

represent creative activities which draw out potentialities from all five categories—psycho-motor, perceptual, cognitive, affective, and volitional—they are necessarily at the heart of the Anisa curriculum. As Fred R. Schwart writes in *The Structure and Potential of Art Education*:

The conception of the centrality of art in the curriculum is revolutionary. To accept it would mean the total reorientation of societies, values, goals, aspirations, beliefs, habits, prejudices, and ideas. One implication lies in the valuing of art products as important objects not only for aesthetic contemplation and study but also for seeking man's significance, his possibilities, and his status in the unexplained conglomeration of events and phenomena.

Charles E. Silberman made a salient point in *Crisis in the Classroom*:

The scientist and the poet do not live at antipodes; on the contrary, the artificial separation of these aspects or modes of knowing—the false dichotomy between the cognitive and the affective domains—can only cripple the development of thought and feeling. If this be so, then poetry, music, painting, dance, and other arts are not frills to be indulged in if time is left over from the real business of education—they are the business of education.

It is one thing to have an intuition that art belongs at the heart of the curriculum. It is another to have an explicit philosophical base, and a coherent body of theory that not only says that art should be at the heart of the curriculum, but explains why. The Anisa Model is an expression of such a conviction and its justification.

FIELDING THE ANISA MODEL

By NANCY McCORMICK RAMBUSCH

I have engaged in the calculated diffusion of two educational ideologies in the past twenty years. In one attempt, from 1953 to 1963, I acted as a "circuit rider," moving an American formulation of the ideas of Maria Montessori across the United States. In another, in 1973-74, I helped "install" the Anisa model in a single public elementary school in Hampden, Maine. What I report here are some personal reflections on diffusion experience. I do not pretend to scientific, historical or even personal objectivity. Retrospective nostalgia and partisan perception are inevitable in any first-person account of events. The idiosyncratic nature of my information comes from the role I assumed in these enterprises. Judith Meyer has described this role in relationship to the American Montessori movement:

Rambusch's role in the diffusion process can be described as a change agent role, the helper or person who is trying to affect change, i.e., adoption.

There were many theories of planned change but as yet no theory of "changing," or of how change actually occurs. Warren Bennis suggests that when change agents write of their work they do so as "theoretical orphans." This assessment seems accurate when one considers that the economy of "changing" is not identical to the economy of the idea which invokes the "changing."

In the 1973-74 academic year, the Anisa model went to the field in four different locations: Hampden, Maine; Suffield, Connecticut; Fall River, Massachusetts and Kansas City, Missouri. The diffusion model used by Anisa is characterized by Donald Schon as the center-periphery model.

The center-periphery model rests on three basic elements:

- (1) The innovation to be diffused exists, fully realized in its essentials, prior to its diffusion.
- (2) Diffusion is the movement of an innovation from a center out to its ultimate users.
- (3) Directed diffusion is a centrally managed process of dissemination, training and provision of resources and incentives.

Schon argues that the effectiveness of a center-periphery system depends first upon the level of resources and energy at the center, then upon the number of points on the periphery, the length of radii of the spokes through which the diffusion occurs, and the energy required to facilitate adoption. I do not believe that the election of this diffusion model was conscious at the outset of the Anisa field experience, but that a description of it serves to "fit" the administrative

relationship which developed between the Anisa group at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, and the institution which received the model.

Prototypical change agents in the center-periphery model of diffusion are the agricultural extension agent, the pharmaceutical firm's "detail man" (who explains new drugs to physicians), and the salesman. A change agent using the agricultural extension agent as a model would reckon himself effective depending upon his own energies and skills, the number and location of the farmers he serves, and the time and effort he expends on each farmer.

Research in the diffusion of innovation supports the notion that the success of a change agent is positively related to (1) the extent of change effort, (2) the degree to which the program is compatible with client needs, (3) the extent to which the change agent works through opinion leaders and (4) the credibility of the change agent. (See Everett M. Rogers and F. Floyd Shoemaker, *Communication or Innovation*.)

