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The purpose of this study was to determine the various values that can be found in teachers of an open school system and how those values differed among various teacher groups within the school. The value systems (Tribalistic, Egocentric, Conformist, Manipulative, Sociocentric, and Existential) were based on the "Levels of Psychological Existence" developed by Clare W. Graves.

A values test was utilized in order to collect data. The "Values for Teaching Test" was administered to 492 teachers and staff members of the school district. Specific hypotheses regarding value differences in selective teachers and staff groups were tested.

The results were significant on the following levels—existential, sociocentric, and conformist with relation to grade level taught, educational job profile, and sex of the respondent.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

For many years, educators and laymen alike have been attempting to discover a viable alternative to the traditional school. The pursuit of an effective alternative that will create a learning environment favorable for all teachers and students has been the goal of many educational interests. The traditional school environment is conducive to learning for some students, but not all of them. By the same token, some teachers function better in the traditional environment, while others prefer other systems. Out of this concern for a more effective learning environment, the open classroom concept was conceived. This concept, which is no longer in its infancy, was greeted with mixed emotions. Some felt it was the ultimate answer to problems in the educational system. But, as with the traditional school, some could not adapt to it and found it to be too "permissive."

Even with all the research done in various school systems, the controversy and the problem still exist. The purpose of this thesis is to describe the predominant value systems of a school district that is attempting to answer the question, "What is the best method of instruction for all teachers and students?"
This chapter will be divided into four basic areas: A brief discussion of the open school system, a description of the school system investigated and the community surrounding it, an explanation of the thesis problem, and, a preview of the contents of each chapter.

The Open School System

In order for the classroom to function in the traditional school system, students and teachers must conform to the rules. One of the reasons is because the conveyance of subject matter is the primary concern. In the open school system, subject matter is important also, but, more emphasis is placed upon the individual student and his needs, while at the same time he is allowed more freedom to learn in his own way.

There have been numerous conjectures as to the reason for the emergence of the open school. Probably the most accurate, however, is that many students are losing interest in their education because they no longer feel a part of it. So much emphasis has been placed on imparting as much information as possible in as short a time as possible that many students have begun to think of themselves as receptacles on an assembly line. Because they no longer feel involved in the process of education, and because they feel they are the least important part of it, many students have dropped out and many attend class in "body only." According to John Holt, in his book, How Children Fail, forty percent of those students who
begin high school, quit before they finish (1, p. 15). Many of today's students want to be recognized as individuals. They feel they are not the same or learn in the same way as all other students. Neil Postman and Charles Weingartner, in their book, *Teaching as a Subversive Activity*, say the new education

... forces us to focus on the individuality and the uniqueness of the meaning maker (student). In most of the other metaphors (systems) there is an assumption of the "sameness" in all learners. There is always the implication that all learning will occur in the same way (3, p. 91).

In effect, the open school is an attempt to reject the assumption that all students are alike. It tries to generate an increase in student motivation by treating the student as an individual who is capable of learning in his own way.

Even with these lofty ideals, however, many problems have occurred within the open school system. Research has indicated that although some individuals operate well in the freedom of the open environment, many do not. It has been hypothesized that some teachers and students require the well-defined structure of the traditional school while others function quite well in the structure of the open school. Some teachers moving into the open school out of the traditional school fail to adapt their teaching methods to the open system. Research in eleven studies at the University of Illinois has indicated:

... many children do better in open space classes from both an educational and psychological
perspective . . . however . . . some do better in self-contained classrooms . . . many do well in either type . . . . The difference depends most-ly on the psychological make-up of the child, but also . . . on the teacher's mind set (2, p. 29).

The "subject-centered" (3) curriculum in the traditional school focuses on speaker-audience communication while the "student-centered" (3) curriculum in the open school focuses on dyadic communication. It seems quite obvious, then, that one would not use the same method of instruction in the open school as in the traditional school. Also important is the adaptability of the teacher to the open environment. If the teacher can not adapt, then much of the potential for effective instruction may be lost. Earl Kelly remarks:

Now it comes about that whatever we tell the learner, he will make something that is all his own out of it, and it will be different from what we held so dear and attempted to "transmit." He will build it into his own scheme of things, and relate it uniquely to what he already uniquely holds as experience. Thus he builds a world all his own, and what is really im-portant is what he makes of what we tell him, not what we intended (3, p. 92).

Therefore, not only must the teacher be adaptable to the open school environment, but to the psychological makeup and the value system of the student as well. One must keep in mind that a person's value system determines how that person communicates within a situation and reacts to that situation (4). Perhaps when the value systems of teachers and students are more fully understood, many of the communication barriers in open, as well as traditional, schools will be reduced.

To be truly an open system, then, the teachers and students within the system must be psychologically "open." Altogether
too often, however, schools have been physically constructed to facilitate an open atmosphere, for example, there were no walls between classrooms. Mere architectural design does not guarantee an open classroom. In many cases, to overcome the noise and confusion created by this design, partitions and bookcases have been erected between classes. Architectural design could be advantageous in some circumstances, but, obviously, it is not the only answer. Teaching methods must be geared toward openness and the teacher and student must want more effective interpersonal communication.

A school district in Texas was selected for this study because of its attempt to create an open system. In order to preserve this school district's anonymity, it will be referred to as Central City School District. A description of this system and the community surrounding it will follow.

Central City School District
A Flexible System

Central City is a suburban community located twenty miles from a large metropolitan city. It is surrounded by seven colleges and universities. Between 1970 and 1974, this community grew from 17,782 people to 37,500. A study taken in 1972 indicated that fifty-two percent of the then 30,000 population was twenty-six years of age or younger. In 1974, the median income was $16,000. Central City is not a mere extension of the metropolitan city it is near. It is separate, distinct, and in a different county. There is a great
emphasis on education and physical activity. There are thirteen elementary schools, three middle schools, one high school with grades nine and ten, and one senior high school with grades eleven and twelve. This city has twelve well-kept parks and four youth centers. It is a young, growing, well-educated community.

