

Chapter Eleven

Leading the Change Process

Superintendents, top-level union leaders, and board of education members—if they have the will and the inclination—are the people in the school district who are positioned to relate to the larger community and to sources of political and economic power in ways that make it possible to sustain serious change efforts over a long period of time. The key to systemic reform, therefore, is the development of the capacity of school districts to support and sustain reform efforts at the building level and to ensure that those who occupy top-level positions in the system have the inclinations and skills to use this capacity to the fullest. To do this, educational leaders must think and act in strategic ways, for it is through strategy that the future is invented.

Three Types of Change

At least three types of change exist: procedural change, technological change, and structural and cultural (systemic) change:

1. *Procedural change* consists of altering the way the job is done. Such changes usually have to do with the sequence in which events occur, the speed with which they occur, or the forms that give shape and direction to action. For instance, in determining the process by which a patient is admitted to a hospital, it makes little

difference whether blood pressure is taken prior to, concurrent with, or after taking her or his temperature. What does make a difference is ensuring that all the necessary steps are taken. However, some sequences are more efficient than others, and often the quest for efficiency leads to procedural changes. For example, taking patients' temperature concurrently with assessing their blood pressure saves time.

2. *Technological change* consists of changing the means by which the job is done, for example, switching from typewriters to word processors to prepare manuscripts or switching from a mercury to an electronic thermometer to take patients' temperatures. In both examples, the job being done remains the same; the means by which it is done is all that has changed.

3. *Structural and cultural (systemic) change* consists of changing the nature of the work itself, reorienting its purpose, and refocusing its intent. For example, many American businesses are now attempting to focus their activity on customers and their needs, whereas in the past their focus may have been on the technical properties of products. Such changes require alterations in rules, roles, and relationships as well as in beliefs, values, and orientations. It is this kind of change that is suggested by the term *systemic change*, for it requires alterations in both the structure of the organization (the system of rules, roles, and relationships) and the culture (the system of beliefs, values, and orientations) in which the structure is embedded.

In the life of healthy organizations, procedural change and incremental technological change are relatively commonplace occurrences; consequently, leaders have considerable experience in managing these types of changes. Equally important, researchers and consultants who write about these changes have numerous cases to use for study and discussion. Until recently, in fact, most empirical studies of change have focused on technological and procedural change rather than on systemic change. For example, studies in agriculture and medicine regarding the processes by which innovations are adopted and adapted were typically interested in determining the characteristics of early and later adapters. To the extent that they were concerned with systemic and cultural issues, they usually dealt with the attributes of people rather than

Parts of this chapter appeared in Phillip C. Schlechty, "On the Frontier of School Reform with Trailblazers, Pioneers, and Settlers," *Journal of Staff Development*, Fall 1993, 14(4), 46-51. The author would like to thank the *Journal of Staff Development*.

of systems. Thus procedural and technological change are much better understood than is systemic change.

It should not be surprising that structural and cultural change in organizations is relatively uncommon, for it challenges the roots of an organization and the assumptions upon which it is based. It focuses on an organization's purpose (its reason for being); the rules, roles, and relationships that determine how that purpose will be pursued; and the beliefs, values, and commitments that give meaning to the rules, roles, and relationships that give rise to the sense of purpose that gives direction to the life of the organization. Such changes are not undertaken lightly or often, for they are cataclysmic events in the life of the organization. Thus they are not as accessible to study and analysis as are technological and procedural changes.

Implications for Leaders

Procedural change is largely a matter of communication, monitoring, evaluation, and enforcement. The new procedure must be described and communicated to those who are to use it. Sometimes this is done in writing, sometimes in workshops, sometimes in one-on-one conversations. Persuasion may be involved if old habits have come to be valued, and even in the simplest forms of procedural change, those who must act on the change need to have some ownership of it, but the complexity of this leadership task is relatively low.

After the change has been communicated, some means must be established to ensure that the new procedure is implemented and old patterns are not reestablished. Sometimes this involves nothing more than a cursory inspection, but it may require intensive feedback and support sessions. Much depends on how deeply ingrained the old procedure was, how much value the workers placed on it, and how convinced they are that the new procedure will, in the long run, make their lives somehow better.

