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Abstract

This dissertation, explores and examines various foundations for thinking about organizational systems, i.e., organizational epistemics. There are several ways to examine "systems" and several levels at which criteria apply to systems. First, the study establishes the minimum demands on "systems" andformulates what is essentially a system for systems or an organizational system for selecting organizations' designs.

By adopting a generic model, one that stipulates minimum requirements for assessing organizational designs, each administrative organization is evaluated in terms of the theoretical justification used to ensure an effective and efficient organizational structure.

The future effectiveness of organizational designs is contingent on changes in society, in education, and in the private sector, e.g., responses to social, economic, and cultural exigencies. This dissertation explores possibilities for the future as organizations respond to new and unusual variables. The format suggested in this study may well provide a glimpse of what the future holds for organizational designs in the world of tomorrow.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The topic of organizational epistemology is one that should be of common interest to any administrator or academic. The uncommon interest should come for anyone reading this dissertation. Generally, there are theoretical, methodological administrators whose primary concern is for ideas and the assumptions that guide them.

If we adopt a generic model, one that stipulates minimum requirements for assessing organizational designs, it is possible to evaluate administrators in terms of their theoretical justification for making decisions. Administrators, we know, do theoretical jobs, and the theories they use are either left unarticulated or are suggested subtly because they do not want to cause trouble for their less-academic listeners.

Some of the more complex issues of theory, competing criteria for theory, and questions posed about the decision bases that direct the theories used in administrative organizations are reviewed in this chapter. Theories usually employ concepts or abstractions and in terms of these, formulate principles or laws. There are two primary theories that concern this study: Critical Theory and Foundational Theory. On the problematic side is the critical theorist, is one who tends to rely on psychological
criteria to make decisions. Critical theorists have also been known to use foundational language to justify an analysis on soft data, hence qualitative analysis. Examples of this can be seen in diaries, logs, or other forms of oral or written accounts of experience.

Foundational theorists, on the other hand, hold more to theoretical and logically defensible or methodologically justifiable grounds for their use of theory. Trying to justify and rationalize the behavior of an administrator turns on how one understands the nature of the administrative theory.

The major question, then, devalues the nature of the criteria used for each theory. If, for instance, to use a game analogy, there are criteria for games of one type, say bridge, and there are criteria for another game, say chess, the question is how do the criteria for each game apply to the other game if the definition and moves are totally different. The answer, although the game may be different, is that the theory behind the criteria does not change. To quote T. Frank Saunders (1992) in his efforts to develop minimum criteria for structural evaluation, "The problem is one of internal consistency."

In like fashion, how do the criteria for critical theory apply to the foundational concepts of a more traditional idea of theories? Critical theorists, like
Willower, in his article "Philosophy and the Study of Educational Administration" (1985), suggests the use of a less-structured, hypothesis-oriented mode in qualitative investigation, limiting administrators to observational field studies to gain a better understanding of educational administration.

In contrast Evers (1985) uses positivist philosophy theory as grounds for discounting a philosophy of administration. He notes,

> If philosophy, or some conception of it, has systematic consequences for some discipline or body of theory, where is the mistake in counting this class of consequences, together with supporting philosophical arguments, as elements of a philosophy of that discipline or body of theory? (p. 5).

Two methodological questions arise:

1. Can we examine each theory for the internal consistency of the criteria peculiar to that theory? Yes, because the rules in a game are held to be internally consistent no matter what the game. The rules for the game should stay the same and should not be changed in mid-stride, e.g., the queen must always take the king in a game of chess.

2. Can we conceptually generate a set of criteria to unify the two different sets of criteria? Must not theories abide by the same rules regardless of what the particular rules are? The answer is yes; a set of
criteria can be formed by establishing a "game theory" or a "theory for theory." In other words, if the rules of the game are to be changed, then everyone must know that the rules have been changed.

But what does this type of inquiry have to do with administration? The administrator should attempt to justify the theoretical stance used to make decisions for the organization. It would be reassuring to think that administrators choose on the bases of coherent and theoretically defensible grounds when it comes to decision making. Does anyone really care whether there is a theoretical rationale for administrative behavior, or is it acceptable that the organization functions serendipitously?
Given the plethora of materials in explaining organizational structures in educational administration, there is an underlying need for administrators to identify some criteria and a rationale for knowing which structure is appropriate for any given organization and under what circumstances the selection will be effective for the organization's mission.

The process of identifying criteria as part of the rationale for effective selection of an organizational design must include a review of the literature specifically dealing with organizational structures. However, the absence of emphasis in the literature is somewhat constraining in that authors on this subject tend to ignore the underlying traditional models and fail to examine the structural appropriateness of their organizational design to the diverse groups to which the design might apply.

It would serve writers well when referring to organizations to begin with the organizational chart, place the major functions of the organization in some hierarchical sequence in terms of levels of responsibility, and then find some way to establish performance requirements for positions on the chart.

Despite a concern in common with traditionalists for capturing the essence of social structure, current writers make similar mistakes when interpreting organizations'
adaptation to culture. This study defines the components of the organization in such a way as to help anyone interested in "diagnosing" or examining an organization for its effectiveness to gain a broad perspective on designing, developing, and monitoring the organization in question.

Only in recent years has the question of organizational effectiveness included such categories as "climate," cross-cultural policies, cultural diversity, and equity of evaluation (Schlessman-Frost & Saunders, 1986). Scant attention has been given to the problems of transporting traditional designs to "new" groups, and as such,

The structure of qualitative elements in a cross- or multicultural workplace is generic to other management contexts and as such educationists should identify options and develop instruments which serve as option opening vehicles for the purpose of helping would-be employers (Schlessman-Frost & Saunders, 1986, p. 79).

Writers do not usually spend much time on the theoretical rationale for doing what they do. In his book Model for Models (1986), Saunders identifies writers perspectives by using their degree of attention to models. There are those who think an analysis of ideas about models is important but distracts from the points at issue. Some inquirers pay initial attention to the model question and then come to believe that the model reflects reality. Then, there is the not widely adopted position on models that holds that models do indeed create and organize all meanings
and even make "reality" what it is (Saunders, 1976).

Saunders further notes that in general terms, the continuum on models can be seen to begin as scaled duplicates of some original, develop into analogical extensions of some original, and go on to impose a structure or form on a variety of non-determinate data in search of some plausible hypothesis with which to coordinate explanatory systems (p. 35). It is often easier and more acceptable to the general reader or administrator/consumer to make "practical" suggestions than to try to explain the basis for systems used to justify or give structural integrity to the organization designs at issue.

Hypotheses

The term or concept, hypothesis, as used in the literature has three variations. In one sense, the simplistic form, the term is unexamined and used as a kind of "pooled ignorance" to refer to a way of distilling an idea from the assiduous collection of data uninformed by a controlling thesis (Nagel, 1960, p. 77). In the second usage, the term hypothesis is used to select from the data collected the relevant material to "prove" or "validate" the primary research proposal purpose, allowing the inquirer to assume conclusions or justify the research itself. The
third way hypothesis is used is as an informing design, model, system, or instrumentality (Saunders, 1992). This study proposes the following hypotheses.

1. Administrators grounded in a less hypothesis-oriented style of thinking are more likely to create a discourse fallacy when making decisions. Administrators are thought to make decisions that are grounded in psychological analysis.

2. Methodological problems associated with the effective selection of an organizational structure are inappropriate. The questions used to investigate the methodology do not follow rigorous criteria and, therefore, confound the solution process, i.e., the problems are incorrectly identified and should be responsible to the canons of inquiry.

3. Structure selection can prove to be ineffective to a particular organizational mission. An example of this could be a public school run by an authoritarian leader.

Assumptions

The assumption basis for this study suggests that an organization is defined as a "social system," (a set of persons with an identifying characteristic and a set of relationships established among them), with a structure (formal/informal) in place, a clearly defined mission,
written policies, and effective criteria for evaluating its employees.

Part of the argument of this assumption is that organizational studies in the past, to their detriment, have drawn on a range of materials and theoretical approaches that have been too restrictive. Consequently, writers have failed to reflect on the complexity of organizations and have used a limited number of theoretical examples. The following assumptions are discussed in subsequent chapters.

- There is a single, well defined organizational purpose.
- There are basic, formalized organizational designs.
- Organizational designs use categories and variables appropriate to any organizational system.
- There are criteria by which each organizational design can be evaluated individually and collectively.
- There are models by which an organization can review organizational structures to facilitate the selection of an appropriate structure for that organization.
- Employees are oriented to a set of goals and objectives.

Limitations

Two limitations restrict the literature relative to this study.
1. The absence of emphasis on educational administration structures as theoretical paradigms.
2. The tendency of authors to ignore the traditional models for defining structural appropriateness.

Organization of remaining Chapters

Chapter 2 describes the collection and examination of selected literature related to organizational structures and identifies commonalities/similarities in structural design. According to Saunders and Decker (1976), "For all theory there should be a model from which the theory is derived and which combines theories into a formal explanatory system" (p. 12). Consequently, a generic model is needed to serve as a working tool/guideline for organizational patterns. Chapter 3 uses selected literature to present educational theory and related topics. The review sequences appropriate literature in search of criteria for the development of an organizational paradigm. Chapter 4 addresses the development of such a model, including rules and language for identifying and evaluating models and suggestions for organizations to utilize and match administrative structures, objectives, and responsibilities to the most effective model. The model provided by this research will serve to help organizations identify a rationale and criteria for determining which structure to use in their organization. Chapter 5 summarizes the past literature as
the base for present conditions; present/modern day thinking as referred to social exigencies; and speculation on what the future holds for educational administration structures.
CHAPTER 2

METHOD: Theoretical and Philosophical

Justifications

Introduction

This chapter, examines different foundations for thinking about organizational systems, i.e., organizational epistemics. There are several ways to examine "systems" and several levels at which analytic criteria apply to systems. Minimum demands on "systems," and a formulation of what is essentially a system for system or system for selecting organizational designs, are established.

