DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 082 370   EA 005 491

AUTHOR   Porter, Catherine M.; Schmuck, Richard A.
TITLE   Psychological Effects of Training in Organization
                Development on School District Personnel in Key Line
                Positions.
INSTITUTION   Oregon Univ., Eugene. Center for Advanced Study of
                Educational Administration.
SPONS AGENCY   National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.1
REPORT NO   CASEA-TR-14
BUREAU NO   BR-3-0083
PUB DATE   May 73
CONTRACT   NE-C-00-3-0083
NOTE   16p.
AVAILABLE FROM Publications Department, CASEA, 1472 Kincaid Street,
                Eugene, Oregon 97403 ($1.00)

EDRS PRICE   MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS   *Administrative Personnel; Change Agents;
                *Communication Skills; Educational Programs;
                Hypothesis Testing; *Intervention; Organizational
                Change; *Organizational Development; School
                Districts

ABSTRACT
                The purpose of this study was to assess any changes
in cognitions and attitudes in relation to Organizational Development
(OD) goals and procedures that may have occurred among the 65
participants who attended an initial training event. The goals of
this event were to establish widespread understanding and favorable
attitudes about organization development, to identify intergroup
problems (especially across hierarchical levels) that would provide
the content and motivation for subsequent communication skill
training and problemsolving, and to establish norms for collaboration
within and across the various participating role-groups.
Questionnaires were administered to these participants and and to a
matched comparison group from two nearby school districts during the
spring terms in 1968, 1969, and 1970. Although interpretations of the
data are not unequivocal, the authors are convinced that experiencing
the imaging procedure so early in the total OD design did predispose
most of the key line personnel to look favorably on subsequent OD
training for the entire district. (Authors/WM)

Technical
Report No. 14

May 1973

PSYCHOLOGICAL EFFECTS OF TRAINING IN ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT ON SCHOOL DISTRICT PERSONNEL IN KEY LINE POSITIONS

Catherine M. Porter
Richard A. Schmuck

Psychological Effects of Training in Organization Development

on School District Personnel in Key Line Positions

Catherine M. Porter

Richard A. Schmuck

The data described here were collected as part of a two and one-half year organization development (OD) project to help an entire school district become more self-renewing. The OD intervention was the experimental treatment of a major research project of CASEA's Program on Strategies of Organizational Change. CASEA's efforts started during the fall of 1967 with entry, contract-building, and diagnostic data collections. Active consultation with the district's subsystems commenced in the spring of 1968, climaxed in the summer of 1969 with the preparation of a cadre of internal organizational specialists, and ended during the spring of 1970 (see Schmuck and Runkel, 1972; and Porter, 1972 for details).

The initial training event (April 7-11, 1968) was attended by 65 key line personnel, including the superintendent and his assistants ("the cabinet"), all of the principals, teachers representing every building in the district, and the officers of the local education association. The goals of this event were to establish widespread understanding and favorable attitudes about organization development, to identify intergroup problems -- especially across hierarchical levels -- that would provide the content (and motivation) for subsequent communication skill training and problem solving, and to establish norms for collaboration within and across the various participating role-groups.

Although organization development does not primarily aim to achieve changes in individuals, particular psychological changes should occur with respect to participants' cognitions and attitudes about organizational

tasks, role relationships, and group norms. Indeed, the April, 1968 train-
ing event deliberately aimed at raising the participants' levels of infor-
mation and attitudes about OD. We believed that it would be especially
important to the viability of a long-term OD effort within a school district
for the attitudes of key line personnel to be favorable toward that effort.

The Training Event

The event lasted four days, but only the superintendent's cabinet
was present all of the time. On the first day, before the others arrived,
the superintendent and his cabinet discussed ways in which communication
was breaking down among them, the lack of clarity in their role definitions,
the ambiguous norms that existed within the cabinet, and finally, their
strengths as a group. They were trained to use the communication skills
of paraphrasing, behavior description, description of feelings, and impres-
sion checking during these discussions.

On the second day, the principals joined the cabinet in a spe-
cially designed "imaging" procedure that uncovered the organizational prob-
lems viewed by each group as involving the other. (See Schmuck, Runkel,
Saturen, Martell, and Derr, 1972, pp. 158-159 for details.) The problems
that were brought out were earmarked for future problem-solving.

The imaging procedure began as follows: First, the cabinet and
principals divided into three units; the cabinet, the elementary principals,
and the secondary principals. Next, each of these groups met separately to
consider helpful and unhelpful work-related behaviors of the other two
groups toward their own group. At the end of two hours, all agreed-upon

actions of the other groups were written in large letters on sh

newsprint. The session ended with a brief period of training in the com

munication skills of paraphrasing and behavior description.

