

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 136 398

EA 009 316

AUTHOR Griffiths, Daniel E.
TITLE Some Thoughts About Theory in Educational Administration--1975.
INSTITUTION University Council for Educational Administration, Columbus, Ohio.
PUB DATE Oct 75
NOTE 9p.; For related documents, see EA 009 317 and EA 009 321
JOURNAL CIT UCEA Review; v17 n1 pp12-18,28 Oct 1975
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Personnel; Administrator Role; *Educational Administration; Elementary Secondary Education; *Organizational Theories; Post Secondary Education; Theories; *Trend Analysis

ABSTRACT

This article presents a brief discussion of issues related to the relationship between administrative theory and the practice of educational administration. In particular, the discussion focuses on four questions: 1) Are administrative theories particular or general? 2) Is theory a guide to action for administrators? 3) What is the place of theory in the preparation of practitioners? and 4) What should be the new directions in theory development? The author concludes his discussion by arguing that administrative theory has not thus far achieved its promise of providing a solid base for the practice of educational administration. (JG)

* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

SOME THOUGHTS ABOUT THEORY IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION — 1975

by
Daniel E. Griffiths

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

This paper has a history which, in part, explains why it is being given today. It has its roots in the International Intervisitation Programme which was held in England and Scotland during the summer of 1974. At that time representatives of 22 English speaking countries met to discuss *Educational Administration: New Directions in Theory and Practice*. In spite of the fact that many papers were aptly characterized by an Indian participant as exhibiting "sublime dullness," and that the conference climate was tuned to a high degree of international academic political intrigue, the conference did stimulate a controversy on theory of the type not seen since the late 50's and early 60's.

A paper by T. Barr Greenfield sparked most of the controversy.¹ Greenfield concluded his paper with a number of recommendations, one of which was:

We should begin to regard with healthy skepticism the claim that a general science of organization and administration is at hand.²

Since I have always had a healthy skepticism concerning this point I was quite surprised to note the opposition it provoked. This was especially true of the Austrialians, almost equaled by Canadians and those from the developing Commonwealth countries. Apparently, many have the idea that they possess the truth and have deified theory. While Greenfield only discussed his warning by saying that most theories had been generated in the United States and should be carefully tested prior to importation (the validity of this point should be questioned by no one) the conference members read the warning as a threat to their priesthood. Further evidence of the priesthood posture struck by some was the remark made by the President of the Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration that since there were practitioners present he would not give a scholarly paper. It is true that his paper

was not scholarly, but it would have taken far more than the absence of practitioners to make it so. It is sad to note that what Andrew Halpin warned against at the first University Council for Educational Administration seminar in 1957 has now come to pass.³ You will remember he said:

- "We must guard against castigating the practitioner as 'purely empirical.'" (p. 11)
- "Administrators and social scientists alike must guard against personal motives that are less than lofty." (p. 13)
- "Neither a particular theory nor the *idea of theory* are things to be sold, to be marketed as an advertiser might market a new breakfast cereal." (p. 15)
- "These premises lead to a preoccupation with theory for the sake of theory, a form of intellectual masturbation." (p. 15)
- "This should teach all of us concerned with theory development some sense of humility . . ." (p. 17)
- "But if we view various theories of administration in the spirit of Bohr's principle of complementarity rather than construe these theories as *competing* explanations of the truth, our progress will be healthier. The attitude may also alleviate some of the obnoxious symptoms of young investigators freshly pregnant with theory." (p. 18)

As I raised Greenfield's issue and others which follow in this paper last summer at the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration meeting I was quite surprised at the level of anxiety that was generated. If the presentation of ideas which seem to be obvious and innocent caused such an emotional response it may well be fruitful to raise them and others here.

I shall discuss a number of questions and points of view under four headings:

1. Are administrative theories particular or general?
2. Is theory a guide to action for administrators?



Dean Daniel Griffiths was the featured speaker at the UCEA Plenary Session in Dallas last February. His paper, as well as reactions by Donald Levine and William Monahan are reprinted here.

