

CHAPTER NINE

THE PROCESSES OF NO-CHANGE

INTRODUCTION

Almost three years after the initial staff meetings the impetus for change to break the 'lock step' progression of the timetable which had been the main objective and thrust of the committee of the teachers had died. The resolve of those involved had been fatally weakened. It was still being pushed by Luke from the committee but his was a lone voice in the wilderness and his final letter to the Headmaster sounded the death knell for this particular project. The letter (dated Year 4, Term 3) said:

I have been somewhat depressed since our meeting when I asked you to sit down with a small group of senior staff and allow us to explain the curriculum model that I submitted last year [see Appendix 9].

I pushed for change for so long because I believed that the Staff and children of [the School] deserve better. I realise now the futility of the exercise and concede that I should have laid down and died with the remainder of the Curriculum Committee early in 1994.

I would like to withdraw my proposals for the curriculum improvement. I apologise for wasting your time.

The letter was a stinging and provocative response from Luke born from frustration and the perceived vacillation of the Headmaster.

Some changes to the curriculum had been made; staff now hold classes before and after school to increase the scope of offerings on the timetable. Joint classes with other schools in the district had been initiated and TAFE and TRAC¹ courses were being undertaken by the less academic students. Those students who were particularly gifted in certain subjects were

¹See footnote 14, Chapter 8.

accelerated into the years above to stretch their skills and talents. Gifted and talented programs were also offered during the holidays and after school in a wide range of disciplines. However, the jump to a radically innovative timetable did not materialise. The timetable for the majority of the students was still basically the same as it had always been. The visionary aims of staff and the curriculum committee had not been realised and the status quo, with a few peripheral changes, had been maintained.

In this chapter four differing perspectives will be examined to reflect the feelings of key players and groups in this saga as to the outcomes of the processes of change: firstly, the 'outside' pessimists, the 'I told you sos'; secondly, the teachers' opinions on why the change failed to be implemented; thirdly, the Headmaster views will be assessed; and lastly those of the curriculum committee.

THE 'I TOLD YOU SOS'

Former members of staff were sceptical of the teachers' intentions to create a new timetable structure and even at the initial regional conference back in March of 1992 a university lecturer remarked, 'do not get enthusiastic about curriculum changes at [the School] because nothing will happen'.²

Staff 12 (9/1994), another former teacher, was also pessimistic as to staff's chances of being able to implement new curriculum policies:

... if you try to do something; which is too innovative you are going to fall flat on your bum owing to the nature of the spectrum of the conservatism of the School ... any change cannot rise above the environment.

The previous Headmaster was at a loss to suggest how to change successfully the traditional structures and operations of the School. For example, during his incumbency he had changed the style of the boy's jacket and even though the majority of the community thought that the old blazer was dated, the issue had not been handled delicately enough and disapproval from sections of the community had been voiced. The Headmaster (9/1994) remarked sadly on this incident which had been but one nail in his coffin:

... the way it was done, getting rid of the ... jacket, was not very tactful. That could have been done better

² Quoted by Staff 1 (Dec 1994) on the comments made by a University lecturer whose name must remain confidential.

This former Headmaster had been severely criticised for the manner in which he had tried to implement change but he had justified his precipitative stance with the remark (loc.cit.) that:

... people say you should not make changes too quickly. The trouble is that if you do not you get sucked in to the status quo and you never make those changes. You have got to make changes early on, within reason obviously. I was too direct and I was trying to do the impossible. I do not suffer fools gladly.

The 'I told you sos' were mainly people who had worked at the School and had since left. However, amongst the present teachers all were positive and even though they might have reservations about the likely success of the mooted changes kept such concerns to themselves. The general optimism was pervasive. As staff 1 (9/1994) remarked when hearing of the pessimistic comments of the visiting university lecturer:

... I could see what he was talking about, but I did not believe it was really impossible to change for the better at that time.

Thus, even though former members of the School community were cynical as to the chances of success, the optimism of the current teachers was high. Their value-rational goals had taken precedence over their cultural knowledge and past experiences; a situation and state of mind which were to cloud their strategies as the move to change the curriculum structures took hold. A more sobering and hard-headed assessment of the organisational culture would have produced an agenda more in keeping with the real obstacles that were to be encountered. Throughout the central two years of the meetings by both staff and the committee what was noticeably missing was a practical and realistic appraisal of the culture of the School and a forthright analysis of what to do when problems arose. The committee was adept at outlining the problems, as Appendix 6 fully describes, but weak on developing political tactics to meet the challenges of rebuttal and procrastination by the Headmaster whom the committee recognised very early on was the 'gatekeeper' to curriculum change. It was easy to forget organisational reality when riding the waves of enthusiasm and depressingly difficult to step aside and view likely outcomes with cold detachment. No one likes the damp squib taking the fizzle out of staff's moments of hopefulness and optimism, but this cultural appraisal was lacking and the committee failed to acknowledge its significance openly and develop an appropriate strategy to counter recognised problems and obstacles.

THE STAFF'S OPINIONS ON THE FAILURE

Staff's opinion as to why the curriculum changes themselves never eventuated were mixed. Some staff had even forgotten that the curriculum changes were still being discussed and their memories had to be jogged to gain a response. One senior staff member (staff 15: 10/1994) who had not been involved with the committee replied:

... what curriculum changes were we to undergo that we did not undergo? I do not know why nothing has happened. To be perfectly honest I have not thought a great deal about it.

One of the main reasons that was given when staff were asked to give their explanations as to why the proposed curriculum initiatives had failed related to the fact that the majority of staff saw themselves as working long and hard hours with little time to contemplate educational issues. Staff saw their 'spare' time as valuable and were reluctant to devote this time to the more philosophical and nebulous topics of structural reform which gave little immediate assistance to their present pressing needs; especially as past experiences had taught them that such discussions were unlikely to bear fruit anyway. Staff recognised the need to spend more time on educational policy matters but felt that they spent more than enough time as it was at the School. As a senior staff member (staff 15: 10/1994) explained:

I do not know why, but it [the curriculum change] certainly has not progressed very far. Staff are highly involved in the School, [and therefore have little spare time].

Another senior staff member (staff 11: 11/1994) also commented that there were not many opportunities to discuss educational issues:

... curriculum initiatives? It is something I did not get involved with. It did not cross my hearth rug. It should not have died away. I think another thing which is a problem here is [that] we have too many meetings to talk about fairly inconsequential things. Fewer things on more important issues, which were policy making ones or an exploration of policy, would be time much better spent.

A staff member who had tried himself to implement changes within his department and had failed concurred with these sentiments in relation to the paucity of available time to discuss educational matters in greater depth. He remarked (staff 5: 11/1994) that:

... they [the hierarchy] are not prepared to change the structure of the School

and the activities of the School in order to make more time [to] address the problems which are coming up with curriculum change.

Other teachers' lack of knowledge on the proposed timetable changes hindered their ability to argue effectively against adverse or contrary comments. They felt unable to lobby the Headmaster whom they saw as the main person to convince of the proposal's merits for fear of being unable to counter his disagreements satisfactorily. As one of the Housemasters (staff 26: 10/1994) explained:

... with curriculum change like the vertical timetable, I cannot change something that I do not know a lot about. I can be supportive of people who do ... but I probably would not walk into the Headmaster's office for an interview because he would ask me a question that I did not have the expertise to answer.

Staff's ignorance as to the mechanics of differing timetable mechanisms was a factor that the curriculum committee appreciated but felt that they had little power to remedy. Staff 15 (10/1994) who had little knowledge of the proposed changes but could appreciate the difficulties, commented on this matter:

... I am aware that it is very difficult to set up a vertical system and it would be contingent upon a lot of things external to the School as well as within [it]. But I do not claim to be an expert in that area, I really have not been in on curriculum discussions.

Besides the curriculum committee, other staff also saw the Headmaster as the main obstacle to the proposed changes and that the curriculum committee was playing a 'wait and see game'. In this regard one teacher (staff 5: 11/1994) outlined what he thought was the problem:

... the committee did not think that they would get it past the Headmaster. They did not want to see it fail, go down the tubes. I assume they are waiting for a more opportune time. maybe, [for] the boss to perceive some sort of change and hopefully the planning they have done will be able to be used.

All staff without exception viewed the Headmaster as the 'gatekeeper' of change. If there were to be any shift from the traditional structures it would be at his behest and no other. All staff were sufficiently politically aware of the organisational dynamics and cultural collective imagery of the institution to see the Headmaster as the central actor in the processes of change. As one teacher (staff 15: 10/1994) typically responded:

... [some of] the ideas that came out of that original committee ... would

definitely not be acceptable to the Headmaster, so they would not have got anywhere. Those that were acceptable to him I imagine you would have to keep coming back at him with them saying this is a good idea. If he thought it was a good idea he would implement it, and he is in a position to do so. But anyone else who wants to implement something would have to convince him. I imagine that is the way the system works. The buck stops with him and he makes the decisions as far as I see it.

A few staff perceived that the only alternative option was to enlist the help of external theorists and practitioners who could give more weight to the committee's arguments. One such teacher (staff 15: 10/1994) suggested that:

... I think there would have to be an efficient and technical forcer who could convince the Headmaster of the right way to go before he would go in any direction. He is very cautious, he takes a long time to make a decision. He may not be allowed to change things too quickly. Council may not have given him the brief.

A key 'tribal elder' (staff 11: 11/1994) also agreed that the way to convince the Headmaster was to use the support of those who have experience and standing:

... people often want the benefit of an experienced judgement. Someone who has been around long enough to give an opinion.