Next, one group sat in a circle surrounded by members of the

other two groups. Participants sitting in the outer ring read aloud the

descriptions they had written of the inside group. A member of the inner

circle then paraphrased the description to make sure that his colleagues

understood it. After all items describing the inside group were read, the

remaining two groups took their turns in the center circle. During this

step, group members of the inner circle who were receiving descriptions

of their own group were _not_ allowed to defend their group against the

allegations made by the others.

After this step, the three groups again met separately to find

evidence that would support the descriptions they had received; they were

instructed to recall examples of their own behavior that could have given

the other group its impressions. The three groups then came together

once again with one group forming the inner circle. Each inner group told

the others of the evidence they had recalled to verify the perceptions of

the others. Once again, the inner group was discouraged from defending

itself; members were asked simply to describe the behavioral events they

thought supported the others' percepti

On the evening of the second day, the teachers arrived to join

the principals and cabinet, and for four hours all of the line personnel

with formal authority in the district met together. A modified imaging

procedure was continued, culminating in a large meeting in which the three

groups specified the organizational problems they thought existed in the

district. Discussion was ` pene. . and constructive; most per-
sonnel had never before nfronted persons i ner status positions so
openly with their perce tions of district pro ns. The principals went
back to their buildings the next day, leaving t ne for teachers and cabinet
to interact with one another. On the fourth da the cabinet met alone to
schedule some subsequent dates for problem-solvi .

Hypotheses and Measures

The purpose of this particular analysis was to assess any changes
in cognitions and attitudes in relation to OD goals and procedures that may
have occurred among the 65 participants who attended this training event.
Data were available for assessing psychological changes over a two-year
period. Questionnaires were administered to these participants and to a
matched comparison group from two nearby school districts during the spring
terms in 1968, 1969, and 1970. For details of the matching procedure, see
Porter (1972).

We tested eight hypotheses by comparing responses of participants
from two control districts. Data were used only from those respondents who
answered all questions unambiguously in 1968 and 1970. Staff turnover and
incomplete questionnaires account for the reduced number of respondents
appearing in the analysis (43 in the experimental group and 41 in the con-
trol group).

Eight questionnaire items were used to measure an equal number of
dependent variables, one dependent variable for each hypothesis. Responses
to items asking about one's own attitudes involved choices to the follow-
ing scale: (1) I would approve strongly, (2) I would approve mildly or

some, (3) I wouldn't care one way or the other, (4) I would disapprove mildly or some, or (5) I would disapprove strongly. Responses to items asking for predictions of how others would behave involved choices to this scale: (A) Yes, I think most would, (B) Maybe about half would, (C) No, most would not do this, or (D) I don't know.

The hypotheses tested (and the items used to measure the dependent variables) were that, as a result of organization development, the experimental group would be more likely than the control group to:

1. <u>Disapprove of a teacher suppressing or stopping an argument between two other teachers</u>. The questionnaire item was: Suppose Teacher X were present when two others got into a hot argument about how the school is run. And suppose Teacher X tried to get them to quiet down and stop arguing. How would you feel about the behavior of Teacher X?

2. <u>Approve of asking other teachers for help in teaching</u>. The item was: Suppose Teacher X wants to improve his classroom effectiveness. If X asked another teacher to observe his teaching and then have a conference about it afterward, how would you feel toward X?

3. <u>Approve of discussing personal feelings in groups</u>. The item was: Suppose you are in a committee meeting with Teacher X and the other members begin to describe their personal feelings about what goes on in the school; Teacher X listens to them and tells his own feelings. How would you feel about X?

4. <u>Predict that their peers would not take sides in a personal disagreement</u>. The item was: Suppose a teacher (Teacher X) is present when two others get into a hot argument about how the school is run. If teachers you know in your school were in Teacher X's place, what would

most of them be likely to do? Would most of the teachers in your school probably listen to both arguers and then side with the one they thought was right?

5. <u>Predict that their peers would act as negotiators in a mis-understanding of their peers</u>. The item was: Suppose a teacher (Teacher X) is present when two others get into a hot argument on how the school is run. If teachers you know in your school were in Teacher X's place, what would most of them be likely to do? Would they try to help each one in the argu-ment to understand the viewpoint of the other?

6. <u>Predict that their peers would continue communication with a peer who had injured their feelings</u>. The item was: Suppose Teacher X feels hurt and "put down" by something another teacher has said to him. In teacher X's place, would most of the teachers you know in your school be likely to tell the other teacher that they felt hurt and put down?

7. <u>Predict that their peers would not close off communication with another after having felt hurt by the other</u>. The item was: Suppose Teacher X feels hurt and "put down" by something another teacher has said to him. In Teacher X's place, would most of the teachers in your school be likely to tell their friends that the other teacher is hard to get along with?

