DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 053 439 EA 003 531

AUTHOR	Saxe, Richard W., Ed.
TITLE	Source Materials for Educational Administration: Critiques.
INSTITUTION	Toledo Univ., Ohio. Coll. of Education.
PUB DATE	Jan 69
NOTE	73p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrative Organization, *Administrative Principles, Behavior Theories, Bureaucracy, *Educational Administration, Educational History, *Educational Theories, Evaluation Techniques, *Human Relations, Leadership, Literary Criticism, Management Systems, Political Influences, Self Actualization, Social Behavior, Social Problems
IDENTIFIERS	Accommodation Theory

ABSTRACT

This document consists of 17 graduate student critiques of sources that contribute to an historical perspective and a knowledge of educational administration. Each article consists of a brief synopsis of the selected source, followed by two types of evaluation in terms of (1) the student's experience, and (2) a comparative analysis with other sources familiar to the student. (Author)

SOURCE MATERIALS FOR EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION: CRITIQUES

CONTRIBUTORS

Dan Apling
Paul A. Benson
Gerald J. Biernacki
Carlomagno J.M. Blanco
Eugene R. Bohland
Phillip H. Coffman
Samuel L. Creighton
Sister Thomas More Hill OSU
Donald L. Hummel
John F. Keysor
William Lehrer
Katherine MacKinnon
Larry McDougle
Joseph W. Rutherford
Sister M. Karen Shirilla
Charles W. Wachtell

Edited by
Richard W. Saxe

Published by
The Department of Educational
Administration and Supervision
at the
University of Toledo
January, 1969

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SOURCE MATERIALS FOR EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION: CRITIQUES

INTRODUCTION

Students of educational administration need to see their profession in its historical perspective. One way of approaching this task is to read histories of education and tease out references to administration.[1] Another approach is to read extensively in original source materials of the subject. The latter method, seemed superior for many reasons and was elected by fifteen graduate students beginning a year of study of various aspects of administration.

In order to secure the reactions of colleagues in addition to those of their instructor, it seemed necessary to organize reactions to the readings and to circulate them in some fashion. Each student, therefore, agreed to accept one source arbitrarily selected in order to permit as broad a scope as possible. These reactions are assembled here. They were completed in the fourth week of the first quarter after the preparation of one prior report. Each student will prepare several such critiques throughout the first quarter of study.[2] These have been chosen at this early date for two reasons:

1. To give students an overview of some of the important sources and to serve as a guide to further critiques.
2. To familiarize students with the format of the critique.

Selection of Sources

For this second critique in the series students were restricted to a list of twenty-five sources. Each of these was chosen because of its importance in regard to a particular contribution to the growing knowledge of educational administration. Others might prepare another list but those selected meet the particular purposes of these students at this time. We shall present a brief defense of the seventeen chosen sources.

To understand the reasons for certain selected sources it would be helpful to examine Table 1. This is a much simplified representation of three major developments during the time period of 1910 to 1960. The fact that contributors in general administration are placed next to those in educational administration should not suggest a causative relationship, although there is much evidence to support this notion. Although developments in business preceded developments in education, it is likely that both were reacting to changes in society.

TABLE I

DEVELOPMENT OF
EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION
c 1919-1960: SOME COMPARISONS

	Contributors	
Time	Administration, General	Administration, Educational
c 1910	Task Orientation[a]	
	F. W. Taylor	Franklin Bobbitt
	Henri Fayol	Frank Spaulding
c 1930	People Orientation[b]	
	Mary Parker Follett	Wilbur A. Yauch
	Elton Mayo	G. Robert Koopman
c 1950	Social Science Orientation[c]	
	Chester Barnard	Roald F. Campbell
	Herbert Simon	Jacob Getzels & Egon Guba

[a] Sometimes referred to as the Scientific Management Movement or the Classical Organization Theory.

[b] In the schools this was the time of "democratic leadership."

[c] Barnard's famous work Functions of the Executive was published in 1938 but it was not until much later that it became known and influential.

At any rate, Table 1 explains the selection of F. W. Taylor and Henri Fayol. These two men taken together provide the rationale for scientific management. Taylor focused on the minute details of the various tasks of the worker and Fayol performed a similar service for top management. The much maligned Taylor should be honored for his still influential concepts of time study and an analytical approach to all problems. It was his predominantly economic view of man which earned him much hostility: "The principal object of management should be to secure the maximum prosperity for the employer, coupled with the maximum prosperity for each employee."[3]

Henri Fayol is best known for his elements -- planning, organizing, commanding, coordinating, and controlling. Fayol contributed and explained many principles and precepts, but it was his five elements which were borrowed by public administration and later by educational administration. Although we have placed Fayol with Taylor in the category of those subscribing to the rabble hypothesis or economic view of man, it is clear that he saw dimensions of administration beyond mere task definition and evaluation: "Distinction must be made between a manager's official authority deriving from office and personal authority, compounded of intelligence, experience, moral worth, ability to lead, past services, etc."[4] And again: "Harmony, union among the personnel of a concern is great strength in that concern. Effort then should be made to establish it."[5]

When we turn to the counterparts of Taylor and Fayol in educational administration we find that neither Spaulding nor Bobbitt is represented by a critique. Instead, a secondary source -- Callahan's brilliant review of the influence of scientific management on schools -- is used to demonstrate the truly amazing impact of these concepts of efficiency and economy on the schools. Bobbitt is cited primarily because of his paper for the National Society for the Study of Education in which he attempted to apply scientific management to schools.[6] Spaulding, an eminent, successful superintendent, was most influential in popularizing the new role of the educational administrator as a business manager.[7]

We turn next to a selection not listed in Table 1 -- obviously the names listed are in all cases representative of many others active at the same time -- to see the amplification and application of Fayol's principles to government. Luther Gulick coined the famous acronym POSDCORB to represent the initial letters of his formulation of the essential activities of the President of the United States.[8]

Reaction to the job-oriented view was inevitable and the philosopher of the movement to humanize institutions of any type was Mary Parker Follett. Follett stressed human relations in her many speeches and publications. Educators may well marvel at the timeliness of Follett's opening remarks to a Bureau of Personnel Administration conference in January 1925:

> "I wish to consider in this paper the most fruitful way of dealing with conflict. At the outset I should like to ask you to agree for the moment to thing of conflict as neither good nor bad; to consider it without ethical prejudgment; to think of it not as warfare, but as the appearance of opinions, of interests. For that is what conflict means -- difference.[9]

If Mary Parker Follett was the idealistic advocate of a human-relations emphasis, Elton Mayo was the empiricist. Mayo, a professor of industrial research at the Harvard Business School may be called the father of the human relations approach to administration. Mayo and his colleagues -- especially Fritz J. Roethlisberger and William J. Dickson -- in their Hawthorne experiments discovered and demonstrated the inadequacy of the economic view of man as conceived by Taylor and others. All administrators are aware of the importance of the informal organization and the impact of experimental attention. Both of these important understandings were outcomes of Mayo's work.

A comparable development to the human relations emphasis is represented by the democratic administration point of view. Remnants of the dicta of this recent period are still prevalent in the statements of school administrators.[10] Wilbur A. Yauch was selected as spokesman for the proponents of democratic leadership. Among those who have studied the development of administration, Chester I. Barnard is almost a unanimous choice as the administrator-writer who spelled out the need for a general theory of administration. Barnard's book, The Functions of the Executive, is based on both experience and

the social sciences. It is a more comprehensive approach than either Taylor-Fayol or Follet-Mayo in that it deals with phenomena central to both positions -- task and people. Barnard studies the process of administration with careful attention to the meaning of the organizational setting.

There is an easy transition from Barnard to Herbert Simon who built upon and extended Barnard's work. Simon uses the methodology of several social sciences in his attempt to develop a science of administrative behavior. Simon is a prolific scholar who continues to exert influence on the development of a theoretical approach to administration. His recent work on organizations is worthy of study although we have selected his earlier contribution Administrative Behavior for our critique.

We could name several students of administration who currently represent a theoretical approach but any list would include Chris Argyris. Argyris continues to study individuals in organizations and, with his colleague E. W. Bakke, he believes that the needs of individuals are definitely not identical to those of formal organizations; they are inevitably opposed. Although a process of mutual accommodation called "fusion" is possible, the main effect of Argyris' concern is to emphasize the importance of the individual in the organizational design.

Talcott Parsons should be among the writers studied since his work is the foundation for many others active today. Restrictions of time and space prevented us from attempting to synthesize the work of this controversial, influential sociologist.

Robert Presthus is the final selection in the general area. His book, The Organizational Society, introduces the helpful concepts of upward-mobiles, indifferents, and ambivalents which have already proved useful to students of administration.

It is difficult to establish a chronological order for those advocating a social science - theoretical approach to educational administration. The founding of the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration in 1947 and their subsequent support of the Campbell and Gregg volume Administrative Behavior in Education in 1957 was important.

The small volume by Coladarci and Getzels (1955) could possibly be a pioneer effort to construct a theory for educational administrators. We include Griffith's review of theories and models (1959) as a collection of early efforts at theory building. The Getzels and Guba formulation of administration as a social system is a landmark event in the development of educational administration.

The final selection of Professor Halpin's work could have been placed at an earlier date to acknowledge his work on leadership. However, Halpin continues to study various aspects of administration, as witness his more recent work on climate in schools.

We are well into the social science period now. Many important sources have been omitted from this collection e.g., Litchfield, Blau and Scott, etc. It is probable that these will be selected for appropriate attention by several of the students preparing the following critiques.[11] However, we believe that the selections enclosed in this writing provide an outline or overview of essential elements in the continuing development of theoretical approaches to educational administration.

Critiques

The final task of these introductory comments is to describe the student critique. The directions given to students requested that they first set down a brief synopsis of the content of the volume or part of a volume selected. They were then asked to make two types of evaluation, first in terms of their own experience and, then, in comparison with other sources with which they were familiar. The students were properly humble about presuming to evaluate authoriites at such an early stage in their academic program. It was their instructor who insisted that they discard their polite reticence and begin at once. We know that most students will become somewhat more perceptive as they enter further into the literature of administration. However, to wait until the final critique of the quarter would make it more difficult to share their evaluations with colleagues. The critiques follow in the order in which they have been discussed in these remarks.

REFERENCES

[1] One wonders why there has been no publication devoted solely to the historical development of educational administration. There are excellent summaries and chapters in general works but these treatments, however well done, cannot be comprehensive. See, for example, Willard R. Lane, Ronald G. Corwin, and William G. Monahan, Foundations of Educational Administration, New York: The Macmillan Co., 1966, pp. 3-27; or Roald F. Campbell, John E. Corbally, Jr., and John A. Ramseyer, Introduction to Educational Administration, 3rd edition, Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1966, Chapter 3. or Daniel Griffiths (ed.) Behavioral Science and Educational Administration, Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education, 1964, Chapter IV.

[2] The writer first encountered this approach as a student of Roald F. Campbell, now Dean of the Graduate School of Education at the University of Chicago.

[3] Frederick W. Taylor, The Principles of Scientific Management, New York: Haper and Brothers, 1911, p. 9.

[4] Henri Fayol, General and Industrial Management, trans. Constance Storrs, London: Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons, Ltd., 1949.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Franklin Bobbitt, The Supervision of City Schools, Twelfth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1913. Note, also, that for a time it was the National Society for the Scientific Study of Education.

[7] See, Frank E. Spaulding, "Improving School Systems Through Scientific Management." Proceedings of the Department of Superintendence, National Education Association, 1913, Washington: NEA, 1913, pp. 249-79.

[8] Luther Gulick and Lyndell Urwick (eds.), Papers on the Science of Administration, New York: Institute of Public Administration, Columbia University, 1937, p. 13. Every paper in this collection is worthy of careful study by the student of educational administration.

