

Résumé

Cet article décrit l'expérience vécu par une équipe de professeurs de la faculté des sciences de l'éducation de l'Université de Toronto. Ces professeurs ont travaillé pendant dix ans à la mise sur pied d'un programme pratique de formation préalable des enseignants du primaire, afin de former des enseignants réfléchis. Ce travail de mise au point est décrit selon plusieurs points de vue: planification par une équipe d'enseignants, conception de stages pratiques, formulation des éléments du programme, établissement des liens avec le milieu, évaluation du travail des candidats et du programme. La notion d'enseignant réfléchi (Schon, 1987), décrite au début de l'article, sert de point de convergence au débat. Ce compte rendu vise à informer et peut-être même à aider d'autres enseignants qui s'occupent de parfaire et d'améliorer les programmes de formation préalable des enseignants.

Thomas J. Ritchie, *University of Winnipeg*

Creating Educational Change: Reports on Administrators' Methods

Abstract

Educational administrators are assigned the job of improving education by improving the quality of instruction. The purpose of this paper is to describe and analyse supervisors' methods. This study explores how they think they can have some effect. Eleven methods administrators report they use to effect change in subordinates are discussed. The methods are: option creating, focusing, modelling, persuading, direct ordering, threatening, and propagating. Supervisors are assessed as placing a high emphasis, medium emphasis, low emphasis, or no emphasis on a particular method. The analysis and comparison of supervisors' methods illuminate the organizational change process.

Résumé

Les administrateurs du système d'éducation ont pour mandat d'améliorer l'éducation en relevant la qualité de l'enseignement. Cet article vise à décrire et à analyser diverses méthodes utilisées par les superviseurs, et notamment la façon dont ils estiment pouvoir exercer une certaine influence. Onze méthodes que des administrateurs affirment utiliser pour provoquer des changements chez leurs subordonnés sont ainsi analysées. Ces méthodes sont: la création d'options, la focalisation, la modélisation, la persuasion, les ordres directs, les menaces et la propagation. L'évaluation des superviseurs se fait en fonction de l'importance (grande, moyenne, faible ou nulle) qu'ils attachent à une méthode particulière. L'analyse et la comparaison des méthodes utilisées par les superviseurs illustrent le processus de changement organisationnel.

Thomas J. Ritchie
University of Winnipeg

Creating Educational Change: Reports on Administrators' Methods

The educational supervisors in this study are expected to facilitate and demonstrate leadership in the change process in schools. The supervisor's goal is to improve education by improving teaching. The purpose of this paper is to describe and analyze supervisors' methods for influencing and changing subordinates. The educational administrators in the study are experienced individuals who are dutifully carrying out their responsibilities. The supervisors range in experience from four to thirty-seven years.

The literature suggests that it is difficult to create changes in educators and it is very important that school administrators are involved and supportive (Fullan, 1982). Less is known about exactly what actions administrators should and do take. Little research has been done in the way of techniques supervisors use. When it comes to improving instruction by direct interaction with teachers the literature is particularly pessimistic.

It is stated that if teaching performance is deemed below standards, "supervisory ratings may be ineffective in promoting teacher improvement" (Bridges, 1984, p. 21). There is no evidence that any kind of supervision makes a difference (Dussault, 1970; Mosher & Purpel, 1972; Harris, 1978; Blumberg, 1978; Turner & Clift, 1988). Studies that investigate whether or not supervisors' evaluation work promotes improvement are almost impossible to find. Tuckman and Oliver (1968) designed an experiment to test the effects of feedback on teacher supervisees' behaviour and concluded, "such feedback is doing more harm than good". A major survey concludes that supervisees receiving supervisory treatment, "do not sense any particular improvement" (Lawton, Hickcox, Leithwood, & Musella, 1986).

Research can suggest both what is possible and what is lacking in administrative practice. Through a more complete understanding of adminis-

trators who are trying to improve teaching better theory and critical appraisal can be built. It is towards that goal that this study is directed.

The study of context

One school district in Southern Ontario was selected as a site for the study. A formal policy document outlines a process administrators are to follow and discusses the goals of their administrative work. Local policy states that the administrator's purpose is "to bring about improvement in student learning - through the professional development and /or improvement of teachers".