By adopting a general model, one that stipulates minimum requirements for assessing organizational designs, administrators can evaluate each administrative organization in terms of the theoretical justification used to ensure effective and efficient organizational structure.

The future effectiveness of organizational designs is contingent on the changes in society, in education, and in the private sector, e.g., responses to social, economic, and cultural exigencies. This chapter explores possibilities for the future as organizations respond to new and unusual variables. The format suggested in this study may well provide a glimpse of what the future holds for organizational designs.
A number of writers on administration, particularly on educational administration, have acknowledged the importance of explicit links between philosophy and administration. For example, Greenfield (1975) argues in Colin W. Evers' (1985) article, "Philosophy of Administration," that the implications of the phenomenological view are of critical importance in shaping views and guiding ideas for organizations founded on them. Griffiths (1979) found that the evaluation of current organizational theory is designed to clarify and come to some agreement on the epistemological question of whether there can be a science of organization comparable to the sciences of physics or chemistry? There is clearly some constraint on this question set by the definition of science used in the argument.

In view of the importance being attached to recent work in the philosophy of science, it may be useful to specify, at least in general terms, some of its main features. There is no fundamental epistemological distinction between observational statements and theoretical statements. The statements of scientific theory form a network. Statements central to the structure of the network and the organization of inference appear as the most theoretical part of the network, or as its "center." This center is most removed from sensory experience, for example, laws of logic and mathematics or very general laws of physics. In general, a
direct empirical hit on theoretical targets cannot be obtained, for what has gone into specifying the target is the whole network.

Evers, (1988) finds this new philosophy controversial. However, despite some important exceptions, two broad trends seem to be emerging. First, there has been a shift away from foundational theories of justification. There is, the practice of justifying knowledge claims by showing they can be derived, in some sense, from members of another class of more epistemically secure knowledge claims. Other writers see this position as increasingly untenable, largely as a result of the collapse of the observation/theory distinction. Once epistemologists in the foundation tradition are seen to be using, for example, questionable theories of learning and perception to identify some unquestionable, or at least more reliable, foundations for knowledge, the point of epistemic mode of justification collapses.

The trend then shifts toward realism and detailed argument for this conclusion is complex, but the outline strategy is simple enough. If uncontroversial touchstones or paradigms of the real, humdrum, and familiar physical objects like chairs, tables, walls, and doors exist and if there is no sharp distinction between observation and theory, then there is no obvious methodological ground for
regarding theoretical objects like atoms, electrons, or organizations as instrumental fictions rather than as real objects on the same ontological footing as their more familiar (though theory-laden) counterparts.

Of course, it may be argued within a theory network standard, that reality must cohere with what the network will admit as evidence for its standard. It is worth emphasizing, says Evers (1988), that an important methodological point is involved in conjoining these two trends.

In recognition of this dichotomy, the bulk of Hodgkinson's (1985) introductory argument consists of arguing the relevance of values for administrative processes. In practice, the essence is arguing that, contrary to what Simon (1945) and other positivists think, administration is not a science but a humanism. The main conclusion, is that "administration is rightly to be considered as one of the humanities and, as such, a ground for philosophy" (Evers, 1988, p. 5). A more worrying feature of this argument is that it appears to rule out the possibility of a philosophy of science or such specialized philosophies as those of mathematics, physics, or biology. This is because, says Evers, there would be no intersection of the required, presumably distinct, realms of discourse,
and, second, were the hybrid to exist, an essential feature of philosophy, namely concern with value, would be absent.

Whether philosophy should be relevant to administration turns on how the nature of administration is understood. If, for example, administration involves both reasoning and judgments of value, a prima facie case would exist for each of these two realms of discourse. On the other hand there have been major inroads in the field of curriculum in such disciplines as sociology, political science, mathematics and economics, and in the larger body of the administration sciences as well. Some Research institutions for instance are tailoring courses to stimulate critical thinking skills as a way to expand and discover, intellectually speaking, different avenues for assessing phenomena and uncovering newer forms of knowledge bases, hence qualitative research.

Critical theorists forward three major factors bearing on attempts to model the study of educational administration after the social sciences. First, theories from various disciplines of the social sciences were borrowed for use in the study of educational administration. A consequence was a failure to develop theories grounded in schooling realities and in the practice of educational administration. Second, the employment of social science theories and methods was largely unaffected by contemporary debates in the parent disciplines adopted. Discussion centered around
such issues as power and control, the approach to inquiry, the role of values and ideology in inquiry, as well as general perspectives on human life and behavior.

A third important aspect of the adaptation of social theories to educational administration was a by-product of the first two: an implicit and uncritical adoption of the conceptual orientation and the modes of inquiry dominant in American social science. The conceptual orientation was that of structural functionalism following the Parsonian school of thought in the tradition of logical positivism. The guiding principles were hypothetico-deductive, objective and value-free inquiry independent of social context and patterned after the textbook image of the physical science (Yeakey, 1987).

The foundations framework of logical positivism has been characterized as having a preoccupation with social order, with maintenance of the status quo in its subordination of man to a controlled environment in which values are characterized as nonrational; in which reason is reduced to both a technical and consistent calculation of means and ends; in which structures and processes are valued as functional; and in which human intentions are of minimal importance. Such research tends to analyze parts of a system in terms of the respective contributions to the whole, since the major assumption is the maintenance of
presumed homogeneity and equilibrium among parts. Researchers speak to the positivists' preoccupation with socialization, role assignment, and behavioral control as seen from the vantage point of some superordinate system, (Yeakey, 1987).

Theorists critical of the dominant orientation (who are often labeled critical theorists because of their leveled critiques against the positivist framework) are influenced by Marxist and phenomenological schools of thought. Critical theory argues against an overly integrated view of society which attends only to those aspects thought to be functional and therefore valuable for the overall requirements the educational system brings to society. Yeakey (1987) purports that "research in the tradition of critical thought poses an alternate view which gives priority to individuality, to shared values, to vision and impulse, as well as reason" (p. 25).

Further, critical theory repudiates the principles and the preoccupation with "hard" data, as detrimental to the understanding of educational administration as a social discipline. Logical positivism, as a detached science, has been credited with precluding discussions of larger social issues by divorcing social theory from its social structure. Yeakey (1987) also seems to think that critical theory, with its Marxist and phenomenological traditions, seeks to
analyze organizations and their structural and ideological features within the larger social context they inhabit.

In accepting scientific method and critical thinking as concepts which embody the values of order and logic, examiners subscribe to the general doctrine of rational inquiry. In their general comments, writers like Bates (1980) and Habermas (1971) idealize critical thinking as a style of analysis. The written expression of scientific knowledge ideally takes the form of a reasoned and systematic exposition. Conclusions will be supported by reasons. Hypotheses will be considered with respect to the balance of favorable and contrary evidence. Certain logical relationships exist between conclusions and the reasons for the conclusions. Other logical relationships hold between hypotheses and the reasons that call for their rejection or modification. Relationships such as these, say critical thinkers (not critical theorists), are the stuff of logic, and it means using logic objectively in thinking out a problem. The emphasis is usually on rational thought as opposed to mental derangement, divine revelation, stupidity or prejudice (Simpkins, 1987).

However, says Simpkins (1987), two extreme views are held on the way the idealized doctrine of rational inquiry should be applied to guide research in educational administration. Those who support each view define
scientific method and critical thinking from a somewhat different perspective. In the discussion that follows, the "idealization" of inquirers is examined in relation to two research traditions in educational administration (established and emergent), and it is suggested that each comment reflects views taken from both the established and emergent research traditions.

Although inquirers into educational administration theory generally favor the canons of the established research tradition, many of their comments display acceptance of the assumptions of the emergent alternative research tradition. The flexible conservatism which underlies their comments and criticisms appears to represent a functional emphasis in their criteria of assessment, one in which deference is paid to the need for formal logic and structure in argument and research design, together with acceptance of informal methods of research and imaginative approaches to data analysis.

Critical theory holds that criticism is endemic to inquiry.

Implicit in critical theory is an examination of the assumptions, the philosophy, the ideology which underlies all forms of knowledge, in general, and organizational theory, in particular. It is almost conventional wisdom that nothing is unphilosophical or lacking in ideology, for facts are embedded in the very context of values. Indeed the disdain for the philosophical, for the ideological biases of all knowledge is, in itself, a philosophy, a form of
ideology that serves to legitimate the status quo (Yeakey, 1987, p. 27).

Current controversies regarding theory in educational administration deal more with philosophical issues the surrounding theory development and application than with the contents of various theories (Willower, 1985, p. 7).

In other words says Willower (1985), who is believed to represent the "politically correct" thinkers, philosophy is a human creation and should be discussed in three broad areas. The first has to do with the ideas and methods of educational administration, the second deals with communication and verification within the field, and the third treats values and the normative side of educational administration.

Perhaps advancement in educational administration as a field of study will be better served when there are a variety of ideas and methods available than when there are fewer. Commitments to the one true theory or a single best method of research are naive. They are relics of an older social science and were not seriously entertained in educational administration even when the theory was first widely embraced in the field. Occasional references to grand theory in the 1950s and early 1960s were to highly abstract as opposed to less abstract, middle range-type theories or to a single sovereign theory. More to the point, the self-critical feature of inquiry underscores the
futility of long-term commitments to a particular scientific theory or method (Willower, 1985).

Willower (1985) suggests that the criterion for an appropriate philosophy is straightforwardness. The philosophy should encourage and be able to accommodate a variety of ideas, theories, and methods. This rules out philosophies given to absolutes, transcendent ideas, or final truths. It rules out philosophies presented as finished systems of thought rather than as open, growing ones.

