1-1-1981

An investigation of differentiation in a public school system as an organizational response to Chapter 766.

Peter J. Bittel
University of Massachusetts Amherst

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations_1

Recommended Citation
https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations_1/3634
AN INVESTIGATION OF DIFFERENTIATION IN A PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM AS AN ORGANIZATIONAL RESPONSE TO CHAPTER 766

A Dissertation Presented

By

PETER J. BITTEL

Submitted to the Graduate School of the University of Massachusetts in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

February 1981
AN INVESTIGATION OF DIFFERENTIATION IN A PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM AS AN ORGANIZATIONAL RESPONSE TO CHAPTER 766

A Dissertation Presented
By
PETER J. BITTEL

Approved as to style and content by:

Dr. Arthur Eve, Committee Chairman

Dr. Harvey Scribner, Committee Member

Dr. Jay Melrose, Committee Member

Dr. Sue Freeman, Committee Member

Dr. Mario Fantini, Dean of the School of Education
University of Massachusetts
DEDICATION

To my mother and father

iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I wish to express sincere appreciation to my four committee members, Dr. Arthur Eve, Dr. Harvey Scribner, Dr. Sue J. M. Freeman and Dr. Jay Melrose. Their support, encouragement and assistance were gratifying and invaluable. Through his sensitivity, awareness and vision Dr. Eve was both a mentor and a chairman as he encouraged broad perspective, quality work, integrity of motivation and high expectation for a thoughtful contribution to the field. Dr. Scribner provided the wisdom to put the fresh ideas of the immediate in the perspective of the long-term political realities of our schools. Dr. Freeman helped considerably in strengthening the document, in having it make sense and in suggesting conceptual and theoretical background. Dr. Melrose's high professional standards helped overcome cliche, jargon and non-sequitur while underscoring the cross disciplinary nature of the work.

My brother, Dr. Ronald Bittel, patiently persevered as an editor with humor and insight. My wife Kate’s support and encouragement enabled me to persist through the long haul. I also wish to give a special thanks to my parents for their love and kindness. They taught me that people who get on in the world are people who are not content to
merely witness circumstances but are people who fashion and form those circumstances for the greater good.

Finally, I wish to thank my young son, Luke, who provided me with many moments of encouragement whether they were the times he wished to share the typing with me or the time he offered to edit "Dad's book."
This study grew out of a conviction that the substantive and dramatic changes that are unfolding in the organizational design of public schools are receiving only passing attention. This dissertation will be of primary interest to those who wish to gain a better understanding of the complexity of the demands facing our public school staffs. Building on accepted techniques of qualitative methodology including analysis of historical documents, participant observation and unstructured interviewing, the dissertation draws from the organizational literature in business, social work, human services and education.

The intent is to explore and describe the role of educators who are continually interacting in a variety of multidimensional ways, each action dynamically influencing subsequent events. To achieve this goal the dissertation describes the perceptions, attitudes and impressions of two groups of professionals (teachers and social workers) as they respond to the demands of special education legislation. While this response and interaction is peculiar to the particular school system of Alpha, an understanding of the personal and organizational impact of their decision making process may have implications for organizational response in other communities.
To this end, the focus of the study is on a description of the school environment, the organizational climate, the communication pattern between staff members, and the response to new and different demands and the changing nature of attitudes and viewpoints in schools.
ABSTRACT

AN INVESTIGATION OF DIFFERENTIATION IN A PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM AS AN ORGANIZATIONAL RESPONSE TO CHAPTER 766

February, 1981
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Directed by: Arthur W. Eve, Ph.D.

The number of demands facing American public education have dramatically increased over the last twenty years. These demands have come from those concerned about tax reform, classroom discipline, sex education, vocational education, equal opportunity for the handicapped, community control, school dropouts and many more issues. It is difficult to deny that these are serious problems facing all of us concerned about our schools yet the presence of these issues creates an additional, more serious concern: is the organizational management of schools flexible enough to adapt to the changing demands of society?

Differentiation in a Public School System is a study of a school system's response to the demands of special education legislation, Chapter 766. Typically, a complex organization responds to new demands by reordering its
subgroups not only to perform additional roles and tasks but also to adopt new behaviors, attitudes and interactions to support organizational adaptation. Such a response is called differentiation.

This study seeks to describe this response through an in-depth analysis of the Alpha public school system and its use of social workers to meet new environmental demands. The analysis of the differentiation process has implications for the study of the interactions between teachers and social workers, for the study of decision making processes in school organizations and for the study of the impact of special education legislation on schools.

This study draws on important research in the fields of education, social work, organizational development and educational management. Data are specifically applied to a typology of differentiation and describe the nature of the organizational response through a discussion of the changing relationships between two subgroups.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

American public education has increasingly taken on a multiplicity of roles that are often confusing and conflicting to those who believe that the primary mission of public education is the teaching of the three R's. Many of these new activities--such as vocational training, special education, competency based testing, and mental health services have emerged in response to the complex technological and demographic forces driving American society. Many of these new expectations of what schools should do lie outside of what traditionally has been perceived as the role of public education: teaching the basics.

The Alpha public school system in this study is an example of an educational system that has taken on an increased number of roles in response to the needs of a changing environment. In the past ten years, this small New England community of 31,000 people has experienced changing forces that have caused it to adapt and modify its educational system.

The building of low income housing has attracted residents who have called for the establishment and
implementation of a bilingual education program and an increase in social services to be made available to a population living largely at the poverty level. The availability of public monies for the development of vocational and occupational programs has fostered collaboration with the city's vocational high school and has increased the availability of vocational and occupational services within the school system. The technology boom of the mid and late 1960's led to the generation of a significant increase in the number of audio-visual aids and created a need for a media department to support this audio-visual usage. Shifting population has caused the closing of six of the system's fourteen schools in this ten year period and the enlarging of one school. The number of staff has shown a net increase while the number of students has declined.

Perhaps one of the most dramatic demands on the school system came as a result of the enactment of the special education law (Chapter 766) in 1974. This Massachusetts law required that children identified as having special needs receive education in "the least restrictive environment." Further, this law and the resulting regulations were a detailed compilation of rights, procedures and approaches that guaranteed equal education opportunity to the handicapped. Due process safeguards, the right to an individualized education plan and program, the right of parent and student involvement in educational
planning and programming, the right to confidentiality, the avoidance of categorical labels and the right to comprehensive, non-discriminatory assessments were guaranteed and clearly delineated in Chapter 766. An elaborate appeals procedure was also defined to further ensure the protection of parent and student rights.

Even though the school system had begun preparations for complying with the law since 1972 there was a significant amount of organizational adaptation and modification that had to be made. Some of the teaching staff in regular education were angry that the law was forcing them to teach the "basket cases" and that an increasing proportion of the dwindling financial resources were being committed to these "special kids" at the expense of "regular kids." Further, the law authorized the expansion of special education personnel to almost fifteen percent of the total teaching staff while the decreasing student population was simultaneously forcing the closing of schools, a freeze on hiring regular teaching staff, and a lack of expansion in regular education. During the period of 1972-1975, the Alpha public school system saw the mushrooming of a small special education program that originally involved less than fifty children to at least a dozen programs servicing well over four hundred and fifty children.
What was the impact of such a dramatic staff increase of social workers, psychologists and speech pathologists on the organization, especially when the new staff members had been trained in highly specialized or at least different skill areas than regular teachers and principals? No longer did the public school just employ teachers; in addition, a significant number of counselors, psychologists, nurses, doctors, aides, truant officers, therapists and specialists in many fields also held jobs in public education (as noted in Appendix A, page 200). Additionally, the Alpha public school system was now dramatically involved in contracting with parents, social service agencies, private schools and private therapists and arranging transportation for these children and sometimes for their families (as noted in Appendix B, page 201). These were certainly a different set of demands, both in quantity and diversity, that were being placed on the neighborhood school and the school system than had previously been experienced.

**Background**

As the demands facing public education continue to be diverse, numerous and sometimes conflict ridden, administrative response to the demand is often to delegate or design additional components of the organization. Managers, planners, administrators and other decision makers must be
sensitive to the impact of staff differentiation on the
effective functioning of an organization. In fact, the
nature of the organizational response to such a changing,
turbulent environment is the focus of increased attention
in the study of complex organizations.

The author became concerned about the difference in
values, motivation and world view between such specialists as social workers and the regular teachers performing
traditional classroom roles. If there was a difference,
what effect did that difference have on the functioning of
the organization as it sought to meet its goals? Was there
really a shared sense of mission among these groups with
differentiated roles, diverse training and dissimilar
status levels?

The special education legislation enacted in Massa-
chusetts in 1974 represented a particular demand that
school systems change the nature and scope of their organ-
izational response to special needs students. Of the many
differentiated responses generated in order to comply with
this demand, a change in the staffing pattern in the
schools was an outstanding example.

Such staff differentiation was planned for and in
fact codified within the regulations governing the adminis-
tration of this law. However, little attention has been
focused on the comparatively massive influence of
individuals with specialized, differentiated training upon an environment which had up until this time maintained a limited and restricted composition of its staff primarily to just two groups: teachers and principals.

Much of the study of organizational response to environmental change has taken place within the profit making sector in the fields of organizational sociology, psychology and business management. Certainly, within the last fifteen years such concepts as boundary spanning, management of organizational conflict, goal setting and staff motivation have emerged as important areas of knowledge and expertise for decision makers in the business community. There has not been a similar application of organizational concepts to the non-profit making sector yet this sector is faced with a similar set of demands for organizational response to a changing environment as is the profit making sector.

Lawrence and Lorsch in their Organization and Environment (1969) attempted to understand organizational adaptation to environmental change by utilizing the concept of organizational differentiation. Gabarro (1971), following on their work, applied this concept to his study of school systems responding to the changing demands of increased minority enrollment. The conceptual framework of differentiation is helpful in understanding the response of school systems to the demands of Chapter 766 and the
potential impact of that response on their organizational structure.

Several factors do have implications for the application of the typology of organizational differentiation to the study of the response of school systems. At least thirty new specialties either emerged or had increased significance within school systems as a result of the special education law (as noted in Appendix A, page 200) and the demand for interorganizational response also increased as a direct result of this law. School systems found themselves dealing with a variety of organizations with whom they had previously little or no interaction (as noted in Appendix B, page 201). Previously, school systems had been withdrawn from interaction with other community service organizations partially out of the very clear and delimited roles of teachers and principals within the organizational structure of schools.

Little attention was given to the possible impact that a diverse number of specialties would have on the perceived organizational goals of school systems. The organization now found itself operating with a staff that not only had different levels and types of formal training and previous experiences but also had different status positions associated with that training and experience. Etzioni (1969), Lortie (1975) and Gartner (1976) have all identified the potential implications of different kinds
of training and expertise that exist in the preparation of human service personnel. However, little attention has been focused on the effects of staff differentiation in school systems.

The result was that the decision makers in the public schools, including school boards, superintendents, central administrators and principals operated an organizational structure in which a good number of their staff had training and expertise that significantly differed from their own backgrounds and training. Additionally, teachers in regular education interacted with a number of colleagues who have significantly different training, experiences and status than they have. What effect did those differences have on public education: its character, its mission and its potentiality?

**Purpose**

The purpose of this study was to develop a descriptive profile of selected personnel within the Alpha public school system as this system responded to the demands of Chapter 766. The focus of this descriptive profile included the following issues: (1) a description of the nature of differentiation as observed in two subgroups, teachers and social workers, within the Alpha public school system; (2) a delineation of the organizational and individual reasons that this differentiation had emerged; (3) a description of
the perceptions of teachers and social workers regarding their respective colleagues and a delineation of the impact that such perceived differences might have on their effectiveness; and (4) recommendations for in-service training and other forms of integration that might assist school system personnel to improve their effectiveness in dealing with the demands of a differentiated environment.

Questions to be Answered

A series of questions were generated from this purpose:

1. What were some of the staff changes that have emerged in the Alpha public school system in response to Chapter 766?
2. What preparation was made for the incorporation of new staff into an organization that previously consisted primarily of teachers and principals?
3. With the advent of Chapter 766, how did teachers and social workers perceive their effectiveness in working with each other as well as with the administrative components of the school system?
4. What were the personal characteristics, professional training, background, attitude, motivation and philosophical approach of teachers and social workers that might define them as separate groups? Were these differences perceived? If so, how did they affect the functioning of teachers and social workers in their work environments?
5. What modifications in organizational design were perceived by teachers and social workers for improving their effectiveness in working with their colleagues within the same organizations?
Significance of the Study

A recurring theme throughout this study is the gaining of new insights about the school system and its staff. A primary contribution of this study is to provide an understanding of the distinct backgrounds and functions of teachers and social workers in one organization. Furthermore, this study provides information about the characteristics of teachers and social workers and the manner in which these characteristics facilitate or inhibit effective collegial interaction and mobilization for organizational goals.

This study also provides an understanding of the changing milieu of school systems as a result of the changed demands of the environment: the law in this case. Although there have been studies of teachers in schools (Lortie, 1969, 1975) and social workers in schools (Granich, 1963; Gartner, 1976), there has been no study of teachers and social workers utilizing the organizational concept of differentiation (Lawrence and Lorsch, 1970; Gabarro, 1971). Although there has been attention to Chapter 766 (Blanchard, 1976; Weatherly and Lipsky, 1977) there has been no attempt to study the impact of the law on the organization of a school. Nor has there been an attempt to understand the modus operandi that has emerged in schools as a result of Chapter 766 defining increased fields of
influence and expertise for such specialties as social work.

Finally, in a more general way this study documents the nature and extent of differentiation that exists in one school system through a comparison of teachers and social workers. This study suggests possibilities for additional research as well as encourages the increased application of organizational concepts to school systems.

This study utilizes the organizational concept of differentiation in developing a profile of a school system responding to one aspect of environmental change, Chapter 766. This profile is based on the perceptual responses of teachers and social workers in one school system and does not generalize beyond these groups or this school system. This study does not test or validate differentiation as theory nor does it focus on the advisability of Chapter 766.

Design of Study

This investigation emerged from a pilot study conducted in 1978 that was initiated to assess differentiation between selected social workers and teachers in a small city school system. The author's interest in differentiation was furthered by his role as participant observer in this organization for the past five years. The pilot study helped to refine the area of investigation and to develop
and formulate an unstructured interview guide. It also attempted to determine the suitability of data gathering and data presentation being applied to a typology developed by Lawrence and Lorsch (1967) and refined by Gabarro (1971). The pilot study suggested that an additional typology utilized by Argyris (1967) would help in structuring the participants' views of their skill levels.

An unstructured interview guide was field tested in the pilot study and modified for the present study to be consistent with the typology of Lawrence, Lorsch and Gabarro.

The data from participant observation and unstructured interviewing are considered in relation to the differentiation described by Lawrence and Lorsch (1970). They had analyzed the differences between subgroups along four cognitive orientations or attributes:

- **Time Orientation**: time horizon of problems most often worked on by the individual.
- **Goal Orientation**: priority ordering of organizational goals by an individual in performing his job.
- **Interpersonal Orientation**: style of work interaction most preferred by the individual.
- **Formality of Structure**: the degree of structure characteristic of the subgroup's organization, in terms of reporting procedures, span of control and levels of hierarchy.

John J. Gabarro (1971) in a later study applied these dimensions to a school system and his field data suggested that
a subgroup's orientation to change was also a relevant and useful dimension of differentiation:

**Orientation to Change:**
the degree to which a subgroup's work involves the changing of methods and programs.

Additionally, the interview guide called for a number of subjective judgments about the participant's view of their work and skill level that followed the adapted typology reported by Argyris (1967):

*Figure 1.1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dynamically ordered viewpoints of active participation</th>
<th>Statically ordered viewpoints of passive participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The need to have a high sense of self-worth and self regard related to their technological abilities</td>
<td>The need to have a low sense of self-worth and self regard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The need to be active</td>
<td>The need to be passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The need to work with others</td>
<td>The need to be alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The need for variety and challenge in their work world</td>
<td>The need for routine, nonchallenging work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The need to have some close friendships while at work</td>
<td>The need not to make close friendships while at work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The need to produce quality work</td>
<td>The need to produce adequate (quantitative) work to make a fair day's pay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Almost no need to overemphasize the importance of material rewards

The need to emphasize the importance of material rewards

The need to learn more about other kinds of work within the same job family

Almost no need to learn other kinds of work in the same job family

To achieve the goals of the dissertation's limited analysis, the author conducted a series of unstructured interviews of selected social workers and teachers in the Alpha public school system. Eight social workers and sixteen teachers were interviewed for this study.

Interviews were also conducted with the Director of Special Education and with the Assistant Superintendent of Schools to gain an historical perspective on the organizational planning conducted in preparation for the impact of Chapter 766. The State Department of Education audit of the Alpha school system conducted in 1974 was also examined to improve the accuracy of the historical perspective.

Each interview was conducted in an area distinct from the working environment that afforded privacy and facilitated the confidentiality of the responses. Each participant was informed that this was a comparative study of social workers and teachers to determine what it meant to be an effective social worker or an effective teacher in the school setting. All participants were told that this study was not being used for internal organizational
purposes by the author and that their individual identities
would be kept confidential.

The participants were also informed that the inter-
view was intended to solicit information on job related
roles and not personally related characteristics.

After the interviews were conducted, the interview
materials were summarized by the author within a twenty-
four hour period. The author's summary was then cross
checked with another reader to increase accuracy. The
second reader was an individual with clinical, academic
and administrative experience in schools and with Chapter
766.

Participant observation data were noted in a log kept
over the two year period of the study. This data were
organized in relationship to the Argyris typology and then
applied to the dimensions presented by Lawrence, Lorsch
and Gabarro.

**Definition of Terms**

**Differentiation:** This refers to the differences in atti-
tudes and behaviors, not simply division of labor,
a specialization of knowledge. It is operationally
defined as the differences between major subgroups
in terms of their cognitive and attitudinal dif-
ferences (Lawrence and Lorsch, 1970; Gabarro, 1971).

**Integration:** This is the state of collaboration that
exists among subgroups which is necessary unless an
organization breaks down into a set of its different
segments and components. This is considered to be a
reciprocal state to differentiation (Lawrence and
**Chapter 766:** Chapter 766 is the title of the special education legislation that was enacted in 1974 by the Massachusetts State Legislature requiring school systems to provide equal educational opportunities for handicapped or special needs students. This legislation was accompanied by an elaborate codification of laws and an extensive bureaucratic structure.

**Public Law 94-142:** This refers to the Federal special education legislation that closely parallels Chapter 766.

**Participant Observation:** This is a method in which the observer participates in the daily life of the people under study, either openly in the role of researcher or covertly in some disguised role, observing things that happen, listening to what is said, and questioning people, over some length of time. It allows the observer to ask questions in such a way as to enable the subjects to talk about what is on their minds and what is of concern to them without forcing them to respond to the observer's interests, concerns, or preconceptions (Becker and Geer, 1970).

**Unstructured Interview:** This is a guided conversation which elicits from the subject what he or she considers to be important descriptions of a situation under study. This is a technique where researchers attempt to capture the words of their subjects and not merely a summary of responses (Bogdan and Taylor, 1975).

**Social Worker:** This is a staff member of a school system with a MSW who performs home visits, writes home assessment reports at special education evaluation meetings, chairs evaluation meetings, provides immediate crisis intervention, counsels students and parents on a short term and on a long term basis, provides formal and informal case reviews to teachers, assists family in understanding and accepting the role of the school, acts as a facilitator of communication and cooperation among students, families, school personnel, outside agencies and individuals. The social worker coordinates referral and placement of students into appropriate facilities outside the school system, participates in appropriate inservice workshops on such topics as: emotional and social needs of student, family and school relationships, behavioral management and crisis intervention.
Teacher: This is a staff member of the school system who is certified in areas appropriate to class assignments in the regular elementary and secondary school programs. Contractual obligations specify: hours of duty, absences, policy on leaving the school building, number of lesson preparations, recess, lunch and such non-teaching duties as record keeping and classroom appearance.

Evaluation Team Meeting: This is a formal meeting held under the provision of Chapter 766 to devise an educational plan for a child in need of special education services. A home assessment, a special education assessment, a psychological assessment, a medical assessment are required and other assessments may be recommended in order to write an individual educational plan (IEP).

Organization of Dissertation

The study is organized into five chapters. Chapter I discusses the background, problem, purpose, significance, limitations and organization of the dissertation.

Chapter II provides the reader with a clear understanding of the topic by reviewing all relevant literature. An in depth analysis of differentiation is presented along with pertinent analysis of research on the role of teachers and the role of social workers and a discussion of the implications of this data for organizational effectiveness.

Chapter III details the methods employed in this study including a discussion of the theoretical grounding of the methodology, the design of this study and the structure of the interview guide.
Chapter IV presents the relevant data gathered and analyses the material to give the reader an understanding of the impact of differentiation on the system.

Chapter V presents a summary and discussion of the research. Additionally, this chapter focuses on recommendations for achieving integration within the system, discusses possibilities for additional research, considers the implications of this particular research for school systems and lastly generates conclusions about teachers and social workers in the school system.
Footnotes

1Chapter 766 is the colloquial name applied to the Bartley-Daly Special Education Act. This act is also called the Special Education Act of 1972 or Chapter 766 of the Massachusetts General Laws.

2The reader should note that a series of lead or introductory questions are stated more fully in the Interview Guide, Appendix C, page 204.
CHAPTER II
A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In an attempt to understand the organizational impact of the interaction between social workers and teachers in schools, it is helpful to consider it in the framework of differentiation. A review of selected literature dealing with the concept of differentiation in the organization of a school system suggests that the literature be considered under the following four categories: (1) a theoretical discussion of differentiation; (2) social workers in school systems; (3) teachers in school systems and (4) the implications of differentiation for organizational effectiveness.

