order needs which can only be satisfied off the job when the pay check is cashed.

The clustered structure of an Organic-Adaptive staffing model is based on aspects of the Scanlon Plan. Since these temporary clusters of problem solvers are brought together for a specific purpose, the composition of the cluster must be such that the required resources necessary for solving the problem are present. The composition of the group obviously would include individuals with diverse specialties, ranging from clerical or secretarial ability, technical skill and various modes of media, subject area expertise, competence in a specific mode of instruction; to various abilities in managerial or administrative roles. Regardless of their specialties, the individuals clustered together temporarily for a specific purpose, would each have an equal opportunity to provide relevant input into decision-making and subsequent action. Obviously under varying circumstances not all members of the group would choose to exert equal influence on the process or product, but the
decision would be theirs.

POWER STRATEGIES

The discussion of the actual operation of the clustered model raises the question of consistency and continuity. How for example, in an organization where there is no centralized authority or accountability, is direction maintained? Who coordinates the interaction of "clusters"? How is the composition of the clusters determined in the first place? How is evaluation performed? Before these and other questions about the Organic-Adaptive staff can be answered, it is necessary to clarify one essential point; an understanding of the operation of this model requires a shift in one's frame of reference concerning the behavior of human beings in organizations. Once an individual agrees with the assumptions listed in McGregor's Theory Y, it is necessary to re-think traditional policies of power, control, responsibility, accountability, management and decision-making, otherwise any organizational schema developed would merely be putting old wine in new bottles. Once the assumptions in Theory Y are made the basis of a new organizational structure, concepts such as decentralization, management by objectives, consultative supervision, democratic leadership, and collegial interaction cease being hollow rhetoric and become possible new strategies for or-
ganizing human resources.

In an Organic-Adaptive staff, based on the assumptions of Theory Y, using temporary clusters of problem-solving specialists as the organizational unit, one will find a strategy of power much different from the traditional line and staff hierarchy of organization. The following principles illustrate this new strategy:

1. In an Organic-Adaptive model there is little or no linear approach to authority. Instead, one finds at a given point in time a number of problem-solving clusters, each autonomous from the other as far as power to control one another is concerned. The only bodies to have direct influence (not control) on these problem solving clusters are the Senate Cluster and the Managerial Cluster. The former has the task of defining priorities—establishing which problems should consume the limited resources—and then turning the actual job of finding solutions over to the appropriate cluster of personnel. The latter coordinates the flow of information between clusters of decision-makers.

2. Subordinate-superior relationships are discouraged except when established for a specific purpose. (Perhaps where simple tasks needed to be accomplished very quickly the cluster would decide to operate for a time under the direct subordination of one of their members chosen to administer the task.) There is no chain of command since leadership is collegial and elective, and since mem-
bership in the cluster is constantly changing as the task at hand changes, the individual will find himself constantly fluctuating in and out of collegial, superior and subordinate roles.

3. Accountability will be found in many different places in the clustered organizational structure as opposed to the pyramidal structure where the individual at the apex is accountable for the actions of all subordinates. One cluster might be established to budget the institution's funds. If their decisions were exposed to public or collegial criticism, that cluster alone would account for those decisions. Another cluster might be organized to bring up to a predetermined standard the reading skills of all slow readers in a school. Another might assume the task of providing students with a formal learning opportunity in ecology studies. Regardless what task they are performing, a cluster is accountable to itself. Accountability is diffused literally, and no coordinating or priority-setting cluster could assume or be held responsible for another cluster's activities.

4. Individuals and clusters of individuals take upon themselves areas of responsibility and degrees of accountability which vary a great deal within the organization. There are basically three modes of organizing personnel into action clusters. The first of these is a self-select mode where the individual himself chooses to or-
ganize a cluster of specialists to undertake a specific function. The second is a peer-select mode where colleagues within a cluster request additional or different personnel to help them accomplish a defined task; they may split into new problem solving groups to accommodate a perceived need among students or staff. The third mode is a Senate-select mode where the Senate Cluster, whose task it is to look out for institutional priorities selects personnel and organizes clusters to accomplish certain objectives. All this may be contrasted to other forms of staff-use where personnel functions are determined by static charts or rigid job descriptions.

5. Evaluation of program and personnel is done within the various clusters. Collegial relationships decrease the need for control as well as the tendency to dependency. In an organization where individuality is stressed above conformity, and interpersonal competence is valued higher than technical competence it is likely that controlling activities would take the form of self-control, self-evaluation, descriptive nonevaluative feedback from colleagues, and cooperative peer influence commonly found in small group settings.

The points listed in the five paragraphs above demon-
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24Argyris, loc. cit., p. 18. Nonevaluative feedback describes a relationship without placing a value judgment on it.
strate some of the distinct differences between an Organic-Adaptive and a Bureaucratic model of organization. Authority and accountability are diffused, and the equation "authority = responsibility" has been erased since neither are constant within a cluster or to the individual. The requirement in a bureaucratic organization of "function following form" is flip-flopped to a large extent, in the Organic-Adaptive structure where function generates form, and new forms, in turn, give birth to attractive more effective means of using the available resources. Thus an advantage can be seen in maximizing alternatives so that a wide range of options are available to students and teaching personnel as they go about selecting means for goal achievement. Alternative means and options are not really part of a school's vocabulary that is organized around a bureaucratic model.