Finally, some effort should be expended, though it often is not, in determining whether the change in procedure produces the intended results and does not produce any unintended and undesirable results. For example, Northwest Airlines, which historically had a poor on-time record, has become known as the "on-time air-

line" through two procedural changes: adding time to each flight, which gave the airline some leeway in the schedule, and rigidly enforcing on-time departures. As a result, Northwest Airlines regularly appears as the leader in percentage of on-time departures and arrivals.

But the story does not end there. It is also the case that, on average, Northwest flights take longer for passengers, and Northwest personnel feel much less able to respond to some situations: for example, delaying a departure by two minutes might allow a customer coming in on another flight to make a connection, but that delay isn't allowed under rigid enforcement of on-time rules. As a result, although on-time departures have increased, flexibility and response to the needs of individual customers may have suffered.

The Northwest Airlines illustration indicates one of the greatest dangers confronting leaders who are bent on procedural change: they need to be clear on the goals to be served by the change. Northwest's leaders must ask if the goal was to improve customer service or to improve on-time performance. If it was the former, then a too-rigid adherence to on-time rules may have led to negative consequences; if the latter, then rigid adherence to the rules may be appropriate, in spite of the impact on individual customers. Procedural changes that are not evaluated in terms of the values of the system can distort those values in the long term.

Technological change, like procedural change, requires communication, monitoring, and evaluation. However, technological changes require considerably more attention to training and support than procedural changes. The development of new skills is likely to be necessary if technological changes are to be implemented effectively. People cannot do what they do not know how to do. It is therefore the obligation of leaders to ensure that those they lead know how to do what is expected of them.

Much of the best thinking about staff development in education is associated with the implementation of technological changes, that is, changes in the means of doing the job, whatever the means and whatever the job. Bruce Joyce and Beverly Showers (1987) have much to say about these matters, and I will not try to add or detract from what they have said. Suffice it to say that supporting technological change requires much more than instituting awareness workshops; it requires as well the creation of

opportunities to practice and observe and opportunities to be coached and to coach others. When the effort to install technological changes fails, it is likely that leaders have simply not appreciated and provided for the quality of training and support that is required. Or the effort may fail because of the fact that in schools, as in other organizations, technological changes often require structural changes too.

Systemic change, which usually involves procedural and technological changes as well, calls upon leaders to do all the things they must do to lead procedural and technological change—and more. It also calls on them to think, to conceptualize, to see relationships between and among events that might escape others, to help others see these relationships and overcome fear, and to assure, cajole, coach, and inspire hope. Most of all, systemic change calls upon leaders to be wise and sometimes demanding but always to be supportive of and reassuring to teachers.

Four Key Questions

As a leader who teaches, a leader who would promote systemic change must be prepared to answer four key questions:

1. Why is change needed?
2. What kind of change is needed and what will it mean for us when the change comes about?
3. Is what we are being asked to do really possible? Has it been done before? By whom? Can we see it in practice?
4. How do we do it? What skills do we need and how will they be developed?

These questions, properly framed, suggest four different types of lessons that leaders must teach and that need to be learned if the change process is to be properly directed. The first question—Why change?—calls for the analysis of values, beliefs, and commitments and context; studies of the past; and anticipation of the future. The type of lesson required is a *value clarification* lesson. The second question—What is it?—is asking that a vision, direction, or intention be clearly stated and articulated in a way that allows the person asking the question to understand the answer and make it

his or her own. The type of lesson required is a *concept development* lesson.

The third question—Can it be done?—is a request for real-life hands-on experience or testimony from those who have had such an experience. The type of lesson required is a *demonstration* lesson. The final question—How do we do it?—is a request for assistance in developing the skills and habits required to do the job. The type of lesson required is a *skill development* lesson.

Value clarification lessons rely heavily on dialogue, discussion, and logical analysis. Such lessons require detailed attention to the values participants bring to the discussion, the values the proposed change promises to enhance or serve, and the values the change is likely to threaten. Among the values most likely to be threatened by any radical change is that of security. Consequently, those who would promote systemic change must be carefully attuned to the significance various actors give to this value, for some of the greatest resistance to change can occur in protecting this value.