3. What is the place of theory in the preparation of the practitioner?
4. What should be the new directions in theory development?

I intend in this paper to present an overview rather than a study in depth of each point. The purpose of the paper is to raise to the level of consciousness some old and some new issues without being either comprehensive or complete. It would be unrealistic to even attempt to treat these topics comprehensively and completely in a brief paper, however, the ideas form the basis around which I am attempting a volume entitled *Administrative Theory and Research*. I might also add that readers of the first draft of this paper have found it opinionated and dogmatic. Both goals were achieved with minimal effort on my part. My revisions have, I hope, made the paper somewhat less dogmatic; however, I see no reason to be ashamed of having opinions.

Are administrative theories particular or general?

All of the theories employed in educational administration are adapted from theories developed in other fields. Therefore, the question of whether theories are general or particular is of considerable consequence. While there have been numerous discussions of this issue, they have not affected the widespread practice of borrowing theories, concepts, and research regardless of the source.

One study which did attempt to use a theoretical frame developed in industry and government to categorize New York City school personnel found serious differences.⁴ These were summarized as follows:

A significant distinction between Presthus' and our studies, however, occurs in the fact that some two-thirds of all teachers were found to be either pupil-oriented or intellectuals. Presthus has no categories even remotely resembling these, leading us to question the wholesale and indiscriminate application of studies of business, industry, the military, and the federal government to education.⁵

The only theory developed exclusively from studies of educational institutions (11 studies of universities) known to me bears no resemblance to any of the theories now in use in educational administration. While I would feel more comfortable with the Cohen, March, and Olsen formulation if I could see some clear relationship between their research and the resulting theory, nonetheless the theory appears to explain certain aspects of university governance. Their theoretical framework can be summarized as follows:⁶ While most organizations can be so named some of the time, public, educational, and illegitimate ones consistently display the characteristics of organized anarchies. They operate on the basis of inconsistent and ill-defined preferences--fuzzy goals, if you will; unclear technology, that is, their own processes are not understood by their members;

and fluid participation, that is, the members change frequently and devote varying amounts of time and energy to decision-making and, further, the audiences and decision makers change capriciously. Decision-making in such organizations is described by the authors as the "Garbage Can Model," for obvious reasons.

While I have been making the argument that administrative theories might well be more particularistic than general I do not go to the extreme position of Mayntz who says:

Propositions which hold for such diverse phenomena as an army, a trade union, and a university . . . must necessarily be either trivial or so abstract as to tell hardly anything of interest about concrete reality.

. . . After all, the distinct character of an organization is certainly determined, among other things, by the nature, interests, and values of those who are instrumental in maintaining it.⁷

To hold such a position means that the holder believes that every organization is unique and that one could not generalize at all. Rather, it would seem that borrowing of theories or research studies should be done with great care. There is little concern for the problem in the literature of educational administration. When it does appear it is in a cavalier form as witness Lipham's statement, "Heavy reliance must be placed upon transfer of learning - to the dismay of some who express fear that inappropriate transfer will be made."⁸ Or witness Crane and Walker's puzzling conclusion:

In the present state of both organizational and administrative studies, it could be said that a theory can be dependable without its having been rigorously tested in educational organizations.⁹

Whether one can safely borrow research or theory done in a particular type of organization is dependent on whether there is a reasonable degree of isomorphism. This might be ascertained by applying a set of criteria developed by Katzell.¹⁰ These are in summary:

Size

Degree of interaction and interdependence

Personalities of organizational members

Degree of congruence between organizational goals and goals and needs of members

Who has ability and motivation to take action to further organizations' objectives.

It can be seen that these criteria are sufficiently detailed as to act as a brake on those who are prone to use theories and studies from other organizations in a thoughtless manner.

Is theory a guide to action for administrators?