In an attempt to be as accurate as possible, a request was made of Central City School District to describe their system. They were asked to mention only those areas in which they felt their system may be unique from other systems. A list was provided by their Public Information Director, who remains anonymous: "Following are some ways in which we feel that (Central City) School District might differ from other school systems."

1. All schools in the district except one have been opened since 1961 and all are carpeted and air conditioned.

2. The district utilizes the team-teaching, open classroom concept throughout all levels of its program.

3. Teachers are involved in the interview process of selecting new members for teaching teams and also participate in planning new schools.

4. The district is one of the fastest growing in the state; enrollment has gone from 3,500 in 1967-68 to 15,200 in April 1976.

5. The district is operating a campus-style Senior High School for only juniors and seniors with the goal of developing a marketable skill in each graduate.

6. District students score above national norms on major testing programs and achieve excellence in
literary, athletic and musical competition sponsored by the Texas University Inter-
scholastic League.

7. Voters have approved bond issues for school district building programs in the last five years that have totaled almost $60 million.

8. The district cooperates with the City of (Central City) to save tax dollars by jointly purchasing school and park sites and utilizing school facilities for after-school and summer community recreation activities.

The second characteristic in the list mentions that this district "utilizes the team-teaching, open classroom concept throughout all levels of its program." Earlier comments in this chapter presented a somewhat discouraging picture of "open schools" as a whole. The Central City School District, however, appears to be working, probably because of modifications they have made to their system. This system was first observed by the author in the fall of 1974. At that time, free access was permitted to an entire elementary school and discussions were held with its principal, teachers, and students. The entire school appeared to be working smoothly as a unit.

"Flexible open school" system, however, is a better label for the system observed than merely open school system. Open school connotes the opposite extreme of the traditional school, and it has already been discussed that this system does not work for everyone. "Flexible" needs to be added to "open school" because it better describes the system observed. The Central City School District is flexible because the teachers
working within it are capable of providing structure to those students who are in need of it, while allowing those students who can function with some independence to do so.

Statement of Problem

The purpose of this study was to identify the various values that can be found in the teachers and staff of Central City School District. A study of the value systems of teachers of a single school system has not, as yet, been undertaken. The investigative approach utilized in this thesis is based largely on the theories of Clare W. Graves as modified by Scott Meyers, Susan Meyers, Charles Hughes, Vincent Flowers et. al. This type of assessment of individual and group value systems will be called "Value System Analysis." The Value System Analysis enables the researcher to apply an ipsative measure to the various value systems operating within a defined educational system.

Contents of Study

Chapter I has offered a brief analysis of the open school and the school system investigated. The use of Value System Analysis and its application to the educational system will be presented in more detail in the remainder of this thesis.

In Chapter II, the theoretical basis upon which the research instrument is based will be presented.

Chapter III will explain the procedures of the investigation. This will include a discussion of the design of
the measuring instrument, the criterion for population
selection and method of test administration, and the statistical procedures used to interpret the data.

Chapter IV will report the results of the research and present other relevant findings.

Chapter V will include conclusions and implications for further research.
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CHAPTER II

THE THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK OF VALUE SYSTEM ANALYSIS

This investigation of a single school system is based on the original work of Clare W. Graves. Graves' view of societal structures and human value systems offers a useful framework to use in understanding and coping with the significant ways that people are different. This chapter will present a brief explanation of this approach.

Clare W. Graves, currently at Union College in Schenectady, New York, has researched man and his behavior for over twenty years. In his work, Graves indicates that man is an open-system organism who has been gradually evolving into higher levels of psychological existence. He points out that there are similarities between his Levels of Psychological Existence and the work of Abraham H. Maslow, and that his work, to some degree, is an extension of Maslow's views (1, p. 132).

Graves' Levels of Psychological Existence

Graves' Levels of Psychological Existence is a human values theory which has practicable application in the fields of communication and education.
Theoretical Basis

Today's unrest, immorality and unethical behavior are viewed by many as a decline of our society. The Levels of Psychological Existence theory, however, presents an optimistic outlook toward societal struggles. Graves views this "decline" quite differently.

... man's troublesome behavior can be seen as a healthy sign, as a sign of growth, rather than as a sign of decay, as a sign of searching for a better form of existence rather than a sign of disintegration of all that is good, as a sign of the emergence of that which is better, which is more human in man rather than as a sign of a breakthrough of the worst that is in him (1, p. 132).

Graves feels that the reasoning surrounding the negative view of man is based on a premise composed of three parts:

1. That beneath it all man is a beast driven by original sin, aggressiveness, and a death instinct.

2. That civilized human behavior, good values, can only be superimposed on man and therefore must be constantly imposed upon him lest his animalism override his humanism.

3. That these good values, Judeo-Christian ethics, Buddhist principles or the like, have been revealed to man and are the prime tenets by which he should live (1, p. 132).

To counter this trend of logic, Graves presents another point of view:

1. That man's nature is not a set thing, that it is ever emergent, that it is an open system, not a closed system.

2. That man's nature evolved by saccadic, quantum-like jumps from one steady-state system to another.
3. That man's values change from system to system as his total psychology emerges in new form with each quantum-like jump to a new steady state of being (1, pp. 132-133).

In other words, Graves' theory states that the development of the psychology of the human being is an emergent process marked by the progressive subordination of older lower-level value systems to new, higher level value systems. Graves states:

As each existential state emerges, man believes that the problems of human existence are the problems with which he is faced at the level he has arrived. He develops . . . a thematic value system appropriate to his current existential state (1, p. 134).

As man's physical conditions change, he normally tends to change his psychology.

Graves' research indicates:

Adult man's psychology which includes his values, develops from the existential states of man. These states emerge as man solves certain hierarchically ordered existential problems crucial to him in his existence. The solution of man's current problems of existence . . . creates, in turn, new existential problems (1, p. 133).

