

57304

other health care specialists to treat primary malnutrition and related diseases. These are but a few of the obvious savings that accrue from investment in environmental control measures.

Unfortunately communities and their correctional agencies too often deny themselves the rich

returns on environmental health investments because they do not sufficiently appreciate the potential returns to be derived from more generous support of environmental control services and do not distinguish between expenditures and investments.

MICROFILM

Strategies for Organizational Change by Working With Administrators

BY J. ROBERT RUSSO, D.ED.

Professor of Psychology, Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville

57304

MODERN SOCIETY has gotten so complex and messed up that the traditional neighbor helping neighbor is simply not enough anymore. Few traditional communities are left. For what are often good reasons, very few of us take care of our older relatives in our own homes when they get feeble. We have convalescent, nursing, and shelter care homes to take care of our old people. Some forms of helping have become a big profitmaking business. Serious abuses are common and many made public. The way our society has organized the delivery of help is easy to criticize. Bureaucratic organization has weaknesses. It is the subject of much ridicule. Your job may look like part of an American sham. You are confronted by one agency, under bureaucrats, with liberty and justice for some. You are too busy using band-aids instead of "miracle drugs" treating symptoms not causes. No one has come up with a good substitute for bureaucracy as a way to organize a group of people to do jobs and at the same time have a way to check on the workers to see that they are doing what they're supposed to do. Many of the weaknesses may not be caused by the structure but by the people who operate it. Who are these people? How can you deal with them to get more of what you and your clients need?

Every bureaucratic organization has adminis-

trators and administrators and administrators. Somehow we have come to relate administration with leadership. Many administrators have been to school and studied the best ways to get you to do your job and to make the organization run smoothly. Administrators have been studied.

Most authors begin by dividing administrators into two categories of some sort and then talk about the different ways these two types of administrators behave. Amitai Etzioni's two major administrative types are instrumental and expressive leaders.¹ The instrumental leader type needs overt respect, stands hostility well, worries a lot about the budget and how it is distributed. Etzioni contrasts this with the expressive leader who needs to be loved and to be friendly. The expressive leader is less able to stand hostility and has a need to maintain a close relationship with people in the various parts of the system. Etzioni's work has been followed by other refinements of the terms "instrumental" and "expressive." MacGregor in *The Human Side of Enterprise*² uses relatively analogous terms—Theory X (instrumental) and Theory Y (expressive). Blake and Morton's³ *Corporate Excellence Through Grid Organization Development* is based on two extremes of leadership styles, concern for production (instrumental) and concern for people (expressive). Drawing on earlier work by the sociologist Talcott Parsons,⁴ Guba and Bridwell,⁵ of the University of Chicago's Midwest Administration Center, defined a middle position of leadership style. The transactional leader is an intermediate type between nomothetic (instrumental) and idiographic (expressive). Additional

¹ Amitai Etzioni, "Dual Leadership in Complex Organizations," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 30, No. 5, October 1965.

² Douglas MacGregor, *The Human Side of Enterprise*, McGraw Hill, N.Y., 1960.

³ Robert R. Blake and Jane S. Morton, *Corporate Excellence Through Grid Organization Development*, Gulf Publishing Co., Houston, 1968.

⁴ Talcott Parsons and Robert Bales, et al., *Family, Socialization and Interaction Process*, Free Press, Glencoe, Ill., 1955.

⁵ Egon G. Guba and C.E. Bridwell, *Administrative Relationships*, Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1957.

detail for each administrative type is developed by these authors dealing with concepts of power, control, authority, subordinate/superordinate relationships, communications, and human relations.

Of more immediate interest are administrative types commonly found in human service organizations. Some of the characteristics and traits discussed below may be found in all of us, but they are especially easy to see in administrators.

"Cut and Cover."—Country folks know what a sickle bar is and how it works. For city folks, a sickle bar is a kind of hay and grass mower that sticks out close to the ground from the side of the machine. It has a series of fixed blades on a bar that moves back and forth against a set of teeth that do not move. If all of the blades are sharp and none of the teeth are broken, all of the grass gets cut with the back and forth motion of the blades against the teeth. The hay falls into a neat pattern in the field. Even if some of the teeth are broken or some of the blades are dull, enough of the hay gets cut so that it pushes over the uncut hay. The appearance of the field is no different than when the hay is properly mowed. Some supervisors cut and cover. The operator of the defective mower isn't found out until it is time to rake and bale the hay. The nursing supervisor isn't found out until the body of the "runaway" patient is found on the floor by his bed.