Quite unlike other professions, the justification for theory development in administration has rested largely on a claim that it can be used as a guide to action for administrators. It seems to me that while theory has something to offer it has less to offer the practitioner than we have thought. Just what does theory have to offer? From my own experience I have found the following guides to action which have come directly from theory:

- Theory provides a general framework for viewing the world.
- There are at least three dimensions for my social system: ideographic, nomothetic, cultural.
- If the concept of role is valid in a practical sense, and there is some doubt about this, then there are three kinds of role conflict.
- If one element of the system I administer is disturbed, other elements are likely to be disturbed. (However, I cannot predict what they will be.)
- Game theory helps me to understand certain conflict situations.
- Over time the various sub-units will tend towards autonomy.
- Systems are characterized by equifinality - there is no one best way.

While these are quite helpful, it is rather obvious that the list hardly deals with the totality of the real world of the administrator. A much more complete list could, and has been constructed when research findings are included.¹¹ It is interesting to note that very few attempts have been made to specify theories or theoretical information that would be of value to administrators. A much more fruitful task would be to specify research findings that would be useful to practitioners. Such findings as the following have been of help to me:

Utilizing the preparation end of Factor x, Preparation for Decision Making vs. Taking Final Action results in better decisions.¹²

Both group decisions and individual choices are riskier after group discussion to consensus than before.¹³

The cooperative development of impartial policies and regulations leads to a sense of greater power on the part of faculties.¹⁴

It does seem that research findings, appropriately written-up would serve as better guides to action than theory in its present state of development.

What is the place of theory in the preparation of administrators?

I take it that professors believe that preparation programs should be based on theory. This impression was gained from listening to professors both in this country and around the world. I had thought that non-American professors, alone, were prone to elevating the importance of theory beyond a reasonable level, but this may also be true of American professors. For instance, the Campbell and Newell study showed that 76% of the University Council for Educational Administration professors responded "Strongly Agree" or "Tend to Agree" with the statement, "The literature of educational administration should be theory-based."¹⁵ This uncritical embracing of theory on the part of professors is one side of the coin. On the other side is the statement by Greenfield:

The possibility of training administrators through the study of organization theory has been seriously overstated . . . training should move away from attempts to teach a broad social science of organizations-in-general toward a familiarity with specific organizations and their problems.¹⁶

While I have no way of knowing whether there has been a serious overestimation of the value of theory in administrator education, the feelings aroused by Greenfield's comment would suggest that his observation was valid for a large part of the world.

My feeling at this point in time is that any program based on theory would be a very thin one. Further, I am quite certain that although American professors talk a good game about theory, and non-Americans believe them, that in fact, few, if any, programs are theory-based.

A close reading of a chapter called, "The Theory-Based Perspective" in *Social Science Content for Preparing Educational Leaders* reveals the weakness of our theoretical base and the soft thinking we use in discussing the subject.¹⁷ One table entitled "Showing Criteria and Level of Selected Theories" contains the names of 13 authors representing 12 "theories." Nine of the authors have never written anything theoretical about educational administration and the inclusion of Marcuse leaves me talking to myself. Of the remaining four names, there are two theories of educational administration; the last reference is to a collection of articles and research papers. Apparently the authors have rather loose standards as to what constitutes a theory appropriate for educational administration.

Other descriptions of the use of theory in preparing administrators utilize much the same theories, but generally in a more discrete manner. The point is that there is not enough theory which has a clear and demonstrated relationship to educational administra-

tion on which to base a program of preparation. If professors believe that they can adequately prepare administrators on present theories, then they have indeed overestimated the power of the theories.

It seems to me that the proper place of theory in preparation programs is to give administrators an insight into how theoreticians think about administration and organizational behavior, to understand and interpret theory-based research, and to provide a frame of reference in which to conceptualize problems. In order to accomplish these outcomes, theory should be read and discussed in the context of specific cases, situations, and problems. I believe that the major value of the study of theory is to researchers, however, rather than to administrators. More time should be devoted in practitioner programs to the study of research findings whether or not they are related to theory. If I may be permitted an analogy: it is more valuable for an optometrist to have a general knowledge of the theory of optics plus an intensive knowledge of research which informs him of particular lenses which remedy particular eye dysfunctions.