Those who are best at concept development often seem to rely heavily on the Socratic dialogue, focused discussion, and pointed questions, combined with the use of figurative language (indicating what the concept is like) and counterexamples intended to distinguish the concept from other notions with which it might be confused. For example, I began this discussion with a distinction between three types of change. Now I am using the fact that I made this distinction as an example of another concept, the concept of a concept development lesson.

Demonstration lessons require the existence of models and exemplars—real or contrived, empirically demonstrable, or theoretically described. Those who ask the question, *Can it be done?* are seeking assurance that what they are being called on to do is possible and that if they commit effort to the task, it is likely that they can do what the concept or vision calls on them to do. The techniques associated with demonstration lessons are those commonly referred to as modeling and illustrating and—where real-life situations do not yet exist—simulating actions based on theoretically derived models.

Skill development lessons, like demonstration lessons, usually rely heavily on modeling and simulation, but they are more likely to be active and involve coaching, experimental tries, corrective

feedback, and opportunities to practice than is the case with demonstration lessons. Demonstration lessons are intended to be persuasive, to show that things can be done. Skill development lessons are intended to develop the understandings, skills, attitudes, and habits of mind that permit people to do with confidence and ease what at first is exceedingly difficult, awkward, and perhaps even threatening and frightening.

Five Types of Actors

As I view the matter, at least five types of actors participate in any change process. Each of these types requires a different kind of support from those who are charged with responsibility for leading the change effort. Furthermore, those who play different roles in the change process have different needs for some of the lessons described. It is therefore critical that leaders understand whom they are addressing at different stages in the process, for the needs of different actors will be different from time to time.

Trailblazers

Paradigm-breaking journeys are not for the timid, and we should not expect everyone, or even almost everyone, to willingly be among the first to undertake such a trip. Those who take the first steps in systemic change are *trailblazers*: they are willing to go, in terms understood by *Star Trek* fans, where no person has gone before, without maps and without the benefit of empirically based models and with little to guide them except belief in themselves, a desire for novelty, the freedom to try, and the vision that motivates and guides them.

The most important requirement for trailblazers is a clear, guiding vision. Trailblazers want to know that they can go someplace that is different; they are motivated by novelty or excited by risks. Once they have found a vision in which they believe, all they want and need is encouragement to pursue it and support for that pursuit. Most of all, trailblazers want to be recognized for their unique brand of courage and to be celebrated, recognized, praised, and honored.

Trailblazers are not egomaniacs, but they are often monomaniacs with a mission. They know where they want to go, even if they are not quite sure how they are going to get there or what obstacles they will confront on the way. When they do confront obstacles, they are likely to view them in highly personal terms, for their vision is a personal vision, and anything that stands in the way of the pursuit of that vision is a personal threat. As a result, trailblazers have a need for a great deal of personal and personalized support.

Leaders should be sensitive to the fact that trailblazers need to be reinforced constantly in the view that the vision they are pursuing is worth the quest and that others, especially powerful others, see what they do as important enough to give them unusual latitude and provide them with unconventional forms of support, such as noncategorical funding, flexible schedules, or special access to the human and physical resources of the system. Equally important, trailblazers need to be reminded constantly that they are on a community quest, not a private venture. The vision the trailblazer is pursuing is a private one; it is up to other leaders in the system to link this to a larger vision. (Daniel Boone may simply have wanted "elbow room," but national leaders saw that he, and especially those who followed him, could have an effect on America's claim to be a nation that spread from shore to shore, which was later articulated as America's "manifest destiny.")