A disadvantage of the Organic-Adaptive staffing model, if not fully understood and incorporated into an outgoing training program, is the requirement of effective human relationships within all parts of the organization. In a traditional structure the only important relationships that are defined by the institution are those which appear on organizational charts and in manuals. In the Organic-Adaptive structure good interpersonal relationships are essential. It is this requirement which convinces the author that his model is one of the future and not likely to be
implemented until better means are worked out for preparing personnel in the area of interpersonal competence.

Classical bureaucratic structures wink at the problem of developing people with better interpersonal competence and pretend that rules, regulations and reward systems which require logical behavior will cause subordinates to be more competent in interpersonal relations. Argyris disagrees:

It is not necessarily true that if rules are stated clearly, interpersonal confusion is minimized. In the world of the pyramid structure, clearly defined relations can create problems, especially for the subordinates who tend to experience a world full of clearly defined rules and regulations as a world tending toward rigidity and increasingly requiring submissiveness.25

The bureaucratic staffing model assumes that an individual's behavior is governed by explicit logical thinking; the clustered staffing model hopes for and encourages rational thinking, but assumes that human nature is somewhat illogical. It is interesting to note the ironic fact that traditional models, which emphasize rationality, planning, etc., fail to adhere to their own advice in dealing with the emotional dimension of human beings—that is—they are irrational in dealing with human irrationality. The clustered model of staff use attempts to recognize the emotional non-rational aspect of man, and allow for it within the

structure of the organization. Through a measure of reciprocity the clustered model attempts to bend the objectives and circumstances of the organization to a degree which will allow a larger measure of individuality and "non-rational" behavior from among the participants in the organization.

In a bureaucracy the leader's position gives him the responsibility of major problem solving and decision-making. His authority to act is based on the mantle of position he wears as much as on his actual competence. A classical example of the power of position is found in the role of rank in the military.

One of the most important things a new recruit in military basic training learns is that 'you salute the uniform not the man.' A bureaucratic organization incorporates impersonality to the extent that the individual learns to relate to superiors and subordinates in the authority structure as the embodiments of roles, not as whole human beings. If a man has the right to wear certain insignia of rank, you salute the insignia, the symbol of rationality, of graded and systematized authority, not the man wearing it. And you expect--demand even--stylized deference by subordinates to the symbol of rank you wear, in the form of a salute or equivalent demeanor, not as a balm to your ego, but as a continuous legitimization of the authority you bear. This is the logic of the relationship between superiors and subordinates.26

In an Organic-Adaptive cluster, shared problem-solving and diffused decision-making almost eliminate the power of

position. Authority to act is born within the cluster through a democratic process, and is based on competence, both technical and interpersonal, rather than a mantle of position. This writer believes it is sensible to follow Argyris's lead and declare that the first step for increasing organizational efficiency is for the personnel in the organization to increase their interpersonal competence, and the place to begin good interpersonal relations is the removal of artificial barriers such as rank and title.
CHAPTER IV

AN OPERATIONAL DEFINITION

Having established the basic assumptions, structural characteristics and power strategies of an Organic-Adaptive model of staff use, and compared how they differ from traditional structures, it is now possible to describe the operation of a model. This description of a hypothetical school staff, organized on a clustered model, should help answer the questions about coordination and evaluation raised in the previous chapter.

The author, by developing this model, wishes to avoid a critical mistake made in other recently developed staffing models. Many a school official has rejected the notion of staff differentiation because he erroneously equated the Temple City version of staff differentiation with the concept staff differentiation. By describing a proposed model too precisely, with a high degree of specificity, one loses a large amount of flexibility—thus reducing the degree to which it is generalizable in other locations. Such has been
the case with Temple City's model.\footnote{Temple City Unified School District, Temple City, California, \textit{A Project Proposal: The Temple City Differentiated Staffing Project}, Submitted to the United States Office of Education under the Educational Professions Development Act, \textit{Division of Program Administration, Bureau of Educational Personnel Development}, 1968.} The Temple City model, although immensely more flexible and adaptive than a conventional staffing pattern, tends to be somewhat mechanical in its application of the concept. Teachers must fit into predetermined role descriptions, salary levels are fixed and rigidly established, hierarchical positions on the vertical scale are titled in such a manner as to clearly identify the level of prestige and authority associated with the position, and finally the new pattern displays all the traits of a developing new orthodoxy. As explained in the next chapter, this criticism of the Temple City Staffing Model does not negate its usefulness. This writer fully believes that a form of staff differentiation is a necessary transitional step in the movement toward more flexible, adaptive staffing forms. Perhaps the major objective of differentiated staffing, when viewed transitionally, is to "break the back" of the single standard salary schedule; thus making possible the recognition of teacher individuality.\footnote{At a February, 1970 meeting of the Leadership Training Institute Panel for More Effective School Personnel Utilization, Dwight W. Allen, Chairman, indicated that given the scarcity of funds this should be one of the priorities of that panel.}
The Organic-Adaptive concept of staffing developed in this study must be viewed in general terms to remain viable. Attempts at implementing the concept will provide the specificity required of a model. An operational definition of but one possible application of the concept follows; it must be viewed as an alternative—one of many alternatives—and should not necessarily be equated with the broader concept being developed by the author.