"Please Mommy or Daddy?"—It is human to want to be liked. Some administrators, bosses, and supervisors behave as if people work harder for somebody they like. A supervisor/staff relationship should be based on more than that. Respect should be based on performance on the part of both the staff and the supervisor. Granted, a lot of adults are still dependent—they need a parent. Some administrators use this need, and some even go as far as to hire and keep a staff of the dependent type. Staff lunches, coffee hours and beer after work look more like a family gathering with father at the head of the table rather than a relaxed work group. This variation of the expressive leadership style is common in "socializing" organizations like schools, churches, and rehabilitation centers. Art Berliner⁶ worked in the Federal penitentiary in Fort Worth and saw a lot of different kinds of administrators in his bureaucracy. He said that the fallacy of this

type of administration is the assumption that adults retain such pervasive dependency attitudes that the function of work is to please Daddy rather than to satisfy more mature needs.

"What Shall We Do?"—Democracy is becoming popular. Participative management is sometimes taken to mean that group decisions are always better than individual effort and responsibility. Even though the majority has often been wrong—a lot of examples like Viet Nam can be provided here—there is often wisdom in numbers. The sharp bosses know when the key staff people should have influence on decisions because these people have information from the firing line that the bosses don't have. On the other hand, the boss sometimes has information that the subordinates do not. The efficient boss makes it clear whether just an opinion is being asked for or whether the group is really going to make the decision. Staff people who get their "head bumped" too many times will rebel. The lumps come when they think what they say really counts only to find out that the decision has already been made. Said professionally, overparticipation in the decision-making process as well as the more frequent decisional deprivation both tend to increase staff dissatisfaction.⁷

"Really Don't Like This Job."—A friend of mine campaigned hard to get elected as the chairperson of an academic department in a university. Within 2 weeks after taking office, he began to draw X's through the dates on a calendar showing how many days he had left in his term as chairperson. Often these X's were drawn with an audience. He would make comments like, "I can't wait to get back to my full-time teaching." There is a group of bosses who apologize for being just that by saying such things as, "Somebody has to do the paper work." These bosses are very uncomfortable when they have to tell people "no" or "We don't have any money for that." There are probably many reasons for this attitude, but it seems that in the helping professions there is a widely held value that the only people who are really making contributions are those in a direct treatment role. It has become very popular to attack and criticize bureaucracy organization, managers, and administrators. It is difficult for some people who have been on the firing line and participating in these attacks on administrators to find themselves as one of the enemy. They need to apologize for their leadership position.

"The Super Helper."—Some administrators

⁶ Arthur Berliner, "Some Pitfalls in Administrative Behavior," *Social Casework*, Vol. 52, November 1971.

⁷ James A. Conway, "Test of Linearity Between Teachers' Participation in Decision Making and Their Perceptions of Their Schools as Organizations," *Administration Science Quarterly*, Vol. 21, March 1976.

treat staff members like clients. When you are with them you get the feeling that you are being treated, educated, rehabilitated, or counseled. This kind of boss seems to enjoy helping you out of predicaments. Extreme cases of this type enjoy taking care of and doing things for the staff. They come across as if what they normally would be expected to do for you is a special favor because they are such concerned persons.

"You, Mr. Staff."—These bosses act as if staff people were working *for* them. They see staff members as extra arms and legs to do their bidding. Of course, you work under the guidance and direction of your bosses. They can get you fired, though they don't pay you. Both you and the boss are paid by the same people. Beyond that, both of you should be working for clients and to deliver service to your consumers.

"The Admiral" (can be female too).—Clean, neat, spotless, scrubbed and tidy are the watch words. The appearance must be "shipshape." The desk and office of this supervisor are always uncluttered. Pride comes from massive index files that are cross-referenced. Personal cleanliness is almost a fetish. They consume a lot of paper. You will be impressed by their concern for your grooming and clothes.