Because trailblazers are leading the way into a new world, whether that world is a physical frontier or the creation of a new system or new way of doing business, they seldom have access to a body of research and experience to guide them. What, then, do they use as guides? First, they use experiences they and others have gained in circumstances that are analogous to those they are about to confront. It is not coincidental, I think, that the language of space travel is laced with terminology that refers to early explorers who took voyages on the ocean, just as spaceships now take voyages to the moon. Even the names of spacecraft often refer to other explorers in other times. Trailblazers need, therefore, the opportunity to visit with and read about trailblazers from other fields (for example, from business, the military, or medical services), and they need time to discuss and assimilate what they learn from these

encounters. From these experiences, relevant analogies are discovered and come to be understood. (I have found that leaders whose language is rich with figures of speech and who argue by analogy are particularly good at inspiring and directing trailblazers.)

A second source of guidance for trailblazers is the experiences of other trailblazers who are moving in roughly the same direction and over the same terrain. The rendezvous was one of the ways early trailblazers on America's frontier got information from other trailblazers. Today we refer to this as networking, a process in which people who are endeavoring to move in a common direction develop mechanisms to ensure regular interactions. Providing opportunities for networking is one of the primary contributions change leaders can make to the continuing growth and development of trailblazers.

It is important to understand that networking and rendezvous do much more than provide opportunities for sharing information. Networking provides opportunities for self-affirmation and more than a bit of bragging and storytelling. Trailblazers need opportunities to meet with other trailblazers, and networking turns lonely ordeals into shared ones. Lonely ordeals debilitate; shared ordeals inspire and motivate. Leaders who listen in on these stories can learn much that will later be of value to pioneers. Furthermore, if leaders watch carefully, they can get some insight as to which of the trailblazers have the temperament and the style to be guides as well as trailblazers, for those who come later will need guides as well.

In addition, it is up to leaders and trailblazers to create conditions in which what the trailblazers learn is not lost. Trailblazers tell stories, but they seldom turn these stories into lessons for others. It is up to leaders, therefore, to ensure that the stories are turned into lessons that can serve as sources of guidance for those who would follow, much as mapmakers translated the tales and reports of the early explorers into crude maps that later "researchers" refined and rendered increasingly accurate. Change leaders should never forget that trailblazers need public acknowledgment for their efforts; they need the opportunity to tell others about where they have been and what they have done. Such storytelling serves not only as a source of information for others but also as a continuing source of motivation for the trailblazers.

Staff development budgets that do not make provision for sending trailblazers to conferences where they can brag a bit are, therefore, inadequate. And leaders are not doing their job if they do not seek every opportunity to put local trailblazers out in front, including helping them write proposals to get support for their work and proposals that will permit them to share their work at conferences.

Pioneers

Closely following the trailblazers are the *pioneers*. Like the trailblazers, pioneers are an adventurous and hardy lot who are willing to take considerable risks. Pioneers have many of the same needs as trailblazers. Concept development lessons (the development of a vision that links a personal quest to a larger agenda) are the most important lessons leaders can offer pioneers, but pioneers also have a considerable need for assurance that the trip upon which they will embark is worthwhile. More than trailblazers, pioneers need demonstrations that help to assure them that the journey they are about to take can, in fact, be made. However, they understand that very few people can teach them how to do it, because no one other than the trailblazers has gone to the frontiers the pioneers are set to explore. Thus pioneers need concept development, value clarification, and demonstration lessons. They do not need skill development lessons, and staff developers would be ill advised to try to provide them.

So what does all of this mean in practical terms? First, it means that when change leaders approach pioneers or are attempting to recruit them, their best allies are those who find the trailblazers of sufficient interest to write about them (see, for example, Fiske, 1991; Sizer, 1992). Rather than providing research data, these authors provide anecdotal accounts, reports, and stories. Such stories can inspire prospective pioneers to take the journey, and contained in them are some possible lessons to be learned regarding what pioneers need to know and be able to do to survive the rigors of the journey.

Even more useful to leaders committed to systemic change in schools are the trailblazers themselves, especially if they are colorful and good storytellers. Davy Crockett, for example, did much

more to inspire pioneers than he did as a true trailblazer. Indeed, one could argue that he was a staff developer rather than a trailblazer, because what he often did was take the stories of others, embellish them a bit, and then use them to inspire others to act.