[9] Mary Parker Follett, "The Psychological Foundations: Constructive Conflict," in Henry C. Metcalf (ed.), Scientific Foundations of Business Administration, Baltimore, Md.: Williams and Wilkins Co., 1926, pp. 114-131.

[10] Members of the seminar in educational administration interviewed administrators in all levels of administration and found democratic - humanitarian principles were mentioned more frequently than other theoretical or value formulations. The question asked was: Is there a theory or set of principles which serves as a guide to your actions in administration? If the answer was affirmative the next question was: Will you tell me something about this theory or set of principles?

[11] A critique of Litchfield was added when it became available before our publication date.

FREDERICK W. TAYLOR, The Principles of Scientific Management. (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1911).

Critique by Samuel L. Creighton

Taylor declared that the natural laziness of men is serious, but by far the greatest evil from which both workmen and employers are suffering is the systematic "soldiering" which is almost universal. According to Taylor a workman devotes a considerable portion of his time to studying just how slow he can work and still convince his employer that he is going at a good pace. How do we get more work out of workers who are naturally lazy and engage in systematic "soldiering"?

Taylor proposed that managers use scientific research methods in discovering the best way of performing every piece of work. Under the old type of management "initiative" and "incentive" success depends almost entirely upon getting the "initiative" of the workmen, but under scientific or task management the initiative of the workmen (their hard work, their good will and their ingenuity) is obtained with absolute uniformity and to a greater extent than is possible under the old system.

Perhaps the most prominent single element in modern scientific management is the task idea. The work of every workman is fully planned by the management at least one day in advance and each man receives in most cases complete written instructions describing in detail the task which is to be accomplished, the means to be used in doing the work, and the exact time allowed for doing it.

It is only through enforced standardization of methods, enforced adaptation of the best implements and working conditions, and enforced cooperation that this faster and more efficient work can be assured. The duty of enforcing this cooperation rests with management alone.

Taylor's philosophy can be stated succinctly: In the past the man has been first; in the future the system must be first.

Evaluation

Taylor, who is often and justly called the father of the scientific management movement, should be commended for taking the dramatic step forward in the search for increased efficiency in management. The depth, breadth and results of his voluminous works are truly amazing. He was very systematic and thorough in the research and the dedication he exhibited in carrying forth his studies is truly scientific in concept.

In my opinion, there are two glaring oversights. First, he did not consider the individual workman as having intelligence, pride, feelings or any degree of personal dignity or worth. He treated workers as mere machines that were programmed to operate by the mere "pushing of the right button" by superordinates. In his study of pig iron workers, he was outlining to one of the workers what he wanted and how the worker was to follow the foreman's directions: "When he tells you to pick up a pig and walk, you pick it up and you walk, and when he tells you to sit down and rest, you sit down. You do that right straight through the day. And what's more, no back talk."[1]

In his study of the mechanics in the machine shop, he stated that the work of the shop could be more efficiently accomplished by less men using his scientific approach, but it would be necessary for the old fashioned single foreman to be superseded by a group of seven (inspector, gang boss, speed boss, repair boss, time clerk, route clerk and disciplinarian). It seems as if he he should have also applied his system to the work of the foremen thereby increasing the efficiency in this area with less personnel. Paradox. Decrease in workers, increase in supervisory personnel.

---

[1]F. W. Taylor. The Principles of Scientific Management, p. 46.

Taylor's methods were deeply resented by both management and workers. Managers took umbrage because he insisted they were unqualified unless assisted by highly-trained experts. The resentment of the workers was even deeper. They resisted being asked to behave like machines and move mechanically in accordance with predetermined patterns.[2] Nevertheless, "Although Taylor largely ignored the empathic (personal) aspects of management, his ideas were widely adopted in America...."[3]

Campbell and his co-authors stated: "From the perspective of our day, we find that Taylor took a narrow view of management, and that, moreover, he tended to ignore the psychological or personal aspects of mobilizing human effort. At the same time, he did demonstrate that many jobs could be done more efficiently. Even more important, his work stands as a monument to the concept that management can be studied scientifically."[4]

The scientific management movement had far reaching consequences for educational administration. Demands were made that Taylor's system be applied to education, and these were always coupled with statements concerning the financial savings which would be forthcoming.[5]

---

[2]Daniel Griffiths (ed.), Behavioral Science and Educational Administration, the 63rd Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964), p. 37.

[3]W. Chester Nolte, An Introduction to School Administration, Selected Readings (New York: Macmillan Co., 1966), p. 161.

[4]Ronald F. Campbell, et al. Introduction to Educational Administration, Third edition (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1966), p. 69.

[5]Griffiths, op. cit., p. 80.

HENRI FAYOL, General and Industrial Management.
(New York: Pitman Publishing Co., 1949).

Critique by Phillip H. Coffman

General and Industrial Management by Henri Fayol contains the first two parts of a four part treatise that was never completed. Parts one and two contain the analysis of his basic doctrine and parts three and four were to have shown the practical applications of his principles.

The book begins by dealing briefly with the necessity and possibility of teaching management. The term, "management", is first defined and then sub-divided into various "Requisite Abilities" representing the technical, commercial, financial, security, accounting, and managerial activities. Each of these abilities is further discussed in terms of their necessary physical, mental and moral qualities, and general education, special knowledge and experience. Further, a numerical value is assigned to these abilities as to their relative importance in the classification of employees from the lower ranks of the worker to the higher ranks of the manager. Fayol concludes that, "in businesses of all kinds, the essential ability of the lower ranks is the technical ability characteristic of the business and the essential ability of the higher ranks is managerial ability." As one goes up the scalar chain in the business, the relative importance of managerial ability increases, while that of technical ability decreases.

Fayol is concerned about the absence of instruction in management. He feels that this is due to the absence of theory. He pleads for the establishment of a theory and suggests that the children in the primary grades should be exposed to the principles of management as they are now to the methods of technology.

The second part of the book deals with Fayol's principles and elements of management. The principles, numbering fourteen, range from the division of work, authority, and discipline, to unity, initiative, and esprit de corps. "Be it a

case of commerce, industry, politics, religion, war or philanthropy ... there is a management function to be performed, and for its performance there must be principles, that is to say acknowledged truths regarded as proven on which to rely ... without principles one is in darkness and chaos."

The elements of management consist of planning, organizing, command, co-ordination and control. Here Fayol deals with the methods necessary for setting a plan of action, providing the necessary tools, capital and personnel in the organization, setting the organization into operation, maintaining harmony among all of the activities, and controlling all aspects to see that they are exercised in line with the established principles.

Evaluation

Henri Fayol deserves recognition for being a pioneer writer on the essence of administrative management. Of the many attempts to summarize theories in this field, he perhaps stands the test of time better than most others.

The uniqueness of his book lies in the fact that he speaks with great authority from a highly successful background in the field of industrial management. He was no desk-chair theorist, but a practical mining engineer, a geologist, and a scientist, who based his conclusions not on laboratory style observations but on personal experiences and applications. No other writer in this period became so personally involved in viewing management from the top-down. One appreciates his practical wisdom in dealing with human beings and his concern for the young worker to make a successful career. His style is compressed and precise; his ideas are easy to comprehend.

Fayol used the same analytical approach as Taylor but applied it in a new and significant area--the top level of administrative management. Both of these early writers realized that the problem of personnel and its management at all levels is the "key" to industrial success. And both applied scientific method to this problem.

Fayol's principles might be viewed by Mooney and Reiley as an "administrative design theory" as contrasted to "organization theory" or the behavioral approach.[1] This "administrative theory" builds a technology of formal organization for the practitioner. The organization is a complex of mechanisms, rules, laws, and principles. In essence, the organization is a machine; the administration is the operator. This theory is after all, "the major invention and device by which civilized men in complex societies try to control their culture."[2]

Fayol's major tenets dealing with specialization, responsibility, unity of direction, and unity of command have been amplified by such writers as Barnard, Urwick, and Mooney. Barnard, the first to deal in the social sciences, goes far deeper into the theoretical system of administration than anything ever hinted at by Fayol.

An essential step in the development of an art to a science is the classification of information. Administration in any organization is composed of a number of rational functions. Rational organization theory has a long and productive history, beginning with the military and the Roman Catholic Church, refined through the industrial revolution, expanded by Weber, Taylor and Fayol, and adapted to modern day by Mooney and Reiley. Fayol's five elements of administration were the basis for many subsequent taxonomies. Probably the best known classification to follow was POSDCORB. Gulick expanded the five elements into seven: planning, organizing, staffing, directing, co-ordinating, reporting, and budgeting.

The influence of Henri Fayol has been strong and continuous despite the present trends in administrative theory. Those who continue to seek a "design" theory, or

---

[1]James D. Mooney and Alan C. Reiley, Onward Industry (New York: Harper Brothers, 1931).

[2]Dwight Waldo, The Study of Public Administration (New York: Random House, 1955).

one which draws its attention to the components and processes of the firm or plant as a whole, will no doubt establish a taxonomy of elements which can be traced to Henri Fayol.

RAYMOND E. CALLAHAN, Education and the Cult of Efficiency
(Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1962).
Critique by Gerald Biernacki

This is a history of the origin and development of the adoption of business values and practices in educational administration. Callahan found that this adoption had started about 1900 and had reached the point, by 1930, that, among other things, school administrators perceived themselves as business managers, or as they would say, "school executives" rather than as scholars and educational philosophers.

The American Culture at this time was permeated with the power of business, industrial groups and the strength of the business ideology. Adding to the problem was the extreme weakness and vulnerability of schoolmen, especially school administrators. Callahan was surprised and dismayed to learn how many decisions educational administrators made or were forced to make, not on educational grounds, but as a means of appeasing critics in order to maintain their positions in the school.

Callahan further states that two major independent efforts are needed. One is to change the nature and improve the quality of our graduate work in educational administration; the other is to seek ways and means of reducing the extreme vulnerability of our superintendents in the local school districts.

Between the years 1900-1910 the schools were especially being pressured by four factors: 1) the dominance of businessmen and the acceptance of business values (especially the concern for efficiency and economy); 2) the creation of critical, cost-conscious, reform-minded public, led by profit-seeking muckraking journals; 3) the alleged mismanagement of all American institutions; and 4) the increased cost of living. All of these factors created a situation of readiness for the great preachers of the gospel of efficiency, Frederick W. Taylor and his disciples. School administrators, already under constant pressure to make education more practical in order to serve the business society better, were brought under even stronger criticism and forced to demonstrate that they were operating the schools efficiently. (p. 18)

In 1910 a new system of industrial management known as "scientific management" or the "Taylor System" became popular. Scientific management was essentially a system for getting greater productivity from human labor. (p. 25) The ideas associated with scientific management rapidly spread and were readily accepted due in part to conditions which existed in American society (e.g., the rising cost of living) the years of publicity given to conservation and the elimination of waste, and the reform attitude of the public) and in part to the fact that scientific management had captured the imagination of the American people. Its enthusiastic reception was manifested in and generated by the popular press. The popular journals assured that scientific management had universal applicability and could be applied by anyone with common sense. (p. 42) Taylor was partly responsible for the notion of universal applicability, for he said that his principles could be applied with equal force to all social activities and institutions. (p. 43)

American educators in administrative positions were under heavy pressure so some applied the great panacea, scientific management, to education. Frank Spaulding applied scientific management ideas to education and his conception of it amounted to an analysis of the budget. He studied per-pupil costs and pupil-recitation costs to determine dollar value. His decisions on what should be taught were made not on educational, but on financial grounds. (p. 73) He felt that the financial and the educational aspects of the administrator's job were inseparable and should be handled by the same person. Spaulding felt that superintendents, by emphasizing the business nature of the superintendency, could elevate their status and possibly even raise their salaries. (pp. 75-76) Franklin Bobbitt connected the origin and development of the platoon school in Gary, Indiana, with scientific management and described how scientific management principles had been applied in the Gary schools. Bobbitt continually drew parallels between management and the worker in industry, and the administrator and teacher in education.