"Mr. Menopause" (can be female too).—Afraid, fearful, shy and indecisive describes them. A lot of these people get to be boss without the usual education and training. From their humble beginnings they have risen higher than they really think they should be—and it shows.

"The Party Line."—This characteristic is seen most often in the largest organizations. You never get to really know what the boss believes. All that is told you has come from "upstairs." If the staff members could read and had copies of the memos and orders, they wouldn't need a boss. They direct you when they are told to direct, they supervise you on schedule, and they evaluate by the forms provided to them.

The Boss's Job

These may seem like attacks on supervisors, managers, and administrators, but let me quickly add that I do not know anybody who is an ideal boss. What we expect of human service administrators probably cannot be found in one person. Skills in human relations, decisionmaking, personnel practices, budget management, project evaluation, program management, planning, and "seer of the future" are a few of the skills and

talents that would help to make a good manager. Those who come the closest to having all these skills would likely be paid much more in private industry than in the management of human services. It is also nice if the boss happens to know something about the actual service the organization is supposed to provide. On top of all of this, you expect the boss to know about your job and understand the daily frustrations that you have. Don't be surprised if your superiors seem to have a lot of other things on their minds—they do. As human services become universal rights for all, the pressure on the system gets greater. The need for coordination and planning increases, but as the workload goes up and the budget down, planning and coordination are the first things to go. Your organization's budget is made for 1 or 2 years at a time. Your organization's achievements count when the budget is provided to you. Systematic change based on planning and coordination does not show results in 1 or even 2 years, so it is an unusual outfit that risks part of the budget for long-term planning. This kind of thing may be one of the distractions that keep the boss from being more understanding and interested in your problem.

The Boss's Assistant

Assistants are important people to know. They are usually in charge of areas that can make a big difference in your job. Ordering supplies, approving vacation schedules, overtime pay, work records, special time off, and minor changes in the routine operations are often part of their responsibility. On the surface this may not look like too much, but watch out. The informal power of these assistants can be great. Some of them have worked themselves into a position where they are "dispensers of political favors." If they like you, supplies will come fast, vacations will be when you prefer, your promotion papers will be forwarded promptly without important documents being misplaced, personal leave will be easy to get approved.

The boss values these assistants and probably asks them for a good deal of advice on decisions that relate to their area of responsibility. They focus their concerns in the supply, demand, and allocation of resources to the organization. Often these assistants act as a buffer and take the heat off the boss. They often are the administrators who tell you "no." The power these assistants hold is official, and usually not because of their

great charisma. These instrumental-resource oriented types are likely to make their boss look like a nice guy. With assistants of the instrumental type, the big boss may be mistakenly viewed as more accommodating and less able to withstand conflict than is really the case. The boss may look like an expressive leader type, concerned about the social and emotional needs of the staff. Be careful. It has been my experience that the administrative assistant reflects rather closely the attitudes and values of the boss.

These assistants may seem to be evasive when you ask them questions. Remember, they aren't the boss and don't make decisions openly that the boss would be responsible for later. They will be evasive in their answers even though they may know what the boss plans to do or what the boss would approve of if he were asked in the right way. These assistants' responsibility is usually very limited, but often their power is great and they occupy a key link in the chain of command.

Your Immediate Supervisor

The link in the chain of command closest to you may have a lot to do with your present job satisfaction and your future career. Take a very close look at your supervisor. You may see your immediate supervisor as a boss. Be aware that the department chairpersons, the ward supervisors, the charge nurses, the team leaders, the lieutenants, or whatever they may be called in your organization, are subordinates. They have a lot of bosses. In fact, they may well view themselves as powerless, helpless pawns that are constantly being "used" by the organization. On the other hand, your supervisor may indeed feel like the most important member of the team. Obviously, how the supervisor feels about the job will have a great influence on what is thought of you and how you are treated.

A supervisor just out of specialized college training may feel important but may lack much real experience. His knowledge will be mostly from books and lectures. Give him a chance. You expect him to treat you with an open mind, so the least you can do is treat him the same way. The more likely case is that your supervisor had the same job you have now or one very much like it. He has probably worked in the organization for quite a few years and has seen people like you

come and go, and probably long enough to see people above him succeed and fail. Because he has been where you are, he may feel he knows very clearly how you should do your job. The way he sees your job now is the way he saw the job when he had it. In fancier language, his perception of your role is based on his personal experience. Your perception of the job will be different than his. As a new employee, you would probably be wise to accept the supervisor's view of your job even though it's not the same view that you got from the people that hired you or the view that you have of your job after having been there a few months. Sometimes it's helpful to put yourself in the supervisor's role. What would you do? How would you act toward a new employee? Maybe your decisions would be frighteningly similar.