Such remarks were, with hindsight, unerringly correct and pre-empted suggestions made by the Headmaster in his detailed response document to the Coordinators concerning the value and necessity of external experts' and curriculum theorists' opinions on the proposals outlined by Luke. These comments reflect staff's perspicacity and intuitive knowledge of workings of the organisation to a degree which gives credence to the notion that the teachers knew exactly what would happen to the proposed changes and how the organisation really operated. However, what the committee lacked was the political sophistication to develop strategies to circumvent the obstacles that arose and be proactive rather than reactive to the problems encountered.

This external validation was important if it were realised that the Headmaster was unlikely to make such an important, and therefore threatening to his position, decision unless the change could be justified from all quarters. What is important here is not the presumption that the Headmaster simply needs ownership of the changes to push them through but a realisation that because of the fragility of the last Headmaster's tenure the present incumbent will not make a precipitous decision. If the structural changes were contentious the argument for their implementation must be rock solid which would require complete support from all concerned,

including external educational experts, before the Headmaster would give his personal backing.

Such a strategy from the Headmaster **was** politically astute. If he wanted he could reject submissions from staff because the philosophical educational support had not been forthcoming from the 'experts' (teachers were implicitly judged not to be expert). However, if this support were given and staff's rationale behind the move to implement the new curriculum structures was accepted then the Headmaster could use this as a defence if the changes did not work and there was a community backlash.

The organisational culture of the School had led staff to expect little involvement in the decision-making process to implement the proposed changes. Neither did they perceive any control over the outcome of the final decision and if the curriculum committee failed to convince the Headmaster of the scheme's merits there would be only muted, if any, open response to the decision. The following comment (staff 6: 11/1994) is indicative of the attitude of the teachers to change and reflects their compliant nature and the part they expect to play:

... we are not used to change insomuch as we have had part of it, input into the area of change. People simply accept their lot and if it comes to the crunch and if you question us, if your job depends on it, I will do whatever it is that I have to do. Especially now the economic climate accentuates something like that. [You] tend to look at yourself and see how one can fit in.

THE HEADMASTER'S PERSPECTIVE

The Headmaster's aims and objectives for the curriculum were not that dissimilar from the staff's. He likewise wished 'to see a wide variety of activities' and 'an attempt to accommodate the individual' (Headmaster: 3/1995). He felt that with any major changes to the curriculum he would be obliged to report the matter to the Council but essentially most of the issues pertaining to classroom activities were left to him.

He also saw the need to ensure that the parents, as clients of the School, were consulted as there was 'pressure, particularly today, when you are competing for enrolments, to provide ... these types of courses (accelerative learning programs)'. He also recognised that there were 'outside pressures and political pressures to change the curriculum and to move much more to the practical things' (ibid.).

As the Headmaster commented (ibid.) with respect to the ability of outside influences, the P

& F, Old-Boys, Council members and other vested interests to change either existing strategies or lobby for a maintenance of the present traditions and status quo:

... I have to think about parents and Old-Boys and Council and the Diocese. All of those things as well as staff and students. There is [often] a resistance to change, [but this] can help you too. I find the community is often very concerned, very supportive. It is not as if you have parents and Old-Boys who do not give a damn.

The Headmaster's educational goals were to create a balanced curriculum within a 'family, caring school', and if:

... sometimes I am challenged by staff saying that if I really want the academic [excellence], why not just do that and nothing else. [But this] is not how I see it. (Headmaster: 3/1995)

Before the initial curriculum meetings were instigated the Headmaster had broadened the selection of subject choices to promote a more eclectic offering. As the Headmaster (ibid.) remarked in this respect:

... one of the initiatives we wanted to introduce a few years ago was to get a better balance between the class numbers - philosophical reasons. We wanted the boys exposed to art and music as well as a language. When they were given their [subject] choices they tended to go one way. We tried to structure that - you may choose, but you must have one from the creative arts, one from this etc.

The Headmaster was supportive of the committee's ambitions and enterprise but appreciated that 'people do develop individual strategies within the classroom, but as a whole-school approach it is very, very difficult'.

He thought that even though the original objectives of staff and the committee had not been achieved, 'we have done a lot [curriculum changes]. If you look back to see what has been happening I think [staff 27] has achieved an enormous amount' (ibid.).

The Headmaster commented further on the positive aspects of what had happened, remarking:

... it started us to think about changing the day. Now we have an extended School day, so I think that is an enormous win and we have become more flexible in working with [other schools in the district]. (ibid.)

He also saw problems with the early proposals and the changes that would have to be forced onto staff to accommodate the new routines. The Headmaster (ibid.) suggested that the teachers would react unfavourably to extensions to the School day:

... I could see that the curriculum changes that would have to come into the structure would not please all staff. [The length of the School day] would have been one of the things; you immediately get a reaction [from the staff], 'I am only here from 8.30am to 4.30pm'.

The Headmaster regarded the proposals outlined by the committee as major changes to the School's present routines and as such would require extensive review, assessment and deliberation. The Headmaster commented (ibid.) on the problems that would be encountered if the new organisational structures were to be realised:

... we have to move slowly, there is resentment at first, you would not rush that. This cannot be done in that way and it would be something that we would have to take carefully through Council. We would have to look at the way it would work ... We ought to get enthused with ideas; we have got to do that, but it is when it comes down to putting those ideas into practicalities and how they will work, and how they will work without costing enormous sums of money, that is when the problem comes.

Even though the Headmaster felt that there was a great deal more student accelerative learning now in place than ever before, he could not envision the day when it would ever be possible to move to the more radical structures mooted by staff. He was in agreement with the teachers of the importance of individual extension but lamented the fact that, 'the [existing structure] will take a lot of breaking down and you will not do that in a hurry' (ibid.). Perhaps, 'we can achieve it in part or maybe we can do more than that'.

The Headmaster also criticised staff for spending a disproportionate amount of their time, and his, on other less pertinent and unimportant problems like School discipline instead of focusing on developing the curriculum ideas. He lamented (ibid.) the fact that:

... last year the conflict seemed to be the [student] discipline issue, that was the major one. Sadly to my mind because it detracted [from the timetable matters]. We were back onto discipline when we should have been looking at curriculum issues which we had begun. We ran away from it and got side-tracked.

The Headmaster saw the obsession of staff with student discipline problems as a failure on the part of the teachers to commit their efforts to the curriculum changes. He commented in this

regard (ibid.):

... we focused on the wrong things. Perhaps what we were talking about in curriculum changes was a very difficult thing. People latched onto something more immediate and easier; let us have detentions, that sort of thing. Detentions are the least of our worries, the major things are these [curriculum] ideas.

He summarised by saying:

It shows you that the morale and the environment are important for the staff. If we can keep that right, we can perhaps achieve some of the other things. We have never been more stretched in our lives, but that happens every year. (ibid.)

It is obvious from the above comments and perspective of the Headmaster that there was a perception gulf between him and the teachers. For example, during the period of research and investigation by the committee, student discipline was a frequently raised topic which staff thought had not been dealt with adequately by the hierarchy. That is, the students were not being disciplined adequately. Staff believed that this issue ought to be addressed before any consideration could be given to other broader issues like curriculum change. There was a perception on the part of staff that until the 'nuts and bolts' were in place and stability and continuity were restored, all other topics must be deferred. The Headmaster, however, did not appreciate that the teachers could not be confident in implementing a broader educational agenda until the basics were fixed. Certainly a lack of confidence in the management of the School rested with the Headmaster's ability to keep the day-to-day operations of the School harmonious and smooth.

One of the key aspects underlying the nature of change centred on the fact that if staff felt that the School was, in their opinion, not being run 'properly', with respect to their perceptions of their goals and values, then the committee would have the impossible task of motivating the teachers to give their support and time to their initiatives. Too much time, as staff 11 (quoted on page 3) stated, was spent on 'inconsequential things' which should have been fixed but still lingered. Not that student discipline was an aspect of School management which was inconsequential but that it was a matter which should be solved routinely by existing mechanisms.

The 'discipline' issue significantly side-tracked' staff to the frustration of the Headmaster, but he failed to deal with the matter effectively and for a period of at least two years the topic was never far from the surface and progress on other topics was hampered.

The Headmaster might also have had a broader picture of the problems facing the School, as he was in a position to get an overview of the School community's opinions and feelings, but unless this wider perspective was communicated to staff they were unlikely to understand the rationales behind his thinking. The proposed changes might in fact have had more complex repercussions than the committee appreciated but unless there was frank and open discussion on the topics, there must always be a gulf between the committee's and the Headmaster's perceptions.

A failing of the committee was not to seek ways around the Headmaster's uncommunicative nature to give him greater ownership and understanding of their proposals. The committee was naive in not understanding how to win the Headmaster over or, if they did, then not developing strategies to accommodate the situation. The committee was always trying to pre-guess the Headmaster's actions and responses instead of direct communication. However, a culture at the School had developed which did not invite outspoken and forthright exchange of ideas. The committee members had previous ideas quashed too quickly because they had voiced them prematurely and incompletely.

THE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE'S VIEWS

As has been outlined in the last chapter the curriculum committee was acutely aware of the nature of its task and the obstacles which had to be overcome. Appendix 6 provides an example of the degree to which the members of the committee had appraised the difficulties, problems and advantages of the vertical semester re-organisation; it is a highly professional and well-thought document. The committee was culturally aware of the social dynamics and structures of the School and were under no illusions as to the enormity of the task that lay before them. However, the team realised that there were major factors which would aid them in their task. These can be summarised as:

- * The whole staff, including the Headmaster's group, were in agreement that the main focus of change should be centred on curriculum initiatives and had given the committee a mandate to research and suggest models of differing strategies that could be employed.

- * The educational changes were philosophically sound and would benefit the students and their learning capabilities.

