Thomas B. Greenfield
A Challenging Perspective of Organizations

SCOTT BAILEY
Ore City Independent School District

Abstract

Organizations are not real; people are. Any science or theory of organizations must consider how the organization impinges, in a very real and tangible way, on the lives of its members. This article traces the development of one such theoretical branch of organizational science through the pioneering work of Thomas B. Greenfield. The author uses Greenfield's work as a lens to examine a personal transformation in belief and practice.

Epistemology; Hermeneutics; Postmodernism; Phenomenology; Positivism: These concepts represent just a few of the many with which I struggled during the first summer of my doctoral studies. Entering that doctoral program in educational leadership, I wasn't quite sure what to expect, but the ideas I encountered were definitely outside of anything I had anticipated. Though difficult to analyze in hindsight, I suppose my expectations centered around issues of school management, law, curriculum, personnel, and the like, making the program a mere extension of my master's degree program; however, that basically sums up what the program is not. Instead, I encountered a barrage of complex, dense theoretical readings that engaged me in an examination of the meanings of school, of democracy, of the individual. Frankly, along with the other members of my cohort, I was taken by surprise. Together, we grappled with new ideas and complex jargon, struggling to make meaning of this new information, to understand the new perspectives, to see the world through new lenses.

Most of our readings projected a postmodern view of the world, condemning attempts to explain the world through positivistic science (and I can use those terms with confidence, now). My classmates and I found the readings, though difficult, to be stimulating. To me, however, having been trained as a scientist, the readings were often discouraging, for they described a world that is chaotic and unexplainable, with no ultimate truth to be found. After all, scientists spend their entire careers searching for ultimate truths, so the news that there are none is more than a little disheartening. Some of the readings (Wheatley, 1999) even tried to turn science on itself, proclaiming that science's inconsistencies (i.e., Newtonian vs. quantum mechanics) offered "proof" that science was ultimately unreliable and should not be used to explain human affairs. Natural scientists, myself included, understand and appreciate these "inconsistencies," however, realizing that different rules apply to different systems at different times. Furthermore, we do not attempt to cross-apply theories and methods to disciplines for which they were not designed. As a result of this intellectual foment, I, more than others perhaps, was struggling to make sense of and accept these new ideas. Then, I read Greenfield.

In a piece describing "willfulness and nonnatural order in organizations" (p. 142), Thomas B. Greenfield (1984) clarified that which puzzled me, allowing me to set aside my doubts and go about crystallizing my understanding of all this new information. Basically, in this reading, Greenfield conceded that the natural, physical world is orderly and explainable through scientific means. Those means, however, do not apply to people because people are, by nature, "willful," meaning that they can choose any course of action at any time, thereby exempting them from predictive possibilities. Moreover, organizations are human creations, meaning that they are, by definition, "nonnatural." Thus, we should not expect positivistic science, which is designed to explain the natural world, to explain accurately the nonnatural world. And that, for this scientist, is acceptable. For most of the cohort, however, it apparently was not.

Having read the Greenfield piece, I went to the next class confident in my understanding and sure that the cohort finally had something around which we could rally. Was I ever wrong! I believe that I was the only person in the group with anything good to say about Greenfield's ideas. The rest wanted a better explanation, not an abdication. It was then that I knew I must read more of Greenfield and, before completing the program, defend him before my peers. This paper is the beginning of that process.

To begin understanding the significance and, particularly, the uniqueness of Thomas B. Greenfield's ideas, one must first understand something about the man, about his journey on the road to self-discovery and how that discovery applies to the larger society. But first, a warning: It is a strange and crooked road that turns upon itself, leading not only back to the beginning but also through and beyond it into uncharted territory. At times, in fact, there was no road at all, no trail, only Greenfield, alone, a trailblazer, willing to step into the wilderness

of the unknown and face the dragon of convention. Actually, the dragon's name was Griffiths and the wilderness was a small conference room used by the International Intervisitation Programme in 1974. But first, the story of how Greenfield made it to this room.