Because the supervisor has been there for a long time, he probably has valuable information about the rest of the organization that could be a big help to you. If you get started off on the wrong foot with the supervisor, information may not be shared with you when you need it. You may be allowed to make mistakes when the supervisor's information could have helped. This will be especially true if for some reason you have been judged as one of those new employees who won't be here too long anyway. In some human service organizations the staff turnover is so great that supervisors have good reason to believe you'll be gone soon. A most extreme example of this is the loss of 300 prison guards in 1 year at a state prison that employs less than that number at any one time.⁸ Your supervisor is probably aware of similar but less dramatic employment statistics for public mental hospitals and other institutions. To make your relationship with him even worse, let your supervisor know that you think you know more about your job (or his) than he does. If you do, your supervisor's opinion about how long you will last is likely to be right.

Some of the most important things for you to do quickly are to find out if the supervisor used to have a job similar to yours, if he likes to be asked for advice, or if he expects you to leave him alone until you're in trouble. Another critical area of information that you need is which of the institutional rules and policies he openly supports, which of the rules and policies he ignores, and which of the rules and policies he would like to change. Another helpful characteristic for you to identify is his tolerance for conflict. Is it "har-

⁸ James B. Jacobs, "The Making of a Correctional Officer," Center for Studies in Criminal Justice, University of Chicago Law School, unpublished paper, 1975.

mony at all costs?" Ignore problems as long as possible? Is conflict something to be avoided, or is conflict an exciting potential for change?

How different are your supervisor's personal values and priorities from his supervisors', and with which superiors does he cooperate? Whom does he ignore, and with whom does he have trouble? Whom does he influence and who influences him? It's probably not possible for you to get complete answers to all of these questions. The answers will come in pieces. Some questions will be answered sooner than others. Sometimes you may think you have all the pieces, only to find out after you get other information that your first answer was either incomplete or wrong. One way to get a handle on the "influence flow" in the organization is to do a little research. Try to get answers for these four questions from everybody you work with. Now don't call a meeting and pass out a questionnaire, but keep your eyes and ears open. You may even feel comfortable asking a few people directly. The four questions are:

(1) From whom (you probably want to say, "who" unless you want to display your proper grammar) do you get advice and information about your job?

(2) To whom do you give advice and information about their job?

(3) From whom do you take orders?

(4) To whom do you give orders?

When you get part of the information (research data), begin to plot it in a chart of the organization's formal structure (the way it is supposed to be). A little counting will show you that there are eight possible combinations of answers for the questions. For instance, staff member A may feel that he takes orders from staff member B, but B doesn't think she gives orders to A. A neat description of this process is

given by Jim Roney⁹ who has developed a simple way to look at this "influence flow."

So Now You Want to Change the Place

Unless your research tells you otherwise, your supervisor is probably the first one you should talk to if you want to make any changes in the way things are done. Before you approach him with direct suggestions for change, it is usually a good idea to lay out the problem you have seen and ask for his advice and counsel. There are at least three good reasons for this. Two of these reasons are directly related to your supervisor. One is that it makes the supervisor feel helpful, and another is that he may have a better idea than you. The third reason is that it is hard to make real changes. There are many theories of organizational change. A multitude of articles have been published.¹⁰

One of the common reasons for "failure" of organizational change attempts is that the change gets started, looks like it may work, and then gets sucked into the "system." Social welfare and health care agencies try to coordinate services for multiproblem families through team approaches, between-agency case conferences, and new legislation. Such attempts to provide better service to clients usually results in the hiring of more people that create more professional jobs and another layer of bureaucracy.¹¹

A second common fate of "almost successful" changes is to be treated like an experiment or demonstration. This special status of the "innovation" threatens its life for two major reasons. First, "the program" is given its own special budget. Second, the originators—maybe you—are pleased when the boss proudly points out the program to visiting dignitaries and mentions it in the annual report. As soon as "the program" has lost its public relations value, the special budget on which the program has become dependent will disappear.