More to the point in terms of the contemporary scene, an appropriate philosophy would not be burdened with a heavy predetermined ideological content. Views steeped in a fixed ideology often exhibit a "them versus us" mentally, a tendency to divide the world into two starkly different camps, one full of error, if not evil, and the other anointed with truth. Looking to less modern philosophies, this criterion would not pose insurmountable problems for analytic philosophy, some types of existentialism, phenomenology that emphasized phenomenological methods, or various forms of naturalism, empiricism, pragmatism, or instrumentalism (Willower, 1985).

However, Dewey, (1938) argues that "a philosophy of education, like any theory, has to be stated in words, in symbols" (p. 19). Dewey further notes,
Just because traditional education was a matter of routine in which the plans and programs were handed down from the past, it does not follow that progressive education is a matter of planless improvisation. Just because progressive schools cannot rely upon established traditions and institutional habits, they must either proceed more or less haphazardly or be directed by ideas which, when they are made articulate and coherent, form a philosophy of education. Revolt against the kind of organization characteristic of the traditional school constitutes a demand for a kind of organization based upon ideas, (p. 19).

It is easy to see, then, how mistaken Willower (1985) and other critical thinkers like himself are in suggesting that a traditional philosophy of education is "burdened with a heavy predetermined ideological content" (p. 7). Dewey (1938) states,

I admit gladly that the new education is simpler in principle than the old. It is in harmony with principles of growth, while there is very much which is artificial in the old selection and arrangement of subjects and methods, and artificiality always leads to unnecessary complexity. But the easy and simple are not always identical. After the artificial and complex is [sic] once institutionally established and ingrained in custom and routine, it is easier to walk in the paths that have been beaten than it is, after taking a new point of view, to work out what is practically involved in the new point of view, (p. 20).

Idealism, a philosophy which has been extremely influential and pervasive, maintains that everything that exists is a mind or a state of mind. To quote Joseph Blau (1952, p. 188),

It is as a metaphysical position that idealism has made its greatest impression upon philosophic thought. Metaphysical idealism agrees in the belief that what men experience, the constant flux of becoming, the
confusion of sensation, instability, and change, is not real existence, not reality. To the idealist, reality is intelligible and valuable through and through, and it is man's system of meanings and man's system of values with which reality is imbued.

At the beginning of the twentieth century, in Europe, England, and America, philosophic systems designed to refute the idealist view and to insist that things are not significantly changed by knowing them were developed almost simultaneously. "These various movements, because of this central insistence on the independent reality of the objects of human knowledge, were known as 'realisms'" (Blau, 1952, p. 275).

In the German countries, the realist school developed as phenomenology; in France there was a significant revival of the realist philosophy known as neo-Thomism; in England, the Cambridge school of realistic philosophy was followed; and in America, the cause of realism was fostered by William James, and its development was carried on by many of his students for the first two decades of the twentieth century.

It was not until 1910, notes Blau (1952), that six American philosophers, who developed what became known as "The New Realism," met to define the basis of their agreement and to formulate and expound a realistic philosophy which they regarded as novel. They were Ralph Barton Perry, Edwin B. Holt, William Pepperell Montague, Walter B. Pitkin, Edward Gleason Spaulding, and Walter T.
These six men, were in part responsible for the abandoning of the traditional search of philosophers for an all-embracing system, and it was charged that they contented themselves with a step-by-step advance toward an understanding of the universe and man's relation to it (Blau, 1952).

Whether because of the failure of the group to answer, adequately, criticisms of their view of the objectivity of relations or because of some other reason, deficiency on the part of the new realists led to the rise of another group who called themselves "critical realists." This group was made up of Durant Drake, Arthur O. Lovejoy, James Bissett Pratt, Arthur K. Rogers, Roy Wood Sellers, George Santayana, and C. A. Strong. The book which these seven wrote conjointly, called *Essays in Critical Realism* (1920), was given the subtitle "a cooperative study of the problem of knowledge." "The critical realists held that in certain contexts, it is proper to draw a distinction between the object which is known and the state of consciousness which is the vehicle of the knowledge" (Blau, 1952, p. 280).

There were other American philosophers of this period who were more-or-less akin to these realists in their theories of knowledge but who remained outside of the cooperative groups.
But there is little more to add to the story of American realism as such. Its exclusive concern with agreement in theory of knowledge reduced it to bareness as a system of thought, although its insights and emphases have merged into other philosophic positions and have strengthened them.

It is not too much to say that, between them, realism and pragmatism destroyed the thin and bloodless academic idealism of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, making it necessary for a more "tough-minded" type of objective idealism to develop in order that idealism as a way of thought might survive (Blau, 1952, p. 283).

Presently in educational administration, a wide range of perspectives and approaches is being employed. Willower (1985) notes

Despite this fact, one continues to find references in the literature to unnamed legions who are bent on imposing a single perspective and methods. These references take several forms. A popular one juxtaposes a naive realism with another position, often a version of idealism. The argument usually goes like this. The realist position that there is world independent of mind is presented. It is taken to be a view in which "facts" are also independent of mind. Science then becomes the process of uncovering these facts which are somehow out there waiting to be discovered. Once they are discovered they are good forever. Moreover, the only true method of discovery is experimental. Realist metaphysics are thus connected to what is labeled positivism, which is supposed to be a proper title for the conception of science just given. This conception is the one allegedly being imposed (p. 6).

It has also been suggested by Willower (1985) that advancement in educational administration will be served by receptivity to a variety of ideas and methods and that a philosophy that would promote such advancement must be open and growing. The notion that scientists dominate and shut
out alternative views was shown to be far-fetched, says Willower. To the contrary, the prevailing spirit of inquiry is one that values thoughtful explanation, novel ideas, and insightful hypotheses and speculations. This sort of hunch-getting, imaginative-idea-generating activity represents the creative side of inquiry.

There is also a critical side that features criticism and the process of verification. The blending of the creative and critical provides a kind of scientific ideal in which one conceives and lovingly sculpts ideas or theories and then earnestly strives to falsify them. Admittedly, says Willower (1985) such an idea often will not be attained, and some will not try at all. For instance, it is hard to imagine a Marxist scholar seeking to disprove Marxian theory. Willowers' personal preference is toward a less-structured, hypothesis-oriented mode in qualitative investigations.

On the other hand, positivism enthusiastically embraces the idea that concepts must be defined in terms of sets of operations. Operationalism is seen as an antidote for the plethora of fuzzy concepts in the literature of educational administration. There was, and still is, great concern over the "is-ought" dichotomy: "is" being facts and "ought" being values. It was not so much that theoreticians were to deal with facts and not values as it was that they
should distinguish carefully between them. Finally, there was the underlying assumption that "organizations were like physical science entities: They were rational, subject to universal generalizations, and the administration of all organizations had more in common than not" (Griffith, 1983, p. 203).
CHAPTER 3
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter, dedicated to a review of the literature, presents some of the ideas advanced by major writers on educational administration and organizational design. The pattern for the chapter is to order the selected references in terms of their acceptability to this study's criteria for adequacy. By sequencing the materials in this fashion, ideas can be placed on a continuum from inappropriate to the most acceptable as judged by the rigorous parameters established in Chapter 2. The review includes critical comments, with the criteria used for each comment specified.

The thesis that there is one organizational structure for all organizations is no more apparent than the claim that the term organization has been clearly defined. Writers on educational organizational designs say that organization, in the social sense, refers to either the pattern or structure of relations among a number of persons oriented to a set of goals or objectives, or it refers to the group, as a whole, viewed as a unity.

Members of the group are assumed to be oriented to a specific set of goals and objectives whenever the whole is viewed as a unity. Although such a characterization may apply to the most general dimensions of an organization, the
existence of contradictory sets of goals and objectives held by group members precludes actual unity by definition. The resulting internal resistances and compromises are within the goals and objectives.

"There was a recent shift in organizational theory, the most prominent being the dominant closed systems model of the 1950s and 1960s replaced later by organizations as open systems" (Evers & Lakomski, 1991, pp. 60-61). Although closed systems thinking continues, this shift was so marked that Meyer declared the systems debate closed on the side of openness (Meyer, 1978).

These developments in the parent discipline, notes Evers & Lakomski (1991, p. 61) were directly reflected, and accepted, in educational administration so that Hoy could state: "there is now a general consensus that modern organizations, including educational ones, are open systems" (Hoy, 1982, p. 2).

Being able to focus on processes and activities outside school organizations, the open systems, or in Willower's (1982) term context, perspectives facilitate discussion of issues which, allegedly, did not come into the purview of the closed or rational model of the early Theory Movement. Among these are the role of women and racial minorities in administration and unions, issues raised by Griffiths (1979), and more generally, the turbulence and political unrest experienced in the United States in the 1960s and 1970s (Hoy, 1982, p. 2).
Structure provides endless avenues of analysis for the neoclassical theory of organization. The neoclassical analysis of structure centers on frictions which appear internal to the organization among people performing different functions, (Scott & Mitchell, 1972, p. 47).

Hall, (1977) postulates that organizational structure serves two basic functions. First, structures are designed to minimize or at least regulate the influence of individual variations on the organization. Structure is imposed to ensure that individuals conform to the requirements of the organization and not vice versa. Second, structure is the setting in which power is exercised. Structure also sets or determines which positions have power, and where decisions are made, the flow of information is largely determined by structure.

Despite the importance of structures to members and the behaviors of the organization, there are surprisingly few hard facts about structures. And because there are, for practical purposes, few limits on the number and types of alternative structures, we need to know more about structures to guide our choices for working within them, (Mackenzie, 1978, p. 75).

Organizational structures are dynamic and changing. One also notices that the extant interaction patterns can affect future interaction patterns. There is some degree of regularity and control on behavior even though there can be many forces to change the structures. Mackenzie (1978) notes that structures can be changed, and by changing the task processes and the structures, managers can rearrange
the pattern of interactions and the sequences of these interactions to accomplish specified ends.