The Theoretical Underpinnings of Differentiation

Lawrence and Lorsch were not the first authors to consider the differences in the various goals of subgroups within an organization and the potentiality for conflict that such different goals might cause. They were, however, among the first to suggest that such differences are more pervasive and deep seated in individuals and their organizational interaction than had been previously supposed. In their study of industrial
organizations they expanded on this idea of differences between subgroups that had traditionally been thought of as a division of labor, a specialization of knowledge or a particular frame of reference. By differentiation they meant the differences in attitudes and behaviors that exist among members of an organization's subgroups. Operationally, they developed a typology for defining differentiation as the differences among members in their cognitive and emotional orientations:

- **Time Orientation**: time horizon of problems most typically worked on by the individual.
- **Goal Orientation**: the priority ordering of organizational goals by an individual in performing his job.
- **Interpersonal Orientation**: the style of work interaction most preferred by the individual in his job, i.e., task centered interaction as compared to socially centered interactions.
- **Formality of Structure**: the degree of structure characteristic of the subgroup's organization, in terms of reporting procedures, span of control and levels in the hierarchy.

Lawrence and Lorsch theorize that such differentiation is in fact a sign of organizational health since an organization must adapt to the changing environment. They developed subsequent contingency concepts of organizational effectiveness called integration or collaboration among the subgroups. Hence, an effective organization in their view
is one characterized by increased differentiation among
the parts as well as concomitant integration of diverse
subunits. Conversely, an inefficient organization allows
a subgroup to pursue its goals at the expense of the
organizational goals.

For example, American car manufacturers responded
to the energy crisis by producing smaller, more gas effici-
ent cars. However, such a small car division must colla-
borate with other divisions in the organization. Without
such integration, a subsystem begins to serve its own needs
at the expense of the mission of the organization. Dif-
ferentiation yielded the advantages of increased efficiency
and effectiveness but unless integration was affected the
supposed gain actually accelerates the fragmentation of
financial, personnel and managerial resources.

The effectiveness of American car manufacturers, like
other organizations, is directly related to the ability to
affect the differentiation process and then to incorporate
it into the organizational mission through integration.

Gabarro expanded directly from the work of Lawrence
and Lorsch and considered the concepts of differentiation
and integration as they apply to school systems facing in-
creased minority enrollment.³ Gabarro's work substantially
confirmed the application of the concepts of differentia-
tion and integration in considering the effectiveness of
school systems to a changing environment. In a comparison
study Gabarro found that the more adaptive, effective system was the system that provided for significant differentiation among its subunits so that they could address the needs of a changing environment (e.g., the demands of increased minority enrollment) while also building a number of organizational constructs that facilitated integration and collaboration among the subunits.

Gabarro's field study suggests that a subgroup's orientation to change was a relevant dimension in studying school systems and he described this dimension as follows:

**Orientation to Change:** the degree to which a subgroup's work involves the changing of methods and programs.\(^4\)

Lawrence, Lorsch and Gabarro represents an enhancement of the traditional view of differentiation by their stress on the emotional and attitudinal factors that affect organizational adaptation at a given point in time.

Such a traditional view was best expressed by Peter Blau:

The term *differentiation* refers specifically to the number of structural components that are formally distinguished in terms of any one criterion. The empirical measures used are number of branches, number of occupational positions (division of labor), number of hierarchical levels, number of divisions, and number of sections within branches or divisions.\(^5\)

Traditional writers such as Blau emphasize work related roles or task groups unlike Lawrence, Lorsch and Gabarro
who focus on the less examined attitudinal characteristics that either enhance or detract from organization effectiveness.

Tajfel is also representative of the difference between a more traditional application of differentiation and the implications suggested by Lawrence, Lorsch and Gabarro. Tajfel considers this topic as an example of linguistic, ethnic and categoric differences. He argues that "the erosion, preservation or creation of differentials have been, in recent years, one of the fundamental features of some of the most acute social and industrial conflicts." In Tajfel's attempt to apply differentiation to an increased understanding of human behavior, he states that it is "one of the most important and also one of the most neglected areas of social psychology." The central contention in Tajfel's theory of differentiation is that such behavior in and outside of organizations must be understood in terms of an individual's process for establishing a positively valued social identity:

The theory predicts that intergroup differentiation will occur in situations in which persons are divided in two or more groups. The term 'differentiation' is used here to denote a variety of phenomena associated with the establishment of a positively valued distinctiveness, i.e., it covers ingroup favoritism and discrimination against the outgroup as well as perceptual and value differentiations between one's own group and comparison groups.
Differentiation then is a concept that has long been used to describe individual and group behavior in family, community and organizational life. However, Lawrence, Lorsch and Gabarro employ this term in a more generic fashion.

Social Workers in School Systems

There is a considerable amount of literature concerning the role of social workers in public education. Social workers themselves have written extensively about the subject in an attempt to clarify the divergent views of the social worker's job responsibilities. The inter-relationship between social workers and teachers has historically received little attention in education literature. Consistently, social workers have struggled to identify and define their field and area of expertise.

Social workers, viewed as an occupational category, exhibit an extraordinary amount of diversity. They range from the proverbial old lady in tennis shoes, armed with good intentions and a high school diploma, administering to the needs, as she interprets them, of her caseload, to the young man with the Ph. D. degree from a graduate school of social welfare trained in a program of evaluative research on the merits of the new casework technique.

It was with this background that Phari and Gottesfeld conducted numerous interviews with social workers like Selma Fraiberg, Fritz Redi and Helen Perlman in order to assess the state of the art. They concluded that there is
no one definition of a social worker. Certainly, there are shared common values but this is a profession whose leaders "cannot and will not be conveniently defined, no matter how vague the definition."14

Traditional writers in the field of social work have often seen a shared set of values between teachers and social workers because of an historic commonality between Freud and Dewey that underscored the power of individual growth, the social nature of conduct and the responsibility to a community in a democracy.15 The social worker was the collaborator with teachers and administrators in meeting the needs of children. These writers saw the social worker as the "specialist...who brings into the organization competence for a specific task that supplements 'the main line job' of teaching...."16

A growing body of literature, however, argues that this particular issue of specialization is having a significant effect on interprofessional relationships and performance within schools and human service organizations. Polansky reports that social workers judged themselves to have lower social usefulness and lower personal gratification than either nurses or teachers (the other accepted work roles for women at the time.)17 Slade reports a significant lack of understanding on the part of other professions toward the role of social workers.18 Although teachers applied "positive characteristics" to social
workers, they did not accord equal status in terms of salary and job responsibility according to Batchelder.19

Major attention was first focused on the area of difference in attitudes between social workers and teachers in a study conducted in New York City by Belle Granich.20 Granich argued that "they are both members, along with nurses and librarians, of a group of feminine professions, all of comparatively low status and poor pay" yet there is a measurable degree of disharmony and miscommunication between the groups.21 Granich found that the teachers have a significantly different set of goals for the social workers than the social workers have for themselves. Specifically, teachers see the social work function as a conduit of information between home and school and as an information gathering service for teachers. Social workers on the other hand identify their primary goal as that of providing direct service to the child.22 Further, social workers are concerned that "the greatest call for help is with the aggressively disruptive, not the quiet, non-learner whose behavior is manageable."23

A variety of studies have been conducted which urged school social workers to be aware of attitudinal differences when consulting a teacher.24 A 1968 study conducted by Lela Costin found that social workers were continuing to define their role in terms drawn from the literature of the 1940's and 1950's, that there was little awareness
of changes in the public schools and there was a reluctance to delegate responsibilities.\textsuperscript{25} Meares highlighted this role confusion in a survey of social workers by suggesting that social work today

\begin{quote}
 is in transition from a predominately clinical casework approach of solving students' problems to that of a home-school-community liaison and educational counseling with the child and his parents.\textsuperscript{26}
\end{quote}

However, many social workers are still unwilling to delegate responsibility or accept that others might share in some of their traditional roles of counseling children. A discrepancy between traditional and emerging roles is noted in the current literature that supports "the team approach, experimentation with different training models, and the development of pupil personnel services" to meet larger number of defined needs with a limited amount of human manpower resources.\textsuperscript{27}

Bettinelli is more specific in her analysis of the points of difference between teachers and social workers.\textsuperscript{28} She finds that both teachers and social workers have similar attitudes toward aggressive behaviors but that only social workers are more concerned about the quiet child. It is unlikely, she says, that a quiet child be "labeled 'disturbed' because he does not interfere with the teacher's role or with what the teacher considers important: the learning of the group."\textsuperscript{29} While Bettinelli does not examine the diverse training backgrounds between
teachers and social workers, she does conclude that teacher
attitudes more clearly resemble the social workers' views when teachers have an increased number of courses in child development and have more professional experience.30

Others have argued that the root cause of the difficulties in collaboration between teachers and social workers is that the latter feel they have nothing to learn from the former. It has been pointed out that such elitism fosters confrontive rather than collaborative behaviors.31

Alan Gartner has provided another perspective on the differences between social workers and teachers in his study of these groups in the context of four professions: social work, education, law and medicine. While he finds differences between social workers and teachers, they primarily are discernible only in the area of training. Social workers are generally in professional training for longer periods with substantial ingredients of clinical practice and supervision.32 However, Gartner argues that teachers and social workers are quite alike in their choice to work in a bureaucracy with a minimum of autonomy, their lack of specialized knowledge and their cultural grounding in the lower middle and middle classes.33 Additionally, the clients of teachers and social workers are primarily children, unlike the broader service fields of law and medicine.34 He further argues that a professional
similarity exists between teachers and social workers because they are like nurses and librarians in that all four are semi-professions, e.g., "wherein study of a theoretic nature is replaced with the acquisition of technical skills."\(^3^5\)

Increasingly, the literature has accepted a lack of harmony between the traditional social work practice of individual, clinically focused therapy and the emerging needs of providing counseling and mental health services in schools. Caplan has argued for increased inter-organizational collaboration among teachers, counsellors and social workers in the form of Human Service Centers rather than traditional autonomous agencies of aid and family service.\(^3^6\) Costin has pointed out that social workers need this collaboration with others in the professional community in order to draw them away from traditional diagnosis of personality dysfunction and subsequent therapeutic intervention to a model that focuses on both a situational and environmental approach identifying characteristics in groups of students.\(^3^7\) Thus, increased awareness of team building and organizational development skills are important in these new models.

The University of Connecticut School of Social Work is an example of one of the programs that has tried to incorporate a concept of collaboration in their training programs. One of the models they developed stipulate that
social workers can not attend continuing education classes unless they bring a teacher or principal along with them.  

Conversely, social workers should be able to and be encouraged to attend teacher workshops.

This confusion for social workers in their roles and goals has led them to accept a wide variety of responsibilities within the school system. They perform home assessments, write reports, place children in programs and treat emotional difficulties that range from the mild, short term cases to the acute long term clients. They are therapists, coordinators, facilitators, trainers, discussion leaders and program evaluators.

In summary, the literature on social workers describes them as an occupational group searching for a clear cut identity and groping for a model of integration into the organizations for which they work. Etzioni and others have described social work as an emerging profession that has the ingredients of autonomy and has the societal recognition of possessing a high degree of technical knowledge.

**Teacher Roles in School Systems**

Comparatively little work has been done in considering teachers in their working environment: the classroom and the organization of the school. There is a considerable amount of material about the purposes of our schools, the allocation of scarce resources, the controversies and
conflicts endemic to a multicultural society, the futuristic planning for effective utilization of new technologies in education and the role of collective bargaining, but there is a scarcity of material that considers teachers as members of complex organizations. Some new material, however, has been forthcoming to help teachers understand organizations and bureaucracy.\textsuperscript{41} This is a serious gap in our understanding of schools, especially in light of recent reports that suggest many teachers have considered changing careers citing job dissatisfaction, low pay, poor self-esteem and stress as major determinents.\textsuperscript{42}

Bidwell and Katz in separate works have argued for increased autonomy for teachers in the organizational framework of schools both to achieve greater effectiveness with students and also to increase their perceptions of self-worth and job satisfaction.\textsuperscript{43}

Cole identifies issues of teacher dissatisfaction as being consistent with the low status and minimal autonomy of the elementary school teacher.\textsuperscript{44} Corwin argues that while there has been an increase in political power by teachers there has not been a concomitant increase in either job satisfaction or status improvement.\textsuperscript{45}

Dan Lortie has provided important information about teacher role and autonomy. In his early work, he documented the following points:
1. Schools, unlike other organizations, are organizations controlled by laymen, since school committees are rarely composed of professional educators.
2. There was a lack of clarity on colleague group boundaries among teachers and a concommitant fear of spanning perceived boundaries.
3. Teachers have limited prestige and comparatively low economic expectations.
4. There was a "feminism" of the profession that accepted a norm of teaching as supplemental to other career goals and other incomes.
5. Teachers have low autonomy and no specific skill, i.e., teachers have no arcane body of substantive or technical knowledge to assist professional status vis-a-vis the school board and the public at large.
6. Finally, teachers have questionable professional identity because of the lack of a clearly defined technical jargon that distinguished them from the general populace.46

Lortie identified a paradoxical position in which teachers find themselves. He notes widespread resistance to "merit pay" or any prestige awards that would not treat teachers uniformly alike. Teachers argued that any "differentiation...will lead to envy and hostility among teachers, preventing the cooperation which is necessary to effective education." He poses a particularly relevant question: "Why does a group which expresses so little concern for extrinsic rewards perceive them as so dangerous to peer solidarity?"47

In his later work, Lortie has continued to stress the same theme of the lack of teacher autonomy and the associated lack of professional collaboration that teachers have been able to engender among themselves.48 He sees this as
an attempt to maintain one of the few boundaries allowed classroom teachers: the lack of intrusion into classroom management. Ironically, this is one of the most debated areas of teacher effectiveness and certainly the area of schooling which would benefit from a collaboration of skills, abilities and resources.

Lortie also was concerned about the continual erosion of teacher judgment. He correctly pointed out that teachers unlike doctors and lawyers, often have their judgments and positions questioned which further adds to the conflict inherent in a teacher's role.

Although teachers have difficulty meeting individual needs in the grouped structure of public schools, they are expected to make individual assessments and decisions about students. Such work with people involves considerable judgment; to prescribe particular remedies for learning difficulties, for example, is not a cut-and-dried matter—it involves intuition as well as explicit reasoning. One's judgments, moreover, need time to reveal their merit or inadequacy; others must be willing to extend trust until the results are in. Similar conditions apply to the practice of psychotherapy; diagnoses and treatment interact over time as the therapist tests various possibilities. But although the tasks and imperatives may be similar for teachers and therapists, there is normally a large difference in their prestige. Therapists may be licensed psychologists or physicians; where that is so, their claims to trust are buttressed by impressive qualifications based on protracted study.

Although it would require separate research to find out how willing members of the public are to trust teachers' judgments about individual students, that trust rarely matches that extended to qualified therapists. Teachers are certified to teach in schools without demon-
strating expert knowledge of individual psychology.

There is evidence, moreover, that parents question teachers' judgments and do not feel constrained to 'wait it out'; one hears of administrators overruling teachers' judgments. Again we find that the imperatives of teaching and the status of teachers are misaligned.

In each comparison, we found that persons performing tasks similar to teachers' enjoyed greater status rights. Teachers have fewer resources, and less control over them, than theater directors. Teachers have less discretionary power and fewer resources than managers. Teachers have less formal recognition to support their judgments than do psychotherapists. Teachers therefore can be said to be comparatively poorer in the status resources which facilitate accomplishment of the tasks listed here. Recalling how deeply teachers feel about their psychic rewards, we would expect them to develop ideas about these points of stress and tension.49

In summary, the school emerges from the literature as an organization that does not encourage differentiation or autonomy among its staff. When then are the implications for an organization that has been forced to undergo dramatic change such as the special education legislation of 766 and 94-142? What happens to an organization that can only achieve its stated goal by differentiation of its staff and resources while that very differentiation was in fact never an organizational value previous to the legal pressure to change?
Implications for Organizational Effectiveness

In considering the school as a complex organization, it is helpful for this study to understand the school in the context of its environment—its social setting, its cultural, fiscal, political and economic determinants. Differentiation occurs in response to the need to change or adapt to new demands on the system. Emery and Trist developed a typology of "causal textures" of a variety of organizational environments that stimulate adaptation.50

The traditional school system is seen by Gabarro as a loose connection of subgroups because historically there has been little occasion for required collaboration.51 However, as the nature of the collaboration changes there must also be an associated change within the organization. Thompson points out that the more complex the interdependence the greater the difficulty and coordination costs of achieving integration of the units.52 Others have seen collaboration and integration even more difficult to achieve when one subgroup is dependent on another subgroup for service support and not merely financial or organizational support.53 Lorsch and Allen have found that the greater the required interdependence between subgroups, the more elaborate are the integrating mechanisms required to coordinate them and the greater the effort needed to bring about integration.54
For years John Gardner has attempted to awaken readers to the "dry rot" consuming our organizations and eventually our society as well as our lack of willingness to change and adapt our complex systems. Sarason argues this same point even more cogently for the professional community by saying that what is required is "not only to learn new ways of thinking and acting but to unlearn old ones...." In considering professional growth and organizational development Sarason argues for a new set of administrative practices to accommodate the changes that must be forced to create effective organizations. His point is that any recommendations must be specific to the organization but as a society concerned with the effectiveness of our institutions we must grow beyond "the point [where] programs and procedures are developed without considering the needs and satisfaction of the staff." 

Argyris supplies the reader with a concept of organizational health that has been based on autonomy. He argues that healthy human beings tend to find dependence, subordination and submissiveness frustrating and that their organizational response to this psychological failure is to maintain differentiation as a boundary and a source of protection.

There has been little consideration of the impact of a diverse number of specialties upon an organization that had previously limited itself to one area of specialization.
For instance, there had been some early concern about the impact of psychiatry on schools but this kind of concern received little serious treatment either by the specialists or by the schools. Similarly, Blanchard reports on the expanding role of speech pathologists under Chapter 766 but with little attention to the organizational impact of such change. Within the traditional educational context, the prevailing view seems to have been the more services provided the better for the school.

Weatherley and Lipsky were the first to identify increased specialization as a potential problem in school organizations. In their work on the implementation of special education legislation in Massachusetts they have pointed out that teachers consider special needs children as problems while specialists consider the same students to be creative challenges. Additionally, they have observed status, autonomy and salary differences in the three school systems they studied. Such differences were among the points of potential conflict cited by Weatherley and Lipsky.

Summary

The review of selected literature provides background information on the theoretical underpinnings of the concept of differentiation of a complex organization in response to a changing environment. Additionally, the
literature supplies information concerning separate roles, functions, careers and possible points of differentiation between teachers and social workers in response to the legal demands of recently enacted special education legislation. Lastly, the literature raises some general questions about the mode of response of an organization to a changing environment.

The purpose of this review was to provide a context in which to describe differentiation in a public school system in response to special education legislation. Perspectives were needed from the fields of organizational development, social work and educational management.

The review of the literature from organizational development indicates that effective organizations respond to new demands by differentiation of their subgroups and a useful typology is indicated. The advantages of differentiation are eroded when the reciprocal process of integration is not engaged. The inability to achieve collaboration among subgroups creates fragmentation and modifies the mission of the total organization.

There have been limited applications of organizational development studies to the fields of education and human services. There has been little consideration of the impact of a diverse number of specialities upon organizational structures, such as schools, that have previously defined their mission to a very small number of role functions.
This review has been helpful in considering the impact of special education legislation on the mission, the character and the staff composition of a public school system.

The review of the literature from the field of social work indicates a considerable diversity of opinion about the role and function of social workers in schools. Some writers have seen social workers as too traditionally grounded in clinically focused, individual therapy while others have concluded that social workers created too much conflict with teachers over treatment goals. Some writers have identified social workers as ancillary in the work of teachers while others described their role as pivotal and essential to a successful educational experience.

According to several writers, social workers' concerns with status and autonomy issues create a block to collaborative efforts with teachers. Social workers are reluctant to share their expertise by encouraging all school staff to take responsibility for the psychosocial needs of students. Several writers point out that this is less an issue of therapeutic treatment and is more closely associated with social workers' concerns regarding the maintenance of professional identity. This identity distinguishes them from teachers because of the degree of technical knowledge.

The literature from educational management as it relates to the teaching profession indicates widespread
job dissatisfaction, lack of autonomy, low esteem, limited role possibilities and professional recognition. All these factors make teachers susceptible to defensiveness and disharmony in their working relationships with colleagues from other disciplines. These concerns take on additional significance when considered in the perspective of the changing nature of the school organization. New demands for additional services and for cross disciplinary collaboration rather than building on the strong points of the teaching profession seemed to underscore their own concerns about professional status and autonomy.
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CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter presents a detailed description of the methodology rationale, and procedures used in researching, reporting, describing and analyzing a case study of differentiation in a public school. The chapter includes a discussion of and rationale for the case study approach with an indepth discussion of data collection techniques used in the field: historical perspective, participant observation and unstructured interview. Additional material is also presented to describe the site and protocol selection. Chapter III also describes the data analysis and method of presentation that has been employed in this study of differentiation.