Some educators identified themselves as efficiency experts and became involved in the work of surveying school systems. The survey was used because educators were looking for evidence to counteract criticisms of inefficiency and waste in the school system. School administrators were told repeatedly by leading educators that the survey was an excellent device to use in defense against hostile critics and that is was a valuable instrument for obtaining more money for the schools. (p. 115) The surveys undoubtedly contributed to the adoption by the schools of standardized tests and teacher rating procedures. (p. 118)

After 1911 the idea that school administration should be a separate profession distinct from teaching developed. The combination of the development of specialized graduate work in school administration, and the growing influence of business on education with subsequent adoption of the business industrial practices and business organizational pattern led to this idea. (pp. 215-216) Callahan, feels that the wholesale adoption and application of business techniques to an institution whose primary purpose was the education of children was a horrible mistake. However, he felt that attempting to produce the finest product at the lowest cost was admirable but unfortunately, in education, the emphasis came to rest on "lowest cost" at the expense of quality. Callahan criticizes the leading educators in the universities, Strayer, Cubberley, Bobbitt and others, for not being a restraining force since they were not under direct attack nor were they extremely vulnerable. He discusses the fact that they capitulated to the business ideology and focused the attention of graduate courses in school administration toward business aspects of education. He asks for a higher standard of scholarship in graduate schools today with a well rounded course of study in the humanities.

Evaluation

Callahan states that his book is a study of the social forces that have shaped the administration of the public schools. I feel that it does an excellent job

in describing the pressures applied by the business and industrial sectors of our society to education and its administrators. However, I feel that it does not give sufficient attention to other social forces of that time.

Callahan explained clearly how educators were intimidated by the business ideology. He also makes a good case when he discusses the vulnerability of administrators (especially superintendents) to the whims of pressure groups. This book helps explain why certain courses became part of the curriculum, why so much clerical work became a set portion of the teachers job, and why the existing tumult for the year-round school and maximum utilization of school buildings.

I agree with Callahan that an administrator must have a good education in the humanities and social sciences but I feel that he has neglected the point that administrators do need some of the training given in the scientific management area. The areas of finance management, public relations, human relations, negotiations and business administration are everyday concerns of today's administrators.

Also, Dr. Callahan thinks that federal aid to education would solve the problems of schools concerning inadequate financing and vulnerability of superintendents. I think he is a bit optimistic in this recommendation. The trend at the present time is to give categorical aid which ties the hands of the administrator, that is, the funds are earmarked for specific purposes. The original intent of many legislative acts is sometimes diluted or changed by guidelines and/or interpretations of the guidelines by the bureaucracy handling the program. Moreover, some districts get only a small percentage of their tax money back from the federal government.

J. J. McDermott reviewing this book in the Commonweal stated that "Dr. Callahan's book combines a fidelity to historical data characteristic of a monograph, with a balanced sense of values and an incisiveness all too rare in efforts of this kind."[1]

---

[1]J. J. McDermott, "Review of Education and the Cult of Efficiency," Commonweal, LXXIV (January 11, 1963), 415.

J. W. Stein states in the Library Journal that the author has written an important critical work for educational collections.[2] W. H. Cartwright writes in the Mississippi Valley Historical Review that Professor Callahan has done a service in pointing up a significant weakness in American public education and the book deserves to be read not only by those whom it indicts, but by all those concerned with the improvement of schools.[3]

From the very beginning the efficiency movement provoked intellectual competition, if not outright opposition. Individuals became increasingly aware of the limitations of scientific management. Mary Parker Follett thought that the profession of business management was based on the motive of service and a foundation of science. She felt that the real service of businessmen is not just the production and distribution of manufactured articles. It is "....to give an opportunity for individual development though the better organization of human relationships....The process of production is as important for the welfare of society as the product of production."[4]

Roethlisberger and Dickson concluded that people work better if treated like human beings, with some specifications as to what is meant by "human beings." It was this idea which some commentators hailed as "the great illumination."[5]

In conclusion, I feel that the scientific management era did substantially affect the educational system of America. Dr. Callahan's book, in my opinion, is an excellent account of this subject. Consequently, I would recommend that it be required reading for administrators and would-be administrators.

---

[2]J. W. Stein, "Review of Education and the Cult of Efficiency," Library Journal, LXXXVII (October 1, 1962), 3445.

[3]W. H. Cartwright, "Review of Education and the Cult of Efficiency," Mississippi Valley Historical Review, XXXXIX (March, 1963), 722.

[4]Henry C. Metcalf and Lyndell Urwick (eds.), Dynamic Administration: The Collected Papers of Mary Parker Follett (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1940), p. 141.

[5]Bertram M. Gross, "The Scientific Approach to Administration," Daniel Griffiths (ed.), Behavioral Science and Educational Administration, Sixty-third Yearbook NSSE II (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964) 33-72.

LUTHER GULICK, LYNDELL URWICK (eds.), Papers on the Science of Administration (New York: Institute of Public Administration, 1937).

Critique by Charles W. Wachtell

Gulick made two personal contributions in this compilation of thoughts on the "Science of Administration". In the first, "Notes on the Theory of Organization," he presents a brief but comprehensive treatise on organization both governmental and business. The development is interesting in that the author starts with the most rudimentary notions about the need for some sort of organization and proceeds to complicated patterns of organization currently in use.

In an organization of any considerable size, there must be a division of work or labor. This is because men differ in nature, capacity, and skill and gain greatly in dexterity by specialization. The same man cannot be two places at the same time; one man cannot do two things at the same time; and there is the matter of human nature, time and space. This division, however, has three clear limitations: The first arises from volume. If a subdividing results in less than full time work for a man, it has gone too far. Secondly, a man has to be able to do specific work before it can be assigned to him. Thirdly, subdivision of work must not pass beyond physical division into organic division. That is, one must be present in order to do the work.

Coordination of work is necessary in order to reach successfully a corporate goal. The coordination may be by the dominance of an idea or by organization. In this instance, the organization is being considered. In the organization, it is essential to observe the "master principles" of having no worker answering to more than one boss and keeping the span of control within bounds dictated by diversification and human limitations. Sir Ian Hamilton wrote, "The nearer we approach the supreme head of the organization, the more we ought to work toward groups of three; the closer we get to the foot of the whole organization, (infantry of the line), the more we work towards groups of six."[1]

---

[1] Sir Ian Hamilton, The Soul and Body of an Army (London: Arnold, 1921).

Henri Fayol said, "A minister has twenty assistants, where the Administrative Theory says that the manager at the head of a big undertaking should not have more than five or six."[2]

The executive, then, must be organized in such a manner as to be more adequate in a complicated situation. In order to do so, it is first necessary to ask, "What is the work of the chief executive?" The answer, according to Gulick, is POSDCORB. POSDCORB is a catchword, each of the letters standing for an activity in an order designed to provide for an orderly, effective administrative process. It is explained as follows:

P - Planning, that is working out in broad outline the things that need to be done and the methods for doing them to accomplish the purpose set for the enterprise;

O - Organizing, that is the establishing of the formal structure of authority through which work subdivisions are arranged, defined, and coordinated for the defined objective;

S - Staffing, that is the whole personnel function of bringing in and training the staff and maintaining favorable conditions of work;

D - Directing, that is the continuous task of making decisions and embodying them in specific and general orders and instructions and serving as leader of the enterprise.

C - Co-ordinating, that is the all important duty of interrelating the various parts of the work;

R - Reporting, that is keeping those to whom the executive is responsible informed as to what is going on, which thus includes

---

[2] Henri Fayol, "The Administrative Theory in the State," Address in Brussels, September 13, 1923.

keeping himself and his subordinates informed through records, research, and inspection.

B - Budgeting, with all that goes with budgeting in the form of fiscal planning, accounting, and control.

If these functions can be accepted as major duties of the chief executive, it follows that they may be organized as subdivisions of the executive. In large organiations, one or all parts of POSDCORB may be suborganized.

It may be noted that the Army has contributed much to the theory of organization.[3] One of the military approaches that retains civilian application is the concept of line and staff. In the military organization, however, the coordinating staff is normally only half as large as POSDCORB suggests. The Army general or coordinating staff consists of the G1, 2, 3, and 4. The "1" is concerned with personnel matters; the "2" is intelligence (military information, especially concerning an enemy); the "3" is organization, plans, operations, and training; and the "4" is responsible for all materiel. During time of military occupation, a G5 is added to work with civilian authorities of the occupied nation.

The staff personnel devote their time to knowing, thinking, and planning. The line personnel, who comprise the bulk of most organizations, are the doers or workers. Needless to say, staff people work, and line people think and plan. However, the formal planning remains with the staff, and the responsibility for executing those plans is exclusively that of the line. It is no doubt poetically correct that the glory goes to the doers. It must also be significant that, as General von Seeckt remarked before World War I, "Staff officers have no names."[4]

---

[3]Readers should know that Mr. Wachtell, who is preparing this critique, completed a career in the army prior to enteringeducation as a profession (ed.).

[4]Walter Goerlitz, History of the German General Staff (New York: Frederick Praeger Publishers, 1957).

Mr. Gulick has condensed a considerable volume of profound information about organization, much of which is now truistic. While he wasn't original in his reflections about "division of labor", he did explain the idea better than Adam Smith. Smith said, ". . .the division of labor is limited by the extent of the market."[5]

Gulick's coordinating staff pattern, I feel, may have been designed to meet all contingencies. That is to say, it would not be necessary to use all of POSDCORB, but all or various parts of it could serve specific needs. The duties of the military G2 might be a trifle difficult to place in this pattern, but, of course, that is a uniquely military function.

My personal feeling is that Gulick's staff is too large. For example, the "Coordinating" and "Reporting" can and should be performed by all other staff members, including subordinate or operating staff members. This would leave the chief executive's span of control nearer the recommendations of Hamilton and Fayol.

---

[5] Adam Smith, The Wealth of Nations (New York: Modern Library, Inc., 1937).

MARY PARKER FOLLETT, Dynamic Administration
(New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1940).

Critique by Donald L. Hummel

Mary Parker Follett became the first great exponent of the importance of human relations in administration. She worked to help bring about a better-ordered society in which the individual might live a more satisfying life.

Her philosophy was that any enduring society, any continuously productive industrial organization, must be grounded upon recognition of the motivating desires of the individual and of the group. Follett sought to emphasize the fact that the democratic way of life, implemented by intelligent organization and administration of government and industry, is to work toward an honest integration of all points of view, to the end that every individuality may be mobilized and made to count both as a person and as an effective part of his group and of society as a whole.

Follett knew that the fundamental organizational problem of any enterprise, be it national government, local government, business management, an educational system or church administration, is the building and maintenance of dynamic, yet harmonious, human relationships. Human relationships are at their best when difference is solved through conference and co-operation, when the parties at interest (1) evoke each other's latent ideas based upon the facts of the situation, (2) come to see each other's viewpoints and to understand each other better, and (3) integrate those viewpoints and become united in the pursuit of their common goal.

Follett proposed that one test of business administration should be: is the organization such that both employers and employees, or co-managers, co-directors, are stimulated to a reciprocal activity which will give more than mere adjustment, more than an equilibrium? The outlook is narrowed, the activity is restricted, the chances of business success largely diminished when thinking is constrained within

the limits of what has been called an either - or situation. There is often the possibility of something better than either of two given alternatives.

The four principles which Follett delineated to express her view of organization were:

(1) Co-ordination by direct contact of the responsible people concerned.

(2) Co-ordination in the early stages.

(3) Co-ordination as a reciprocal relating of all the features in a situation.

(4) Co-ordination as a continuing process.

According to Follett, rightly understood and interpreted, these principles form the basis, the psychological foundations, upon which an enduring, smoothly operating organization must rest.