The second point is also important. Staff differentiation is a concept developed for the more effective use of school personnel; however, as the concept became more widely disseminated, educators have tended to focus on the means and missed the ends. The emphasis seems to center on salary and role differentiation rather than using school personnel more effectively. An Organic-Adaptive concept of staff use, developed around a clustered model, faces the same danger; when all the time it has as its goal the more effective use of school personnel.

THE SCHOOL AS AN OPERATIONAL UNIT

As seen in figure 3, (Pages 74-76), this descriptive

---

3 On numerous occasions Dwight W. Allen has stated that 'friends', not enemies of the concept of staff differentiation are causing the most confusion about the concept. Their changing of labels, leaving the thing virtually unchanged, subverts the concept because they call their resultant mongrel structure differentiated staffing.
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model assumes the school as the operational unit. The implementation of such a model in the real world would require a great degree of autonomy from the district bureaucratic hierarchy. Although this description will be concerned only with the internal organizational characteristics of a school staff, it assumes a situation where the supervisory personnel of the district would operate in tandem. Their relationship to individuals in the model school would have to approximate the relationships of the personnel within the model. This assumption frees the description from concerns not immediate to a typical individual school.

THE SCHOOL

A school operating with an Organic-Adaptive model of staffing would essentially have two separate but integrated phases of activity. The first phase is an informal one dedicated to the objectives of the individuals in that school, including both students and adults. Here the student is given the freedom to choose what he will learn and how he will learn it. The student is expected to be active and use his time productively, but the student himself determines the rate and sequencing of his independent efforts. The adult resources during this phase are also pursuing their own personal professional goals and are not
restricted by a narrow definition of content-matter nor by any particular methodology. They will interact with colleagues and students on a very human level. They will be involved in their own studies, informal group activities, and one-to-one interaction with students; all helping to establish a climate of a community of scholars. This first phase is known as the tutorial phase.

The second phase, more formally structured, is designed to achieve certain societal objectives dictated by the state and community as well as some objectives institutional in nature determined by the adults and students of the school. This phase, known as the "clustered phase" places the adults and students of the institution in problem-solving groups where they interact to accomplish certain objectives deemed important by the society and the school.

STAFF ROLES--TUTORIAL PHASE

The total human resources in the school are left unstructured during this phase to perform on a tutorial baseline. (See figure 3, pages 74-76). Although the school is staffed with a rich variety of specialists, the common denominator across the whole is that level of activity where they interact with students as tutors. In this activity they are not teachers of specialized subject matter, or administrators, or student teachers, or paraprofessionals,
but are adults with varying backgrounds available to students with the intention of establishing relationships resembling Carl Roger's "client-centered relationship". Members of the staff, when acting in this tutorial role find themselves in a learning environment similar to the teacher in a modularly scheduled school during his unstructured time. That is to say, the teacher gets off the stage as presenter of information or professor of knowledge, retreats to the wings and places the student on stage with the lead part of the drama. Typically the student will be involved in an individually prescribed learning package, a student-developed project, laboratory work, small interaction-group work, or individual reading, media viewing, and listening, and the adult acts as a consultant to the activity. Perhaps the best way to describe the activity of the teacher in the tutorial role is to describe a situation in which the teacher and student would likely find themselves. The following quote taken from the Plowden Report describes an action slice of that environment.

When . . . seven year olds notice the birds that come to the bird table outside the classroom window, . . . some may decide, after discussion with [a] teacher, to make their own aviary. They will set to with a will, and paint the birds in flight, make models of them in clay or papier mache, write stories and poems about them and look
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up reference books to find out more about their habits. Children are not assimilating inert ideas but are wholly involved in thinking, feeling and doing. The slow and the bright share a common experience and each takes from it what he can at his own level. There is no attempt to put reading and writing into separate compartments; both serve a wider purpose, and artificial barriers do not fragment the learning experience.\(^5\)

In the tutorial role, staff resources are available to guide, ask questions, suggest possible alternatives, reinforce, stimulate, motivate, etc., but never to take charge, prescribe, direct or otherwise release the student from responsibility of determining the course of his actions. This description of the role of staff at the tutorial level could go on *ad infinitum*, but for the purpose of this illustration it should suffice to list the basic characteristics of the tutorial role.

(1) Staff members will attempt to establish a client-centered relationship with students who seek their help or those with whom they otherwise interact.

(2) The staff should philosophically agree that the most significant learning which influences behavior is self-discovered learning, that self-discovered learning cannot be directly communicated to another person, and

that learning which can be taught to another person will have little significant influence on behavior.\(^6\)

(3) Staff members will interact with each other openly and freely, and will be encouraged to combine resources to help students who have requested aid. They will be encouraged to combine their talents to enrich the learning environment with staff initiated projects, displays, ad hoc learning opportunities for children, discussions on current problems, etc. They will be responsible for creating an exciting and stimulating learning climate which encourages children to be involved in non-structured learning activities.

(4) Staff members will operate on an open door policy so that they will be immediately available to students. Typically this would mean that while involved in the tutorial role they would be found in resource centers, libraries, laboratories, discussion centers, etc.; anywhere students gather informally to learn.

