

CHAPTER 5

THOMAS BARR GREENFIELD - EARLY YEARS

Study life. If you want to understand educational administration, study life
(Greenfield, lecture notes).

The experience at the International Intervisitation Program (IIP) 1974 changed Thomas Greenfield's life. In his IIP paper (1975c), Greenfield outlined an alternative view of organisations and publicly turned his back on years of working in another mode of knowledge creation. From a logical positivist base during the 1960s, Greenfield now declared his shift to a phenomenological view of organisation and administration, one which placed the individual at the centre of the organisation. This chapter looks briefly at Greenfield's early years, his teaching and school administration career and his move to the University of Alberta and post-graduate studies. It concludes with Greenfield's years as Research Director with the Canadian Teachers' Federation in Ottawa and his move to the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE), Toronto. In order to build a comprehensive ideography, each of Greenfield's papers, in chronological order, is described and briefly analysed. The elements of the analysis lie in the selection and order of the material for comment and in the choice of passages for exact quotation. As far as

possible, Greenfield speaks for himself with minimal intervention of the researcher.

Early Years

Thomas Barr Greenfield was born at Nokomis, Saskatchewan, on the prairies of Canada, May 4 1930, into a farming community and lived the first years of his life on the farm. In one of the few references in his published works about his early life, he writes about beginning formal learning in a school where a single teacher taught many children in eight grades

We used to watch the hands of the clock on the teacher's desk move slowly to four. At that hour, if one were old enough and had no younger brothers or sisters to transport home by buggy or cutter, one might ride home on horseback through an open, unspoiled, tranquil landscape to a homestead that, short years before, was virgin prairie (1979a:99).

This seemingly idyllic life for a child did not last long but had a lasting impression on Greenfield's adult identity as teacher, administrator and scholar. He recalled how a combination of Great Depression, Canadian winters and several years of 'dust bowl' drought drove many prairie farmers (including the Greenfield family) from the land:

at a point of crisis in my family, I went to live in the city. The farm part of my family has never shared my city life, though I can, or could, shift fairly easily back to farm ways (1979a:99).

This rustic side of Thomas Greenfield came as a shock to those who knew him in the Toronto years of his life. Les

McLean, in his remarks on the occasion of the memorial service for Greenfield at OISE, Thursday, January 28 1993, referred to him as once a "Gentleman Farmer". Thom and Millie Greenfield were then partners with some others in a country property, acquired mainly for tramping the woods and fields, and although it was not his favorite, Thom Greenfield enjoyed the change of pace, from time to time. From early days the city was his milieu. Even when living in Vancouver - "a nice place to be a kid"(Greenfield interview, 26.9.90) - he remembered having a longing for something else. The 'something else' he came later to identify as one city, Toronto. He lived in Toronto, Ontario, from 1965 when he first went to work at OISE, until his death on December 19, 1992.

By the time the young Greenfield was in Grade 2, his mother, a teacher, had moved to Vancouver. He was raised by his mother (whose maiden name was 'Barr') in the days when there was little public sympathy for sole parents and a maiden aunt. His growing years were influenced by a generally left-wing ideology, in a kind of environment of protest (Greenfield and Ribbins, 1993:232) that stemmed from the vivid sense of social outrage his mother felt at the injustices she had suffered. In conversations with Greenfield, his father was never mentioned.

Greenfield's elementary and secondary education

took place in Vancouver, 1936 -1947, and then BA degree studies, majoring in English and German at the University of British Columbia (UBC), 1947-1951, graduating 17 May 1951. He declared (Greenfield interview 26.9.90) that he just fell into these studies accidentally and really had no idea what he was going to do at university. Then, since he needed a job and teaching was the obvious and easiest way and he had the example of his mother, he did Teacher Training (secondary school) at UBC, 1951-1952. From 1952-1959, after a very brief period teaching secondary school and because of a shortage of elementary teachers, he taught elementary grades with the Vancouver School Board. Initially, teaching ten year olds was very difficult for him. He recognised that he was unprepared in both experience, attitude and specific training for that level of teaching. Indeed, his background in intellectual study contributed to his unease at elementary teaching. However, he was "quite happy". The school was creative and was "doing good things for students" (Greenfield interview, 4.10.90). Greenfield had a fair amount of success as a classroom teacher and, in a typically system's way of reward, he was appointed Vice Principal of Queen Alexandra School, 1958 -1959. His duties were all the things the Head of School did not want to look after, for example books, supplies, milk money. This was not a happy year for him. The principal was "very aggressive, direct and directing, very much of his own opinion, repressive and

cruel to children, indifferent to the teachers and indifferent to me" (Greenfield interview, 26.9.90). In contrast, Greenfield's first principal was "incompetently laissez-faire" (Greenfield interview 4.10.90). At the time he was also working in the Teachers' Union and had risen to a position of some responsibility. So, as teacher, administrator and unionist he was gaining some of his first insights into "the placing of meaning on experience" (1979a:97) and the relationship between experience and ideas, between symbol and reality (p97). He was also faced with the reality of practical administration and realised that he could possibly become a practising administrator.

Then another happenstance ... Greenfield was invited by the General Secretary of the Teachers' Union to go to Edmonton, Alberta, where there was a scholarship to study Educational Administration. The Graduate program in Educational Administration at the University of Alberta, made possible by Kellogg Foundation money, had begun in 1956. The first year was devoted to planning and preparation and the first students arrived in the Fall of 1957. The functions of the program were the training of educational leaders, the discovery and ordering of administrative knowledge and the dissemination of ideas.

Greenfield had gone to Alberta, indirectly, to prepare for a career in educational administration. His prime motivation for leaving Vancouver and his Vice-

Principal's job, was to get away from a difficult principal. Any conscious choice in him focussed on the simple fact that the invitation came his way. Opportunity was knocking. He had been teaching for seven years, was comfortable and content with what he was doing and was gaining a reputation as a creative and inspired teacher. He had had a taste of administration. Yet, he had no great desire to change. In retrospect, his decision to go to Alberta was more by default. Since there was no reason not to do it, he accepted the offer. Nevertheless, he was aware that this kind of study could lead to a career in administration and at twenty nine, that offered some future security for him.

Post-graduate Studies

Greenfield went to the University of Alberta for one year, 1959, and stayed four. He joined the Masters program, under John Andrews, who, like himself, had come to Alberta from British Columbia and from a career in teaching and principalship in one of the small port towns and who longed for something more socially useful. Andrews had left Canada and gone to the University of Chicago to study and so had had first hand contact with the burgeoning Theory Movement. The academic study of educational administration in Alberta was just establishing itself. Greenfield (Interview, 4.10.90) commented upon the two kinds of staff members at the university in the late fifties/early sixties. The older were from a background of

senior positions in administration, mainly former superintendents of school districts. The other kind were well in touch with the thinking and directions taken by the proponents of the Theory Movement and were teaching the new science of administration. Greenfield was very attracted to the thinking and research methods encouraged by the new science. He felt that all the difficulties and complexities that he had been introduced to in his study of the arts could be answered; that these things could be calculated and exactly resolved. The new science offered clarity and certainty and he had a sense of turning away from what, for many years, he had understood as knowledge. The artist in him was giving way to the scientist - at least for the moment. Through Professor John Andrews, whose background was in physics and who became a strong mentor and model for him, Greenfield was introduced to administration as science. The Theory Movement, which later he was to write against so eloquently and so often, could claim Greenfield as a firm supporter in the 1960s. At this stage he had a firm belief that science could and should be used to solve social problems. Twenty years later, Greenfield wrote:

Some people invent ideas that give shape and meaning to their experience; others borrow ideas to understand themselves. And many have little or no choice as others' ideas are forced upon them in the same way that the air surrounds them. They must breathe the air or suffocate; so must they accept others' ideas or break through them to a new atmosphere, to other ideas, to a new reality (1979a:97).

Greenfield's breakthrough to a new reality was still many years away.

His Masters thesis, entitled *Teacher Leader Behavior and its Relationship to Pupil Growth*, completed in 1961, was supervised by Professor Andrews. Leadership was one of the areas of widespread interest at the time, and the topic was actually suggested by Andrews. As the title suggested, the central concern of the study was to consider the relationship of teacher leader behavior to pupil growth. Greenfield used a pre-existing instrument, the Teacher Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (TLBDQ) which was an adaptation of the Ohio LBDQ devised by Stogdill and Coons (1957). Greenfield (1961b:94) wrote that in empirical studies of leadership, the Ohio studies were probably the most useful presented to date. The study involved fifty one Grade 9 teachers of Social Studies and Mathematics, in three urban Alberta school systems, and their pupils. The leader behavior was described by three groups of people - principals, five other teachers in the school and then ten students in each teacher's class. Greenfield's first published paper (1961a) provided an abbreviated account of the study. The work fitted firmly within the current positivistic frame of research. The data were analysed by both parametric and non-parametric methods, the parametric analysis proving to be the stronger and therefore, the one used in the study. Indeed, the study showed Greenfield's mastery of statistical techniques

and methods, the clarity of his thinking and an awareness of the sensitive nuances that were involved in research, for example, the difficulty in identifying the factors which are predictive of teaching success; the difficulty of defining success and leadership and effectiveness and the difficulty in making the connection between teacher behavior and pupil growth. Greenfield was careful in drawing conclusions about the generalizability of the results and was well aware of the limitations of the research.

In chapter One of the actual thesis, Greenfield stated:

The kind of knowledge which permits rational, purposeful change is that knowledge which is precise, objective, and communicable. That is, it is the kind of knowledge which is derived from research and is characteristically scientific. It is the kind of knowledge which is the reverse of that which has mistakenly been called 'art' and which has often been the only tool for shaping administrative change (Greenfield, 1961a:1).

This is Greenfield in logical empiricist mode. Later on he defined leadership in operational terms only, declaring that such definitions are:

extremely useful in research situations, but if the results of such research are to have wider application and use in educational settings, the attempt will have to be made to establish leadership in other terms (1961a:118).

Logical positivism upheld operationalism, which demanded that definitions of concepts be expressed as equivalences

to sets of operations, a doctrine whose heart, Michael Scriven (1969:198) believed, was in the right place, but whose head was in the wrong place. Positivists also believed in a value-free social science. Greenfield expressed the need to emphasise "the independence of 'is' and 'ought' in science" and stated that the research:

seeks only to discover what the relation of the leader behavior of teachers is to such a measure of growth and does not imply that it is 'good' or that such a relationship ought to exist (1961a:48-49).

As young academic and scholar, under the strong influence of a mentor who was thoroughly schooled in and convinced of the value of positivistic science, Greenfield was unquestioning of the meaning of such quantitative research and unthinkingly accepted what was offered as knowledge. He was a scholar of the times, caught up in the promise of the New Movement as academics and researchers imported knowledge from the social sciences into educational administration and subjected ideas and theories to quantitative analysis. The new perspective taught that knowledge was scientific and that science offered the answers to all the educational problems of the day. Greenfield, at this time in his life, had no reason to doubt that this was so.