The Case Study Approach

The case study method is an attempt to qualitatively describe a series of events, attitudes, behaviors and interactions that existed in the particular unit under examination. It is a methodology of description and not quantification. The case study method presents a
pattern of activities which consists of a reiterative cycle of sequentially collected data, analyzing it to develop crude hypotheses which guide the next stage of data gathering, collecting additional data, re-analysis and further hypotheses, developing and rechecking with additional data collection followed by continued analysis.¹

This particular method of data collection and analysis has been represented in a variety of academic disciplines. Business administration (Towl, 1969; Willings, 1968), medicine (Becker, 1956) and in social psychology and sociology (Whyte, 1943; Liebow, 1967) have all employed the case study approach.

Case study methods are a form of field research studies. These had been in decline for some years prior to their recent resurgence partially because there has always been associated with [them] a certain gaminess and zest; to a limited extent, its return to prominence is probably associated with a resurgence of those qualities in contemporary scientific practice.²

There has been considerable concern that such studies were not objective or accurate but subjective and biased. There is a viewpoint that argues that objectivity can only be obtained through reliable data and that it is extremely difficult to be neutral when people are involved and their responses are evaluated qualitatively.

Increasingly, however, educational research has been making more effective use of field research procedures and methodology. This movement appears to be an attempt to
understand the role of educators who are continually interacting in a variety of multidimensional ways, each action dynamically influencing subsequent events. Geoffrey and Smith (1968) used these techniques when they designed a non-participant observer study to document student interaction. In a similar study, Jackson (1968) described the preferential treatment given to some students. Smith and Keith (1970) used participant observation techniques in their study of an innovative elementary school. Wolcott (1973) used qualitative designs in his study of an elementary school principal. Fagan (1974) employed anthropological field techniques in his study of elementary schools. Lincoln (1978) designed a case study analysis of the Anisa model. Hoy (1979) was perhaps referring to the important place of qualitative methodology in educational research when he argued that "questions of fact can be answered through scientific investigation, but questions of value cannot be verified through scientific inquiry."³

Educational research has increasingly demanded a cross disciplinary approach. This had been the case in the field of educational administration. In addition to being a relatively new field of academic endeavor, there is still the interdisciplinary sorting process of "what aspects of sociology, psychology, political science and economics can add to our understanding of educational administration."⁴

Smith and Keith (1971), Wolcott (1975), and Wilson (1974,
1977) have provided helpful insights into this cross disciplinary search with their description of field research methodology and its application to educational research.

The importance of naming, identifying and describing emergent organizational and societal patterns has been well documented (Whyte, 1943; Homans, 1950; Glasser and Straus, 1967; Sarason, 1971; Bogden and Taylor, 1975; Schatzmen and Strauss, 1973) but it is clear that qualitative methodology has its limitations in accuracy and application much as the quantification procedures limit the environmental pattern they describe. Statistical analysis, quantification, survey method, participant observation, cross referenced criterion checking, intensive interviewing and "going native" (or the taking on of a lifestyle indigenous to the environment) all have specific limitations. It is of crucial importance that the researcher be aware of the strengths and weaknesses of the chosen methodology to facilitate its most effective use.5

Glenn Jacobs' underscored this point when he argued:

I am not suggesting that we cast out the standard scientific criterion of relevance, internal consistency, replicability, objectivity, and so on. I mean simply that these should not be idolatrizied, for they are merely tools ancillary to ourselves as research instruments.6

In this study the author seeks to describe the working relationships between teachers and social workers that
suggested organizational as well as attitudinal distinctions between these two groups. There are data to suggest that such a comparison study enhances the accuracy of the description of emerging theory because it enables the researcher:

1. to detail precisely the similarities and differences of the groups and describe the structural conditions which compel or impede these group characteristics.
2. to calculate the impact of a given order of events on the described outcome.7

Such a comparison study describes characteristics of differentiation which existed between teachers and social workers not as a static event but as a description of behaviors and attitudes that developed over time. These interactions were molded by the environmental demands and characteristics of the school system and the state law and were honed by the individual and societal views of professional status.

A case study approach employing qualitative methods is capable of addressing several aspects often associated with the issue of differentiation in a public school:

1. Assuming that organizations are systems of individuals and groups which act on one another (Barton and Anderson, 1974), how have social workers and teachers acted on one another to promote the best needs of children?

2. In our democracy, it is accepted that individuals differ on a wide variety of issues. When these same individuals enter schools as teachers, social workers or
parents, why is it commonly believed that there is an agreed on set of goals and attitudes? What is the organizational tolerance for pluralism?

3. In many studies we have sought to understand why our schools work or don't work because of the teaching methods, or the classroom supplies or the number of students. All too rarely have we sought to understand the dynamic and interactional characteristics of the staff in schools as a key to discovering what makes effective schools and actualized people.

These are some of the aspects associated with the topic of differentiation that must be considered in the decision to choose a methodology (Rist, 1979). In choosing a qualitative approach, the researcher places emphasis on the perceptions of others.

Qualitative methodology is an attempt to understand and relate the underlying attitudes and assumptions that influence behavior:

Qualitative research is predicated upon the assumption that this method of 'inner understanding' enables a comprehension of human behavior in greater depth than is possible from the study of surface behavior, the focus of quantitative methodologies.8

It is such an understanding that the writer seeks in his descriptions of how social workers and teachers influence each other, their schools and the children with whom they work.

Data Collection

Ben David has reminded researchers that they should
organize their studies according to their own purposes, based upon their own needs in relation to the material and subject and not attempt to conform to any idealized model. For our study, it is useful to employ three major tools of the qualitative researcher: the historical perspective, participant observation and the interview.

The historical perspective. Teachers and social workers have been formally interacting with each other in the school system under study since the inception of Chapter 766 in 1974. Before that there was a pattern of more casual association between the two groups. It seems essential not only to describe the actual level of interaction and the impact on the organization at the period of study (1978-1980) but also to describe as much as possible this behavior and its changes over time.

The author examined a variety of documents to elaborate on this picture of changing and emerging behavior patterns and the role that the organizational structure played in this behavior. School department publications, special education department minutes, guidelines, handbooks and publications were examined. Newspaper articles were gleaned for periodic reflection of the response of the school and the community to the law. Additionally, this material was supplemented by oral history interviews with the Special Education Director and the Assistant
Superintendent to consider relevant points in the implementation of 766, the initial inclusion of social work services into the school department and the design and planning involved in the interaction of differentiated response to 766. The report of the State Department of Education audit of the Alpha School System was also examined.

**Participant observation.** Among the variety of research techniques available to the field researcher is the methodology of participant observation.

By participant observation we mean that method in which the observer participates in the daily life of the people under study, either openly in the role of researcher or covertly in some disguised role, observing things that happen, listening to what is said and questioning people, over some length of time.\(^\text{11}\)

This technique does place the observer in close contact with the social, environmental and attitudinal changes that take place in "the passing present."\(^\text{12}\) These are changes that evolved slowly and are observed through relatively long periods of residence. As already mentioned, participant observation studies have been conducted in schools, hospitals and communities as well as among immigrants (Jacobs, 1970), college students (Whyte, 1943) and the military (Sullivan, 1970). It is a methodology that enables the researcher to get close to the subject by becoming part of it, by assuming a role, by participating
in the activities at hand.

The methodology of this technique involves several important characteristics:

1. The participant observer shares in the life activities and sentiments of people in face-to-face relationships.
2. The role of the participant observer requires both detachment and personal involvement.
3. The researcher acquires a social role which is determined by the requirement of the research design and the framework of the culture.
4. The scientific interests of the participant observer are interdependent with the cultural framework of the people being studied.
5. The social role of the researcher is a natural part of the cultural life of the observed.

The participant observer must be aware of all nuances of the study while maintaining the focus of his goals albeit goals and research directions were often elaborated and delineated on the basis of new data. Wax identified this as the Scandinavian quality called manvit, or intelligence manifested in common sense and shrewdness—the property called "Having one's wits about one."14

The participant observer often finds himself not so much in the position of role taker as role maker.15 This is because of the multiplicity of demands on the participant's time, expertise and involvement: a sharer in the demands of the task at hand as well as an investigator, codifier and analyzer of the interactions that evolve and are manifested from that task activity.16 Of equal import-
ance is the ability of the participant observer to manipulate and interact with his environment in such a way as to gain a clear perspective of the developments at hand.\textsuperscript{17}

The careful researcher must be cognizant of the cautious limitations inherent in the methodology of participant observation. This methodology is not used to solicit information designed to quantify or over generalize.\textsuperscript{18} In observing through an assumed role the researcher adopts an ambivalent position between involver and investigator that shapes the character of the data.\textsuperscript{19} The advantages of exercising influence and manipulation of the environment to organize the data must be carefully understood as having only a fine distinction between coloring and creating the data.\textsuperscript{20}

The pretended role can potentially compromise the role of the researcher because of the potentiality of distortion of the data and "a complete participant must continually remind himself that, above all, he is there as an observer: this is his primary role."\textsuperscript{21} 'Going native' may sometimes inhibit the development of flexible concepts, for the observer can find himself defining the values of those studied, rather than actually studying them.\textsuperscript{22}

The advantages of this methodology in describing hard to quantify material such as emergent values,
attitudes and patterns have already been addressed. The careful researcher must be always aware of the impact of bias. Examination of historical documents, regular note taking and conversations with an impartial associate serve to cross check impressions and emerging trends. An additional check on accuracy is provided by the application of the data to an existing typology, such as the differentiation scheme developed by Lawrence and Lorsch:

The conceptual framework through which the data are collected is essential to the observer. As indicated earlier, the framework cannot be allowed to restrict the data. The framework should, in fact, tend to free the observation from the personal bias of the observer since it dictates elements of behavior to be observed. It makes it possible for the observer to check the observations of the first since both are looking at the same elements.23

Participant observation is a useful tool in this study of social workers and teachers as they interact with each other because it enables the careful researcher to provide a description of behaviors and interactions that are not easily quantifiable.

The interview. The interview is another important tool available to the field researcher. The interview is, of course, one of the many ways in which two people communicate information:

Regarded as an information gathering tool, the interview is designed to minimize the local, concrete, immediate circumstances of the particular encounter—including respective personalities of the participants and to emphasize only
those aspects that can be kept general enough and demonstrable enough to be counted.\textsuperscript{24}

The interview enables the field research to get a view of the data that is different from the view provided by participant observation because it allows for a variety of questions: the challenge or devil's advocate's question, the hypothetical question, posing the ideal, offering interpretations or testing propositions on respondents.\textsuperscript{25} Questions can also be rephrased and cross referenced so that they are able to increase the accuracy of participant observations.

Lofland (1971) provided a methodology for approaching interviews through the utilization of a "non structured interview" guide. These questions are typically open-ended and designed to allow the respondent a range of conversational and informational possibilities. The attempt is always to elicit information and not regulate or control the flow of data.

The interview gives the researcher an opportunity to bring hunches, ideas, impressions and interpretations to the surface where they are dealt with and discussed. The interviews are constructed in such a way that rapport is established with the respondents thus enabling the interviewer to approach key issues from different points of view.

A well structured interview is likely to yield sometimes, often when least expected, the kind of information which gives a real
understanding of attitude... Indeed, it gives not only verbal responses but a whole behavior pattern.26

The interviews enhance the data obtained from participant observation and provides an opportunity to improve accuracy by the testing of ideas and conceptual frameworks.

Research Site Selection and Protocol

This is a comparative case study of teachers and social workers in a mid sized school system (4,000 pupils). This section presents a theoretical basis for research design decisions regarding: (a) access and entry, (b) confidentiality and setting and (c) the researcher's role and schedule.

Access and entry. The researcher had the opportunity to be a member of the school system under study for some three years before assuming the role of participant observer and before instituting the pilot study which would serve as a guide for later investigation. The researcher had the unique position and opportunity of being neither a teacher nor a social worker but having first hand dealings with both groups. Credibility was established through work experiences with both groups. The researcher had been originally trained as a classroom teacher and had several years of actual classroom teaching experience. As a result
this background enriched the researcher's identified role as a Speech Pathologist and enabled him to be acceptable to a group of teachers.

A significant portion of the researcher's clinical work dealt with counselling and in fact he participated in weekly psychiatric supervision sessions with the social workers. Along with the school psychologists, the researcher was commonly identified both administratively and occupationally as a member of the "clinical group." This, in combination with the researcher's other activities as a President of the Board of a non profit corporation providing community services, furthered in the researcher's identification as someone who understood the demands and disciplines of "mental health."

While deliberate plans for access and entry were not an issue in this particular study, it was consistently important to establish and maintain trust levels with both groups. Rapport and trust have continuously been documented as important tools to the field researcher (Glazer, 1972; Blau, 1974; Janes, 1969). Additionally, it was important for the researcher not to become involved in the intramural squabbles sometimes encountered in the schools.

The researcher's role became apparent to those teachers and social workers who were interviewed but was unknown to other members of the school community. Johnson, in his study of social workers, argued that it is encumbent
on the researcher to appreciate and assess the trust levels and the fluid nature of interpersonal relationships in order to effectively achieve the goals of a study. In his experience, "the development of relations of trust constitutes a pattern which could actually result in more objective observations." 27

Confidentiality and setting. The participant observation data was obtained in classrooms, the offices of administrators, social workers and psychologists as well as in other settings such as school playgrounds and teacher's lounges. The interviews were conducted in a private space that would ensure an uninterrupted face-to-face conversation and promote confidentiality. If the interviewee had a preference for a particular site this was respected; generally, however, the interviews were conducted in the researcher's office or the respondent's home.

The aim of this protocol was to achieve a relaxed atmosphere for the interviews, an atmosphere conducive to the serious sharing of information. Wildman (1977) argued that the setting has no negative effects on the field research whereas Phillips (1971) felt that the setting can bias the study. This researcher attempted to avoid this particular theoretical issue by the choice of a neutral setting that was acceptable to the respondent.
All respondents were told that the interview was conducted as part of the researcher's doctoral work and that the researcher was seeking to better understand "what made good teachers and good social workers." The respondents were all told that they were selected because they were recognized by the researcher and their colleagues as being "good" teachers or "good" social workers. All respondents were informed that this material would not be used for internal purposes but would appear in disguised form in the researcher's dissertation. Interviews were tape recorded with the permission of respondents and notes were sometimes taken during the interview.

All respondents were assured confidentiality of their responses. Confidentiality places a double kind of responsibility on us; we are bound by the right of privacy of the informant and by the fact that we made a commitment as an inducement to gain cooperation and are ethically bound to honor that commitment as privileged communication.28

Role and schedule. The researcher participated fully in his responsibilities as a speech and language pathologist but made a point of taking regular field notes from 1978-1980, the period of time covered by the study. The researcher attempted to follow Becker's three stages of field analysis:
the selection and definition of problems, concepts and indices; the check on the frequency and distribution of phenomena; and the incorporation of individual findings into a model of the organization under study.29

In addition, the researcher made a point of summarizing interview material within a twenty-four hour period from the time it was collected.

Presentation and data analysis. The data for this study of differentiation between teachers and social workers in a public school were gleaned from field research using the tools of historical perspective, participant observation and unstructured interviews. These data were then presented in the framework of the typology of Lawrence and Lorsch described in Chapter II. Accuracy was improved by a respect for and understanding of the methodological implications of participant observation and interviewing, regular and consistent reporting procedures and the cross checking of the data with a colleague not associated with the school system.

The data are presented in Chapter IV and are analyzed in Chapter V. The analysis of the data includes two crucial points of examination: (1) the manner in which teachers and social workers influence each other through a consideration of the Lawrence and Lorsch model of differentiation, and (2) the influence and implications that this differentiation has on the organizational mission
of a service organization, such as a school.30

Summary

It is important to consider the methodology in relationship to the goals of the study and in the perspective of the material to be analyzed.

This study is concerned with the impact of recently implemented special education legislation on the organizational character of a public school system. The legislation has required the addition of a wide variety of staff, including social workers, who did not hold positions of significant influence in schools prior to the passage of Chapter 766. In many cases, this additional staff has had no prior experience in schools but in fact often drew on experience from other systems such as medical, prison, human services and social services. This study was designed in order to describe the changes on the organizational character of a school system when two groups with different training and experience began to work with each other as colleagues.

In order to accomplish the aims of this study, the researcher employed the techniques of qualitative methodology and developed a case study of the Alpha school system. Historical perspective, participant observation and unstructured interview techniques were all utilized to provide different views of the interaction between social
workers and teachers. This study was concerned with the following questions:

1. Did differentiation take place in the Alpha school system in response to the demands of Chapter 766? Was the employment of social workers an example of such a differentiated response?

2. How did such differentiation affect the perceptions of teachers about themselves, their work and the school system? What was the effect of such differentiation on the organizational nature of the school system and was it really an effective means of meeting the needs of Chapter 766?

3. What attitudes and behaviors were observable that would provide insight into the working relationships between teachers and social workers? What are the perceptions of teachers and social workers about the impact of differentiation upon their professional roles?
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CHAPTER IV
DATA PRESENTATION

Introduction

This chapter contains a detailed presentation of the data gathered through three principal techniques of the qualitative methodology as presented in Chapter III: historical perspective, participant observation and unstructured interview.

Using these three tools, the reader will be able to gain distinct perspectives that, when taken together, form the case study:

A. The historical perspective presents an overview of the special education legislation as it evolved and as it affected the school system. This section included three perspectives on the impact of that legislation: one from the Special Education Director, one from the Assistant Superintendent of Schools and one from the State Department of Education Audit Team. All three viewpoints were discussed in Alpha and highlighted themes for the following years.

B. The participant observation perspective was the result of the author’s two year exploration of
"the passing present" and was an attempt to report the social, environmental and attitudinal change that emerged for teachers and social workers in the school system as a result of the impact of Chapter 766.

C. The unstructured interview (as outlined in Appendix C) was designed to report in the words of the teachers and social workers the changes in their own functioning within the school system in response to the legislation. Eight social workers and sixteen teachers were interviewed with this purpose in mind.

The Historical Perspective

There has been a movement in the United States for some time to affect a change in public policy and apply scarce resources to the education of the handicapped. However, it was the crush of litigation, arguing that the handicapped must be provided with equal rights, that accounted for two of the more significant pieces of legislation in this field (i.e., Massachusetts Chapter 766 and the Public Law 94-142).

Chapter 766 attempted to abolish the rigid categorizations of the past. It was argued that such labels as educable, trainable, custodial and minimal brain dysfunction really had not one scintilla of scientific validation, and
had long ago collapsed clinically but had survived out of administrative convenience. In many ways, Massachusetts was an historically favorable environment in which to attempt a change in the hard and fast categories of the past. The state had provided educational leadership from the early "Old Satan Deluder Act" of 1647 which mandated public education, through Horace Mann and finally up to the Bartley-Daly Special Education Act or Chapter 766, as it was commonly called.

The legislature was initially quite clear in the goals associated with this act:

1. past 'development of special education programs has resulted in great variation of services...'
2. 'past methods of labeling and defining the needs of children have had a stigmatizing effect and have caused special education programs to be overly narrow and rigid.'
3. 'it is the purpose of this act to provide for a uniform and flexible system of special education programs...'
4. 'to provide a flexible and non-discriminatory system for identifying and evaluating the individual needs of children requiring special education...'
5. 'to prevent denials of equal educational opportunity on the basis of national origin, sex, economic status, race, religion and physical and mental handicap...'
6. 'this act is designed to remedy past inequities...'

From a national perspective, considerable data had been gathered to confirm the compelling need for a reorganization and a rethinking of services to the handicapped:
1. there are more than eight million handicapped children in the United States today; [1976]
2. the special education needs of such children are not being completely met;
3. more than half of the handicapped children in the United States do not receive educational services which would enable them to have full equality of opportunity;
4. one million of the handicapped children are excluded entirely from the public school system and will not go through the educational process with their peers;
5. there are many handicapped children throughout the United States participating in regular school programs whose handicaps prevent them from having successful educational experiences because their handicaps are undetected;
6. because of the lack of adequate services within the public school system, families are often forced to find services outside the public system, often at great distance from their homes and at their own expense;
7. developments in the training of teachers and in diagnostic and instructional procedures have advanced to the point that, given appropriate funding, state and local education agencies can and will provide effective special education and related services to meet the needs of the handicapped;
8. State and local education agencies have a responsibility to provide education for all handicapped children, but present financial resources are inadequate to meet the special education needs of handicapped children;
9. it is in the national interest that the Federal Government assist State and local efforts to provide programs to meet the educational needs of handicapped children in order to assure equal protection of the law.2

Both Chapter 766 and P.L. 94-142 were a series of guidelines, mandates and regulations designed to legislate the handicapped into the classrooms or more specifically into an appropriate education in "the least restrictive environment." There are similarities and differences in
the laws as they reflect the impact of state and national litigation and lobby pressures.

Both laws seek to provide free appropriate public education for the handicapped. Both laws outline clear due process safeguards, although 766 goes much further in its specificity about parent and student rights. 766 utilizes a cost sharing system with the local communities while 94-142 requires the states under the threat of withholding public funds to subsidize the provisions of the law. Both pieces of legislation are committed to the local control of educational services within the regulations of the law. The ultimate aim is the generation of funds at the federal level to flow through the State Education Agency down to the local education agency (LEA). In the event of non-compliance, federal and state funds are withheld from school systems. Both 766 and 94-142 are consistent with court rulings regarding bias free testing, confidentiality and due process procedures. Both laws have recognized the importance of thoughtful participation and administration of the legislation by including parent groups and public advisory bodies in the formal positions of consumer advocates for special education.