**STAFF ROLES--CLUSTERED PHASE**

The second phase of staff involvement is more formal and goal oriented than the first. It is determined by the temporary problem-solving teams of students and adults and

\(^6\)Rogers, *loc. cit.*
is constantly evolving and adapting. As mentioned earlier, the Senate Cluster, a body whose membership represents students, teachers, and non-professional personnel, establishes priorities which are based on the institution's primary objectives as well as on state and community mandates. Once identified, these top priority goals become organizing centers for problem-solving clusters. Then groups of teaching professionals, technicians and students are brought together to accomplish the objectives established by the Senate Cluster. Other clusters may form without approval from the Senate Cluster when the need is felt since the number of clusters established by the Senate Cluster is held to a minimum.

A cluster might be formed to explain vocational possibilities students might be interested in after completion of the school program; another to prevent school dropouts. A cluster might be established to offer its students education in aesthetics, another in education of the self; and others in Black studies, sex education or perhaps values studies. Clusters might be developed to organize community action programs, to educate parents and students in drug use and abuse, to teach certain varieties of mathematics, to develop a program of study in all aspects of communication, or to organize students in instructional roles for younger or older students. A traveling seminar cluster might be established for an extended learning ex-
perience "on the road". Other clusters could be formed for teaching micro-biology or statistics. Whatever the purpose of any cluster, there is an emphasis on assembling a group of diverse educational specialists, with skills or knowledge related to the achievement of the objectives of the cluster. Adults are selected because they possess competence relevant to the objectives of the cluster, students choose to join a cluster out of interest or because it is among the alternatives deemed essential by the priority-setting body of the institution. In the latter case students might be required to be involved in a certain percentage of the priority clusters in operation.

In any given period, a day, a week or month, an individual will find his time allocated to both tutorial and clustered activity. The percentage of time spent in either role will vary from day to day and from individual to individual, but all staff members are found in both phases.

A TYPICAL ASSIGNMENT

A typical staff member might find his talent being used in a variety of ways. Take John Brown for instance, a hypothetical figure for this illustration, who had taught for a number of years in a traditional school which required two preparations in his field of Social Studies, one in American History and the other in Problems
of Democracy. In the traditional assignment John lectured during most of each period, five of the seven periods of the day, five days a week. In the Organic-Adaptive model John typically spends nearly sixty percent of his time in a tutorial role, working with individual students. Sometimes he is involved with groups of two or three which request his help and occasionally as many as a dozen are engaged in a project that requires his skill. The rest of his time is spent in cluster activity. Different clusters meet on different days, but during the week John typically is working with students and colleagues in four or five different clusters.

Because of his talent in developing performance-based curriculum, John finds himself playing a major role in a cluster designed to teach students critical thinking skills for decision making. In that cluster he is working with a person from a Science background, a past school administrator who is now of course involved in instruction, and a student intern from the University. Altogether there are eighty students who have chosen to meet with this cluster twice a week. John predicts that at the rate students are progressing through the performance goals, established by the cluster when it first began developing a program, the last meeting of the group is probably four weeks away.

In another cluster, designed to provide students with aesthetic education, John has a much less important role.
Here he is more supportive and offers his knowledge of the history of Art. The other three adult members of the cluster, one of which is a practicing professional musician recruited twice a week from a nearby town, carry a larger responsibility.

A third area of formal cluster activity John is engaged in is a community-action program where students associated with the cluster spend their entire time in City Hall, in the business district, and in the varied social and economic neighborhoods of the community. John's Political Science expertise was used in setting up this experiential program. No performance objectives were established after the four-member team of adults decided it would be foolish to anticipate beforehand what students should learn from the experience. It was therefore decided that it would be better to have students meet once a week in the evening in private homes, to design action programs and to rap for a number of hours about what they were experiencing. The community-action cluster, in its second week, has two weeks yet to go.

John is presently developing a drop-out prevention center in conjunction with the two coaches. Because of his excellent rapport with a number of potential drop-outs, the Senate Cluster requested he organize the drop-out cluster. John responded positively to their request; even though he was heavily committed, he agreed that he had considerable
influence on the students most likely to quit school before receiving their necessary credits for a degree. John in turn asked the Managerial Cluster to seek the support of the two coaches to help him organize the cluster.

Through this imaginary situation it is possible to see the nature of an individual's involvement in cluster activity. Each cluster of course has a different life span, and as the school year progresses, membership in different types of clusters also evolves.

PERMANENT CLUSTERS

Two clusters are permanent features of the Organic Adaptive staff, namely the Managerial Cluster and the Senate Cluster. (See figure 3, pages 74-76). Although membership in these clusters is temporary, with different representation and different expertise as conditions change, the clusters are stable features and operate throughout the life of the organization. The Managerial and the Senate Cluster are representative of the total staff and student population of the school.

It must be remembered that any organization is faced with a limited number of resources and therefore must determine how those limited resources can best be used. For that reason the Senate Cluster establishes priorities among problems to be solved, or objectives to be achieved. The
resources available are then focused on the objectives of highest priority. Certainly the principle of reciprocity is considered in the decisions establishing top priorities and selecting resources for accomplishing goals most effectively.

Membership in the Senate Cluster is not a full-time responsibility, therefore individuals serving as resources to the Senate Cluster are also involved at the tutorial base-line, and in other problem solving clusters.