Criticism Criterion

"The general theme is that human behavior disrupts the best laid organizational plans and thwarts the cleanness of the logical relationships found in the structure (Scott and Mitchell, 1972, p. 47).

A classical reductionistic error is made here because the authors have confused human behavior as a valued activity with the organization structures under which human behavior is described as a state of affairs. Human behavior should never be reduced to the conditions under which the behavior occurs. Nor should an organizational structure be reduced to human behavior. This would be analogous to claiming that the dress pattern is the person wearing the dress. The most significant issue in a methodological sense is the use of incompatible criteria to refer to a common event or issue.

Organizational Types

A number of serious attempts have been made to classify the genus organization by species, to deduce a typology or taxonomy of organizations. These endeavors are important to the thesis. The existence of discrete subsets of organizations might mitigate against the possibility of a philosophy of administration grounded upon some communality
of organizational structure and function. A popular
taxonomy is that of Blau and Scott (1962). They classify
organizations as (a) mutual benefit associations (unions,
churches), (b) business concerns (manufacturing firms,
banks), (c) service organizations (hospitals, schools), and
(d) commonwealth organizations (army, police). Hodgkinson
(1978) appears to support the Blau and Scott taxonomy and
feels that it is clearly valuational in the sense that it is
based on the notion of cui bono. That is to say, one of the
ways in which organizations can be typified is by the nature
and distribution of the rewards they produce. In other
words, they can be typed by purpose and by beneficiary.

Hodgkinson (1978) refers to the social systems approach
by using Katz and Kahn's (1966) development of a four-way
classification of organizations: (a) productive, (b)
maintenance, (c) adaptive, and (d) managerial-political.
Katz and Kahn also deduce a second order set of classifying
marks. These differentiate organizations on the basis of
(1) their end products, (2) whether they have to do with
persons or objects (e.g. schools versus factories), (3) on
the basis of the kind of organizational reward, whether this
is expressive and intrinsic (terminal values) or extraneous
and extrinsic (instrumental values); (4) on the basis of
whether the organization has a high or a low degree of
bureaucratization; and (5) on the basis of whether the organization tends towards stability or toward growth.

Hodgkinson: The Nature of Organizations

A major presumption of an administration profession would be that its members can be distinguished by their superior knowledge of organizations, superior, that is, to non-administrative organizational members. A concern of administrative philosophy, therefore, would be with the substance of this claim. HOW? What logic underlies and what values are implicated by the body of organizational theory? (Hodgkinson, 1978, p. 24).

Waldo (1961) suggests that a trend is discernible away from administrative theory as such to organization theory, a shift which would be consistent with the mid-twentieth century vogue for behaviorism. He also pointed out that administrative theory would suggest an engagement with the world, a striving after values, whereas organizational theory has more factual connotations and is less value-involved.

Hodgkinson (1978) goes further by stating that organizational theory does not escape, much less resolve, any of the value problems attached to administrative action, but it does suggest the possibility of theory, models, and conceptual aids-to-navigation which might invest administration with a special competence, a competence not immediately accessible to any member in the organization as one, moreover, which is science-based and intellectually respectable. What are the dimensions and viability of this
claim? Hodgkinson states that it is possible to discern more sharply the logic of administration by directing attention to the study of organizations.

Haas and Drabek (1973) distinguished no fewer than eight "perspectives" of organizational thinking and research: rational, classical, human relations, natural systems, conflict, exchange, technological, and open systems perspectives. Each of these perspectives can be characterized by a theoretical model, and each can serve to structure the perception of researchers and their selection of variables for study. And each explanation reflects its own Weltanschauung. Yet none, according to the authors, can serve as an entirely adequate or discrete theoretical base (Hodgkinson, 1978).

Criticism Criterion

Discussions about theory can be placed on a continuum from theories about things to theories that only refer to other theories (Saunders, 1976, p. 9).

Owens (1970), in his book Organizational Behavior in Schools, considers a theory to be a thought process, a way of thinking about reality to understand that reality better and to describe it more accurately. One way of conceptualizing theory is to think of it as model-building.

A popular notion about theory is that it deals with some kind of ideal state, some condition which ought to be.
Some behavioral theorists do not share this notion but, instead, insist that theory helps to explain what is and not what ought to be, a theoretical look at how administrators view organizational structure.

Griffiths' Evolution in Research and Theory

There is little question that the mode of scientific inquiry that dominated the period that coincided with the beginning years of the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) was logical positivism. "The influence of this mode of scientific thinking came suddenly and dramatically to a field best characterized by intellectual provincialism and naivete" (Griffiths, 1983, p. 202). A change was made at the 1954 meeting of the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA) in Denver. Several university centers of the Cooperative Program in Educational Administration (CPEA) financed the attendance of six social scientists at the NCPEA, chaired by Daniel E. Griffiths. They not only carried the message that the social sciences had a great deal to offer professors of educational administration, but also that social science was to be conveyed in the form of theory, and that theory was in the logical positivist mode. Denver's NCPEA meeting was followed by the Coladarci and Getzel monograph on theory in

Criticism Criterion 1

There appears to be some disagreement with Griffiths' (1983) account of scientific inquiry. Scientific inquiry was not born of logical positivism.

Language analysis used in its conceptual formal framework deriving primarily from the logical foundations of mathematics and the rebirth in the 20th century of Kantian Idealism, makes much of modern mathematics and theoretical physics as models of adequate language structure, hence scientific inquiry (Saunders, 1965, p. 1).

One decade saw theoretical production of the quantity and quality not seen before or since in educational administration, and this literature was dominated by logical positivism. The lone voice against positivism was that of Orin Graff (1956), who favored "a far less scientific approach," one that would have gained more support in 1983 than in 1964. What was the logical positivism that was advocated and accepted? Griffiths (1983) postulates that it was contained in the definition of theory as presented by Halpin at the 1954 NCPEA meeting and attributed to Feigl (1951):

Griffiths proposed to define a "theory" as a set of assumptions which can be derived by purely logico-mathematical procedures and a larger set of empirical laws. Theories, noted Griffiths, were to be verified by deriving a theoretical statement (a statement composed of theoretical terms) from the theory, and testing it with an observational statement
in which the terms were nontheatrical and objective. This is the theoretical-observational dichotomy (Griffiths, 1983, p. 203).

Griffiths (1983) also found that it is relatively easy to identify the dominant philosophy of science in the 1950s and 1960s and also very difficult to find a dominant philosophical mode in the present period. There is the acknowledgment that logical positivism is badly flawed, but there is no clear sign that a post-positivistic approach has been developed. A great many alternatives are being proposed such as phenomenology, ethnomethodology, symbolic interaction, neo-symbolic interaction, and the sociology of the absurd.

**Criticism Criterion 2**

"The lone voice against positivism was that of Orin Graff in "Developing a Value Framework for Educational Administration" (Griffiths, 1983, p. 203).

Classical physical models, necessarily originating in common sense language, were found to be properly descriptive of the natural state of affairs, and objects examined were quite easily seen as independent of knowers. The theories of classical physics purportedly expressed the direct connections between language and the magnitudes observed. However, the meanings carried by the language of these models were sometimes incidentally accepted by modern thinkers. This incidental carryover misleads thinkers allowing them to import old presuppositions into new analysis. This radical shift of terminological systems from classical to modern methods so modifies the categories of thought as to render the methods incompatible or at best simplistic (Saunders, 1965, pp. 1-2).

Organizational theory and the philosophy of science
"Although the volume of literature on educational administration is quite small, it is heavily oriented to a critical view of traditional theory" Griffiths, 1983, p. 208). For example, a recent article by Bates (1982), a New Zealander working in Australia, listed 73 references, of which 40 were written by Commonwealth scholars and, in many cases, were published in the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. The majority of these articles are violently opposed to traditional theory and supportive of alternative approaches. As one reads Bates and Greenfield (1975), one gains the impression that they consider advocates of traditional theory to be idiots at best and pathological at worst. These expressions were often reciprocated and are viewed as representing two extreme positions, administrators who believe there can be scientific theories of educational administration and administrators who believe there can be no such theories.

The literature of organizational theory and the philosophy of science contains a wide array of philosophical, scientific, metaphysical, and epistemological views. In the United States, for example, Griffiths (1983) posits that the positivist view is strongly presented in the most widely used textbooks. Mohanahan and Hengst (1982) in their recent book, for instance, use the Fiegl (1951) definition of theory that was presented at a national
conference by Halpin (1954). He too defined theory as "a set of assumptions from which can be derived by purely logico-mathematical procedures" (p. 3). Theories were to be verified by deriving a theoretical statement, a statement composed of the theoretical-observational dichotomy. Hoy and Miskel (1978) present administrative theory rooted in the theory movement of the 1950s and 1960s—a view that is apparently now considered to be "traditional" and that appears to be modified positivism.

Criticisms of positivism and of the traditional approach to theory in educational administration are now appearing. The criticisms range from the fact that organizational theories ignore the presence of unions and fail to account for the scarcity of women and minorities in top administrative positions, to the failure to account for the degree of external control that is exercised over practically all organizations. The objections include the notion that organizational theories strive to be universal but end up with only limited applicability. Even the rationality of organizations is now being questioned.

Criticism Criterion 1

"The philosophy of science contains a wide array of philosophical, scientific, metaphysical, and epistemological views, a view that is apparently now considered to be 'traditional'" (Griffiths, 1983, p. 207).
It would be remiss not to point out that logical positivists attempt to absolve themselves from involvement with reality and substance claims. The metaphysical question concerning "substance" is usually ruled out, by the verification criteria, as spurious (Saunders, 1965, p. 4).