The formal policy in the study setting prescribes that the administrator is to work to create change in subordinate behaviour through a five-step cycle that is derived from the clinical supervision model (see Goldhammer, Anderson, & Krajewski, 1980). First, the administrator and organizational subordinate identify a list of priority goals. Secondly, a cooperative diagnosis of how well the subordinate is meeting these expectations takes place. Thirdly, written developmental and/or improvement goals are redefined into specific behavioural objectives that are pursued. Step four requires the two to carry on a series of data-based written communications related to the achievement of objectives. Finally, a written data-based communication from the supervisor identifies to what degree the teacher has achieved his or her objectives and whether or not a further cycle is immediately required.

The administrators in this study report that the formal process for change outlined in policy is difficult to follow. The policy is described as "idealistic", "too general", "overly time consuming," and "too formal". Nevertheless, the administrators all claim to be "working in the spirit" of the policy.

Method

A research method utilizing open-ended interviews was used to explore how practicing administrators attempt to fulfil their change-agent responsibilities. One cannot assume that the retrospective impressions of administrators about their practices constitute adequate support for constructing a picture of what really occurred, but it is not the specifics of behaviour actually exhibited which are the primary focus of this study. The ideas that inform behaviour were under investigation. Such managerial intentions can be properly investigated by interviewing.

Seven persons were interviewed: two area superintendents, a high school principal, a junior high school principal, an elementary principal and vice-principal, and a high school department head. Each person was inter-

viewed on site and the interviews were taped and later transcribed. Each person was interviewed for a period of no less than three hours. At the end of the interviewing participants reported that they were satisfied that their perspective on being an administrative change agent had been adequately explained.

The administrators were asked to talk about their goals, their experiences, and particular situations in a friendly conversational manner suggested in the research literature (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982). All interviews were transcribed and coded by a letter and page number designation forming a document file maintained by the researcher. An inductive analysis of the document file to discover themes was then performed (see Glasser, 1978; LeCompte & Goetz, 1981). The statements of the seven administrators were grouped under emerging themes with a coded record of all the statements supporting each theme kept. This system enabled the researcher to create an "audit trail" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), a record of statements "grounding" themes. The analysis is grounded in the interviews and validated by the interviews (LeCompte & Goetz, 1981).

Once themes were identified their intensity was quantitatively estimated. In this case a quantitative grading based on an estimate of intensity is made. Intensity is itself estimated by repeatedly reading and reflecting on supervisors' statements. This analysis involves not a counting of words but rather an interpretation of the importance, the intensity, of what is said.

The goal of the study was not to select a representative sample so to generalize to a larger population. This was an exploratory study designed to develop insight into individuals and generate hypotheses concerning supervisors. The participants were selected from a convenient listing of administrators who were willing to cooperate and identified themselves as educational supervisors. The collection and analysis of data is consistent with the interpretive paradigm for social science research (Burrell & Morgan, 1979). The sample and methodology is suitable for the exploratory purposes of the study.

Findings

One can assume that what persons believe is reflected in what they do. If a person emphasizes an interpersonal method it can be hypothesized that it is readily apparent in his/her behaviour. Similarly if a person does not emphasize a particular method one could assume that the person would display little or no example of the method in his/her behaviour. This analysis claims accuracy only in terms of what individual administrators emphasize in

reports concerning their behaviour. Actual behaviour would have to be observed to substantiate the degree to which what each supervisor says is reflected in his/her actual behaviour. This is a study of what administrators believe, not an observational study of how they actually behave. The reader is therefore cautioned in terms of making inferences about the observable behaviour of these seven people.

The analysis of supervisors' actions is limited by the available data in the document file maintained by the researcher. The reader is further cautioned that it is by no means assumed that this represents an analysis of the complete intentional change-agent behaviour of the seven administrators. These administrators may well behave in ways that go beyond what they offer in their reports.

The methods administrators report they use to effect change in subordinates will be discussed. This listing presents in each case those which are reported by at least two supervisors. Eleven methods that have been identified in the data are: ameliorating, pacing, friending, helping, option creating, focusing, modelling, persuading, direct ordering, threatening, and propagating.