According to Graves, these phenomena are a function of two basic components, adjustment-of-the-organism-to-the-environment and adjustment-of-the-environment-to-the-organism:

The states which emerge . . . arise as each different and ordinal set of human problems are resolved. As the two components, adjustment-of-the-organism-to-the-environment and adjustment-of-the-environment-to-the-organism, develop in their spurt and plateau fashion, higher and higher psychological systems emerge. The alteration of the components produces a cyclic emergence of existential states which dictates that the psychology, and thus the values of
every other system, is at one and the same time like and unlike its cyclic partners . . . (1, p. 134).

On each level of existence, a person has a particular psychology which is peculiar to that level. On a particular level out of which a person is operating, his feelings, acts, ethics, values, motivations, and thoughts are indicative of that level.

An individual does not move automatically from one level of existence to another. According to Graves, a person may not be constitutionally or genetically equipped to change in the normal upward direction if the conditions of his existence change. Under certain conditions, the individual may move through a hierarchically ordered series of behaviors or value systems to some end, or he may stabilize his existence and live out the remainder of his life at any particular level or combination of levels in the hierarchy.

A person may appear to demonstrate positive or negative behavior on a particular level, or under certain circumstances, regress to a value system lower in the hierarchy. Graves states:

... an adult lives in a potentially open system of needs, values, and aspirations, but he often settles into what approximates a closed system. When he is in any one level, he has only the behavioral degrees of freedom afforded him at that level (1, p. 133).

People, therefore, have a potentially open system of needs, values, and aspirations. A person's predominant value level, thus, influences that individual's behavior.
The Value Levels

The next few pages gives a brief description of the levels of psychological existence. These levels are adapted from the work of Graves (1) (2). A single word label is used at each level for convenience of discussion.

Level 1, reactive.--Man's primary motivation at this level is the satisfaction of his basic physiological needs, which he can not take care of on his own. He is not aware of his self or others as human beings. He can not reason; he merely reacts to feelings of pain, hunger, warmth, cold, etc. This level applies only to infants, people with serious brain deterioration, and certain psychopathic conditions, and therefore, will be defined, but for this study, disregarded.

Level 2, tribalistic.--Man, at this level, has a strong need for stability and safety and he feels the way to fulfill these needs is through rigid adherence to the traditions of his tribe. His existence is based on myth, tradition, spirits, magic, and superstition. He follows a ritualistic way of life, and he will do everything to win the favor of his "elders." Changes in his usual way of existence threaten this person to a great degree, as he usually has difficulty adapting to them.

Man on this level accomplishes little more than the fulfillment of his basic physiological needs. He is merely aware of the problems of sustenance, illness, reproduction, and
VALUE SYSTEMS USED IN VSA

EXISTENTIAL
A personal activist who seeks to live within society's constraints while enjoying his maximum individual freedom. Tends to be inter-directed and self-motivating. Reality accepts ambiguity in people and situations. This value system is quite tolerant, but, at the same time, expects high levels of performance of self and others. Responds to reasons, not to rules, and is managed through competence, not status or position. May be expressed by dropping out of society in order to pursue individualistic interests and alternative lifestyles.

MANIPULATIVE
Achievement-oriented, self-serving, and aggressive - but within the constraints of society. Enjoys wheeling and dealing, engaging in various forms of competition, and demonstrating his ability to motivate, attain goals, and get ahead in life. Manipulation may be either conscious or private or it may be open, above-board, and displayed. Designed to produce evidence of success, accomplishment, and winning. This mode of adjustment will be found in abundance in politics, management, and in sales and marketing professions.

EGOCENTRIC
Unashamed, self-centered assertiveness. Aggressiveness takes many forms as he resists against authority figures, norms, rules, and standards. Somewhat flamboyant in behavior in order to gain attention. Often brash, rough, brazen, abrasive, and even uncoordinately. May appear "irresistible" - feels that the world is a hostile and alien place. May internalize the impulses into an angry, embittered, and biting personality. Manifests itself positively in creativity, willingness to break with tradition, and dogged determination.

REACTIVE
Functions at the physiological level - reacts to stimuli such as hunger, pain, cold, warmth, and sleep in order to obtain the immediate satisfaction of basic human needs. Pure Reactives are virtually value-less - concerned only with survival. Seen in new-born infants, profoundly retarded, severe stroke victims, and the elderly. Can be either a temporary state (like a person on drugs or in a state of emotional or physical shock) or a permanent state of existence.

Note that these value systems are essentially modes of adjustment used by individuals and even cultures to cope with their perception of the reality of their world - and help to explain where man is, where he has been, and where he is going. Each mode of adjustment contains a set of assumptions about the nature of man, methods of learning, modes of thinking, preferred motivational strategies, and total lifestyles. Some individuals may assume single modes of adjustment; others may develop clusters of several value systems. An individual lives in a potentially open system of needs, values, and aspirations, but may settle into a closed system - depending on his genetic and psychological makeup, as well as the conditions within his life-space. Clare W. Graves has formulated an exciting and highly prescriptive theory of human values that speaks to the issues that confront our society today - and the kinds of value systems that will most likely emerge in the future.

SOCIOPRISTIC
Personalistic concern for self-discovery, human dignity, and the uniqueness of each person, as well as the inherent worth of people as a whole. By finding basic value in people and humanity in general, a SOCIOPRISTIC individual will spend his time and energy working in behalf of social causes. SOCIOPRISTICS are opposed to the manipulative use of people, as well as the mindless punishment of rigid conformity systems. Reflected in the "helping" professions and new theories and methods of personal introspection.

CONFORMIST
Finds structure, security, and predictability in systems of various types rooted in directive design. Strongly committed to what he considers to be the "right way." Promotes clearly-defined social rules - prefers order, structure, patterns, and sequential time-frames. Somewhat rigid in responding to diversity and ambiguity. Likes a "cut and dried" kind of world and is prone to impose his system, concepts of right and wrong, rules, and procedures on others. Places a premium on sacrifice, discipline, and adhering to the established norms of society.

TRIBALISTIC
Seeks safety and security in a threatening world by focusing on power, chiefdoms, clans, rituals, or, the norms established by a clan (family, work-unit, team, or tribe). Depends on the mystical forces inherent in life and tends to be both superstitious and ritualistic. Needs to find some way to explain the unexplainable. Expressed in highly-visible group affiliation and preference for "paternalistic" atmospheres.
disputes. He limits his actions to attempts to fulfill these needs.