Mary Parker Follett was convinced of three things: first, that all problems are fundamentally problems in human relations; secondly, while every human being is different, there is a sufficiently large common factor in human reactions to similar situations to permit the development of principles of administration; thirdly, and in consequence, those principles must be discovered and applied wherever the organization of human endeavors is required in the pursuit of a common objective.

Evaluation

Clearly, Follett's ideas have influenced educational administration. The purpose of any educational organization is that of co-ordinating efforts toward the achievement of its goal, which in this case has to do with teaching and learning. The administrator, to fulfill this duty, must influence the development of goals and policies, aid in planning and implementing appropriate programs, and procure and manage resources, money, and material necessary to support his program.

The administrator must work with the board of education, the community, the faculty as a group, individual teachers, department heads, coaches, and other administrative officers. Government of schools poses distinctive problems in finding ways of enlisting and integrating the energies and initiative of the relatively large number among whom responsibility for decision making is shared.

Follett stated that, if the organization is to function smoothly, it is necessary to maintain dynamic, yet harmonious human relationships. Because this is the case in education, we must remember that decisions are not, in practice, individual. They result from the interaction of individuals and groups, the attitudes which persons involved in the process hold, and the environment in which the enterprise operates.

Follett in her paper, The Meaning of Responsibility in Business Management, stated, "An Executive decision is only a moment in a process. The growth of decision, the accumulation of authority, not the final step, is what we need most to study." John Locke agreed with Follett as interpreted by Simon in Administrative Behavior. Locke emphasized the importance in studying the functioning of an enterprise, of distinguishing between the process of deciding how an enterprise shall be run and of doing what has been decided shall be done. In any enterprise, business, governmental, or educational, the responsibility of doing is widely distributed among those who make up the enterprise. Making an organizational decision is not often an instantaneous act by an individual. It is usually a process in which the ideas, analyses, and factual contributions of many individuals may be assembled for final approval by an executive.

In support of this argument note that Metcalf and Urwick in their book, Dynamic Administration, referred to Follett's works as follows.

> Human relationships, the ways and work of society and of industry, are at their best when difference is solved through conference and cooperation, when the parties at interest (1) evoke each other's latent ideas based upon

the facts of the situation, (2) come to see each other's viewpoints and to understand each other better, and (3) integrate those viewpoints and become united in the pursuit of their common goal.

Campbell, Corbally and Ramseyer in Introduction to Educational Administration agree that the emphasis on human relations supplied by Follett has also influenced educational administration. This emphasis was reflected in the "democratic administration" movement. Democratic administration had many exponents, but, for the most part, they did little to give greater insight into the realities of school organizations and their operations.

It is safe to conclude that Mary Parker Follett's ideas on human relations have become an important aspect of all management.

ELTON MAYO, The Human Problems of an Industrial Civilization (New York: Macmillan Co., 1933).

Critique by Joseph W. Rutherford

Basically, Elton Mayo's[1] book may be considered a dichotomy. The first five chapters deal with research into fatigue, monotony, the Hawthorne Experiment and the subsequent Western Electric Inquiry, and the meaning of morale. The last three chapters draw heavily on the first five chapters in the discussion of the individual in a highly industrial society and in the governments of the 1930's. To a busy administrator, this latter part is the more significant and contains the important conclusions of the first part.

With respect to the chapters on fatigue, monotony, and morale, the salient conclusion is that there is no single, simple fact which can be pinpointed to identify any one of the characteristics or conditions affecting the individual in the complex industrial societies of the world. Indeed, Mayo inferred that individual differences defy the establishment of a blanket theorem. However, Mayo would opt for much additional research in the area of social problems. In brief, his studies raised many more questions than they answered.

No discussion of Mayo would be complete without referring to the Hawthorne Experiment. This involved the interjection and withdrawal of variables in "test room" and "non-test room" situations. This research showed that something other than economics and the working conditions was important in the output of the workers. This point is important in his later writings.

The more significant section of this book deals with the problems of an industrial society from anthropoligcal and governmental points of view. Mayo

---

[1]George Elton Mayo was an Australian who taught logic, philosophy, and ethics until he came to the United States and entered industrial research in 1922.

emphasized the commonality of problems faced by the various industrial powers no matter what the form of government might be. A major point in describing the problems which we face is the "anomie"; i.e., planlessness in living of our society with all its ramifications. His contention here is that our study of society has not kept abreast of our technological advancements.

Evaluation

In the light of the subsequent writings of Mayo, one especially significant thing about this work is what is not said. By this I mean he was mainly considering the problems of individuals as individuals and not of individuals as members of a sub-group within society. He did anticipate the concept of group dynamics functioning within a society. But his focus was upon the function of the individual either by himself or as a member of society.

This book was written in 1933 in the midst of the depression. This probably influenced his view of the problems of the industrial society and the relationships of government to industry. It must be remembered that in 1933 people, Americans especially, did not realize the uniqueness of the American society and the American dream--nor of its ability to solve various social problems. By way of example, a large section of this book was devoted to the problems of the various ethnic groups in Chicago and to the problems created there by their existence. Although many problems exist today, the problem of ethnic assimilation has apparently been solved. It must be noted that during the 1930's the question of race relations was not a significant issue. If we are to judge from past experiences, the problems of race relations will also be solved.

Significantly, Mayo was concerned some 35 years ago with many of the same problems with which we are beset today:

1. The disintegration of our social system.
2. The structured struggle between management and the working class.
3. The functioning of an individual in a highly complex industrial society.
4. The development of an enlightened, elite management pool.
5. The pulling together of the then current ideas in research management.
6. The approach of studying management in the society rather than in a vacuum as was then the case.

Surprisingly, Mayo's conclusions are not what earned him esteem in the management field. Rather, he provided research evidence of the need to understand human motivation and suggested how modern management can get things done through people.

All who deal with morale, motivations, and human relations owe a debt to Mayo and his colleagues. From our present perspective we may criticize aspects of his design, but this does not lessen the importance of his contribution nor its impact upon practice in many areas. Is it possible that the success of team teaching in many situations is due to the same important influences discovered in Mayo's work and not to the structural design?

F. J. ROETHLISBERGER AND WILLIAM J. DICKSON, Management and the Worker (Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1939).

Critique by Sister M. Karen Shirilla

John Morley once said "There are some books which cannot be adequately reviewed for twenty or thirty years after they come out." Management and the Worker is just such a classic. It is a comprehensive report of a five year social and industrial, psychological study performed at the Hawthorne (Chicago) plant of Western Electric between the years 1927 and 1932. The stimulus for this research in the field of human relations was some inconclusive experimentation at the same plant from 1924 to 1927 to determine the effect of illumination on worker efficiency.

The designers of the research, members of Mayo's school of human relations at the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, initially sought to assess the physical determinants of productivity rather than the psychological determinants. In presenting their work seven years after the conclusion of the experimentation the authors, F. Roethlisberger, a sociologist at Harvard, and Wm. Dickson of Western Electric, chose to report the "course of inquiry" and "a continuous history of the entire series of experiments" rather than treat this work from the standpoint of investigators at the end of the inquiry. They felt that this was more desirable to insure a greater degree of objectivity and give insight into the nature of the task undertaken. To quote the authors, "In most cases the results obtained instead of giving definite answers to the original questions demanded a restatement of them so that the admitted inconclusiveness of the previous findings led to inquiries not anticipated in the original plan."

Chronologically the study divides naturally into four sections corresponding to the four stages of inquiry and a concluding section on the application to the research. Part I is concerned with the five member Relay Assembly Test Room series of twelve experiments on working conditions and employee efficiency. Part II considers the

interviewing of 20,000 employees to determine those aspects of the working environment which they either favored or disliked. Part III analyzes the interviews and presents a general theory to explain the nature of employee satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Part IV deals with the experiment in the Bank Wiring Observation Room on the effect of informal organizations. The book concludes with Part V entitled "Applications to Practice of Research Results" with hardly a link between the unresolved problems of the previous sections and the implementation of the counselling program initiated the following year and continuing for the next twenty years.

Anyone familiar with the precision and sophistication with which research today is reported to the educated public would be a bit bemused and possibly entertained by the length, detail, and informal style of this presentation. One becomes fascinated not so much by what the authors conclude but rather by what they do not conclude from their experimentation.

More interesting, however, is the initial wave of criticism which struck not so much the empirical studies as such, but the expression of the Mayo school's ideology under whose leadership these studies were undertaken. Henry Landsberger in Hawthorne Revisited published in 1958 takes to task those critics of Management and the Worker whose criticisms apply to the Mayo school rather than to the research itself.

Clark Kerr in an article which appeared in the Fortune magazine in 1954 entitled "What Became of the Independent Spirit?" criticizes Roethlisberger and Dickson for their inadequate conceptualization of major problems of industrial relations. Kerr, speaking as a liberal economist, takes issue with the human relations school as having a faulty view of society; of characterizing the worker as being in need of submerging himself in the purposes of a larger group in order to find freedom. This orientation, he claims, leads to three further deficiencies in assumption with which Koivisto in a 1953 article in the American Journal of Sociology concurs: a view of the worker as

not a goal-setting creature but as accepting the goals of the management; a failure to pay attention to collective bargaining; a failure to take unions into account.

The fact the Management and the Worker was published when unions were of vital interest should not imply consideration of unions in 1930 when they were unknown to the worker particularly at Hawthorne. But one cannot deny that a conflict existed at that time whose tensions contributed to the rise in unions in 1939. Nor can one deny the effect that the depression had on work output. Yet this was not fully dealt with in the report.

Others like Bendix and Fisher whose article appears in the 1949 issue of Review of Economics and Statistics disagree with what emerges as a fundamental assumption of Mayo, that cooperation and collaboration is social health, and that conflict is a social disease. Proponents of the industrial, social, or the institutional theory of conflict are exasperated by the authors' failure to consider economic and institutional movements outside the plant.

Some critics like Hart whose writings appear in the Canadian Journal of Economic and Political Science, 1949, feel that the study is overly psychological and would prefer a sociological level of analysis. In using the rather individualistic theory like that of Freud, the authors pay lip service to sociology and dedicate their empirical research to psychology. Thus there appears an over-balance in the direction of providing a good morale, and educating supervisors to consciousness of employee needs.

Roethlisberger and Dickson conclude with an unconvincing description of the counseling program they proposed to reduce the existing tension between management and the employer. Was this meant to replace any need for consideration of collective bargaining?

The counseling program continued for twenty years after the conclusion of the empirical studies and was described in a publication by Roethlisberger and Dickson entitled Counseling in an Organization. It was published in 1966 ten years after the counseling program was discontinued. As strong as was the wave of criticism that met

Roethlisberger and Dickson's first book this one has not yet merited the attention of the critics. It seems safe to conclude that the human relations view of management has been superseded by other approaches such as the social science approach.

Management and the Worker is a seminal work in the sense that much research has been inspired by it. There is no doubt of the tremendous impetus which the Hawthorne Studies gave sociological and social psychological studies of industrial problems. To that one needs only to realize how common the phrase "Hawthorne Effect" has become despite the fact that it was never used by the authors. Because of its widespread use in so many fields today one is never quite sure whether it is being used in its stealthy context referring to the inconclusiveness of an inquiry, or in its positive sense referring to that special treatment which inevitably results in increased output.

Despite its limitations, Management and the Worker has served society well--1) in showing that empirical research within industry and organizations in general was possbile; 2) in broadening and profoundly changing industrial psychology; 3) in touching upon most of the problem areas into which the field of human relations in industry has devoted its energies ever since. It has withstood the test of time.

WILBUR A. YAUCH, Improving Human Relations in School Administration (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1949).

Critique by William Lehrer

Wilbur Yauch in Improving Human Relations in School Administration is attempting to present practical suggestions concerning ways in which the principal can provide teachers with democratic experiences. No particular philosophic position with regard to educational methodology is evident as a prerequisite. Yauch points out that the principal may hold that the subject matter children learn should be sternly restricted to the so-called fundamentals. He may just as well believe that all modern activities exemplified by the "progressive" school are the true basis for an adequate education. But regardless of such beliefs, he must possess a firm conviction that the ultimate purpose of the school is to build democratic character in children, and that the quickest and most effective method is to devote his major concern to securing these characteristics in teachers.