Supervisors were assessed as placing a high emphasis, medium emphasis, low emphasis, or no emphasis on a particular method. A high emphasis means a supervisor indicates the use and importance of a method. A medium emphasis means a supervisor in relation to himself or herself and the other supervisors places considerable emphasis on a method but not as much as other methods they may use. A low emphasis means that while a method may be used it is not emphasized and likely not used much. No emphasis means possibly no awareness and likely little or no use of the method.

The interpersonal methods and the analysis assessing the degree of emphasis each administrator places on a method are summarized in Table 1. The discussion that follows offers a full explanation of the findings reported in Table 1.

Ameliorating

The administrators in the study report that they try to ameliorate negative connotations that may be associated with their working to change a subordinate. Most of the administrators recognize the possible threat posed by an "improvement programme" and appear to make their own special efforts to present it in the best possible light. This may help lower subordinate resistance. The data show that administrative work is ameliorated through

Table 1
Interpersonal Methods Matrix

	Supervisors						
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Interpersonal Methods							
Ameliorating	H	-	M	L	-	-	L
Pacing	H	-	-	H	-	-	L
Friending	-	L	-	L	-	M	H
Helping	-	-	-	M	L	H	H
Option							
Creating	H	-	-	L	-	-	-
Focusing	H	L	-	L	-	-	L
Modelling	-	-	H	L	L	-	-
Persuading	-	-	L	L	-	-	H
Direct							
Ordering	L	L	H	H	L	-	L
Threatening	L	-	-	-	L	-	-
Propagating	H	-	H	L	-	-	-

Key:

- H - high emphasis
- M - medium emphasis
- L - low emphasis
- - no emphasis

careful diction, by emphasizing its positive aspects, and by the use of testimonials.

Administrator A is assessed as placing a high emphasis on the ameliorating method. He substitutes words in phrases. One example of substitution is captured in the statement, "some staff members produce, at least evolve, at different rates". The word "growth" is substituted for a term such as compliance. "Improvement" replaces the more neutral "change in behaviour" (A10). "Spin off" objectives appear to more accurately be administrator's objectives (A12, A13). Administrators are positively depicted as individuals who "work with you" and are helpful (A6). A programme for change is equated with a "motherhood" objective like doing a better job for kids (A7). Testimonials are also used by this administrator. It is claimed that, "Experienced teachers

admit every year that they have done a better job because of the supervision practice" (A16). Administrator A offers examples of ameliorating through careful diction, positive association, and the testimonial. He thus attempts to set a tone of a relaxed, friendly, open, honest, sharing, caring, challenging, and cooperative effort to better education (A16, A19, A22).

Administrator C is assessed as placing a medium emphasis on ameliorating. Words are chosen that enhance the image of the "proper" subordinate and detract from the image of the "poor" subordinate. "Professional" is the adjective applied to a compliant teacher (C3). Teacher subordinates who are accepting are "effective" and those who are not accepting are "conservative" and "paranoid" (C3). It is repeatedly emphasized that the programme for change is a "cooperative" process (C16). The administrator provides a testimonial to describe the end result of the interaction, saying, "To make a long story short, I saw the teacher about two weeks ago and he said this is the best year he ever had. And the new principal is quite pleased with him" (C52). Administrator C, like Administrator A, provides illustrations of ameliorating through careful diction, positive association, and the testimonial. The administrator demonstrates the use of ameliorating in the interview data; however, one suspects that he is more likely to prescribe it for his administrative subordinates than actually practicing it in his own administrative work. Thus he is assessed as placing a medium emphasis on the method.

Administrator D is assessed as placing low emphasis on ameliorating. She illustrates ameliorating in saying, "I like people to be professional enough that you don't have to come down heavy on anybody or anything and that people can work together and behave in a democratic fashion" (D32). In this case, being democratic and professional is positively associated with the programme for change. The testimonial is here again used when she states that feedback from teacher subordinates indicates that the programme for change is "of some use to them" (D11).