The differences between Chapter 766 of the Massachusetts Acts of 1972 and PL 94-142 passed by the Congress in 1975 speak to the nuances between federal and state
public policy, to identified priorities and to the political milieu that surrounds the passage of most legislation. The appeals process has considerably less teeth in 94-142 than in 766: it is not well detailed, the arbitration panels are not clearly defined and the procedures are vague. There is also continuing concern that 94-142 is inadequately funded.

One important aspect in 766 is the issue of education in "the least restrictive environment" which is also a hallmark of 94-142. However, only sixteen states have statutes to support this approach and federal regulatory powers are not spelled out. 766 is more precise in the stipulation about "least restrictive environment" while 94-142 addresses itself to a "free, appropriate public education."3

94-142 categorizes the children who should be served by labelling their disability. Massachusetts, on the other hand, was one of the first states to develop a special education law based on non-labelling of children. The rationale used in 766 was that any labelling continued to support the attitude of identifying human beings as defective.4

**Policy Implication of Litigation and Legislation**

The movement behind the development of Chapter 766
has added a new vocabulary and new criteria by which to consider the appropriateness of programs and directions for equal educational rights for the handicapped. Let us consider these new demands from four different perspectives:

1. the right to an education in the least restrictive environment;
2. the right to individualized education for the handicapped appropriate to their specific needs;
3. the right of parental and student involvement in the educational program with due process and confidentiality safeguards;
4. the avoidance of categorical labels.

First, all handicapped children have a right to education in the least restrictive environment possible. The history of segregation, exclusion and isolation of the handicapped as a matter of policy has been documented extensively on both national and state levels. The right is grounded in "The Doctrine of the Least Restrictive Alternative."^5

In essence, this doctrine provides that, when the government pursued a legitimate goal that may involve the restricting of fundamental liberty, it must do so using the least restrictive alternative available. Applied to education, courts have ruled in principle that special education systems or practices are inappropriate if they remove children from their extended peer groups without benefit of constitutional safeguards. Special placements are sometimes a restriction of such fundamental liberty.
The law requires that substantive efforts be made by educators to maintain handicapped children with their peers in the regular education setting, and that the state bear the burden of proof when making placements.

Secondly, for a long time, the goal of equal education for the handicapped was simply translated to mean that special education students were to be put into programs that were characterized by a reduction in the number of students per instructional unit, assignment of a teacher who had additional credits in some aspects of special education and application of a milder, less rigorous curriculum.

Now, under Chapter 766 and PL 94-142, each student is required to have an individualized educational plan that must specify the decisions related to assessment, the identified needs, the goals of intervention and methods to evaluate these objectives based on need, the determination of a learning environment specific to identified needs and the specific criteria for the termination of intervention. These procedures identified a child centered consideration of program alternatives as opposed to programs designed for administrative convenience.

Thirdly, parents and students have a right to be involved in all aspects of the educational process and can make substantive contributions through their involvement in the planning of appropriate education. Parents and
students clearly have a right to constitutional due process in any matter related to an anticipated change in placement, including the assessment, planning, programming and evaluation processes. Formal hearings and all the steps related to procedural safeguards are to be utilized only when substantive disagreement exists between parents and the school regarding appropriate education.

And fourth, the use of categorical labels and classification practices is now considered poor form and speaks to the lack of imagination in conceptualizing the individual child. A good deal of literature has recognized the potentially harmful effects of such labels on self concept, and on the expectations of others such as teachers, peers, parents and employers.

The special education legislation was clear and precise in the specific tasks placed on the school system. These demands were more specific in nature, diverse in content and carefully monitored than most other educational legislation. The Alpha school system had then to determine the scope of fiscal, managerial and personnel resources that would be committed to meet these requirements.

Alpha Community Response

The growing pressure to ensure equal rights to handicapped children on the state level was paralleled quite closely by the Alpha School System. As early as 1960 there
was an effort to educate the "retarded" in a special classroom, albeit this classroom was in a one room school house located in a cemetery. In the late 1960's the Title I project funded services for a rather advanced speech and language center, several reading clinics and a part-time social worker to supplement the efforts of the guidance department. By the early 1970's more serious attention was being paid to the area of special education: a larger budget, two more sites and the hiring of new and additional staff to run these programs.

Figure 4.1 represents the change in the allocation of the system's resources over a ten year period to support the efforts of special education. During this period special education absorbed increasingly larger amounts of the system's resources with little awareness of the effects on the entire school system. Less of the scarce resources were available to the regular education program in a continuing shrinkage of money and staff allocation. Differentiation was accomplished by the development of new programs, staffed by new groups of personnel at an ever increasing cost to the operation of the regular education program. There is no indication that such decisions were made in a collaborative planning effort by all members of the school community, but rather that these decisions were made to meet the perceived short term demands of Chapter 766 by a limited number of decision makers.
### Figure 4.1

**Alpha Student Enrollment and Finances**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Department Budget</strong></td>
<td>$3,966,568</td>
<td>$6,031,074</td>
<td>$6,248,044</td>
<td>$6,970,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Education Budget</strong></td>
<td>$42,371</td>
<td>$945,634</td>
<td>$1,133,734</td>
<td>$1,423,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Student Roster</strong></td>
<td>4,758</td>
<td>4,529</td>
<td>4,520</td>
<td>4,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Education Student Roster</strong></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Professional Employees</strong></td>
<td>308</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Education Professional Employees</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per Pupil Cost District-wide</strong></td>
<td>$833</td>
<td>$1,331</td>
<td>$1,382</td>
<td>$1,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per Pupil Cost Special Education</strong></td>
<td>$963</td>
<td>$1,953</td>
<td>$2,448.67</td>
<td>$2,910</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1969-1979 per pupil cost district wide: increase of 180 percent
1969-1979 per pupil cost special education: increase of 302 percent

*The inclusion of dollar figure amounts is presented only as an indication of trends in the allocation of fiscal resources and not as a precise measurement of units of service during an inflationary period.*
By examining the allocation of the scarce resources of this school system, the impact of special education on the system became somewhat clearer. In 1969 special education served forty-four students with five staff members with the resources of one percent of the total budget. In preparation for implementing Chapter 766 the FY '74 budget designated services for four hundred and eighty-four students with a staff of forty-six and a total budget allocation of $945,634 or twenty-two times the budget five years previously which represented 16 percent of the total school budget. In FY '75 to meet the increased demands of the law the system designated four hundred and sixty-three students to be served by fifty-one staff members with a total allocation of $1,133,734 or 15.6 percent of the total budget. By 1979 special education was serving four hundred and sixty-nine students with sixty-three staff at a cost of $1,423,204 or 20.4 percent of the school budget.

It is important to note that during this same period the system experienced a decline in enrollment and a decrease in regular teaching staff.

During this ten year period there was a net gain of eighteen teaching positions and an increase of fifty-eight positions in special education direct service personnel. The school system increased its annual budget in the five year period 1974-1979 by approximately 13.4 percent while the special education allocation increased 33.5 percent.
In 1979 it cost the school system $1,548 to educate a student while special education spent approximately $2,910 per student with some placements costing in excess of $20,000. In FY '79 special education served 10.86 percent of the student population with 19.8 percent of the staff and 20.4 percent of the budget. Special education per pupil cost increased at a higher rate than districtwide cost and absorbed a bigger percentage of the budget (Figure 4.2).

Figure 4.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY '74</th>
<th>FY '79</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Education student population (%)</td>
<td>10.68%</td>
<td>10.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education staff (%)</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education budget (%)</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Pupil Cost district wide</td>
<td>$1,331</td>
<td>$1,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Pupil Cost special education</td>
<td>$1,953</td>
<td>$2,910</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
During this period there was generally a good deal of support for the special education program by the community, the school committee and the staff. The newspaper wrote several articles about the programs and the school was the first to be audited by the state in 1975 and found to be exemplary in its performance and commitment in implementing the law. By all appearances this was a model system for meeting the needs of special education students in the least restrictive environment and this decade of programmatic and fiscal expansion was without serious challenge until the budget negotiations for FY '81.

Three Views of Administrative Response

In an attempt to understand the rationales and viewpoints influencing the Alpha School System during this early period, information was gleaned from three sources involved in decision making during this period. The Director of Special Education is directly responsible for the design and implementation of the special education program. The Assistant Superintendent of Schools is directly responsible for the curriculum development and financial operation of the regular education component during this period and was witness to the erosion of both programmatic and fiscal resources for regular education. The State Department of Education is responsible for the supervision of Chapter 766 legal requirements and is central resource
for technical assistance to school systems.

The following themes emerged from the data gleaned from the three views of administrative response to Chapter 766:

- that these three groups perceived that regular education teachers responded to the law in general and the Alpha Special Education Department in particular as a disenfranchisement of their authority and influence in the school system;
- that special education was a response to immediate demands without reference to long term needs in Alpha;
- that the application of differentiation was exclusionary and noncollaborative;
- that the application of the decision making process was nonparticipatory, insensitive to the environmental concerns of the school community and single minded in its approach to problem solving;
- that the lack of understanding of and appreciation for the impact of exclusionary actions disrupted the mission of the organization.

The Director of special education. The director came to the system with a number of characteristics that separated him from the mainstream of the public school professional staff. He had prior experience on the West Coast, was not an Alpha native and took the position because it offered "the possibility for professional advancement." Within three years he had tripled his staff, expanded his program and budget and earned his doctorate in education.

It had been rare prior to 1979 to hire an "outsider." An unwritten rule gave employment preference to local personnel and even as late as 1980 the School Committee
insisted that all local candidates must be interviewed for all professional and non-professional positions. During this period, however, the number of special education employees without local ties grew to be significantly more different from the demographic profile of those employed in regular education. This Special Education administrator was the only decision maker to have professional experience outside of the system, the only administrator to hold a doctorate, the only administrator to have published and the only one to have maintained his residence out of the town. His hiring practices were in many ways reflective of these differences.

He felt that he came to Alpha at "just the right time." Not only was there a significant push locally and nationally for special education but the climate reflected the "belief of the Great Society--if you put enough money and enough talent into a project the problem will be solved." There was a feeling of acceptance by the school committee and the administration because many of them seemed to "really care about special education, in general, and me, in particular." In those days, "I wasn't viewed as taking things away from regular education, but was supplementing their programs." Although there were some "stormy battles they gave me mostly what I wanted."

One of these stormy battles dealt with the treatment of students with emotional or adjustment problems. There
was general consensus about the interventions necessary to help children with reading, speech, or physical problems. There was considerable argument, however, over the school's responsibility for the treatment of children's emotional difficulties that might intrude on any remediation efforts. Many in the community found it difficult to understand how emotional factors affected a child's learning. For instance, "that Learning Disabilities Group [the local society for the Prevention of Learning Disabilities] did not believe in emotional factors stopping anything," noted the Special Education Director. While there was support for "precision teaching, management by objectives, program prototypes, resource rooms and remedial reading," social workers were viewed as a "bunch of do-gooder mush-heads who spent their time probing into family life." For many, family life was not an appropriate area of school concern, especially when it dealt with difficult to document issues such as "emotional abuse."

Originally, the school system contracted for social work services from the local aid and family service group. As part of the move to centralize staff and increase control over this therapy, the special education director secured three positions for social workers in 1974 and five in 1976. From the very beginning they were involved in a "clinical group" with a psychologist and a psychiatric consultant. The staffing pattern was such that no social
worker was full-time in any one school and, often, two social workers would be handling individual cases in each school.

The social workers were nominally brought on to serve as the "home component." According to the regulations of Chapter 766 the presentation of a home assessment was necessary at each team meeting for new referrals. This assessment would often lead to a recommendation for "counselling of the student or home management sessions for the family." In several instances, the parents took this "as a personal attack on their parenting style."

From the very beginning the themes of organizational disharmony were present in this group. The Special Education Director found it "hard to find social workers who knew anything about schools--they were all so clinically trained." No job description existed and there was never an introduction, a seminar or a presentation of what a social worker would do. In part, "this was because of the enormous inservice training that needed to be conducted to simply familiarize the teaching staff with the law and the referral process."

In addition, it was a difficult organizational integration because social workers had so much more flexibility in their jobs than teachers and they often took positions that were antagonistic, confrontive and not helpful to teachers. For example, social workers were often concerned
why a child was acting out and wished to help him "process this adjustment reaction" while the harried teacher needed a return to "good behavior" to go on with her job.

Very early during the growth of special education in Alpha there was the formation of a group that met regularly and was made up of individuals who had not existed organizationally three years before: the Director of Special Education, the Director of the Early Childhood Program, the staff psychologists, the psychiatric consultant and the social workers.

For a short time the guidance department was represented but this was short lived. The Special Education Director stated that there was an initial struggle over territory but "I simply refused to meet until they met in my office and that settled that issue." Apparently, little attention was given to involving principals or teachers in this group—-even special education teachers were excluded. This group was not "intentionally exclusionary" but it did lead to a "source of resentment for years."

The group staffing model was maintained and became known as the "clinical group." No significant modifications were made in this design until 1980. This clinical group continued to make significant program decisions and to a great degree influenced the expenditure of monies and staff within the system.
Assistant Superintendent of Schools. The Assistant Superintendent of Schools provided a quite different perspective for the researcher. This man was born and raised in Alpha, raised his family here and both he and his wife taught school in the Alpha system. He shared the respect of his community and his colleagues much like the Director of Special Education but for quite different reasons. Like many of his fellow administrators, he rose "through the ranks" and shared blood and friendship relationships with many members of the teaching staff. Unlike the director, he viewed his tenure as a commitment to "a place, a town, an educational system."

The Assistant Superintendent was quite clear that the special education law was "not needed here." The small community of Alpha was "caught up in a state law to force communities to do things for special needs children" which we "were already doing without all this red tape." In fact 766 "generated, as far as teachers and administrators were concerned, a degree of animosity toward the program,...suddenly special education was by statute sacrosanct during a period when there was retrenchment throughout public education."

The Assistant Superintendent saw "a reduction in regular education programs by the expansion of special education." This had been a fine school system, he believed, that had offered a good education but the rapid
growth of special education caused a cutback not necessarily in daily service in the classroom but in programs that made us a little different: the foreign language program, the violin program, materials available to classroom teachers, specific instructional materials, TV and the audio-visual department, library acquisitions, etc....

Special education represented the redirection of scarce resources in the system rather than the allocation of new, previously untapped sources.

The Assistant Superintendent recalled that in the early days, special education teachers received a five hundred dollar premium for teaching special needs youngsters. Many of the staff still received that premium while "the regular classroom teacher now has to handle some of these kids through mainstreaming and he doesn't get a cent extra for it." In addition to that it was the "creative teachers" who got the most difficult kids and this causes additional "resentment."

There was a "widespread feeling that anything was all right for special education kids." Tuition figures of fifteen to twenty thousand dollars, which was the cost of a few special education programs, were "hard to swallow in days of a reduction in force and cutbacks in the supplies of paper and crayons for the classroom teachers." The Assistant Superintendent argued that special education never seemed to consolidate: the numbers, "the mandated"
services, the diversification of staff all required a bigger, more complex outfit. He often wondered if it was really necessary or if this was a quota system that must be maintained to keep the "special education power bloc intact."

He argued the point that consistently the differences in the approach by special education often put it in conflict with the regular education programs. The system of special education did not have a policy for limiting its numbers, for devising strategies to work in the classroom, or to make "special education an ancillary service and not the focus of the systems' resources."

Again and again the theme of big government intervention and intrusion into a functional school system emerged. Rather than teachers designing programs to meet children's special needs as they had before the law, they were now "told" what to do because of the "institutionalization" of 766 and its regulations.

This gentleman pressed an interesting point concerning the impact of diversification and differentiation on a school system when he described Alpha as having several federal programs which were competing for clients. Title I was presumed to serve children with developmental problems which came as some surprise to the child developmental specialists in 766. The reimbursement schedule grants of 94-142 actually "penalized a system like Alpha
because they had to go out and create new client populations just to become eligible for the funds" because 94-142 monies could not be used to supplant existing programs.

The Assistant Superintendent felt that there were problems between the teachers and the social workers from the very beginning. "There was no problem in their coming in but the problem was when they suddenly were in the position to make judgments--when in most cases they have no idea of what goes on inside of a classroom." The social workers were "not that precise" in what they wanted to do or in what they did. He felt they were never really understood by either the teachers or the administration and made very little attempt to explain their own positions.

The perception of the system was very much that the "social worker was there to chase down home problems much more than the teacher would do." In fact, at one time teachers were forbidden from visiting students' homes. The social worker was "supposed to act as a sort of link between schools and families in other than school hours."

The issue of the success or failure (effectiveness) of social workers was something that was clearly frustrating for him because "so much of it [pupil adjustment] lies outside of their control." The function and operation of the social workers varied on the basis of the school environment, their own personality, and their own
interests. There was certainly no standardization—"no curriculum to be followed." If things did not work out somehow, it never "seemed due to the social worker being ineffective." It was always the family, the child, the environment or whatever. He agreed that much of their effectiveness was tempered by other factors but was angered at the social worker's unwillingness to assess alternative means to be more effective.

In closing, he underscored what he thought to be an important point of differentiation between teachers and social workers. Immediately, when social workers entered the system, they entered independent of many of the rules of the school building. "The main distinction between teachers and administrators is being a slave to bells and from the very beginning social workers ignored the bells." Others who had this luxury--department heads, media specialists, supervisory or special subject teachers to an extent--all spent years building up a license that was immediately given to the social workers. "That in itself generated a good deal of uneasiness among staff who were supposed to be colleagues."

The State Department of Education. A main thrust behind the implementation of Chapter 766 in Massachusetts was the establishment of the Bureau of Special Education headed by an Assistant Commissioner. Part of the
activities of this bureau were to support and encourage the development and implementation of the special education law. One means of accomplishing this task was through a "Program Audit."

In 1975, Alpha volunteered to be the first program in the state to be audited and received positive reviews in the audit report, "__________ Audit by the Massachusetts Department of Education, Bureau of Program Audit and Assistance." The state was warm in its praise of the efforts of Alpha:

After our brief but intensive visit to Alpha we found among and throughout the entire staff, professional and non-professional, a most cordial, friendly, open and direct response to our oftentimes probing questions. Evidence of this was garnered through our numerous contacts with members of the school committee, school administration and staff, parents, students, cafeteria workers, and custodial staff.

We were impressed by the genuine concern for young people evidenced in all our deliberations during the three-day visit.

Alpha has been identifying, evaluating, and prescribing for children with special needs several years prior to Chapter 766 of the Acts of 1972. Under the very able leadership of the Director of Special Education, the programs for children in need of special services have been engineered and developed for Alpha children well in advance of Chapter 766.

We find that the numbers and quality of special education programs of the Alpha Public Schools are adequate to provide for the students who are presently in program prototypes 502.1 through 502-6. More than this there appears to be a continuing commitment to expand and improve upon the educational and support services for all children residing in the city of Alpha.
Much of the state's own evaluation confirmed the description given by the Assistant Superintendent of a system that was committed to serving the handicapped before the law imposed the obligation. The central difference was that the state obviously did not consider this an intrusion while the Assistant Superintendent did.

However, there were several points in the state report that raised questions about the interrelationship of staff. The audit report recommended:

a. that Alpha hold inservice workshops for all staff and not have them segregated by field and area of specialization;

b. that the 'school social workers be utilized to provide closer communication and involvement between home and school' and not be as responsible to providing counselling in school;

c. that the kindergarten teachers should be involved in screening kindergarten children and that regular classroom teachers should be involved in educational planning meetings;

d. that there were several concerns about the exclusion of teachers from the special education process by their training, attendance at core meetings, participation on screening teams, having their own copy of an educational plan, and the establishment of a consistent flow of communication between regular and special education.

The state had reported pride on the part of the teachers that the system was working as well as it did for some children but dissatisfaction that many of these teachers were not involved except in a nominal and superficial way in its operation.
The historical perspective provides us with information about the state and national climate that caused a set of demands to be placed on the Alpha school system. The demands were a careful and precise codification of regulations providing for education of the handicapped. These demands also contributed to the decision to hire staff who had training and experience different and distinct from regular educators in the Alpha school system. In response to these demands, the Alpha school system chose to increase the allocation of financial, personnel and managerial resources to special education by drawing from existing regular education programs and mortgaging future programmatic growth in regular education.

Little attention was directed to the potential impact on the organizational character of the school system of such a major allocation of financial resources and such a significant recruitment of staff with different backgrounds. The Special Education Director was myopic in his attention to the bureaucratic implementation of the regulations and in his lack of attention to special education staff development needs. The Assistant Superintendent witnessed the erosion in the autonomy of regular teachers and administrators, the shrinking of financial resources, the loss of positions and the developing uneasiness in the interaction between teachers and social workers. The State Department of Education highlighted the developing
staff and organizational difficulties as well as the increasing alienation of teachers, but felt its primary mission was the implementation of the regulations.

The historical perspective indicated that the decision to hire social workers was a differentiated response to Chapter 766. The social workers had different training, background and role function as well as indicating quite a different view of the goals of the school system. This decision to differentiate was made in response to the perceived demands of the regulations and was made apparently without any appreciation for the resultant change in the character of the organization. Such a decision did indeed affect the character and mission of the entire school system because it affected the roles of the staff, the goals of the system, the allocation of scarce resources and the future plans.

The historical perspective acquired through interviews with two administrators and an analysis of documents has indicated the following themes that became evident as a result of differentiation:

- that the regular education staff felt the law and the implementors of the law were intrusive since this whole program appeared critical of the previous attempts in Alpha to meet the needs of the handicapped;

- that the perceptions of those interviewed indicated that the differentiation seemed exclusionary and noncollaborative to both regular and special education;
that a low priority was given to the participation of regular education in the planning, implementation and program delivery of special education services;

that it was ironic that these demands were placed by Chapter 766 to involve children in the mainstream of education yet the implementation excluded and alienated teachers and principals who were pivotal to this process;

and that decisions were made in response to immediate concerns and not with a long term perspective.