The Formative Years

Born on a family farm in Saskatchewan, Greenfield (Greenfield & Ribbins, 1993) recollects a longing for the "cities and their various wonders" (p. 230). This longing ultimately led him to the University of British Columbia, where he took a degree in English and German, subjects that would profoundly influence his views on organizations and human reality. Upon graduating, Greenfield needed a job quickly, and teaching "seemed the easiest and most obvious thing" (p. 230). After a brief stint as a secondary teacher, he was placed in an elementary school in Vancouver, a position he found "difficult." Within a year, however, he was promoted to vice-principal and then deputy principal. In these positions, Greenfield worked first for a laissez-faire principal and then for a very authoritarian one; the contrast in leadership styles led to his first thoughts about what administrators do and how they impact the lives of others.

Nevertheless, he didn't get to think about these aspects of administration long because he wasn't in the position long: He was offered a scholarship to study educational administration, and he accepted. He began working closely with a professor who had trained at the University of Chicago and was well versed in the new "Theory Movement." This professor introduced Greenfield to a new, systems way of thinking. In this view, the world and everything in it is part of a natural system and can thus be summarized by a few natural laws that unveil ultimate truth. Despite his earlier studies in the liberal arts, Greenfield found this positivistic view very attractive. Using these methods, he felt that difficulties and complexities he had been introduced to in the arts could now be answered: In fact, those answers could be calculated exactly. Reflecting on this time, Greenfield says that though he was a willing participant, he "had a sense of turning my back on what I had understood to be knowledge for many years" (Greenfield & Ribbins, 1993, p. 231). In essence, by adopting the scientific mindset, he saw himself giving up "sloppy, impractical, and soft" notions for "clarity, answers, and certainty" (p. 231). In fact, he became so steeped in the quantitative methods of the theory movement and logical positivism that he grounded both his master's and doctoral work in the associated techniques (Greenfield & Ribbins, 1993).

Upon receipt of his Ph.D., Greenfield became the research director at the Canadian Teacher's Federation. Though this was not a prestigious position, it was the only one available at the time, as he was now "too educated" to return to the classroom. In this position, his primary responsibility was investigating (instead of researching) those aims, which furthered the purpose of the Federation. He grew discontent, discovering that he was but a "tame scientist," hired to "add

a certain cachet to the proper opinions that my employers wanted to highlight" (Greenfield & Ribbins, 1993, p. 234). Greenfield viewed research as a means of creating superior knowledge and resented the political control placed on him. Consequently, when offered a position at the newly formed Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Greenfield eagerly accepted.

At the institute, Greenfield found greater academic freedom than he experienced with the Teacher's Federation, but he was unable to capitalize on it because he was promoted to head of the department. During his term, he managed rapid growth within the department and became known as something of a risk-taker. Because the department was new, it could not attract renowned scholars; instead, Greenfield recruited young scholars still in their formative years and built the department around their specializations. This approach dissatisfied some of the senior members in the department, prompting one of them to challenge Greenfield's leadership. Though Greenfield won a second term, the political savvy of his challenger made the situation unproductive and unpleasant so he resigned his position and returned to the professorship. His return to the teaching ranks revealed that he was again being called on to act as a "tame scientist," usually in the form of a "strategic lever against popular opinion" (Greenfield & Ribbins, 1993, p. 235).

In 1968, while still at the institute, Greenfield was called on to review years of research using the Leadership Behaviour Description Questionnaire, examining the implications and outcomes. This standardized, quantitative questionnaire was a long-standing tool used by researchers, but as Greenfield analyzed the results obtained with it, he grew skeptical. He began to doubt that the theory and methodology, which were said to make the survey effective, were really effective; moreover, though he possessed thorough knowledge of the statistical methods behind them, his doubts about all quantitative techniques grew.