I favor programs in which potential practitioners and potential researchers would study together in a foundations core stressing theory, but then branch off with administrators having a highly clinical program and researchers more theoretical.

New Directions

The need to de-emphasize the place of theory in educational administration has come about because of the failure of the field to produce new theories and to revise old ones. With the exception of the work of Cohen, March and Olsen, there have been no new theories since the 50's.¹⁸ While there has been a moderate flow of research, particularly doctoral dissertations, theoretical thinking has not kept pace with the discovery of facts. Neither have theories been constructed to keep pace with modern thinking in the behavioral sciences, with philosophical insights, and with social change.

The lack of scholarly productivity is very probably due to a concern for other activities on the part of professors. It is more in the tenor of the times to be an activist, to be concerned with doing rather than thinking and writing.

Campbell and Newell conclude:

We sense that for some professors, more frequently among those who are practice-oriented, compensation has become an overriding concern. These persons probably contribute to the impression held by many citizens and some students that professors merely use the university as a base from which to be absent in the pursuit of income from private consulting.¹⁹

Professors have been diverted from their central task; the creation of knowledge, and educational administration has suffered as the result.

“ . . . it would seem, at this point, to be a fruitless pursuit to strive for a single theory to explain administrative behavior.”

While at the International Intervisitation Programme it struck me that there was as much fuzziness about theory as there was 20 years ago in the States, but that there are more fuzzy people now than then. Not once, for instance, did any of the speakers or vocal discussants say what they meant by theory and particular theories were identified only under duress.

It appears that, in a large part of the world, the theory movement has been perverted to an ideology and is badly in need of renovation and redirection. Here in the States the theory movement has simply disintegrated. I note that the *Educational Administration Abstracts* has a section, at or near the back of each volume, entitled “Theory Development.” Few, very few, of the annotations deal with educational administration and equally few are theoretical in any strict sense of the word. I would suggest that the Fiegl definition that was generally accepted 15 years ago be reinstated and that only work which approximates this definition be acceptable as theoretical.

One of the most constructive products of the International Intervisitation Programme was the plea on the part of some of the younger participants to revise and develop theories based on the most modern thinking in the social and physical sciences. It was the feeling that administrative theory in education had made few gains in several years and that progress had passed educational administration by. The question was raised, but not answered, as to what were the new developments that should be incorporated in theory building.

In my opinion we should begin with a reconceptualization of administration and organizations. The theories of educational administration and the theories of administration and organizational behavior used in our field are based on certain assumptions which are no longer valid. It is assumed that organizations have goals which the members strive to attain, that there are roles, sets of expectations for the members, which are agreed upon (the nomothetic and idiographic dimensions), and that behavior is more or less governed by a set of rules (bureaucratic structure). The whole thing is viewed in our theories as essentially orderly and rational.

A different view has been offered by Lord Morris of Grasmere who has described clearly and concisely an emerging concept of the administrator in the modern world.²⁰

The new significant element he said is, "The peoples do not want to be governed, and clearly they do not believe that there is any real and final necessity to be governed"²¹ and further, "Yet governments must clearly go on trying to govern. And it is against this background that administrators will have to live and work."²² In terms of governmental leadership he thinks, "The most that is likely to emerge is a leader who is a genius at forecasting what is practical in government, which means fundamentally, and perhaps exclusively, what is acceptable."²³

We are, apparently, living with a new kind of politics and this has its repercussions on all who would aspire to govern and to administer. As Lord Morris put it, "The new Machiavelli can no longer make up his mind what he wants to do, and then bring the people round to putting up with it. His primary problem, almost it seems his whole problem, is to find some act of government, or any act of government, which is acceptable."²⁴

Men are saying much the same thing in our country. Commager was correct when he said: "There is no consensus. There is less harmony in our society, to my mind, than at any time since, say, Reconstruction. Perhaps the '60's and '70's are a great divide -- the divide of disillusionment."²⁵