- * The committee was enthusiastic, skilled and had convinced itself of the desirability of finding innovative pupil-centred learning strategies.
- * The P & F body was pleased that staff were researching alternative teaching strategies.
- * The NSW Department of School Education policies were encouraging schools to seek alternative curriculum programs to give students a more diverse and suitable range of subjects, especially for those pupils who were not academically motivated.

As one of the committee members (Luke: 4/1993) remarked:

... what we did last year (Year 1, Term 3) was a tremendous platform - everyone wanted change. It is the most inspired I have been with the staff, ever. They were prepared to plan, come up with ideas and express them and take some trouble about expressing them ... The staff just did not vote on something; they went through a whole term of seminars. It was not just a matter of putting up their hands; they each put something down and presented something to be reported.

Although a significant departure from the existing structure the change was not seen to be a radical move by the committee. The fundamental traditions of the School and its historical rituals did not indeed want to be changed by them or staff; they liked and appreciated their value and stability. As another member of the committee (Matthew: 4/1993) mentioned in this regard:

... I do not think the change will be that revolutionary as it is basically an internal curricular change.

However, the committee realised that even though they had made every effort to minimise the impact of the change to the organisational structure and perceived none of the interruptions to the normal routines as being insurmountable, the Headmaster himself would need to be convinced that the proposed changes would not be threatening to his philosophical ideals and traditional practices.

Even after the turmoil of the resignation of the last Headmaster and the damage that staff perceived that he had done, staff optimism was still in evidence as to the potential of the School. Staff had displayed their solidarity, values and concerns as to the direction that last Headmaster was taking them and had taken precipitative action to remedy the situation. That

optimism and idealism was still a driving force behind the curriculum changes and, as one teacher (Luke: 12/1994) commented:

... all of us were saying during the fight against [the last Headmaster], [the School] has got so much potential, we cannot just let it go down the drain.

The philosophy of the curriculum proposals had the backing and commitment of the staff coupled with their input and discussion documents. As Matthew (4/1993) remarked at the time, he was surprised at the total agreement from the teachers as to the subject of educational reform:

... the shock when I saw that from every group each one had the same topic as their main priority.

Even though there was backing by the P & F, an enthusiastic and vigilant committee, an appreciation and acceptance by staff of the extra workload that would fall upon them and an Education Department that was promoting curriculum change there were still fears as to the likelihood of the success of these initiatives.

The committee was particularly concerned with a number of issues which would have had to be overcome if the new structures were to be successfully implemented. Firstly, the need to keep staff fully informed of their progress so that the initial enthusiasm of the teachers was not lost. Luke (2/1993) was worried about being too efficient and thereby sowing the seeds of failure 'by allowing a distance to form between the change agents and the teachers resulting in a lack of ownership by the staff of the developments'. Secondly, 'everyone wants change - the staff's greatest concern is that they fear it is not going to happen. [They have a] lack of faith in the system' (Luke: 4/1993).

It was staff's fear that after all their effort they would be rewarded with nothing. There was a foreboding amongst the teachers and the members of the committee that the 'system' would not allow change or experimentation; and by 'system' staff meant primarily the Headmaster. As one of the committee members (Luke: 12/1994) remarked later:

... [staff members] were disappointed, in the early days of the curriculum committee. [The committee members] were badgered with questions, 'how is it going?' And all the rest of it. They [the teachers] read between the lines. We [the committee] did not have to say it was not going anywhere. Another thing down the drain and they have given up expecting anything.

Thirdly, the committee was caught between several conflicting political issues and did not know how to proceed. On the one hand staff needed to be kept informed in order to maintain their ownership of the change process. On the other, the committee was not permitted to inform the teachers of their progress. And as Luke (2/1993) then observed:

... [the Headmaster] does not like anticipations worked up when he does not want the thing to happen any way.

The committee was keenly aware that to maintain staff participation they must, 'publish or perish' (John: 2/1993). However, they also knew that owing to the flexible nature of their model they could not produce a definitively structured draft document which would satisfy the Headmaster's questions concerning its implementation. The committee was unable to see how it was possible to keep staff informed, allow the Headmaster to control the flow of information, produce a document which would please all sceptical parties and yet remain faithful to the original objectives and maintain the enthusiasm and commitment of staff.

It was eventually realised by the committee that the policy of trying to 'keep on pre-guessing the boss' (Luke: 2/1993) was limiting their chances of success. The mood of the committee and staff by the end of Year 2 was one of pessimism; a situation later summarised by Luke (12/1994) with the statement:

... I think they [the staff] can be enticed again but it cannot be one of those, 'let us all sit down and think thoughts again'. As far as they are concerned they have finished that. We had a job, as a curriculum committee, to turn their thoughts into something tangible and essentially we have let them down.

SUMMARY OF 'THE COMMITTEE'S STRATEGIES

In Havelock's (1973) book, *The Change Agents Guide to Innovation in Education*, he clearly and succinctly outlines the stages that agents of change must consider if they wish to see their innovations reach fruition. His research is methodical and covered the processes of change in numerous schools to reflect teachers' opinions as to how they themselves have succeeded or failed in their particular change program.

One of the Havelock's (1973: 153) main conclusions is that:

... change will only lead to real progress if it is brought about in an orderly sequence of goal-setting, planning and systematic execution.

If all one has to do is to deal rationally, systematically and methodically with one's objectives and the processes of change that he outlines so clearly, then why did the proposed curriculum structures of this School fail to materialise?

Back in the early days of the curriculum committee's existence I was asked to produce a document outlining the basic stages of change. The committee members, as part of their planning, wanted as much information and guidance as they could muster. After all I was studying it and I was seen as the resident expert. They were novices too in this saga and were keen as were all the staff to see their educational dreams realised. I had just read Havelock's book and was impressed with its simplicity and reasoned framework. Appendix 10, a strategic summary of the processes of change, was submitted to the committee at the last meeting of Year 2, Term 1 and the paper discussed. The members of the committee agreed that they were at stage II, the 'Awareness' phase, level 'B'.³

By the end of Year 3, Term 4, after meeting upon meeting, hours and hours of research, timetable experimentation and discussion the committee, composed of highly skilled, experienced, competent and dedicated educational professionals, had made little progress. Something had obviously gone wrong, but what was it?

Havelock (1973: xi) summarises the following key features that change agents would need for success, these are:

- a. Diagram the organisation as a system. What are its goals, norms, key sub-systems and key people?
- b. Find allies and potential allies.
- c. Build 'expert power' know your innovation inside-out.
- d. Be persistent; successful change agents try harder and keep on trying.
- e. If you have an adversary analyse the situation from his [sic] point of view.
- f. Develop a sense of timing and act strategically.
- g. Let others share the credit.

³ See Appendix 10 page 1.

Each of these points will be appraised and act as the starting point for an analysis of the committee's failure to proceed beyond the early stages of Havelock's planned change program.

Diagram the Organisation

Did the committee know the 'system'? Havelock does not explain what he means by this word but from his inclusion of the notions of 'goals', 'norms' and 'key people' he would undoubtedly be suggesting that change agents must know and understand the structures, hierarchy and rational operations of the School. However, he does not define exactly what he means and there is no indication that he appreciates the importance in the process of change of teachers' perceptions of the organisational culture. It is this culture that is a significant clue as to why this curriculum-based change does not eventuate - how staff actually view their place and value in the School, how things actually work and interact and the style of communication rather than its formal lines. Havelock's systematic approach neglects to deal with why change more often than not fails to reach even the early stages of change and the pivotal significance of the teachers' cultural perceptions.

The teachers were very perceptive people; the collective culture of the School and personal experiences clearly establish the consequences of actions which were not politically correct. Staff knew exactly what behaviour was acceptable and what conduct would elicit a negative response from the hierarchy. Staff were acutely aware of their relative positions of power within the School and those members of staff who wielded influence and were party to the decision-making processes. However, it is doubtful whether staff knew exactly what the School's goals were. As previously outlined (see Chapter 7: 'goal setting') staff did not know **precisely** what they were. They had read the published maxims but the real goals, those goals that could be drawn from observable action and consequences of decisions, were the subject of gossip, innuendo and subsequently ill-defined. The teachers were not concerned with the 'School's goals', per se, because they were aware that the 'Headmaster's objectives' were the 'real goals'. The majority of the time spent in the committee meetings, when the actual model was not being discussed and reviewed, was occupied in discussing ways of 'selling' the proposals to the Headmaster in such a way as to meet with his approval.

The following comments all reflect the committee's awareness of whom they had to persuade if their proposals were to be trialed and just as importantly the methods they thought would have to be employed to ensure success.

Luke's (2/1993) comments that, 'we must keep him sweet', and that, 'the committee will lack credibility if I have the chair', accentuate the committee's cultural knowledge. Matthew (2/1993) remarked that, 'the Headmaster has not disapproved it so it must be okay'. 'The end justifies the means' rationalised John (2/1993) who questioned, 'what is the boss' Achilles heel?' Or, appreciating the delicacy of what they were trying to achieve, John (ibid.) suggested that, 'whatever you design make it fit in the existing structure; He [the Headmaster] is worried about losing control'. Likewise Simon (3/1993) acknowledged that, 'a hand-in-glove approach will be needed to convince the Head'.

However, despite its cultural awareness the committee still failed to achieve its objectives. The conclusion that must be drawn is that the members, even though they were sufficiently aware of the culture of the School and in particular how the Headmaster operated, were not adequately cognisant of the political strategies that needed to be employed to achieve success. Their initial enthusiasm blurred their vision as to the realities of the institutional social dynamics and dulled the edges of their collective knowledge as to how things really operated at the School. The committee did not develop a tactically considered campaign of action which dealt with a series of response mechanisms which could rebut those challenges and reactions to their proposals which they **knew** would eventuate. The committee was not politically naive, simply politically negligent.