The tribalistic individual would rarely be an active participant in organizations, including the educational system. Rather, he is usually the one found taking orders and carrying them out. He is quite happy with this arrangement and would be very uncomfortable in administrative positions as he would not know how to manage this sort of position.

A level 2 teacher must have an understanding principal that carefully explains the rules to follow in completing his work, while the tribalistic student must have a teacher who carefully supervises his work and makes certain that he understands tasks. Concepts, time, space, quantity, and materiality do not motivate this individual, therefore, productive effort is limited to the task at hand.

**Level 3, egocentric.**—Man begins to view himself as a distinct individual for the first time as he arrives at level 3. He is aware that death is the ultimate end of life, and this awareness stimulates his desire for survival. He, thus, may subscribe to the "eye for an eye, tooth for a tooth" doctrine. To this individual, survival is the only goal--to the victor belongs the spoils--and anything goes in his efforts to win.

A person at the egocentric level manifests many personal characteristics. He is a rugged individualist and he is often selfish, thoughtless, unscrupulous, and dishonest. But, he
is also creative, adventurous, and strives hard to survive. He has not learned to function within the constraints imposed by society. He responds primarily to those he views as more powerful than himself. He interprets reward or punishment in terms of his own personal achievement. He perceives that in this world many try, but very few succeed. The power ethic, therefore, prevails.

The egocentric would be found only rarely as a career educator because any type educational system is too structured for him. He is much happier in jobs that afford him the opportunity to be in control of things, active, and spontaneous. The egocentric student learns best when a lot of activity is required to get to a "reward" and the reward is given soon after the act is performed.

Level 4, conformist.--At this level, man bases his way of life on the conviction that there must be some rationale to explain his perception of the world. He leads his life as if it were a test of his "worthiness." He believes in directed design, that there are forces guiding man and his destiny. He feels he must, therefore, lead the saintly way of life.

Since salvation is the ultimate reward for the right way of living, the level 4 individual makes sacrifices in the here and now. His typical behavior is denial, deference, piety, modesty, self-sacrifice, harsh self-discipline, and no self-indulgence.

This individual demonstrates a low tolerance for ambiguity, and has a difficult time accepting those persons whose values are different from his own. He merely accepts his
role in life as a fact that he must learn to live with. But, regardless of the role assigned him, he strives for perfection. His own wants and desires are secondary. His primary concern is what the world expects of him by virtue of his position.

This individual functions best in rigidly defined roles and positions. It is quite probable that the strictly defined structure of the traditional school is the most favorable environment for this individual, and, thus, the structure of the open school would create too much dissonance within him. This type teacher makes certain that school rules are enforced and obeyed. The conformist student avoids actions that lead to punishment. For this student, learning means memorizing and instant recall.

Level 5, manipulative.—Man at this level, like the egocentric, again seeks to conquer the world. Instead of utilizing the raw power strategies of the egocentric, however, he attempts to gain success through learning the world's secrets. He is very ambitious and attempts to achieve status and recognition through the manipulation of people and things around him.

Unlike the conformist, he does not believe in pre-determined fate. He is materialistic and gains status and recognition on his own through rational, objective positivism. Other important values are achievement, competition, the entrepreneurial attitude, scheming, and manipulating. He will utilize any means possible to achieve his goals, but within the constraints placed upon him by society.
A person with a high level of manipulativeness would usually not be found in a teaching position. He is very often found in administrative work because this position provides him with more opportunities to achieve the status he requires. He will attain the necessary higher education to achieve this status. The manipulative student learns best through his own efforts, with the presence of mild risks, and much variety in the learning environment.

**Level 6, sociocentric.**--The sociocentric individual basically concerns himself with his interpersonal relationships. He wants and needs to belong and be accepted. He values harmonious relationships and dislikes violence. He has little respect for materialistic individuals and manipulative management. He respects the authority of those contemporaries whom he holds in high regard and who merit his trust. He believes that getting along with others is more important than getting ahead and values what is best for people as a whole. On the surface, the sociocentric individual may appear shallow. But, Graves says, man on this level is seeking to be with and within the feelings of his valued-other. Graves calls these values "personalistic."

A sociocentric person does not believe that an individual's high status is the measure of a man. In believing that there are other means to a living than hard work, he tends to live in the "here and now" and find meaning in everything he does.
In the educational system, the sociocentric individual would normally enjoy and be found working with students on a one-to-one basis. He usually functions best, then, in elementary schools, special education, and counseling positions, but would also be found in other positions as well. This person is quite adaptable to the structure of the open school. The sociocentric student learns through observation of others or his environment, does not require reinforcement or rewards, and does not have to engage in the behavior he observes in order to learn from it.

Level 7, existential.—When man reaches the existential level, he is striving to become a "self-actualizing" person. In other words, he is no longer operating out of the subsistence level systems, but has passed onto a "being-level" system.

At this level, man has high tolerance for ambiguity and is accepting of those whose values are not the same as his, as long as they do not bother him. He likes the freedom to function on his own without constraints of authority. He is goal-oriented, but not for selfish reasons. He is more concerned with the restoration of the world, being no longer hindered by basic human fears. He values spontaneity, creativity, all human wants (but is not governed by them), and experiential learning. He dislikes artificiality.

It would be very rare for a high level existential teacher to remain very long in the traditional school system.
He functions better in a more flexible school environment. The existential person requires freedom, the opportunity to be creative, and appreciates the challenge a flexible system affords. Since the existential individual values minimal structure, he would not get along very well with a conformist principal.

The existential teacher values the spontaneity and creativity that derive from the structure of a flexible school. He is not frustrated when rules are not followed or curriculums are not enforced, because he is quite adaptable to changes the situation may call for. The existential person respects and can adapt to individual differences in students. He receives great satisfaction from showing the student how to become an autonomous individual. The level 7 student learns best when his teacher poses problems, provides him with ways to analyze the problem, and leaves up to him the decision of which answers to accept.