The Cluster of Managerial experts is responsible for disseminating information and coordinating the institution's efforts. Personnel are recruited from each existing cluster so that coordination will be complete and the Managerial Cluster can provide a linking-pin function between individuals and clusters within the school. (See figure 3, pages 74-76). Members of the Managerial Cluster must enlist the support of individuals and groups in an organization which has no line of authority, nor cudgel to immediately straighten out offenders of a given norm—a difficult task by most standards. The Managerial Cluster and the Senate Cluster must be viewed as co-equals to all other clusters which come into being; in the language of a bureaucratic organization, their relationship to the other clusters or individuals must be viewed as a staff rather than a line relationship. These two permanent clusters must be regarded as service-rendering bodies.
Since authority lies with the total body of staff members and students, and is delegated to the Senate Cluster to establish priorities and to the Managerial experts for coordination purposes, on any issue of importance, (an individual would have to decide for himself what was important enough to be resolved in this manner) the decisions of these clusters could be overriden by a vote of the whole. The issue in contention would be presented to the body of the whole in a duly called assembly, all sides of the issue would be presented, and a consensus would be attempted.

All other clusters are temporary, based on specific objectives to be achieved or immediate problems to be solved. A cluster is considered successful when it self-dissolves. Any group enduring for any great length of time is open to criticism, and could be encouraged by the Managerial Cluster to establish more specific objectives to facilitate the completion of the task. Obviously the clustered concept of temporary task-oriented groups is based on the notion of performance goals but is not enslaved by it. Performance goals do, however, simplify the process of evaluating procedures and products and thus help determine whether a cluster has met its primary objectives and can be disbanded.

When applied directly to the educational setting, the
cluster concept eliminates the rigidity of the departmental structure with its course offerings, and replaces linear learning with modular learning. It makes possible the accomplishment of institutional objectives free from the contamination of a "departmental" point of view and allows the principle of juxtaposition—where individuals with very diverse backgrounds interact and create program—to operate freely. In this setting, courses which formerly had no more justification than "the structure of the discipline required it" can be replaced by something more relevant to students, the society and the professionals on the teaching staff.
CHAPTER V

A DEVELOPMENTAL SPECTRUM OF STAFFING MODELS

A survey of the significantly different approaches to school personnel utilization induces the researcher to categorize and classify the different models discovered. Although any number of schemes could have been employed, this writer has chosen a developmental spectrum which allows one to look at the characterizing features of the various structures. (See figure 4, page 91).

This spectrum can be used to chart the development of a school's staffing arrangement as it moves from rigidity to flexibility, from authoritarian to democratic, from impersonal to collegial and from a pyramidal to a clustered form. As more and more specialization takes place and decentralization of authority becomes more prominent, an organization moves across the spectrum from left to right.

The spectrum can be examined in greater depth by referring to figures 8-14 on pages 112-118. In these charts any number of different staffing structures can be compared according to the way authority is allocated, the major characteristics of reciprocity, the degree of collegiality existent, the basic assumptions held concerning human behavior, attitudes concerning resource use, characteristics
of communication, and policies for remuneration and promotion. With their twenty-one variable classification scheme, these charts should be helpful in classifying and subsequently locating a given model of staff use at its appropriate position along the developmental continuum. By classifying and positioning a model along a continuum, the student of staffing structures bypasses the bind of dealing with models that are labeled innovative or traditional, differentiated or non-differentiated, good or bad, and authoritarian or non-authoritarian. He breaks the habit of dichotomous thinking and describes the model developmentally. A good deal will have been accomplished if this developmental spectrum only helps to objectify discussions concerning differing patterns of staff utilization. At present many of the nation's teacher organizations are missing a chance to significantly improve the profession because they refuse to consider some potentially powerful ideas due to the negative affective labels attached to the ideas by their more cautious members. We have long needed a more neutral means for identifying innovations in school staffing.

The reader may notice the extra attention paid the concept of staff differentiation in this chapter. Since so little of the literature really sets forth the fundamental characteristics of the concept, and usually only defines the operational characteristics of a specific model, the
author has attempted to define the major characteristics which make the concept different and unique from more conventional forms of staffing.

Differentiated staffing is key in a discussion of the Organic-Adaptive concept, as stated earlier, because it is an important first transitional step away from the pyramidal structure. (See figure 7, page 100).

The Benevolent Authoritative and the Participative Group structures receive far less attention because they do not differ a great deal from that which came before nor from that which follows them on the continuum.

A brief description of the six categories of classification on the spectrum follows.

EXPLOITATIVE AUTHORITATIVE STAFFING MODELS (PRE-BUREAUCRATIC)

It has been stated above that for any staffing pattern to be truly responsive to the needs of learners it must depart from a highly authoritative exploitative structure. Exploitation of adult personnel in the staffing model can only lead to exploitation of students. Just as it is impossible to really teach the democratic process in an autocratic environment, it is impossible to really individualize learning for students in an organization of undifferentiated teaching roles.

Only a minority of schools today can be considered exploitative; however, one needs only look back a decade or
two to find classic examples of exploitative authoritative structures, with their emphasis on motivation through coercion and threat of punishment, total ignorance of any form of reciprocity, disregard for interpersonal relations, arbitrary promotion techniques, lack of diffused decision-making, one-way information flow, and very subjective evaluation of performance by superiors. The Exploitative Authoritative Staffing model is considered pre-bureaucratic and is the last vestige of a patrimonial structure of authority. (See Figure 5, Page 95).