A criterion for criticism posed by Evers and Lakomski (1991) in "Logical Empiricism and Griffiths's Administrative Theory" states,

If the study of administration is to become scientific, administration must assume the characteristics of a science. Inquiry in administration must come to be characterized by objectivity, reliability, operational definitions, coherence or systematic structure, and comprehensiveness (Griffiths 1959, p. 45).

Griffiths suggests that administrative theory has the additional functions of guiding action, explaining the nature of administration, and leading to new facts and systematic knowledge about administration. Note that his given requirements for guiding inquiry in administration are based on the five features of science that Fiegl (1953) expounds in his "Scientific Outlook" article. Similarly, Griffiths's account of administrative theory and its functions are based on Feigl's, definition of theory as a set of assumptions from which may derive a set of empirical laws (Griffiths, 1959, p. 28).

As modest and as abstract as these formulations appear, they nevertheless exert powerful constraints on the way Griffiths theorizes, on how he structures his own theory, and on how he represents the theories of others. This
assessment may come as a surprise in view of the way Griffiths, himself, saw matters in 1983. Reviewing the connection between philosophy of science and research in administration, he remarks:

A reasonable conclusion to be reached from a review of the prevalent philosophy of science and the four prominent studies of the late 1950s and early 1960s is that they were little related. Although the prevalent scientific philosophy in the rhetoric of the day was logical positivism, no study or line of studies was done completely in the positivist mode (Griffiths, 1983, pp. 206-207).

Nevertheless, Evers and Lakomski (1991), note:

It is one thing to say "they were little related" and another to say that no study "was done completely in the positivist mode." If our criticisms of foundational empiricism are correct nothing can be completely done in the so-called positivist mode because that mode is false (p. 56).

Nothing actually matches up to the mode's descriptions of knowledge, inquiry, and the process of justification. What Griffiths (1959) draws attention to, with his focus on empirical studies, is a standard symptom of bad philosophical practice. Philosophical theories can manifest flaws in other ways. For the authors, the decisive test of logical empiricism's influence is how it figures in the construction, design, and justification of administrative theories; in short, the constraints it imposes on theorizing (Evers and Lakomski, 1991, p. 56).

First as a consequence of Feigl's hypothetico-deductive framework partitioning statements into hypotheses and testable consequences, Griffiths places great emphasis on identifying and articulating the core assumptions of his theory. True, there are no purely logico-mathematical derivations as Feigl's framework requires, but then administrative theory, then and now, is not a quantitatively formalized theory. Some of its individual claims, though, do admit to formalization into mathematical expressions. Second, Griffiths
places great store in establishing operational definitions of terms: "One of the major problems in theory construction is the development of operational concepts" (Griffiths, 1959, p. 46).

Evers and Lakomski (1991) points out that for the logical empiricist (and positivist), operational definitions are important because they provide an obvious way in which theoretical terms can be given empirical content. It is a requirement imposed by theory of meaning.

Third, Griffiths (1959) support of Halpin (1958) on this matter, his account of scientific administrative theory eschews values, essentially for the reason that unlike propositions of fact, they cannot be verified empirically. Griffiths follows by citing Thompson (1958) approvingly: "The values capable of being attached to education and to administration will not be incorporated into the theoretical system itself; rather the system will treat such values as variables" (p. 17).

Criticism Criterion 2

Is logical positivism empirical?

Where the empiricist does encounter difficulty is in connection with the truths of formal logic and mathematics. For whereas a scientific generalization is readily admitted to be fallible, the truths of mathematics and logic appear to everyone to be necessary and certain. But if empiricism is correct no proposition which has a factual content can be necessary or certain. Accordingly the empiricist must deal with the truths of logic and mathematics in one of the two following ways: he must say either that they are not necessary truths, in which case he must account for the universal conviction that they are; or he must
explain how a proposition which is empty of all factual content can be true and useful and surprising. If neither of these courses proves satisfactory, positivists should be obliged to give way to rationalism (Ayer, 1952, pp. 72-73).

Greenfield: The Search for a Human and Humane Understanding of Administration

Evers and Lakomski (1991) found that until 1974

Criticisms of the behavioral science approach to educational administration were mounted largely from within the philosophical assumptions of traditional science. The shift in emphasis from closed to open systems that occurred in the 1960s is an important result of this kind of critique. However in 1974, Thomas Greenfield, using the occasion of an International Intervisitation Program address in Bristol, launched a major assault on many of the philosophical and methodological assumptions that dominated traditional theory and research in educational administration (Greenfield, 1975, p. 76).

Promoters of the science of administration claimed to have found a rational basis for human decision making and a value-free technology for increasing the effectiveness and efficiency of organizations. Within a critical perspective, Greenfield (1975) examines those claims and their mobilization in regards to what Halpin (1970) called the "New Movement" in educational administration. The aim is, first, to describe the intellectual and ideological development of this once-revolutionary movement. Second, examine the consequences and offer a critique of the scientific approach to understanding the problems of administration. Finally, speak about the problems of
administrative studies in education today and suggest how those who are concerned with improving such studies might approach them in the future.

Greenfield (1986) asserts that by publishing "Administrative Behavior" in 1945, Herbert Simon was responsible for transforming the educational administration field. Simon offered a totally new conception of the nature of administration and, more importantly, a new set of rules for inquiry into administrative realities. What Simon offered was a method of value-free inquiry into decision-making and administrative rationality. The unfortunate consequence of Simon's work has been to shift attention from questions about the nature of administration to an obsessive concern for the methods of inquiry into it. Simon's critique of earlier knowledge in administration was that it offered little more than practitioners' judgments on their experience.

Simon's (1945) achievement was to overthrow the past wisdom of the field—a wisdom that derived from the experience, observation, and reflection of writers who were administrators, not scientists. Noting that the principles of administration occurred only in pairs, Simon (1957) damned them as nothing more than mutually contradictory proverbs. Such knowledge suffered, he said, from "superficiality, oversimplification, and lack of realism"
Simon's great failure was his own decision to focus exclusively on the factual basis of decision and to regard as irrelevant all the other forces that shaped them but which his science could not predict or control.

The revolutionary goals that Modern Organization Theory promised generally for administration were echoed in Halpin's New Movement in educational administration. Although the ideology of these movements still reigns supreme as a kind of Doctrine of the Revolution of Science in Administration, this Revolution, has failed; it has been unable to answer why the science that Simon stipulated to solve administrative problems has notably failed to do so, (Greenfield, 1986 p. 5).

Greenfield (1986) also noted that positivistic science could not derive a value as real as that of a science of administration, which can deal only with facts and which does so by eliminating from its consideration all human passion, weakness, strength, conviction, hope, will, pity, frailty, altruism, courage, vice, and virtue. Simon, instead, led the science of administration down a narrow road which in its own impotence is inward-looking, self-deluding, self-defeating, and unnecessarily boring. The current overwhelming acceptance of positivistic science in administration, says Greenfield, has led theory and research to emphasize the epiphenomena of reality rather than the phenomenological force of that reality itself. This approach yields hard, but often impotent, irrelevant, or misleading data that are the only reality recognized by the hypothetico-deductive models favored in such science.
In this science, only that which is quantifiable and
calculable is real, for that is the only kind of reality
consistent with the limited rationality that finds its
ultimate expression in the linear workings of computers.

Evers and Lakomski (1991) point to the foregoing
discussion of Greenfield's (1986) view of scientific
knowledge:

If there is no objectivity in the natural sciences,
then it is an easy matter to extend the thesis to the
social sciences. However, if all the objections to his
position on scientific knowledge are sound, if
objectivity does exist in the natural sciences, his
most significant claims about educational
administration would still appear to be largely
untouched. Inasmuch as we are the originators of these
realities, they lie within our control. But this is a
form of control that can be extended to social
realities. This is because, for Greenfield,
organizations are not things, at least not as chairs
and tables are things (p. 95).

They have no ontological reality, and it is no use
studying them as though they did. They are an invented
social reality of human creation. It is people who are
responsible for organizations and people who change
them. Organizations have reality only through human
action, and it is that action (and the human will
driving it) that we must come to understand.

"Organizations are a form of socially constructed
reality" say Evers and Lakomski, (1991, p. 88). They agree
with Greenfield that science deals with brute data, with
chairs and tables and facts that press themselves upon our
understanding so forcibly that no one can question their
existence, but organizational reality is defined by nonbrute
data, by meanings, human intentions, actions, and are. . . .
cultural artifacts: They are systems of meaning that can be understood only through the interpretation of meaning.

Criticism Criterion

A. J. Ayer (1952), in his book *Language Truth and Logic*, helps to explain why positivist theory is often suspect. Ayer wrote that he was unable to accept the criterion which the positivists employ to distinguish a metaphysical utterance from a genuine synthetic proposition. He noted,

They, positivists, require of a synthetic proposition that it should, in principle at least, be conclusively verifiable. And, no proposition is capable, even in principle, of being verified conclusively, but only at best of being rendered highly probable, the positivist criterion, so far from marking the distinction between literal sense and nonsense, as it is intended to do, makes every utterance nonsensical (p. 135).

It should also be added, says Ayer, that

It is characteristic of the positivist to hold that all symbols, other than logical constants, must either themselves stand for sense-contents or else be explicitly definable in terms of symbols which stand for sense-contents. It is plain that such physical symbols as "atom" or "molecule" or "electron" fail to satisfy this condition, and some positivists have been prepared on this account to regard the use of them as illegitimate. They would not have been so ruthless if they had realized that they ought also, if they were to be consistent in the application of their criterion, to have condemned the use of symbols which stand for material things, (p. 136).
CHAPTER 4
SUMMARY OF ACCOUNTABILITY: Some Criteria, Categories, and Models

Introduction

Over the years, much has been written about the "new" demands on organizations to adapt and to modify their structures to accommodate and even contribute to the welfare of the society. Management patterns have been distilled to some basic variations designating degrees of control. Managers are seen as directive, passive, or democratic (participatory). Ostensibly, the design of the organization should be consonant with the management style of the leader.