Find Allies and Potential Allies

One of the strengths of the initial program of change was that a distinct majority of staff agreed to the changes and developments they would like to see at the School. Not all the teachers were in agreement though that a vertical semester timetable was the preferred model and as one Coordinator (staff 6: 11/ 994) stated:

... I would say that the majority of [this department's] staff feel the vertical timetable is not the way to go. In fact not really an issue in the area of teaching [this subject], as you can accelerate any child in any group at any time.

However, even these staff who were satisfied that they would be able to achieve the stated objectives of a more individualised curriculum without changing the existing structure were not opposed to the committee's aims and goals.

The Headmaster himself was present at all the formative staff meetings and was in agreement (or offered no resistance) with the educational ideals and thrust of the staff's desire to establish a more equitable teaching program. The Headmaster (3/1995) was also aware of the

perceptions amongst the parents that the academic standards of the school were considered weak. Any change which could overcome this perception was welcomed by him; he commented in this regard:

... the other major aim had been the academic [performance of the students]; to raise standards and do something about that as there is a perception in the community [that the standards are not good enough].

External curriculum experts from both the universities and state government reports⁴ were all pushing for curriculum change although the methods by which such aspirations were actually to be achieved were not considered or too nebulous. The committee thought that it could get only moral support from these experts and reports as they had nothing concrete to offer or curriculum models to suggest. From the research that had been undertaken there appeared to be no other schools or personnel that the committee could turn too.

After the debacle of the rejection of the P & F submission the committee did not attempt to invite parental support, neither did the members feel the need, at this stage, to seek their input nor that of the student body. The committee members thought that when a model had been finalised and proposals accepted in principle by the staff and the Headmaster then this would be a more appropriate time to consult these groups.

The committee had thus unwittingly divested itself of three potential allies; allies that, as it transpired, would be sorely lacking. Firstly, the parents who would actively support their concerns and likewise the pressure that could be brought to bear by the students on the parents to seek more suitable educational curriculum structures. Lastly, the external professionals who, although they could not provide practical solutions could fully support the philosophical dimensions of the proposals which would give the committee's submission more substance and ameliorate the Headmaster's fears of a too radical a change.

Build 'Expert Power'

Appendices 7a and 7b are but two of the many documents that were collated from the research undertaken by the committee. Apart from visiting appropriate schools all other options were exercised. By the end of Year 2, Term 1 the committee was fully conversant

⁴ See The Australian Education Council review body's report entitled, 'Young People's Participation in Post-Compulsory Education and Training', Chaired by Brian Finn. Report presented in July 1991. See also the report by Eric Mayer on 'Key Competencies'; a report which developed the ideas propounded by the 'Finn Report'. Subsequent to these reports, the Employment and Skills Formation Council of the National Board of Employment, Education and Training released a study entitled, 'The Australian Vocational Certificate Training System. This committee, chaired by Laurie Carmichael, recommended that there should be greater inclusion of vocational subjects into school curricula to achieve greater harmony between pathways in school education and vocational interests.

with the major aspects of their proposed changes. However, the very nature of their flexible model defied close scrutiny and critical analysis. There were some questions, that could only be answered **after** the model was tested. It would be impossible to predict or find solutions to the logistical problems until the trial eventuated and was assessed. As with any new structure it would only be by trialing the project that a true assessment of the unitised timetable's success could be appreciated. The concerns of the committee turned from fine-tuning the model to the practicalities of obtaining permission to experiment. However, without one they could not convince anyone of the other. The committee was unable to resolve this issue. It 'knew' the innovation but not the political strategies to execute it.

Be Persistent

The momentum for change lasted for a year from the initial curriculum meetings in Year 1, Term 1 to the final curriculum committee meeting at the end of Year 2, Term 1. At this point the 'towel' was thrown in; the committee perceived intractable problems which they were unable to solve, at least in the short term. The curriculum changes needed time and effort, there was an unconscious decision by the group to devote more of their time to other more immediate pressing matters. As the chair of the committee pessimistically remarked (John: 4/1995) concerning the time it would take to implement the required changes:

... it will take me too long to get there; to get this unit curriculum up [and running]. It will take the next twelve years.

Another member of the committee (Simon: 10/1994) agreed with John about the length of time it would take to achieve their objectives and how little time was made available on a day-to-day basis for the project:

... you have an ever shrinking staff, perhaps shrinking clientele as well. We try to offer the same program that we always have. Everybody is spread too thin, working too hard on non-academic things and they cannot focus on the academic and enunciate what they want. They do not have time. I do not have time any more to think about curriculum changes. Everyone is chock-a-block here; all that extra work. They may be keen for change but they may not physically be able to come to the party.

The curriculum committee needed time to meet regularly. A committee member (Luke: 12/1994) bemoaned the lack of financial backing which, if it had been forthcoming, could have remedied the situation:

... the boss has said it must not cost anything. At some stage the School has officially to allocate the resources to this project.

The committee members had the enthusiasm and the energy to give to the task, but little spare time in which to achieve their goals. Their persistence to the task was related to the perceived return that their efforts could achieve and increasingly and subconsciously the committee was meeting less and less often; 'why bust your guts?', commented Luke (12/1994) despairingly. With diminishing returns the committee members decided independently to channel their energies elsewhere.

However, the following comment Luke (12/1994) clearly indicates that the time factor was not the paramount obstacle to progress but the lack of determination and persistence on behalf of the members of the committee. He felt that the committee had not persevered and had balked when the going got tough, as he explained:

... the committee admitted that the hard part was to come and it found ways, without necessarily being conscious about it, to put the fight off. And essentially it will be put off forever; it will not happen. If it happens it will be for a different reason.

If You Have an Adversary, Analyse the Situation

The committee members were completely aware of the human, financial, and cultural obstacles to their proposals. Their feelings on the matter were succinctly voiced by John (4/1995) when he remarked:

... if the Headmaster cannot see the benefit of it, then you have 'minor Buckley's' of pushing it through. Even though the majority of the staff would support it.

The committee was always trying to 'second-guess the boss' (Luke: 2/1993) and were unwilling to have open and frank meetings with him to discuss contentious issues. They considered that an open forum with him would achieve little and create even more obstacles, especially if the Headmaster directed them specifically not to pursue a certain course of action or solution. They tried to achieve their objectives through manipulation, seeing this as the only way of gaining acceptance for a scheme which the Headmaster might initially disapprove of. In all the minutes of the committee meetings there was never one suggestion that the Headmaster might be asked to one of the meetings to air opinion and concern. 'Second-guessing' became the order of the day with the Headmaster's thoughts and feelings on any issue being divined

from other encounters, conversations and the collective wisdom and experience of the committee members. They perceived that the only chance the curriculum proposals had of success was to convince the Headmaster of their benefit to his goals and objectives for the School and not state exactly what they intended to do. One such objection, the members thought, related to the effect the new timetable might have on existing activities which the Headmaster might want preserved. As John (2/1993) explained:

... the Headmaster has a philosophy of activities and sport as a part of the School curriculum. He is worried that if he lets us have a 'go at' sport we will do something to it. But if we assure him that we in fact want to accredit it and not do away with it, it will then fit in with his philosophy.

The committee also tried to create the situation where the Headmaster was given the opportunity of controlling the agenda and having his 'ego smoothed'. Luke (2/1993) discussed the strategy thus:

... we need to establish that VSO is not the answer for the School, thus giving the Headmaster the opportunity of saying, 'I told you so' [he has not been convinced of its merit due to personal past experiences]. Thus indicating that his perceptions are better than ours and thus putting him at his ease and not on the offensive. This would pave the way for further discussion and curriculum changes in a less threatening manner.

The committee was unable to predict accurately enough how the Headmaster would respond to certain proposals and were afraid that if they were too open their plans might be instantly scuttled. However, the committee knew that their ideas had to be sanctioned by the Headmaster and that he would be unwilling to instigate any action until the committee could tell him exactly how the project would operate. The committee was continually on the defensive trying to circumvent every conceivable eventuality or impediment that the Headmaster might throw at them. Thus many hours of valuable meetings dissolved into talk about the Headmaster's reactions and goals to mythical propositions and less time confronting the fact that at some point they would have to state their case clearly and plainly and forthrightly confront the consequences of such action.

The committee knew their adversaries but did not develop, or were unable to develop, procedures or stratagems to deal with them. If the Headmaster's perspective, outlined above, was taken as a reflection of his support for the goals of the committee then the question that must be answered is why did the committee see the Headmaster as an adversary?

This paradox can be explained if the dichotomy between the Headmaster's ideological

educational views and how he saw his leadership role and desire to keep control at all costs is considered. The committee was unable to cope with or rationalise this double-sided behaviour, they acknowledged the cultural dynamics of the organisation but lacked the courage to deal with the likely scenarios that they knew would develop. The committee not only 'put off the fight' (Luke) but perceived it as a fight in the first place. Such was the 'power in the glove' (staff 1) of the organisational hierarchy that past experiences and the collective imagery of the teachers led the committee to view the change process as a fight and not something which could be dealt with on a more open and non-confrontational basis.

Develop a Sense of Timing and Act Strategically

It might be suggested, owing to the committee's failure to secure change, that the curriculum issues were mooted at the wrong time. The committee could not be adequately financially resourced, but as the minutes of April 1993's meeting note, the members thought that if the School were to stay competitive and maintain enrolments then the School could not afford not to re-assess its curriculum structures and that the School would benefit from these changes. Both the Headmaster and staff realised that the School needed to respond to both parental and societal pressures to create a more flexible and successful curriculum. It was thought by the committee that the strained financial climate would help, not hinder, their progress.