Greenfield proceeded from Masters to doctoral studies, 1961-1963, still at the University of Alberta. Erwin Miklos (Miklos interview, 22.10.90) was a fellow

student in those days and recalled that Greenfield was just as competent and intellectually stimulating then, when he had those more positivistic, functionalist and scientific ideas, as now (1990). Thirty years ago, the doctoral program at the University of Alberta was very heavily influenced by people coming from a number of the social science areas such as sociology, psychology and economics. Professor Miklos commented upon the interesting phenomenon that people in education, whose backgrounds were similar to the social scientists, namely educational psychologists, educational sociologists, were ignored in those days, and the university looked to the "real" social scientists and their disciplines for knowledge and research methodology. This almost total preoccupation with the social sciences meant that there was such little conceptual variety in the perspectives that students became informed about. The major social science lens through which to view the world was the systems metaphor.

Greenfield's doctoral thesis, entitled *Systems Analysis in Education: A Factor Analysis and Analysis of Variance of Pupil Achievement* (1963), continued in the positivistic, functionalist vein. Systems analysis looked for the commonness between orders of data or behavior and had the potential of providing a framework for the interdisciplinary movement (then a current trend in administration), by providing a general theory and by indicating areas for useful application of the theory

through isomorphies of various kinds (1963:18-19). Then Greenfield wrote that:

if administration is to be a field of content and not merely the study of rules, it will require a form and structure which can be provided by general systems theory (1963:19).

Systems theory would provide the framework for the foundation of and growth in the particular kind of knowledge that was educational administration. Greenfield, along with most scholars of the day, believed that and for the next few years, Greenfield's work and energies attempted to ratify and realise that belief.

Andrews again supervised this research. Greenfield also acknowledged the help of Doctor J.A. McGregor, Doctor S.M. Hunka and his own wife, Millie, who helped in the collection of data and the preparation of the report. The study is a learned extension and expansion of the work undertaken at Masters level. Greenfield's attention was now on educational systems and the three common units of system organisation, the classroom, school and school district. After noting the most serious impediments to educational research, the thesis introduced the concept of systems in education, stating that:

the theory of systems analysis is an attempt to generalise beyond known empirical relationships but without attempting to formulate a theory of everything (1963:3).

He argued for the applicability of systems theory to

education: "it provides ultimately a rational basis for decision making in educational administration" (p4) and "enables maximum efficiency to be gained from limited resources" (p7). The purpose of the work was to do a multi-variate statistical analysis in order to discover relationships between variables within systems and outputs. Twenty two Alberta school districts participated. In each district, two schools were selected and in each school, two classes. Thus an analysis of variance involving twenty two districts, forty four schools and eighty eight classes was possible and two thousand and sixty nine Grade 9 pupils were involved. Data was collected for each pupil, involving achievement on Alberta Departmental Examinations, socio-economic status, academic ability, motivation and hours of study. Thirteen tests were used - three of socio-economic status, two of educational motivation, five of academic achievement and three of educational ability. Almost thirty years later, as he recalled this work, Greenfield expressed some pride in his ability to "do" a factor analysis and an analysis of variance. "Most people wouldn't even know what it was!" (Greenfield interview, 4. 10.90). However, he was horrified at the title of the thesis - "a terrible title ... I cringe to think of it, a blaring trumpet advertising method, and no substance at all" (Greenfield and Ribbins, 1993:233). Greenfield's doctoral dissertation was hard to come by. He offered all kinds of specious excuses when requests for a copy were

made, such as "I cannot find it; You wouldn't be interested anyway; It is in a box somewhere in the basement". A copy was finally obtained from the University of Alberta library and when Greenfield was informed that the elusive document had been acquired, he commented haughtily that "To read it is a waste of time!" The thesis did indeed show a comprehensive knowledge, both theoretical and practical, of systems, a careful and skilled use of statistical methods and their application and a thoughtful and highly relevant interpretation of results and their implications for education. His judgment of "no substance at all" was made from a totally different mind set and experience of the administrative world.

Early Publications

Greenfield was now, 1962/63, setting the groundwork for his own theory of organisation, which formed the focus of thinking and research for the rest of his academic life and which provided the touchstone for all his associated theorizing and questioning. He began to articulate this thinking in his papers of the late 1960s and proceeded to develop it throughout the remainder of his published work. He never lost touch with general systems thinking as outlined in the first chapter of his thesis, *The Nature of Systems Analysis*, where he drew heavily on the general systems theory of Ludwig von Bertalanffy (quoted in the 1973b paper, precursor to the controversial 1974 paper) and of Kenneth Boulding (quoted in Greenfield's 1964d paper

and frequently in later papers, particularly in 1979a). Greenfield cited Griffiths in his doctoral thesis, in terms of "the application of knowledge from various sources" to the problems of administration (1963:16). Greenfield's thesis made the reader aware of the fluency of his literary style, even in a work composed of such numerical equations and multiple correlations. The language used and the clear and forceful expression of ideas in an attractive and easy flowing style, developed, perhaps, during his undergraduate arts education, contained the seeds of that elegant, literary expression that is commonly associated with his later works

During his years in Alberta, Greenfield had six papers published. *Leadership Training for Educational Administrators* coauthored with Lawrence Downey, was a summary of the purposes, programs, origin and development of the first five years' operation of the Division of Educational Administration at the University of Alberta. It combined the functions of a review (without any great depth of treatment) and advertising material for future students and formed the basis of a report to the Kellogg Foundation and other companies who had financially supported the setting up of the Division.

A Procedure for Program Evaluation (1961c) presented some ideas on evaluation, taken largely from his Masters thesis, and offered a formal scheme for the

evaluation of administrative behavior and a review of some procedures for measurement, with particular emphasis upon the measurement of pupil characteristics. The scheme for evaluation was based upon a design constructed by Andrew Halpin (1957:155-199). There was a fleeting glimpse of Greenfield, the philosopher, as he mused that:

nothing is more obvious than the statement that we live in an imperfect world; yet it is a world which is remarkably subject to re-modelling and re-arrangement such that a condition 'nearer to the heart's desire' is produced. This is nothing more than the idea and hope of progress (1961c:83).

and of Greenfield, the organisational theorist, who boldly declared that "organisation is not an end in itself but is rather a construction for achieving purposes" (p93). The predominant voice, however, was the voice of Greenfield, logical empiricist.

The Principalship (1962a) focused on the skills a principal needed to do the job, and how those skills might be acquired. Greenfield based this short article on four discrete talents suggested by Downey and Reeves (in Greenfield, 1962a:19) namely, the skills of business management, human relations, educational technology and creative speculation (p19) and worked from a brief description of each of these skills to a comprehensive definition of administration. This was a theoretical, academic paper which would probably have had practising administrators nodding. The writer was obviously a student

of administration.

School Athletics: Boon or Blight? (1962b) seemed an unlikely title for one of Greenfield's papers. It was based on work by American sociologist, James Coleman and considered the relationship of school athletic programs to academic achievement. Coleman discovered that the greater the emphasis upon athletics as a value in the school, the lower the status of high academic achievement among students (1962b:15). Greenfield asked how relevant were these findings for Canadian schools and offered a critique of Coleman's methodology. Then, in the conclusion he stated:

The real value of Coleman's study may be to suggest that whatever it is, morale is related to the values and ways of thinking of the masses of adolescents in our schools. The lesson, then, is that values of the school and the pupil may be quite independent of each other ... To improve the effectiveness of our schools, we must know and take into consideration the values of adolescents; and we may have to be prepared as well to change attitudes of adolescents if we are to make much progress in increasing their knowledge (p18).

Never an athlete himself, Greenfield felt strongly about this aspect of school culture and focused on the relationship between values, attitude and knowledge. In an interesting and engaging discussion Greenfield revealed an early interest in values, an area which would remain a perennial concern for him.

In 1962 Greenfield was associate editor of the *Canadian Administrator*, the journal of the Division of

Educational Administration, at the University of Alberta. *The Politics of Education: Practice and Theory* and *The Politics of Education: Controversy and Control* (1962c;1962d), coauthored with Richard Baird and published in that journal, focussed on what was political about education. The first considered the difference between an institutional and a behaviorist approach to educational administration - a behaviorist saw political relationships where an institutionalist saw only technical problems of management (1962c:33). It pointed out that politics pervaded the action of every administrator who made decisions and did not stop with the provincial legislature and the elected or appointed school board. *Controversy and Control* concentrated on the actions of people to control administrative systems by legislative means and by more informal methods, such as pressure groups. It concluded with "three serious objections to administrative systems ... maintaining the structure of a closed political system" (1962d:38) namely, mistaking practice for principle; ignoring interest groups and being insensitive to changes in the environment.

Greenfield was awarded his PhD in 1963. Recently married (in the summer of 1962 at the University of Alberta) he was looking for a job in the academic world. He was now "too educated" to return to teaching and was feeling the need to do something appropriate to the kind of knowledge he had attained over four years in Alberta.

At the time academic positions in Canada were scarce and after one failed attempt to land a position in the USA, he became Research Director with the Canadian Teachers' Federation in Ottawa. He had been prominent in Teachers' Union activities in Vancouver immediately before going to Alberta and was actually approached by the General Secretary of the Teachers' Union about accepting the scholarship that would lead to tertiary studies. Floyd G. Robinson, who later went on to head the Department of Educational Psychology at the newly-formed Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) actually recruited Greenfield for the research position. Andrews was again influential in this career move for Greenfield. He had excelled in his studies at the University of Alberta, and Andrews recognising Greenfield's academic potential, recommended him highly. Greenfield's credentials could not be doubted. He had worked with the Teachers' Union and gained some credibility therein in British Columbia; his academic credentials were of the highest standard; he had mastered the intricacies of difficult, quantitative, scientific research and he had had six papers published.

Greenfield: Research Director

The responsibilities of the Director's job were threefold: to do some research; to be an advocate for research and to manage a group of junior researchers. In hindsight, Greenfield believed that his main role was that

of advocacy. The culture of the Teachers' Federation of the time sheds some light on why this was so and adds some understanding to Greenfield's experience over the next couple of years. The Federation had set up a whole wing dedicated to research and there was a deeply felt sense that the unit was much on public display. They were education scientists, very much imbued with the attitude that saw the typical role of the researcher as the creator of superior knowledge (Greenfield and Ribbins, 1993:234). And as well, they were hired to further the cause of teachers and their interests. It was not long before Greenfield felt that he was merely a "tame scientist", hired to add a certain cachet to the proper opinions which the employers within the organisation wanted to highlight (p234). The political control was subtle and mostly unspoken, understood by reason of the nature of the organisation. The other wing of the Federation was the political wing, and relationships between the two units were competitive and strained. The research group struggled to be independent and the political side applied pressure to ensure that the research group was controlled. Greenfield became aware of "certain sacred territories":

There were certain things you couldn't do, even though from the research perspective, we felt we needed to do them. There were certain things within the culture of education that were sacred (Greenfield interview, 4.10.90).