An understanding of Graves' theory causes one to realize individual differences in humans and the futility of treating individuals as if those differences did not exist. One should also realize that individuals do not function out of one level of existence only. At times, one, two, or more levels may dominate his behavior. For example, an individual may exhibit a different value construct at school as compared to his behavior at home.
The remaining chapters will discuss the procedures used to determine the various value clusters found in Central City School District and their implications. This chapter has explained the theory behind the research instrument and the vocabulary that will be used to explain the results of this study.
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CHAPTER III

VALUE SYSTEM ANALYSIS IN EDUCATION

In recent years, increasing importance has been placed upon the critical significance of effective communication. With this in mind, a great deal of research in this area has been completed. But, the discovery has not been made until recently that the work of Clare W. Graves is quite adaptable for use in the areas of communication and education.

In 1975, Sherry C. Rhodes designed a values package consisting of written material, games, and activities based upon the theories of Clare Graves. The purpose of this package was to "Create awareness and understanding for seventh grade students in the value systems so as to achieve a more complementary classroom atmosphere" (3). Also, in 1975, Larry W. Long tested a military organization to determine the value clusters that were influencing military communication. The design of the measuring instrument in Long's study is similar to the Values for Teaching instrument used in this thesis.

Chapter III will discuss the design of the test instrument, the criterion for population selection and method of test administration, and the statistical procedures that were followed.
Design of the Test Instrument

The original "Values for Teaching Test" was developed by Don E. Beck and Christopher C. Cowan, Directors of the Center for Values Research, and has been used in various in-service teacher training programs in Texas (1). The test was developed in such a way that it would effectively indicate a person's value system as a correlation to the major issues confronting an employee of a school district.

The instrument utilized in this study resulted from a revision of the earlier Values for Teaching Test. Conclusions made by Beck, Cowan, and Larry W. Long indicate that the current Values for Teaching Test permits a more valid measure.

The following areas were selected as "Value Issues" confronting the school district employee:

1. The value of classroom management
2. The value of innovation in the classroom
3. The value of a teaching salary
4. The value of my principal or supervisor
5. The value of loyalty to the school district
6. The value of the assignment of grades in an educational system
7. The value I assess towards my students
8. The value of education in the United States

Following Graves' theory, each respondent was given the opportunity to respond to each of these issues at each value level that Graves' describes. (Level 1 was eliminated). There were six possible responses devised for each issue. Each
response was typical of a tribalistic, egocentric, conformist, manipulative, sociocentric, and existential response. Each respondent was given the opportunity to distribute a point value in correlation to the value he placed on each response—a minimum of zero to a maximum of twelve points for each issue.

Method of Test Administration

The selection of the population was the first consideration to be made during this investigation. A school district was chosen that was felt not to be traditional in its method of operation. As mentioned in Chapter I of this thesis, the anonymity of this school district will be preserved.

It was decided that as many individuals as possible would be tested during normal working hours. The Values for Teaching Test was administered to the faculty of the school district during a scheduled in-service training session in February of 1976.

Respondents were tested in two groups. One group consisted of the middle and high school teachers and the other group was comprised of elementary teachers. There were 177 high school personnel and teachers, 121 middle school personnel and teachers, and 194 elementary personnel and teachers tested. The tests were administered in the auditorium of the new campus-style senior high school of Central City. Respondents were assured that the test was to be used for
educational research only, and that their anonymity would be preserved. They were encouraged to utilize as much time as necessary to complete the test, that there were no "right" or "wrong" answers, and that they would receive a complete report of the results when the investigation was completed. No individuals refused to take the test.

Statistical Procedures

The following are the demographic variables that were taken into consideration in order to complete the Value System Analysis for teachers:

1. Educational job profile (e.g., teaching subject or actual job function)
2. Years of teaching experience
3. Chronological age
4. Level of education
5. Marital status
6. Sex

These variables and the value dominance of each were utilized to ascertain the conclusions made in the Value System Analysis of the school district tested.

Total point sums were tabulated for each value level response on each of the value issues presented to individual respondents. Each respondent could have exhibited a total numerical value that ranged from zero to ninety-six on a particular level of psychological existence. Statistically, the numerical value of the sum of all of the levels of psychological existence could not have been greater or less than
ninety-six since the test is an ipsative measure. A total of twelve points had to be distributed for each value issue. Therefore, a respondent could have distributed sixteen points on each of the value levels, or he could have distributed the ninety-six point total in any way he chose. The value statements were randomly placed to eliminate guessing, and to ensure that the respondent read each statement carefully. None of the tests had an even distribution of numerical values (sixteen points per level of psychological existence), nor did any of the tests have the maximum (ninety-six points) points placed on a particular value level. There was no artificial skewing of the results found after analyzation of the data.

An analysis of variance was conducted to determine the probability of the results being due to chance, or other influences beyond the control of the testing environment. It was determined that a .05 level of confidence was desirable to validate the results of the Value System Analysis of the school district.

Chapter IV has been reserved for the application of Graves' theories.


CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The purpose of this chapter is to report the results of the Value System Analysis which was conducted with the cooperation of Central City School District.

Certain rules of caution must be observed while evaluating the data presented:

1. The results do not imply that one single value system is better or worse than another.

2. The data does not necessarily imply that intelligence is a correlate of the values described. Each person applies his intelligence in a style compatible with his value system.

3. Most persons display tendencies, in varying degrees, toward all six value systems (1, p. 40).

This chapter will be divided into the following basic areas: The value differences based upon educational job profile, years of teaching experience, chronological age, level of education, marital status, sex, the type of school where employed.

The Value Differences Based Upon Educational Job Profile

Table I illustrates the differences in levels of psychological existence according to educational job profile.