The committee also felt that they were politically aware enough to develop a strategy for success. Certainly Appendix 6 is a fine example of a timetabled plan and strategy. However, Havelock (1973) fails to warn prospective change agents that there is more to the change process than a sound plan and considered strategy. What the committee lacked was the political and practical strategies to deal with the responses from the Headmaster which, they correctly assessed, were likely to arise and hinder progress. The culture of the School dictated to the committee that it would be a 'him and us' situation. They contemplated no other. Having established this oppositional stance the committee did not have the skills nor the courage to deal with the problems that they knew they would have to face. They knew that if they tackled the Headmaster head-on they were unlikely to win, past experiences of others had established this fact. They needed the support of the staff if they were to take this position but the staff, as a group, had been divided and no one was willing any longer to stick their neck above the parapet. What the committee opted to do instead was to out-think and out-manoeuvre the Headmaster. At this they were simply out of their depth and lacked the political agility. They implicitly made the collective decision of keeping their jobs and let the curriculum issues be decided at another time and perhaps under another Headmaster.

Let Others Share the Credit

The committee members were not 'glory hunters'. As far as they were concerned anyone could get the credit as long as the objectives were achieved. This was not altruism but a desire to create a better timetable for the students and to give them, the teachers, ultimately, greater job satisfaction. Perhaps the angle that should have been taken was not to 'let others share the credit' but 'let the key person own the credit'. This strategy might have won the day, but that would have involved the full involvement of the Headmaster and this was never considered by the committee; the mindset was oppositional rather than collaborative, a sad epitaph as all sides had much to gain and almost nothing to lose by the implementation of the new ideas. It would have taken a brave and clever person to bring both sides together.

CONCLUSION

Havelock's (1973) definitive strategies outline the stages of planned change and indicate critical areas that have to be addressed if change is to be forthcoming. The curriculum committee basically followed these strategies, but this was not enough to achieve their goals. What they did not know, and Havelock fails to outline, was how to surmount resistance to progress and what avenues to take when certain roads were blocked. The committee members had an excellent knowledge of the culture of the School, they knew the 'client system' (Havelock, 1973: 44) but they did not possess either the political strategies to overcome the barriers to change nor the mastery of the techniques to acquire power to turn events to their advantage. Within the cultural framework of this organisation what was needed by the committee members was less Havelockian rationalism and more Machiavellian guile.

Caught up in the whirlwind of their initial enthusiasm they thought that the excellence of their ideas coupled with the full support of the staff would win the day. Their optimism ruled their hearts and left their accumulated cultural wisdom of how the School actually operated to be shelved until reality caught up with them. The benefit of hindsight offered alternative tactics to the committee but the opportunity had been lost and the members keenly felt their failure. The committee members would undoubtedly be much wiser next time around. However, there might not be a next time and even if there were these staff would have probably moved to other schools by then and fresh new faces would have replaced them. The cycle of no-change would be perpetuated.

How was it that a change which had so much support, so much initial idealism, purpose and confidence failed? Or was the curriculum reorganisation doomed to failure before it started? Is

schooling, as Bates (1985: 283) suggests, a gigantic agency of social control', with change being 'directed towards a more effective maintenance of the status quo rather than towards significant alterations in the direction and practices of the system' (ibid.: 284)? Certainly the findings of this study suggest that the forces which perpetuate the status quo are underestimated by rational change theorists like Havelock and that teachers themselves lack the political skills to develop astute plans of action to pursue their objectives. How successful is change instigated by the rank and file ever likely to be, especially in hierarchical organisations? Did staff simply underestimate the enormity and impossibility of their task and not realise that the Havelockian model of change better suits the **leaders** who manage change as opposed to the teachers who try to effect bottom-up change?

In attempting to draw the main themes of the thesis together, the next chapter deals with these issues; the politics and the power of change, the forces which control the traditional structures, the mechanisms by which change might be achieved and the strategies that must be planned and executed by a 'curriculum committee' if their objectives are to be fulfilled.

As Luke (2/1993) clearly stated, the staff did not fear the extra workload that the change to the timetable would undoubtedly have meant, nor the anxieties brought about by the change to routines and established practices. The teachers were simply worried that nothing would happen. They were more afraid of no-change rather than change. No-change reflected, once more, their inability to control their professional destiny and a disquieting statement exposing for all to see their lack of power and worth. Change offered professional satisfaction and perhaps freedom, no-change only reinforced the daily round and their place within it.

CHAPTER TEN

THY ROD AND THY STAFF *Conclusions to the Processes of Change*

INTRODUCTION

How was it that after a plethora of meetings charged with excitement and collegiality to discuss organisational changes, nothing much changed? How was it that an enthusiastic, educationally experienced and dedicated curriculum committee failed to deliver on its mandate from staff to suggest models for curriculum change? What outcomes and conclusions can be drawn from the teachers' initial fervour to plan new initiatives, to the point in time where subsequent failure seemed inevitable and little major restructuring occurred?

The perceptions of the teachers themselves were studied simply because it was they who were the ones who would operate and work within the new context if and when change occurred; it was they who tried to enact the changes and transform the collective dream into reality. As it happened it was they who by their acceptance of the structures also impeded such changes. The teachers needed ownership of the curriculum changes, be they externally imposed or self-driven, as they had to devote hours re-writing syllabi and re-learning their approach to teaching. They also needed not only power to enact such changes but the political will and skill to see them to fruition. In itself, ownership was not enough. Their dormant power had been activated to depose the last Headmaster but such was the fragmentation and disempowerment of the teachers that they were unable to activate value-rational educational change - they were kept mute within the tight confines of traditional practice and control.

From the staff's point of view their research into vertical timetabling was extensive and thorough. By all accounts the major documents produced by the curriculum committee over the main two years of the proposed change initiatives, outlined in Appendices 1-10, were well-planned, thoughtful documents. They detailed problem areas, contentious issues, plans of action and specified goals of a two year implementation timeframe which did not appear initially unrealistic if staff enthusiasm was to be maintained. Staff motivation for the curriculum

change came from a variety of internal and external sources and had the full support of all teachers. So how was it that the concept of restructuring the timetable never eventuated, let alone reached trial implementation stage? Why did the proposed changes not come about?

Findings suggest that many factors contributed to the committee's failure to achieve significant aspects of their curriculum brief from the teachers, that was, to break the lock-step progression of the students and develop more equitable and conceptually logical teaching strategies. These factors all relate principally to power, leadership qualities and the organisational culture of the School.

How are the processes of change affected by the organisational culture of the School? How does the use of power by the hierarchy limit or enhance the ability of the teaching staff to effect change? Why are innovative educational concepts so rarely fostered or encouraged within schools? The answers to these initial questions, guiding the research, were found not to be mutually exclusive but were inextricably linked to the School's culture which so affected the processes of change.

This chapter will draw together the prevailing themes of the study, notably those dilemmas that are posed by Machiavelli (1958 [1513], 1970 [1519]) and Hobbes (1968 [1651]) concerning governance, power and the established order, the constraining and enabling duality of structure so clearly outlined by Giddens (1979, 1984) and the gulf between theoretical, educational concepts and their practical application that Havelock (1973), Holt (1987), and Ruddock (1991) and many others analyse from the perspective of the agents of change. In light of these themes, the original questions which guided the study will be revisited and possible explanations provided. Finally, the implications for the implementation of educational change will be assessed in the light of the findings of this study and from the perspective for so long proposed by Greenfield (1980-1993), that is, through the teachers themselves.

TEMPORAL POWER AND TEACHER-CENTRED CHANGE

Administration is about Power and Powerful People
(Greenfield 1986: 74)

The use of power by the hierarchy in this School severely limited the ability of the teachers to effect change. This power, witnessed through the actions and non-actions of staff, was embodied in an elitist, traditional structure which established hierarchical dominance and control over the decision-making process. However, this structure was not, in itself, questioned by staff nor did they consider that structural change was a necessary prerequisite for change to eventuate. They accepted the maintenance of stability and traditions that such structures provided and, for a variety of reasons, did not question the right of the Headmaster

to impose his will over the goals of this institution. Power was vested by the teachers in the Headmaster, thereby limiting their personal freedom to act. But this 'giving' of power was not unconditional and expectations were placed upon the Headmaster by the teachers to fulfil their hopes and wishes in his role as educational leader, that was to lead.

However, the teachers' acceptance of this structure, in itself, also prevented change. Its very stability generated traditional routines and loose coupling of responsibilities, decision-making and communication of goals whose significance on the process of change was recognised by the curriculum committee members. However, they did not have the necessary political skills or management expertise to resolve or mitigate their effects.

This was not a pluralist organisation; the Staff Association was ineffectual and in the final analysis all major educational decisions were made by the Headmaster. No meetings of Coordinators or Housemasters had the power to act unilaterally and their positions were simply advisory. Similarly the curriculum committee had no power to enact anything, it could only advise. The Headmaster's power kept the committee from pushing change too quickly. Change, if there was to be change, would happen slowly and if there was doubt as to the change's success then no decisions would be made and further clarification sought. The Headmaster subsequently re-focused on those areas of the School where improvement was achievable with minimal risk and on traditional events which reflected purpose and affirmation of the School's worth. His power over the actions of staff maintained stability but was seen to have an educational cost.