Administrator G is assessed as placing a low emphasis on ameliorating. He tells subordinates not to worry about the programme for change and that it is not designed to call into question their competence but is rather designed to help them in areas they identify (G5). Apart from some direct positive associations of the programme for change with helping he does not utilize other ameliorating strategies.

Administrator B appears to place no emphasis on amelioration. On the contrary the administrator exhibits a blunt and straight-forward manner of communication. Administrators E and F are also assessed as placing no

emphasis on ameliorating. They make no reference to the self-conscious use of any of the ameliorating processes.

Pacing

Pacing refers to a timing for implementation that is realistic and workable and thus prevents overloading and frustration. It involves the measured and steady implementation of an objective. The data suggest that several administrators self-consciously utilize the pacing method.

Administrator A is assessed as placing a high emphasis on pacing. He paces the general implementation of policy in his school and the implementation work of individual subordinates. In reference to the programme for change policy he states, "I guess one [bit] of my advice would be to go a little slowly at the beginning because there's no use, because it has taken us four or five years to get where we are" (A34). In reference to pacing subordinates he states, "But there's such a thing as overloading a teacher. First thing you know you've got a problem classroom" (A38).

Administrator D is assessed as placing a high emphasis on pacing. On a school level the administrator "plants seeds" in preparation for innovations she is planning years ahead (D48). She states, "You pace changes and be patient and not lose sight of the ultimate goal" (D48). On an individual subordinate level she states, "And I think that's another thing that good supervision has to do, you have to recognize those people that are not already a part of the system and have to bring them on board gradually" (D12). In one instance she reports, "So I said I think you should give yourself a three-year period to be certain. And I think that removed a lot of her feeling of stress right there" (D15).

Administrator G is assessed as placing a low emphasis on this method. He expresses some concern over how quickly policy material is dispensed to subordinates, preferring a slow-paced approach (G4, G16). There is no evidence concerning how or if he uses pacing with individual subordinates.

Administrators B, C, E, and F do not indicate an emphasis on pacing in their interview data. All are assessed as placing no emphasis on this method.

Friending

Friending is the process of developing interpersonal relations with a subordinate that are characterized by mutual affection independently of sexual

or family love. A sound relationship increases communication, may reduce resistance, and increases informal and formal influence. It is the practice of several administrators to establish a friendly relationship with subordinates prior to trying seriously to exert any influence over them.

Administrator G is assessed as placing a high emphasis on friendly relations. The administrator feels that a sound relationship is crucial to the success of the programme for change and suggests that he has developed this with subordinates (G21). He relies upon his friendly personality and functions in an informal manner (G35, G44). The term *rapport* is used by this administrator to partly refer to friendly as well as trusting relations (G3). Evaluation is less important to this administrator than the quality of relations with subordinates (F19). The casual, relaxed, affable style this administrator prefers to use depends on friendly relations with subordinates. He reports that subordinates respond to him in a friendly way (G39).

Administrator B is assessed as placing low emphasis on friending. It does not appear overly significant in the context of all the administrator states; however, he does report some friending. The administrator tries to meet with principle subordinates in a friendly way over lunch or by playing sports activities (B6).

Administrator F is assessed as placing a low emphasis on friending. The administrator is very concerned with the relationship between an administrator and a subordinate (F7). While long association means he probably enjoys friendly relations with subordinates, he reports that he is mostly concerned to have a trusting, as opposed to a friendly, administrative relationship (F23, F28). The whole orientation of this administrator can be interpreted to certainly favour friendly relations whenever possible.

Administrator D is assessed as placing low emphasis on friending. This administrator reports that it may take three years before friendly relations with subordinates begin to improve administrative results and reduce subordinate stress (D12, D19). She reports on a case where she took a subordinate out to lunch to continue a serious discussion of the subordinate's personal objectives (D55). Administrator D believes there should be more to an administrator relationship than just being a friend (D30).

Administrator A reports neither use nor emphasis on this method. He is assessed as placing no emphasis on friending. Administrator C is also assessed as placing no emphasis on friending. He states a strong preference for friending as a method for his subordinates to utilize (C12, C38). At the same time he does not address himself nor indicate his own use of this

method. Administrator E places no emphasis on friending although he would appreciate the respect of his subordinates.