I have found that trailblazer teachers and administrators are invaluable as sources of inspiration and direction for pioneers and even for settlers (see below). But here a caution is in order. Too often, in their quest for authenticity, change leaders, especially staff development specialists, remove trailblazers from their natural habitat on the frontier and move them into the central office or, worse, to the university campus, in the hope that the stories they will tell will reach a wider audience. Sometimes this works, but more frequently it is a bad experience both for the trailblazers and for those with whom they are to work. The teamwork that it takes to build community, which is what pioneers must do, requires a different style than does the early exploration of new frontiers.

Monomaniacs with a mission can quickly come to appear to others to be egomaniacs whose only mission is to advance themselves. Trailblazers are needed, but they are not easy to live with in the sedate environments of committee meetings and seminar rooms.

Settlers

After the trailblazers and the pioneers come the *settlers*. Settlers need to know what they are expected to do and where they are going to go. They need much more detail and more carefully drawn maps than do those who have gone before them. Settlers are bold, but they are not adventurers. They need to be persuaded that the venture upon which they are being asked to embark is worthwhile. Consequently, leaders must give careful attention to developing good value clarification lessons that help the settlers understand why the change is needed. Settlers also want assurance that they are not set on a fool's mission and that what is being suggested can be done; thus, they have considerable need for demonstration lessons such as site visits where pioneering work is already under way, conversations with pioneers and trailblazers, testimonials from those who have tried, and books and articles that provide rich descriptions of what can be expected.

Much more than either pioneers or trailblazers, settlers want skill development lessons. They want to be sure that they know how to do what they are required to do. Indeed, many potential settlers will not move until they are assured that the requisite knowledge and support are available to them. Change leaders and staff developers who support them must therefore give attention to providing systematic training supported by coaching, opportunities for feedback and critique, and above all, protection from negative consequences for faulty tries and failed efforts. (It is here that the ideas of writers like Joyce and Showers, 1987, regarding the design and delivery of staff development become especially useful.)

Perhaps the most critical thing to remember about settlers is that they need strong, constant, and reassuring leadership that inspires them to keep going when they are tempted to turn back. Those who would work with settlers must understand that systemic change does not make things better or easier in the short run; instead, it is likely to create uncertainty, doubt, and confusion. The new practices called for are likely to be frightening and demanding, and the results may be no better—at least in the short run—than doing things the old way. Fullan's notion (1991) of the "implementation dip" comes to mind here; it assumes that a natural part of the change process is short-term deterioration in performance capacity, because the old way of doing things, although perhaps not as good as the new way, has one advantage: it is familiar and people know how to do it. The new way is unfamiliar and requires learning and practice.

Without persistent leadership by people who have been there and without encouragement from others who are going there (this country's settlers traveled in wagon trains, not alone), it is unlikely that settlers will stay the course. Accordingly, it is critical that leaders understand the terrain well enough to point out progress, especially when those who are unfamiliar with the terrain become discouraged. Benchmarks of progress are, therefore, essential, and feedback regarding progress toward these benchmarks is critical. Assessment and constant monitoring, coupled with public appraisals of progress toward restructuring goals, are important. For example, improved student performance is certainly a goal of restructuring and systemic change, but an intermediate goal might be to have teachers and building administrators become more

systematic in using data regarding student performance to evaluate the merit and worth of decisions they make.

Helping settlers learn how to use such data and evidence of progress in the use of the data are necessary antecedents to answering the question, Does restructuring and systemic change improve student performance? Until such changes have occurred, this question cannot be answered. The first-order assessment questions for those who are engaged in the change are, therefore, What evidence do we have that we are, in fact, doing our business differently today than we did yesterday? and, Why do we think the new way of doing business will improve our results? Settlers need the answers to such questions, both to keep them going and to provide assurance that where they are going is worth the effort.

Stay-at-Homes

Two situations motivate change:

1. Present conditions are so intolerable or dangerous to people's interests and values that the only alternative is to do something. The Puritans who left England to settle in America were driven by such motives.
2. A new and compelling vision inspires so much hope of a new day, a better life, or a full realization of existing values that risks seem tolerable when measured against the rewards. The utopian settlements on the American frontier are examples of such vision-driven change.