What are the reasons for the collapse of consensus? Robert Nisbet has given considerable thought to the problem and has expressed it this way:

There is every reason for concluding that we are living in one of history's twilight periods; in our time a twilight of politics. It is the fate of all civilizations to outgrow the system of power that binds them. This, quite clearly, is happening in the West today, not least in the United States. I believe the waning of the political order . . . is a fact of highest significance, and far too little noted.²⁶

Currents of localism and regionalism, as well as of ethnic, religious, communal, and other particularist values, all generated in such large degree by the repugnance for the national state and its processes of power will surely sweep up educational institutions along with other signal features of our society.²⁷

It will be very difficult to be an administrator in these circumstances. Government policies (including those of boards of education) will be apt to be very changeable and the circumstances which affect statesmanship will affect administration. The administrator will, for instance, have to see that his methods are "acceptable" and he will have to make everything that he does "comprehensible" to the various publics. Further, it is the traditional role of the administrator to propose solutions to the problems confronting his institution. This role will continue unchanged; however, it must function within the new context. As Lord Morris said, "But the professional administrator must research the facts and devise an operable scheme. And by the same token it is his task to present an *acceptable* scheme; for today only acceptable schemes are operable."²⁸

It is my opinion that we are now at the stage described by Lord Morris in practice, but not in our theory. It is clear to me that faculties of schools of education really don't want deans, that public school teachers don't want principals or superintendents, but that these administrators are necessary if the institutions are going to operate. Both personal observation and the literature indicate that school principals feel that they do not have clearly defined jobs. Collective bargaining contracts have stripped away most their authority and functions without offering replacements. Most deans are in similar straits, some because of contracts, others because of the power of faculties, senates or other bodies.

New theories are needed to describe and explain the kinds of organizations which are emerging and the administration which will be necessary.

It seems to me that in order to understand the way members view the organizations in which they work and live that it is useful to examine a philosophical position which is now very popular in Western Europe and which is gaining supporters in this country, namely, phenomenology. Greenfield raised this point at the International Intervisitation Programme when he recommended that: "Research into organizational problems should consider and begin to use the phenomenological perspective."²⁹

To many in the conference phenomenology was a brand new word and it was made the butt of jokes and off-hand comments. To the British, and the few Europeans on the scene, it was familiar and was the object of great excitement. To the Americans, it was the cause of considerable consternation. The term is familiar to us; the phenomenology fad rose in the United States after World War II and subsided in the early 1950's. Only the ASCD was ever excited about it and then because it fits their anarchical view of the universe, a view now shared by increasing numbers. However, according to recent educational history what is popular in England today will be popular in the U.S. tomorrow. I could stretch it a bit and say that what was popular in the U.S. 40 years ago is popular in England today and will be popular in the U.S. tomorrow. Further, we were thoroughly confused by the way Greenfield used the term, particularly the people he associated with it. In discussing, but not defining phenomenology, he says it is, ". . . that view which sees organization as the perceived social reality within which individuals make decisions."³⁰

“. . . the justification for theory development in administration has rested largely on a claim that it can be used as a guide to action for administrators.”

It is my feeling that, although Greenfield should be thanked for shaking us out of our theory lethargy, his view of phenomenology was rudimentary and naive. I suspect that what he did was to interpret phenomenology loosely and use it to support some ideological concepts which he holds. For instance, many scholars, particularly in Western Europe put great emphasis on one's personal experience and it is made the center for theoretical work.

This leads Greenfield to define theory as, "Sets of meanings which people use to make sense of their world and behavior within it."³¹

In short, he equates theory with commonsense, and this I believe we should reject.