Educational job profile consisted of ten different categories. They were:
TABLE I
THE VALUE DIFFERENCES BASED UPON EDUCATIONAL JOB PROFILE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean S. D.</th>
<th>Mean S. D.</th>
<th>Mean S. D.</th>
<th>Mean S. D.</th>
<th>Mean S. D.</th>
<th>Mean S. D.</th>
<th>Mean S. D.</th>
<th>Mean S. D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20.21</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>30.21</td>
<td>10.76</td>
<td>10.42</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>20.95</td>
<td>11.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>21.34</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>24.77</td>
<td>9.45</td>
<td>11.98</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td>9.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>24.35</td>
<td>9.28</td>
<td>25.92</td>
<td>8.21</td>
<td>10.72</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>17.53</td>
<td>7.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>22.71</td>
<td>8.54</td>
<td>22.71</td>
<td>7.98</td>
<td>13.20</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>19.53</td>
<td>8.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25.08</td>
<td>10.16</td>
<td>22.46</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>12.03</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>20.84</td>
<td>10.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>23.05</td>
<td>9.39</td>
<td>23.35</td>
<td>8.53</td>
<td>9.83</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>20.67</td>
<td>7.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20.44</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>20.48</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>12.48</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>22.48</td>
<td>7.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28.22</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>27.84</td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td>9.59</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>13.51</td>
<td>8.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>27.67</td>
<td>9.42</td>
<td>23.62</td>
<td>9.22</td>
<td>11.64</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>11.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*"7"--Existential, "6"--Sociocentric, "5"--Manipulative, "4"--Conformist, "3"--Egocentric, "2"--Tribalistic.
1. Administrative personnel  
2. Vocational teachers  
3. Elementary teachers  
4. Liberal arts teachers  
5. Fine arts teachers  
6. Social science teachers  
7. Applied science teachers  
8. Health and physical education teachers  
9. Special education teachers and counselors  
10. Special Staff (this category includes teacher's aides, speech therapists, etc.)  

Each respondent was placed in one of these categories as determined by his specific job profile in the school district.

These data indicate that special education and counseling personnel are shown to have a higher existential level than any other job profile. The administrative personnel and health and physical education teachers had the lowest existential scores.

The administrative personnel of Central City School District scored the highest, the special education and counseling personnel scored the next highest, and the health and physical education teachers scored the lowest in sociocentrism.

The health and physical education teachers scored the highest in the level of conformity, the administrative personnel scored the next highest, while the elementary teachers, fine arts teachers and special education and counseling personnel scored the lowest.
The Value Differences Based Upon Years of Teaching Experience

Table II demonstrates the various differences in levels of psychological existence according to the teacher's years of experience.

TABLE II
THE VALUE DIFFERENCES BASED UPON YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Levels of Psychological Existence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>24.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>24.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>23.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>22.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*"7"--Existential, "6"--Sociocentric, "5"--Manipulative, "4"--Conformist, "3"--Egocentric, "2"--Tribalistic.

The following is a breakdown of the six groups found under years of teaching experience:

Group I 0-3 years
Group II 4-6 years
Group III 7-9 years
Group IV 10-12 years
Group V 13-15 years
Group VI 16 years and over
These data demonstrate that the more teaching experience an individual has, the more his tendency to move in the direction of sociocentrism. It also shows that this school system has 37.25% teachers with less than three years experience and 66.4% with less than six years experience.

The Value Differences Based Upon Chronological Age

Table III illustrates the differences in levels of psychological existence with reference to the chronological age of the individuals tested.

These data indicate that the younger an individual is, the higher his existential score, and the older an individual is, the more he moves in the direction of sociocentrism.

It should be noted that 55% of this school system are thirty years of age or younger.

The Value Differences Based Upon Level of Educational Attainment

The differences in levels of psychological existence according to educational attainment are illustrated in Table IV.

These data indicate that the greater the amount of exposure a person has to higher education, the less likely he is to be tribalistic in his values. This would add evidence to the argument subscribed to by many educators that the more exposure a person has to formal education, the greater the experiential and inquisitive approach he assumes in his
**TABLE III**

**THE VALUE DIFFERENCES BASED UPON CHRONOLOGICAL AGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Number</th>
<th>Levels of Psychological Existence</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean S. D.</td>
<td>Mean S. D.</td>
<td>Mean S. D.</td>
<td>Mean S. D.</td>
<td>Mean S. D.</td>
<td>Mean S. D.</td>
<td>Mean S. D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>16.50</td>
<td>7.78</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>8.49</td>
<td>14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>23.71</td>
<td>9.32</td>
<td>25.48</td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>11.14</td>
<td>6.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>23.63</td>
<td>7.63</td>
<td>27.61</td>
<td>10.01</td>
<td>12.51</td>
<td>6.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19.67</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>26.08</td>
<td>9.21</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>7.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The breakdown of the age groupings is as follows:

Group I  less than 21 years of age
Group II  21 to 25 years of age
Group III 26 to 30 years of age
Group IV  31 to 39 years of age
Group V  40 to 49 years of age
Group VI  more than 50 years of age

**"7"--Existential, "6"--Sociocentric, "5"--Manipulative, "4"--Conformist, "3"--Egocentric, "2"--Tribalistic.**
TABLE IV
THE VALUE DIFFERENCES BASED UPON LEVEL OF EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group*</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Levels of Psychological Existence</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean S. D.</td>
<td>Mean S. D.</td>
<td>Mean S. D.</td>
<td>Mean S. D.</td>
<td>Mean S. D.</td>
<td>Mean S. D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.75</td>
<td>9.41</td>
<td>23.93</td>
<td>8.28</td>
<td>11.55</td>
<td>6.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24.50</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td>25.24</td>
<td>8.39</td>
<td>10.48</td>
<td>5.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24.22</td>
<td>9.07</td>
<td>30.91</td>
<td>10.06</td>
<td>11.52</td>
<td>5.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.40</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>26.60</td>
<td>12.76</td>
<td>12.60</td>
<td>7.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24.60</td>
<td>10.04</td>
<td>28.20</td>
<td>10.11</td>
<td>10.20</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Following is a breakdown of the educational levels represented by the five groups:

Group I  Bachelor's Degree
Group II  Master's Degree
Group III  Master's Degree plus 30 hours
Group IV  Doctorate
Group V  High School, some college (this is teacher's aides, etc.)