Participant Observation Perspective

The author has had an opportunity to gather first hand impressions in seven of the ten district schools over a two year period. This data was gathered in a variety of places within the school building such as in staff meetings, lunch time conversation and teacher room discussion. This material was noted in a log book and the highlights of the data are presented here.

These observations took place from 1978 through 1980 or from four to six years after Alpha had started to work with Chapter 766. The historical perspective has provided some themes about that earlier period and it was helpful to see how those trends evolved.

From 1974 through 1978, special education in Alpha dramatically increased its staff, its programs and the number of children served. Each year teachers and staff in addition to interacting with new staff and new programs
were faced with new forms for educational plans, newly revised procedures for placement in special education programs, newly revised reporting procedures and an array of bureaucratic forms and required paperwork.

An entire reversal in the decision making process was taking place with special education drawing on more and more of the system's resources. Teachers and social workers were very much a microcosm of this shift. Teachers had less to say about not only which students were to be in their class but also less to say about which behavioral and academic programs were to be applied. Social workers, on the other hand, were making increasingly large numbers of recommendations about programs for children and the delivery of these programs in regular education classes.

Using the techniques of participant observation, the following themes emerged from this investigation:

- that differentiation did take place in the Alpha public school system;

- that social workers had considerably more control over their working environment than did teachers;

- that teachers became increasingly aware of their role restriction and lack of autonomy as they observed the performance of social workers;

- that while teachers and social workers had different training, experience and background the organizational environment consistently supported role flexibility, creativity and innovation in only one group, the social workers;
- that differentiation was increasingly maintained as a boundary between teachers and social workers and not as a functional position intended to address difficulties effecting the mission of the entire organization;

- and that there was an absence of integrative activities that further allowed differentiation to be maintained as a boundary.

The data has suggested the typology to be used in reporting:

Teachers' views of teachers;
Teachers' views of social workers;
Social workers' views of social workers;
Social workers' views of teachers.

Additionally, it was helpful for the researcher to organize this data into categories adapted from the work of Argyris (Figure 4.3). This adaptation allowed for the presentation of a continuum of work related views observed in social workers and teachers. This continuum ranges from a set of dynamically ordered viewpoints of active participation in the environment to a set of statically ordered viewpoints of passive participation of the environment.

**Teachers' Views of Teachers**

A good deal of the conversation with teachers over the last two years increasingly reflected awareness of and sensitivity toward stress issues: staff bumping, class-
## Figure 4.3
The Argyris Typology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dynamically ordered viewpoints of active participation</th>
<th>Statically ordered viewpoints of passive participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The need to have a high sense of self worth and self regard related to technological abilities</td>
<td>The need to have a low sense of self worth and self regard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The need to be active</td>
<td>The need to be passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The need to work with others</td>
<td>The need to work alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The need for variety and challenge in one's work</td>
<td>The need for routine, nonchallenging work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The need to have some close friendships while at work</td>
<td>The need not to make close friendships while at work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The need to produce quality work</td>
<td>The need to produce adequate (quantitative) work at a fair day's pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost no need to over-emphasize material rewards</td>
<td>The need to emphasize material rewards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The need to learn about other kinds of work within the same job family</td>
<td>Almost no need to learn about other kinds of work in the same job family</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Argyris, *Organizations*, p. 241.
room control, drugs and strikes. More and more teachers were talking about their frustrations, why they became teachers and what few options they have for altering their present employment. These issues are very consistent with the national literature, both of the professional and the more colloquial nature.

Teachers in Alpha alluded to the change that has taken place in their system. Most of the staff were able to note the difference since they have been teaching for longer than ten years and were aware of enough history to note the difference. While outsiders have moved in (the central administration is now made up of individuals who came from other states), this was quite a change for a parochial system where many of the principals were related to each other and where it was unusual to find a teacher who had not been raised in the town. It seemed that this factor contributed to an increased fear of not being valued, understood or cared about. After all, the assumption in the system had always been that "you hire your own kind because they understand you."

It is generally common to find most of the school buildings deserted after 2:30 p.m., the mandatory dismissal time. Many teachers talked about staying after to work on special projects, but this norm was not observed in the data. Often teachers stayed after for social events such as baby showers or surprise parties. There
was a good deal of order around the bell system and most teachers have lunch together in the teachers' room—there were a number of comments and considerable peer pressure directed toward those who wished to have lunch alone. Once a month, on curriculum days, most teachers went out to lunch with other teachers.

The author was continually struck by the fact that most teachers were "lifers." While there was talk that they might someday do something else, they presented no real options or motivation for making a change. Administration was viewed as upward mobility within the system, while good teaching did not necessarily increase status. In fact, because good teaching was hard to quantify and was so ego involved it often became a source of strain and one-upsmanship on the staff. Status was improved by the additional accumulation of tasks and responsibilities that got one out of the classroom: making announcements, arranging for the PTO, coordinating a book club, or calling about a field trip.

The researcher was surprised to find that many of the teachers had only met the minimal standards of teacher certification in order to be hired and had not pursued in-service training, workshops, graduate degrees programs or other mechanisms for formal learning. This became a significant issue during this period. One reason was that many of the newly hired special education staff did pursue
these areas of formal training and this helped teachers to perceive themselves as second class citizens. Secondly, this was one of the few ways in which teachers could have been better prepared to cope with the problems that this growing town now faced such as: ethnic diversity, drug abuse and an increasing crime rate.

A gathering point for teachers seemed to be the monthly TGIF ("Thank God It's Friday") parties, nominally sponsored by the Teacher's Union. At such gatherings, the author was often struck by the disillusionment of such comments as: "only sixteen more days until Christmas vacation...I had three free periods today...the money ain't good but you can't beat the time off...do you know, I had three meetings after school this week." But after all, teaching was "a good job with great hours if you have a family...."

However, a good number of the teachers observed did not approach their profession in the manner noted. Rather there was conversational excitement about what they were doing. "I really enjoy coming to work--it's almost not work for me," one teacher told the researcher. Consistently, however, this group of teachers were observed to have high expectations of their work, pursue a good number of outside interests but have low expectations that the environment would reinforce or reward their effective activities.
Teachers were angry that the law was "dropped on them," as one teacher remarked. The common opinion was that they now had to deal with considerable bureaucratic regulation and had less control over their jobs.

Special Education in general, and social workers in particular, became convenient targets for a good deal of misdirected anger. A popular teacher room joke was passed around in 1978 that went something like this—"an evaluation team is made up of a bunch of specialists who each examine part of a child and they end up with a dismembered child." Many of the teachers felt dismembered by not participating in meetings or by being unprepared professionally for lengthy meetings with a more clinical focus.

Hostility ran much higher in 1978 when the teacher's union negotiated a part of the contract that would provide each teacher a stipend of $10.00 for every evaluation planning meeting that extended after 3:00 p.m. or began before 7:45 a.m. Teachers became paid participants but the value of their participation became questionable when the special education team chairman, in an economy drive, began dismissing them a minute before the deadline so that the teachers were unable to collect the money.

Teachers were also uncomfortable at these evaluation planning meetings because of the self comparison of their role to that of their colleagues, such as the social workers. Teachers presented hand written reports on
special education forms while social workers regularly presented typewritten reports in their own format with a notation of their degrees. Social workers had secretarial help in this process which was not made available to the teachers. Additionally, social workers typically had a good deal to say at these meetings while teachers did not. As one teacher moaned after such a meeting "Why should I go to an educational planning meeting--I just sit there and say nothing."

The environment supported and promoted the second class status of teachers through the subtle issues of payment for meetings, secretarial assistance, and the use of forms. However, the exclusion of teachers from the decision making process was not subtle. They did not have an input into decisions about the allocation of the system's resources even though the regular education resources were diminishing. They did not have input into the decision about a child's placement: according to the special education law they were at the planning meeting at the pleasure of the chairman and they were required to accept the child into their classroom if that was the decision of the team. The point of exclusion was underscored by the state regulations which identified the five required components of a full team evaluation planning meeting; but, it did not include the classroom teacher. It is ironic that the purpose of the law was to involve special needs children in
the mainstream of the school system, yet a key component in this mainstream, the classroom teacher, was consistently excluded and alienated.

**Teachers' Views of Social Workers**

Although the views of teachers towards social workers varied almost as much as the personalities of the teachers and of the social workers and the characteristics of the schools in which they both worked, there were some commonly viewed characteristics that emerged in the data.

In all of the schools the social workers had an office, a telephone, an appointment book, a separate schedule and numerous meetings with many parents, agencies, administrators and other professionals. For most of the teachers, the role of the social worker was to work with kids and help the teachers understand about their families. Hence, the other duties associated with a school social worker such as evaluation, inter-agency coordination, court hearings and services to substantially separate special education programs did not meet the needs of the regular teachers. Further, most of these other activities were neither explained nor alluded to. Most of the teachers were unaware of the multiple responsibilities of the social workers, but were quite cognizant of the shortage of services to "their kids."
Partially, this was a factor of the ever expanding task responsibility of the social worker--often at the whim of a principal or in response to a specific crisis. There was no attempt to define the role or explain the duties. In this way, the social workers gave the impression of being always busy but rarely meeting the needs of the teachers. "Then whose needs were they meeting?" asked the teachers.

To add to the ambiguity of the situation, there was general agreement by the Special Education Director that social workers could counsel and work with a non 766 child if they "had time." This represented a significant departure from the carefully codified regulations of 766 but was developed in an attempt to be responsive and not "make a federal case out of every kid with an adjustment problem."

For the teachers, they were suddenly dealing with another new set of rules: special education referrals with all the backup of a law with clear guidelines in tandem with a waiting list of non 766 students, who were seen at the whim and discretion of the social worker. Many teachers actually had fewer results with the more informal system and some intramural rivalry developed around the issue of which teachers received the more prompt and efficient service from the social worker. Again, because the teachers did not have the entire picture of what a social worker did they felt their needs unmet and their
dissatisfaction increased. "What do they [the social workers] do that is so special anyhow."

The confusing character of the relationship between teachers and social workers was not helped by the absence of clear guidelines. No one, including the Special Education Director, the social workers or the teachers were quite clear about what a social worker did. There were no guidelines available about just what made "an adjustment problem" and even less agreement about when a child no longer had "an adjustment problem." Such a state of affairs did little to help the teachers understand how the differentiation of social work activity was helping to meet the goals of the entire school system.

It could have been argued that specialization in education was a trend with which the teachers should have been quite familiar. However, the specialization of the chemistry teacher who came from a teacher's college, met classes just like everyone else and had a grade book was quite a different type of specialization from that of social workers who had very few duties in common with teachers.

During this period of investigation, several union related issues emerged: two contracts, a bumping and seniority procedure, and the suspension of two teachers. It was not unnoticed by the teaching staff that not only did the social workers not participate but that they were
even unaware of many of these issues as they became public conversation among the rank and file. It was not generally known that no social worker was a member of the teachers' union although each school was aware that their social worker was not a member of their union which was out "there fighting for their rights with a hostile and uncaring school board and administration."

Another pressure point became the evaluation of children. The staff psychiatrist, as a matter of policy, refused to see children directly and preferred the time honored custom of supervision of social workers and psychologists who would provide the data with which to make a diagnosis and develop a treatment plan. However, the social workers were continually squeezed by the teachers who insisted that social workers did not have the training for this kind of diagnosis and treatment. This was up to the "good doctor" and not the "do-gooder."

Again, no real attempt was made to explain how and why social workers were capable of performing the task--it was assumed by the clinical staff that any intelligent group would understand this time honored method. Obviously, this intelligent group of teachers did not.

One of the major issues that emerged continually from teachers was "what do the social workers do?" They could see some very fine results but these occasions were too few and far between to make sense for a full-time position.
They more easily understood the other positions in special education, such as resource room teacher since this was clearly evolving from the educational model. The ambiguity of the social workers role, the mystification of the method and manner of work, the absence of similar training and educational backgrounds, all made this quite confusing and threatening to many teachers.

This new person clearly had some higher status but the nature of this status was as ambiguous as the role. This higher status was confirmed for many teachers by the private office, the telephone, the appointment book and the presumption of higher salary (actually social workers were paid on the teacher's salary scale). The author witnessed teachers attempting to address this status issue through dialogue, confrontation, and clear communication. However, many chose to withdraw, and neither the social workers nor any other part of the organizational structure sought to facilitate a more open communication and understanding between the two groups.

Social Workers' View of Social Workers

These social workers had a strong group identity both as a result of professional training and as a factor of their placement in what they often called a "hostile" system. During the period under investigation the social workers along with the psychologists and speech
pathologists met with the psychiatrist to discuss cases. This "clinical group" established a separate identity and as a matter of policy excluded classroom teachers and other school personnel from participation in cases because of the "clinical" nature of the discussions.

These sessions were very much psychodynamically oriented and it was felt that the educational staff could not understand these discussions, and even that their presence would breach the confidentiality of the discussions. This was an important avenue of education and in-service training open to the social workers. They were aware that they were the only group in the school system who met like this "on school time" with the autonomy to decide their own agendas.

In addition to the case presentation, these sessions also became an opportunity to establish a "clinical focus." There was general, although unspoken, acceptance of the "medical model" in which a good deal of the decision making, directiveness and diagnostic responsibility was given over to the M.D. This was quite different from the more participatory decision making process involved in many educational groups, authoritarian structures notwithstanding. Additionally, this group functioned as a block of voice votes in securing resources from the special education administration and the superintendent. It was common for the social workers to meet as a group while it was a
rarity for the teachers.

The social workers maintained a strong group and professional identity perhaps due in part to their minority position in the system. They actively participated in activities that supported their role, profession and function as distinct from teaching. They controlled the hiring of the social work staff, participated in formal learning experiences outside of the system which were related to social work and not education and avoided the constraints of the school routine and all union activity.

Upward mobility was not possible for social workers within the Alpha system if only because certification requirements eliminated them from formal positions of authority in a school system such as superintendent, principal or special education director. Upward mobility was another job in another environment, which incidentally helped to maintain differentiation as a boundary. There was little motivation by organizational demand or by professional growth for social workers to integrate their activities with those of the regular teaching staff.

However, in many respects, the environment was a positive place for the social workers in which to work. Their training had provided them with experience with a wide variety of community groups, many of whom were now pleased to have someone in the schools addressing their needs. Additionally, the school system offered a good
deal more autonomy to social workers than they had had in the social service system. That system accorded social workers a prescribed role and a low status in comparison to psychiatrists and psychologists and did not allow them decision making power concerning the placement of clients, the allocation of resources or the coordination of programs. Such autonomy helped maintain the self perception of social workers that they were a thoughtful, vibrant group who really did have an important mission.

**Social Workers' View of Teachers**

Seymour Sarason described an attitude that occurred sixteen years before our period of investigation that correctly summed up the researcher's observations:

The attitude that teachers need help from mental health professionals but that mental health professionals have nothing to learn from education is widespread.9

This attitude was still widespread and was alive and well in Alpha.

In their meetings the social workers were generally quite critical of the teachers and saw them as "threatened," "incompetent," and maintaining the "norm of mediocrity." There was a general decision of the restricted area of their knowledge, the lack of any valuable input at meetings and the poorly written reports that characterized the teachers as a group.
The social workers, all of whom grew up outside of Alpha and had other work experiences prior to coming to Alpha, viewed the teachers as the "townies." The teachers were the conservatives, traditionalists who had not had an idea in years, who were related to half the staff by blood or marriage, and were merely waiting for retirement. Even the medical model supported this position. The social workers thought of themselves as the medical doctors and the teachers as the direct care staff who needed to be directed at each step of the way. It was not uncommon to leave a treatment plan totally unexplained to a teacher because "it's just so hard to explain dynamics to them."

The individual isolation of the teachers from their colleagues and from the issues of classroom management continued to surprise the social workers. From their model, it was common to engage in collegial discussion, case presentation and supervision where treatment styles were usually openly discussed and considered. It was uncommon for a tenured teacher in Alpha, however, to receive any but the briefest visits from the school principal. The distinctions appreciated early in collegial staff social work training, among evaluation, supervision and consultation, were certainly less clear for teachers. Isolation on the part of the teachers was both defensive and consistent with their training or treatment at Alpha.
Concepts such as adolescent adjustment reaction, schizoid tendency, transference, benign effect, and developmental lag were commonly used in the clinical group but became impossible for that group to consider explaining to the teachers. This lack of explanation existed partially because of the time it would take to seriously address some of these issues in human development and partially because of the feeling that the teachers had a strong anti-intellectual bent.

The author witnessed several of the social workers seeking to establish closer rapport with the teaching staff. Sometimes these efforts were rebuffed by teachers who were confused by the role, intentions and attitudes of the social workers.

However, the maintenance of differentiation as a boundary, rather than a measure of effective organizational response, seemed to be closely associated with the diversity of goals in the organization. Teachers had a set of task goals which had to be achieved in certain time frames such as curriculum, stanine scores and grade point average. The social worker, on the other hand, was more concerned with the process of student growth and had usually developed a set of psychological goals to assist in their treatment.

Sometimes these goals were in direct conflict. The teacher's goal was met when a student achieved a satisfactory performance in reading, for instance. The social
worker, on the other hand, had a goal that such performance levels not be an outward manifestation of maladjustment. Goals of task performance did sometimes create undo anxiety, compulsivity and tension. Social workers and teachers were often not able to resolve these differences in goals.

However, the researcher did observe social workers who were able to involve teachers in the resolution of the conflict over a particular student's goals. Such conflict resolution called for an understanding of teachers as individuals and of teachers as participants in the constraints of the school environment. The latter view offered significantly more latitude and flexibility for the resolution of problems.

The author's impression was that for either teachers or social workers to bridge the gap of differentiation and to establish collaborative, integrative efforts there must be a good deal of individual motivation to do this. The environment maintained and supported each group in their specific roles and tasks, but not in the establishment of integrative activities.

Participant Observation in the Context of the Argyris Typology

The data from participant observation indicated that differentiation did take place in the Alpha School System
and that an example of this differentiation was the employment of social workers. In a comparative view between teachers and social workers several themes emerged that were associated with differentiation, such as the manner in which status and autonomy issues effected the perceptions of these two groups about their own jobs and the jobs of their colleagues. A major theme that emerged was the influence of the organizational environment upon the effectiveness of differentiation and on the job performance of both social workers and teachers.

It appeared that the organizational environment of the Alpha School System accorded social workers a good deal of control over their working conditions, while this same environment increasingly restricted the flexibility and autonomy of the regular education teachers. It also appeared that the system attributed status and high value to the abilities of the social workers to meet the demands of the special education legislation. Conversely, the organizational environment placed less value and accorded decreased amounts of status to teachers because they were perceived not to be able to participate in the immediate demands of the legislation. However, such an approach lessened the effectiveness of differentiation because it allowed neither group to enter into a collaborative or integrative effort. There was no reward for social workers to interact with a group perceived to be of low status and
not especially skillful. On the other hand, teachers were intimidated by the supposed technical skills and high status of the social workers.

It was helpful to consider this material in the context of the adapted continuum of the Argyris typology (Figure 4.3). This continuum ranged from a set of dynamically ordered viewpoints of active participation in the environment to a set of statically ordered viewpoints of passive participation in the environment. This typology allowed for an increased understanding of the manner in which the organizational environment limited the effectiveness of the differentiation process.

An effective, efficient organization engaged in the differentiation process in order to meet the demands of new environmental stimuli. For example, an efficient military response to the threat of guerilla warfare might be the establishment of a special force with specific training and background to meet this need. However, if the military system allowed this special unit to become an elite, a status or a position of particular privilege denied to the regular army then who would be surprised at the resentment and hostility of the regular members? Such a situation created a conflict in goals between the groups and their lack of collaborative efforts impaired the ability of the military to perform its primary mission—the defense of the nation. In short, unless differentiation
was associated with the reciprocal process of integration or collaboration the gains of that differentiation would be eroded in the face of the fragmentation of goals, the competition and conflict of the subgroups for available resources.

Using the Argyris typology the following themes emerged in the study of differentiation in the Alpha School System:

- that the organizational environment of the school system mitigated the positive effects of the differentiation process by according artificially high levels of status and responsibility to social workers at the expense of teachers;

- that the effectiveness of both groups was impaired by the fostering of competitive rather than collaborative efforts;

- and that the school organization consistently supported the social workers' flexibility and creativity while limiting the dynamic, active input of regular teachers.

The need to have a high sense of self worth and self regard related to their technological abilities

Social workers on the one hand were constantly going to workshops and bringing in new material. They often discussed going into private practice, or consulting or providing supervision to others. When the social workers saw changes they were often dramatic and spoken about in
their group meetings with a good deal of comment. Teachers on the other hand were typically silent about their triumphs and successes. The social workers had a good deal of input in the decision making process while the teachers were systematically excluded from other than routine levels of responsibility. The environment supported positive feelings of self worth in one group while promoting negative feelings in the other. Such a disparity of treatment and feeling had to foster friction between the two groups.

The need to be active ........ The need to be passive

The author observed that the social workers always wanted to be doing different things even if they were not that directly related to case productivity: workshops, lunches with other colleagues or agencies, observing new or prospective programs on site visits. While they often complained about their workload, there was certainly a sense that they had not accepted its limitations by any narrowing of role. Such activities were recognized and reinforced by the organizational environment.