Failure of the center-periphery model results from the depletion of resources and energy at the center, the overloading of the capacity at the radii and the mishandling of feedback from the periphery to the center. Such failure, Schon says, takes the form of simple ineffectiveness of diffusion, distortion of the message or, disintegration of the system as a whole.

As field preparation, Anisa sponsored a summer workshop at the University of Massachusetts in 1973 for those staff members who would be implementing the model in their institutions in the coming year. I, together with Anisa staff member Magdalene Carney, organized the Summer Laboratory School which served as a training site for other Anisa staff members, many of whom were working in an ungraded setting for the first time. The school operated as a half day program for the children and as virtually a full day program for the Anisa staff. We rehearsed in private every lesson and strategy that we proposed to present to the children "in public." The focus of the program was the Anisa definition of pedagogy, "the organization of environments and the guidance of interactions"; the pedagogy of the program was Montessori-oriented. Our practical concerns centered on the observation and management of children and the enhancement of their purposive activity.

At the end of the summer, I was asked to act as Coordinator of the Anisa project in Hampden, Maine, at the Earl C. McGraw School, serving children in kindergarten through third grade. I had a slight acquaintance with the six McGraw teachers and their principal, who had come to the workshop. I had visited Hampden with other Anisa staff members for a week at the end of the summer.

The chief strength of the Anisa staff members was their theoretical knowledge of various aspects of the model. In retrospect, I believe that of all the Anisa groups in the field, the Hampden, Maine, team had the greatest "field" advantage. The Hampden group was organized *as a team*. At the outset of the project I had negotiated for a group with stable membership. Three of us, Michael Kalinowski, Linda Pratt and myself, stayed together the whole year, saw ourselves as a team and were seen by the Hampden staff as a team. Michael Kalinowski's interest was Human Development, Linda Pratt's Reading, and mine Pedagogy and Organizational Behavior. All three of us were doctoral students in the Anisa program, though our backgrounds and ages were very different.

We experienced the excitement and commitment of a brief and intense time together, doing a difficult job. The physical presence of the Anisa team in Hampden in 1973-74 amounted to three days every two weeks from September through December, and three days every month thereafter. We calculated that we needed two days of planning time for every day in the field. Since these planning days were not in the Anisa contract, we spent many weekends during the year in planning. Although many other Anisa staff members joined us at Hampden in the course of the year, the Hampden team represented to the McGraw staff a special definition of Anisa. I take this to be inevitable in a process of "changing." The notion that the missionaries sent to bring the word of God to the aborigines were interchangeable is a fantasy indulged in only by religious superiors.

The "changing" process in Hampden involved multiple perspectives. Of those doing the changing, some were at the center and some at the periphery of those being changed; some administrated the change and some implemented it directly. The theoreticians "back" at the University of Massachusetts (or Mother Church) were intent upon the transmission of ideas without distortion. The clients were intent on having whatever was offered them match what they already had. Those in the change agent role attempted a "fit" between the two groups, aware constantly that one or both might feel misrepresented or ignored.

Anisa took to the field as an elaborate idea. The client system—the Hampden, Maine, Public Schools—in the person of the Superintendent of Schools, John Skehan, accepted that idea and mandated its incarnation in the Earl C. McGraw school. Richard Carlson points to "the school superintendent [as] at the focal point in the decision process regarding [educational] innovations." School systems functioning as bureaucracies have those in power make the decisions which the powerless are expected to implement. The first order of business for the Anisa team at McGraw was to convince those re-

luctant staff members that they wanted what they had been "handed" by the superintendent.

The most critical person for the success of the Anisa Model at McGraw was the principal, Willard Hillier. His was the responsibility for overseeing the incarnational process on a daily basis. He is an outstanding administrator who had the respect and confidence of his staff long before the Anisa team arrived. From the beginning of our work together, he translated theory into imaginative administrative practice. He proved continually to be the most effective ally and advocate the Anisa Model had in Hampden.