The third and most common fate of organizational change attempts is that "the program" gets isolated from the larger system. "... it and the rest of the system become rigid separately, in defense against one another."¹² The isolation often produces a win-lose situation. It becomes a battle between the "new" and the "old." The old "... has a crust of traditional practices which nothing short of dynamite can remove."¹³ The "old" usually controls a loyal army.

Now for some hope. Organizations do change.

⁹ James Roney, Jr., "A Case Study of Administrative Structure in a Health Department," *Human Organization*, Vol. 24, No. 4, Winter 1965.

¹⁰ W.W. Charters, Jr., Robert B. Everhart, John E. Jones, John S. Packard, Roland J. Pellegrin, Larry J. Reynolds, and C. Thompson Wacaster, *The Process of Planned Change in the School's Instructional Organization*, CASEA Monograph No. 25, University of Oregon, Eugene, 1973.

John DiNunzio, Donald I. Willower and Frederick Lynch, "Some Consequences of a Sponsored Innovation in an Elementary School," *Journal of Educational Administration* (in press).

Henry Mintzberg, Duru Raisinighani, and Andre Theoret, "The Structure of 'Unstructured' Decision Process," *Administration Science Quarterly*, Vol. 21, June 1976.

Jeremiah O'Connell, *Managing Organizational Innovations*, R.D. Irwin, Inc., Homewood, Ill., 1968.

¹¹ Norman Fainstein and Susan Fainstein, "Innovation in Urban Bureaucracies," *American Behavioral Scientist*, Vol. 15, No. 4, March 1972.

¹² Rolf P. Lyton, "Linking an Innovative Subsystem into the System," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 14, No. 3, September 1969, p. 420.

¹³ Leo Levy and Allen N. Herzog, "The Birth and Demise of a Planning Unit in a State Mental Health Department," *Community Mental Health*, Vol. 7, No. 3, September 1971, p. 199.

Why do they change? More important to you is, "How can they be changed?" The most honest answer to these questions is that nobody really knows, but we have begun to find out. Some of the major conditions for promoting and sustaining change or organizational innovations are discussed in the final section.

Some Conditions That May Make Your Change Successful

Talk first to your immediate supervisor and ask for help. The answer to your request for help may give you some clues to how he would react to your direct suggestions. In the process of his giving you help, the idea that you had may even come to him. There are few things more powerful than a boss with an idea that is *his*, that he thinks may work. One staff member put it this way: "I'd kept the idea up in the minds of the administrators and all of a sudden they thought it was a great idea, and they began to" Put in a more different language, "those who had power, sanctions, and communication linkages and boundary roles appeared to be important in the adoption of innovations."¹⁴ This means simply that those who control resources, rewards and punishments and have contact are more likely to get something changed than those who don't.

It may make you feel better to bitch to the boss about problems, but it won't make the problem go away, and it probably won't make the boss feel any better. Don't lay a problem on the supervisor without having a list of possible solutions in your head, or better yet, on paper. The very best is to have your solutions organized in order from the one you think is the best to the one that you like the least.

There may be times when you feel it is necessary to go around the rules and regulations—to skip some links in the chain of command. Bob Devito,¹⁵ who is a psychiatrist turned hospital administrator, says that such behavior is probably a symptom of organizational anxiety. As an administrator, he would view your coming directly to him in a rather neutral way. At least he would not punish you for making an appointment. All administrators don't feel that way. When you can't get what you think you ought to have from your immediate superior, you are confronted with

this question: Will going around them to get what I want be worth the price I may have to pay? Even if you win this time and get what you want, what about tomorrow?