He resented the political control that was put on him, even

though it was not all that binding nor difficult to live with and under. But what there was of it, he did not want and it was a source of tension with him and with the unit in general. It was Greenfield's first experience of the difference between professional and bureaucratic control. Bureaucratic control he would always resist, sometimes passively, often very openly.

On 2 June 1994, an interview was conducted with Dr. Wilf Brown, Director, Economic Services and Dr. Geraldine Gilliss, Director, Research and Information Services at the Teachers' Federation Headquarters in Ottawa. Both Brown and Gilliss had worked as research assistants under Greenfield in the early 1960s. They remembered it as a small unit, consisting of a research director and twelve employees, all "special people" - there was a tradition in the unit of hiring only the best people - and it was particularly close-knit. Brown believed that the unit made a considerable impact. They were all aware that they were working for an interest group and that the organisation as a whole, had a love/hate relationship with the research unit. Brown remembered Greenfield as a supportive and encouraging manager, who was eager to facilitate the work of the research assistants as best he could. He treated staff as colleagues and "would go to bat" for them organisationally. In difficult situations, Greenfield (whom they knew exclusively as 'Barr') was calm and had the ability to listen carefully to all players. He had

high standards for the unit and was extremely demanding on both himself and staff. Still, he was able to inspire them to excel. Brown appreciated the fact that Greenfield could assess people without being judgmental. He remembered that Greenfield would often give his own books to those assistants who needed to update their knowledge or to think a little more creatively. Intellectually, he was very curious and tried hard to identify what he could do best for the unit and with the unit. He must have succeeded in this because there was never any controversy about the thoroughness of the research while Greenfield was in charge. Personally, both Brown and Gilliss found it took a long time to get to know Greenfield. He was very quiet and socialised only minimally with the work group.

Initially, Greenfield was happy in the job but it was not long before the tension of political control and to a degree, the lack of academic freedom began to wear away at him. The salary was good. He travelled extensively. The work was easy - this very fact was enough to be dissatisfying. Nothing in his training had prepared him for the work culture he found in Ottawa.

During those two years in Ottawa, Greenfield worked on several issues of concern (mainly economic) to the Teachers' Federation. The survey was the predominant form of data collection and his first published work in 1964, entitled *Survey Research: Design and Analysis*, began with

two examples of survey research (one from the Coleman study referred to previously (1962b) and proceeded to a full rationale of the survey as a research instrument. Part One, *Research and the Social Survey*, made the connection between the survey and scientific methods of research. In this section, Greenfield commented on the low status of survey research and suggested that one reason might be that the designers of surveys had sometimes failed to distinguish between 'is' and 'ought' questions and that it was a misuse of the survey to use "the nose-counting technique as an infallible guide to action" (1964a:114). He further declared that the most important discontinuity in survey research was the lack of an overall theory to guide the process (p115). Part Two, *Instrumentation in Social Surveys*, looked at the form of questionnaires, kinds of questions, the content and wording of questions, attitude scales, pilot studies and the question of error in surveys. The article could almost be entitled 'All a Researcher Needed to Know about Surveys.' Every possible issue was discussed and explained. Doctor T. Barr Greenfield was now writing with authority, grounded in knowledge and experience and was developing an increasingly high profile in Canadian education circles.

He had five articles published in 1964 with research and research methods as the central theme. The Teacher Research Movement was then a vested interest for the Federation and, in two of these articles (1964a;1964b)

Greenfield concentrated on teacher research, encouraged teachers to be involved and warned them of the pitfalls inherent in classroom research as it was currently practised.

Some Problems and Methods in Teacher-Conducted Research (1964a), the report of a workshop on classroom research belonged to the latter category. It began with a basic definition of research:

Research is directed discovery. It is an attempt to describe and explain the every day occurrences of this world in all its multiplicity and variety ...
No research can hope to provide final answers to a problem. In education, we are only now beginning to look for the rational, research-based knowledge which might be described as scientific (1964a:8).

Discussion moved on to the process of research, distinguishing between social sciences research and research in the physical sciences; the design of experimental research, replete with models and algebraic equations and then Greenfield provided solutions to some of the common problems facing quantitative research in the classroom, for example the evaluation of school programs and instruction; the difficulty of ensuring an adequate control group; and the need to devise research designs that result in reliable findings. The paper is simply written, matter-of-fact in tone and addresses some fairly basic ground rules for the elementary researcher.

Problems and Prospects of the Teacher Research

Movement in Canada (1964b) noted a much more professionally confident and comfortable Greenfield. It was the published version of a paper given at the Third Canadian Conference on Educational Research at Macdonald College, Ste-Anne-de-Bellevue, Quebec in early June 1964, one of three papers that focussed on Teacher Research which is roughly equivalent to Action Research as it is understood today. Greenfield made his view of classroom research clear from the very beginning:

... any research in the classroom worthy of the name research, or the teacher's time in carrying it out must be connected in some way to the methodology, purposes and theory of the main stream of research thinking and practice (1964b:133).

He based this position on three notions. Firstly that classroom research as it is practised indicated that it was designed:

not so much as a tool for increasing knowledge and understanding as it is intended as a device for persuading the teacher to change his [sic] ways (p133).

Secondly, current research tended to re-emphasise theory development, and was concerned that "theory influence practice by the dissemination of new or previously developed knowledge" (p133). Thirdly, Greenfield believed that:

appropriate research by teachers must be developed within a framework which takes cognizance of the fact that teachers are neither theoreticians nor research methodologists (p134).

Section One, *Theory and Basic Research in Education*, considered the nature, purpose and special characteristics of classroom research, with "its two rather different wings" - one reached back to its earliest traditions and "represents the scientific movement in behavioral science applied to education" (p134). The other, reacting to "single variable laboratory-type experimentation applied to the "complex, multivariate problems of the classroom" focused on the efforts of theory-oriented researchers in education to account for the " divergent phenomena of education and leads to understanding, prediction and, ultimately, to control of fundamental processes in education" (p135). Greenfield stated that theory must account for both "main effects" and "interactions", and that the reaction to obvious inadequacies in earlier educational theory had been a "movement not to abandon theory but to create better and, inevitably, more complex theory to explain the phenomena of education". To create better theory, "theory which is of greatest relevance to improved practice", and which attempts to explain this "blooming welter" (p135) of classroom phenomena, teachers must be involved. That was Greenfield's thesis and he proceeded to convince teachers by naming and explaining some of the problems inherent in classroom research, such as the need to clarify the specific purpose of classroom research and to set attainable expectations; the importance of distinguishing between research specialists and teachers

and administrators who happen to be involved in classroom research; the competence of teachers and the practicality of them carrying out self-constructed projects; the difficulty of dissemination of information and the promotion of new techniques and technology. Some solutions could be found at the Federation level and others in the local classroom by individual teachers.

Section Two, *The Teacher Research Movement* (pp138 - 143) was a perceptive and empathic account of current practice in classroom research and the assumptions, often unsubstantiated, on which it was founded. Greenfield was alert to the fact that:

despite its research format and emphasis upon rationality, the teacher research movement may be recognised as primarily a persuasive device (p140)

and that:

at best then, the original conception of classroom research seems to lead to a cul-de-sac, requiring a re-definition and re-direction of the whole activity (p140).

His comment on using Chi Squares (p140) contained shades of that cynical humour Greenfield became adept at using in later articles when he felt deeply about an issue or wanted to draw the reader's attention to what he considered was unadulterated nonsense.

He did, however, consider some positive prospects for classroom research, for example, in the areas of

innovation in teaching and the diffusion of research-based technology and in the political power of teachers over curriculum in particular (pp146 - 147). Greenfield advocated a situation where research activities were coordinated by "new organisations broadly representative of expert skill and professional interests in educational research" and deplored the "notion of the teacher researcher who, like a lonely Victorian inventor in his cluttered workshop, strives to find the gimmick that works" (p147). The teacher who wanted to try out a new idea, technique or device in the classroom was encouraged to do so. Greenfield suggested a general redefinition of what the teacher was doing in such circumstances with the emphasis placed on "discovering how classroom situations modify established theory or outcomes predicted by theory" (p147). Teachers were not "theory producers or testers" but "the relevance of classroom conditions to theoretical propositions" was recognised and the validation of theory was not limited to "the particular but mutable circumstances which happen to hold in one or even a number of classrooms" (p147).

Problems and Prospects presaged, in construction and style, so many of Greenfield's later and better known articles. Curiously, from a position whose focus was primarily the doing of research, this paper is the work of a thinker who is primarily a theorist. The foundations of this thinking are soundly reasoned, substantiated from the

literature and clearly expressed with that ease and subtlety of language that Greenfield readers in the 1980s and 1990s recognised as one of the distinguishing marks of his prose style. The issue of teacher research is expansively covered. Each paragraph is densely packed with fact and thought and perceptive opinion. The reader could stop for some private musing after almost every sentence. In this paper there is promise of the Greenfield of later years.

Teacher Research on Programmed Instruction: A Collection and Critique of Studies (1965a) prepared in 1964 but published later, gathered together eleven studies on the effectiveness of programmed instruction. The studies were conducted by teachers, and supported by the Canadian Teachers' Federation. The purpose of the collection was to examine teacher research as research; to provide models for classroom research and insights into the quality of thought which classroom research stimulated among those who engaged in it: and to enable the examination of the conditions necessary for the organisation and conduct of valid research by teachers (Greenfield, 1965a:3-4). Greenfield edited the volume and wrote the Introduction, Chapter Three, *The Organisation of Teacher Research* and Chapter Four, *A Critique of Teacher Research*. Chapter Three replicated much of a former paper (1964b). Chapter Four focused on design and difficulties in the studies and offered "some very limited evidence" (1965a:49) about the

value and effectiveness of teacher research itself. The designs of the studies were compared in four tables and the critique commented on the problem of establishing equivalent groups and the relationships of the designs to the conclusions drawn from the results obtained. The conclusions reached were very much in favour of teacher instruction and not programmed instruction (p54).

The final section (pp54-55) compared classroom research with other research and noted that:

one of the major differences between the outcomes of teacher research and general academic research may be that teachers will tend to interpret the findings of their research in terms of the realities and limitations of present systems of school and classroom organisation while the academic researcher makes interpretations according to freer terms of reference (1965a:54).