The author encountered teachers who wished to be more involved: in establishing a teacher center, in working in the teachers union, in facilitating P.T.O. groups. These were accepted roles for additional participation, but few teachers elected these courses. The impression was that
even these accepted activities were discouraged by the administration in that no reward or recognition was given for these activities.

The need to work with others

The need to be alone

By the nature of their activities both groups spend a good deal of time working without adult contact—-the teachers more so than the social workers. The social workers were generally more willing to take on new tasks with a sense of independence and accept individual responsibility, in fact the nature of their crisis intervention work often demanded this. However, for several years they maintained a unified position that they must meet together as social workers in a clinical group in order to express their ideas, come up with new treatment plans and avoid getting stale.

The teachers were much more isolated in their work. It was rare to find team teaching, study groups, curriculum committees or other forms of collegial activities. The union was the only group activity that seemed to generate widespread support; this last activity was really outside their role as teachers but rather in their role as employees.

Such a tradition of isolated, individual action made it easier for the teacher to remain within the narrow role
restrictions of the organization. However, this tradition also made it difficult for teachers to understand the clinical group activities and difficult for them to participate in collaborative efforts.

The need for variety and challenge in their work

...........

The need for routine, non-challenging work

Both groups expressed an equal number of complaints about routine and boring tasks. The social workers, however, reported a good deal more success at adding variety to their activities. The tasks of the social worker were inherently diverse but variety was also supported by an administrative structure that encouraged experimentation and creativity in the solving of problems with special needs students.

Teaching was also inherently diverse, but recognition was not available for activities that might change the status quo. It was difficult for teachers to vary their activities while remaining within the routine of the school.

The impression of these observations was that variety was acceptable with the social workers and was tolerated because the organizational environment had little previous experience with either social workers or special needs children. However, the environment had a good deal of experience with regular teachers; the bottom line was that this group did not have to have interesting or challenging
jobs but that they just had to keep up the reading and math scores.

The need to have some close friendships while at work ............

The need not to make close friendships while at work

The data indicated that both groups had a strong need to seek friendships among the people with whom they worked but that friendships between the groups was limited. The conflict between teachers and social workers over status, autonomy and organizational influence seemed to preclude such friendships. The organizational gap created in the differentiation process, of course, was often bridged by such informal integrative devices as friendship but this did not happen in the case of the Alpha School System.

The need to produce quality work ............

The need to produce adequate (quantitative) work to make a fair day's pay

Consistently, the social workers were much more likely to argue for the best possible approach, the most creative program or for the reconsideration of a program that could be better. Teachers were more likely to "just want to get through the day and cover so many pages in the text." The position of each group at opposite ends of the continuum was not explained by the innate talent of the
group, or by the nature of their commitment to the children, or by the quality of their training.

Simply, the social workers wanted to produce quality work because they felt their work really made an impact on the system and on the child. They knew this because the organizational environment encouraged such quality work. On the other hand, the teachers were only encouraged to be minimally competent. The teachers had very little expectation that quality work on their part would even be noticed by the organization.

Almost no need to overemphasize the importance of material rewards

The need to emphasize the importance of material rewards

It was not likely for either group to emphasize the amount of money they were making. The social workers were typically conversant about a new case, a recent workshop, a successfully revised program or other aspects of their jobs which were satisfying to them. This was not the case with the teachers.

Teacher dissatisfaction with their jobs was high and observed continuously throughout this period. The conversations were typically about the frustration of their performance and that of their students or about the boring nature of their work. Typically, they talked about how they spent their summer and other vacation periods. As
one teacher said, "Those three months off really make this job tolerable."

The need to learn more about other kinds of work in the same job family .......... Almost no need to learn more about other kinds of work within the same job family

It was common to find some teachers and all of the social workers taking additional courses and workshops in their area of specialization and in other areas of interest which would improve or relate to their job in some way. However, the significant difference between the two groups appeared to be in the nature of the outside employment that many of these individuals held. Teachers commonly worked in construction, remodeling, shopkeeping, tax preparation, real estate and catering. On the other hand, social workers stayed within the same job family: private practice, consultation and counselling in other organizations.

The Argyris typology was helpful in considering the impact of differentiation on the Alpha School System because it provided insight about the different character of social worker and teacher job performance. Additionally, it provided useful information about the role of the organizational environment in describing the positive or negative gain of differentiation by the extent of its attention to collaborative and integrative activities.
The following themes did emerge from the application of participant observation data to the Argyris typology:

- that differentiation did exist between teachers and social workers in that there was a difference in attitudes and behaviors;

- that teachers typically were observed to be at that point in the continuum that was statically ordered and passively participative;

- that passive participation did not serve the needs of an organization concerned with effective dealing with the changing nature of environmental demands but did meet the needs of an organization concerned with meeting minimal standards;

- that passive or active participation was not an innate factor or due to training but a factor manipulated by the organizational environment;

- that passive participation was helpful to differentiation in the short term because it allowed this process to proceed with a minimum of controversy;

- and that passive participation was deleterious to differentiation in the long term because it was operationally antagonistic to collaboration and integration.

The Unstructured Interview Perspective

The researcher had the opportunity of obtaining data from twenty-four respondents previously or currently employed in the Alpha School System. Sixteen teachers and six social workers were interviewed while they were holding positions in Alpha. In addition, two social workers who had previously worked in Alpha were interviewed.
These interviews followed the interview guide outlined in Appendix C and were consistent with the methodological considerations for unstructured interviewing presented in Chapter III.¹⁰

It was helpful to apply this data to the typology developed by Lawrence, Lorsch and Gabarro in that such application provided a deeper understanding of the nature of the differentiation (Figure 4.4). The impression in Alpha was that social workers were a little different only because they had gone to social work school instead of a teacher's college. This inaccurate assumption was a basis for a good deal of the organizational conflict between social workers and teachers and for a good deal of the erosion of the effectiveness of the differentiation process.

For these authors, differentiation was not merely a division of labor or another job categorization but was in fact a difference in "attitudes and behaviors." For differentiation to be an effective tool in meeting the new needs of the environment, then differentiation was in fact represented by a significant difference in the cognitive and attitudinal perspectives of the subgroups.¹¹

In Alpha, differentiation did take place in that social workers and teachers had significantly different cognitive and attitudinal perspectives. This in fact was a significantly effective response to the new environmental
Figure 4.4
The Typology of Lawrence, Lorsch and Gabarro

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Orientation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time Orientation:</td>
<td>time horizon of problems most often worked on by the individual.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal Orientation:</td>
<td>priority ordering of organizational goals by an individual in performing his job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Orientation:</td>
<td>style of work interaction most preferred by the individual.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formality of Structure:</td>
<td>the degree of structure characteristic of the subgroup's organization, in terms of reporting procedures, span of control and levels of hierarchy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation to Change:</td>
<td>the degree to which a subgroup's world involves the changing of methods and programs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Gabarro, p. II-17.
demands of special education in that each subgroup of teachers and social workers had the background, attitude and training to meet the needs in their areas while collaborating to support the mission of the organization: educating all children.

The discrepancy between the desired and the actual outcomes of this differentiation process, however, was clearer as the data were applied to the typology (Figure 4.4). The environment did little to assist either the teachers or social workers in understanding the cognitive and attitudinal differences between the groups which in turn promoted intergroup conflict and limited the application of necessary integrating devices.

The themes that emerged in this application of the data from unstructured interviewing to the Lawrence, Lorsch and Gabarro typology are:

- that differentiation did occur in the Alpha School System;

- that social workers were an example of such a differentiation process in that they did not merely represent a different job with different training, but demonstrated different behaviors and attitudes in the Alpha School System;

- that the absence of dialogue concerning the roles and functions of the differentiation process caused this process to be perceived with confusion and hostility by the regular education teachers;
- that the organizational environment applied
  the differentiation process with a sense that
  such groups as social workers were not dis-
  similar from specialists like reading teachers
  and art supervisors;

- and that the lack of understanding in the nature
  and extent of the differentiation process pre-
  cluded the organizational environment from
  developing adequate integrative devices.

**Time Orientation:** time horizon of problems most often
worked on by the individual.

All teachers interviewed spoke of their work in terms
of the academic year. They were assigned a class of chil-
dren in September and with few exceptions worked with the
same children until June of the following year. At the end
of the school year "I just stop working with the kids be-
cause it's the end of the first grade." In one or two
cases teachers did work with students on a curriculum
project over a five year period. All teachers interviewed
were assigned their schedules from eight o'clock to three
o'clock and had that particular day divided up into
academic learning components, e.g., reading and math by
the principal, or by established building procedure. One
teacher expressed the belief that "I didn't see the kids
often enough" but added that she had no control over the
amount of time she worked with a specific class or a
specific child. While all teachers reported occasional
afternoon conferences and evening meetings, they added
that they most often left the school building by three
o'clock.
Social workers were unanimous in that they "enjoy the autonomy of my schedule." The social workers all described their flexibility of hours, e.g., late mornings, evening work and half days.

The social workers dealt with children on the basis of individually contracted time commitments determined by the child's needs and not by the schedule of the school. They typically worked with children individually or in groups, for sessions of weekly varying time periods in durations of one to twenty-four months. They all determined the amount of time they worked with each child and how they organized their schedule. All social workers reported that it was necessary to sometimes cancel sessions or increase sessions based on their perceived responsibility to respond to identified crisis situations.

All the social workers reported that they did not feel that they had to demonstrate progress in a particular time frame and one social worker summed up this attitude by stating that "it's crazy to think that because a child is six, he should be reading at a certain level in the first grade." Another said that she starts "where I see them functioning" and where they're placed in a grade. All social workers stated that they had considerable determination over the selection of students with whom they worked and one of them clearly explained that "I can't work with someone who doesn't want to be worked with."
One teacher noted this disparity of time orientation when she said that "social workers are not consistent in seeing kids." She did not understand why they cancelled therapy sessions and seemed to have no regular schedule. Another teacher was concerned that the social worker in her school "came to work late every single day" and "certainly took more than a half hour for lunch." Another teacher was perplexed as to why a social worker would "see a kid, year after year." Further, there was concern that a social worker had been working with a child and then, "in the middle of the year," just stop seeing him.

Only three of the ten schools had full-time social work staff, the remainder of the social workers either being part-time or sharing time at schools. Teachers were even more critical of this arrangement because the part-time social workers "were like prostitutes and cops, they're never there when you need them."

Most teachers and social workers commented on the issue of long term therapy with just about everyone critical of such long-term work. The social worker felt long term therapy often raised a discrepancy between the "client's goals and the system's goals" which they had little ability to resolve. The client's goal was mental health while the system's goal was placement in a classroom. The teachers felt that such therapy was a misuse of the school's resources or as one teacher observed negatively,
"it's the same rotten kids that keep getting all the attention."

However, the decision to continue long-term treatment was not simple and was often complicated by the parents who had developed rapport with the social worker, were distrustful of outside mental health groups or were unwilling to recognize the seriousness of the problem at hand in such a way that it warranted "outside professional help."

Strategically, it was a great deal more difficult for teachers to follow up on personal or emotional issues with students because of the lack of flexibility of their schedule. But many did:

I can't just kick the kid out the door and say that's it until the fifth period tomorrow and I don't want to think about you--I can't do that.

However, during the period of investigation, a teacher was accused of molesting a student after school hours. Following a lengthy trial the teacher was finally acquitted but was admonished by the court that his defense of counselling seemed to show poor judgment at the least and over extension of his role as teacher at the best.

This became a sensitive point for male teachers especially. For some this was a convenient way of viewing his job--"I teach him math from 9:05 to 9:48--that's it..."

Clearly, a norm for limited participation in the student's life was defined by the community and by the teachers. The
social workers were allowed to expand on that norm somewhat but "overinvolvement" was a consistent theme in many of the interviews. Since time was in short supply, one of the most convenient group measurements of involvement was the quantifiable amount of time allocated to each case.

**Goal Orientation:** priority ordering or organizational goals by an individual in performing his job.

There was a general feeling that "everyone has their own feelings for goals but difficulty articulating them."

All teachers felt that the goal of the public education system was to teach children the basic academic skills such as reading, writing and math. One teacher said that she guessed the goals "were the goals set down by the state but everyone sort of has the goals they want to get the kids to learn." Another teacher felt that there was "more of an emphasis on competency" and "moving toward a basic training for jobs." She further offered that she liked to be with teachers who shared "common goals" i.e., with "teachers who are concerned with building kids' egos."

Another teacher told the author that "I avoid thinking about them [Alpha's goals] because they might be in conflict with my own goals." All of the teachers expressed the concern that they were expected to make improvement in the cognitive level of functioning in the children they were teaching and that sometimes this created stress because
the demand for group performance caused them to lose sight of the individual needs of the children. "Always there is a conflict between the class of children and being child centered." One teacher explained it this way: "My goals for these kids is that they can read at a second grade level by June and that's all that matters to my principal." Anything else she does "is nice but doesn't keep the principal off my back."

Goal confusion was common among the teachers. One felt that the goal of the system was "to please the public" and when asked if that would extend to segregation, for instance, the respondent felt the school system had a responsibility to comply if that was the need of the community. Another felt that "I don't think anyone in Alpha could tell you what the goals are; I don't think anyone has thought that far." Another challenged the interviewer to see if even the Superintendent could articulate the goals.

The social workers were unanimous in viewing the system's goals as cognitive learning and in disavowing their part in it. They stated that they were more concerned with the "whole child" which one defined as the "combination of cognitive and affective development." One social worker expressed the belief that educational goals (academic learning) "can be in direct conflict with therapeutic goals" and in fact may have caused or contributed to the need for therapy.
All the social workers felt that the system was going through a change in its goals. One explained that "education (to inculcate academic skills) is the primary goal" which was why there was still a question about "why we're here after we've been in the system for five years." Another said that while education was still the primary goal "766 has forced awareness of other aspects of the child...even though most teachers still don't accept it." One social worker felt teachers did not like them because the goals in special education forced the regular teachers "to break their structure of all cognitive and no affective."

One social worker felt that "psychologically orientated teachers were a joy to work with, but that they were rare." The social workers, like the teachers, felt that teachers were bound in by the demands for academic performance. One social worker felt that a big part of the difference in goals between the two groups was that "teachers were trained in such a narrow fashion" and that the system did not support any variance from such narrow training.

One particularly well-respected science teacher typified this view of the integrated teacher. The teacher argued that: "basic to any educational process is giving kids a sense of self concept and self worth...subject matter is secondary to getting the kids to like to learn..."
Interestingly, social workers often had similar goals to those described by many teachers but the assumption of both groups was that their goals were so different that there was no margin for collaboration.

**Interpersonal Orientation:** style of work interaction most preferred by the individual.

All the teachers interviewed described their work as essentially the same from year to year. They all described changes they made in the presentation of the material but that curriculum, schedules, ages and scope of presentation were the same one year to another. One teacher said that she really liked the "consistency" and that "one day was just like every other day." As a group they expressed pleasure in the presentation of organic material (i.e., material that was organized and systematically arranged). All the teachers had been assigned to the same buildings and even the same classrooms for at least five years and consistently spoke about "my classroom," "my school," "my kids," and "my principal." Additionally, all the teachers said they preferred to work with kids "who didn't act up" and who "behaved themselves in class." "Some of the quiet kids are really neat to work with." All the teachers explained that they worked well in large groups but were trying to "individualize" into smaller groups of from four to six children.
The social workers were clear that they were not classroom teachers by choice. One stated that he would not want to be a teacher because it was "too much scut work...I'd rather work with people than a group." They felt that their work was dynamic, i.e., concerned with the variety of forces operating in a given field. They were pleased with the variety of problems, ages and people with whom they worked. They all spoke about the environmental diversity in their jobs. They worked in classrooms, offices, homes and even in a variety of school buildings. Actually, because of a peculiarity of the special education law one social worker even has responsibility for children receiving educational services in other school districts.

One social worker explained her functioning as that attempt to establish trust and rapport in a "system that fosters distrust and where teachers are treated like children...the fifteen minute rule before and after school, monitor study hall and lunch duties." Her style of interaction was to foster dialogue and communication "on an adult level."

Clearly, this goal was to be tested by those who felt that social workers spoke "gobbledy gook." As one teacher put it:

the social worker comes in with two strikes against him...first they’re viewed as do-gooder
types of people that aren't going to be supportive to teachers and secondly, that they're going to be so much of a student advocate that they'll disrupt everything.

Both the teacher and the social worker viewed a key to effectiveness in treating behavior problems as the gaining of faculty support, but this was certainly difficult in an environment where positive reinforcement and support by the superordinate was rare. Said one teacher:

I think it is difficult for the administration to give praise and positive feedback and I think it's also hard for administration to supervise teachers or social workers who really need help.

Continually, in the course of the interviews a pattern of effectiveness or ineffectiveness emerged that was more related to the individual than to the group of teachers or social workers since the system appeared to take little responsibility for this continuation of therapeutic services. The successful social worker demonstrated rapport with the teaching staff on a variety of levels, communicated about the diverse number of responsibilities demanded by the job, and made a point of responding to each teacher on each inquiry as quickly as possible. One of these successful social workers summed up the dilemma when she said:

I don't know what to do any more... I'm there but I'm so overburdened, busy, dealing with too many psyches, too many problems... Just because I work people bring it to me but the other parts of the system aren't and that's making me become just like them--angry, uncaring, avoiding.
All the social workers spoke of the autonomy they had and felt they needed in their jobs. They preferred to work with children individually or in small groups (two to three children). It was important that they themselves designed the criteria for the success or failure of their prescribed treatment of a child, in a time frame selected by them. As a group they were more concerned with the children who are passive, quiet and withdrawn as opposed to the acting out kids. One social worker highlighted this when she spoke of children "being appropriately rebellious" to the restraints imposed by the school system.

The teachers all described their primary interaction with their colleagues as taking place in the lunchroom and during coffee breaks. Two teachers reported that they would ask their principal for help in solving classroom problems while one teacher felt that she had no classroom problems that she could not solve. All of the teachers reported that in their student teaching experience they presented their problems to their supervising teacher but only one teacher reported that she has asked other teachers for advice on her classroom problems after she became a full-time teacher.

All the social workers spoke about the weekly supervision sessions as a critical support element in their job. These sessions consisted of the presentation of a
case to the psychiatrist and members of the clinical staff (social workers, psychologists, program directors and speech pathologists) and a followup meeting of group supervision with other social workers. It was consistent with their training experience to work in collaboration with their colleagues.

**Formality of Structure:** the degree of structure characteristic of the subgroup's organization, in terms of reporting procedures, span of control and levels of hierarchy.

The teachers interviewed all reported that they were directly responsible to the building principal and that they were involved in quarterly reporting procedures for the children in their class. They reported that an informal and random reporting procedure existed for issues such as classroom problems, absences, appropriateness of textbooks and departmental and school policies. All sixteen teachers interviewed reported parental contact to be minimal; while a secondary school teacher reported contact with only twenty parents of the one hundred and twenty she worked with throughout the school year.

The teachers felt that they wanted a smaller class size—"the key ingredient in education is a small setting"—but none of them felt that had any actual control over the number of children admitted into their classroom. In fact, one teacher reported that since the principal felt
she was the best teacher in her particular cluster that
"he actually assigned more kids into my class than any of
the others." All spoke of the assignment of curriculum
guidelines and the pressure to be sure that the class did
well on the yearly standardized exams. "If one kid learns
to read but the other kids don't progress enough you're
really not doing your job" one teacher declared.

None of the teachers interviewed participated in
"teaching activities" after school, although one teacher
had been taking courses toward her master's degree for
the past ten years. One half of the teachers had master's
degrees. All the teachers were members of the union but
they did not feel that this was "professional" but instead
was related more to job security.

The social workers worked with children almost ex-
clusively who were categorized as 766 children. As special
needs children they were required to go through a sub-
stantial referral, evaluation process which involved the
meeting of the evaluation team (principal, psychologist,
teacher, social worker, etc.). The social workers saw
themselves responsible to their principals and the Director
of Special Education but lines of authority were clouded
considerably and seemed to vary on a case to case basis.
The social workers did feel that they had responsibility
to their supervision group.
The social workers also worked with a variety of grades, administrators, schools and a multitude of agencies. One social worker noted that this was different from the classroom teacher who really only worked with her class and was "oblivious to what was happening in the rest of the world."

Social workers reported that they did not commonly file reports on children's progress except for the oral reports at an evaluation meeting which was a yearly meeting to assess a child's progress. They stated that their reporting increased in direct proportion to the "seriousness of the case" depending on "the crisis of the moment." They all spoke about the nature of their verbal reporting procedures to the supervision group, to the principal and to parents. All the social workers had met with the parents of the children they were seeing and, in many cases the social workers were also treating the parents.

In summary, teachers were responsible for reporting their activities and methods for meeting program objectives to the evaluation team; this was accepted as a matter of form and procedure. Social workers, on the other hand, were sensitive about issues of autonomy and seemed very reluctant to formally accept any process of reporting on their activities to the educational staff. One social worker summed up her views on the school's reporting procedure by stating that "educationally trained
people cannot provide me with adequate supervision" and have reluctantly "accepted me now as a necessary part of the staff."