In this institution the Headmaster had the power to advance or stifle careers, to terminate or extend employment, to bestow position or title and to follow his own educational values and goals. This was great power, an exhibition of control over one's destiny which was both comforting and debilitating. Again, the authority of the Headmaster to govern was not questioned, only the character of its execution. The manner in which this power was used significantly affected staff's willingness to contribute time, energy and effort to change the curriculum. How they felt they were professionally treated, a reflection, they perceived, of their worth, bore a direct relation to their involvement in the promotion of change.

The use of sanctions to maintain organisational stability was also not questioned by the teachers as long as it related to the nurturing of staff professionalism. However, where sanctions of whatever sort were used as an agency of social control to limit debate rather than enable it, conflict and division were the result. The perceptions of the teachers that power was used not to promote educational goals but to confine them and that power was used to divide and rule staff and not to unite them, caused dissension and passive resistance to become

manifest. It was the actions or non-actions of those in power to dominate what was, or was not, discussed and an expedient wish to control the voice of alternative or contrary opinion which resulted in the unintended consequences of non-participation and absenteeism on the part of the teachers. Conflict took many forms and its management did not gauge nor understand its depth or variety with the result that an obstructive counter culture evolved.

The use of power by the Headmaster had fundamental consequences for the processes of change at this School. Its use, as perceived by the teachers, significantly determined how they acted or did not act and their opinions as to their ability to change educational practices. The expedient use of power in this School, either covert or overt, and it did not matter which, was seen by the teachers to prejudice their involvement in the decision-making process and implicitly denigrated their professional worth and commitment. Power was used to control tradition and established routines rather than to promote value-rational objectives. The degree to which sanctions were used to maintain existing power structures directly influenced the likelihood of the teachers risking their present positions for an ideal or new order.

The use of power by the School's leaders severely impaired the ability of staff to generate new ideas and to tolerate alternative opinion or dissenting views. Whatever may be the leaders' motivations or reasons, the teachers perceived that the daily morning meetings, staff meetings or other general forums were not the places to raise contentious issues nor voice objection to policy matters or strategies. Staff had learnt by the sanctioned example and humiliation of others that it was unwise to speak publicly on sensitive issues which confronted or questioned authority or the existing order of things. Thus no one talked about alternative approaches nor did they offer different solutions to problems. Open debate was stifled and new ideas were not aired; the culture was one of silence and passivity rather than candid and shared discussion and argument.

It must be stressed that this may or may not be an expedient decision of the Headmaster - it may simply reflect his style of leadership - but the unintended consequences were clear. New ideas and personal opinions were **perceived** not to be encouraged, except within the confines of small meetings and committees, out of public view where discussion was minuted and controlled. Good ideas were lost in these minutes of committee meetings where no decisions were made and only recommendations given for the Headmaster's consideration.

This procedural inertia severely restricted the emergence of innovative ideas and suggestions which might have helped establish new frameworks or policies from the collective pool of wisdom and experience of staff. There were no meetings at which staff could freely air their views and it was implied by their absence that the teachers' wisdom was not worth harnessing.

In this study the use of present power, as opposed to the established power structure itself, was seen to have a fundamental and profound effect on the ability of the teachers to effect change. Without free and open dialogue, a sharing of ideals, goals and visions, the staff retreated to the sanctuary of the classroom to attain professional satisfaction and creativity. The passive and active aspects of present power whilst maintaining organisational checks and balances stultified the voicing of differing opinions, new ideas or changes to existing practices. The continuance of control over the educational agenda through the use of strategic and sanctioned power resulted in harm to the professional fabric of the School, the integrity and perceived worth of the staff and above all curriculum change.

Machiavelli's merciless stance on the rights and wrongs of action may be morally reprehensible as human life is seen nowadays to be too sacred to snuff out at a whim of the 'common good'. Machiavelli saw the death of opponents as a necessary consequence to provide stability of society or the means to remove the leaders; adversaries in Renaissance Florence were scarred to death, whereas today we tend to scar for life by neither fostering nor encouraging innovation, professionalism and the worth of the individual.

EDUCATIONAL THEORY AND PRACTICE

*Between the Conception and Creation, Between the Emotion and
the Response ... Lies the Shadow
(quoted from T.S.Eliot 1917)*

The underlying ontology of this thesis was based on the recognition that staff at this School had their own visions of organisational reality, a reality which was born from their understanding of social interactions and their place and worth within the School. Their imagery of the School's culture was primarily focused on personal experience more than any other factor. How individual staff members or groups were treated significantly affected their perspective of the dynamics of the School. These first-hand events or ordeals portrayed their world and their opinions as to how the 'system' actually operated, as opposed to any stated rhetoric.

In the divide between educational theory, the value-rational goals and aspirations of staff and actual practice and the cultural separation of the teachers' dreams from reality that a 'shadow' was cast. Staff perceived that there were different agendas operating other than those which encompassed educational change, however beneficial those innovative ideas might have been. It was these non-educational aspects of the organisational culture which deeply affected the likelihood of curriculum change. At the heart of this issue was the relationship between staff

and the leaders, notably in this hierarchical institution the Headmaster. The differing respective views of organisational realities and contrasting goals and visions caused conflict and division. Battles were being fought which were seldom openly confrontational but passively defiant, oppositional or adversarial. Educational theory had no hope of being implemented when so much apathy, mistrust, conflict and disunity were prevalent. Staff were too busy coping with their daily existence, organisational failures, what they should or should not be saying or doing and their employment futures to worry about innovation and value-rational objectives. Curriculum was a low priority when other more immediate social, political and management problems had to be solved.

Whitehead's comments (quoted by Bennis 1969: 31-32) on freedom and change in society best summarise the feelings of the teachers towards what they felt should have been happening in the School:

The art of free society consists first in the maintenance of the symbolic code, and secondly, in the fearlessness of revision ... those societies which cannot combine reverence to their symbols with the freedom of revision must ultimately decay.

The teachers did not wish to change the traditions and rituals of the School. They had no desire, for whatever reason, to change the hierarchical nature of the present power structures. They consciously sought the maintenance of the symbolic code but also the freedom to change and revise their educational programs to give both the students and themselves greater control over, and satisfaction with, the learning process. The challenge for leaders was not only to create and maintain organisational stability, and the rituals and procedures which formed and perpetuated it, but also to allow and encourage collective argument and opinion to form an open consensus for progress. Primarily, staff did not necessarily want all their ideas to be put into action but the opportunity to present their opinions in open forums where they were **seen** to be respected and valued.

Staff at this School were loyal to the institution's symbolic code and had faith in its intrinsic value. However, what was missing was a fearlessness of revision, the need to assess and re-assess the School's goals and objectives in relation to the quality of the education it provided. Such change required an atmosphere of tolerance, trust and stability. Stability there may have been, but trust and tolerance there was not.

Staff perceived a 'him and us' relationship between themselves and the Headmaster which cultivated doubt, indecision, a power culture which repressed open discussion, a destabilisation of the communication process and, above all, conflict. These factors ensured

that the 'shadow' between dreams and organisational realities and possibilities was never illuminated.

The Headmaster's leadership style, either deliberately or by default, had created a situation of mistrust and suspicion. The majority of the curriculum committee meetings were spent discussing strategies which might persuade the Headmaster of the opportunities the new timetables might present rather than the problems of developing a workable model. Knowing that all decisions passed through him, the committee was afraid that if they were not circumspect or politically astute the Headmaster might call a halt to all future plans if he perceived the proposals as too controversial or threatening his control. Likewise, poor communication between the curriculum committee and the Headmaster, a lack of a clear definition of the proposals by the committee to allay the fears of the Headmaster and misunderstandings as to the outcomes of the changes, set the scene for procrastination and hesitation.

The enabling and yet confining nature of structural, traditional power which Giddens (op.cit.) so clearly defines created a duality which also needed to be dealt with by the Headmaster. That was, how to maintain control and yet empower others: how to allow freedom of action and yet limit those actions which threatened the community's well-being and success; how to permit freedom of speech and yet reign in negative and denigrating talk; and how to assess the 'unintended consequences' (Giddens 1984) of the decisions made and to appreciate the vagaries of Machiavelli's (op.cit.) *fortuna*. It was this balance between control and freedom, between coercion and integration which staff saw as the key role of leadership: to be able to govern and regulate debate on contentious issues in an open forum without feeling threatened; to be able to argue opposing voices of dissent with vigour and knowledge born from experience and certainty of direction and goal; and to know when to act and when not to act and to consider the manner in which those actions were performed. It is not surprising that Machiavelli (op.cit.) and Greenfield (1993) fail to give clear directions as to how leaders might lead when the task seems so daunting.

There will be no creative change at this School until ideas are conceived and aired. There will be no channel for the emotions unless they are vented publicly and not in small corners where it matters not. Such was the desire of the Headmaster to maintain control over every agenda and every decision that there was no opportunity for open discussion. Even if there were meetings of this ilk, committees were formed which over time and energy spent achieved the same objective. 'Young Turks' never had their day, no new blood was drawn, different ideas went unsung and withered; such was the consequence of the inability of the teachers to conceive, voice or create their dreams.

Innovative educational concepts, especially those that wish to break new educational ground, need an atmosphere of stability, mutual trust and a confluence of perceived goals. Such concepts will not be fostered or encouraged until this creative, educationally fostering culture exists.

ORGANISATIONAL CULTURE AND THE PROCESSES OF CHANGE

Changing the Established Order of Things

(Machiavelli 1958[1513]: 29)

The major finding of this research is that change is primarily a cultural phenomenon. In other words, the processes of change are inextricably interwoven with the organisational culture. It behoves any change agent to understand the cultural dynamics of the organisation **before** strategies of change are planned. Whatever the type, strategy, or approach to change, the successful change agent must comprehend the organisational culture and its implications and consequences for the social dynamics of those involved. The strategies for planned change come **after** this knowledge and not before. The agents must be aware of the prevailing power structures, the styles of leadership and their effects on staff, the mechanisms by which new ideas are communicated and controlled, how decisions are reached and who is able to contribute to the process before appropriate programs of action can be contemplated. Not only must change agents understand the organisational culture but they must also recognise and locate those areas which might present barriers to change. The obstacles that are likely to be encountered are developed from an awareness of this cultural perspective.