Effective change agents act in a variety of roles. Ronald Havelock suggests that among their most important are those of catalyst, solution giver, resource linker, process linker and process helper.

As *catalyst*, the change agent exerts pressure on the institution to change, by prodding people within it to become less complacent and to attend to problems of mutual concern.

As *solution giver*, the change agent knows both what solutions to offer and when and how to offer them, so that the client can have ownership in them.

As *resource linker*, the change agent keeps the client in touch with the theoretical underpinnings of his practice and helps him in the diagnosis of his problems. The change agent helps in the formulation and adoption of solutions and offers the client information on the change process itself. At the beginning of an innovation's field trial, people are the greatest resource the change agent can make available to the client.

As *process linker*, the change agent involves himself in the "fielding" of the innovation. Practically, he has skills in bringing about change in people and organizations. He strives to make the client progressively more capable of generating his own change.

The change agent role central to making an innovation work in the field is that of Havelock's *process-helper*, a role in which the change agent begins a six-step negotiation with the client. The first step is building a relationship with the client; the second step is helping diagnose the client's problem; the third step is helping the client acquire relevant resources; the fourth step is helping the client choose a solution; the fifth step is helping the client in gaining acceptance for the solution the client has chosen, and the final step is stabilizing the innovation and generating in the client the capability for self-renewal. The Anisa team's experience at McGraw in 1973-74 provides an illustration of this staged behavior.

Building a relationship between the change agent and client means working with everyone in the client system at the same time. Although

administrators and teachers often see themselves and are seen in an adversary relationship, such was not the case at McGraw. Despite varying degrees of commitment to the Anisa idea, the McGraw staff was unified in a cautious willingness to try it out. Havelock suggests that a secure and well-delineated helping role is the change agent's starting point. At a late August workshop, the Anisa team introduced the McGraw staff to notions of environmental design in interaction with behavioral management and instructional strategy. At that time, the McGraw staff drew up a behavioral charter for the school in the coming year. The staff decided upon the behaviors which it wanted to present to the children as normative, and the ground rules it believed consistent with these behaviors. The staff also decided upon the routines of the school day and the responsibilities of each teacher in relationship to the responsibilities of all staff members. Principal Willard Hillier captured the spirit of the meeting when he concluded it by saying, "The children belong to all of us."

Ways in which the Anisa team offered help to the McGraw staff were varied. The two extremely competent kindergarten teachers, Christine MacGregor and Carol Kelsey, wanted to pool their adjacent spaces, materials and programs. The team helped them analyze their program, reorganize their physical space and move their furniture. The team then demonstrated ways in which teachers could get information about children through the rearrangement of their physical environment. When the children walked into kindergarten on the first day of school and started working as if by magic, the kindergarten teachers accepted the Anisa team as credible. They knew that we knew what we were doing. The effects of the Anisa team's fall planning, done with the McGraw staff in late summer, began to be felt by everyone almost as soon as school opened.

By our second visit, the teachers expressed the opinion that they "knew" as much about their children in late September as they had at Thanksgiving the previous year. They saw their management problems as greatly diminished and their behavioral charter as working. (Throughout the year, the principal felt no qualms about entering the classrooms and reminding teachers of their covenanted responsibilities to the children.)

Anisa had contracted originally to do a three-year project at McGraw, starting with Kindergarten and First Grade the first year, and adding one grade each year. By late September, it was apparent that the Anisa team would be dealing with the whole school all of the time. The principal did not want a have/have not polarity between the teachers who had our attention and those who did not. We were becoming close to the McGraw staff more quickly than we had originally anticipated. We all wanted to capitalize on

the entire staff's interest. We requested Anisa at Amherst to reconfigure the contract. We and the McGraw staff had decided upon this step together.