8. <u>Predict that their peers would keep communication open with one another after a disagreement</u>. The item was: Suppose Teacher X strongly disagrees with something B says at a staff meeting. In Teacher X's place, would most of the teachers in your school seek out B to discuss the disa-greement?

Supported Hypotheses

An overview of the analysis indicates that four of the eight
hypotheses were confirmed. Hypotheses 1, 3, 6, and 8 received support,
while hypotheses 2, 4, 5, and 7 did not. Here are the results in some
detail; the four confirmed hypotheses are discussed first.

Hypothesis 1. This hypothesis stated that the experimental group
would be more likely than the controls to disapprove of a teacher suppressing
an argument between two other teachers by trying to get them to quiet down
and to stop arguing. One value of OD is to uncover conflicts so that they
can be worked on constructively. In order to accept this hypothesis, more
experimental respondents compared to controls should have selected scale-
points 3, 4, or 5, and less should have selected points 1 or 2. Like all oth-
er items, this item was analyzed by comparing the experimental teachers and
principals with their matched controls and the entire experimental group
with the entire control group in 1970. Chi square analyses for both of these
comparisons were statistically significant in the predicted direction. An-
other analysis was made comparing the experimental group in 1970 with itself
in 1968. This statistical analysis showed no difference. Accordingly, we
obtained statistically significant evidence that the central office adminis-
trators, the principals, and the teachers of the experimental district were
less ready, as a group, to approve of quieting-down interpersonal conflict
than were those in the comparison sample and that they, the experimental
group, had this readiness early in the project and maintained it through-
out.

Hypothesis 3. This hypothesis stated that the experimental
group would be more likely than the controls to approve of discussing per-
sonal feelings in groups. Results indicated that although the experimental
and control groups did not differ on this item in 1968, the experimental
group significantly changed-between 1968 and 1970 in the expected direction
and in contrast the control group did not change. Hypothesis 3 thus was
accepted.

Hypothesis 6. This hypothesis stated that the experimental group
would be more likely than the control group to predict that their peers
would continue communications with a peer who had injured their feelings.
According to this prediction, there should have been fewer experimental re-
spondents selecting C or D and more selecting A or B in 1970 compared with
1968; and fewer control respondents selecting A or B than the experimental
subjects in 1970. Comparison of the experimental group and the control
group as well as the experimental group with itself strongly supported
this hypothesis. Data showed, for example, that while 59.9% of the experi-
mental group answered in the predicted categories in 1970, only 26.7% of
the control group did so answer. And, only 31.2% of the experimental group
answered in the predicted categories in 1968 compared with 59.9% in 1970.

Hypothesis 8. This hypothesis stated that the experimental group,
compared with the control group, would be more likely to predict that their
peers would keep communication open with others after a disagreement. Ac-
cording to this prediction, there should have been fewer experimental re-
spondents selecting C or D and more selecting A or B in 1970 than in 1968,
and there should have been more experimental respondents selecting A or B

compared to the controls in 1970. Analyses indicated a definite tendency
(p >.10) for this hypothesis to be confirmed. Specifically, 78.1% of the
experimental subjects answered in the predicted categories in 1970 compared
with 56.8% of the control group, and 68.7% of the experimental group answered
A or B in 1968 compared with 78.1% in 1970.

Unsupported Hypotheses

The four unsupported hypotheses were numbered 2, 4, 5, and 7.

Hypothesis 2. This hypothesis stated that the experimental group
would be more likely than the controls to approve of asking other teachers
for help in teaching. To accept this hypothesis, there should have been
fewer respondents selecting 3, 4, or 5 and more selecting 1 or 2 in the ex-
perimental group than in the control group. Chi square analyses were not
significant and the Z scores used in the comparison of the experimental
group with itself in 1970 and 1968 also were not significant.

Hypothesis 4. This hypothesis stated that the experimental group
would be more likely than the controls to predict that their peers would
not take sides in a personal disagreement. To accept this hypothesis, there
should have been fewer experimental respondents selecting scale points A or
D and more selecting B or C in 1970 than in 1968. Furthermore, since choices
B or C would suggest that teachers were less likely to take sides in a per-
sonal disagreement more of the experimental group should have selected these
scale points than the control group in 1970. Data analyses showed that the
experimental group did not change on this item and that the experimental

and the control groups did not differ.

Hypothesis 5. This hypothesis stated that the experimental group would be more likely to predict that their peers would act as negotiators in a misunderstanding of other peers. In comparing data of the experimental group, no significant difference was found. We should point out, however, that members of both the experimental and the control groups thought that their colleagues would be likely to act as negotiators in a misunderstanding of their peers. Very high numbers of both groups approved of such mediating behaviors.