Another reoccurring theme which appears throughout the book is the importance of the principal. Yauch feels that the principal is one individual in the educational heirarchy who can make an immediate and profitable contribution to improving school practices. Regardless of the quality and character of the teachers he gets from teacher education institutions, regardless of the attitudes and predispositions of the community, and even regardless of the status and attitudes of present faculty members, he can begin at once to provide teachers with vital experiences to increase their ability to guide the lives of boys and girls toward more effective democratic behavior.

Even though the book was published in 1949, a great deal of the theory which is put forth may be relevant today. For example, when discussing leadership, Yauch feels that when individuals come together to carry on a common task it is necessary for them to have some direction and coordination of their individual efforts. He goes on to say that leaders have a variety of ways of influencing group behavior. These techniques may

be used for two opposing ends: aggrandizement of the leader as an individual, or progressive emancipation of the group from continued dependence upon individual leadership. The test of the adequacy of the leadership is always obtained by determining its long-term effect on group conduct. If the teachers are better able to think through their own problems without too much help from the principal, proper leadership has been exercised. If the teachers not only continue to depend upon him, but also become incapable of action without his help, the leadership has been poor or undesirable.

When discussing human relations in schools, Yauch points out that if spontaneous, almost unconscious, social organization arises from the relations of workers in industry, it would seem inevitable that the social organization of teachers in a school would develop just as naturally. That such is the case could hardly be denied by any observant principal. The faculty is more than a name given to a collection of teachers under a common roof. By virtue of their close proximity, common professional purposes, and allegiance to the same authority, teachers are bound into a closely knit social organization with a form and substance of its own. The conscientious principal needs to know a great deal about the human composition of the faculty if he expects to deal appropriately with it.

Yauch continues by saying that when individuals work together in a common environment with common purposes, it is a known fact of social psychology that they will develop a set of relations that distinguish them as a group. Within the group there may be conflicts, irritations, cross purposes, but to the outside world the members will present a united front that magnifies the unity and hides the differences. In general, a group, whether it be in a factory, a school, or wherever else people are present, is characterized by intense loyalty, identification with the group's purposes, and close social cohesiveness. Even in the loosely organized group, composed of a few individuals chosen by an outside power, the members develop an informal organization that greatly modifies their individual behavior. Membership is gained by the willingness of the individual to further the purposes chosen by the group.

In summary, Wilbur Yauch states that the success of the entire venture in co-operative control depends almost entirely on the competence of the principal. The faculty will expect vigorous direction. The principal must be conscious of the problems of transition from one form of control to the other. The teachers will vary considerably in their thinking and acting to new ways. Without his constant and intelligent guidance there is not much hope that the program will ever succeed.

Evaluation

We can learn a great deal concerning human behavior and the interaction between individuals and within groups from this book. It is not a standard text in school administration, but one in which the practicing principal can learn how to improve the quality of educational leadership in his school.

Public school administrators must remind themselves of the tremendous responsibility which is theirs to provide quality leadership if the group is to achieve its purposes. Not only must the good leader employ with great care good leadership techniques, but he must go further in guiding the developing activities of the members. Too often public school administrators sit in their office waiting for teachers to create problems which must be solved. If they wait for teachers to find the skill and insight necessary for doing their own thinking, such administratiors will be doomed to eternal disappointment. Groups are not likely to act without leadership. I have found that if the principal does not exert some kind of pressure to act, someone else will, with the disadvantage that the guidance may be less helpful and less legitimate than that offered by the designated status leader.

An extremely important section of Yauch's work deals with the problem of human relations in the public schools. As we can recall from Elton Mayo's[1] studies which dealt with the problems of well knit social groups in the industrial environment, we are able to draw many parallels. Mayo pointed out that interrelationships among workers

[1] Elton Mayo, The Social Problems of an Industrial Civilization (Andover, Mass.: The Andover Press, 1945).

were rarely planned or formally organized. They consisted of basic human relationships out of which emerged a loosely knit social structure dominating the behavior of individual workers. Changes in social and psychological organization played a most important part in deciding how much work a person did and how satisfied he was to do it. The same is true in public education. Group organization cannot be forced upon a collection of individuals; it must grow out of the relationships of the people who compose it. A would-be leader may be deeply interested in working a group out of a collection of individuals, but there is little he can do about it from outside. Only time and experience will provide the working material for forming the group. A very important fact to remember is that only as the leader is accepted as an actual working member, can he hope to influence the group's direction and purposes.

Yauch points out and this writer agrees that every individual is important in his own right. Public school administrators must build the self concept of teachers and make sure that they understand their role and contribution to the organization.

Finally, as Yauch states, our concern in educational institutions is in the development of the individual child in the direction of making him more effective in a democracy. This educational administrators dare not forget.

CHESTER I. BARNARD, The Functions of the Executive (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1938).

Critique by Eugene R. Bohland

The theory of cooperation and organization constitutes the first half of the book. The second half is a study of the functions and the methods of operations of executives in formal organizations. Barnard states that it is evident that many lack an interest in the science of organization because they are oblivious to the art of organizing, not perceiving the significant elements.

Careful inspection of the observable actions of human beings in our society -- their movements, their speech, and the thought and emotions evident from their action and speech --shows that many and sometimes most of them are determined or directed by their connection with formal organizations. Barnard defines formal organization as that kind of cooperation among men that is conscious, deliberate, purposeful.

Essential assumptions for Barnard may be summarized as follows:

1. The individual human being possesses a limited power of choice. At the same time he is a resultant of, and is narrowly limited by, the factors of the total situation. He has motives, arrives at purposes, and wills to accomplish them. His method is to select a particular factor or set of factors in the total situation and to change the situation by operations on these factors. These are, from the viewpoint of purpose, the limiting factors; and are the strategic points of attack.
2. Among the most important limiting factors in the situation of each individual are his own biological limitations. The most effective method of overcoming these limitations has been that of cooperation. This requires the adoption of a group, or non-personal, purpose. The situation with reference to such a purpose is composed of innumerable factors, which must be discriminated as limiting or non-limiting factors.

3. Cooperation is a social aspect of the total situation and social factors arise from it. These factors may be in turn the limiting factors of any situation. This arises from two considerations: a. The processes of interaction must be discovered or invented; b. the interaction changes the motives and interest of those participating in the cooperation.

4. The persistence of cooperation depends on two conditions: a. its effectiveness; and b. its efficiency. Effectiveness relates to the accomplishment of the cooperative purpose, which is social and non-personal in character. Efficiency relates to the satisfaction of individual motives, and is personal in character. The test of effectiveness can be measured. The test of efficiency is the eliciting of sufficient individual wills to cooperate.

5. The survival of cooperation, therefore, depends upon two interrelated and interdependent classes of processes: a. those which relate to the system of cooperation as a whole in relation to the environment; and b. those which relate to the creation or distribution of satisfactions among individuals.

6. The instability and failures of cooperation arise from defects in each of these classes of processes separately, and from defects in their combination. The functions of the executive are those of securing the effective adaption of these processes.

The elements of an organization are therefore: 1. communication; 2. willingness to serve; and 3. common purpose. For the continued existence of an organization either effectiveness or efficiency is necessary; and the longer the life, the more necessary both are.

The net satisfactions which induce a man to contribute his efforts to an organization result from the positive advantages as against the disadvantages which are entailed.

An organization can secure the efforts necessary to its existence, then, either by the objective inducements it provides or by changing states of mind. The specific inducements that may be offered are of several classes, for example: a. material inducements; b. personal non-material opportunities; c. desirable physical conditions; d. ideal benefactions. General incentives afforded are, for example: e. associational attractiveness; f. adaptation of conditions to habitual methods and attitudes; g. the opportunity of enlarged participation; h. the condition of communion. Persuasion is: a. the creation of coercive conditions; b. the rationalization of opportunity; and c. the inculcation of motives.

Thus, the efficiency of a cooperative system is its capacity to maintain itself by the individual satisfactions it affords. This may be called its capacity of equilibrium, the balancing of burdens by satisfactions which results in continuance.

Evaluation

Barnard's theory of equilibrium raised a new concept in administration in that there was consideration for the individual. Taylor did not consider the feelings of the individual and his task system was resented by the workers. Campbell states that Barnard's concept of equilibrium remains a popular concept with effectiveness being the achievement of organizational goals and efficiency their achievement with due regard for the people in the organization.

I believe that the incentive factor is vital to school administration. There are very few organizations in existence where an individual enters at a job classification and remains on that same classification for the entire length of service. This is true of the classroom teacher whose incentive is material in the form of a salary schedule. It is therefore important to the school administrator to provide both specific and general incentives to insure that the organization remains efficient.

Barnard lists communication as one of three executive functions. Daniel Davies points out that studies of the administrator's job show repeatedly that 90 per cent or more of his time is spent in talking, listening, writing or reading. Therefore, communication involves more time and people than does any other single administrative activity.

HERBERT A. SIMON, Administrative Behavior
(New York: Macmillan Co., 1945).

Critique by Larry McDougle

Simon lists some accepted administrative principles which increase administrative efficiency:

(1) Specialization of the task among the group;

(2) Arranging the members of the group in a determinate hierarchy of authority;

(3) Limiting the span of control at any point in the hierarchy to a small number;

(4) Grouping the workers, for purposes of control, according to:

(a) purpose,

(b) process,

(c) clientele, and

(d) place.

None of these four principles survive critical analysis in very good shape. Newton's third law of motion says that for every action, there is an equal and opposite reaction. This means quite simply that there is no such thing as a single force. Forces exist in pairs. Principles of administration seem to do the same thing. For nearly every principle, there is another which may be equally plausible and acceptable which may contradict the first.

The question is "Can anything be salvaged which will be useful in constructing an administrative theory?" The answer is a qualitative yes with overall efficiency being a guiding criterion. No singular criterion is a sound basis for application to an administrative situation. A detailed analysis of all relevant issues needs to be conducted.

Consider this program for developing an administrative theory. First a set of concepts must be identified and defined. A brilliant analogy here is the set of

mathematical principles developed by Newton. In his Mathematical Principles of Natural Philosophy, he begins by defining such terms as mass, force, momentum, and acceleration. He makes it clear to the reader at the outset that "If you do not accept these definitions, there is no need to read any further." In short, he is saying that his arguments are consistent within the framework of his definitions. These definitions must be accepted for theory which follows to have any meaning.

Once the concepts are establihsed, it becomes necessary to develop operational definitions of all terms which now become a part of the "language" of the proposed theory. This "language" may or may not be distinct and unique. As the descriptions become more sophisticated, avenues begin to open for meaningful progress in the evolution of a valid administrative theory or set of principles.

Once the theory has been born, the question arises concerning implementation. It is an unwritten law of the natural sciences that when two theories explain a given phenomena equally well, the simpler of the two should be chosen. A classic example of this was the conflict which raged for more than a century between the Copernican hypothesis and the Ptolemaic hypothesis. The Copernican theory was eventually accepted, not so much because it was more correct, but because it was simpler. In looking at administrative objectives, when there are several alternatives that lead to the same accomplishment, the one should be selected which involves the least expenditure.

The entire issue comes down to the question, "Can administration aspire to be a 'science' or must it be at best, an 'art'?" The nature of its subject may make the former aspiration a difficult goal to achieve, but the ultimate success of any theory will be reflected by the "exactness" with which its guiding principles become defined.

Bertram M. Gross[1] evaluates the work of Simon. He sees Simon as a systematic theory-builder who gives attention to rigorous definition and precise formulation of relationships. He is concerned with the methodology of the social sciences.