The straight way to go around your immediate superior is to tell him you are going to see his boss about whatever it is (to ask him for permission risks the chance that he may tell you, "No, you can't see the boss."). When you have chosen to tell your supervisor that you're going to see his boss, don't expect the next person up the line to support you or even be pleased to see you. Your visit means that something is amiss. The status quo is being threatened. If your immediate supervisor insists on going with you to see the boss, the big boss will usually not support your position in your supervisor's presence. The organizational morale depends upon the big boss publicly supporting your supervisor. Now, if the big boss really believes that you are right, after you leave your supervisor may get chewed out, but not in your presence. Even if your immediate supervisor is not present when you talk to the boss, it is very likely that the boss has already been briefed in advance on the issue and given all of the arguments you have used unsuccessfully with your supervisor. Because of this, you better have some new and strong reasons ready if you have already used your biggest artillery with your immediate supervisor. Continued appeal to higher authority usually follows the same process—your arguments being conveyed to the next in command before you even get to them. It can be a tough road to go. Be careful and make your decision to do this with as much information as you can get about the people and the issue.

An experienced security officer in an institution for delinquents has this advice: "If you feel you've got to do it, make sure what you're trying to do is important enough. You have to use good judgment and common sense when you decide to buck the system." Part of common sense is to realize that (a) all of the details need to be worked out ahead of time; (b) if you don't follow up every detail, it will probably get messed up; (c) most people you will have to deal with mean well but don't really know what they are doing or why; and (d) you probably haven't thought of the really best answer, so keep on asking yourself the question.

When you go to see the supervisor or when they come to you, don't dump your whole load. Don't try to cure the ills of the world with this

¹⁴ J. Victor Baldrige and Robert A. Burnham, "Organizational Innovation: Individual, Organizational and Environmental Impacts," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 20, Summer 1975, p. 175.

¹⁵ Robert A. Devito, "The Supervisory Bypass: A Symptom of Organizational Anxiety," *Hospital and Community Psychiatry*, Vol. 25, No. 11, 1974.

program change. You will have time to reform the CIA next year. Simply put, don't bring up irrelevant issues. Keep your personal beliefs to yourself. Only deal with controversial things that are directly related to the change that you want. International politics and religious beliefs probably don't have anything to do with it.

One alternative to the straight way is the "everything is ready to go" approach. You have thought out all of the possible problems that will be created by the change you want to make. You have at least one answer for each of the problems. The budget will not be hurt. Other staff members' turf has been protected or negotiated. Other agencies and organizations have informally agreed. The "professional literature," like newsletters, journals, or recent books indicate that it is a good idea. The change will help the clients. The risk is small. To make such a change will be a feather in the boss's cap. This kind of strategy takes a lot of time. Other people usually must be involved. Most of these other people will mean well and intend to keep their commitment to you when the chips are down, but some may not. It is a good idea to be "two deep." Each necessary element in your plan should have at least one alternative in case somebody backs out. Planning, coordination, and constant followup are key factors. Putting together such a package will take time beyond your normal working hours. The wrapping on this ready-to-go package is the potential benefit to the image of the organization and the boss' creative leadership in thinking of such an idea. An example of such an "everything is ready-to-go" program is provided by the vocational training program developed by a youth supervisor in a correctional institution. He modified the strategy a bit by using a step-wise approach. The key elements in his package included no financial cost, negotiated turf with other staff, a potentially therapeutic program for clients, more efficient utilization of staff skills, an agreement with major unions, tax deductible contributions from community businesses, an agreement with labor unions, and a lot of patience.

One of the things that I felt was badly needed out there at the institution was a program that a kid could get into that would do him some good when he got back out on the street. A lot of kids liked mechanical work, things they could do with their hands. They didn't need a lot of books, because a lot of those kids couldn't read. They can't use figures too well. I felt that small engine mechanical repair work must be a place to begin.

I was told that it couldn't be done because we didn't have the equipment, money to buy the equipment, or a qualified teacher. So it was just kind of sloughed off. Well, I still felt that the program was worthwhile. I believed in it, so I kept at it—still getting the same answers, until one day I got a little disgusted with the whole thing and I decided that I would get equipment someplace, and I would teach it myself. I had been an auto mechanic for about 20 years, so I went downtown to (a retail chain store) and I talked to the manager. I explained to him what I had in mind and that we needed tools to be able to do the work. He told me he would check it out with his superiors and he would let me know in a couple of weeks. Two weeks went by and, sure enough, they came out with a nice set of tools for us. That was a big step, and then they also threw in five or six small engines. So I went back to the institution with it and said, "Now I've got the tools, I have the engines to work on. Now let's see if we can't get this set up." They came back with, "Well, we don't have any place to put it, no room to accommodate that kind of job program." At that time we had one wing in our building that we didn't operate anymore, and there were 16 rooms back in the wing. They were small rooms, but I felt that we could take and knock a wall out between two rooms and make one workshop out of it. I went up and asked the superintendent about it. He said, "Well, can you get the boys to do it?" I said, "They would jump at the chance to try to knock a jail down." So he said, "Well, you'll have to check with the union on it." And, of course, the union said that we couldn't do it because there would probably be supervisors or somebody around there other than the boys that would be doing the work. We had a little hassle over that, but they finally agreed that I could use boys to knock the walls down in the two rooms where I wanted to make a workshop. The boys were enthusiastic. They made a work bench, painted it, painted the cabinets, and we moved in with our tools and the cabinets. We were able to have five boys in the morning class.