Helping

This method involves encouraging a subordinate to become willingly involved in the programme for change by offering and helping with an issue the subordinate identifies. The subordinates may be attracted by the notion that they will be given a helping hand in achieving their classroom goals. It is only a preliminary stage in the programme for change in the administrator's mind.

Administrator F is assessed as placing high emphasis on the helping method. The administrator reports really wanting to help subordinates with their concerns. While he appears less likely to use helping as a means to the goal of introducing his own objectives he does use the involvement to at least monitor subordinate performance (F23, F27).

Administrator G is assessed as placing a high emphasis on helping. He believes that, "You have to get them into that stage as a professional that you're there answering a need" (G31). The same administrator says, "The end of that conversation can also be, just a minute, there's some things that I'm concerned about" (G32). The administrator believes it is a method that leads to introducing his own objectives.

Administrator D does use the helping method. She is assessed as placing a medium emphasis on it. Administrator D suggests, "you work with them once, until they have developed some trust in the process" (D25). She appears to put significant effort into helping subordinates with their concerns while at the same time being prepared to introduce and demand attention to her goals as she sees fit. The administrator involves consultants where time or expertise are a constraint.

Administrator E is assessed as placing a low emphasis on helping. The administrator reports, "I always ask, was there anything specific you would like me to watch for" (E24). The administrator reports spending very limited time with subordinates. He does little more than make a few suggestions addressing their concerns.

Administrators A, B, and C are assessed as placing no emphasis in practice on the helping method. Administrator A could potentially, in following policy, help a teacher subordinate. The administrator on the other hand tries to have subordinates select objectives he at minimum approves. He

appears to avoid working through a subordinate's objective although he refers to the programme for change as a "helping" process.

Option creating

The option-creating method is used to guide the subordinate's decision-making. The subordinate is told that he or she is free to choose from a general set of options. All of the options are acceptable priorities for the administrator. The administrator can in this way involve a subordinate in general goals while at the same time creating more of an impression of free choice. The subordinate may then feel more motivated because of his or her seeming involvement in selecting goals and will perhaps feel more like making a personal commitment to the process.

Administrator A is assessed as placing a high emphasis on the option creating method. He uses this method in advance of the first formal administrative meeting and suggests that subordinates come to a meeting with ideas that they have selected from objectives that he provides (A7). He may disapprove of subordinates' suggestions that do not fit with his objectives (A27).

Administrator D is assessed as placing a low emphasis on option creating. She reports using the method (D15). At the same time it is more likely with this administrator that she would accept a subordinate's priority goal if it did not "fit" within the options the administrator had identified.

Administrators B, C, E, F, and G are assessed as placing no emphasis on the option-creating method. Administrator F reports that teachers are first made aware of the priorities they must somehow address (F10). It is the principal and not him that essentially does this task.

Focusing

The focusing method refers to the negotiating of a narrow centre of interest and activity for the supervision process. It involves specifying the boundaries around or restricting that which is to be observed for the purposes of the programme-for-change. Subordinates are encouraged to set a specific target goal for a programme-for-change cycle that falls within a general goal that has been accepted. Focusing is the logical method to follow option creating.

Administrator A is assessed as placing a high emphasis on the focusing method. He clearly defines areas within which subordinates create specific

goals that are then further negotiated with the administrator and evaluated (A7, A8). A teacher with a generally approved option is told, "pick a part that you'd think you'd like to work on and that would be one of the things you'll do" (A38).

Administrator B is assessed as placing a low emphasis on the focusing method. He uses this method to some degree since, in setting out general objectives for administrative subordinates, he appears to leave it to them to narrowly define and establish evaluative criteria (B3). He does not discuss it much in the interview data.

Administrator D most certainly uses focusing. She is assessed as placing a low emphasis on it. Administrator D tells her subordinates, "you look at those things as they're outlined and you pick an area and then. . . usually the pre-conference is spent trying to narrow it down. . . and put some assessment in that "(D15). The administrator refers to focusing as the "rifle" as opposed to "shotgun" approach to supervising (D75).