In fact, it was his knowledge of statistics, of the way numbers and data could be manipulated to obtain certain results that first introduced the seeds of doubt. He saw that no real solutions to problems existed; the only solutions were those imposed by the researcher. Truth was reduced to a pattern in a data set, and depending on the researcher, multiple patterns could be found leading to multiple truths. Additionally, any data outside the pattern was simply discarded as error. Granted, Greenfield understood why the "error" was ignored, but he went one step further. He realized that in the social sciences, educational administration included, that error represented more than a mere statistical deviation—it represented people. Greenfield could not convince himself of the appropriateness of casting aside these people in order to clean up a set of numbers. Research, methods, meaning, truth, and reality all merged into a tangled mess. Preoccupied with the mess, Greenfield began to turn back to his liberal arts background which had instilled in him the need to think things out and the belief that "the world was a mystery and that understanding of it was gained only with great difficulty, much skepticism, and a lot of work" (Greenfield & Ribbins, 1993, p. 236). He

challenged Simon's (1957) argument that we need the scientist and universally applicable scientific theory to interpret reality, for, in this case, the object of study (organizations) are not even real; they are "cultural artifacts," and what goes on in them is a product of "individual action, intention, and will" (Greenfield, 1984, p. 150).

A New Theory Emerges

In short, Greenfield (1973) proclaimed, the human world could not be reduced to a set of laws or rules that could predict and control human behavior; human beings are living creatures, capricious and willful, who cannot be constrained with such rules. By presenting these ideas in that paper at the 1974 International Intervisitation Programme (IIP), Greenfield, entered the den of the dragon and, according to Culbertson (1988):

> . . . fired a shot at the theory movement that was heard around the world. Striking hard at the key suppositions of the theory movement, he precipitated controversy that has not yet ended. He stressed that organizations cannot be equated with such objective phenomena as planets and stars. Rather, organizations are social inventions, which humans construe in diverse ways. Organizations do not think, choose, or act as theories claim; rather, individuals do. Nor are organizations regulated by scientific laws; rather they are guided by human intentions and decisions. Greenfield stressed that academicians, who assume that 'social-scientific secrets' can explain 'how organizations work or how policy should be made,' indulge 'at best in a premature hope and at worst in a delusion.' (p. 20)

Greenfield's argument represented another "new" theory, one that viewed organizations "not as structures subject to universal laws but as cultural artifacts dependent on the specific meaning and intention of people within them" (Greenfield, 1993d, p. 4).

Greenfield (1993d) relates that the reaction to his questioning of empiricism, functionalism, positivism, and an "erroneously objective and control-oriented rationalism as a basis for knowledge" was "instant and negative" (p. 171). In fact, as Greenfield was presenting the paper, one of his harshest critics, Daniel Griffiths (who ultimately came to soften his views), challenged him from the floor, proclaiming to all that Greenfield was "poorly informed" and in need of "more reading" (Greenfield & Ribbins, 1993, p. 245). By enduring the maelstrom of criticism that ensued, Greenfield (1993d) realized that the personal dedication to these methods that many educational researchers carried did not represent "an objective truth about the world" but a "deeply held conviction and bias that could be challenged only by putting oneself in jeopardy" (p. 171). The attack was so rancorous and so universal that Greenfield would spend

the next 20 years defending, developing, and placing his ideas in the context of educational administration.

Greenfield's Theory of Organization and Administration

Before Greenfield's 1974 attack on the current practices in educational administration, the field concerned itself with finding and explaining general laws and theories which administrators could use to control, direct, and improve organizations (namely, schools). The ideal of the time was to reduce all knowledge into a single theory of administrative behavior that would, as Griffiths (1957) explains:

> . . . make it possible to relate what now appear to be discrete acts to one another so as to make a unified concept. The great task of science has been to impose an order upon the universe. Kepler's Laws, for instance, impose a set of relationships upon the planets of the solar system. Within this framework of laws, the motions of the planets makes sense, their positions can be predicted, and order is apparent to all who care to look for it. This is the great task of theory in educational administration. Within a set of principles yet to be formulated, it will be possible to predict the behavior of individuals within the organization framework, and it will be possible to make decisions that will result in a more efficient and effective enterprise. (p. 388)

All of which, as Greenfield (1993f) concedes, sounds great, but the one great question remains: "What did the planets do before Kepler imposed order on them?" (p. 207). And so it is with people; they do not need theories to guide their behavior, for their behaviors are already in place. At best, a theory can describe what is already there and help people understand their lived experiences.