Simon's goal was to develop a value-free science of administrative behavior, even to the point of a "science of man" which must accommodate "his dual nature as a social and as a rational animal."

Simon constantly argued that valid principles of administration can be developed. However, the formulation must divorce administrative theory from value-judgments. Furthermore, it must develop criteria for describing and diagnosing administrative situations and then properly weigh these criteria.

In contrast to Barnard who placed a great deal of emphasis upon the formal network of authority, Simon viewed the importance of informal channels in communication. He considered administrative theory itself as a stop-gap measure in the rationality of organizations. In fact, he saw organizations existing to "compensate for the limited rationality of individuals."

One last thought. Perhaps more than anyone else, Simon applied advanced mathematical analysis to the social sciences. In this respect, he was reverting to or recapturing some of the spirit of Taylor. His mathematical analysis of influence and decision-making was at an unusually high level of sophistication. His mechanistic approach operated at a higher level than Taylor's, but then it was "buoyed up by the achievements of experimental psychology, learning theory, and information theory."

---

[1]Bertram M. Gross, "The Scientific Approach to Administration", Behavioral Science and Educational Administration. Sixty-third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. Daniel E. Griffiths, editor. University of Chicago Press, 1964, pp. 64-72.

CHRIS ARGYRIS, Personality and Organization, The Conflict Between System and the Individual (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957).

Critique by Katherine MacKinnon

Argyris' objective is to help explain basic causes of human behavior in ongoing human organizations and to create a systematic and integrated consideration of current research of human relations in ongoing organizations. Argyris' clarity of style reveals his thorough understanding of the topics he discusses. There are over 640 footnotes in this carefully documented work. The quality of analysis and synthesis that have been brought to bear on the work of so many others makes this an exceptionally usable book for the educational administrator.

The first and important concept developed is the prediction and control of behavior based on understanding. Fundamental to this understanding is self-awareness. Says Argyris, it is impossible to understand others unless we understand ourselves. This principle of self-awareness Argyris considers necessary but not sufficient to understanding human behavior. He believes that a valid diagnosis of human situations also requires knowledge of the best principles available.

As he discusses the human personality Argyris explains basic properties of personality as they would be seen and understood by an administrator. He supplies examples of how the dynamics of personality operate in an organizational setting. Although it is certainly not prescriptive, this book is one to which an administrator with a problem could turn. It would help him to understand the human principles involved in the situation so that he could try to achieve long term goals by his decision. It would also be an excellent reference to the other sources which discuss the topics and research in which an administrator is interested.

One finds psychological terms included with their usual meanings but they are discussed in the way they would be manifested in an organizational setting: such terms

as adjustment and adaptation, psychic energy, psychological needs, abilities, and interests. The self, the development of defense mechanisms, and the continually changing and developing personality toward self-actualization must be understood by the administrator if he is to correctly interpret and understand observed behavior in those in his organization.

The section on personality is followed by an equally well developed section on the formal organization. In it the work of scholars in the area is discussed with some evaluation of their ideas in light of what we know about the human personality. On the basis of a logical analysis, Argyris concludes that the formal organizational principles make demands of relatively healthy individuals that are incongruent with their needs. Frustration, conflict, failure, and short time perspective are predicted as resultants of this basic incongruency.

As this idea is developed in the sections which follow, one is struck by the dissimilarities between the teacher and the worker whom Argyris discusses. Administrator and teacher are more nearly alike in background, training and goals, or at least in the understanding of differing goals. This should make the job of the intelligent administrator less difficult in the educational organization than in most others. One is also struck by the idea that when the product, the student, is part of the organization, he is more similar to the workers here described than are many of the teachers. Therefore, there is much of merit in Argyris' approach to explain the position of the student in the organization as well as the positions of the teachers and the educational administrative hierarchy.

ROBERT PRESTHUS, The Organizational Society
(New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962).

Critique by Sister Thomas More Hill OSU

Robert Presthus' recent study, The Organizational Society, is an enlightening and highly readable addition to the social literature of bureaucratic structure. Presthus, a Cornell political scientist, examines the impact of big organizations on modern society and attempts to define the patterns of accommodation that occur in the bureaucratic milieu. His particular approach makes use of psychological conceptions and inquiries. His concern is similar to Chris Argyris' Personality and Organization, Victor Thompson's Modern Organization and Whyte's Organization Man.

With an acknowledged debt to Max Weber, Thorstein Veblen and principally to Harry Stack Sullivan, the author achieves originality in his synthesis of theories and in his classification of the three bureaucratic types or patterns of accommodation.

Presthus does not accept the Freudian view that man is inevitably in conflict with his society. On the contrary, he feels that social organizations often enhance man's freedom and opportunity.

> In this respect every social organization, the family, the church, the university, the union, the corporation has a Janus-like character. It encourages individual autonomy at the same time it demands conformity with its ends and the means to achieve them. Striking a balance has always been difficult. But today it seems that organizational demands have further distorted the organizational-individual equation. (p. 25)

The functional and dysfunctional consequences are apparent as the author turns to an analysis of the structural characteristics of a bureaucracy. Relying heavily on Max Weber's model, Presthus outlines several common characteristics of all large-scale operations: large size, specialization, hierarchy, status anxiety, oligarchy, co-optation, efficiency and rationality. Such organizations provide a distinctive work atmosphere for their members. Behavioral expectations are clearly

prescribed and interpersonal relations are structured by distinctions among authority, status and rank. At the same time, conflict is always present. This is especially represented in the tensions between those in hierarchical positions who monopolize organizational power and those in specialists' roles.

The next chapter traces the historical developments which culminated in this organizational society. Beginning about 1875, social, economic and political trends prepared the way. These trends included separation of ownership from management, increasing size of businesses, the decline of competition, the development of a political economy, and the emergence of an employee society.

Supplementing this historical background, Presthus discusses the social basis of personality as a preface to an analysis of individual behavior in this changed organizational context. His analysis utilizes tools of social psychology and cultural anthropology and particularly Harry Stack Sullivan's interpersonal theory of psychiatry. Sullivan developed the theory that each person's personality is the result of his pattern of accommodation with people who are significant to him. From this viewpoint, socially-validated beliefs are instilled in the young through anxiety-conformity-approval syndrome. In this way culturally defined patterns of behavior come to motivate human beings as strongly as biology determinants.

This process persists through life. Success today, Presthus emphasizes, requires higher education. This education is generally the prerogative of middle-class families who train their children to strive, to be punctual and to suppress emotions. These attributes prove functional in organizational society and result in the acquisition of status and prestige. Those who possess these qualities are drawn into the organization and gradually assume leadership. In this way the socialization process is tuned to the organization's demand for consistency, conformity and muting of conflict. This bureaucratic structure constitutes a "structured field." In such a field highly differentiated systems of authority,

status and small groups provide compelling stimuli that evoke compliance and deference to authority. Such responses are rewarding because they reduce anxiety and increase mobility by securing the approval of the authority figure. By using rewards and sanctions the desired values are inculcated in the members.

Presthus underscores his interpersonal theory of accommodation by dividing the participants into three classes: the upward-mobiles, the indifferents, and the ambivalents. The upward-mobile is the most successful organization member because he identifies with the organization and derives strength from the involvement. He is generally extroverted and has mastered the "human relations" approach. Yet he regards his subordinates with detachment. This leads him to make decisions in terms of the organization rather than the individual. "To some extent the successful organizer must view men as instruments, as pawns to be manipulated in some master plan." (p. 178) The upward-mobile enjoys organizational life, is successful, and reaps the rewards of status.

The second type of accommodation is one of indifference or withdrawal. The indifferent does not compete for favors; rather he sees organizations as "calculated systems of frustration." (p. 205) His accommodation is one of two stages--alienation or indifference. The alienated comes with great expectations. But when bureaucratic limitations blunt his hopes he becomes alienated. On another level, the individual has been taught not to expect much. Usually a member of a lower or middle class income range, he tends to reject the offers of authority, and status. Instead he separates his work from the "meaningful" aspects of his life which include leisure and recreation.

The last group, the ambivalents, have a self-system that is generally dysfunctional. Creative and anxious, the ambivalent's values conflict with bureaucratic values. He cannot play the organization game. His fear of authority often distorts his interpersonal relations. Since his preferences include a desire for creativity and a work climate that fosters openness and spontaneity, group decision-making proves stifling. He rejects systems of authority which rest upon subjective prestige bases rather than

upon objective professional claims. "The ambivalent's tragedy is that he cares too much, but can do too little." (p. 285)

In the concluding chapter, Presthus turns from the impact on individuals to the larger social consequences. Because individual growth and creativity are often at odds with organizational logic, the utilization of talent is frequently inhibited. Even if this perspective has been forced on society by Russia's economic and military thrust, the results could prove beneficial. Perhaps if bureaucratic structures are retained in applied spheres to which they are suited, they can be sharply modified in others, particularly in creative areas. The first step in this re-orientation is the awareness of organizational dysfunctions.

The author's view of the "Ambivalents," those always sensitive to the need for change, may be a key to educators. Although Presthus' analysis did not grow out of research in educational institutions, the similarities are obvious and his conclusions can be readily applied. As J. C. Hutchinson points out in Social Studies (January 1964), while "practical" administrators dialogue with talented "alienated" scientists will the bureaucratic demands for "loyalty and submission" smother genius and creativity? If survival chances of a society living in fear of nuclear devastation are largely a function of its ability to meet change, will organization society make it? Presthus' analysis should make administrators extremely aware of the need to develop more humanistic values and realistic working climates for individuals engaged in art, education and research.

What has been said of large corporations can likewise be applied to religious institutions in the Post-Vatican II era. Communities are currently rewriting and updating their constitutions and regulations in order to be more relevant in today's society. The present bureaucratic governmental structure is being decentralized according to the principles of collegiality and subsidiarity in order to achieve consultative decision-making.

Presthus' achievement in reviewing theories is perceptive. He does not advocate the acceptance of any one theory but employs a common-sense approach. But despite the plenitude of his research findings, it is doubtful that the very general propositions can go much beyond the speculative stage. As Philip Monypenny observes in the American Political Science Review (March 1963), the "general argument is rather supported by the reader's awareness of parallel situations and by its inherent plausibility." (p. 166)

Presthus' research and arguments should be most valuable as reference material for future social scientists. This imaginative work, though sometimes marred by overstatement, is not only provocative but also defies indifference.

LITCHFIELD, EDWARD H. "Notes on a General Theory of Administration," Administrative Science Quarterly, I. (June, 1956), 3-29

Critique by Carlomagno J.M. Blanco

In the opinion of this writer the first serious attempt to look at theory development in adminstration began just a little over a decade ago. Edward H. Litchfield, at that time preparing for the chancellorship at Pittsburgh, produced these notes which appeared in the first issue of the Administrative Science Quarterly, a bold venture of the Cornell University Graduate School of Business and Public Administration, and now one of the leading publications in the field.

The article examines the state of administration and the administrative process. Litchfield looks into contrived reasons for the lack of a theory in administration. The article criticizes the attitudes and demeanor of administrators and social scientists in their relationships with one another and in their handling of the concepts of administration. Litchfield laments the lack of communication between and among these two groups of people; he deplores the use of terminologies which limit the understanding of administration by the general public as a whole. He derides the profession for the lack of a level of generalization that would " enable it to systematize and explain administrative phenomena which occur in related fields." These same criticisms were echoed a few years later by Halpin and others.

Litchfield, unlike other critics, was able to suggest and formulate hypotheses and propositions leading to the development of a general theory applicable to all types of administrative endeavors -- hospital, military, public, civil, or educational administration. Administration, he contends, is a cycle of action which encompasses several functions and dimensions. The five major propositions and the accompanying minor propositions set up bases for empirical testing and analyses.