This chapter addresses the development of a generic models including rules and language for identifying and evaluating models. Also suggestions for organizations to utilize and match administrative structure, objectives, and responsibilities to the most effective models.

Invariably when speaking of management styles, the word leadership comes to mind. Although not necessarily obvious, there is a significant difference in meaning between the terms leadership and management, although they are used interchangeably in the literature. As Kossen (1975) notes, Leadership is a type of activity that deals directly with people and their behavior; it is only one aspect of management. Management, a broader concept, includes the activity of leadership, but in addition may be nonbehavioral and involves functions that do not directly or immediately affect others (p. 97).
Figure 1 outlines three common types of managers. Douglas McGregor, Warren Bennis, and many others have suggested that *autocratic*, *democratic*, and *laissez-faire* are the terms used to describe management behavior source. From this Figure the reader can see an example of characteristic patterns of the organizational structure for each type of leadership.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE</th>
<th>CLIMATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AUTOCRATIC</strong></td>
<td>This &quot;top heavy&quot; or authoritarian style of management is where the leader tells the subordinate what to do with no line of feedback, thus a tense environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Organizational Structure Diagram" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEMOCRATIC</strong></td>
<td>Although somewhat top heavy, there is a free flow of ideas, and subordinates are allowed to communicate back up the line as well as with each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Organizational Structure Diagram" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAISSEZ-FAIRE</strong></td>
<td>Subordinates adopt a very relaxed climate when this type of setting is created by a manager. They are allowed to communicate with each other on developing ideas, while the leader remains somewhat passive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Organizational Structure Diagram" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Portrait of a Manager
When referring to their organizations, most managers talk about the structure of the company and the unique arrangement of reporting relationships and responsibilities found within the particular firm. When asked to describe their organization's structure they typically utilize organization charts. Figures 2 and 3 are typical organization charts depicting a private and public company respectively. It is clear from these charts that both companies have a person in charge, that there are specific areas of responsibility and that the lines of authority are also clear.
Figure 2. Organizational Structure of a Private Company

(YMCA Volunteer Organization)
Figure 3. Organizational Structure of a Public Company
(Sunbelt Packaging)
The formal structure (skeleton) and the informal relationships (living personalities and their interrelationships) must be considered in drawing the organization chart or shaping the organization. As the company grows, so will the need for an increasingly formal structure. At the same time, the preservation of informal relationships will become even more important. Any executive responsible for organizational planning must take into account the different personalities that move through the same position, as well as the changes that take place in the same personality over time.

An organization chart is a graphic portrayal of certain aspects of the organization. Such charts usually show only the principal divisions or positions and the lines of formal authority. The typical organization is often limited to certain departments or relationships that management wants to emphasize. The design of an organization chart can range from a mechanical drawing to an artistic creation. Mechanical charts consist of little more than lines drawn between standard-size boxes in which the appropriate titles appear. In more artistic charts, attention is paid to balance, spacing, and style of printing. Here, color is often used, and dominant and subordinate departments and divisions are indicated. Such charts look more like advertising copy than like an engineering blueprints.
Generally speaking, organization charts can be thought of as graphic representations. Their use and form should be determined by what is effective in getting ideas across to their audience.

An organization's structure must also match, or "fit," the firm's strategy. It must be in tune with the human resources, culture, and management processes required to move the company toward its stated objectives. "When properly done, changes in organizations can be a powerful tool with which to implement new strategy" (Stonich, 1982, p. 47).

When the organization must contend with cross-cultural issues, a change from product to customer-centered research and development, the world market for their advertisement and sales, and phases of growth of the organization with the attending expansion or reduction of scope and degrees of subtlety, very close and deliberate attention must be paid to the correct types of organization for the correct moment and strategy. Stonich, (1982) notes:

It should consider both today's organization structure and any future changes required to implement the chosen strategy. To clarify the place of an organization's structure depends both on its ability to define strategy and respond to important forces operating in its external environment, and on having the appropriate structure required to manage the complex internal activities that will move the firm toward its strategic goal (pp. 47-48).

Let us assume that each organization must begin with
- a mission
- goals
- objectives
- activities
- policies
- organizational charts
- job descriptions
- monitoring procedures
- performance evaluations
- overall evaluations of profitability and progress (Saunders, 1981, p. 23)

Table 1 depicts the mission, goals and policy statements for a public and private company. This table also tells the reader that there are generic components to a mission statement. For example, having a long-range commitment and the notion of a democratic process should always be clear to an employee or a potential customer. Likewise, goals and policies have generic components. The following are brief definitions of what constitutes a mission, goals and policy.
Table 1. Mission, Goals, and Policies of Public and Private Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generic Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To develop first-class research, graduate, and postdoctoral programs that produce a remarkably high return on the state's investment of resources, part of which is undergraduate education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mission Statements

There are many ways of writing mission statements. The following are suggested by Saunders (1983):

1. An overall value language for education; e.g., "Expansion of human options where the effects of a judgment are always determined, in so far as possible, by those being affected by judgment."

2. A procedure for setting the parameters and categories for writing goals for the mission; e.g., "This expansion of options establishes the curriculum forms, programmatic sequences, and coursework, as determined by the faculty/students/administration of the educational institution."

3. The directives to be followed in evaluating the progress and/or perceptions of those involved in the educational development; e.g., "When the mission is accomplished students will be able to demonstrate their expanded understanding, receptively/expressively, by their scope and depth of information/content, vocabulary/abstractions, cultural awareness/perspective, as evaluated by professionals in appropriate studies, (p.1).

Goals

"Goals are operationally developed definitions of a value held by a person. Expressed operationally, goals serve to point to what is known, e.g., knowing when a desired result has been accomplished. Goals also provide the criteria for measuring a single objective and also for coordinating the activities derived from different objectives designed to contribute to the accomplishment of the given goal (Engle and Saunders, 1981, p. 24).

Policies

Policies are operationalized parameters and guidelines of the mission and goals of an organization. Policies are what organizations and employees are held responsible for; the legal constraints for which the organization is constrained; as well as the discretionary categories (Saunders, 1992).
Table 2, which is a continuation of Table 1, illustrates the generic make-up for objectives and activities are important to a company and what should be found in those statements. The word responsibility is again important when developing company objectives, and it is linked to outcomes. Activities are not always included in a company's portfolio and can sometimes be overlooked or left to the assumption of a manager. In most cases, activities can come either before or after objectives. The following sections define objectives and activities.

Objectives

Objectives are derived from the language of the goals and are specifications ascribed to the major concepts contained within a goal. The specifications are
Table 2. Objectives and Activities of Public and Private Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Organizations</th>
<th>Private Organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives</strong></td>
<td><strong>Activities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To increase the number of faculty members by 5% to accommodate the demands placed on undergraduate education. Also to continue to improve the recruitment, retention, and graduation of minority students.</td>
<td>Operations Implementation Functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes expected Unit responsibilities Coordination of components Benefits by units</td>
<td>The combination of a new four-year maintenance program in Hospitality Management will increase productivity and will spark a tremendous growth in investments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To recognize the potential interests of each employee geared toward specific professions and careers and to prepare employees for professional training.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
operationally stated and capable of measurement to determine the phases of completion. Plowman, (1971) in Engle, Saunders, and Blake (1981) finds that,

"An objective is defined as a quantifiable and/or observable achievement accomplished under specifiable conditions. Objectives should reflect the critical factors required for the accomplishment of a goal" (p. 25).

Engle, Saunders, and Blake (1981) further noted that objectives derived from a single goal, taken collectively, assure the attainment of that goal, and the objectives are mutually exclusive while addressing the wide range of problems identified by the goal. Objectives should also be stated in such a way that specific activities can be directly derived. Objectives also provide the evaluation criteria for identifying and measuring the completion of an activity.

Activities

Activities are the specific tasks required to accomplish an objective from which they are derived. The activities should be stated in precise terms; i.e., stated in a way that these performances can be specified and measured (Engle, Saunders, & Blake, 1981, p. 26).

The information in Table 3 reminds us that when designing a job description, clear criteria must always be evident when advertising that job. In most private and public organization job descriptions are available from the Human Resources or Personnel Department. In some cases
Table 3. Job Descriptions Within Public and Private Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Organizations</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Private Organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Psychology</td>
<td>Clear criteria (A criterion is a yardstick or measuring instrument used to place some score or event on a continuum).</td>
<td>Marketing Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate/Assistant Professor, tenure track, full-time beginning September 1, 1993. Ph.D. in School Psychology is required and three plus years as a school psychologist. Preference given to candidates eligible for Colorado School Psychology credential, NASP certification, or licensure as psychologist. Background in assessment/multicultural issues desirable. Responsibilities include: Teaching at the graduate level in area of assessment, treatment and consultation; field work supervision; advise graduate students; conduct scholarly research. Seeking an individual who has a strong interest in providing leadership for the School Psychology Program. Applications will be reviewed beginning in January and will continue until position is filled. Applicants should submit a letter of interest, vita, official transcript, and three letters of recommendation to: Dr. Elinor Katz, Director, School of Education, University of Denver, Denver, CO 80208. The University of Denver is committed to enhancing the diversity of its faculty and staff and encourages applications particularly from women, minorities, veterans, and the disabled.</td>
<td>The Sunbelt Packaging Company seeks a creative and energetic individual to market boxes, prepare marketing budgets and project sales; work with a marketing assistant and oversee sales representatives, publicity, and exhibits program, etc. Macintosh experience preferred. Strong communication and organizational skills necessary. Salary commensurate with experience.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
though, a company will hire an employee without a job description. In the absence of a job description, it becomes difficult to monitor that employee or even to perform an effective evaluation. Table 4 illustrates how having clear criteria links an employee to production outcomes and, ultimate, to responsibility for job change.