The Human Factor

Understanding Greenfield requires understanding his experiences and how those experiences influenced him. One such experience was his early study of the German language and culture, including a trip to Germany (Greenfield & Ribbins, 1993). From that study, Greenfield became acquainted with the work of the German intellectual Max Weber, who provided a foundation for much of Greenfield's work and his view of society. Weber contended that analyzing society required beginning with its most basic unit, the individual human being (Eldridge, 1971). Greenfield (1993g) argued that the positivistic practices dominating the field of educational research and administration were flawed in that they overlooked this basic idea—the idea that organizations are made up of individual human beings.

Greenfield (1993g) asserts that few people find difficulty in speaking of organizations as living things; organizations are said to "adapt to their environment,

clarify goals, serve functions, and act to implement policy" (p. 1). As illustrated by Getzels (1958), contemporary thought held that people occupy organizations in much the same fashion as they occupy houses; people may move in and out of the organization, but the overall structure remains the same and actually has a shaping effect on the people within it. Therefore, by changing the structure one can change the people. Greenfield (1993g) disagrees, contending that this perception of organizations is ultimately misguided because it treats organizations as if they are not only real, but also "distinct from the actions, feelings, and purposes of people" (p. 1) who make the organization up. In his earliest argument, Greenfield rejects the "dualism which conveniently separates people and organizations," arguing instead that it is "a mistaken belief in the reality of organizations [that] has diverted our attention from human action and intention as the stuff from which organizations are made" (p. 1). As an analogy, Greenfield (1993g) offers the following:

> If people are inherently part of organizations, if organizations themselves are expressions of how people believe they should relate to each other, we then have good grounds to question an organization theory, which assumes the universality of organizational forms and effects. This argument suggests that organization theorists have been so busy defining the forest that they have failed to notice differences among the trees—and worse, have ignored objects in the forest that are not trees at all. (p. 5)

To sum, organizations are not real, but people are; thus, we learn about organizations only by studying the people who operate within them.

If organizations and people are considered to be "inextricably intertwined," then "it may not be so easy to alter organizations, or lead them, or to administer them, without touching something inexplicably human" (Greenfield, 1993g, p. 1). Failing to do this results in two possible outcomes. The first possibility occurs when those in control of organizations fail to understand the experiences and perspectives of the members of the organization, a situation which ultimately brings oppression to those who are least understood, for as Szasz (1976) points out, the "less a person understands another, the greater is his urge to classify him—in terms of nationality, religion, [or] occupation. . . . In short, classifying another person renders intimate acquaintance with him quite unnecessary—and impossible" (p. 46). It is such a view that removes notions of right and wrong and allows individuals to perpetrate horrific acts on their fellow human beings; it is the same view held by many who were responsible for the atrocities of the Holocaust.

Greenfield (1993a) contends that the second possibility that arises from not seeing the humanness in organizations is to eliminate from consideration "all human passion, weakness, strength, conviction, hope, will, pity, frailty, altruism, courage, vice, and virtue," thereby leading "the science of administration down

a narrow road which in its own impotence is inward-looking, self-deluding, self-defeating, and unnecessarily boring" (p. 139). Greenfield (1993e) attacks this brand of positivistic science, noting that it only attends to the "facts" of the world and it conveniently removes anything resembling human values. In so doing, however, science and theory render themselves useless to practicing administrators because, though they may "separate fact and value, the administrator cannot," for they are "inextricably intertwined in the world administrators deal with" (p. 32). Greenfield (1993c) sees philosophical and value questions as constituting the crux of administrative action. From this perspective, it is apparent that no theory of administration or organization can be effective unless it attends to both facts and values, with the emphasis on values.