In one sense this next strategy is a minor variation of the "everything is ready to go" approach. The big difference is that in this approach the boss is "judo'ed" into acceptance of the idea—you use the power of the structure on the bureaucracy. Now, this is really risky business for you, but if you want to play high stakes, this is a "sand-bagged long shot" that works the best in the biggest state controlled organizations. Said another way, "... large complex organizations with a heterogeneous environment are more likely to adopt innovations than a small, simple organization with a relatively stable, homogeneous environment."¹⁰

After you have completed the checklist of financial costs, potential problems each with at least two answers, other staff and agency turf, and improved service to clients, two other major items must be considered before you take this approach. First, be sure that your plans do not interfere with any private profit being made by any superiors, and, second, you must be able to afford clothing, food and shelter in case your

¹⁰ Baldridge, *loc. cit.*

plans don't work. This approach is just like the "everything is ready to go" strategy, except an additional step is added right before you go to the boss with your good idea for him to accept as his own. This important additional step involves getting support of the state director, the government, the council, or whoever is the really big boss. (Sometimes the really big boss is money. If you can get a Federal grant to do your thing, it is often the equivalent of getting the big boss's approval.) How do you get to see the big boss?

State directors' offices are usually in the state capitol. Whatever you do, *don't* make an appointment. If you do, an administrative aide, as a part of his job, will want to know what it's about in advance and will probably involve your lower level bosses. At this point you do not want them involved. Find out when the big boss is in and go to his office. Do this on your own time. Just walk in. Tell the receptionist that you are a peon or its equivalent in your organization and that you have an idea that will either improve the service to clients or reduce the agency's budget, but that you need the director's advice and counsel. Tell the receptionist that (a) you will wait, (b) it will only take a few minutes, and (c) that you would be most happy to see the director between the already scheduled appointments. Probably by now you are saying that it won't work. They'll never let me in! Maybe you are right. That's one of the chances you have to take. (To cover for this, some people have been deliberately sloppy in telling the receptionist their name or local office address.)

The state director gets easily isolated from what is going on at the grass roots level. He has most likely been away from the action for a long time. At one time he was probably a professional helper. He now has a conflict. Within the limits of professional ethics, you are asking him to participate with a fellow professional in formulating organizational goals.¹⁷ For him to participate he needs to know what is going on. Most of the big bosses are uncomfortable because they don't know what's really going on, and they don't know how to find out. Your visit represents a chance for them to get out with the real world of their organization without ever leaving their office. They see you as an opportunity for an efficient way to accomplish visiting the troops without all

of the time, travel, and inconvenience of actually going into the field.

When you are first introduced to the big boss, the proper social amenities about the weather and things of that nature are going to be discussed as they are in any uncomfortable social situation. It's uncomfortable for you, but also for the big boss, who probably hasn't seen a peon for a long time and probably isn't all that familiar with what you do, and this really bothers him. After the social amenities, get right to the point. Have your story together. Practice it on some intelligent listeners. Don't memorize it, but have a key word outline in your head. The entire pitch should not take more than three minutes. Of course, you've got to let the director interrupt with questions. Answer them straightforwardly and go on to the next part of your outline. Remember, leave out unrelated personal beliefs that may be controversial. Listen closely to any sign of interest. Repeat what he said that you liked and write it down as soon as you get out of his office. Be sensitive to his non-verbal messages that it's time for you to leave—looking away from you, looking at papers on the desk, or standing up are non-verbal clues that your time is up. Do not make the director open the door to the office before you get the message that it's time to go.