Greenfield advocated a partnership between teacher researchers and academic researchers and recommended that teacher research be more coordinated, sequential and directed than was the case. The chapter concluded with suggestions for further study plus implications and recommendations. This monograph published the results of quantitative research on programmed instruction and provided a clear example of Greenfield, the quantitative statistician.

Administration and Systems Analysis (1964d) was published in the Canadian Administrator and focused upon the then-current "critical re-examination" of research, not

only in education, but in "virtually all research which studies the behavior of living organisms" (Greenfield, 1964d:25). The paper concentrated on some of the fundamental premises on which the New Movement was then being launched. Greenfield asserted that:

Part of the criticism contends that research has too frequently emphasised facts that may be interesting in themselves but which are meaningless or irrelevant beyond some very specific context (1964:25).

He reminded readers that "the study of administration as a scientific enquiry is of comparatively recent vintage" (p25) and proceeded to mention some "trenchant criticisms" that were being levelled at practitioners but with which he did not concur. Later, however, he would come to agree with such criticisms. He noted that "administration is not alone in recognising the inadequacy of its science and its art" but that:

scholars in various behavioral sciences are concerned that the complexity and specialisation of their knowledge has somehow missed the point of some general but important problems in our contemporary society (pp25-26).

Greenfield then focused on "perhaps the most important of these social issues, that is, the nature of organisations" (p26). He noted that virtually every activity in modern life is organised:

The importance of organisations is that they do things; our concern is that educational organisations should do the right things and that they should do them well. The difficulty is, however, that though we know what we

wish our organisations to do, we cannot be sure how to make them do our will. In some instances we cannot even be sure what the ultimate effects of organisations are (p26).

These musings from the early 1960s are a significant part of the evolution of Greenfield's thinking. The nature of organisation is pivotal and central, indeed the touchstone, of Greenfield's later theoretical stance. Here, though, using Kenneth Boulding as his source, Greenfield declared that:

organisations have regularities and principles of action which are potentially as knowable and predictable as the motions of the planets. Organisations are units or systems and their effectiveness may be due to some characteristic of the whole rather than to individual parts studied in isolation from the organisation. Though we do not have complete understanding of the principles of organisation, there is reason for optimism ... *In fact, the notion that a general theory of organisation is possible may be one of the great ideas of our century.* [Author's emphasis] (p26).

Problems like "Do children learn better in small or large classes ?" needed to be considered in their settings in larger and more powerful systems and not considered in isolation from the organisations in which they were observed, because "the problems of administration are to a large extent, the problems of organisation and systems" (p27). Greenfield proceeded to discuss the concept of systems, its applicability to education and used his own doctoral research study as an exemplar. The study pointed to the fact that:

A theory of organisation demands much more precise knowledge of the operation of systems than is available from subjective evaluations of organisational operation. Systems analysis attempts to answer how organisations do work rather than how they ought to work. [Emphasis Greenfield's] (p30).

The later Greenfield disowned this kind of thinking completely. But years of critical experience, both personal and professional, changes in career placements and life style, some severe politicking against him, a crucial sabbatical year, 1972-1973, and profound, and sometime continuous reflection on all of this, were yet to shape his thinking and living in an indelible and incontrovertible way.

A significant area of interest of the Teachers' Federation of the time, June 1964, concerned economic issues such as salary scales and benefits other than salaries. Greenfield supervised "some low level survey research" and some of the results appeared in a paper entitled, *Collective Bargaining by Teachers' Organisations in Canada: A Description of Practice and Survey of Opinion* (1964c). The paper was for restricted distribution only. Greenfield's name appeared nowhere on the document. Authorship was attributed to the Research Division, Canadian Teachers' Federation. Greenfield, however, did include this paper in the list of his publications and papers. The paper analysed the legal provisions governing collective bargaining by teachers in Canada, with reference to provisions in various provinces, and presented opinions

of:

knowledgeable commentators in Teachers' organisations about the advantages and disadvantages of the legal structure governing collective bargaining in their province (Greenfield, 1965c:1).

So, it aimed to "shed some light upon the relationship between legislative regulations and effective collective bargaining" (p1). The methodology was explained briefly (pp2-3) and a longer analysis of the data followed. The data suggested a great variety in legal regulations and little uniformity of opinion. Few organisations were completely satisfied with the present systems of collective bargaining. There was general agreement, however, that collective bargaining was a right which teachers could claim and employers must grant (p20).

The study recommended that attention be paid to many "extra-legal factors" such as the history, purposes, policies, practices, structure, attitudes and power of a teachers' organisation in relation to the social and political conditions which obtained in any particular province, in decisions about which systems were most "advantageous" or "effective" for teachers' organisations (p21). This "low-level" research merely confirmed what was already known. Given the aims of the research, the questionnaire was predictable and the data analysis provided statistics on which to base another Teachers' Union campaign. Such research only ratified Greenfield's

feeling of being "a tame scientist" (Greenfield interview, 10.9.90).

The Consolidation of Ontario School Districts (1965c) and *Classroom Research and Teacher Decision Making* (1965d) followed the pattern of research on political issues. The first was a report of a survey undertaken by the "Optimum Size Committee" of the Ontario Teachers' Federation with the technical assistance of the Research Division of the Canadian Teachers Federation. Greenfield assisted with the design and conduct of the research and wrote the report. Questionnaires were sent to "all teachers in the township school areas of the county and district inspectorates" (1965c:7) both those that had not been affected by the reorganisation of school districts into larger units of administration that began January 1 1965, and those which were consolidated into new township school areas. The study aimed at:

1. determining teaching conditions within newly consolidated districts in particular, and in those consolidated previously;
2. providing specific information about salary, fringe benefits, availability of school services, adequacy of school facilities and community attitudes to education;
3. determining there were differing teaching conditions between the two kinds of areas;
4. providing a base measurement on teaching conditions in the township school areas in order to observe change over time (pp6-7).

The rates of response were 82.1% for teachers in existing consolidations and 86.3% for new consolidations. The principal findings of the study centred around school and class; school plant, facilities and services; supervision; salary and tenure; the community; anticipated effects of consolidation. In general, teachers held positive expectations for the consolidation and the study concluded that teaching conditions in the consolidated districts were superior to those in the unconsolidated districts but factors outside the status of consolidation were also noted as being influential, for example district size, school size and district location. Again, this is a simple, fairly large-scale survey research project that served to confirm what teachers in the system already knew. Greenfield's growing disenchantment and impatience with such politically motivated research is not difficult to imagine. The project does, however, provide an example of how the central Research Division assisted provincial federations in establishing research-based information on significant issues and Greenfield's prominent role therein.

Classroom Research and Teacher Decision Making

(1965d) asked to what degree did classroom research affect teacher decision making and what specific procedures in teachers' research influenced the decisions concerning the effectiveness of a specific instructional device? The study was allied to the project on the use of programmed instruction sponsored by the Canadian Teachers' Federation,

1963-64, and teachers using the programs were asked to compare pupil achievement under program-based instruction against pupil achievement under teacher-based instruction. There was a wide range in teachers' estimates of effectiveness. Then, decisions made by the research group were compared with similar decisions made by a non-research group. The research design was questionnaire based and questions dealt with seven attitudes and decisions - the effectiveness of programs; the role that programs might best play in classroom instruction; the use of the same programs on future occasions; recommendation of programs to other teachers; use of specially developed programs; change of school courses to accommodate existing programs and the expectations for future development of programmed instruction. In only one item was there a significant difference between the patterns of opinion in the two groups (1965d:71). The limitations of the study are obvious, for example, the study dealt with the impact of teacher research on decision making about programmed instruction only and no generalizations could be validly made. Indeed, the study showed that:

[Teachers'] attitudes towards programs and the decisions they make in their classrooms as a result of these attitudes are seemingly formed by other more powerful and pervasive experiences (Greenfield, 1965d:76).

The study raised, once again, the whole question of teacher research. What is its function? How influential is it in

improving instruction? What experiences or influences shape teacher decision making? Greenfield declared that teachers were "consumers of research" rather than "producers of research (p77); that teaching was the only professional field that expected the practitioner to conduct research upon which practice was based and that the professional research establishment must provide teachers with better and more usable products. His concluding remarks advocated a re-examination of "what we are trying to do in teacher research and the adequacy of the means we are using" (p78).

From Ottawa to Toronto

By the end of the academic year, 1965, Greenfield was feeling very frustrated working in the rather routine environment of the Research Division. That mountain had been conquered. The work had ceased to be professionally satisfying and he was becoming more resentful of the kind of political control being exercised over the Division. In 1965 the whole University system began to expand and he began to think about leaving the Teachers' Federation. There were two possibilities facing him - either to move back to the University of Alberta or to join the newly formed Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE). His long-time mentor, Professor John Andrews, was moving to OISE as the Chair of the new Department of Educational Administration and invited Greenfield to join him. Working again with Andrews was an attraction for Greenfield and the

prospect of moving to Toronto, a city he had often visited and whose ambience he enjoyed, influenced the decision. The thought of moving again to a purely academic setting, in a large city, was the clincher. Greenfield left the Research Division at the end of 1965 and Doctor Ted Humphreys replaced him as Director. Greenfield had been two years in the position of Director. With the Research Division on the verge of fundamental organisational change, Humphreys remained for one year and then he too joined the Department of Educational Administration at OISE. Greenfield remained at OISE from 1965 until his retirement in 1990. OISE provided Greenfield with a base from which to work and freedom and support for his academic studies. Toronto supported him in terms of life space. In turn, Greenfield's work and reputation gave OISE international stature.

OISE was, at the time, a new creation. Established by a special act of the Ontario legislature, it was both a graduate school of education in loose affiliation with the University of Toronto and a research and field development institute in education, similar in many respects to the Midwest Administration Centre of the University of Chicago. The Institute aimed to combine theory and practice so that, in addition to graduate classes and basic and applied research and the development of curricular materials, the Institute was responsible for the dissemination of the results of educational studies throughout Ontario. The

combination of these functions within a single institute was highly innovative. Innovation extended to OISE's complete independence from the University of Toronto, something that had been a nagging itch to the University's administrators over the years. In 1992-1993, OISE underwent a complete administrative restructuring and is now under the control of the Faculty of Education, University of Toronto (FEUT). In 1990-1991, the years the author was in attendance, OISE had seven hundred and seventy full-time students and sixteen hundred part-time students, half of these being candidates for doctoral degrees.

On July 1, 1965, Greenfield joined the Department of Educational Administration at OISE. Professor Robert W.B. Jackson was the first Director of the Institute. The staff of the Department of Educational Administration consisted of John Andrews (Chair), Thomas Barr Greenfield, Brock Rideout and Glenn A. Scott (part-time). Andrews and Greenfield were the two full-time educational administration specialists; Rideout's specialty was finance. Finance was not seen as qualifying within the developing definition of the new science of educational administration, and Greenfield's memories of Rideout's role were very hazy - "I didn't even think of him as part of it. He did his thing, taught in his very limited areas, as we saw it then but was a member of the Department" (Greenfield interview, 16.1.91). Andrews was Chair of the department for six months and then was promoted to Assistant Director of the Institute. Greenfield

was appointed Acting Head in 1966 and Chair in 1967, a position which he held until the end of 1970.