Evaluation

Litchfield's treatise led the way to intensive empirical studies that were later produced by educational theorists such as Halpin, Crofts, Stogdill, Hill, and Gibb. His

propositions set up the whole network of empirical studies that led to the development of paradigms in administrative behavior and processes. Administrative behavior became possible to measure, so did leadership aspects. It is difficult to say today exactly what Litchfield's contribution was but things are certainly going on and the process of theory development in administration owes much to Litchfield.

The criticisms Litchfield advanced, in my opinion, were too critical, even radical perhaps, for the time. It certainly took a lot of courage to say what he said considering the fact that people in certain specific fields guard their areas of specialization and do not welcome criticism. There is no way of knowing reactions to this article. If we follow the products of research efforts after Litchfield, we can conjecture that the reactions were positive.

What Litchfield was saying was that the world has changed and, therefore, administrative operations must change. In order to establish this change, certain guidelines must be set up and, at that time, there were none available. Litchfield did not preach; instead he offered his reactions to what was going on from his own expertise. Neither did he say that administration ought to be something more than what was already in practice. What he was saying was that administration could be intelligent and helpful regardless of the type of operation concerned.

Andrew Halpin, a year later, echoed the same feelings that Litchfield had conveyed in this article. Like Litchfield, Halpin delved into the problems that have deterred the development of theory. However, Halpin's basic concern was educational administration. On the semantic barrage in empirical studies, both men agreed. Both agree also that clearing the semantic snag which pervades research operations would improve relationships between institutions and people.

Several years ago, a doctoral program featuring an interdepartmental coverage in the fields of business, educational, and public administration was proposed at the University of Hawaii. The program never left the planning stage for several reasons, among them the idea that these three fields are so alien to one another that no compat-

ibility could be reached. I feel that the departments concerned were more worried about their prestige, let alone the course requirements and prerequisites, than the total outcome of the program. This protective shield that academic departments in institutions of higher education seem to employ is very hard to break. In another university, for example, a student is bogged down in his choice of related fields in areas other than education because of the belief of people in specific departments that a proven amount of expertise in a specific area, say sociology or political science, must be shown by the student before he is allowed to enter their courses. Such concepts as maturity and seriousness of purpose of the student are laid aside in favor of departmental prestige.

The parallel I am trying to draw is that the same thing happens in the field of administration. People in different sorts of administrative categories are strongly divided. Both Halpin and Litchfield lament this situation and believe that until this barrier is removed, a common theory of administration cannot be achieved.

One of our problems, again concurring with Halpin's concern for commonality of interpretation, is that most of us are not precise in our versions of theory. We cannot seem to explain it. The problem of definition pervades this field, compounded by research jargon, that seems to have continued over the years.

Litchfield, in formulating his hypotheses, had hoped to achieve the development of theory in viewing the whole administrative activity rather than any one "or less-than-whole combinations of its parts." His ideas seem to be supported by empirical data available to us now.

Both Litchfield and Halpin should be good reading for future administrators and researchers in the social sciences. There must be a way of getting the different fields together to evolve a general course of action. I agree with Litchfield that no matter what its cover is, administration is of one form.

ARTHUR P. COLADARCI and JACOB W. GETZELS
The Use of Theory in Educational Administration
(Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1955).

Critique by Paul A. Benson

In this monograph the authors attempt to provide for us a theory of educational administration. It is common knowledge there are basic procedures in the administration of corporations, hospitals, political organizations, and other for-profit businesses but, today, thirteen years after the copyright date, we in education still have no widely accepted and unified method for the practice of administration.

There are three main reasons for the writing of the report: namely, (1) the inadequacies that lie in the practice of education, (2) the fact that these inadequacies call for better and more theoretical studies, and (3) the assumption that administration is the most strategic target to attack. (1)

Using the basis that theory and practice are interchangeable experiences and that theorizing is constantly present, Coladarci and Getzels say that therefore, theory must be present in education. We have only to look as far (or as near) as our own school district to gaze in wonderment over this profound assertion. Too often it has been stated that "schools run in spite of themselves." Coladarci and Getzels' point is, however: The fact that educational administrators may not be aware of the basis for their actions does not contradict the fact that they are theorizing. (5) Be that as it may, the authors present an integrating approach for the acceptance of the logical bearing of theory on practice. On the grounds of both the definition and the universality of theorizing, then, the theory and practice functions can be seen as necessarily interrelated aspects of professional behavior. (6) And we know that all educators are professionals!

In clarifying the nature of the theory practice relationship, the practical value of theory is best illustrated as a tool providing a guide to, and a check on,

practice offering administrators "a basis for constant, systematic self-criticism and improvement." (8)

Although the authors submit later an illustration of and some basic steps in their use of their theory they are prompt to point out that there are apparent difficulties in the development of theory in educational administration. Following is a brief summary of these difficulties: (10-14)

First is a commitment to "factualism", a term used by W. H. Cowley. Basically, it means that the attempts to make education scientific have instead made it just factual. Thus, became the tendency to make a purely empirical discipline of education and omitting the theoretical interpretations.

Second, is an unwarranted respect for the authority of experts and laws. The point of this difficulty is that we must not always accept on unquestioning trust the opinions of experts in a particular field.

The fear of theorizing is the third unfortunate observation. Many educators prefer to remain practitioners because they feel theory is too difficult, impractical, or not stable. This fear is refuted by stating that theorizing is not too difficult, many educators just underestimate their ability; impracticality is not uselessness, many theories have reduced trial and error by offering new methods and techniques of attack; and theories should not be judged by their length of life; many old theories lead to new progress.

Inadequate professional language is fourth on the list. Here the authors issue a call for common acceptance of definitions of the terms most frequently used in discussing school administration. Metaphors and similes may be useful mechanisms; however, their misuse may lead to ambiguity. Edward Litchfield, in the first Administrative Science Quarterly, 1956, found among his criticisms of administration a major lack of a common set of definitions.[1]

[1]Edward H. Litchfield, "Notes on a General Theory of Administration," Administrative Science Quarterly, I (June, 1956), 8.

Lastly, the authors assail the too frequent tendency to show emotional identification with one's personal views. Inflexibility has lowered the axe on many administrators who have become tied to their own cherished beliefs. "Such an orientation reduces theory to dogma." (14)

Theory development in educational administration can progress only if these tendencies are overcome. Coladarci and Getzels do not attempt to comment in depth on these problems except to mention that some will not be redressed overnight.

The next section is the summary of a theory of administration that has proved useful to the authors. Although neither were administrators, they used the theory in research. They also show how it may be useful in practice. They make no claim that it is the best theory, but rather that decisions can be arrived at through the set of concepts proposed here.

Three dimensions of the administrative relationship constitute the theory to be proposed: (1) the authority dimension, (2) the role dimension, and (3) the affectivity dimension. (16) The functioning of this administrative theory depends on the interaction of all three phases.

It is well understood that administration always involves the managing of authority. Even democracy must have leaders. Max Weber's three sources of legitimate authority are identified as traditional, charismatic, and rational. Clearly dismissing the first two, the author states that: "The administrator's claim to obedience ideally finds its root in the third source of legitimate authority: rationality." (17) Support for this source lies in the fact that both members in the administrative relationship of a school are professionals. Education does not give the control to administrators to elicit traditional or charismatic authority. Such thinking, no doubt, has its basis in the idea of academic freedom, allowing for the development independence, autonomy and reciprocality as essential features of the relationship.

The role dimension has its definition in two types of interaction between the persons involved: functionally diffuse and functionally specific. (19) The former type of interaction identifies the obligations of those involved as being taken for granted. Here it becomes necessary to prove that a role is not a part of the relationship. This type of authority can not exist in education. The functionally specific relationship is defined by technical competence and status within the institution. It is clear to see that this type of relationship must exist if a democracy is to continue. Nevertheless, we are cautioned that there may be evident danger when such a pattern becomes uncontrolled. This becomes evident when we have an administrator in an area where he does not have the educational background. The situation at hand can be seen clearly at the university administrative levels. All too often organizations promote from within, and therefore do not hire a trained administrator. We could all enumerate on specific cases to this effect.

The last dimension, affectivity, utilizes the concepts of universalism and particularism. (23) Particularistic relationships exist when emotional ties define the interaction of the persons involved. Universalistic relationships reverse this interaction to one of functional. The authors draw an obvious conclusion in telling us that universalistic relationship is the ideal for educators. One can not help thinking, however, how easily said and how hard done. The role of the personality becomes evident here and the authors are quick to point out that: "Institutional requirements that the allocation and integration of roles and facilities be made in accordance with universalistic standards may actually be superseded in favor of particularistic standards." (24)

In concluding, the authors emphasize that the functions of theory in the conduct of practice should be included in all decisions. This will provide a rationale for decisions and make them susceptible to evaluation. In this way, administrators contribute "toward the building of a science of education." (28)

Evaluation

In reviewing this article I could not help but entertain the fact that here is a statement of theory and not a research study based on empirical information. "Experts in the field" tell us we need not test a theory, only see that it be logically capable of proof or disproof.[2] However, Coladarci and Getzels previously warned us about the universal acceptance of the experts and laws. Perhaps theory should be put to more than just the test of time.

Aspects of Getzels' later contribution of the social-psychological approach to administration are seen throughout this manuscript. In describing administration as a social process consisting of the nomothetic and idiographic dimensions, the hypotheses are tested through empirical studies. It seems as though Getzels, three years later, took some of his own advice.

One more thought should be mentioned before closing. We have elaborated on theory repeatedly within this critique. However, it is apparent that practice still surpasses theory. This may be due to the fact that administration oftentimes becomes bogged down in the unessential and routine details.

The efforts of this monograph to apply theory in educational administration are indeed commendable. It is now the administrator's responsibility to accept, reject, or rebuild.

---

[2]Daniel E. Griffiths (ed.), Behavioral Science and Educational Administration, Sixty-third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964), p..100.

DANIEL E. GRIFFITHS. Administrative Theory
(New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1959).

Critique by John F. Keysor

In Administrative Theory Daniel E. Griffiths develops the desirability of placing the profession of administration into a theoretical framework. He traces the development and rationale of theory in the natural sciences and indicates many of the problems encountered in attempting to promote a similar progression in the social science related field of administration. A review of several prominent theories is given, and then he develops, in some detail, a theory of his own. His accounting of the requirements for an effective theory is effectively presented, and his theory based on the "decision-making process" is quite enlightening. The book is an interesting exploration into one of the major problems confronting educational administration today.

In the preface Griffiths indicates that educational administration has, in the past, "...been comprised of folklore, testimonials, of reputedly successful administrators, and the speculations of college professors." However, the field of educational administration is entering into a more fruitful period. Support from the Kellogg foundation has developed more interest in the study of educational administration from a scientific and theoretical point of view. This change is not without opposition. A strong antitheoretical bias exists within the ranks of the practicing administrators, and progress will be slow. Yet it is clear that if administration as theory is to prevail, then certain conditions must be met.

According to Griffiths, the study of administration must become more scientific, and a more specific means of communication must be developed. Perhaps most importantly, the problems of administration must be solved through replicable research techniques, and these solutions must lead to principles which can be tied to a base of theory. The present state of the art is not functioning at this level, but numerous theories have been advanced in the past which do warrant some attention.

Griffiths presents summaries of eight theories--four dealing with educational administration and four dealing with other areas of administration. None of these theories have met with a great deal of support because, as the author indicates, "...theory builders are struggling with problems of concept development, theory form, lack of testable hypotheses, and lack of precision."

The author then develops a theory of his own, but does not view it as being the ultimate theory. Rather, he views it as an interim statement which must be developed and refined. A summary of the four assumptions upon which the theory is built follows:

1. Administration is a general behavior pattern found in all organizations.
2. Administration is the process of directing and controlling the behavior of the organization.
3. The function of administration rests in the effective application of the decision-making process throughout the organization.
4. The administrator works with groups (or individuals representing groups) and not with individuals as such.