The second duty of Havelock's *process helper* is diagnosis. In the case of the Anisa Model, the teachers had not seen any need to implement the Model; many of them were not unhappy with their teaching. The Anisa team's theme song, from the beginning, was derived from the Alka-Seltzer commercial, "Try it; you'll like it!" We assured the teachers that they would come to like what they could not avoid trying. An effective team strategy was helping each teacher solve her small problems as a demonstration of our competence and concern. For one teacher, it was help with the revision of her seating arrangement in order to gain better control of her children's behavior; for another, it was our demonstration of small group strategies with the children, which the teacher tried after she saw us succeed. (Throughout the year, the most important skill I brought to the Anisa team and to McGraw was an ability to do anything with the children *practically* that was discussed *theoretically*.)

The third Havelock step involves assisting the client in the acquisition of relevant resources. In the Anisa team's case, we ourselves represented relevant resources in search of opportunities for use, and we were able to call upon the entire Anisa "central" staff in Amherst to help us.

Havelock's fourth step involves helping the client choose a solution. The McGraw "solution" was to make the best fit between the life of the McGraw school and the Anisa Model. We realized that the school was part of an on-going social system with a life and laws of its own. Respecting this fact, we chose to focus on solutions to small problems in the first year. The Anisa Model does not specify solutions, but suggests directions. We found as many of these to pursue as there were teachers and situations.

When an innovative idea takes hold, the client, seeing that the "solution" works, tends to want to diffuse it to the broadest possible group. Havelock characterizes this as the fifth step in the *process helper* chain. At McGraw, the notion of "gaining acceptance" had been built into the original contract by the Superintendent. At the end of the first year, the McGraw principal was cautious about extensive immediate dissemination of the Model. He did not want to see the good things that had come to McGraw through Anisa dissipated through premature exposure. The McGraw staff members also held back from the task of dissemination because they did not feel confirmed in their own competence.

Havelock's final step to implement—the stabilization of the inno-

vation and the development of the capability for self-renewal within the client system: the way in which the McGraw principal, Willard Hillier, functioned as chief staff developer throughout the year—assured us of an organic continuation of the Model after the first-year team's departure. Indeed, the design process of the 1974 summer workshop was an example of the way in which the McGraw teachers became involved in the Model's stabilization. They involved themselves at all stages of the workshop planning. They chose McGraw as the preferred site; they negotiated with us for the format of the lab school to be part of the program. The teachers resisted the idea of teaching in the school; they preferred to let us teach while they watched. It was a measure of our friendliness that we refused to accept their suggestion, but set up instead of a team-taught, multi-age group in which the whole staff participated. The extrapolation of the workshop format to a third summer would involve the McGraw teachers in the total design, organization and conduct of an Anisa lab school.

Helping the client become self-critical and undertake his own self-renewal is the change agent's concluding task. It is critical that the client not see the personalities of the change agents as co-terminus with the Model or the program. Havelock suggests that as the self-renewal capacity of the client develops, the termination of the client-change agent relationship becomes possible. This allows the change agent to move on and the client to become independent. This too happened at McGraw. The staff knew that all of the 1973-74 Anisa team members were leaving at the end of the 1974 summer and saw that team changes meant no diminution of the Model's impact.

The effectiveness of the Anisa model at McGraw in 1973-74 can be judged along parallel dimensions: the energy and resources represented by the Anisa staff at Amherst, and those represented by the McGraw team. I ascribe a great deal of the incarnational success of Anisa at McGraw to the clarity of the Model itself, the extraordinary leadership offered the McGraw staff by Willard Hillier, and the careful attention the Anisa team gave to the McGraw staff needs throughout the year.

Note: The elements of "changing" which I have discussed may appear unrelated substantively to transmission of the Anisa Model at the Earl C. McGraw school in Hampden, Maine, during the 1973-74 school year. If this is so, it is because the complexity of brokering change is not apparent to those readers accustomed to trafficking in ideas rather than in their incarnation.

NANCY MCCORMICK RAMBUSCH, *founder of the American Montessori Society, is currently an associate professor of education at Xavier University, Cincinnati, Ohio.*