BENEVOLENT AUTHORITATIVE STAFFING MODELS

Benevolent authoritarianism describes the manner in which authority is allocated in the pyramidal bureaucratic structure. This division of classification differs from the previous one in its division of labor based on functional specialization and its partial concern for the individual goals of personnel within the organization. School staffing models fitting into this category are typically organized departmentally, and individuals within departments perform specialized tasks. Procedures and rules are well defined and the staff is characterized by its mechanized efficiency. They might be considered functionaries in the negative sense of the word.\(^1\) The pyramidal structure is thoroughly

Figure 5

A PRE-BUREAUCRATIC STAFFING MODEL
defined and positions on the hierarchy are clearly titled. There is little confusion within the system about who is subordinate to whom, and attempts to communicate either up or down the hierarchy follow the line. The staff, with few exceptions, is dependency oriented, and control makes up a large part of the ethos of the organization. Personal relations among the staff members are rather incidental.

Models in this classification would likely have their own appropriate vocabulary to render deference required by the authoritative structure. All Ed.D's or Ph.D's in the system would probably be addressed as "Doctor", Department Heads would likely be referred to as "Mister" so and so, and students caught addressing teachers by their first names would be punished appropriately. An honest exchange of ideas up the hierarchy is seriously hampered because of the continuous legitimation of authority. The subordinate is unlikely to engage a top administrator in an honest and equal exchange of ideas when he is daily made to feel inferior. In both form and function he is subordinate and he learns to act as such.

EXTENDED BUREAUCRATIC STAFFING MODELS

An Extended Bureaucratic Staffing Model (Figure 6, Page 97) differs only slightly from the Benevolent Authoritative Staffing Model. It includes more people with narrowly de-
Figure 6

AN EXTENDED BUREAUCRATIC STAFFING MODEL
fined specialties, and requires a more complex pyramidal structure. For all intents and purposes, the Extended Bureaucratic Model expands the hierarchical arrangement downward, to new levels of subordination. A subtle difference lies in the creation of a whole new class of individuals who for the first time are recognized as superordinate to a new body of subordinates in the organizational structure. Prior to the use of non-professionals in the classroom, teachers were at the bottom of the staffing hierarchy; but with the advent of the teacher-aide, classroom teachers become both subordinate and superordinate—a role which is proving to require a great deal of adjustment on their part.

Although the Extended Bureaucratic Model has been characterized here as the "full bloom" of the bureaucratic structure, it is actually the beginning of modulation of the bureaucratic structure on the developmental spectrum. Once the classroom teacher is freed from the mental tasks of the classroom and school by the use of para-professionals, and drinks the heady brew of superiority, there is no turning back. Put another way, once teachers are freed from the routine non-instructional tasks and find more time for planning, intellective pursuits, and more personalized attention to students, they become more professional. Their attention is diverted from achieving the organiza-
tional goals of the institution—including the orderly and efficient transmission of information; the orderly movement and accountability of children; and the orderly and systematic maintenance of records—and comes to rest on personal professional goals such as improving the learning/teaching process, examining the curriculum for relevance, and providing better resources for learning. Thus the extended bureaucracy typically will herald the beginning of a dialogue concerning the validity of the standard curriculum, standard scheduling techniques, and traditional staffing procedures, which is likely to end in a major overhaul of the total system. For this reason the extended bureaucracy can be considered a staffing innovation which is transitional toward the Organic-Adaptive concept proposed in this study.

CONSULTATIVE DIFFERENTIATED STAFFING MODELS.

The Consultative Differentiated Staffing model (Figure 7, page 100) claims a number of characteristics not found in an extended bureaucracy. A system may identify a number of professional and non-professional levels on a staffing hierarchy, assign a differentiated salary schedule to the various vertical steps, and allow a wide variety of horizontal specialization and call their creation a differentiated staff, but if they do all this and fail to change the
Figure 7
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process of decision-making, the criteria for promotion up the vertical scale, or require a step by step ascension up that scale, then they miss implementing a fully differentiated staff by a wide margin. The concept of differentiated staff is more concerned that the individual abilities and talents of teachers be recognized and put to use, that decision-making be diffused to lower and more appropriate levels, that the teachers and administrators interact on a collegial basis, and that remuneration and promotion be consistent with the amount and type of responsibility held and the unique degree of specialism one can claim, than it is about the clarity and distinctiveness of differentiated vertical steps.

Paramount in a differentiated staffing model is a recognition of individuality. Teachers must be viewed as distinct and different from each other. Teacher individuality must become a factor in the decision-making process when objectives are formulated; it must become one of the criteria in the selection of means for goal achievement. Institutions which are responsible for training teachers must begin to design programs which admit a very diverse group of individuals, fulfill their specific learning needs, and graduate them to be certified unequal. Multiple entry and exit points, and a variety of "teaching" certificates are thus in order. A second prerequisite for real staffing
changes in the direction of a differentiated staff is diffused decision-making. It is primarily a question of power, responsibility and accountability. According to Argyris, top management—in this case, administration—must demonstrate congruence between their stated values and policies about innovation, initiative and risk taking and its subsequent behavior. If administrative leaders really expect teaching personnel to become innovators and demonstrate initiative, then they must take the initiative and innovate. Teachers must risk a good deal to change from the safe position of a traditional staffing pattern; administrators should put the same stakes on the line. This might mean flushing the administrative tubes, and allowing decision making, responsibility and accountability to be distributed downward. It is not enough to allow personnel who are lower down on the pyramidal ladder to make the right decisions; administration must also pass down responsibility and accountability which legitimizes their making decisions right or wrong, allowing them to be responsible for their choices, and truly form a broader decision-making base.