Facts and Values

Greenfield (1993f) contends that, despite the best efforts of science, "facts and values can never be completely separated" (p. 210). Both the scientist and the administrator must always "use judgment to balance the knowledge they have as fact and the values they choose as leaders" (p. 210). In developing this view, Greenfield (1993b) had earlier stated that "facts, whatever they are, are less important to us than our judgment of them," (p. 106) and he uses cigarette smoking as an illustration. He points out that most people know that smoking contributes to lung cancer, yet smokers deny that this "fact" applies to their particular circumstances. To the rationalist, this stance is incomprehensible; he cannot understand this behavior. Smokers, however, see their everyday rituals with cigarettes as a natural part of life, one that they cannot understand being without. Huxley (1977) closes the argument:

> A firm conviction of the material reality of Hell never prevented medieval Christians from doing what their ambition, lust, or covetousness suggested. Lung cancer, traffic accidents and the millions of miserable and misery-creating alcoholics are facts even more certain than was, in Dante's day, the fact of the Inferno. But all such facts are remote and unsubstantial compared with the near, felt fact of a craving here and now, for release or sedation, for a drink or for a smoke. (p. 107)

Thus, what the rationalist (i.e., scientist) does not see is that "facts decide nothing; it is people who decide about the facts" and that, by extension, facts "cannot tell us what to do" (p. 107).

Moreover, as Greenfield (1993d) notes, the fundamental problem of practicing administrators is determining what role values play in their everyday decisions, for, as Hodgkinson (1978) echoes, "the intrusion of values into the decision-making process is not merely inevitable, it is the very substance of decision" (p. 59). Social scientists stumble when they take values as part of developing theories, because "values are special kinds of facts; but never true or false"

(p. 220). Greenfield (1993d) agrees, noting that values are "good or bad, but never falsifiable. The question of the divisibility of facts and values continues to bedevil" those who study them (p. 181).

Organizational Reality

Greenfield (1984) places particular emphasis on the role of the individual in organizations and the study of those organizations. He points out that organizations are completely man-made; therefore, the laws that govern nature need not apply to them. Organizations are "cultural artifacts," products of society, and their only reality is whatever reality people are willing to assign them. In fact, the reality of organizations is like a "conjuror's trick," for "when we reach out to touch such reality, to measure it, to study it, to explain it, or reduce it to its elements, it slips away from us and eludes our grasp" (p. 154). Thus, the organization itself is not a source for answers; instead, one needs to turn to the individuals within the organization, the ones who assign meaning to them and give them reality. Organizations are "best understood in context, from a sense of the concrete events and personalities within them rather than from a set of abstractions or general laws" (Greenfield, 1984, p. 143). Ultimately, then, organizations are "founded in meanings, in human intentions, actions, and experience," and what goes on in them is a "product of individual action, intention, and will": "they are systems of meaning that can only be understood through the interpretation of meaning" (p. 150).

Leadership and Morality

As Greenfield (1984) indicates, the natural implication of viewing organizations as an assemblage of personalities is that "we should speak about leaders rather than leadership and about the character of leaders rather than their characteristics" (p. 143). Elaborating on the argument, he notes that "leadership is a willful act where one person attempts to construct the social world of another" (p. 143), and how leaders perceives others depends on a point of view. When viewing others, however, leaders—like everyone else—"cannot escape ourselves as we make our world and as we try to understand the world others have made around us" (p. 143). Thus, as has often been said, our perceptions really are our realities.

Greenfield (1984) contends that, as leaders try to lead, to build up the social order around them, to create new realities, to will their desires into reality, they "encounter opposing wills" (p. 152). Further, he reasons:

> . . . the organization arises from a web of cross-connected wills as active agents live their lives and strive to make the world as they know it or as they want it to be. But as Schopenhauer says, we sense our will only when we feel opposition to it. "Just as a brook forms no eddy so long as it meets no obstructions, so human nature . . . is such that we do not really notice all that goes on in accordance with our will. . . . On the other hand, everything that obstructs, crosses, or opposes our will, and thus everything unpleasant

and painful, is felt by us immediately, at once, and very plainly." What most
often opposes our will in organizations is, of course, other people. (p. 152)

Organizations, then, are something like a puppet show, where the people in the
organizations serve as an audience who choose to believe that what they are
seeing represents reality, while behind the scenes, human actors control the pup-
pets—and reality—however they see fit. The members of the organization have
two choices; they can either sit back and enjoy the show or they can ask to see
behind the curtain, to "discover who pulls the strings" (p. 152). Disruption occurs
when people can't agree on how the puppets should move.