However, as the Declaration of Independence states so eloquently, basic changes are not lightly undertaken, and people will tolerate a great deal rather than give up what is known. Furthermore, intolerable or threatening conditions, although they can serve as an initial impetus for change, cannot sustain change. In fact, negative forces are seldom adequate to motivate fundamental change and almost never adequate to sustain it. The *Mayflower* Puritans, who had among them some trailblazers, some pioneers, and a substantial number of reluctant and frightened settlers, may have left England because of oppression, but it did not take their leaders long to recognize that a new and compelling vision would be required to sustain them. This new vision, expressed first in the

Mayflower Compact and reinforced by visions based in religious symbols, was as important to the settlement of the New World as were the oppressive conditions that motivated at least some of the *Mayflower* passengers.

Yet it is sometimes forgotten that many Puritans stayed behind; not all boarded the *Mayflower*. Some came to America later, and some never came. Many wanted to come to the New World but could not get up the nerve to try. Others gave up the faith rather than go, and a few even joined the oppressors. Indeed, most of the *Mayflower* Puritans had earlier gone to Holland to escape oppression. Furthermore, not all who came on the *Mayflower* were Puritans; some were adventurers bent on personal gain. And not everyone signed, or ascribed to, the shared vision as expressed in the *Mayflower Compact*.

Stay-at-homes are not bad people, but in the long term of history, they are not likely to be viewed as remarkable or memorable. How many Tory supporters of King George are American students today expected to recall? At the time a change is being contemplated, however, *stay-at-homes* receive a great deal of attention—I think too much. The reason they receive so much attention is that leaders of systemic change tend to be gregarious people who need approval from those they want to lead. People who do not respond enthusiastically, or at least compliantly, to the desires of change leaders are often viewed as problems and, unfortunately for the change process, such problems get attention.

Effective change leaders understand that early in the change process it is probably not wise to spend too much energy trying to convince the *stay-at-homes* that they, too, need to move to the frontier. These leaders accept the fact that some *stay-at-homes* will never come along, that those who do change will only do so after the pioneers and settlers have done their work very well, and that some will only come to the new land for a visit.

One of the greatest dangers when dealing with *stay-at-homes* in the restructuring process is that the strategies used to entice them to change may backfire and convert these relatively benign actors into supporters of the saboteurs (discussed later in this chapter). And saboteurs, whose favorite strategy is to sow distrust through rumors and misinformation, will destroy even the best-organized wagon train if they can gain enough followers. The most likely sources of recruits for the change resisters and saboteurs are

the stay-at-homes and the more timid settlers who feel pressured to move before they have the assurances they need and before they have identified leaders whom they trust.

I have found that the best strategy to use with stay-at-homes, at least in the early stages of structural and cultural change, is benign neglect, coupled with as much generosity of spirit as is possible. We must remember that those who do not particularly want to change are not necessarily opposed if others choose to change. Many stay-at-homes stay at home because they truly love the place. Of course, some people simply are too timid to go to unfamiliar places. Such people are not likely to be encouraged to move by direct assaults on what they currently value or threats to what little security they now enjoy. Instead, they will join with those who for other reasons do not want to change: the saboteurs.

Saboteurs

It is important to understand that *saboteurs*, unlike garden-variety change resisters—that is, the stay-at-homes—are actively committed to stopping change. Not only do they refuse to take the trip; they do not want others to go either. Why is this the case? Obviously, this question calls for more profound psychological insight than I can provide. But I do know that most who take on the role of saboteur do so because they get something out of this role that they do not see themselves able to get out of supporting change. I have also observed that some of the most effective saboteurs have many qualities and needs that are strikingly similar to those of the trailblazers: they are often “lone rangers” and they are not afraid of taking risks.

The difference is that whereas trailblazers will go where others fear to go, saboteurs are likely to stay when others are beginning to be afraid to stay. Loneliness does not have the same meaning to them as it has to the settlers, and isolation often inspires them to even greater effort. To be persecuted, it seems, is to be appreciated and, in a perverse way, to be isolated or excluded is to be honored.