**"7"--Existential, "6"--Sociocentric, "5"--Manipulative, "4"--Conformist, "3"--Egocentric, "2"--Tribalistic.
life-style. In 1975, Larry W. Long found a positive correlation between the increase in the existential level and the increase of formal education, and the same inverse relationship between tribalism and education exhibited in this study (1, p. 45).

The level of significance exhibited by these data on tribalism is greater than .01.

The Value Differences Based Upon Marital Status

Table V illustrates the differences in levels of psychological existence based upon the individual's marital status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Existence</th>
<th>Group I (n=70)</th>
<th>Group II (n=404)</th>
<th>Group III (n=18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S. D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential</td>
<td>23.89</td>
<td>9.24</td>
<td>24.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociocentric</td>
<td>24.46</td>
<td>9.27</td>
<td>24.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manipulative</td>
<td>11.19</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>11.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformist</td>
<td>17.29</td>
<td>9.19</td>
<td>18.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egocentric</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribalistic</td>
<td>15.80</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td>14.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group I represents single individuals, Group II represents married individuals, and Group III represents divorced individuals.
These data indicate a significant difference above the .05 level in the area of tribalism, with the divorced persons having the significantly higher score.

The Value Differences Based Upon Sex

The differences in levels of psychological existence according to sex are illustrated in Table VI.

**TABLE VI**

THE VALUE DIFFERENCES BASED UPON SEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Existence</th>
<th>Male Mean (n=118)</th>
<th>Female Mean (n=376)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S. D.</td>
<td>S. D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential</td>
<td>21.82 8.45</td>
<td>24.68 9.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociocentric</td>
<td>23.12 9.07</td>
<td>25.16 8.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manipulative</td>
<td>12.60 6.67</td>
<td>10.84 6.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformist</td>
<td>21.01 9.09</td>
<td>17.81 8.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egocentric</td>
<td>2.81 3.33</td>
<td>2.42 3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribalistic</td>
<td>14.63 7.06</td>
<td>15.07 6.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above data indicate that the differences in the existential level and conformity were above the .01 level of confidence and the differences in sociocentrism and manipulativeness were above the .05 level of confidence. The females demonstrated higher existential and sociocentric scores, while the males displayed higher manipulative and conformist scores.
The Value Differences Based Upon Type of School

Table VII demonstrates the differences in levels of psychological existence according to the type of school--Group I represents high school, Group II represents middle school, and Group III represents elementary school.

TABLE VII
THE VALUE DIFFERENCES BASED UPON TYPE OF SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Existence</th>
<th>Group I (n=177)</th>
<th>Group II (n=121)</th>
<th>Group III (n=194)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S. D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential</td>
<td>23.58</td>
<td>8.76</td>
<td>22.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociocentric</td>
<td>22.89</td>
<td>8.61</td>
<td>23.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manipulative</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>11.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformist</td>
<td>20.13</td>
<td>8.96</td>
<td>19.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egocentric</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribalistic</td>
<td>14.77</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>15.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Value System Analysis found that the difference in conformity among these three groups was significant above the .01 level. These data tend to indicate that high and middle school teachers have higher conformity scores than elementary teachers.

The difference in sociocentrism among these three groups was found to be significant above the .01 level. Since levels of sociocentrism decreased as levels of conformity increased, the data suggest an inverse correlation between these two variables.
Chapter V will provide conclusions of this study and implications for further research.
CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to describe the various value clusters that exist within a school district in Texas. The research instrument utilized in this study was based on the Levels of Psychological Existence as formulated by Clare W. Graves. The school district that was studied was selected because of its attempts to create an open environment within the system.

The research instrument used in this investigation was developed by Beck, Cowan, and Long. The test was designed so that it would effectively indicate an individual's value system as a correlate to the major issues confronting an employee of a school district. Eight major "Value Issues" were chosen.

Description of the Value Levels in Central City School District

The following results were found through the Value System Analysis of Central City School District:

1. The more teaching experience an individual has, the more he moves in the direction of sociocentrism.

2. The younger an individual is, the higher his existential score, and the older he is, the more he moves in the direction of sociocentrism.

3. The data indicated that the greater exposure a teacher has to formal education in his
personal training, the less tribalism he exhibits.

4. Female teachers tend to exhibit significantly higher existential and sociocentric levels than male teachers. The males displayed significantly more conformity and manipulative value levels.

5. Levels of conformity were found to increase among the teachers as the grade level taught increased.

6. An inverse correlation was found between levels of sociocentrism and the grade level taught. As grade level taught moved from elementary to middle to high school, sociocentrism decreased.

Educational job profiles were found to be significantly different on the following levels--existential, sociocentric, and conformist:

1. Existential
   A. Most dominant--Special education and counseling personnel
   B. Least dominant--Administrative and health and physical education personnel

2. Sociocentric
   A. Most dominant--Administrative and special education and counseling personnel
   B. Least dominant--Health and physical education personnel

3. Conformist
   A. Most dominant--Administrative and health and physical education personnel
   B. Least dominant--Special education and counseling personnel and elementary teachers
Value System Analysis and Its Relation to Education

Most Americans agree that education is paramount, and necessary for success. One of the greatest obstacles to educational efficiency is the fact that many school districts tend to adopt a single mode of operation. The philosophy a school district selects as its method of operation should not restrict a teacher to one educational mode of instruction, but should give him the flexibility to adapt to the particular needs of each individual student. An open school will be effective for some students and teachers, but not for all of them. A traditional school system will, likewise, be effective for some, but not for all.

The following is a brief illustration of possible applications of Value System Analysis.

First, in the area of educational organizational development, Value System Analysis could be used to prepare administrators to deal more effectively with the complex issues in education by providing them with an eclectic framework of value systems. This understanding of value systems could aid an administrator, or a teacher, in responding to both internal and external issues. Second, the teachers and administrators could develop more effective management strategies in understanding and dealing with the diverse value systems of students at all levels. Third, Value System Analysis could be used in the initial selection, placement, and management of personnel.
in the school district. Fourth, administrative communications could be written so that they would communicate more effectively to all six value levels, not just the conformist or sociocentric.