The introduction of new ideas is not seen just as a stage-managed list of implementation strategies but dependent on the thoughts, motivations and limitations of staff to act and have control over the decision-making agenda. The processes of change are as much to do with political manoeuvring as with careful, rational and sequential planning.

The Headmaster was perceived by the curriculum committee and the majority of staff to be a barrier to change rather than an ally because he was culturally never seen to be an ally. Staff had not experienced change nor staff-driven success (with the exception perhaps of the departure of the last Headmaster) because they felt they were not in a position to exercise power to achieve their goals. The personal and professional cost of doing so were deemed too high.

A culture of no-change existed. It is not surprising that the curriculum initiatives failed at the

initial stage of the process when this culture of no-change is analysed. New staff who were employed, fresh from other schools, experiences, teaching colleges or universities soon learnt to keep innovative or novel ideas to themselves and follow the cultural norm of acquiescence and silence. The conflicts born from the conditions and paradoxes of the duality of organisational structure developed into a counter culture which had little to do with value-rational goals or the demands and rigour of change and improvement. The cycle of no-change was perpetuated to the next generation of teachers who accept that change cannot be made at the grass-roots level. The staff culturally 'forgot' how to discuss in a non-confrontational manner and to argue without taking personal offence if ideas were not well received. Interactional skills were 'lost' and would have to be re-learned if in future staff were to discuss freely their thoughts and feelings.

Innovation requires trust and dialogue between the interested parties. It needs to be nurtured in an atmosphere of encouragement and understanding with acknowledgment made by all parties of their respective responsibilities and goals. Mutual distrust between staff, the curriculum committee and the Headmaster created uncertainty of direction and subsequent inertia.

Innovation requires time and energy. There were too many other issues concerning the management of the School which eroded staff's emotional and physical energy. Staff perceived that there were other more important, immediate issues which threatened their professional and personal well-being than to be concerned with curriculum reorganisation and the desire to change the established order of things. Innovation will only occur when the cultural climate permits experimentation, tolerance and collegiality; innovation is too fragile a vessel to weather the many storms raging in the seas of this School.

Ironically the members of curriculum committee had not only failed to introduce change but they had also perpetuated the culture of no-change by their failure. No-change only reinforced the daily round and staff's places within it. Staff perceptions were that in major issues of policy matters, even if the new ideas on a value-rational basis had 'everything going for them' as was the case here, they had little chance of success. They perceived that their time and energy had been wasted and they became cynical; staff were unlikely to be so enthusiastic or giving next time. The committee members who had learnt from their mistakes and errors of political judgement were disbanded. Their collective wisdom of how to proceed next time, if there was to be a next time, had dissipated. The cycle of no-change was perpetuated and any future curriculum committee would start again from scratch. The established order had established itself again.

Machiavelli's (loc.cit.) quote, regarding the difficulties that besets any agent of organisational change, pertinently continues:

... because the innovator has for enemies all those who have done well under the old conditions and lukewarm defenders in those who may do well under the new. This coolness arises partly from fear of the opponents, who have laws on their side, and partly from the incredulity of men, who do not believe in new things until they have had a long experience of them.

Machiavelli identifies here two main factors which limit the implementation of a new order of things at the School: firstly, the power vested with the organisational leader, namely the Headmaster, to maintain the status quo; secondly, the culture of no-change which limits the ability of the teachers to either conceive or believe that they are capable of formulating strategies of change. The teachers' limited experience of change and acceptance of the present traditional, time-honoured practices created scepticism of the worth of new ideas and thereby a disinclination to act. It was only when staff perceived a failure of management and leadership to provide and attain even the most basic educational objectives, that they united and forced change. However, the present curriculum was perceived by staff to be not that bad - after all it had functioned for the last hundred years - and the risks that the new changes implied were considered too great. The initial fervour was swamped by stagnating organisational realities. The curriculum change after initial fostering, festered and then failed.

The Headmaster had to resolve the paradox of being a leader of *virtù*, and yet not resorting to amoral methods to achieve stability of purpose and direction. He needed to equate *necessità*, the humanistic dilemma of action with *virtù*, the moral dimension of those actions. Unintended consequences of passive resistance non-participation and absenteeism were, however, the consequences of the Headmaster's actions and inactions; the vagaries of *fortuna*, the awareness of the Headmaster to the repercussions of actions undertaken, were not recognised or accepted by him. His actions, by default or by design, perpetuated the existing curriculum framework.

The processes of change were significantly affected by the culture of the School. The staff and the curriculum committee's lack of power, political naivety, fragile communication skills, acceptance of traditional decision-making policies, fear of sanctioned responses to inappropriate behaviour all contributed to a culture which discouraged and inhibited change. It is proposed that nothing will change significantly until there is either a different Headmaster, staff unite and thereby become more empowered, or agents of change have both the cultural and political skills and understanding to effect innovation.

RECOMMENDED STRATEGIES FOR THIS COMMITTEE OF CHANGE

Why did the curriculum change fail?

Ultimately the change failed because the committee members were unable to convince the Headmaster of its benefits. Neither did they possess the political strategies or guile with which to persuade him, nor the power to pursue their cause. The cost of open confrontation and conflict was seen to be too high. The committee left itself no other options but to pursue this course, a course which they rejected. It was no wonder, therefore, that the committee resigned itself to a quiet demise.

As delays to the process became apparent, the initial euphoria was not enough to counter the conflict that was in evidence in other quarters of the School. Staff's time and energy were sapped elsewhere and they saw the curriculum changes as a war of attrition that they could not win. There were other battles to fight.

Staff were not a unified group. The Staff Association as a body was ineffectual and there was no other powerful, sizeable internal lobby group which could have supported the committee; indeed the committee members had isolated themselves from the staff and by doing so had lost any patronage.

What options could the committee have employed?

This study indicates that the strategies that the curriculum committee members needed to employ, must reflect their cultural awareness. In this scenario of change the curriculum committee had three main options: be a partisan group and deliberately oppose what they knew would be culturally unacceptable to the Headmaster; strive to convince the Headmaster of the benefits to **him** of the timetable changes; or, implement changes but on a much smaller scale, at subject faculty level, to demonstrate the success of the system. These strategies all required political judgement and cultural knowledge on the part of the agents of change.

Option 1

- * Inform staff directly of the problems they were encountering. Ignore the Headmaster's request to be privy first to the outcomes of the committee. Invent all sorts of reasons, real or otherwise, to hold meetings with staff so that issues could be discussed.

- * Empower staff. Select seemingly inconsequential matters which the staff would like implemented and make every effort to ensure that they became policy. This would give the teachers a sense of achievement and a whiff of their own power and control.
- * Publicly encourage those teachers who did voice their ideas and opinions to promote active exchange of educational ideas. There was safety in numbers.
- * Do not take 'no' for an answer. Be openly confrontational when the occasion demanded, citing, as defence, the mandate from the staff for curriculum change.

These and other strategies needed to be employed by the committee if this option were chosen. However, this would have been a dangerous strategy, the stakes were high and staff concerned had to be prepared to accept any sanctioned responses. This option was not for the faint hearted. However, this approach was undertaken with success by the teachers once before with the early departure of the last Headmaster. The present Headmaster was thus aware of the consequences of staff empowerment. His sanctioned responses to this 'direct' strategy would, as many teachers could testify, be particularly swift and personally damaging.

Option 2

- * Acknowledge where the power lay, incorporate the Headmaster into the discussions, seek his advice and make him feel part of the change process to increase his ownership rather than see him as a person who must be confronted and overcome.
- * Use external experts to allay the fears of the Headmaster as to the validity of the proposed changes and the management risk involved.
- * Seek the Headmaster's advice and opinion.
- * Lobby and seek the help of tribal elders and interested parties like the P & F and students.

The above, overtly political strategy was used by the committee but only to a limiting effect. They did not actively incorporate the Headmaster into their discussions and saw him as a threat to be overcome. The committee did not use the tribal elders effectively and sought only limited help from outside experts or interest groups. The committee also failed to

communicate effectively with staff or use their skills, with the result that an emotional distance developed. In other words the strategies that the committee adopted to effect their plans were ill-defined, vague and failed to come to terms with their undoubted cultural knowledge. They oscillated between contrition and partisanship and did not confront the issue of what to do when their detailed plans, deliberately or otherwise, fell behind schedule or were thwarted. The committee discussed the problems that they might face and even talked about what to do when, and not if, they were opposed. However, no one was prepared to take the risk of opposing the Headmaster's wishes and until this happened there could be no change to the established order. The present staff will now not act until a new Headmaster arrives. It is clear that the cycle of no-change will again be repeated until someone makes a stand who has both the cultural knowledge, political strategies to implement change and secure in their power base.

Option 3

- * Introduce the changes on a much smaller scale in the more junior years, at the subject department level, where the Coordinators did have power to implement change.
- * Demonstrate to the Headmaster the success of the curriculum initiatives with concrete results and external approval
- * Minimise the risk. If failure occurred then the consequences might be acceptable, limiting and therefore justifiable.

This last option recognises the Headmaster's position as the person who would ultimately be called to account if the changes failed. It allows changes to be made with little consultation and within the already accepted spheres of influence of the curriculum committee.