Administrator G is assessed as placing a low emphasis on focusing. He presents an advantage of focusing, saying, "we're evaluating one small facet. . . and that isn't threatening" (G11). He attempts to have subordinates specify the small aspect of their work he will observe (G26), but will do it himself on other occasions (G25, G26).

Administrators C, E, and F do not discuss the focusing method in the interview data. They are assessed as placing no emphasis.

Modelling

Modelling is defined as an individual administrator purposely serving as an excellent example worthy of imitation. The modelling method is used to demonstrate to others how they ought to behave.

Administrator C places a high emphasis on the modelling method. The administrator states in one case, for example, "I saw my job as, first of all, modelling those things and working with small-school principals who were not part of the resource team" (C24). He believes, "You model the behaviour that you expect of other people" (C37, C38). Administrator C refers to a mentor he admires who uses the modelling method (C39).

Administrators D and E indicate a low emphasis on modelling. Administrator D reports modelling to a teacher subordinate behaviour that is consistent with policy (D29). The administrator is aware of and uses the mod-

elling method although he does not emphasize it in the interview data. Administrator E believes administrators should model proper dress in schools (E42). The administrator does not refer to the method except in this sense.

Few of the administrators appear to use modelling. Administrators A, B, F, and G are assessed as placing no emphasis on modelling.

Persuading

Logical argument is used by administrators to influence subordinates. Change induced by genuine acceptance of an argument may be more lasting, for example, than something that is ordered.

Administrator G places a high emphasis on the persuading method. This administrator reports that a teacher can successfully argue against the point but it stays with the subordinate and still may create change (G34). Suggestions based on data are made to subordinates (G33). The administrator reports trying to persuade subordinates that their competence is not in question in the programme-for-change process in order to reduce the threat to them (G26).

One can infer that Administrator C places at least a low emphasis on persuasion even though he does not explicitly say much about it. The administrator believes in administrators developing "a high degree of expertise" (C38). He runs a lot of workshops and training sessions for his subordinates. The administrator displayed a facility at creating argument in the interview process. He believes administrators should be influential people (C40). It would appear then that this administrator's style of working requires some emphasis on persuasive argument.

Administrator D is assessed as placing a low emphasis on the persuasion method. This administrator describes the advantages of persuasion, saying, "But if you impose that upon me I can say, yeah, O.K., I can go ahead and do my own thing. I have no commitment to that" (D39). Providing a rationale for policy directives makes them more acceptable to subordinates (D30). The administrator relies upon persuasion only to the degree that it continues to get results.

Administrators A, B, E, and F appear to place no emphasis on this method. It appears that these administrators just assume the logic and necessity of particular changes and do not feel personally obliged to further explain or justify policy.

Direct Ordering

When a situation calls for it an administrator will issue a direct order to an organizational subordinate. The direct ordering method is most likely to be chosen in the case of clear policy priorities and in other instances after earlier influence efforts have failed. It may generate resistance over time with some subordinates.

Administrators C and D are assessed as placing a high emphasis on direct ordering. The area superintendent gives directives to administrative subordinates (C17). He reports a willingness to issue direct orders to administrative subordinates when he believes they are required (C26). His own role model was a person willing to use direct orders (C39). Administrator D reports issuing direct orders when dealing with an obvious policy priority (D17). She reports that some individuals respond best to an order (D40). In areas where there is no policy urgency she will "try the soft sell first" and use direct orders when required (D42).

Administrators A, B, and E are assessed as placing a low emphasis on direct orders. Administrator A makes his expectations clear to subordinates but does not report often being in a position where he issues a direct order to an individual subordinate. In a case where the situation calls for it he is quite prepared to use direct ordering (A31). Administrator B clearly expects his subordinates to perform in terms of objectives he is responsible for communicating to them (B6). At the same time he does not have to emphasize direct orders because he is less likely to encounter resistance for administrative subordinates and he appears to feel it is relatively easy to take actions against them. Administrator E resorts to direct order as he determines it is necessary (E35). The administrator recognizes that legal factors mean that a situation must be fairly extreme before he can take punitive action against a subordinate who may resist direct orders (E17). He is reluctant to use the direct ordering method unless a situation is important (E42). Administrator G states, "I do give directions. Like there are some 'no discussion' items" (G36). Even a skilled interpersonal-relations type may feel the need to say, "You will bloody well do it." (G42). At the same time it is clear that this administrator has limited bureaucratic authority as a department head and does not emphasize the use of this method and goes to great lengths to convince subordinates by other means.