It is certain that saboteurs can cause trouble no matter where they are, but I have found that the best place to have them is on the inside where they can be watched rather than on the outside where they can cause trouble without its being detected until the

effects have been felt. Certainly, saboteurs can be disruptive, and some will not cooperate even enough to communicate their concerns. However, if change leaders continue to reach out to saboteurs and critics and try hard to hear what the saboteurs are saying, they sometimes will learn a great deal. Among the things to be learned is that some saboteurs were once trailblazers and pioneers, but the leaders whom they had the misfortune to follow did not give them the support they needed and abandoned them at the first sign of trouble.

Resistance and Commitment

Creating commitment to change is not the same thing as overcoming resistance to change. To create commitment, leaders must understand motives. Trailblazers are motivated by novelty, by excitement, and sometimes by the possibility of fame and glory. Pioneers often begin their journey because of intolerable conditions, but they will stay the course only if they become convinced that the new world is really better. Settlers need to know, almost certainly, that the world they are being asked to move to is better than the one they are leaving and that the way to get there is known. And, most of all, they need to know that they are not taking the trip alone.

Stay-at-homes will only move when nearly all of their friends and neighbors have deserted them or when they muster the courage to “come for a visit” and find that they like it better where their old acquaintances are than where they themselves have stayed. Some saboteurs will never come along, and even if they do, they may make the trip as difficult as possible. But as mentioned earlier, saboteurs—quite frequently in my experience—are simply people who behaved as trailblazers and pioneers in some prior movement to another frontier and were betrayed by their leaders. As a result, these people became cynical about the prospects of change or the likelihood that those who espouse the newest clarification call for change really mean it and will stay the course.

Whether the present demand that our schools be restructured will be positively responded to remains to be seen. But I am confident of one thing: without leaders who will stay the course and without staff developers who understand what leads men and women to

the frontier in the first place and what these men and women need to keep on going, all our efforts to reform our schools will fail.

Conclusion

Sociologists and anthropologists have long been aware of the effects of structure and culture, but it is only relatively recently that those who are concerned with more pragmatic matters related to leadership and the management of change have begun to consider the systemic properties of life in organizations. The result is that most of what is known about leadership in the area of structural and cultural change is derived from studies of political leadership in revolutionary periods and religious leadership in times of reform and upheaval. James McGregor Burns's book *Leadership* (1978), which has contributed so much to our thinking about leadership and change (Burns originated the concepts of transactional and transformational leadership), is a clear illustration of this type of work.

Until recently, however, structural and cultural change has been viewed by many as largely beyond the direct control of leaders and planners. Therefore, rather than asking, How can organizations be reoriented so that they do new things and serve new ends? leaders and planners have asked, How can organizations be made to serve the ends they now serve more efficiently? and, How can organizations do the jobs they now do better? Given these latter questions, culture and structure are likely to be viewed as impediments to change, rather than as the content that must be changed.

In any event, this condition is now being changed. Over the past fifteen years, largely through the work of authors like Deal and Kennedy (1982), Peters and Waterman (1982), Ouchi (1981), Pascale and Athos (1981), and others operating out of the tradition of the McKinsey & Company consulting firm, business leaders and educators have been made more aware of the impact of culture on performance and the significance of leaders in shaping symbols and traditions. Writers such as Rosabeth Moss Kanter have done, and are doing, much to help us gain insight into the role of leaders in bringing about change in organizations and the culture of organizations, as are scholars like Warren Bennis. Certainly the work

of scholars and consultants such as W. Edwards Deming, Peter Drucker, and Philip B. Crosby has given great impetus to this movement.

But the fact remains that, at an empirical level, much more is known about the management of procedural and technological change than about the management of structural and cultural change. This is particularly true in the field of education. Perhaps what I have written in the preceding pages will encourage the kind of discussion needed if educators are to take advantage of what American business leaders are just now beginning to learn; that much of the variance in performance of all organizations and of the people in those organizations has to do with the properties of the systems themselves rather than with the attributes and motives of individual men and women.

Ending Statement