All of the social workers spoke about their "social work activities" outside of school hours. They took courses, they taught courses and participated in workshops, and had private clients. All of the social workers described extensive and continuing attempts to improve their skills even though they all had MSW's. An additional issue surfaced in the interviews that had not been originally considered by the author. Concurrently with this study, Alpha experienced a decrease in student population: teachers were concerned about RIF (reduction in force) and were aware of the numbers of children in each grade and their position on the seniority list. The social workers, on the other hand, were oblivious to this concern (one social worker was even unaware of it being discussed). It seemed that because Chapter 766 and the more recent PL 94-142 were mandated pieces of legislation, special education was one of the last areas in which a school system could have cut back. Further protection was accorded the social workers because they determined the number of children that they worked with and the length of time of each session. Many of the teachers interviewed were displeased that special education "seems to get so much and does so little."
Another point of the differentiation process that created friction between social workers and teachers was the issue of confidentiality. One teacher explained that when she had asked the social worker to explain a certain problem a child was having she was told that "it was confidential" and protected by 766 legislation which was accurate. The teacher complained that "nothing I do is confidential yet they think everything they do is confidential."

All the social workers expressed awareness of the confidentiality issue but none indicated that they had ever directly raised it with a teacher. However, one social worker did report that she commonly held things back from teachers who "I feel can't handle the information" and that you must "work differently in each situation." Teachers, on the other hand, perceived this as exclusionary, another example of low status in Alpha.

The teachers had a very clear hierarchy. In response to a question about career goals, one teacher said that she would try to be department head "because that's what I would have to do to be important." They expressed the belief that upward mobility for a teacher was to be a department head or a principal. The social workers all agreed that upward mobility would be to work in "more of a clinical setting" such as a mental health clinic or family service agency. All the social workers agreed that they
had not done that because you "have to work fifty or sixty hours in a place like that," unlike the school system with its varied schedule and generous vacation times.

None of the social workers ever wanted to be teachers although one social worker had her teaching certificate as part of her school social work program. One social worker felt that teachers were "jealous of social workers." Indeed, two teachers reported that they felt social workers were paid more than they were (social workers were on the same salary schedule as teachers). One teacher complained that the social worker in her building was always working closely with the principal, had an office, an appointment book and a telephone and seemed "to go out for lunch at least twice a week." A social worker reported that she often felt uncomfortable with teacher comments about the flexibility that social workers had in their jobs and was continuously surprised with teachers "magical thinking." They "think that just because I am working with a kid that he will get better immediately and then say to me: 'why aren't you fixing it?' These educators just don't understand issues of dynamic process."

Another point of friction between the two groups was the role confusion played in the Alpha School System. The social workers, while jealously guarding their autonomy and distinctiveness, often ended up "in a vacuum because of the lack of confidence by teachers." Partly, this was
due to administrative confusion in that "no one ever introduced new social workers to the faculty much less identified their roles and goals." Another difficulty that a social worker defined was her colleagues insistence on the maintenance of role which she demurred by saying "it doesn't matter what someone's role is--teachers, social workers, math teachers--it matters what they're saying." It was almost as if the attempt at flexibility sometimes left the impression of rolelessness.

An interesting feature of the environmental structure which emerged was that the informal span of control had a greater "potential impact on change agents than the formal chain of command." The informal was more likely to be controlled and operated by a teacher and not a social worker. This informal span of control was based upon "personal contacts, socializing after school, considerable work relationships and in some cases blood relationships." The social workers were often not aware that such a network existed and it was commonly reported by the social workers that they would cite examples of being highly critical of a teacher "only to find out you were talking to their second cousin."

Social workers, on the other hand, were able to develop an extensive network of community contacts which they generally operated on with a "good deal of license" since the "community viewed us as the innovators in a
school system that had a reputation for being just a
little to the right of Ghenghis Khan." Unfortunately, the interviews did not unearth any material to suggest that an effective continuum of services was conceptually or actually developed by any social worker.

**Orientation to Change:** the degree to which a subgroup's work involves the changing of methods and programs.

All the teachers interviewed described change in terms of a "new school" as a different organization which was more individually orientated, where cognitive and affective child development issues were in harmony and where "there was a sense of belonging for staff and students--people would really feel a part of the place." One teacher seemed to speak for many when she said that "change can never really happen here--you know how this place is." They all described their activities as essentially the same year after year. One teacher felt that she and other teachers in general should be working with kids "on other things beside skill areas but teachers aren't trained enough to handle it."

One social worker described her activities as in "the vanguard of change" in the school system. They all stressed that the diversity of cases, needs and problems that arose continually put them in the position of thinking about other new ways to meet children's problems. "No two
families or kids are alike, or present the same problem or take the same amount of time to handle it." One social worker, in fact, reported that she really liked her job because "it's always changing and I get to make a lot of the decisions about my part in what changes."

All the sixteen teachers interviewed had worked solely in schools and all but two of them had only worked for Alpha. All the social workers interviewed had held other jobs and in fact viewed school social work as a change in their careers for them. Only one social worker had worked extensively with children before coming to this school system. One social worker said that "no way am I staying here for a long time because I keep having to fight their damn, narrow-minded structure."

The teachers reported taking outside courses to improve their teaching style but several reported that their only "real incentive was the small pay raise" ($100 for each course). One teacher reported that her colleagues are openly critical of after school activities and "can't imagine why you would take a course" for other than money. Partly, this was related to the open hostility accorded the in-service training program which one teacher called an insult to "anyone who could walk and chew gum at the same time."

Several of the teachers identified their student teaching experience as an important determinant of their
future performance. Some "leave student teaching with a sense that its just beginning, that there's so much to learn and try" while others leave "convinced they should start planning on their retirement." "How can you hope for any change in a situation like that?"

Several times teachers identified the lack of balance of priorities among their colleagues--a balance that is necessary to flexible styles of learning and teaching. In Alpha there was a mixture of people who are very subject matter oriented and others who have gone overboard in the other direction--place so much emphasis on the student teacher relationship that they have sacrificed the respect and stability students need.

Change, they felt, was very much individually conceived and directed with an absence of collegial agreement or discussion backed by "an administration [which] will support anything that doesn't make waves."

The social workers seemed to have a firmer handle on the need to change and mapped out strategies to promote alternatives around particular cases. One method for managing this was to use outside agencies as the "buffer or point" and to "finese out the desired good from the dialogue with the teachers." It was here that several social workers reported their "finest moments" in facilitating a productive outcome in the midst of situations that could quite "easily become adversarial and
counterproductive." One way for the social workers to collaborate was to involve the teachers in the decision making process rather than making them the problem. "That really took the heat off us," said one teacher, "because you didn't have some do-gooder telling us we were all wet."

In summary, the data from the unstructured interviews indicated that differentiation did take place in the Alpha School System and that the social workers were an example of such a differentiated response. This was not just a difference between groups based upon a division of labor but rather it was a differentiation of resources that represented different attitudes, behaviors and beliefs in the accomplishment of the organizational mission.

Differentiation was evident in the time horizon of the problems typically addressed. Teachers had routine time commitments and had little control over either schedules or allocation of time to specific problems. Social workers had flexible schedules determined by their preference for style of work and their perception of most urgent need. Social workers typically considered problems in the context of a longitudinal perspective while teachers were aware of them in the confines of the academic calendar.

The perception of goals also highlighted differentiation between the groups. Social workers ascribed to "client centered" goals which were most often related to
emotional growth and which were most often in conflict with the system. Teachers ascribed to task related, cognitive learning goals which they perceived to be the goals of the system. Both groups seemed to operate on the basic assumption that their goals were accepted and understood by the other group's members.

The data applied to the dimension of interpersonal orientation found teachers with preferences for isolationist activities which seemed mismatched with the collegial approach of the social workers. Teachers were much more aware of the effects on a child's learning environment and expressed a preference for not engaging in collegial, superordinate or parental dynamics.

Social workers operated in a more diffuse environment that allowed for flexibility, autonomy and transition. Teachers were clear in the limits and constraints in the carefully prescribed environmental expectations in Alpha but the structure did allow them upward mobility in the form of promotions. The social workers perceived the rules of the system in a casual way and were often casual in their response to the routine requirements of the system.

Both groups were orientated to change but the groups had different expectations of the exact nature of that change. Social workers sought an even more diffuse environment while the teachers had higher task related expectations. Interestingly, both groups had little
expectation for change within the Alpha system with the social workers expressing their intention to seek other professional opportunities and the teachers very much expressing the feeling of being locked in.

The data from historical perspective, participant observation and unstructured interviews have all indicated that differentiation did take place in the Alpha School System in response to the emerging demands of the special education legislation, Chapter 766. Such differentiation was not simply a division of labor as between teachers and social workers but was in fact a differentiated response represented by different behaviors, attitudes and expectations. As this differentiation proceeded and few integrative methods were introduced the process became in some respects a cure worse than the disease: intergroup fragmentation caused conflict, for the system's resources and prevented the pursuit of the primary mission of the organization which was the best possible education for children.

The situation in Alpha was not unlike the hypothetical response of a government in establishing an intelligence agency. In response to an identified need the government established a special agency complete with professionally trained staff. The difficulty emerged as this subsystem absorbed greater amounts of financial, personnel and managerial resources from other areas of the government
operation. At some point both the subsystem and the government must decide what was the mission of the entire organization: the leadership of the nation or the investigation of its perceived enemies?

The differentiated response was crucial to the survival of the organization by effectively addressing an immediate threat. The differentiated response became destructive to the mission of the organization when the goals of the subsystem became competitive with the goals of the system. The difficulty, of course, was the integration of the subsystem without a diminishment in its pursuit of mission or quality of service.
Footnotes

1 Taken from the *Chapter 766 Regulations*, October 1, 1975, p. 2-4.


9 Sarason, *op. cit.*, p. 68.


CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

A detailed analysis of the data gathered on differentiation between social workers and teachers that has emerged in the Alpha public school system has been included in this chapter. In addition to a discussion of the relevant data, this chapter also explores the implications of the data for future educational planning and future research on organizational development in school systems. This chapter has been divided into three major sections: Summary and Analysis of the Data, Conclusions and Recommendations.

The Summary and Analysis of the Data include a detailed description of the data gleaned from the historical perspective, participant observation and unstructured interviewing techniques employed in the Alpha School System. The Conclusions section highlights the major themes of this study and also includes a statement concerning the implications for future planning based upon an understanding of these themes. The final section includes Recommendations for the establishment of short and long term integrating
devices within the Alpha School System and in addition focuses on the implications of this study for future research.

**Summary and Analysis of the Data**

The role of public education in our society has been of continuing concern throughout this study. As public institutions, school systems are often subjected to the demands of pressure groups. Many times these demands are translated into actions by administrators and other decision makers. The demands on public education are frequently diverse, numerous and sometimes conflict ridden. It has been the assumption of the author that these demands often lead to an administrative response that involves delegation of responsibility or the design of new program components in the organization. Such a response has been theoretically defined as differentiation and is usually interpreted as a sign of a healthy organization since it is an indication that the organization is coming to grips with the demands of a turbulent environment.

The question for schools, as with other organizations, is "what happens to the effectiveness of the organization after differentiation has taken place?" Does the school system really improve its ability to address the needs that are identified or, does the overall effectiveness of the entire organization decline in its attempt to
allocate scarce resources to the newly established component?

Theoretically, Lawrence and Lorsch postulated that an organization increases its effectiveness through differentiation in response to the demands of the environment. However, it was also suggested that this effectiveness would eventually peak and then decline without the engagement of the reciprocal process of integration or "the state of collaboration existing among subgroups as perceived by members of these subgroups."¹ They pointed out that the greater the degree of differentiation the more responsive the organization was to the environment. Lawrence and Lorsch also emphasized that the greater the differentiation, the more difficult the integration and, subsequently, the greater the propensity for the organization to break down into isolated, separate components; hence, they cease to function as a system but rather operate as a series of ineffective subsystems.

This study has used the concept of differentiation as a framework for collecting and analyzing information regarding one school system's response to the demands of the special education legislation in Massachusetts. To meet the needs of Chapter 766, the Alpha public school system hired social workers, as well as a variety of other special education staff, who were added specifically to address the demands of children with special needs. In
effect, Alpha differentiated in response to the demands of the environment. This study has explored that differentiated response and the implications of Alpha's response for the effectiveness of the school system and the special education program.

The historical perspective. Alpha was in fact involved in a national movement that pushed for equal educational opportunity for the handicapped. While Alpha was proud of its tradition of educating the handicapped it was education given at the whim of the system, in separate and unequal buildings without equal protection under the law. In economic hard times, it is not surprising to find that the handicapped had a considerably less vocal constituency than the basketball team in lobbying for financial support.

It is interesting that many of the regular educator respondents drew on this past experience and cited the fine performance of Alpha. The regulations of Chapter 766 often became confused with a nostalgia for the past and a generalized frustration with government bureaucracy and control. Neither of these viewpoints are essentially helpful in discussions of the effectiveness of the special education legislation as it applied to programs in Alpha. Such feelings of frustration remained with the regular teaching staff and in part contributed to their negative impression of the social workers and others identified with
Chapter 766. Special education was viewed as an unwanted change agent that replaced services to handicapped children with a good deal of paperwork. This attitude, however, was never openly challenged or addressed by decision makers in the central administration, the school committee, the special education department or the school building.

An examination of the available financial data clearly suggests that special education made considerable inroads into the professional positions and monies available to regular education. During the period under study (September 1978 through June 1980), special education increased its staff, its programs and its budgetary allotment while regular education lost ground in all areas.

During this period none of the documents examined indicated that any full presentation or discussion of the allocation of these resources was offered to the teachers or the community. It was clear from conversations that teachers were aware in a nonspecific fashion of the increased budget of special education. But nowhere in the minutes of the school board, superintendent's reports, or newspaper articles was the issue of money and programs for special education openly and totally discussed. Budget items were proposed in isolation as a response to immediate needs and never in the context of planning needs for future growth. The groundwork was in place for a good deal of
misinformation that promoted resentment and a lack of understanding on the part of the community, the regular teachers and the special education teachers concerning the identification of priorities and matching resources. As long as priorities were not identified and budgets were increased, resentment was generalized to special education rather than to either the priorities or the decision makers.

An important understanding from this historical perspective is that the response to 766 was not the only demand being placed on this community and the Alpha School System. The character of the town was changing rather rapidly in the 1970's with an increased low income population, a shifting, economic base and rapid building of homes, businesses and community centers. The school system was also losing some of its provincial character—by the end of the decade all central administrators would, for the first time, have lived and worked in places other than Alpha.

Aside from any concerns about law, positions or budgets the teaching staff suddenly had to deal with the infusion of a large number of colleagues who were not born and raised in Alpha. Currently, the overwhelming majority of regular teaching positions are held by Alpha natives while only eleven of the sixty-three positions in special education fall in this category. This in itself created
a distinction; the data, however, do not indicate the nature of the impact of this distinction.

The historical record indicates that the State Department of Education was aware of many of the exclusionary practices of the Alpha special education department. It was noted that teachers were often not included in staffings; inservice programs were segregated by specialization and limited in number. Clearly, teachers were not viewed as an important part of the special education operation, yet a key part of the law was the issue of normalization or the involvement of special education children in regular programs. This was the central point that made this law so different from all previous legislation, yet the key people to implement this component, regular teachers, were involved in the process only as second class citizens. However, little attempt was made to establish integrative processes that would have promoted the success of the differentiation process.

Participant Observation Perspective

Teachers' view of teachers. Teachers were quite conversant with the issues of stress reaction and teacher burnout. There is a good deal of popularity for these topics in both the system's in-service programs and in the professional literature. Most teachers left the building by 2:30 p.m. and, after hour school activities were limited and generally
supported by only a small number of teachers. Special education, in general, and social workers in particular were convenient targets for teacher anxiety about change within the school system and received a good deal of critical attention in teacher rooms. Neither the mission of special education nor its bureaucratic constraints were generally understood by the regular education teaching community and both segments shared responsibility for the lack of communication on these issues. Many teachers quietly argued that the ten dollar stipend paid for core evaluation attendance was degrading but, since the union had argued for it, little was publicly said. Injury was added to insult when the teachers were often dismissed just before they would have been eligible for their ten dollar stipend. The reality for many teachers was that they were excluded from the special education process because the law did not specifically name them to the evaluation team and this was perceived as disenfranchisement. The Alpha special education department had certainly taken advantage of excluding teachers by this means.

Teachers' view of social workers. Teachers almost unanimously viewed the major component of a social workers' job as serving as liaison with the home, which was not the view that was held by the social workers themselves. This perceived role confusion of social workers obfuscated the
multiple responsibilities of social workers and made the many role demands of therapist, coordinator and program evaluator unknown to teachers. Teachers felt that social workers held a higher status within the system; in part, this may have been because the office, the privacy, the autonomy, the greater amount of formal education and secretarial assistance were system perquisites typically reserved for administrators, principals and department chairman, but not for teachers.

Social workers' view of social workers. There was a strong esprit de corps among the social workers that was fashioned by a regular working relationship with each other. There was a generalized sense of superiority especially in regard to "clinical issues" and this group often lobbied for a specific action to be taken by the special education director.

Social workers' view of teachers. Conversations with the social workers indicated that they clearly saw themselves as occupying a higher level of status than that held by teachers. The higher self perception of status level was reinforced by the accoutrements accorded by the system and by a public that was impressed with the social workers' degrees and training.

Social workers viewed the teachers as limited, parochial and traditional. Some were intelligent and
could learn but these qualities were almost incidental to their role as teachers. Continually, they expressed surprise at the interpersonal isolation of teachers since they themselves often worked with a good deal of group and collegial supervision. Likewise, with the exception of one social worker, they had little understanding of the demands of a classroom and a good deal of insensitivity to the establishment of special programs within a classroom.

A continuing point of confusion in goals between social workers and teachers was that social workers were actively concerned about client growth in emotional and social adjustment areas while teachers were actively concerned about performance in task related areas. Sometimes, these goals were in conflict for individual children.

Dimensions in relation to the Argyris typology. In terms of this typology, the author perceived teachers to function in a more participative than dynamic mode while social workers more often were found operating at the opposite end of Argyris' continuum. This seemed more a factor of environmental determinants than outstanding occupational or personal characteristics. Teachers generally expressed a low sense of self worth related to their technological abilities while social workers had a good deal of self regard in this area. Teachers were more
likely than social workers to be passive and not initiate activities and change. Teachers in the Alpha public school system worked almost exclusively alone while social workers embraced a collegial forum.

However, both groups expressed a need for challenging work—the social workers being in a stronger organizational position to effect that. Both groups had a variety of personal friendships at work although these often confined themselves to personnel in the same job categories. Individuals in each group expressed a need to produce quality work while a prevailing trend was that the longer a person was employed by the system the more likely he was to argue for "adequate work for a fair day's pay." Both groups had few pretensions about the material rewards in education, but both groups did value the time off. Social workers were much more likely to participate in activities that helped them understand more about their job while both groups were as likely to engage in outside activities that were "creative."

Continuously, the observer was impressed with the impact that the school environment had on the teachers by limiting the possibilities for autonomy, growth and creativity. Increased self-confidence, specific feedback on activities, administrative support for expanded in-service training programs, and a clear dialogue about the changes the system was experiencing all are factors that
would have quite possibly changed the placement of teachers on Argyris' adapted typology.

**Unstructured Interview Perspective**

**Time Orientation:** time horizon of problems most often worked on by the individual.

Social workers and teachers have such different approaches to schedules that they seem to be working in different places. Teachers' schedules are imposed, rigid and inflexible both on a weekly and yearly basis. Social workers determine their own schedules and rarely maintain consistency on a weekly or yearly basis. Teachers look to a certain degree of student performance in a particular time frame based on nationally normed test scores. Social workers base their treatment plans on the individual needs of each client regardless of the time frames of the academic year. Both groups presented serious but unresolved questions about the responsibility of the school in providing long term therapy to students. Both groups expressed concern about the pressure of time in relationship to performance demands--this was especially true for the social workers who were often assigned new responsibilities in response to emerging crisis situations.

**Goal Orientation:** priority ordering of organizational goals by an individual in performing his job.
Both groups are in general agreement that the organization's goal is to "educate kids." Teachers order their work around the fulfillment of this goal. Social workers, however, describe successful job performance as their ability to help children sometimes in spite of this goal. The teachers who were interviewed all spoke of class goals or group goals while the social workers consistently identified individual goals for both themselves and their clients. Both social workers and teachers felt that social workers' goals for affective development in childhood (social and emotional growth) were often in conflict with the cognitive goals of the system and their implementation by teachers.

It was clear in the responses that the lack of formulated system goals in which the staff had input created confusion and a lack of direction on the part of both teachers and social workers. This was so because uncertainty of direction often allowed programs and actions of staff to be second guessed by administrators, teachers and parents. Additionally, lack of clear statement of goals and priorities left teachers and social workers at the mercy of whatever pressure group had the stage at a given moment.

**Interpersonal Orientation:** style of work interaction most preferred by the individual.
All of the teachers interviewed described their work as primarily oriented to groups of children and consistent from year to year. Only one teacher expressed considerable satisfaction with this orientation. They all described a lack of personal autonomy in organizing their jobs and viewed their performance as being measured by external norms such as test scores. No teacher reported training in other than the specific cognitive areas which they address in their teaching. All the teachers were very possessive in their expressions of territoriality (e.g., "my school").

On the other hand, all of the social workers described their work as collegially orientated to individual children as well as dynamic in that they considered the diverse forces operating in a given field. Flexibility of scheduling, the autonomy of client and treatment selection and the diversity of problems were all aspects of job preference for them. They showed increased concern for children who were quiet and withdrawn rather than with children who were "acting-out," although most of their referrals from teachers were from the latter group. They all spoke about diverse training backgrounds although knowledge of teaching methods and curriculum were decidedly limited. The social workers were more global in their views of children's needs as well as in the selection of work environment. All the social workers described their
opposition to nationally imposed norms for a child's growth through latency and adolescence.