This option dramatically reduces the risk to the Headmaster, allows experimentation at a level which would minimise changes to existing traditions and the status quo, demonstrates the value of the changes and requires a shorter timeframe for implementation.

The committee considered this option but evidence from the experiences of other schools suggested that this 'small scale' approach was fraught with logistical difficulties and would fail to have any significant benefits. It was rejected.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

(a) Implications for Organisational Change

In this study the strategies of change were governed and decided in reference to the organisational culture of the School. Well-planned and well-structured programs of action come to nought, as has been demonstrated here, unless change agents can adopt strategies which take note of the social and cultural dynamics of the institution. The processes of change are interwoven with a knowledge of how the individuals, or groups, actually operate and change strategies must be based on this knowledge.

Uncovering the organisational culture plays a dominant role in this research because without its appreciation any interpretations as to how the structure can be changed are meaningless. A comprehension of the cultural perceptions of the teachers of this School is crucial and fundamental to any analysis of change. How are ideas communicated? How are decisions made and by whom? Do the teachers feel they can voice differing opinions in staff meetings? Does the Headmaster encourage a free and open debate on contentious issues? Do the staff think they can contribute to the mechanisms by which decisions are reached? What experiences of the staff have been communicated through the collective culture which might affect their wish to participate in new changes? What are the sanctionable activities that staff avoid? What past episodes have affected how the Headmaster might react to certain situations? Who are the tribal elders who can be called upon to convince the decision-makers of the opportunities presented by the proposed changes? Is, in fact, the culture of the School one of no-change rather than change?

These and other **cultural** questions must be asked and answered before a full picture of the operation of a school can be developed. Only then can appropriate strategies be adopted which will present the best chances of success and allow implementation of the innovative ideas. It is the lack of an understanding of the organisational culture of educational establishments that gives rise to the dichotomy between actual practice and theory. The feelings, thoughts, goals and aspirations of the teachers themselves give clues as to how a school is really managed and what steps have to be undertaken before change is realised.

The teachers and the curriculum committee at the School were fully aware of how decisions were made, they knew the tribal elders who had the influence to turn the opinions of the Headmaster. They appreciated the fragility of staff enthusiasm and morale and how easily might their optimism for change dissipate. They understood the significance of staff owning the change and the necessity of sound and competent planning to persuade the Headmaster of

the benefits that the change might bring. They acknowledged the channels of communication and the methods by which new ideas were discussed and the restricted access of staff to controversial issues. They were cognisant of the leadership style of the Headmaster, his weaknesses and strengths and what actions he would tolerate and others which might raise his ire.

The committee, therefore, understood the culture of the School and the personality traits of the Headmaster. Their collective wisdom could pin-point astutely the problems they might encounter as the timeframe of action unfolded. The committee was aware of **all** the major problems that did indeed eventuate. The staff disappointment as the committee failed to deliver on its brief, the difficulties of convincing the Headmaster of their ideas, the resistance to the change of traditional routines and structures and the need to produce relatively quickly a model which might be trialed were but some of the problems recognised by the committee and upon which, despite these insights, they still stumbled.

Why was it then that the staff embarked upon change at all if they were so culturally aware? Should they not have recognised the folly of attempting to change the curriculum structure in the first place without the Headmaster's open and enthusiastic support?

What has to be recognised here is that this cultural knowledge is but the first stage of cultural awareness that change agents must possess. The second is to develop strategies to deal effectively with the difficulties they rightly assess will eventuate. Staff were culturally aware but wrongly presumed that their initial fervour and idealism would be enough to precipitate change. Staff's value-rationalism far out-weighed their political astuteness.

The curriculum committee recognised the style of leadership of the Headmaster, the means by which ideas were communicated and controlled, the methods by which decisions were reached, the degree to which the teachers were able to empower their professional lives, the scale of the change and the significance of its impact on the traditional structures of the School, identified those members of staff who had more influence than others and other cultural parameters which needed to be detailed before understanding was complete. However, this was not enough. The next step in the change process is to build on this cultural knowledge and develop political strategies to formulate appropriate plans of action which reflect this organisational climate.

To be successful a plan of action, the timeframe and the tactics must be based on this cultural awareness. The curriculum committee developed some strategies to accommodate the passage of the curriculum changes but failed to address the major issue of convincing the Headmaster

that the timetable restructuring was not only beneficial to the future development of the School but would not threaten his position with the Council nor upset the status quo to an extent which might provoke a backlash from disgruntled external clientele, namely Old-Boys and the P & F.

The curriculum committee despite its cultural perceptions did not know how to overcome the obstacles which it **knew** would become apparent. The committee did not conceptualise fully the strategies that needed to be employed to ensure that they were successful and more importantly what steps to take when they met resistance.

This required a political sophistication which was not in evidence at this School. It required time, skill, tenacity and above all moral courage. The committee members all too often skirted the bigger issues because they could retreat to the haven of the classroom in times of trouble. They had not been schooled in how changes were to be made. They had never experienced radical change and accepted too readily no-change as a matter of tradition.

The committee realised that at some stage someone, and it should have been them, needed to take a stand. No one, however, when the time came was willing to do this. The perceived risks were considered too great; there was no one who wished to hold their heads above the parapet. Too many in the past had had them blown off.

The great irony, or at least, contradiction, of the staff's desire to implement curriculum initiatives was that even though they wished to effect change they ultimately settled for the comfort of no-change instead. Change was seen as an exciting intellectual challenge but the responsibilities encompassed were either ignored, thought of as too risky, not fully understood or rejected when too many difficulties arose.

The teachers were poor implementers of change as even though they recognised the prevailing culture of the School, still idealistically thought of curriculum change as an analytical, rational and linear process even though their pragmatic cultural awareness told that the path to success would be anything other than straightforward or ingenuous. The curriculum committee recognised that there were many cultural parameters which would deflect the course of their initiatives and yet their plans of action failed to address them.

In this study organisational change is not seen as a linear process, neither is it considered rational, prosaic or complete. Staff recognised that the processes of change were evolute phenomena with loci centred on power, leadership and the culture of the organisation. It is also not suggested here that change cannot take place without structural change. Not only did

the staff at the School not desire it - even though it is clearly apparent that they would have been unable, unwilling or inexperienced to do so - but they saw these other factors as prohibiting change.

(b) Possible Strategies for Agents of Change

It is proposed that change agents internal or external, must be aware of the following fundamental principles of change implementation:

- * an understanding of the organisational culture especially barriers to change;
- * the development of strategies of change which accommodate the weaknesses, strengths and uniqueness of the organisational culture;
- * an acceptance by the change agents that change requires moral courage;
- * an analysis of the differing temporal aspects of power;
- * a recognition that the wielding of hierarchical power significantly affects those who suffer the decisions of such power; and,
- * a realisation that innovative ideas are fragile, they require energy, tolerance, understanding and, above all nurture.

Strategies for successful change cannot be formed before the cultural dynamics of the organisation are understood. Assessment must initially be made of the cultural parameters, the styles of leadership, means of communication, the degree of empowerment of the staff, the decision-making processes and other issues which have been highlighted in this research. These strategies must reflect this culture and either adopt policies which will circumvent problem areas or use present policies to best advantage. When the strategies have been planned it must be recognised by the agents of change that battles, if the organisational dynamics are so structured, will have to be fought. Someone will have to take a stand and argue for change. This requires courage and a position of power.

(c) Possible Directions for Future Research

The majority of the change literature has centred on differing models or strategies of change, Caldwell and Spink's (1988) 'collaborative' model, Havelock's (1973) structured and linear stages of planned change, Zaltman and Duncan's (1977) assessment of the degree of 'pressure' - in other words power - to be used, or Kets de Vries and Miller's (1985) detailed analysis of the effects of leadership characteristics and many, many others consider alternative approaches to facilitate the implementation of change. However, no **one** methodology reflects the multitude of differing organisational cultures evident in schools; it behoves any change agent to study this culture as the chosen model for change must be based on this initial assessment of the political and social dynamics of the institution. It may then be possible to discern what framework of planned organisational change may be appropriate. It may be that teachers simply need a greater sense of self-esteem and self-worth with change induced through individual and group empowerment or, as Ellzey (1979: 159) suggests, change agents could utilise constructive conflict so that 'the expression of negative feelings allows for positive feelings and ideas to emerge and be supported'.

Owens and Steinhoff (1976) describe the relationships between interacting subsystems but neglect the over-riding significance of power in their model. As Giddens (1968: 268) remarks, 'power extends as deeply into the roots of social life as do values and norms' and it is certainly evident in this study that the effects of power are ubiquitous and need further research, especially coupled with Hall and Hord's (1987) 'concerns-based' approach which acknowledges the importance of teachers' perceptions and feelings to effective change.

It is suggested here that before any strategies, models, frameworks or tactics can be employed the culture of the institution is a key deciding factor in the direction to be taken. Pertaining to schools, more research needs to be undertaken which not only follows this cultural dimension but which also recognises the part played by the teachers themselves and their perceptions of organisational reality that affect which program of change to follow. Key aspects of this culture are reflected through the enabling and constraining duality of traditional power structures (Giddens 1979), particularly as they affect the actions of staff.

However, there will continue to be a disparity between educational theory and practice until new ideas are tolerated, voiced and argued at a scholarly, open level. There will be no innovation in schools until school leaders encourage a 'fearlessness of revision' and accept the benefits of a culture of change rather than no-change. The hierarchical exercise of power will continue to provoke unintended consequences until its effects on teacher morale and involvement are assessed and recognised. There will continue to be a shadow between

teachers' dreams and their creation until there is more research which sheds further light on why it is that there is nothing more difficult to execute nor more dubious of success than to try and establish a new order of things.