If organizations are products of individual action and will, with no substan-
tive reality of their own, then understanding organizations requires understand-
ing individuals and the meanings that surround them. Part of understanding the
individuals stems from understanding the people that lead them and the "mean-
ings that bind leaders, followers, and all participants in the social setting. Such a
setting we may call an organization . . ." (Greenfield, 1984, p. 159). Furthermore,
it becomes the task of the leader "to create the moral order that binds them and
the people around them. . . . They weave the social fabric that allows us to be,
to exist" (p. 159). In short, leaders are people, too; they are subject to the same
capriciousness and willfulness that characterizes all people.

It is the leader's job to enter the social arena, to mediate between and among
the many conflicting wills and meanings that are present. Greenfield (1984) relates
that it is the leader "who decides what will be and makes it so" (p. 160). In that
respect, leaders are "arbiters and constructors of social reality," and, importantly,
their acts are moral acts. Thus, "to conclude that leadership is a moral activity
is perhaps to belabor the obvious or to state a platitude" (p. 160). But, Green-
field points out, "it is strange how often the obvious and the platitudinous are
overlooked in studies of leaders in schools and strange, too, how frequently such
truths are ignored" (p. 160). Any science, any theory, that attempts to explain
organizations or administrative practices must address these truths.

Implications

Acceptance in the Field

Before discussing the implications of Greenfield's work, a brief look at how it has
been accepted is necessary. Hodgkinson (1993) outlines Greenfield's influence in
the field, noting that he has not always been readily accepted and has often been
directly opposed, but such "attempts that have been made throughout that period
to dispose of or bury Greenfield once and for all" have failed (p. xiv). He notes
that Greenfield's major contribution has been to illuminate the dialectical oppo-
sition of the positions taken by educational researchers, stating that the debate
regarding "qualitative–quantitative, art–science, subjective–objective, individ-
ual–collective, phenomenological–logical" has never been resolved (p. xiv).

Greenfield is largely responsible for the initiation of that debate, and remains "a stimulating irritant to the ranks of the professoriate. For some a burr under their saddles, for others a continuing inspiration" (p. xiv).

Interestingly, Hodgkinson (1993) continues, the extent to which Greenfield's ideas have been either accepted or rejected within the field demands investigation. Greenfield is a Canadian, publishing primarily in that country, as well as in England, "where he is generally revered and has influenced generations of students, not to mention the sizeable contingent of colleagues persuaded to his viewpoint" (p. xv). His writings, however, are targeted primarily at the United States, and it is here that Greenfield encounters his greatest opposition. Hodgkinson (1993) finds this opposition intriguing since the two nations are so similar. "What," he asks, "is the threat?" (p. xv). He finds that it "touches upon deep-seated philosophical differences between the USA and the rest of the English-speaking world" (p. xv). Perhaps, Greenfield threatens the "value-based approach" to educational organizations in the United States, or does it go further than that, "to the tacit philosophy of pragmatism and its underlying ideology of positivism? Could it be that Greenfield strikes at the American roots? Does he, as the Romans used to say, touch the point with a needle?" (p. xv).

Personal Acceptance and Implications

Whatever Greenfield's influence has been on the field of educational administration, studying his work has had a great personal impact on this writer, this educator. Greenfield's arguments regarding the centrality of the individual in organizational reality has profoundly impacted the way I think about organizations, particularly schools. An example from my personal experience will illuminate the way my understanding has changed.

One of my major job responsibilities is to serve as testing coordinator for my school, a mid-size high school in Texas. In that role, I oversee the administration of all standardized tests that are mandated by the state and required by colleges as part of their admissions criteria. Operating under the assumption that these tests accurately measure the ability and achievement levels of students, I was confident that my job was an important one. However, after reading Greenfield, I am not so sure anymore. His arguments have completely soaked through my thinking and practice as an educator. For instance, where I once saw a test that measured a student's achievement, I now see a student who is a victim of a test, a reality that we have created through the organization.