Following are brief definitions of a job description, monitoring procedures and evaluation.

Job description

Webster's dictionary (1992) defines job description as an orderly record of the essential activities involved in the performance of a task that is abstracted from a job analysis and used in classifying and evaluating jobs and in the selection and placement of employees. An effective organization should always have a written job description for its employees. Where there is no job description available, an effective evaluation cannot take place.
Table 4. Monitoring Procedures and Performance Evaluations Within Public and Private Organizations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Private Organizations</th>
<th>Monitoring Procedure</th>
<th>Public Organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Staff meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Report of monthly job activities</td>
<td>Production Outcome</td>
<td>Staff Meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-One-on-one meetings with Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Private Organizations</th>
<th>Performance Evaluations</th>
<th>Public Organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. List what you consider to be your primary job duties or assignments. (List in order of priority).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Describe contributions or achievements which indicate your success at improving your performance or exceeding job requirements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Describe any specific changes or improvements you want to make in your performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Describe the coaching, training, or development activities that would help you pursue improved performance, job growth, and learning and (or) career development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility to job change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Do you feel that you have met with the mission of this organization?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Did you consider yourself an effective communicator with your students?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Indicate whether you: Strongly agree- Agree- Disagree- regarding the following semester coursework....</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What would you as an instructor do to make your classes more exciting?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Monitoring procedures

Monitoring procedures can be used as part of an evaluation procedure and include those tools used to monitor employee performances, e.g., a monthly report, database reports using statistics, or weekly staff meetings.

Evaluation

Table 5 depicts the steps commonly used by a public and private organization to conduct evaluations.

Evaluation is the most generic of all the categories of accountability, since it in one sense provides for the measurement of accomplishment for each of the other categories, in a second sense gives meaning to the measurement information by supplying the subject matter discipline and additive variables to perform the assessment; and in the third and most comprehensive way, entails the need to specify an over-arching design or model within which substantive knowing can be justified and integrated in some comprehensive manner (Engle & Saunders, 1981, p. 26).

"Evaluation at this level of sophistication becomes more than measurement in any sense. It assures much more than category identification and procedural monitoring. Evaluation, in a sense, refers to a generic process of valuing, of constructing cherished futures, of assiduously guarding those human meanings which constitute man's greatest contribution to man (Saunders & Blake, 1976, p. 127).

Earlier mission, goals, objective, activities, and policies were identified as generic components that should be found in an organization. As such, they are generic to evaluations when used for the purpose of accountability. The parallel pairs model in this case "can be used as an accountability model by placing the accountability
Table 5. Evaluation Procedures of Public and Private Organizations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIVATE</th>
<th>Overall EVALUATION PROCEDURES</th>
<th>PUBLIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An evaluation form made up by the company will be used to evaluate</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>The tenure process is used to evaluate personnel. For continuing status and promotion,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrators, and staff employees.</td>
<td>Performance assessments</td>
<td>submit to the Provost's Office:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additionally, employees will be evaluated by a committee system,</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Curriculum Vitae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whereby the interviewer will use the committee's input to assess the</td>
<td>Measuring accomplishments</td>
<td>Courses taught in the last 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strengths and weaknesses of the employee (the actual interview will</td>
<td></td>
<td>Services/committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be between the interviewer and the employee). Hopefully, this</td>
<td></td>
<td>List of publications in chronological order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approach will provide a more equitable and meaningful system and</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unpublished works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alleviate some of the fears and concerns associated with the strict</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grants and contracts won</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one-on-one system that is currently used.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Letters of evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Department report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Department Head's recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dean's or V.P.'s recommendation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
categories into the model" (Engle, Saunders, & Blake, 1981, p. 87). The categories were discussed earlier, and Table 6 shows the parallel pairs model as an accountability model.

Organizational Design

Here are a few tips to keep in mind when designing an organization:

1. Establish business objectives. Most managers change the organizational structure because they want to make an improvement or avoid some negative consequence. Managers must establish objectives as the first order of business in creating an organization chart because this enables them to be specific about the consequences, as well as the results to be achieved.

2. Identify major business obstacles. Recognizing specific obstacles often points out a number of important problems that are unrelated to organizational structure. This step spares the manager the task of devising new plans when they are needed. On the other hand, it may show clearly where, how, and what to chart.

3. Consider alternative structures. To help keep the manager from jumping to the conclusion that there is one, and only one, solution, the process of considering alternative structures will show that there is no "ideal" or "perfect" organization.
Table 6. Parallel Pairs Model of Accountability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accountability Categories</th>
<th>Mission</th>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Policies</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parallel Pairs Model as an Accountability Model can be developed by placing the accountability categories into the model (Saunders, 1981).
4. Select a structure that will do the best job.

Each organization incorporates "new" variables into its plans for Survival Cost Accounting (SCA) or Management By Objectives (MBO): an approach to managing, particularly to the processes of planning, leading, and controlling, which makes goals and objectives the heart of the managing of an organization. Following are a list of variables that should be of some concern to organizations:

- organizational climate
- interviewing cross-culturally
- communication
- conflict resolution
- staff development

Typically found in organizations today is an evolution of structural roles and relationships over time. This pattern, once emerged, makes it possible for organizations to accomplish a task efficiently and effectively. Just as often, however, the structure that evolves makes it difficult for individuals to do their best or for the group to perform at a high level. Communication, staff development, organizational climate, and conflict are just some areas for concern when designing an effective organization, (see Table 7). It would usually make sense,
Table 7. Variables Affecting Effective Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Organizational Climate</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Staff Development</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Organization</td>
<td>Shared perceptions</td>
<td>Message</td>
<td>Conflict involving the development and autonomy of individual on identity of individual such as: Cultural values, Language, Behavior, Communication, Social changes, Mgmt. processes</td>
<td>Training, Education, Personnel development, Motivation, Commitment, Effective Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affected behavior</td>
<td>Sender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>Receiver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Media/channel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Verbal/Nonverbal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Downward and upward communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Organization</td>
<td>Shared perceptions</td>
<td>Message</td>
<td>Cultural values, Values, Social change, Language, Behavior, Mgmt. processes, Communication</td>
<td>Training and retraining, Education, Personnel development, Professional growth, Change, Career development, Commitment, Effective evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affected behavior</td>
<td>Sender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>Receiver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Media/channel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nonverbal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parallel Pairs Model as an Accountability Model can be developed by placing the accountability categories into the model (Saunders, 1981).
then, for organizations to select a structure that will work best for a given set of circumstances. It was suggested in Chapter that very little attention is being paid to "new" groups in the workplace. In developing an organization that reflects the transfer of traditional designs (in which the workplace is generic) to management context, the following areas should be reviewed.

Organizational Climate

Although the definitions of climate and culture are blurred, one suggested difference is that culture consists of shared assumptions, values, or norms, while climate is defined by shared perceptions of behavior. Organizational climate is a broad term that refers to employees' perceptions of the general work environment. It is influenced by the formal organization, informal organization, personalities of participants, and organizational leadership.

More specifically, climate is a relatively enduring quality of an environment that is experienced by individuals, affects their behavior, and is based on their collective perceptions of behavior. The definition of organizational climate as a set of internal characteristics is similar in some respects to early descriptions of
personality. Generally speaking, personality is to employees, what climate is to organizations.

In the selection of employees, the interview process becomes an important factor in helping the organization run smoothly. There are variables that must be considered in a "straight" interview, much less in a multicultural interview. Saunders (1989) notes,

Federal and state laws and regulations applying to Equal Employment Opportunity prohibits policies which express, directly or indirectly, any preference, limitation, specification, or discrimination as to race, religion, color, national origin, sex, age, or disability. Eliciting such information from a job applicant, prior to employment, may be deemed as evidence of unlawful discrimination. The laws do not restrict the right of employers to seek full information about prospective employees or to establish the job performance qualifications they consider essential. Whatever qualifications or standards are set, however, must be applied equally to all persons, (p. 1).

Communication and Organizational Behavior

Communication is the essence of effective management. It is the focal point of managerial procedure and the life's blood of any organization.

Two major systems which will allow the manager an opportunity to establish a community of communications with employees are formal and informal. Formal communication systems are created by setting up explicit delegations of duties and patterns of responsibility and typically follow the accepted hierarchical map from top to bottom and vice versa. The formal communication system that exist (sic) in nearly all organizations are (sic) upward, downward, and horizontal. Upward communication deals with messages from
an employee to management and is provided so the employee can make his ideas or opinions known. Downward communication is used by management to send orders, directives, goals, policies, questions, memorandums, etc. to employees at lower levels of the organization. It is probably the most frequently used channel (Lewis, 1975, p. 239).

In addition, Lewis (1975) found that horizontal communication occurs when people on the same organizational level of authority relate to problems at that particular level or task. It is probably the strongest of all the flows of information since people who work very closely together on the same levels seldom have trouble understanding one another. Part of the challenge in communication, says Lewis, depends upon the manager's ability to recognize certain danger signals or barriers to receptivity of information. Because people spend time in organizations, some interesting tensions exist between the psychological needs of individuals and the pressures placed upon them by organizations. Many of the problems of both organization and communication can be solved by careful consideration of the simultaneous impact of organizational structure upon people who are constantly interacting with one another.
One of the major deterrents to effective organizational communication is the inability of people, even those who work closely together, to have the same perception and understanding about the same reality. Hence, the ability of a manager to establish clear channels of communication throughout all levels of the organization will be affected by the perceptions that management and employees have of each other.