In 1966, Greenfield had one paper published, *Teachers Evaluate Programmed Instruction* (1966) which related to work he undertook while at the Research Division in Ottawa and was referred to in the article, *Classroom Research and Teacher Decision Making* (1965d).

Organisational Themes Relevant to Change in Schools (1967), a joint venture between Andrews, Professor and Coordinator of Research at OISE and Greenfield, was the published version of a paper presented at the June 1966, conference of the Canadian Council for Research in Education. The paper described some theoretical approaches based on systems theory to the problems of change in schools. Change was defined as:

a process involving individuals as interacting sub-systems of primary groups which in turn are sub-systems of progressively larger and larger systems (1967:82).

Bennis, Benne and Chin, Griffiths, Miles and Carlson were referred to in their attempts "to develop theory broad enough to accommodate both change and organisation theory" (Andrews and Greenfield, 1967:82). The research highlighted five problem questions to be considered within systems theory:

1. What aspects of the organisational culture affect the rate and nature of change?

2. Can capacity to change be built-in to an organisation?
3. To what extent is the capacity of an organisation to change related to its conflict tolerance and resolution facility?
4. What are the effects of different styles of leader influence upon organisational change behavior? Under what conditions is the use of formal authority functional and dysfunctional in resolving issues?
5. What channels of communication are effective in originating and influencing issues (p85)?

Underlying the focus on organisational change was the nature of organisational culture. The central concept adopted for the analysis of cultures was the organisational theme, defined as "a major constellation of values which characterises the culture and distinguishes it from other comparison cultures" (p86), values "which determine the development of the organisation in the absence of external pressures strong enough to overcome them" (p87). Values were defined as:

criteria for making the choices necessary in the conduct of everyday affairs ... standards to tell us what we ought to do ... which determine our behavior, and ... determine behavior both for individuals and for organisations (p87).

Using Spindler's analysis of social and educational values and Borroman's "dynamic and complex view of the values shaping education" (p88) to identify the values which distinguished among schools, the study introduced Lasswell's typology of change orientation in order to relate values and change as closely as possible. "Armchair

procedures" were used to develop a number of items expressive of the concepts involved in Borroman's and Lasswell's dimensions and then followed a series of interviews with teachers from which change-related value dimensions were abstracted. Nine theoretical value dimensions emerged on which school sub-cultures might be described - school and community; educational opportunity; authority and submission; human nature; intellect and understanding; work and play; evaluation of present school situation; evaluation of the future of education and attitude to change (pp88-91). Then, in order to use " more direct and empirical probes" (p93) there was a set of partially-structured interviews in which teachers were invited to comment upon change in education and upon their feelings towards it. Clusters of values emerged in four broad categories (pp94-98) around change, school and society, the school system and professionalism. Further work was envisaged to define the dimensions operationally, to describe schools in terms of them and to relate value patterns in schools to change behavior in these organisations. Greenfield did not take up the explicit issue of values in education again until much later but values were an area of interest for him from early days. His papers from the late 1970s through to his last published paper in 1991, all contain some thoughts, (although sometimes unformed thoughts), on the connection and interrelationship between organisation and values.

Greenfield's thinking in this area owed much to Christopher Hodgkinson's work on values. The relationship between the two scholars is addressed more fully in Chapter Nine. Greenfield was still developing his thinking in the values area at the time of his final illness in 1992. However, this 1967 paper seemed to reflect more of the thinking and style of Andrews than it did of Greenfield. The methodology is complex and incomplete. The language is dogged and serious and lacks the lightness, subtlety and lilt of Greenfield. Nevertheless, the values focus was of interest to Greenfield.

Greenfield: Head of Department, 1966-1970

Greenfield's tenure as Chair of the Department of Educational Administration at OISE was four years. These were years of growth for the department and formative years for himself. The department grew from four staff, when Greenfield arrived in 1965, to twenty or more when his term as Chair concluded in 1970. His role was managing this speedy growth. Money was no problem. Status, public profile and prestige were all important. He recalled that "the metavalues of the organisation at the time was to grow maximally" (Greenfield interview, 16.1.91) and growth was perceived as good. The department was expanding in staff and student numbers and in the depth and complexity of the programs that were being offered. Greenfield's time was spent in administering a quickly expanding organisation, in recruiting staff, (five people a year from 1967 - 1971),

allocating resources and developing programs and in promoting the image of the new Institute. During this period OISE joined the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) and began attracting big-name scholars for summer schools. Faculty members were attending conferences around the world and becoming major conference speakers themselves. Scholars like American, Laurence Iannacone, contributed to the high-profile, regular faculty. As the public face of the growing department, Greenfield also had to relate to the field. He found it difficult to get along with practitioners at first, but believed in working "in the field", and although he was not a natural "field person", in certain situations he "was not bad, and he surely tried" (Personal correspondence). As well, the Institute moved premises twice in those years, finally settling in Bloor Street West in July 1970. They were, indeed, bustling years - and troubled ones too. Conflict was rife almost from the beginning. Greenfield later stated that conflict is endemic in organisations (1986a:72) and thus is to be expected. The causes were manifold. Here was a new department in the process of expansion, with consequent economic, political and academic demands; an embryonic culture facing the need to develop commitment, to relate positively to the field, to make a name for itself in program development and to arrive at certain settled processes to govern life within the organisation and a leader who was new and untried at

this level.

In effect, Greenfield was involved in creating and building an organisational culture. The brevity of Andrews' time as Head worked against his having a deep impression on the incipient organisation. With Greenfield the position was different. These were formative years. The administrative responsibilities were many and multi-focussed. He was inexperienced in university administration, determined to make a success, ambitious for his own academic career and he made mistakes.

As a leader Greenfield admitted to being "pretty green" (Greenfield and Ribbins, 1993:235) but said he was also "a proactive administrator", who saw things to do and did them. He considered that he was pretty competent and used power comfortably in pursuit of the greater good. He believed he was consultative but at the same time, would override decisions which he considered needed to be overridden and sometimes this was unpopular with factions within the Faculty. In his own words:

Decisions about hiring were often contentious. I was taken up with growth, but I was also keenly aware of the demands the Department was under, demands to expand both research and training programs. These programs had to be staffed. In my view, we had to meet our obligations and this moved me to take risks. I pursued senior, recognised scholars wherever they could be found, but not many of them came. So, the salvation of the Department lay in recruiting new, untried talent. I appointed a woman to the faculty at a time when such an appointment was exceptional, almost to the point of being bizarre. The bemusement of senior Ontario administrators, as a woman - dressed as we would say

today for success -spoke to them on organisation theory was wondrous to behold. The appointment was controversial, not only for her being a woman, but also because her background was in sociology and included no practical experience in education or administration. The appointment was socially difficult too - not least among the wives of the male faculty in the Department. I also took risks in the areas of specialisation I promoted, and in the greenness of the persons I recommended for appointment. On one occasion I persisted with a recommendation after the faculty members narrowly rejected it. That came back to haunt me (Greenfield interview, 16.1.91).

According to Greenfield, "that was the era in which there was a growing recognition of and demand for a more potent democracy in academia" (Interview, 16.1.91). He thought he was encouraging collegiality among staff, was reporting well to Faculty by means of his custom of giving managerial reports and believed he was making provision for greater staff involvement in decision-making. As the Faculty worked on governing structures, Greenfield advocated student involvement in decision making and believed that it was in this issue that he fell foul of some colleagues. In his own words:

... I was an advocate of student involvement, more than the students wanted in fact at that time. It was ultimately seen to be not enough, but at the time, it was more, in fact, than they wanted. I remember thinking at the time 'If we don't offer this, matters will get much worse. I saw it as a way of maintaining a necessary level of central control by offering a level of involvement -'tokenism', it came to be called later: the notion that someone might know better than others, or that there were academic traditions to defend being derisively hooted down (Greenfield interview, 16.1.91).

Those who worked with him, many of whom he himself had employed, had other views. Greenfield's leadership style

was seen as autocratic and imperious; his ideas were unassailable and the positions he took on issues were very extreme, and he was always right. One of his early colleagues, an academic whom Greenfield had recruited from USA, put it thus:

He's really either black or white, so, if he believes in something, or he has a view, he'll be very firm on it. He's not a middle-of-the-road person. Three years into his term, Thom started to have some trouble. His tendency to paint people either black or white started to catch up with him. There was a merit system that resulted in some getting extra pay. Thom administered this and he did not do it very well. People just objected. There were issues of employment too, that made people mad (Hickcox interview, 1.11.90).

The situation was becoming highly destructive both for individuals and for the organisation as a whole. By the end of the academic year 1970-71, the battle lines were well and truly drawn. The faculty was large and powerful. Some scholars had widely respected academic reputations and were senior people in the academic world. Some took offence at the policies and procedures Greenfield was initiating. Some objected to what was described as Greenfield's "autocratic rule" (Scott interview, 7.6.94). Many were "in awe" of Greenfield's critical intelligence, felt uncomfortable in intellectual discussions with him and experienced a sense of professional (perhaps even personal) inferiority (Scott interview, 7.6.94). One of his colleagues had dubbed Greenfield as "the man who would be king" (House interview, 7.6.94) and regarded his manner of leadership as "imperious and impervious to any and every other view except his own".

In his view, Greenfield was totally incapable of self criticism. So, there were personal animosities in play in the department at the time. But there were other forces at work too. Some of the Canadians on staff at OISE objected to working with scholars recruited from USA, "those carpet baggers who showed no commitment to the place, who looked after their own interests first and who played fast and loose with their responsibilities" (House interview, 7.6.94). There were cultural animosities at play too and Greenfield was the focus of both. Nearly everyone was fed up with dealing with him. Curiously, Greenfield seemed to be unaware of much of this foment. He certainly did not appreciate its depth nor passion.