Texas, like many other states, requires high school seniors to pass an exit exam as part of their graduation requirements. My pre-Greenfield philosophy viewed this requirement as entirely acceptable, even necessary. After all, isn't ensuring that our graduates meet some standard, basic level of proficiency a desirable end? My post-Greenfield philosophy says maybe not.

When looking at such exams as a whole, I have decided that they can provide valuable quantitative data that reflect the progress of the school; the tests can

accurately show how a state, district, or even a campus, is performing. However, when we get to the individuals involved in the testing process, the quantitative accuracy seems lost; the circumstances of each individual cry out for subjective, qualitative analysis. Consider, for example, a recent occurrence involving the social studies exit exam in Texas. After test scores had been distributed and the tests released, a group of educators determined that one of the questions had multiple correct answers. This "correction" resulted in more than 300 additional students meeting the "proficient" mark, making them now eligible to graduate. Viewing this incident through my post-Greenfield lens forces me to question the validity of the test itself. After all, how can one obscure answer shift 300 students from "not proficient" to "proficient," when, after (and despite) the change in labeling, these students know no more about social studies than they did before. The individuals remain the same, but the organization treats them differently. In this respect, the test becomes a means of constructing identities for students, a way to categorize individuals in terms of an outside standard that is unrelated to their own personal realities; the organization—as well as the larger society—views and treats the post-test student differently from the pre-test student, even though the individual, in actuality, remains unchanged.

Without the influence of Greenfield on my thinking, I would never have recognized the situation described above as a problem. I would still naively believe that any shortcoming was the responsibility of the student and not an extension of the organization. Unfortunately, like Greenfield, I offer no solution, only recognition that a problem exists, and that the problem manifests itself as an injustice perpetrated on individuals by organizations. Perhaps once aware, greater minds will mediate a solution.

Conclusion

In a discussion of the values and practice of teaching, historian Bernard Barker (2002) repeats MacIntyre's contention that "our lack of common ground condemns us to argument without end" (p. 64). Given the chance, I think Greenfield would answer that argument by noting that our lack of common ground is a result of our looking for answers in the wrong places. We need not be looking to organizations for answers, for the answers will not be found there; the answers are within the people that comprise the organization. As Greenfield (1993b) puts it, "the vital spark, the dynamic of organization is made from nothing more substantial than people thinking and doing" (p. 92). Further, he echoes Hodgkinson's notion that the reason there is no successful science of administration is "stupefyingly simple: the central problems of administrative theory are not scientific at all, but philosophical" (p. 166). These philosophical problems address questions that "deal not so much with what is, but with what ought to be; they deal with values and morality," and, in answering them, "no science can tell us what is right or wrong" (p. 166).

In a world that views organizations as concerned with values and value judgments, Greenfield (1984) notes that "the practical implication of this notion of organizations and their leaders is simply that leaders will try to commit others to the values that they themselves believe are good" (p. 166). Leaders, then, become "entrepreneurs of values," whose task it is to build unity and cohesion among the people in the organization. Greenfield and Ribbins (1993) tell us that this is a difficult job, and that, to "attempt it, some old, but underused tools turn out to be the most reliable and powerful: first, clear-eyed description, a mapping of the administrative world as it is, secondly, reflection of that world, and finally, argument about what to do" (p. 166).

Whatever one's beliefs and understandings of organization, truth, and reality, Greenfield surely presents a challenge. His placing of the individual as the central component in understanding the social world has had a profound personal impact on this author, changing my perceptions of people and society. In summation, Hodgkinson (1993) puts Greenfield's contribution to the field of educational administration most eloquently:

> The problems Professor Greenfield raises are dialectical. They are not susceptible of simple answers or binary logic but the creative tension which they engender, his exposition of that tension, and the reader's own commitment can lead to a dynamic which can humanize and sophisticate our art of educational administration. One can be confident that [his] ideas . . . will extend the limits of our language and therefore our world. To understand Greenfield, whether one agrees with him or not, is to understand the nature of organizational reality better. (p. xvi)

References

Barker, B. (2002). Values and practice: History teaching 1971–2001. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 32*(1), 61–72.