When you go home and tell your local boss that the state director thinks you have a good idea, all hell will break loose. Don't try to stop it. When your immediate supervisor calms down, it sometimes helps to say that as a part of your discussion with the state director you indicated that only under the guidance of a manager like him could such a program change work. As soon as possible let the superior have a genuine role in the future planning and control of the new program. For your superiors to be committed they must feel at least a part of the change is their idea. Also, since the superior most likely has been around longer than you, he will be able to see problems that you have not seen, solutions that you didn't think of, and be able to open local doors more easily for you. If you get this far, good luck, careful planning, and constant followup are the keys.

One other usual consequence of this change strategy is that some other staff members at your level will be threatened and jealous: Threatened because they aren't sure what the change will do to them or their job; jealous because they wish that they had the nerve to do what you have done.

¹⁷ L.L. Wade, "Professionals in Organizations: A Neoteric Model," *Human Organization*, Vol. 26, No. 1, 2, Spring and Summer, 1967.

Getting administrative approval, support from your boss in dealing with first reactions of fellow staff members gives you a good start in changing what you set out to change. But it's just a start. The good feelings of accomplishment and reward are luxuries to be enjoyed. Now the real work begins. To make the change work—to have it really help clients—could be a lifelong task. The hardest part is to get the ball rolling, especially when you have been pushing uphill. The ball will stop and may even roll back if you stop pushing. The upgrade is long, so don't use all of your energy at the bottom. A steady flow of problems will come your way. The more of these you have predirected, the more ready you will be to deal with them. They may not become surprises and may not be crises. For example, in a program where the institutionalized delinquents worked in a mental hospital, it was predicted that contraband would be brought into the delinquents' treatment center from the hospital and that normal sexual contacts would be made between the delinquent boys and female patients and staff at the hospital.¹⁸ Tentative ways to deal with these kinds of things were worked out in advance. Incidents of these types, contraband and sex, happened and were handled with little fuss. If the incidents had not been predicted and alternative solutions already worked out, the new program may have been stopped by the alleged rape of a hospital staff member by one of the boys. The best protection against the development of crisis is preplanning, followed by open communication between the staff and administration that are involved. Your organization's policies and traditions may dictate the form of this communication, but whatever the form is, keep it frequent and open. It is especially important to give those who are against the changes every chance to say their

piece and be listened to carefully. They may even change their mind as they are given a chance to disagree and be heard. A preacher friend once said that for sheer dedication and hard work, one convert is equal to ten birthright church members.

If your clients are concerned, they may be of some help in keeping the change going. Be most careful to respect the delicate position of the clients. Used carefully, pressure can be effective. "... The presence of militant client demands makes it rational, in terms of bureaucratic survival, to do something rather than nothing."¹⁹ The use of client demands to help make a change needs to be included in the detailed planning and the detailed followup. To repeat an earlier caution, clients may mean well but probably won't know quite what they are doing or why. They will need leadership.

In summary, most of your administrative superiors are neither idiots nor geniuses. All are people who feel good when they are respected, needed, and genuinely complimented. They feel bad when they are sick, threatened, and put down. Approached as humans for advice and counsel or with well-conceived and carefully planned suggestions, many administrators will carefully listen, ask clarifying questions, and generally be supportive of staff members they see as people who want to serve clients better. It is a pleasure to have such an administrative superior.

When you try to make changes, remember that every organization is unique to some degree. The organization's history, goals, and position in the larger social structure makes it different. In spite of this, there are many common organizational responses to change. One such commonality is that "When an organization has exhausted its supply of social controls, either because it has few available or because the attempted social controls were ineffective, organizational modification should occur."²⁰

¹⁸ J. Robert Russo, "Mutually Therapeutic Interaction Between Mental Patients and Delinquents," *Hospital and Community Psychiatry*, Vol. 25, No. 8, August 1974.

¹⁹ Frainstein, *op cit.* p. 519.

²⁰ Zelda F. Gamsen, "Organizational Responses to Members," *The Sociological Quarterly*, Spring 1968, p. 146.

A COMMON management trap is to see individual pieces and not the whole and then wonder why mismatched and unattended parts don't mesh and run smoothly.—PATRICK J. MURPHY

END