In the area of teaching, Value System Analysis would assist the teacher in determining whether or not a specific teaching strategy was suitable for a specific student or group of students. It could facilitate counselor-teacher communication in determining learning and motivation strategies for problem students. Value System Analysis could also be used to determine degrees of supervision required by individual students.

The end result of utilizing Value System Analysis could be greater student interest and motivation, and a more efficient educational structure.

Implications for Further Research

There are a multitude of Value System Analyses required. The following offers a few suggestions.

Longitudinal studies should be conducted to observe value systems over a period of time; a study should be done to identify the value sets in student teachers; a study should be conducted to determine the impact college educator's value sets have on their student teachers; Value System Analyses of other school districts, particularly a traditional school, are warranted; studies should be done with school systems in various parts of the United States; also,
investigations that take into account such variables as community size, political atmosphere, ethnic background, and the socio-economic environment would be of extreme value.

Graves' Levels of Psychological Existence provide a broad comprehension of human values applicable to a variety of areas. Value System Analysis is a useful instrument for determining human values and needs and, thus, increasing greater awareness of ourselves and others.
APPENDIX I

MEAN LEVELS OF PSYCHOLOGICAL EXISTENCE
MEAN LEVELS OF PSYCHOLOGICAL EXISTENCE
(ALL GROUPS--492 RESPONDENTS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Level</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existential</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>9.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociocentric</td>
<td>24.67</td>
<td>8.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manipulative</td>
<td>11.26</td>
<td>6.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformist</td>
<td>18.57</td>
<td>8.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egocentric</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribalistic</td>
<td>14.97</td>
<td>6.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX II

ADMINISTRATIVE STRATEGIES

Communication Strategy Questions

Motivation

Communication

Job Design

Administrative Systems and Procedures

Growth Opportunity

Maintenance

Pay and Benefits

Equal Employment Opportunity

Facilities

adapted from V. Flowers, 1975.
Communication Strategy Questions

1. Is our present communication style geared toward all values?

2. Can we develop multi-level communication techniques which will reach all levels simultaneously?

3. Shouldn't our communication process be looked at as lateral rather than up or down the organizational structure?

4. Is it true that each time we communicate, we are communicating to ourselves about ourselves?
Motivation Strategies

Communication

Level 2, tribalistic . . . . I would like to hear that things are getting better for people like me.

Level 3, egocentric . . . . You gotta show me what's in it for me!

Level 4, conformist . . . . I need to know what should be done.

Level 5, manipulative . . . . What's the payoff? Show me the figures.

Level 6, sociocentric . . . . What's it going to do for the student and how does it help people?

Level 7, existential . . . . How does it fit with the broad perspective of where society is heading?
Job Design

Level 2, tribalistic . . . . I'll put up with anything as long as I have a good principal.

Level 3, egocentric . . . . I really don't care as long as I get my money and people keep off my back.

Level 4, conformist . . . . It's everyone's duty to do his job exactly as described by the administration.

Level 5, manipulative . . . . Needs to allow for advancement.

Level 6, sociocentric . . . . Schools should be set up in such a way that disharmony is not promoted between teacher and student.

Level 7, existential . . . . The goals of teaching must be meaningful to me and to society.
Administrative Systems and Procedures

Level 2, tribalistic . . . . I want my principal to make sure we know the rules.

Level 3, egocentric . . . . Schools have rules for everything, I make my own.

Level 4, conformist . . . . Teachers and students shouldn't be allowed to bend rules and should do exactly what the procedures call for.

Level 5, manipulative . . . . They're okay, but you've got to learn how to benefit personally by occasionally working around the rules.

Level 6, sociocentric . . . . They are often too impersonal and sometimes cause conflict.

Level 7, existential . . . . Should serve only as guidelines and permit flexibility and innovation.
Growth Opportunity

Level 2, tribalistic . . . . I want to do as well as most other teachers.

Level 3, egocentric . . . . There's a lot of things I could do if the system would let me.

Level 4, conformist . . . . I have faith that the administration will put me where I am needed most.

Level 5, manipulative . . . . I'm responsible for my own success and am constantly on the lookout for new opportunities.

Level 6, sociocentric . . . . Promotions are fine, but sometimes cause hard feelings and create a "dog-eat-dog" world.

Level 7, existential . . . . I need work of my own choosing that offers continuing challenge.
Maintenance Strategies

Pay and Benefits

Level 2, tribalistic . . . . Pay helps me to meet my bills and benefits to protect me in my old age.

Level 3, egocentric . . . . Whatever it is, it's never enough; they give you only what they have to.

Level 4, conformist . . . . Should be based on faithful and loyal service and in most cases are fairly set.

Level 5, manipulative . . . . It's the name of the game; the person who plays all the angles reaps the rewards.

Level 6, sociocentric . . . . It is an injustice when some individuals get so much more than others.

Level 7, existential . . . . Money is important, but what I do is more important. It should not create financial dependency.
Equal Employment Opportunity

Level 2, tribalistic . . . . I don't think we should have to work with people we don't want to.

Level 3, egocentric . . . . Equal Opportunity--hell! I'll take care of myself.

Level 4, conformist . . . . Like it or not, we should obey the established rules.

Level 5, manipulative . . . . If they can cut it within our system, more power to them.

Level 6, sociocentric . . . . It would be easy if we all accepted each other as human beings.

Level 7, existential . . . . Laws cannot create equality, only a change in people's values.
Facilities

Level 2, tribalistic . . . . Nice working conditions show us that we are cared for.

Level 3, egocentric . . . . This is just another trick to get me to work harder.

Level 4, conformist . . . . Good working conditions are nice to have and even if they are not good, everyone should do the best they can.

Level 5, manipulative . . . . Are a measure of my success; the higher one gets in the school system, the better should be his working conditions.

Level 6, sociocentric . . . . Should be arranged to facilitate better interpersonal relations, especially with students.

Level 7, existential . . . . Working conditions aren't as important as the knowledge that I am allowed to be spontaneous, creative, and facilitate significant learning.
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