Administrator F is aware that his job responsibilities may mean that direct orders must be given to a subordinate (F5). The administrator is assessed as placing no emphasis on direct ordering because he indicates that he has never used this method in practice.

Threatening

Administrators report making statements of a threatening nature to subordinates. The administrator has a "make trouble" potential. Administrators do not necessarily want to proceed with a threat but its very suggestion may cause some change in a subordinate.

Administrators A and B are assessed as placing a low emphasis on threatening. Administrator A cites a case in which he voiced displeasure and notes the value of the implicit threat, saying, "A little pep talk like that kind of got things started" (A34). The administrator notes that supervision directed toward a change is threatening to subordinates in that it can lead to dismissal. Although he will use an implied threat he appears more inclined to downplay this method as much as possible (A10). Administrator E describes a case in which he told subordinates he would call in the teachers' union to examine their "professional conduct" if they did not change (E39).

There is an implicit threat to the process in the fact that supervision for change can lead to dismissal. Administrators are aware of that and because policy is directed toward cooperation, not coercion, they do not emphasize the threatening character of the programme-for-change. Administrators A and E place a very low emphasis on it and the others do not emphasize it at all.

Propagating

The propagating method involves building on the changes an administrator has already induced within one subordinate. It employs subordinate peer influence. In essence, the administrator invents some method whereby individual changes induced by an administrator are shared with peers in order to influence them in a similar policy direction.

Administrators A and C place a high emphasis on propagating. Two forms of the propagating process are reported by Administrator A. Teacher subordinates are put in groups and asked to share with a small number of peers that which they did under the supervision programme (A5, A6). Administrator A says, "And I think possibly this year would help us getting some teachers, who maybe haven't moved as quickly as others, to say why didn't I think of that" (A6). Another form of this method is to have a particular subordinate report on his or her "successful" efforts at a meeting (A6, C60). Administrators can display appropriate enthusiasm for such performances. Other subordinates can be influenced by a peer without direct interaction with the administrator. Administrator C established a one-on-one

process for administrators to work with other administrators he supervises (C27). He reports that he has developed plans to train trainers in California (C33). The administrator passes along information on successful work elsewhere to his subordinates (C60).

Administrator D places a low emphasis on propagating. There is an indication of some level of intentional use in statements such as, "It's just you engineer the environment in such a way that other factors are working for you" (D72).

The balance of the participants do not appear to use the propagating technique. Administrators B, E, F, and G place no emphasis on propagating.

Discussion

Conscientious administrators are given the task of improving subordinates. This study illuminates how some practicing administrators attempt to change behaviour. It identifies interpersonal intentions. The administrators are contrasted and compared in terms of their utilization of eleven interpersonal methods.

At the same time too much is omitted in this reporting. For example, the data raise questions about the ethics and values associated with the means and ends of inducing change in others. Many believe that moral principles can and should inform means. Principles like fairness, honesty, and love should coexist with a concern for efficiency in the means one utilizes. End values are also important. For example, one can run an efficient extermination camp or an efficient food bank. Even when there is agreement on means values there obviously can be disagreement on end values. Ethical questions are not the subject of this report but they can be acknowledged as crucial to the work of supervisors.

The subjects of these change efforts are not examined. It is unlikely that there will be a one-to-one, input-output relationship between an extensive variety of influence tactics and the desired behaviour of subordinates. Rather, it is more prudent to assume that the outcome will be both anticipated and unanticipated reactions, including the politicization and resistance of subordinates. Subordinates are not examined in this study.