A third requirement of a differentiated staff is that of collegiality. This is very similar to the decision-making prerequisite, except that it defines a qualitative rather than a quantitative relationship. That is to say,
rather than defining the relative position on an organizational chart, collegiality attempts to define an interpersonal relationship. The pyramidal structure assumes a concept of individuals which makes them more consonant, dependent, subordinate, submissive and conforming than a review of interpersonal relations and human personality studies indicate they really are. It assumes an individual who suppresses his feelings but can be highly rational; it rewards the intellectual and penalizes the interpersonal and emotional.\(^2\) Collegiality in an organization can be realized when the role of superior and subordinate is minimized. Rather than having leadership positions identified as bastions of superiority and those positions lower down the hierarchy given a lesser degree of esteem, the two positions should relate as colleagues. Their relationship should be one where peers, with different kinds of expertise and knowledge interact in the interest of problem solving. It is common knowledge among teachers and administrators that many teaching functions require vastly senior, more complex and sophisticated skill, knowledge, or talent than many administrative functions. On the other hand, many teaching functions are much junior to administrative jobs. Nevertheless the myth persists that administration is more prestigious and requires more talent or knowledge than

\(^2\)Argyris, loc. cit., p. 158
teaching. Hopefully a collegial relationship between these types will put an end to this foolishness. The teaching/administration relationship would then be one of functional specialists offering different kinds of skill to a joint effort.

Professionalism is a fourth important tenet of the differentiated structure. This is perhaps inappropriately labeled, but is intended to include all those nebulous elements which distinguish a profession from a job. Perhaps this is being idealistic, but hopefully a differentiated staff will be composed of professionals who do not work for an hourly wage, and who do not think in terms of number of hours on the job. Their main purpose for working is not found in the pay envelope which they receive regularly, nor do they have to distract themselves from their purpose to make financial ends meet. The rewards of their profession in financial and personal satisfaction terms are attractive enough to entice the very best minds into the profession. Career satisfaction is great enough to keep the very capable from leaving for greener pastures elsewhere. This requires teachers and administrators to take a fresh look at the remuneration schedule for the profession. A different formula for compensation must be arrived at which has both internal and external consistency. Within the profession a means must be established which provides the teaching professional with both financial, status and self-
fulfillment incentives which are much different from those presently being employed. Dwight W. Allen suggests that compensation be based on the kind and amount of responsibility one is willing and capable of carrying. He further suggests that special inborn teaching talents or individual uniqueness especially valuable to the learning process be rewarded and that a system of reward be established which motivates the teaching professional to strive for excellence. The present single standard salary scale, with promotion based on seniority, encourages mediocrity and conformity and counters the notion of professionalism cited here. External consistency requires compensation schedules to be consistent with the marketplace. There should be high positive correlation between the "cost" of becoming a certain type of specialist in education and the compensation that specialist receives. There should also be a positive correlation between social value of the performance, and compensation for the performance. Professions with similar entrance "costs" and similar performance values should receive similar compensation for the services they perform.

A fully differentiated staff is many things to many people; and as indicated in a previous chapter, a good deal of the confusion surrounding the concept comes from critics poking sticks at one model of staff differentiation, never thinking to look for the larger concept.
To the American Federation of Teachers, Differentiated Staffing is an organizational concept which creates a teacher hierarchy by assigning varying levels of responsibility and compensation to teachers according to their ability and additional assignments. Team teaching and flexible scheduling are inherent in the concept in contrast to the self-contained classroom based on subject matter and grade level. They view it as competitive to the notion of collective bargaining and likely to create divisiveness among teacher ranks which above all else should be cooperative and communal. Some of the major disadvantages they see in the concept are listed as follows:

1. It submerges the teacher in a hierarchy of levels.
2. It vests decision-making with a new elite.
3. It encourages conflict in ambiguity of roles.
4. It limits the advancement of qualified teachers.
5. It diminishes teacher-student relationships.
6. It emphasizes the organizational and structural pattern and not the teaching process.
7. It embodies the philosophy and weakness of merit pay.
8. It lacks discriminatory evaluative procedures.

---

3 Massachusetts Federation of Teachers, "Questions and Answers about Differentiated Staffing," Lynn, Massachusetts, Spring, 1969. Presented before the Differentiated Staffing Workshop, University of Massachusetts, July 1969, Amherst, Massachusetts.
9. Colleges aren't preparing prospective teachers for differentiated roles.\textsuperscript{4}

Roy A. Edelfelt, Executive Secretary for the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards of the National Education Association has a different view. To him differentiated staffing describes "a teacher and his staff."

"The Teacher and his Staff" idea will provide that a teacher have several helpers to perform the job of teaching . . . The teacher with a staff will be a mature professional, . . . a career teacher. Career teacher status will also require competence as the manager or administrator of his staff. The make-up of a teacher's staff will depend on teaching responsibility and assignment.\textsuperscript{5}

At this point in time the two organizations represented here have taken opposite points of view on the value of staff differentiation.

Differentiated staffing as developed by Dwight W. Allen has two prominent features, vertical and horizontal differentiation. Some of his views follow:

1. Horizontal differentiation permits a large degree of teacher specialism.

2. Teachers are allowed to do that which they do well and are not required to perform functions in which they have little skill.