At this point I should offer a definition of phenomenology, but this is more difficult than it should be. It seems that phenomenologists have not agreed on a definition and I suppose this is to be expected. In responding to the question "What is phenomenology?" Thvenaz says, "The question is as irritating for the layman who hearing the word would like to know at least roughly what it means, as it is for the historian of philosophy or the philosophical specialist who has the feeling of pursuing an elusive doctrine, never clearly defined during the fifty years of its rich evolution, . . ."³²

I think though that English's discussion, while probably not satisfactory to phenomenologists does shed some light on the word:

phenomenology: a theoretical point of view that advocates the study of phenomena or direct experience taken naively or at face value; the view that behavior is determined by the phenomena of experience rather than by external, objective, physically described reality. (English, p. 387)

As a way of elaborating English uses the illustration,

Cows, busses, a threatening voice, a delightful aroma, a remembered event of long ago, are to be studied just as they are for the experiencer, not as modified by any observational rules. (English, p. 387)

There are a number of ideas in phenomenology which are of value to us as theoreticians. I believe, for instance, that the real world is much more as it is seen by the phenomenologists than it is as viewed by Weber or Getzels and Guba. And while a theory does not need to correspond to reality to be useful, when given two viewpoints of reality it is more heuristic to choose the one that does correspond more closely.

To get back to the point, it seems to me that Weber sees organizations as essentially goal-directed with the members committed to achieving the goals, rule oriented, relatively stable, fulfilling legitimate (that is, publicly sanctioned) purposes and existing in a world in which there is a high degree of consensus on values and ends. (Greenfield would not agree with this description of the Weberian view. However, I find Greenfield's

understanding of Weber to be strange.) The phenomenologists view organizations as "invented social reality,"³³ as having no goals of their own, but serving as vehicles for the achievement of the goals of their members. It is for this reason that I see the theoretical ideas of Cohen, March and Olsen as more useful than role, decision, or systems theory in explaining behavior in educational organizations. While I do not view Cohen, et al. as phenomenologists, their views of the universe tend in that direction.

Two other comments on phenomenology before dropping it - while it would be useful to study organizations using some of the orientation of the phenomenologists, I would warn against developing phenomenological theories of administration. Phenomenology is essentially a method of inquiry, at best a philosophy.³⁴ The use of phenomenology should be restricted to methods of research, and as variables in theoretical statements. The same would be true of many other values.

"The proper place of theory in preparation programs is to give administrators an insight into how theoreticians think about administration and organizational behavior."

Present efforts at theorizing in educational administration use concepts which are stated in sociological, psychological, economic, or anthropological language and these are abstractions. For instance, we talk of a person as occupying a role. Role is a sociological abstraction. The phenomenologist would prefer to speak of the person as a basic fact. As Vandenberg puts it for education, "The task of educational theory is the restoration of the wholeness of educational phenomena as they appear within the educating perspective."³⁵ Whether this is something more than what many of us mean when we ask for "flat" descriptions of administrative situations I do not know. At any rate what the phenomenologists call for in this instance is highly desirable.

It seems to me that the theories employed in educational administration are essentially Great Man theories, that is, it is assumed that if the administrator is capable enough he will be able to comprehend and resolve all situations in a satisfactory manner. It seems to me that a number of recent studies would lead to precisely the opposite conclusion, namely, there are situations which no administrator, however capable, can comprehend and resolve unless changes are brought about to change the environment or the organization. I have in mind the Nicholas, et al., study of the climates of four elementary schools and the differences in administrative behavior found in each.³⁶ In addition, there are now several studies which attempt to build classification systems of climates and environments.

An experimental study by Frederiksen, et al., employed simulation to test the effect of climate on the people working in it.³⁷ The major finding was that the mean Productivity score, that is, the amount of work completed, is significantly affected by the consistency of climate conditions. More important are the four climates that were contrived and the fact that it was clearly and significantly demonstrated that the climates made a difference in administrative performance.

Taking von Bertalanffy's formulation with which we are all familiar, Emery and Trist developed a concept, "the causal texture of the environment" to account for those processes in the environment which are among the determining conditions of the exchanges between the organization and its environment.³⁸ Four types of causal textures were identified following studies of change problems in hospitals, prisons, educational and political organizations: placid, randomized environment; placid, clustered environment; disturbed, reactive environment; and turbulent fields.