Greenfield's tenure as Head of Department was not renewed after the initial period, 1966-1972. Facts are now vague as to the exact order and nature of events that led to his being "ousted" from the position (Hickcox interview 1.11.90). Whatever happened and at what and by whose instigation, it was nasty, and in some way everyone in the department at the time suffered. There were, in fact, no winners. As Greenfield wrote later: "different people live within different realities" (1979b:99). Perceptions differ. Some remember the events hazily. Some do not remember at all. Some shared their recollections with a couple of strong 'caveats'. Others refused to talk about those times because of the sensitive nature of the events. For still others, time and life experiences in the ensuing

twenty five years have so coloured their memories that the objective, factual truths have been lost. Professor Robin Farquhar, who followed Greenfield as Head, recalled:

Because I was serving as Deputy Director of the University Council for Educational Administration in Columbus, Ohio, at the time when OISE decided to recruit a new Department Chair in Ed. Admin. I knew very little about the events leading up to that decision in Toronto. My recollection of what I heard leaves me uncertain that Greenfield actually resigned from the Department Chairmanship. I think I was given to understand that as his term of office in that position neared its end, and the normal review process was conducted, the Department arrived at the conclusion that it was time to seek new Chair. I also heard that there was a considerable amount of 'politicking' involved during that process and that there were 'pro-Barr' and 'anti-Barr' camps. I seem to recall being told that Larry Iannaccone was active in this regard. (Personal correspondence, 1993.07.23).

Glenn Scott called it "the palace coup" (Interview, 7.6.94) Some could scarcely remember what the issues were but recalled that both staff and students were "split in a horrible way" (Hickcox interview, 1.11.90). House's interpretation was that "there were one or two substantive issues involved but primarily it was a situation of petty concerns and mean spirited behavior which is not uncommon in the academic world" (House interview, 7.6.94). Doctor John Stapleton from the University of Manitoba, who was a student at OISE in the early 1970s recalled that Greenfield had supporters and detractors:

His supporters claimed that he had done a good job and deserved re-appointment, whereas ... those who favored a change in leadership thought that a person with different attributes would be able to create the kinds of linkages with senior educational leaders that would

be needed by the Department in the future (Stapleton, 1994:237).

A few definite and generally agreed-upon facts do emerge from the data. The Department of Educational Administration at OISE in 1970-71 was experiencing some kind of turmoil in the midst of great public expectations and much organisational growth. Some of this turmoil was caused by individuals pursuing their own careers to the detriment of the organisation as a whole. Consequently, life within the organisation was difficult and unpleasant for some. Greenfield's leadership style and behavior were at the centre of the storm. In the natural course of events and nearing the end of his first term as Chair, Greenfield was challenged for the position but expected to continue as Chair. He was completely unaware of the strength of feeling against him.

This lack of awareness of the destructive and personally dangerous climate within the department is indeed puzzling and one can only speculate on the reasons. It is curious that Greenfield had no sense of the degree of discontent and ferment within the department. Staff and students had taken sides and there was real animosity within the Department and he was at the centre of it and he did not know. Perhaps he did know but relied on his own competence and skill to prevail. This is possible. At times, Greenfield's behavior exhibited arrogance and he acted with absolute resolution and complete faith that his

view was the right view. One close friend of Greenfield's over the years, in response to some queries, replied:

An extremely kind person, he could also be cold, rejecting, heartless. He believed that you had to be those things to be a good and righteous administrator, that, in order to make decisions, ultimately, you have to abandon feelings and take action, based on principle (Personal correspondence, 1996).

Indeed, when the impact was felt, Greenfield had no defenses. Was he merely naive? or totally immersed in his own world so that the signs of what one of his colleagues at OISE at the time has called "one of those horrible internecine warfares you get inside organisations" (Hickcox interview, 1.11.90) just passed him by? What were the reasons? Greenfield offered some of his own solution years later, when time had passed and he had shaped and formed for himself, both consciously and unconsciously, a new reality:

The world we know is created by our perception of it. We learn to see and we build what we see ... We believe in the ideas in our heads. We trust our models for the world so deeply that we *make* them true. We will them to be true (Greenfield, 1983:294).

In terms of the word, "make", Greenfield in his own inimitable way, noted the difference between the German *machen* meaning "to cause to happen" and *schaffen* meaning "to give form/shape to" (p300). In other words, the existence of the world is "God's handiwork or responsibility, but the form, shape and reality of the world we see and experience are all our own doing" (p300).

Sometimes the world of social reality and that of personal experience clash. This was the first significant and life-changing clash for Greenfield in the early 1970s. There were others that were equally cataclysmic for him.

Laurence Iannaccone was remembered as "the leader of the faction" (Hickcox interview, 1.11.90) to have Greenfield replaced as Chair. Iannaccone had been a doctoral student of Griffiths at Teachers College in 1957-1958 and was a specialist in the politics of education. People recalled that Iannaccone was "a little bit like Greenfield in style and personality" (Hickcox interview). Greenfield had appointed him to the department and he was one of the most prominent scholars at OISE at the time. Greenfield's recollection of events was that Iannaccone came to him and said he wanted the job: that he could get it if he wanted it and that the best thing Greenfield could do was to just step down. Greenfield was completely dumbfounded. He recalled:

This was my first encounter with the Realpolitik of organisations, and, of course, it rubbed me the wrong way. I might have been persuaded to leave and go back to doing what I really preferred. I decided he was wrong, that he didn't have the power, and even if he did, I wasn't going to go that way. The ensuing months were sheer hell. He was a consummate political animal and he was able to find enough resentment about things I had done and exploit this. It came to a vote of the whole Department, staff, students, support staff - everybody. I could see that to win by a small margin, which I did, was not enough, so I quit (Greenfield and Ribbins, 1993:235).

He never forgot the feelings evoked in him by this kind of

organisational competitiveness. The whole experience and his continuing reflections on the reality of professional (and personal) rejection formed one powerful influence on what, for the moment, was a nascent and iconoclastic theory of organisation. Some years later he wrote:

our own experience of our own organisations is a valuable resource. It is with this experience that the organisational theorist must begin to understand the nature of organisations (Greenfield,1975c:91).

And, later still, reflecting upon this experience with Doctor R.J.S. Macpherson, Greenfield mused:

... I realised that when you get forced to the edge of the cliff, as it were, and you are struggling for your life in some sense, there is nothing behind you, just yourself! (Macpherson, 1984:2)

Herein lay the roots of Greenfield's subjectivism. It is individual people who form organisations and the drama of their lives, in interaction with others, becomes the drama of organisations. A full articulation of this thinking will still be some years away, years when the direction of Greenfield's life, both personally and professionally, changed dramatically and in which his own particular art and practice of educational administration were definitely shaped.

There is a sense in which Greenfield always felt something of a misfit in academic life from this time onwards. Certainly, the next ten to fifteen years of his life caused him to experience a continuous professional

unease and rejection. The intensity of these feelings varied, according to the moment and the event. For example, the immediate aftermath of IIP '74 was traumatic for him and the years that followed had both their highs and lows, but the feeling of not belonging, the feeling of ostracisation persisted, until perhaps, the year before his death in December, 1992. This will be explored further in Chapter Ten.

Greenfield did, in fact, resign, and continued for some months to see himself as a victim of a department power struggle (Stapleton, 1994:237). There was, however, a kind of "sweet victory" for Greenfield in that:

... the man who declared his aspirations to me to take over at the end of the year, returned to the USA. His pretensions had been revealed completely, and the kind of person he was. It didn't do him any good. I only hope he learned something too - something about a dogged character pursuing a hopeless principle (Greenfield interview, 16.1.91).

Iannacone accepted an appointment as Chairman of the Graduate School of Administration, University of California at Riverside, and so, achieved what he was aiming for. His experience at OISE acted as a stepping stone to promotion in USA, and, for some years, Iannacone's focus shifted from research, teaching and writing to practical administration. He learned at first hand some of the realities of administration as Greenfield had.

The process leading to the non-renewal of his

position as Head of Department influenced Greenfield's career fundamentally. Professor Robin Farquhar was chosen as Head. Greenfield, after some initial "licking of wounds" (Greenfield interview 16.1.91) took sabbatical leave.

Publications: 1967-1972

During the period 1967 - 1972, Greenfield authored or co-authored, ten publications. *Research on the Behavior of Educational Leaders: Critique of a Tradition* (1968) was a revised version of a paper delivered at the American Educational Research Association (AERA) conference February 1967, in New York. Greenfield's task in the conference paper was to review the research into leadership, that had been occurring in Canadian school systems over some years. Both his Masters thesis and Doctoral dissertation were based on aspects of leadership and leadership was an enduring interest, so the task held great interest for him. Much of the leadership research of the time used the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) emanating from the Ohio Leadership Studies. Greenfield mentioned "the bloom of LBDQ-based research and psychometric survey designs" (Greenfield, 1968:73) firstly at the University of Alberta and later in other Canadian centres over a ten year period and attributed this fascination of researchers in educational administration with the LBDQ, to "the interest and direction of Andrews" (p55).

The paper stressed the importance of system-based

concepts of organisations, defined as "multi-faceted systems" (p58) and reviewed various leadership studies under four categories, that of input, social structure, social process and output. The general critique of the research which followed, identified the lack of adequate theory " or at least, the lack of attention to theory" (p70) as the fundamental problem in leadership research. The critique then focused on the LBDQ from the bases of the underlying theory and research design. Greenfield noted that the Ohio Leadership Studies began, virtually, without theory (p70) and that later, "theoretical formulations from various sources in organisation theory, small group theory and role theory were used to provide a framework for the LBDQ" (p70). The LBDQ described patterns of behavior exhibited by leaders at a particular time and said nothing about changing patterns nor patterns persisting over time, the sequence of patterns, the kind of group in which the patterns were found nor their relationship with the environment (p57). The salient question remained: "what can a leader do about his scores on the LBDQ or other similar tests?" (p72). Greenfield commented further that:

Theories of leadership are not theories of leading any more than theories of learning are theories of teaching. In studies of leadership we are only beginning to understand the nature of the phenomenon. How this knowledge can be used to improve leader behavior and organisational performance has largely still to be discovered (p72).

Greenfield also mentioned "one shot designs" in leader

behavior research, in which "process can be described only in unidimensional terms" (p73). He stressed the need to create research designs that would permit the study of the dynamics of group process and group process changes over time.

Reflecting on this paper almost twenty five years later, Greenfield recalled that it was firmly within the tradition of the day, that is within the mode of thought and style of the Theory Movement, with emphasis on empirical methods and statistical analysis. He encouraged the use of "classical controlled experimentation" (p73) and the application of techniques of multivariate analysis in explanatory studies, methods with which he was very familiar and skilled in implementing (as his prior research and papers indicate). Yet there was some recognition that these methods were inadequate as a means for studying the complex reality and practice of leadership. He dated the beginnings of his own misgivings about the value of the quantitative approach as a means of promoting understanding about such subjective concepts as educational leadership, to about the time of this paper. A skilled statistician and a former director of research, Greenfield was beginning to question tentatively the logical empiricist approach to understanding the world. In fact, he declared that, in a sense, because of his background and training in the arts, he understood from very early in his academic career that "the world was a mystery, and that

understanding of this mystery was gained only with great difficulty, much work and no little scepticism (Greenfield interview, 16.1.91). Years later Greenfield would articulate over and over again his unswerving conviction that these supposedly objective, statistical analyses on which so much of the research relied for truth, were enormously subjective and dependent upon the observation and interpretation of the researcher and that quantitative research alone was useless as a means of understanding the world and suggesting solutions for social problems. This paper did indeed signal some incipient unease with the accepted creed and methodology of the day. Greenfield's unease and scepticism only increase from hereon.