The essense of the theory resides in the decision-making process. Griffiths indicates that this process is continuous and that isolated decisions are rare. Most interestingly, he indicates that the mark of a good administrator rests in the number of decisions that he does not personally make. That is, decisions are most effectively made by those in direct contact with the problem, and the function of the administrator is not to make these decisions but to see that they are made effectively.

Evaluation

Administrative Theory is pointing toward the future. The position assumed by the author is quite objective, avoiding a completely positive or negative presentation. Griffiths does not proffer ultimate conclusions, but does lay a sound framework upon which a valid theory may be constructed. His approach is more human than Taylor, more scientific than Follett. Yet, it encompasses important and basic concepts from

both. Although his stance is sound, the significant development of a scientific theory for educational administration is well in the future.

Before an acceptable theory can be generated, preliminary research activities must be conducted. Terminology in the field of educational administration lacks precision, and the measurement of successful administration is not yet possible. Scientific theory is based on feedback of the results of hypotheses, and this is not possible until hypotheses can be stated in precise and uniformly understood terms and the results equally measured by all.

Griffiths' theory concerning decision-making as a basis for administrative action certainly has merit. Yet, as he readily admits, it is but a step toward the future development of a more valid theory. However, there are obvious problems in the interim theory advanced by Griffiths.

Griffiths himself is at the mercy of the imprecise vocabulary which he attacks in his paper, and his terminology will be interpreted differently by different people. Also he validates his theory by indicating that the decision-making process has controlled the structure of existing organizations; i.e., organizations that delegated decision-making to lower management became decentralized and the converse. The opposite could be argued. That is, decentralized organizations could have been structured first and then passed down the decision-making process. But valid or not, the Griffiths' approach is on sound ground, and future movements in this direction can only lead to positive advancement in the development of a firm theoretical base for educational administration.

JACOB W. GETZELS and EGON G. GUBA,
"Social Behavior and the Administrative Process," School Review, LXV (1957), 423-41.

Critique by Dan Apling

Getzels and Guba were interested in proposing a conceptual framework by which the study of administration could be knowledgeably undertaken. The proposed theory, a socio-psychological description of social behavior, is hypothetico-deductive in nature and describes administration as a social process. According to this theory, behavior is conceived of as a function of both the nomothetic, or normative dimension of activity in a social system.[1]

According to Getzels, administration may be conceived of as a series of super-ordinate-subordinate relationships within a social system. This theoretical social system involves two major classes of phenomena; first, institutions, which have certain roles and expectations that fulfill the goals of the system and, second, individuals, who have certain personalities and need-dispositions.

The term "institution" is defined simply as those agencies established to carry out the institutionalized functions of a social system. Institutions have several characteristics: they are purposive, they are peopled, they are structural, they are normative and they are sanction-bearing. The most important subunit of the institution is the role. Roles are the structural elements defining the behavior of the role incumbents. As do institutions, roles also have characteristics: they represent positions, offices, or statuses within an institution; they can be defined in terms of role expectations; they are institutional givens; the behaviors associated with a role may be thought of as lying along a continuum from "required" to "prohibited"; and

---

1 Daniel E. Griffiths (ed.) Behavioral Science and Educational Administration. Sixty-third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education II (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964), p.110

they are complementary.

The "individual" dimension in this theory is comprised of personality and need-dispositions. Personality is defined as, "the dynamic organization within the individual of those need-dispositions that govern his reactions to his environment."

In sum, Getzels argued for a social system to be defined by its institutions, each institution by its constituent roles, each role by the expectations attached to that role, and, also by the individuals within the social system, each individual by his personality, and each personality by the need-dispositions of that personality.

According to the authors, "The administrative process inevitably deals with the fulfilment of both nomothetic role expectations and idiographic need-dispositions while the goals of a particular social system are being achieved. The unique task of administration, at least with respect to staff relations, is just this: "... to integrate the demands of the institutions and the demands of the staff members in a way that is at once organizationally productive and individually fulfilling."

The authors have isolated three primary sources of conflict that result from the administrative setting. These are: (1) role-personality conflicts -- these occur as a function of discrepancies between the pattern of expectations attaching to a given role and the pattern of need-dispositions characteristic of the role incumbent; (2)role conflicts -- these occur whenever a role incumbent is required to conform simultaneously to a number of expectations which are mutually exclusive, contradictory, or inconsistent, so that adjustment to one set of requirements makes adjustment to the other impossible or at least difficult; and (3) personality conflicts -- these occur as a function of opposing needs and dispositions within the personality of the role incumbent. Stated another way, in terms of the conceptual model advanced by Getzels and Guba, "the above three types of conflict represent incongruence in the nomothetic and the idiographic dimensions, or in the interaction between the two dimensions of the social system."

The terms "effectiveness", "efficiency", and "satisfaction" are also treated in this article. Effectiveness is defined as a function of the congruence of behavior

with expectations; efficiency as a function of the congruence of behavior with need-dispositions; and satisfaction as a function of the congruence of institutional expectations with individual need-dispositions. According to the authors, effectiveness is situational in origin and point of assessment, efficiency is personal in origin and point of assessment and satisfaction is a function of the relationship between situation and person.

In speaking to the concept "leadership", the authors first define three types of leadership -- nomothetic, idiographic and transactional -- and then argue for the one over the others. Nomothetic leadership -- that which emphasizes the nomothetic dimension -- is the most expeditious route to a goal. Idiographic leadership -- that which emphasizes the idiographic dimension -- believes the most expeditious route to a goal resides in the people involved rather than in the nature of the institutional structure. Transactional leadership -- which is intermediate between the two -- takes into account the institution and the individual and strives to acquire a thorough awareness of the limits and resources of both, within which administrative action may take place.

Evaluation

This writer believes the Getzels and Guba model does what it intends -- establish a theoretical basis for the conceptualization and study of administration. Viewed collectively, when there is disparity between the goals of a given organization and the needs of the workers of that organization, the real test of an administrator's ability to administer and also his ability to lead (transactionally), is whether or not he is able to arbitrate the difficulty and through some form of accomodation effect a reasonable alternative that brings satisfaction to those involved.

Since the formulation of this theoretical conceptual framework model of administration, writers in the area of administrative theory have given it much attention. To a lesser extent, the "model" has been given attention by researchers in the field

of educational administration. As an example of this attention, a recent book deals specifically with the rationale supporting the "model" and also includes a comprehensive analysis of the studies that have been conducted based on it.[2]

2. Jacob W. Getzels, James M. Lipham, and Roald F. Campbell, Educational Administration as a Social Process (New York: Harper and Row Publishers. 1968).

HALPIN, ANDREW W., Theory and Research in Administration. (New York: Macmillan, 1966).

Critique by Sister Thomas More Hill, OSU.

This series of essays discusses the quality and content of some recent research in and theories of educational administration. Andrew W. Halpin's book demonstrates not only the development and power of the author's thinking as both social scientist and social psychologist but also his view of administration as a humanistic pursuit.

His material can be grouped into four categories:

1. Nature of theory and how it should be applied to research
2. Substantive research on administration
3. Study of the relationship between verbal and non-verbal behavior
4. Reflections on the nature of scientific inquiry and the pertinence of these ideas for training research workers.

The style of each essay varies with its assigned purpose. Part II, detailed empirical reporting of scientific data, is the most difficult for a novice in statistics. The concluding chapters are written in a lighter almost journalistic style as they were directed to a university-wide audience.

Halpin points out his purpose in the preface. He notes that graduate training in educational administration has been marked by a dramatic change of emphasis. Beginning about 1954, the new movement has stressed the importance of administrative theory drawn heavily on research from the social sciences. Research from other disciplines gave the needed insights into leadership and group behavior. Concomitantly, some researchers saw the need to develop theory in educational administration rather than to be solely anchored in empiricism.

Succinctly outlining the historical development of theory, Halpin designates the work of Colardarci and Getzels, Use of Theory in Educational Administration (1955) as a signal work in the field. Even though many of the early books took a dim view, Halpin feels that they were the impetus needed for further research.

Halpin saw three substantive problems as separating social scientists and educational administrators: 1) clarification of theory, 2) confusion of taxonomy with theory, 3) domain of new theory and the kinds of predictions desired.

In order to resolve this basic problem, Halpin proposes the acceptance of Feigl's definition of theory -- a set of assumptions from which can be derived by purely logico-mathematical procedures a larger set of empirical laws. Feigl shows that a taxonomy scheme is not a theory.

In the following section, the author presents a paradigm for research on administration plus research data of his own on leadership behavior involving school superintendents and aircraft commanders and the measurement of the organizational climate of 71 elementary schools from six regions of the United States.

In developing his thesis on leadership behavior, he stresses the dilemma of defining leadership because it contains both discipline and evaluative connotations. The confusion has been compounded because there has be a conceptualization of leadership as an essentially innate capacity of the individual regardless of the situation. Various studies of Hemphill, Stogdill and Sanford had demonstrated empirically that variance in leader behavior is associated with situational variance. Because of this broad field, Halpin narrowed his study to certain phases of leader behavior. He readily admits that he has sidestepped some important issues by using only formal organizations and "top" men and omitting the distribution of leadership among members of the group. With this groundwork, however, he feels that additional hypotheses can be tested in the future.

With these limitations in mind, Halpin concentrated on two significant dimensions of leadership -- initiating structure and consideration. These dimensions were defined as follows:

> Initiating structure refers to the leader's behavior in delineating the relationship between himself and members of the work-group, and in endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and methods of procedure. Consideration refers to behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in the relationship between the leader and members of his staff. (p. 86)

In several studies of leadership behavior of aircraft commanders, Halpin discovered that effective leaders were those who scored high on both dimensions.

In a subsequent study the author secured descriptions of the leadership behavior of school superintendents from the superintendents themselves, from members of their staff, and from members of the Board of Education. Results of this study likewise revealed effective or desirable leadership behavior to be characterized by high scores of both initiating structure and consideration. Further studies by the Midwest Center corroborated Halpin's data and established that these two criteria were also interactive.

The next chapter deals with a study which evaluates the organizational climate, "personality," of 71 elementary schools in six states of six different regions. Their factor analysis revealed six profiles arranged on a continuum ranging from "open" through "autonomous," "controlled," "familiar," and "paternal" to "closed." From this co-authored study by Halpin and Don B. Croft, it was concluded that administrators needed training to give them insight into the nature of organizational climates through training in psychoanalysis and clinical psychology as well as social psychology.

In the last section of the book, Halpin turns his attention to broader philosophical and methodological issues involved in research. He is concerned with the techniques and verbal images which often inadvertently limit the creativity of the young researcher. His four-point program for improving research reveals a thoughtful, humanistic approach especially his comments on the integrity of professors who tend to exploit the young scientist.

Halpin strongly affirms that young researchers must be trained to be observant and creative above and beyond being competent in compiling empirical data. In answer to his opponents who contend that such methods bring about a loss of objectivity, Halpin stresses the fact that only in this way is real objectivity achieved. This way what is studied is worth studying and not mere picayune trivia glossed over with research data.

Halpin's concern for the value of research lies in the value-judgment of the researcher.

> We have inducted too many young men and women who are so dedicated to intellectualism and objectivity that they deny their own emotional impulses and also shut themselves off from a whole range of aesthetic experiences. Literally, such people are deformed. I prefer to encourage into scientific careers men and women who are at least whole human beings. (p. 314)

This concluding section on the issues of what is worth studying should be a central concern for both the educator and the social scientist. Great strides could be made in developing theory and testing procedures by combining the knowledge and insights of both professions.

The concluding essay sets forth a strong indictment on the false set of values Halpin sees incorporated into too much of academia. He stresses the need to set values straight and recognize problems without sugarcoating them.

The author's forthright and at times blunt attitude is refreshing and stimulating. How many of his reforms can be accomplished within the restrictions of the work-a-day world in which both policy and politics play significant roles is a question well worth thoughtful consideration and action. All professions need this type of stimulation to motivate them to honestly question and evaluate the status quo.