Culbertson, J. A. (1988). A century's quest for a knowledge base. In N. J. Boyan (Ed.), *Handbook of research on educational administration* (pp. 3–26). New York: Longman.

Eldridge, J. E. T. (Ed.). (1971). *Max Weber: The interpretation of social reality.* London: Thomas Nelson.

Getzels, J. W. (1958). Administration as a social process. In A. W. Halpin (Ed.), *Administrative theory in education* (pp. 150–163). New Tork: McMillan.

Greenfield, T. B. (1973). Organizations as social inventions: Rethinking assumptions about change. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 9*(5), 551–574.

Greenfield, T. B. (1984). Leaders and schools: Willfulness and nonnatural order in organizations. In T. J. Sergiovanni & J. E. Corbally (Eds.), *Leadership and organizational culture: New perspectives on administrative theory and practice* (pp. 260–274). Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Greenfield, T. B. (1993a). Decline and fall of science in educational administration. In T. B.

Greenfield & P. Ribbins (Eds.), *Greenfield on educational administration* (pp. 134–158). London: Routledge.

Greenfield, T. B. (1993b). The man who comes back through the door in the wall: Discovering truth, discovering self, discovering organizations. In T. B. Greenfield & P. Ribbins (Eds.), *Greenfield on educational administration* (pp. 134–158). London: Routledge.

Greenfield, T. B. (1993c). Organizations as talk, chance, action and experience. In T. B. Greenfield & P. Ribbins (Eds.), *Greenfield on educational administration* (pp. 53–72). London: Routledge.

Greenfield, T. B. (1993d). Reforming and re-valuing educational administration: Whence and when cometh the phoenix? In T. B. Greenfield & P. Ribbins (Eds.), *Greenfield on educational administration* (pp. 169–196). London: Routledge.

Greenfield, T. B. (1993e). Research in educational administration in the United States and Canada: An overview and critique. In T. B. Greenfield & P. Ribbins (Eds.), *Greenfield on educational administration* (pp. 26–49). London: Routledge.

Greenfield, T. B. (1993f). Science and service: The making of the profession of educational administration. In T. B. Greenfield & P. Ribbins (Eds.), *Greenfield on educational administration* (pp. 199–225). London: Routledge.

Greenfield, T. B. (1993g). Theory about organization: A new perspective and its implications for schools. In T. B. Greenfield & P. Ribbins (Eds.), *Greenfield on educational administration* (pp. 1–22). London: Routledge.

Greenfield, T., & Ribbins, P. (1993). *Greenfield on educational administration*. London: Routledge.

Griffiths, D. E. (1957). Toward a theory of administrative behavior. In R. F. Campbell & R. T. Gregg (Eds.), *Administrative behavior in education* (pp. 354–390). New York: Harper.

Hodgkinson, C. (1978). *Towards a philosophy of administration*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Hodgkinson, C. (1993). Foreward. In T. B. Greenfield & P. Ribbins (Eds.), *Greenfield on educational administration* (pp. x–xvii). London: Routledge.

Huxley, A. (1977). *Doors of perception*. Frogmore, England: Triad/Panther.

Simon, H. A. (1957). *Administrative behavior* (2nd ed.). New York: Free Press.

Szasz, T. (1976). *Heresies*. Garden City, NY: Anchor.

Wheatley, M. J. (1999). *Leadership and the new science: Discovering order in a chaotic world.* San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

About the Author

Scott Bailey currently serves as the Instructional Facilitator for Ore City Independent School District, assisting teachers at the district level to utilize sound instructional strategies and incorporate data into their instructional practices. Previously, he has served as a building-level administrator and secondary science teacher. He also regularly teachers as an adjunct for the Department of Secondary Education and Educational Leadership at Stephen F. Austin State University. Current research interests focus on improving student performance through campus- and classroom-based initiatives. At the time of writing this article Scott was enrolled in the educational leadership doctoral program at Stephen F. Austin State University in Nacogdoches, Texas, in his second year of a 3-year program of study. E-mail: sbailey@hisd.com