The restructuring of Ontario's schools during the late 1960s and the subsequent confusion and possible chaos had a pervasive influence on all things educational at that time. One of the areas of special interest for Greenfield then was the issue of educational goals and objectives and their interaction with and relationship to all other aspects of the school and system. *Creating Effective School Programs* (1970a) developed a framework for the creation of school programs, all dependent on a "clear statement of educational objectives by the school system" (p20). Greenfield admitted that the structure outlined in the article was ideal and might seem far removed from "the hurly burly of the classroom" (p22), but considered the task of program development "an awesome responsibility" and

one that rested at the individual school level, in interplay with system processes and directions.

This emphasis on the local school in interplay with the system was mentioned again in Greenfield's section of the Review symposium on Morris Janowitz's 1969 book, *Institution Building in Urban Education*. This symposium was published in *Interchange* (1970b). In usual *Interchange* style, there were two reviewers, - the other being Robert J. Havighurst - and the author was given the right of reply. Greenfield's review was an "approving" one (p131). He noted that the book was "an analysis of the relationship between school structure and educational goals" (p127) and applauded the conclusion that "the individual school and its programs are the key to improvement" (p128). He commented that institution building was by no means limited to schools, nor more specifically, only to urban schools but applied to schools in general. Janowitz agreed. Greenfield declared that the most important contribution in the book was the "recognition that the roots of many educational problems lie in the relationship between schools and school systems" (p128) and that Janowitz was really advocating a managerial revolution of schools and school systems. The difficulty lay, Greenfield believed in that:

school systems rarely set clear educational goals or meaningful standards that schools may use as criteria for assessing their programs ... and schools have

remarkably little scope for developing programs (p129).
and that:

most school systems are out of control in the sense that they have no clear notion of what they are trying to do, little information about what educational programs in schools are really doing and no way of finding out (p129).

Greenfield's solution was to regard the two models discussed in the book, the aggregation and the specialisation models, as complementary rather than mutually exclusive. The school and the system were interdependent, each one influencing and being influenced by the other. Schools needed to decide on their own appropriate goals and to set structures that best served those goals. In so doing, the system would then be well served. For Greenfield it was school first, system second.

The years 1970-71 were difficult years for Greenfield as Chair of the Department. His administration role left little time for his academic work, yet the period 1967-1972 saw the focus of Greenfield's work and scholarly interest move to schools and school systems and issues connected with schools and reorganisation. His interest in educational goals and objectives, their nature and meaning, and the processes for goal setting continued and was reflected in the papers of this period.

Developing Accountability in School Systems

(Greenfield, 1972a) focused on goals and goal setting. Greenfield did not consider accountability simply another

"faddish slogan" (Greenfield, 1972c:21) nor only one of the current interests among contemporary issues in education, destined to fade away quickly. Rather he saw accountability in education as an enduring, significant and challenging feature of the educational scene, "one of the fundamental aspects of the administrative task" (p22) involving both individuals and the organisation as a whole and always to be considered in relationship to the goals and objectives of the organisation. In this article Greenfield addressed the pertinent questions of "accountability for what? and accountability to whom?" (p22) proposed five guidelines for increasing accountability in schools and suggested some possible actions that principals might take in response to the introduction of an accountability program in their school system. The article is as relevant today as it was twenty years ago. Indeed "the challenge of problems in accountability is not easily met, though it enlivens the present world of the administrator and promises to remain with us for some time in the future" (p29).

The paper that Greenfield presented to the OISE-OSTC (The Ontario School Trustees' Council) conference, *Financing Public Education in Ontario: Analysing Choices for Effective Planning* May 1971, was revised for publication and printed in the proceedings of the conference entitled *The Planning Process: A Systems*

Perspective for School Boards (1972). Greenfield's paper was entitled *Relating Educational Objectives, Programs and Resources: Policy Analysis for School Systems* (1972d). The introductory remarks centred on the relationship between educational objectives and the allocation of resources. Greenfield's argument focused on his beliefs that "school systems have taken on the job of achieving unlimited objectives with limited resources" (Greenfield, 1972d:27) and that "a real and necessary tension exists between our educational goals and our ability or willingness to achieve them" (p28). Greenfield declared that:

... it is better to recognise explicitly that these two values- the educational and the monetary - underlie all policies developed for school systems, and ... both trustees and administrators struggle with these two competing values, with the result that educational policies bear the marks of inconsistency, expediency, or unsatisfactory compromise (pp28-29).

The paper proceeded to give a specific example (accompanied by eleven tables of statistical analysis) of how a system analytical approach could be applied to educational planning and policy analysis. The example was from the field study completed for York Borough (1972b) and the paper was reprinted as *Policy Analysis in Education: Looking at the Alternatives* (Greenfield, 1972e).

Educational Goals for a School System, (1973a), built on the York Borough Study (Greenfield, 1972b). This is discussed in the following section among Greenfield's field studies. It focused upon "our particular ambivalence

toward educational goals" (Greenfield, 1973a:13) that came from "our reluctance or inability to resolve fundamental issues about what schools are and what they should aim to do" (p13). The article described the process undertaken by an Ontario school system to increase the responsiveness of its schools to educational needs. This immediately surfaced the problem of defining goals "because discussion of increasing responsiveness in schools is difficult when we don't know to what schools should be responding" (p13). The research design involved, in true positivist method, a simple classification of four tasks of education which devolved into thirteen sub-tasks and these devolved further into forty nine specific goals. A later Greenfield would have considered such a classification and hierarchy of goals from those of priority importance, to high importance, to moderate importance and low importance as absurd and providing little meaningful data for school communities. The early 1970s Greenfield did acknowledge that little was known then about processes for setting educational goals. He advocated that different schools and communities establish their own specific goals within an agreed-upon, general framework of educational tasks and avoid the possibility of unilateral goal setting by powerful groups or individuals within the system.

Greenfield's other publications from this period were research field studies that are grouped together and discussed in the next section.

The Field Studies: 1969-1976

The overall goal of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) is to make a contribution to education as a field of both theoretical and applied scholarship. Both theory and practice are considered of equal importance. At the requests of school boards and/or school systems, OISE staff have worked 'in the field' since the beginning of the Institute. Such field studies have always been viewed as important links with educational communities throughout the province. The belief is that the collaboration of academics and practitioners improves the quality of educational practice and refines educational theory. Greenfield became involved in field studies early in his career at OISE.

Developing School Systems: Planning, Organisation and Personnel. A Manual for Trustees, Administrators and Teachers (1969), coauthored with House, Hickcox and Buchanan, was the first of six published works for Greenfield, spanning the period from 1969 to 1976. Cooperative ventures of OISE staff in field work were commonplace. Because of similarities in the nature of the field studies and in the issues under discussion, this section considers all six of Greenfield's field studies together and therefore, disturbs the chronological analysis of his work.

On January 1, 1969, one of the most sweeping

restructurings of Canadian education occurred in Ontario. Nearly fifteen hundred school districts were reorganised into one hundred and twenty five jurisdictions. The political belief was that "bigger was better", a belief that was not shared widely throughout the community. Consequently, the closure of schools and the amalgamation of school districts raised many complex technical, organisational and values issues for stakeholders throughout the province. Inevitably, because of its charter, the staff of the preeminent Graduate School of Education in the province would be involved in helping teachers and administrators cope with and take charge of such extensive changes. In fact, as respected scholars, from the public's point of view, they gave credibility to the changes.

This particular project, the first published that bears the name, T.B. Greenfield, was directed by House, and was described in the Preface as:

a practical guide for all those who strive to develop organisation for productive schools, and is particularly directed at the trustees and administrators who must continually grapple with the realities of these problems (Greenfield et al.1969:i).

It aimed to present a synthesis of selected theory and research and apply this to practical problems in educational administration, so models of planning and decision making were developed, with the emphasis on "what is practical". Each chapter was developed around an

educational proposition and contained a theoretical discussion of the issues and principles involved and a section of practical strategies, guidelines and suggestions. The manual clearly advocated the principles and method of management by objectives and was a valuable handbook for school boards and systems administrators in Ontario at that time.

One can only speculate on the level and degree of Greenfield's involvement in the project. He was Chair of the Department of Educational Administration at OISE and a publicly renowned figure and therefore, his name would have added status to any such field project. Working on school system-based projects was part of creating a reputation, a public, visible image in the community for OISE, and certainly enhanced one's personal career. Such projects also raised considerable amounts of money both for individuals and their institutions. Professor Ed Hickcox, whom Greenfield had employed at OISE and with whom he collaborated on other field study projects, recalled that Greenfield was "good":

He was good in a group. I've never met a person who was better at group discussion. He can read. He can sit there and listen to a discussion, and he has a great ability to say one or two sentences that are so precise, and you can't get off the hook. He was in the field a lot and we did a lot of that kind of work (Hickcox interview, 1.11.90).

The second field project of this period which focused on school system structure and organisation was

Developing and Assessing Objectives for School System Planning: A Report for the Board of Education for the Borough of York (1972b). Authored by Greenfield alone, the study reported the findings of a survey taken in May 1971 to identify and assess educational objectives in York Borough. The study confined itself to the setting of curriculum objectives and attempted to answer such questions as:

Are schools designed to transmit knowledge and, if so, what kinds of knowledge? Is the role of schools to prepare people for the world of work? Should schools attempt to solve social and personal problems? Should schools transmit our cultural heritage and prepare people for responsible citizenship? (Greenfield, 1972b:4).

Five groups in the York Borough Board of Education completed the questionnaire on objectives during the school year 1970-71 - members of the Education Council, coordinators and consultants, elementary teachers, secondary teachers, and trustees. The research design was that of the classic survey; the analysis of results was purely statistical. Greenfield based the study on "the cycle of educational planning" (p3) and concluded that coming to consensus on goals and objectives was an almost impossible task for school communities because of the myriad of intervening variables. Some of these he named were: the lack of existing structures in school systems to support objective setting; the failure to put objectives into practice and a failure to understand that stating

objectives was only the beginning point in the effective planning and management of school systems and led on through program development and evaluation to return to objective setting and policy-making (pp46-57). Greenfield wondered who should decide what in setting school system objectives; should objectives be developed to apply across the school system as a whole; should they be developed by individual schools, or by teachers within schools (pp51-53). The report is thorough and comprehensive, statistically valid and soundly argued. It was a working document for a School Board that was trying to develop a planned approach to management and one, certainly, that could only add to Greenfield's already growing reputation as a significant scholar and statistician in the Canadian educational scene.