I understand that universities would be said to be operating in turbulent fields since most of our troubles arise from the environment itself not from within the organization. By a process that is not entirely clear, the authors feel that an analysis of the environment resulting in turbulent fields implies that McGregor's Theory Y is the proper course of action. This means that a new set of values must be developed--which they feel will take a generation. Not a very encouraging vista!

The other study, of the many that could have been cited, is that of Jurkovich who developed a core typology of organizational environments.³⁹ His typology consists of 64 environments and is expandable. The typology is built upon Emery and Trist's work just referred to, the study of Thompson, and the work of Lawrence and Lorsch.⁴⁰ He sees his typology as an analytical tool to stimulate thinking on alternate directions in which organizations can move.

Some Useful Approaches

While it is true that some of our theories do incorporate the environment, we need other theories in which the field is the dominant factor. A useful start might be to build one or more theories on Emery and Trist's concept of turbulent fields.

Another useful approach might be to build theories of educational administration based upon game theory and such economic concepts as utility. I found Horvath's chapter in *Social Science Content for Preparing Educational Leaders* to be valuable.⁴¹ I am suggesting that these approaches be tested to determine how isomorphic they are with educational settings and if they are to develop administrative theories based upon their assumptions.

I have pointed to some rather obvious problems and concerns: the elevation of the professorship to the priesthood, the tendency towards automatic transfer of theories and research conclusions, the inadequacy of theory as a guide to action, and questions about the significance of theory in the preparation program. Further, I proposed that the nature of administration is changing, that the way people see their organizations differ from previous views, that the situation may be more powerful than the administrator, and that game theory may develop into a significant tool. All of these developments should be incorporated into new theories for educational administration.

Nothing I have said should be construed to mean that I have abandoned my belief in the promise of a solid theoretical base for educational administration. Rather, my comments should be interpreted to mean that thus far theory has not achieved its promise. But, this is because we have not done our homework, not because the promise is unrealistic.

FOOTNOTES

1.—T. Barr Greenfield. "Theory in the Study of Organizations and Administrative Structures: A New Perspective." International Intervisitation Programme, 1974.

2.—Ibid., p. 14.

3.—Andrew Halpin. "The Development of Theory in Educational Administration" in Andrew Halpin (ed.), *Administrative Theory in Education*. Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1958.

4.—Daniel E. Griffiths, Samuel Goldman, Wayne J. McFarland, "Teacher Mobility in New York City," *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 15-31.

5.—Ibid., p. 30.

6.—Michael D. Cohen, James G. March and Johan P. Olsen. "A Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, March 1972, pp. 1-25.

7.—Renate Mayntz. "The Study of Organizations," *Current Sociology*, Vol. 13, No. 3, 1964, pp. 95-155 as quoted in Greenfield, *Ibid.*, p. 3.

8.—James M. Lipham. "Content Selection in Organizational Theory and Behavior in Education," in Jack Culbertson, et al. (eds.), *Social Science Content for Preparing Educational Leaders* (Columbus: Charles E. Merrill), 1973, p. 311.

9.—Jack Culbertson, A. R. Crane and W. G. Walker (eds.). "The Theory-Based Perspective" in *Social Science Content for Preparing Educational Leaders* (Columbus: Charles E. Merrill), 1973, p. 403.

10.—Raymond Katzell. "Contrasting Systems of Work Organization," *American Psychologist*, 1962, 17 pp. 102-108 as summarized in Cary M. Lichtman and Raymond G. Hunt, "Personality and Organization Theory: A Review of Some Conceptual Literature," *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 76, No. 4, pp. 283-285.

11.—Roald Campbell, "Implications for the Practice of Administration," *Behavioral Science and Educational Administration*, National Society for the Study of Education Yearbook, 1964, pp. 279-302.

12.—John Hemphill, Daniel E. Griffiths, Norman Frederiksen. *Administrative Performance and Personality* (New York: Teachers College Press), p. 19.