This is an exploratory study with a limited number of participants. It is not possible to generalize scientifically the findings. The study has succeeded if it has thrown some light on the methods supervisors utilize. The reader must be cautioned against over generalizing the findings, relying upon

one aspect to account for the whole phenomenon of supervision and supervisors. For example, a cynical interpretation of the administrators' change efforts would be to claim they are indicative of an amoral process of controlling by whatever means necessary (including the 'soft sell') within a hierarchy of power. There are insufficient data to make such an assertion.

Based on the findings one might hypothesize that the effective change agent in the study setting is a manager that can ideally utilize most methods. This administrator can ameliorate the image of change efforts. Good interpersonal relations can be skillfully used both to improve communications and to lower resistance to one's influence. This effective administrator knows how to manoeuvre subordinates into wanting to work with him or her. The subordinate's choice of goals can be influenced by limiting the lists of options. Specific goals that focus on strategic ideas can be negotiated. The art of persuasion is well developed. Necessary direct orders and threats are issued. Methods of quickly multiplying influence from one to many are known and employed. Practising all the above techniques ensures maximum impact in terms of realizing the goal of changing subordinates.

If the number of methods used is to be the measure of effectiveness then Administrator D scores well and Administrator F least well. However, such an interpretation downplays the variety of administrative styles that may be acceptable. Since all administrators in this study have successfully held their positions for some time it is perhaps better to hypothesize that in practice administrative styles vary greatly and that this is the norm.

The safest general comment on the supervisors in the study is that they are ordinary people merely trying to do their job. They are attempting to have some effect. It is their assigned responsibility to improve instruction and their end goal is a better education for children. They are employees of a bureaucracy where it is believed that the prescription and close surveillance of what educators do is a rational response to the improvement of education. If they fail to perform their assigned duties organizational sanctions can be brought against them.

REFERENCES

- Blumberg, A. (1978). Supervision: An organizational category in search of itself. In *Instructional supervision: Research and theory*. National Conference Papers, National Invitational Conference on Instructional Supervision: Research and Theory. Kent, Ohio: Kent State University.
- Bogdan, R. & Biklen, S. (1982). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bridges, E. (1984). *Managing the incompetent teacher*. Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.
- Burrell, G., & Morgan, G. (1979). *Sociological paradigms and organisational analysis*. London: Heinman.
- Dussault, B. (1980). *A theory of supervision in teacher education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Fullan, M. (1982). *The meaning of educational change*. Toronto: OISE Press.
- Glasser, B. (1978). *Theoretical sensitivity: Advances in the methodology of grounded theory*. Mill Valley, CA: The Sociology Press.
- Goldhammer, R., Anderson, R., & Krajewski, R. (1980). *Clinical supervision: Special methods for the supervision of teachers*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Harris, B. (1978). Interfacing personnel development, curriculum and evaluation. In *Instructional supervision: Research and theory*. National Conference Papers, National Invitational Conference on Instructional Supervision. Kent, Ohio: Kent State University.
- Lawton, S., Hickcox, E., Leithwood, K., & Musella, D. (1986). *Development and use of performance appraisal of certified education staff in Ontario school boards, Vol. IV*. Toronto: Queen's Printer for Ontario.
- LeCompte, M., & Goetz, M. (1982). Problems of reliability and validity in ethnographic research. *Review of Educational Research*, 52, 31-61.
- Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Mosher, R., & Purpel, D. (1972). *Supervision: The reluctant profession*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Tuckman, B., & Oliver, W. (1968). Effectiveness of feedback to teachers as a function of source. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 59, 297-301.
- Turner, G., & Clift, P. (1988). *Studies in teacher appraisal*. New York: The Falmer Press.

Thomas J. Ritchie serves on the education faculty at the University of Winnipeg. He received his graduate training at the Universities of Manitoba and Toronto. Professor Ritchie is an experienced public school educator and has been a visiting professor at universities in Ontario and Quebec.

Thomas J. Ritchie est professeur à la faculté des sciences de l'éducation de l'Université de Winnipeg. Titulaire de diplôme d'études supérieures de l'Université du Manitoba et de l'Université de Toronto, le professeur Ritchie possède une vaste expérience de l'enseignement public. Il a été professeur invité dans diverses universités de l'Ontario et du Québec.



Detail of "The Family"