Hypothesis 7. This hypothesis stated that the experimental group would be less likely than the controls to predict that their peers would close off communication with another after having felt hurt by the other. As with hypothesis 5, no significant difference was found between the groups or over time, but very high percentages of both groups believed that their peers would attempt to keep communication open with others who may have hurt their feelings.

Discussion

Although these data did not unequivocally prove that the OD training event had a significant psychological impact on the key line personnel, the statistical analyses did show support for four of the eight hypotheses. These analyses do indicate that some psychological effects -- beyond what would be expected by mere chance -- most probably did occur.

A careful comparison of the eight questionnaire items used in the

study does shed some light on why half of the hypotheses came out as expected and the other half did not. For one thing, in two of the four unsupported hypotheses (numbered 5 and 7), the data indicated that very high proportions of both the experimental participants and the controls started out in the pretest of 1968 by approving the favorable behaviors from the OD point of view. These pretest data which we unfortunately neglected to inspect before adopting constituted a ceiling effect leaving very little room for the experimentals to move upward, and thus made these two items relatively less useful compared to the other six for measuring changes of the OD participants.

Secondly, the items used to test the four supported hypotheses described emotionally-laden interpersonal events in which the respondent was being called upon to interact confrontively and directly with colleagues about uncomfortable topics. The items used to test the four unsupported hypotheses (and especially the two where changes from the pretest to the posttest were possible) described less emotional and less confrontive circumstances.

Thirdly, items used to test the supported hypotheses emphasized the highlighting of diversity among colleagues and a belief that individual differences among staff members -- especially differences in feelings and values -- should be played up. The items of the unsupported hypotheses did not emphasize this feature as much.

These results are not surprising in light of the sort of training design that was carried out during the initial four-day OD event. The imaging procedure which emphasized the uncovering of intergroup and interpersonal conflicts in a constructive (yet confrontive) fashion took the

bulk of the workshop time. Participants spent a large amount of time describing feelings of irritation, paraphrasing one another's feeling-statements, and directly confronting one another about their differences in educational values. Even though collaborative problem-solving did take place later during the project within particular subsystems of the district, the primary theme of this first event definitely focused on the importance of uncovering organizational conflicts as a necessary first step for making organizational improvements.

Whatever the reason for the particular psychological changes that did occur as a result of this initial event and subsequent events we are convinced that experiencing the imaging procedure so early in the total OD design did predispose most of the key line personnel to look favorably on subsequent OD training for the entire district. Most of the participants, for example, said that they looked forward to more OD consultation. Moreover, not one of these key line personnel refused to allow subsequent OD consultation within the subsystem in which he had prominent membership. In fact, many of the OD events that took place from spring of 1968 to spring of 1970 were requested in some manner by participants present in this first event.

Key line personnel have also given first-hand support to the implementation of OD on a continuing basis. Seven of the original participants became a part of the 25-member cadre of internal OD specialists that was trained during the summer of 1970 (details on how this team of organizational specialists was developed appear in Chapter 10 of Schmuck and Miles, 1971 and in Schmuck and Runkel, 1972). The superintendent him-

self sought training as an OD specialist during the summer of 1970. And
perhaps the most outstanding fact about the organizational effects of this
initial four-day event is that this cadre of OD specialists survived and
remained stable and productive through a remarkable chain of disruptive
events, including the resignation of the original coordinator of the spe-
cialists, a change in the superintendency in 1971, and a crippling finan-
cial crisis during the period from 1970 to 1972 (see Wyant, 1971, for some
of the details).

Even now in 1973, the OD cadre is showing strong signs of being
self-renewing. It is flourishing with a handful of original members and
with second, third, and even fourth waves of membership carrying on in
effective ways.

References

Porter, Catherine M., The Effect of Training in Organization Deve op-
    ment on School District Personnel in Key Line Positions. Unpub-
    lished doctoral dissertation, Eugene, Oregon: University of
    Oregon, 1972.

Schmuck, Richard and Matthew Miles, Organization Development in Schools.
    Palo Alto, California: National Press Books, 1971.

Schmuck, Richard and Philip Runkel, "Integrating Organizational Speci-
    alists into School Districts," in Burke, W. W., (Ed.), Contem-
    porary Organization Development: Conceptual Orientations and
    Interventions. Washington, D.C.: NTL Institute for Applied
    Behaviroal Science, 1972.

Schmuck, R., P. Runkel, S. Saturen, R. Martell, and B. Derr, Handbook
    of Organization Development in Schools. Palo Alto, California:
    National Press Books, 1972

Wyant, Spencer, "Organizational Specialists in a School District: A
    Follow-up Study." Unpublished Master's thesis, Eugene, Oregon:
    Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration,
    1971.

7