Conflict in Organization

The structural perspective of an organization emphasizes social control and norms of rationality. From this point of view (Bolman & Deal, 1991), conflict is a problem that interferes with the accomplishment of organizational purposes. Hierarchical conflict raises the possibility that the lower levels will ignore or subvert management directives. Conflict among major partisan groups can undermine an organization's effectiveness and the ability of its leadership to function. Such dangers are precisely why the structural perspective emphasizes the need for an hierarchy of authority. A basic function of authority is to resolve conflict. If two individuals or departments cannot resolve a conflict between them, they take it to higher authorities who adjudicate the conflict and make a final decision that is consistent with the organization's goals.
From a political perspective, conflict is not necessarily a problem or a sign that something is amiss in an organization. Environmental imperatives sometimes compel organizations to cope with increasing diversity, which often entails higher levels of conflict.

This happened to American public schools in the 1970s and 1980s as increasing cultural diversity in the society forced them to cope with large numbers of highly vocal interest groups that were often in conflict both with school authorities and with one another (Bolman & Deal, 1991, p. 199).

Consider also the dilemma that confronted many large Japanese corporations in the late 1980s and continues to do so at present. Though firms such as Toyota and Matsushita had long had sales and production facilities overseas, the important decisions were still made by senior managers in Japan (The Multinational, Eastern Style 1989). More diversity meant less cultural homogeneity and more conflict, undermining a distinctive feature of Japanese firms. L. D. Brown (1983) and F. Heffron (1989) both note that there can be both too much and too little conflict in organizations and that intervention may be needed to increase or decrease conflict, depending on the situation.

Conflict is particularly likely to occur at the boundaries, or interfaces, between different groups and units. Horizontal conflict occurs in the interface between different departments or divisions in an organization,
between teachers and principal in a school, and between headquarters and divisions in a large corporation. Cultural conflict occurs between two groups with different values, traditions, beliefs, and lifestyles, for example, between blacks and whites in South Africa or between Catholics and Protestants in Northern Ireland. Cultural conflicts in the larger society are often imported into organizations, but organizations can create cultural conflicts of their own. "Conflict at cultural interfaces can produce complex problems. Different cultural assumptions may result in misunderstandings and communication problems that in the extreme can produce cultural shock" (Brown, 1983, p. 167).

Staff Development

Most formal organizations today recognize that once they have hired an employee, they have an obligation to ensure the continuing education of that individual. This ongoing training is necessary not only for the personal benefit of staff members, but also for constant adjustment to external and internal changes and for improvement in the organization.

Training of employees is not a new phenomenon, particularly in the private sector. For years, organizations have trained new employees in specific job skills. Personal development, training, inservice education, and staff development are all terms that might be
found in the literature associated with the ongoing learning that organizations, schools in most cases, provide for their employees. The National Education Association (1985) defines staff development as "education mandated for practicing professionals" (p. 128).

However preference is given to the broader definition which includes all activities in which professional staff members engage that are intended to enhance their ability to perform their jobs and/or to make them more productive employees. This can include training sessions, activities supported by management, mentoring, peer coaching, action research involving the professional, seminars, and individually determined professional or personal development plans.

Effective or successful staff development should be planned cooperatively by the district administration, staff development professionals, and targeted participants. High-quality staff development is something done with employees, not to them. Consequently, including employees in the planning phases will help to ensure that the participants' views are represented and will build commitment to the resulting staff development plan. Content selected for staff development efforts must reflect the needs of the participants. Even if the intended offerings are to advance
organizational goals, the needs of individuals must also be considered and addressed.

Until these needs are identified and addressed, little change will take place in organizations. "Organizations do not change; people do!" (Castallo, Fletcher, Rossetti, & Sekowski, 1992, p. 133). Noting the effectiveness of staff development on employees and the changes in employee attitude, Castallo et al. found that "Individuals undergoing change in behaviors as a result of staff development efforts will be operating at varying levels of concerns and use, and staff developers should be cognizant of these levels" (p. 133).

Hall and Loucks (1979) provide a model designed to help employees understand concerns as they approach staff development. They found that an employee operating at the lowest level of concern, which they referred to as "awareness," will show little interest for or involvement in the change that is the focus of the staff development effort. Once employees have developed a general interest in and awareness of a specific desired change, they are said to be operating at the "informational" level of concern. The "personal" level of concern finds individuals struggling with the demands of the staff development program and their perceived inadequacy to "do right."
Following the initial staff development training, participants struggle with their ability to "manage" the new skills, to fit the new behaviors into the way they normally behave. Having mastered the management of the new behaviors, the employee then develops a concern for the "consequence" of their new behaviors on others.

This chapter pointed to generic components for organizational structures and rules and language to use when designing organization charts. Chapter 5 will explore the future uses for models such as those indicated in this chapter.
Chapter 5

SUMMARY

John Dewey once defined learning as "foreseen consequences." Saunders (1992) observed that "today is tomorrow's yesterday. . . unless we get there first." We can make tomorrow's management of organizations more effective if we foresee needed decision bases and "get there first" with good plans. "Organizations are a nexus of freedom and compulsion. As invented social realities, they can not only be created but also manipulated" (Greenfield, 1986, p. 17). The world of will, intention, experience, and value is the world of organizations and administration. The building of a new science of administration will depend on the ability to understand reality.

In educational administration, defenders such as Willower (1985) meet the challenge by repeating positions only slightly modified from Simon's philosophical assumptions about the nature of administration and the proper means for inquiry into it. Most scholars will surely continue on the path that Simon and others pioneered, but others are now beginning to question that direction. They seek an alternative way of science, though they will likely abandon the assumptions and methods that Simon espoused as proper for scientific inquiry into administrative and organizational realities (Greenfield, 1986, p. 19).

The task set in the preceding chapters was to examine the most explicitly political challenge to orthodox, positivist, administrative theory and to set criteria for challenging them. This challenge arguably consists of how
critical/political theorists like Griffiths (1959) and foundational/traditional theorists like Blau (1952) have changed the way educational administrative theory relative to organizations is viewed.

The traditional view of organizations is that they are created and controlled by legitimate authorities who set the goals, design the structure, hire and manage the employees, and seek to ensure that the organization functions in ways that are consistent with their objectives. The political perspective suggests that the goals, structure, and policies of an organization emerge from an ongoing process of bargaining and negotiating among major interest groups. This latter view has failed to make good its claim of offering a substantive contribution to organizational theory. The study of organizations must, however, stand upon a resolute examination of people as they strive to realize their ends and to meet the fundamental task of administrative commitment.

An Agenda for the Future

No guarantees for designing a successful organizational framework exist. Attempts have been made to help anticipate and understand the dynamics, external and internal influences that are likely to disrupt the function of organizations of tomorrow. Fortune, (January 25, 1993) reported that "The greatest social convulsions of the years
ahead may occur in the work place, as companies struggling with fast-paced change and brutal competition reshape themselves" (p.41). The continuing reorganization of work itself is part of a social transformation as massive and wrenching as the industrial revolution.

Partly responsible for the collapse of some of the major companies in the United States was their refusal to abandon the old authoritarian hierarchies, to embrace new relationships between employer and employee. This rigid hierarchical scheme for organizing work has severely limited the ability of people working within such organizations.

External Factors That Influence Organizations
External factors which affect organizations include demographic shifts; limited natural resources; a rigid social structure which has undervalued the economic conditions of women and minorities; global depression; a significant increase in the dropout rate of high school students; and, most importantly, the economy. Low wages, massive layoffs, and the high cost of health care have resulted in widespread unemployment and major reversals for virtually every type of organization.

These external problems have forced organizations to re-examine critical issues regarding structure, accountability, cultural diversity, staff development, and the way they do business in general. Putting people first
has become an absolute necessity. Changes must be made at the top, and "defenders of decline will now have to be the architects of prosperity" (Clinton Presidential Address, 1993).

Internal Factors Affecting Organizations

With the changing work force comes the need for better monitoring procedures. Ineffective evaluation methods, employees who refuse to abolish the old hierarchical ways, poor systems of communications, and vertical leadership styles continue to hurt most organizations. A shift toward a more democratic-participatory way of relating between individuals within organizations is needed. The general unwillingness to embrace the concept of a global marketplace and not a labor intensive market has stifled many companies. Countries that are aware that this is what it takes to succeed in the future have seen an increase in the number of jobs available for their people. "Individual actions are important, since the sum of every individual's activities will significantly influence the answer to the question, which direction is the future?" (Kossen 1975, p. 349).

During the late 1920s and early 1930s, industrialized nations were said to form business partners, by establishing themselves as groups. This practice was thought to be the reason many companies failed. This failure ultimately led to the worst depression in the history of the United States.
Much has changed since that time; companies/organizations are making impressive gains in worldwide competitiveness. "The engine is smooth teamwork between those companies and their suppliers" (Tully, 1993, p. 66).

What is now needed is for managers, administrators, and CEOs to realize that downsizing is inevitable and that this streamlined structure fits today's tumultuous, fast-moving marketplace. Adjustments will have to be made to accommodate a smaller work force. Besides improving the work place, an investment in training, cross-training, and retraining will be needed to help organizations attract and retain employees. Training and management development can increase a sense of commitment if they are used to teach knowledge that is less company-oriented and more generalized. Training employees for skills that are needed for other companies, or organizations increases employability (Bolman & Deal, 1991, pp. 203-204).

Administrators will need vision to identify what customers want, rather than what they want for the customer. One way of implementing this policy is to listen to what research and development personnel working within the organization have to say about consumer needs. IBM is typical of the companies that waited too late to "hear" the consumer, resulting in the biggest financial lost in the company's history.
While listening to the consumer is a good idea, most companies will do well to pay attention to their employees by changing old policies for new ones that emphasize people. Employers may bind valued workers with contracts, larger gobbets of freedom, or a bigger share of the profit. Offering some form of security makes sense. People terrified of being laid-off tend to become risk-averse. That renders them unlikely to produce the new, creative ideas that companies will need to prevail in competitive markets (Sherman, 1993, p. 50).

While most organizations may never become so flexible, the paired forces of globalization and information technology imply that managers and administrators who practice shared responsibility with their subordinates might experience a long-term relationship.
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