13.—Dorwin Cartwright, "Risk Taking By Individuals and Groups: An Assessment of Research Employing Choice Dilemmas," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 20, No. 3, 1971, p. 363.

14.—Gerald H. Moeller and W. W. Charters, "Relation of Bureaucratization to Sense of Power Among Teachers," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, March 1966.

15.—Roald F. Campbell, L. Jackson Newell, *A Study of Professors of Educational Administration* (Columbus: University Council for Educational Administration), 1973, p. 88.

16.—Greenfield, *Ibid.*, p. 15.

17.—Culbertson, Crane and Walker, *Ibid.*, p. 404.

18.—Cohen, March and Olsen, *Ibid.*

19.—Campbell and Newell, *Ibid.*, pp. 145-146.

20.—Lord Morris. *Opening Address*, International Intervisitation Programme, 1974, Bristol, England.

21.—Ibid., p. 2.

22.—Ibid., p. 3.

23.—Ibid., p. 3.

24.—Ibid., p. 2.

25.—*Time*, July 15, 1974, p. 23.

26.—Robert Nisbet, "The Decline of Academic Nationalism," *Change*, Summer 1974, p.

(Continued on page 28.)

(Continued from Page 18)

- 27.—Ibid., p. 31.
 28.—Lord Morris, Ibid., p. 6.
 29.—Greenfield, Ibid., p. 13.
 30.—Ibid., p. 3.
 31.—Greenfield, Ibid., p. 5.
 32.—Pierre Thévenaz, *What is Phenomenology* (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1962, p. 37.)
 33.—T. Barr Greenfield, "Organizations as Social Inventions: Rethinking Assumptions About Change," *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, Vol. 9, No. 5, 1973, pp. 351-374.
 34.—James M. Edie (ed.), "Introduction," *What is Phenomenology* (Chicago: Quadrangle Books), 1962.
 35.—Donald Vandenberg, "Phenomenology and Educational research" in David E. Denton (ed.), *Existentialism and Phenomenology in Education* (New York: Teachers College Press), 1974, p. 189.
 36.—Lynn N. Nicholas, Helen E. Virjo, William W. Wattenburg, *Effect of Socioeconomic Setting and Organizational Climate on Problems Brought to Elementary School Offices*, United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Cooperative Research Project No. 2394 (Detroit: Wayne State University), 1965, 169 pp.
 37.—N. Frederiksen, O. Jensen and A. E. Beaton, *Organizational Climates and Administrative Performance* (Princeton: Educational Testing Service), 1968, 376 pp.
 38.—P. E. Emery and E. L. Trist, "The Causal Texture of Organizational Environments," in Joseph Litterer (ed.), *Organizations: Systems, Control and Adaptation*, Vol. II, Second Edition (New York: John Wiley), 1963.
 39.—Ray Jurkovich, "A Core Typology of Organizational Environments," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 19, No. 3, September, 1974.
 40.—James D. Thompson, *Organizations in Action* (London: McGraw-Hill), 1967, pp. 70-73. Paul R. Lawrence, Jay W. Lorsch, *Organization and Environment* (Boston: Harvard Business School), 1967, pp. 23-34.
 41.—Culbertson, et al., Ibid., pp. 245-268.

(Continued from page 27)

efforts in organizations. He maintained that human reforms are appropriate so long as they do not interfere with the basic accomplishment of the objectives for which an organization exists.

Participants included graduate students from the Ohio State University, Syracuse, Rutgers, University of Virginia, University of Tennessee, University of Louisville, Ball State University, and the University of Texas.

Members of the Seminar Committee were:

Meredith Adler, Wes McNeill, Ron Snavely, Planning Committee; John Brock, Mike Brooks, Bob Coburn, Andy Hugar, Charleen McAuliffe, Ken Scott, Joong Shik Shin, Mike Suzuki, and John Thompson. Dr. Charles F. Faber served as advisor.