3. Non-credentialed, but highly qualified individ-

\textsuperscript{4}Ibid.

uals may be brought into contact with children for specific instructional purposes.

4. Students are allowed to perform in instructional roles for other students.

5. Vertical differentiation shatters a reward and promotion system based solely on seniority or longevity and replaces it with one based on special talent, willingness to accept responsibility, or unique degree of specialization.

6. Real classroom career incentives are present in a vertical hierarchy with a minimum of three differentiated levels, each having a different salary range, with the maximum salary of the top category at least double the maximum salary of the lowest category of professional specialization.

7. A top salary for classroom teachers at the highest level on the vertical hierarchy is equal to the top administrative salary in the district—a real incentive to attract and keep qualified individuals in the classroom.

8. A school cabinet, made up to teachers from the upper differentiated levels of the hierarchy, and the school principal formulate new educational policy and make decisions as to what educational functions should be served.

9. Non-tenured positions in the upper differentiated levels, specific job descriptions, with annual evaluation by one's associates in the vertical hierarchy, and intensive inservice training help prohibit the possibility of "dead wood" filling the upper levels of the differentiated vertical hierarchy.

10. Grandfather clauses are established to protect teachers who were advanced on the salary schedule of a traditional staffing arrangement but do not qualify for the upper-hierarchy positions of a newly implemented differentiated
staffing structure.\textsuperscript{6}

Although it is obvious that the Consultative Differentiated Staffing model is still based on classical principles of bureaucratic organization with its pyramidal structure, line authority and carefully defined job descriptions; the development of a cabinet for shared decision-making, the downward diffusion of authority, and the high degree of functional specialization radically departs from school bureaucracies of the past. Differentiated Staffing models can be viewed as a second transitional step away from the traditional staffing structure toward the development of an Organic-Adaptive staffing arrangement.

THE PARTICIPATIVE GROUP STRUCTURE

As a differentiated staffing structure evolves and individuals on the staff begin to become more accustomed to diffused decision-making, it is likely that the first major structural change will be the waning of the vertical line authority. Vertical differentiation is essential to the concept of staff differentiation, yet the legitimation of line authority is not. In fact, inherent in the concept of staff

\textsuperscript{6}This material represents a compilation of various articles, speeches, personal conversations, and film viewings where Dr. Allen explains his views of differentiated staffing. Refer to the bibliography for titles and publication data.
differentiation is the notion of thoroughly diffused decision-making. It is this writer's opinion that the present vertical hierarchy presents a striking alternative to the traditional view of all teachers being equal in ability, the level of responsibility they can assume, and their legitimate earning power. For this reason it is important. However, once the profession begins considering teachers as individual specialists, and individuals are allowed to perform at that level where his particular economic, status, ego, and self-fulfillment needs are satisfied, then the vertical line of authority may begin to blur. At that point participatory decision-making should become more widespread in the staffing arrangement, more and more "cabinet-like" bodies formed to determine policy and coordinate action, and very soon the pyramidal structure will have vanished.

THE ORGANIC-ADAPTIVE STAFFING MODEL

As a school's organizational pattern changes over time, and individuals develop and grow and begin to adopt different assumptions and develop different, more effective means for motivating others, it is probable that that structure will evolve from a bureaucratic to a differentiated and finally a participative group structure as it becomes more flexible. A next step on the developmental spectrum is the establishment of temporary adaptive problem-
solving clusters, operating on the principles described in Chapter III. The Organic-Adaptive staffing concept represents the extent of our present ability to conceptualize from a base of funded knowledge. Although it is found at one extreme of the spectrum in this classification scheme, it in no way represents the final word nor the ultimate in staffing conceptualization. In terms of developing a structure which allows for a wider range of human variability, permitting greater possible development of human potential, the Organic-Adaptive concept offers alternatives for school personnel seeking structural innovations which makes sense and reflects the thinking of current organizational theorists.
### Figure 8: Taxonomy of a Developmental Staffing Spectrum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exploratory</td>
<td>The goals of the organization are usually viewed as broad, and members of the institution have a high degree of flexibility and autonomy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>The goals of the organization are broad, and members have little flexibility or autonomy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative</td>
<td>The organization is characterized by a high degree of participation and cooperation among members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>The organization is characterized by a moderate degree of participation and cooperation among members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic</td>
<td>The organization is characterized by a low degree of participation and cooperation among members.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Adjective

- Cooperative
- Autocratic
- Group
- Participative
- Bureaucratic

### Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Exploratory</th>
<th>Authoritarian</th>
<th>Participative</th>
<th>Democratic</th>
<th>Organic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative attitudes</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person and organization</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal goals</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical goals</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict resolution</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members feel supported</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members feel free and independent</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members feel free and independent</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members feel free and independent</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members feel free and independent</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members feel free and independent</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members feel free and independent</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members feel free and independent</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members feel free and independent</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members feel free and independent</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members feel free and independent</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Note

- The taxonomy is based on the level of participation and cooperation among members, and the degree of flexibility and autonomy for achieving organizational goals.
FIGURE 8
TAXONOMY OF A DECENTRALIZED, SHARING SYSTEM
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Selection</th>
<th>Expansion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development of, improvement in self-assessment of, selection for, expansion of</td>
<td>Development of, selection for, expansion of</td>
<td>Development of, selection for, expansion of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Example:** Development of, improvement in self-assessment of, selection for, expansion of.
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