Teachers were not satisfied with the routine of their jobs and their subservience to bells. Flexibility of scheduling and increased autonomy were the factors most mentioned by teachers as areas in need of improvement.

**Formality of Structure:** the degree of structure characteristic of the subgroup's organization, in terms of reporting procedures, span of control and levels of hierarchy.

All teachers reported clear accountability to the building principal and indicated little professional educator identification. Teaching was a job rather than a profession. They had little impact or influence on the system except in their classrooms and indicated a self perception of low status in the organizations. All teachers reported isolation from their colleagues. It was also clear that the discussion of problems with their peers would raise the awful specter of peer evaluation.

Social workers consistently reported diverse degrees and levels of accountability and felt that they had an impact on classrooms, the schools and the district. Solid professional identification was clear throughout all of the interviews and concomitant high levels of status and self-worth were in evidence. Social workers consistently referred their problems to their colleagues for
"supervision" which was considered to be distinct from evaluation.

The social workers experienced several negative effects from the lack of a formalized structure. It allowed for the consistent delegation of additional duties and responsibilities as the need arose. The principals and special education director, using the system as a model, simply continued to delegate duties and responsibilities without a sense of the priorities or goals of the system. The reduced formality of structure allowed for an increased confusion of the system's roles and goals because teachers and social workers were never sure who was doing what or exactly which person had responsibility. Responsibilities of social worker and some teachers varied widely in the schools studied and evolved in response to situational management demands rather than any organization scheme or design.

Orientation to Change: the degree to which a subgroup's work involves the changing of methods and programs.

Social workers expressed considerable job satisfaction about the nature of the changing environments of schools. They had a global view of this system's adaptation and related it to national trends. The consistency in their jobs was that they were working with new problems and different issues all the time both with individual
students and with the school system. Teachers seemed perplexed by the changing nature of their environment and a real attempt to ignore such changes was evident in their territoriality and self-imposed isolation from their colleagues on both a building and a system level. There was a clear expectation that their roles and jobs would remain immutable.

The social workers as a group viewed change as a healthy, positive sign. Their interagency dealings brought them in contact with a diverse number of individuals from a rather broad spectrum of the community. As a group there was a strong identification with workshops and continuing education programs where they came in contact with a number of people from outside of the immediate area, who were not in their specific job function but were in the same occupational family. On the other hand, the teachers were typically removed from such experiences and contacts by the isolated nature of their jobs, by their non-pursuit of job related learning activities, by their predilection for consistency and by the lack of environmental support received from decision makers in the organization.

Thus, using the Lawrence and Lorsch typology it is clear that differentiation did take place. Differentiation is usually viewed as a healthy sign in an organization. It represents a flexible, changing response to the ebb and flow of the environment's demands. The more adaptive the
system is to its environment "the higher the degree of differentiation among subgroups."³

In the case of the Alpha School System the organization was required to adapt because of the driving force of mandated special education legislation. This adaptation was identified as an intrusion on the historical territoriality of teachers and the parochialism of this public school system. At the core of this concern was a considerable degree of local and societal conflict and disagreement over exactly what a public school is supposed to do. Were the schools supposed to focus solely on preparing citizens who could read and write or were they supposed to prepare citizens who were also healthy in their adjustment to the demands of an increasingly technological society? Was "the classroom the marketplace of ideas where the nation's future depends on the leaders trained through wide exposure to that robust exchange of ideas" as Mr. Justice Brennan asserted? Surely, answers to these concerns are not provided by this study; indeed, these issues will probably continue to provide the sparks of lively controversy for some time. "The main challenge confronting today's organization...is that of responding to changing conditions and adapting to external stress."⁴

What is of primary concern in this study is the rapid process of differentiation which occurred in this system along with a concomitant lethargy in the development of
integrative processes. Lawrence and Lorsch saw integration as the reciprocal process to differentiation and defined integration as the "state of collaboration existing among subgroups as perceived by the members of these subgroups." They pointed out that the greater the degree of differentiation the more responsive the organization was being to the environment. However, the greater the differentiation that occurs in an organization, the more difficult the task of integration became and consequently, the greater the propensity of the organization to break down into isolated, separate components, subsequently ceasing to function as a system but rather operating as a series of ineffective subsystems.

In the case of the Alpha School System we have seen considerable differentiation among the subgroups of teachers and social workers so much so that they often operated as separate units, sometimes at cross purposes. Differentiation for this system was an even more complex issue when one considers the diversity of personnel who now parade through school systems and ostensibly demonstrate different cognitive and attitudinal orientations than the traditional mainstay of public education—the classroom teacher (as noted in Appendix A, page 200). Organizationally, then, administrators, planners and decision makers must be acutely aware that "without a sufficient degree of integration, a system would break
down into separate elements."

Differentiation did exist in Alpha in that social workers and teachers are distinct not only in training, experience and background but also in the expectations placed on them by the environment. From their job descriptions through their verbal statements, each group was called upon to fulfill specifically different functions. More importantly each group demonstrated a distinct set of attitudes, behaviors and assumptions within the organizational environment.

A major theme of this data is that the environment created hostility, antagonism and defensiveness by this differentiation process. Initially conceived of as an effective response to the demands of the special education legislation, the differentiation evolved into a determinant of intraorganizational boundaries as teachers and social workers separated into opposite groups. No planning was conducted to integrate the two groups before this occurred. No attempt was made to address the lessened decision making role of teachers; no attempt was made to clarify the roles and goals of social workers or to provide both groups with information about the allocation of scarce financial, managerial and personnel resources.

In the absence of actions on the part of decision makers to seek integration or collaborative responses, fragmentation and intragroup conflict increased. The
positive aspects of the differentiation process were increasingly eroded as social workers and teachers spent more and more time resolving conflict among themselves and consequently spent less time developing collaborative programs to meet the needs of all the children.

Conclusions

This study has attempted to describe the response of one school system to the demands of a changing environment. To do this, the author has examined the impact of Chapter 766 on the organizational functioning of both teachers and social workers within the Alpha public school system. The following conclusions are suggested from this study:

1. Differentiation did take place in the Alpha public school system. This was an organizational response to environmental demands in the form of the legal and policy implications of the special education legislation, Chapter 766.

2. The evidence did suggest that the social workers were perceived to have distinct attitudinal and cognitive differences from teachers yet no evidence was forthcoming to suggest that any special preparations were made by the organization for adding a significantly different subsystem to the organization.
3. The data did indicate that both teachers and social workers perceived teachers to be less skillful than social workers. This perception seemed to be enhanced by the fact that teachers were comparing themselves to social workers, a group widely identified to have significant cognitive and attitudinal differences yet organizationally incorporated as lateral or collegial entities. Such an administrative design did not allow for official recognition of distinct differences, and appeared to promote feelings of inferiority on the part of the teachers.

4. Alpha's differentiated response was viewed negatively by the teachers. They perceived this response to have drained personnel and financial resources, diminished teacher prestige, and modified internal decision making processes, while increasing teacher accountability, work loads and interactional response to a diverse number of newly incorporated staff. Because of social workers' distinct cognitive and attitudinal differences, their appearance of autonomy and their high visibility in unpleasant and difficult cases, the teachers directed these negative feelings about special education legislation to this group rather than to the decision makers in the system.

5. Both teachers and social workers expressed a number of negative reactions to each other. Lateral antagonism between social workers and teachers was most
often based on confusion over the roles and goals of each
group rather than on questions of competency and effec-
tiveness in specific task performance.

6. All information that was collected suggests that
confusion of roles and goals, absence of organizational
reinforcement for other than adequate work, inability to
promote collaborative efforts between social workers and
teachers and the continuance of an environment that pro-
moted negative comparisons between members holding lateral
positions all mitigated against increased levels of
effectiveness.

Implications for future planning. In Alpha's case it was
likely that alternative forms of management planning would
have alleviated a lateral antagonism and improved per-
formance of both teachers and social workers. Stress
among teachers and social workers increased because of
confusion over roles and goals, misinformation about job
performance and obfuscation of system priorities, all
determinants of ineffectiveness and misapplication of
energies. In Alpha's case, even if the administration
could not have done a great deal to make the environment
more predictable, at least it could have made it more
understandable to the participants.

Secondly, Alpha's experience continually impressed
the observer as containing a series of missed oppor-
tunities. For example, the observer feels that the effectiveness and performance could have been higher for both teachers and social workers. The failure here was not that the staff was poor, or uncommitted, or faced with an impossible task, all characteristics that no doubt exist in many other situations. Rather, the situational form of crisis management allowed for no avenue to draw on unused capacities in order to support creative response to job performance, to develop team building, or to foster thoughtful decision making processes about the use of system resources to meet identified priorities. A. K. Rice's hypothesis seems appropriate in Alpha's case: "If an enterprise fails to provide outlets for unused capacities, they are likely to interfere with task performance." The evidence did indicate that in Alpha's case, task performance would have been more effective if less energy and attention had been channeled into lateral antagonisms.

A third perspective in the Alpha case involved the nature of the management planning process. The responsibility of the management extended beyond the decision to provide a new service, it extended beyond the decision of what new staff to hire to provide that service and it extended beyond the supervision of that staff. Responsible management decisions should include the plan for the
integration of that new component into the functioning of the organization. Alpha is representative of a characteristic approach that adds, delegates and assigns tasks, personnel and services without considering the impact on the entire organizational functioning. Such myopic vision allowed an organization to break down into separate elements.

Thus, it appears short sighted to respond to the demands of a changing environment by a differentiated response alone. Shortsighted because such a level of response will likely support the breakdown of the organization per se. Rather it appears that this response should be followed by a program of integration or collaboration if we are to accept Lawrence and Lorsch's theoretical model. To achieve collaboration between separate elements in an organization, it is logical to suggest that this task generally follows a two stage approach: a short term response that would allow the organization to cope with the immediate needs of its environment and a long term response that would allow an organization to adapt to the demands of its environment.

Integration as a Short Term Response

The Chapter 766 and PL 94-142 legislation stipulates that a planning and evaluation meeting was to be held at least once a year in which all staff working with a child
would meet to define and assess the child's program. In Alpha there was a clear indication that the law was followed but that there was little communication and follow-up past the meeting between the separate service providers. Immediately, then it was important to assure that there be a temporary allocation of organizational resources in establishing regular meeting times. These meetings would facilitate the flow of communication which one teacher had reported to be "non-existent," and would provide an opportunity for continual feedback on performance for both social workers and teachers. It would also establish a forum for discussing the different but equally valuable ways in which both groups work with children.

Communication would be served by having teachers represented at the clinical staff meetings on children in their classes. Likewise, the social workers should attend teacher meetings and make it a point to share lunch times with teachers. Such boundary spanning activities seem basic to the establishment of rapport and harmony.

Likewise, preservice and inservice programs could be expanded to provide both teachers and social workers with a clearer understanding of the roles of both within the system. They could also clarify the particular specialized training experienced by both groups, and add specific suggestions for making the training collaborative rather than competitive.
Integration as a Long Term Response

Lawrence and Lorsch found that in more efficient organizations differentiation and integration were maintained at high levels because people in key integrating roles had relatively higher influence with which to facilitate integration than integrators in less effective organizations. They also discovered that the more effective organizations were able to achieve needed integration through the use of open and confronting conflict resolving behavior.9

Gabarro, in his study on school systems, found that "the more adaptive systems had developed generic central integrative offices for secondary and elementary." He also found that in school systems the greater the span of control of the differentiated components, the more negative the effects on integration.

Rather than supporting the continuance of the school system's division between regular education and special education it might facilitate integration if the system was divided by elementary and secondary organization distinctions. Social workers would then have direct accountability, not to a Director of Special Education but to a Director of Elementary Education or his counterpart. Administrators at building and division levels would be hired on the basis of their varied background and multidisciplinary training, not on the basis of their success in running classrooms alone. Concurrently, there should be
an attempt to reduce the span of control of the social
workers at the same time that teachers are encouraged to
be also involved in outside activities such as meetings
to help design new programs. Likewise, both groups would
be involved in the hiring of teachers, social workers and
school administrators.

An attempt should be made to reduce the mystifica-
tion that the teachers felt surrounded the social worker's
treatment plans and meeting goals. Two of the teachers
interviewed expressed interest in ongoing workshops about
mental health, social and emotional growth. Certainly,
this could be approached through inservice training courses
for credit or the incorporation of such issues, into the
activities of a teacher center which could be renamed a
"learning center" so that social workers and others might
not feel excluded.

Another integrative device is to encourage collabora-
tive learning and training procedures. Such an approach
would support teachers and social workers attending the
same workshops and avoiding those activities that are
exclusively for one group. Such joint training has en-
couraged a collaborative approach to problem solving and
task performance.10

Another approach for supporting integration might be
the formation of a Technical Assistance Team. This team
would be multidisciplinary and would operate across
elementary and secondary division lines. In addition to monitoring the performance of children and the viability of programs, this team also would serve as a continual reminder of the importance of collaborative efforts among the system's subgroups and as an opportunity for dialogue concerning the allocation of the system's resources.

These types of efforts, of course, must be tailored to the needs of each organization but seem to be the form that would maximize effectiveness of both response and performance. Continual attention on the part of management to the nuances of personnel allocation and development seem integral to effective functioning, especially in organizations that are labor intensive, such as school systems.

**Recommendations**

There are several areas of investigation needed in each of the major perspectives considered in this study: the organizational issues of differentiation in the non-profit sector, the process of differentiation in response to special education legislation, and the nature of the environmental determinants effecting individuals in organizations undergoing change.

How extensive is differentiation as a response to emerging needs in the non-profit sector, including school systems? Are such responses merely the tacking on of a
new service capability or is consideration given to the integration of such special efforts in harmonious association with the mission of the entire organization?

The special education legislation was conceived as a change in the school environment to meet the needs of special education children. Would this goal have been better served if it also included an attempt to improve the organizational environment for decision makers, teachers, social workers and others involved in this process? Is organizational health a concept that also meets children's needs as much as codifications of responsibilities, performance levels, and desired outcomes? Were the less than desirable effects of Chapter 766 observed in Alpha, such as intragroup fragmentation, typical of school systems throughout the state? Were other systems more successful at achieving an effective differentiated response? Was the effectiveness of differentiation in Alpha minimized because of the peculiar dynamics between teachers and social workers? Is a conflict in roles, goals and expectations also evident in professional dynamics among teachers and psychologists, special educators, medical doctors and speech pathologists?

Investigation and study is also needed in the environmental aspects effecting this study. It would be interesting to see if the change in preservice and inservice training programs emphasizing collaboration between
teachers and social workers would make this differentiation process more effective in Alpha. Would the data have been as clear if the researcher had an equal access to the spontaneous conversations among teachers that the researcher had among social workers? Would the scope and nature of the differentiated response have been different if the teachers and social workers were not overwhelmingly female while the decision makers were exclusively male? Would differentiation have been more successful if the teachers had as high a self concept as the social workers?

The fields of educational management, special education, social work and organizational development have vast frames of reference. Within these domains, it is necessary to develop concepts and strategies that are operationally sound for our schools in that an emerging trend is that no one discipline is supplying sufficient expertise to deal with the multidimensional problems facing education in the future.

The author recommends that researchers and writers direct increasing amounts of attention to the management of our schools systems. There is a need to be aware of the interrelationships of different groups, different attitudes and different demands on our schools. We need a perspective of the scope of the present issues facing us as well as an awareness of future concerns.
The Alpha experience may in fact by typical of the response of overburdened organizational systems to complex problems and demands. However, there is a need for additional qualitative research to more fully appreciate the relationship between a diverse number of subgroups in our schools. Quantitative verification is necessary to fully appreciate the impact of the differentiation phenomena on our schools. Such studies should involve a larger cross section of professions and school districts through questionnaires to assess the extent of the attitudinal and behavioral distinctions noted in Alpha.

Additionally, we know very little about the impact of such phenomena as differentiation on the effectiveness of our school organizational structures and appropriate evaluation tools need to be devised to address this need. There is a gap in our understanding of how to respond to differentiation or other new demands from a traditional organizational structure such as a school. Specifically, a model for the integration process is needed if we are to continue to place the diverse numbers of demands on our schools as we have been doing for the last ten years.

The author encourages the development of a new school of thought regarding our public school systems. These complex organizations do not merely teach children or give diplomas. Rather, these organizations are major institutions in our society that must be adaptive to new
needs and demands of a changing world. This perspective supports the idea of a thoughtful school management that seeks to change and adapt our schools to the needs of our society through planning, applying conceptual and theoretical tools and through learning new ways to organize our resources. Peter Drucker summarizes this point well.

Today's developed society...depends for leadership on the managers of its major institutions. It depends on their knowledge, on their vision, and on their responsibility. In this society, management—its tasks, its responsibilities, its practices—is central: as a need, as an essential contribution and as a subject of study and knowledge.11
Footnotes


2 Ibid.
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APPENDIX A

Staffing Impact of 766:

**EDUCATION:**
- Principal
- Classroom/Subject Teacher
- Special Educator

**MENTAL HEALTH:**
- Psychologists: Psychometrists
- Therapists
- Social Workers
- Guidance Counselors
- Psychiatrists

**MEDICAL:**
- Pediatrician
- General Practitioner
- Nurse
- Psychiatrist
- Other Specialists: Neurology
- Ophthalmology
- Allergy
- ENT

**SPECIALISTS:**
- Audiologists
- Speech and Language Pathologists
- Occupational Therapists
- Physical Therapist
- Teacher of the Deaf
- Teacher of the Visually Impaired
- Reading Specialists
- Bilingual Education/Interpreter
- Attendance Officer
- Probation Officer
- Welfare and other State Agencies
- Outside Evaluators (second opinions)
- Total Communication Specialists

**OTHERS:**
- Advocates
- Associated Administrators
- State Hearing Officer
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A partial listing of agencies involved with the Special Education Department in Alpha:

Catalyst
Companion Program
Clarke School for the Deaf
   Residential Program
   Day Program
   Audiological Services
   Parent Training
   Psychological Services
   Pre-School
Perkins School for the Blind
Austine School for the Deaf
Willie Ross School for the Deaf
   Outreach
   Audiological Services
   Day Program
   Mental Health Services
Montessori Pre-School
Cloverdale Pre-School
Community Homes for Children
Riverside Industries
Hampshire ARC
Cultural Education Collaborative
Headstart
Hampshire Community Action Commission
Experiment with Travel
Community Mental Health Clinic
Children's Aid and Family Service
Children's Comprehensive Center
Children's Protective Service
Our Lady of Providence
Devereux School
Berkshire Learning Center
Area Housing Authorities
Smith Charities
Social Security Administration
Learning Intervention Family Team (LIFT)
Hampshire Day House
Psychological Services Center
Communication Disorders Clinic
Franklin County Public Hospital
Massachusetts Division of Family Health Services
Northampton State Hospital
Northampton Nursing Home - Pediatric Unit
Advocate Program
Hampshire Correctional Services
ABC House
Maple Valley School
Amherst Community Clinical Nursery School
Massachusetts Rehabilitation Secondary Program for the Deaf
Massachusetts Office of Deafness Secondary School Learning Project
KEY Program, Inc.
Belchertown State School
Hispanic Center
Sojourn, Inc.
HELP for Children, Hampshire Threshold Community Multi-Service Agency, Inc.
Center for Study of Institutional Alternatives
Cloverdale Parent Cooperative Nursery School
Smith College Campus School
Homemaker's Service of Hampshire County, Inc.
Service Organizations of Smith College (SOS)
Rural Early Assistance to Children (REACH)
Hampshire County Human Service Coordinator
Networks
The Bridge
Women and Children First
Northampton Companion Women
East Mountain School
Council for Children
Williston-Northampton School
Boston Center for the Blind
Not a Jail, Not a Hospital (NAJNAH)
Expanded Food and Nutrition Plan (EFNEP)
Department of Mental Health
Department of Public Health
Department of Social Services
Department of Public Welfare
Hampshire County Court
Western Massachusetts Public Health Plastics Clinic
Shriners Hospital
Learning Center for the Multiply Handicapped
LINC Outreach (Learning in Integrated Classrooms)
Hampshire Educational Collaborative
New Directions
Berkshire Learning Center
APPENDIX C

Methodology Section:

Unstructured Interview Guide:

Occupation ________________________________

# of years in field _______________________

# of years in system _______________________

Marriage, children _______________________

Approximate age _______________________

Professional Background:

I) Level of Training - degrees, # of years in school, etc.

II) What experience had you had with school systems prior to working here?

III) What approaches (teaching styles) were you trained in? Most comfortable with?

IV) Was a public school system your first choice for employment?

V) Do you feel that your personal goals (what are they?) are consistent with your career choices?

VI) What have you done to improve your professional abilities since leaving school?
Professional Placement:

1) What do you feel is the goal of this system?

2) What role (responsibility) do you have in the fulfillment of that goal?

3) Professionally, what individual or group is most important to you?

4) What are your professional goals?

5) How are they accomplished in this organization?

6) Do you feel that there is organizational support for flexible action (teamwork, individual initiative)?

7) Is the work you do challenging? Exciting? What control do you have over this quality?

8) Do you engage in outside activities relevant to your field? On a regular basis?

9) How do you think you are viewed by _____? How would you improve communication with _____?

10) Describe what you think a successful school will look like?

11) What do you think is the primary need to be addressed in
Individual Background (optional)

1) What were your parents occupation?

2) When did you first think about becoming?

3) What other occupations had you considered doing?

4) If you had an opportunity to make a career change, what would you do?