The Structure and Process of Decision Making in a School System: An Evaluation report on Organisational Change in Grey County (1972c) was a similar study to that done for York Borough and preceded those field studies done for the Boards of Education of Waterloo County (1974), Wellington County (April, 1976) and Lakehead (June, 1976). The Grey County field study was a cooperative work by a study team from OISE, consisting of Greenfield, Hickcox, Doris Ryan and Scott. The team had acted as consultants to the Director and other senior administrators of Grey County Board of Education as they designed a new organisational structure that was intended

to facilitate communication and decision making within the school system. This particular report was an evaluation of the changes that had occurred over the previous two years and was based upon the team's selected observations and interviews with central administrators, principals and Board members. The team noted their limited observations of community responses to the changes and little contact with schools and acknowledged elements of subjective judgment involved in moving from data to findings to recommendations. Greenfield and Ryan were responsible for the sections on objective setting (the subject of the York study) and community involvement. Hickcox and Scott attended to the section on administrative structure. The research design for the section on objective setting involved observation of a number of meetings through which the objective setting process was carried out and the application of two questionnaires to principals followed up with group discussion of responses and associated issues. The reactions of both principals and the community were noted and commented upon and six recommendations were offered to the Board to help in clearing up some problem areas with community involvement in objective setting. Again, the report was a working document for administrators and probably articulated what those involved already were aware of. However, weight was given to the document and its recommendations because of the scholarship and reputation of the academics involved. Greenfield

recognised that many of the issues being raised in these field studies were value issues and not essentially technical issues but he was also aware that he usually argued the technical case and gave it credibility.

Structure, Decision-Making and Communication in the Waterloo County School System (1974) was published in May 1974, before Greenfield's presentation to IIP'74 in Bristol. In the two years since the publication of the last field study, much had happened that had major impact on Greenfield personally and professionally. He was no longer Chair of the Department of Educational Administration at OISE and had been deeply affected by the process and conditions of his ultimate resignation from this position. He had taken a period of sabbatical leave 1972-73 when he spent some time at the University of Alberta, the University of British Columbia and some months in Germany. There were signs of great changes in his thinking during this time. Clear signals were given in his 1973 paper for the AERA conference of that year and published in the *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* but they had gone largely unnoticed. Greenfield used ask, "How many administrators read the Journal of Behavioral Science?" (Greenfield interview, 4.10.90). Upon return to OISE he was promoted to full Professor and began teaching anew and picking up some of the threads of a former life. This field study was one of those threads. It was a joint venture of OISE and the Midwestern Field

Centre (MFC) and here Greenfield worked with Doris Ryan again, with Janet McIntosh and Art Schwartz from OISE and with John Davis and John Ross from MFC. This too was an evaluation report that focused on the reorganisation of the Waterloo system, based on the functional design recommended in *Developing School Systems* (1969, reprinted 1973). Greenfield was credited with major responsibility for combining the earlier analyses into a cohesive document (Greenfield et al. 1974:iv). There are common elements, even similar phrasing, in this report and the two previous reports and this is not unexpected given the similar nature of the studies. Only the school districts were different. The foci of the study were again the Board, the Director and senior administrators, the three academic divisions of Operation, Planning and Development and Educational Services and, in this study, the schools. Three vital aspects of organisation are targetted for evaluation, namely the administrative structure, procedures for decision making and communication within the organisation. As consultants, the OISE team came to the task largely as strangers needing firstly, to get to know the organisation and understand it "in a way that people within the organisation understand it" (p1). The ultimate aim was to reflect their knowledge of the system back to the administrators to help them in informed decision-making "on what the organisation should be like and whether changes are needed to make the present organisation conform more

closely to the purposes they would like it to serve" (p1).

The method of investigation relied heavily on interviews and observing meetings, a design that Greenfield had used before. The report consisted of an Introductory chapter and then proceeded to discuss the decision making process, basic problems and key issues and concluded by presenting some theoretical propositions already stated in *Developing School Systems* and discussing the alternatives from these perspectives by way of recommendations. The report made clear that the recommendations reflected the values of the study team and not necessarily those of a majority of people in the Waterloo system. For each problem two prevailing viewpoints about how the problem should be resolved were identified: the first viewpoint reflected and supported the existing organisation or practice; the second reflected the belief that some alteration was needed in the existing state of affairs (p23). And this because the interviewees made statements that were supportive of both the "status quo" and the "change" viewpoint. The discussion section provided an elaboration of the viewpoint which favoured some change. In this way nothing was lost. The analysis of key issues was made from the consultants' point of view.

Very early in the Introduction something of Greenfield's "new thinking" can be detected. He wrote:

We worked on the assumption that no one can know an

organisation completely, or, more accurately, that everyone sees an organisation from his [sic] own particular vantage point. We have tried to combine the viewpoints of many people who see the Waterloo school system from very different places in the structure. What emerged from this procedure was not a single "right" view of the organisation, but a multi-faceted expression of it (p1).

This assumption contained elements that would come to be called "subjectivism" and would be particularly associated with Greenfield's theory of organisation. The emphasis on individual perception of reality is mentioned; the sharing of multiple views to come to a greater grasp of the nature of organisation is noted, and most critically and in a break from one of the dominant beliefs of the Theory Movement, the assertion that there is no right view of the organisation is made.

Most of Greenfield's published articles written around this time were school focused. The reorganisation of schooling in Ontario in the late 1960s provided both an educational and entrepreneurial opportunity for OISE academics. The opportunity was there for some first-hand involvement with school districts and boards of trustees and with educational personnel from classroom teachers to administrators at the highest level. The research possibilities were extensive and the impetus to thinking and developing ideas both in practice and in publications was vast. Greenfield's early Field Study reports reflected his interest and growing expertise in school-based or system-based research. The later ones, that is

those of the mid to late 1970s, especially those for the Wellington County Board (1976d) and the Lakehead Board (1976e), represented efforts of colleagues to involve an embittered and increasingly academically and personally isolated Faculty member and erstwhile friend, in an area in which he had once excelled.

The last two of Greenfield's field study reports were published in 1976: *Creating and Changing Curriculum in a School System: A Design for Development, Implementation and Evaluation* (1976d) and *A Study of the Organisational Structure of the Lakehead Board of Education* (1976e). This year was a kind of transition year for Greenfield, academically and professionally. The positivist years of his thinking were at an end. His publications from 1973-1976 waver, in essence and meaning, between positivist and subjectivist thinking. The last of his publications in positivist, quantitative vein came from 1976. That was also the year in which *Theory About What? Some more thoughts about theory in educational administration* (1976f) was published and then followed years of explanatory and sometimes defensive publications in which he sought to clarify the position he outlined in the 1974 IIP paper. These were the years of the intense so-called "Griffiths-Greenfield" debate, which are discussed in chapters six and seven.

Creating and Changing Curriculum in a School System

(1976d) was a report to the Wellington County Board of Education. Greenfield was the Project Coordinator and the team comprised researchers from the Department of Curriculum at OISE, the Midwestern Field Centre and the Trent Valley Centre. Similar to that of other studies, the report was commissioned by the Board trustees; there was great concern for change and evaluation in education and the focus of the study was the process of decision making. The differences occurred in the focus of the study. After ten years of reform there had been considerable decentralisation of curriculum and decision making in curriculum was the issue throughout the school system. The report complimented the trustees for:

probing into important educational and philosophical issues ... and questioning why decisions should be made and what their effects will be as well as what they might cost (Greenfield et al. 1976c:viii).

This was a clear break with the historical role of trustees in Ontario education. The report noted that:

Times are changing ... [Trustees] are taking initiatives in developing policies and making independent decisions about critical values in education (pviii).

The introduction to the report developed and encouraged the changing role of trustees, a change that began to occur as the Ministry of Education centralised the administration of schools into large school districts and at the same time,

decentralised much of its authority on curriculum matters to these districts. With this major expansion in the role of trustees that is, to assume expanded responsibilities for the content of curriculum and for the development and evaluation of it (p7) in April 1975, the Board commissioned a study "which would bring forward recommendations regarding the most effective means of developing, implementing and evaluating local curriculum" (p7). The analysis began during September 1975, and the report and recommendations were completed in April 1976.

The study was carried out in four distinct phases. The first provided a description of curriculum processes within the school system; the second provided feedback to various groups within the system to check the validity of the initial descriptions; the third considered problems and difficulties observed in curriculum processes and the fourth developed implications for change and improvement. The research design focused on observation, interviews and documentary analysis. The report was careful to present "as little interpretive comment as possible" (p73) but warned that some interpretation was inevitable since something of the researchers' sense of issues and problems was always conveyed. The report noted that:

recurring efforts [were made] to check the validity of the descriptions and to ensure that the issues and problems we saw in them were shared at least among major groups in the school system (p73).

Periodic spot checks were made and information, observations and impressions of the study team which each had collected independently, were pooled and checked. Tentative impressions were thus assessed into more secure generalisations and were reported as preliminary findings. These preliminary findings were reported and validated by means of a questionnaire distributed to representatives of all stakeholder groups. Groups were then invited to discuss these findings.

The analysis of the data was a critical description of curriculum processes. Researchers' observations were recorded and what actually happened was contrasted against a model for curriculum development based on four stages, namely assessment of needs, development of curriculum, implementation and evaluation. The movement was from "what is" to "what should be". The section on evaluation considered quantitative vs. qualitative evaluation (p110) and commented upon the "... mistaken notion [that] equates measurement with evaluation" then proceeded to warn that:

... measuring something to describe it does not ensure that [we] have measured the right aspects of it, nor does it provide us with an appropriate standard for judging the numerical outcome ... adequate evaluation requires, first, that curriculum be described in both quantitative and qualitative terms and it requires, secondly, that the standard for judging the curriculum be clearly identified and independently applied by those for whom the evaluation is done (p110-111).

The warning was against intertwining description and analysis so closely that the effect of both is lost. These

statements are significant in the light of one criticism levelled at Greenfield's later theory of research.

The report concluded with few recommendations, because of the complexity of the issues involved and discussed fully in the body of the report, particularly in the analysis chapter; and because the team of researchers chose to convey a simple, clear message where the force and broad intent of the recommendations was unmistakable and where there was plenty of room for local initiative. Detail was shunned in favor of clear communication of the basic thrust of the recommendations. The Board was offered much eminently readable material and "hands-on" suggestions on which to detail their own recommendations and to develop their own blueprints for action.

The last of the field studies that involved Greenfield was *A Study of the Organisational Structure of the Lakehead Board of Education* (1976e). Frank Mitchell, a Doctoral candidate at OISE, was the Project Coordinator, and the OISE team included Professor Robin Farquhar, Assistant Director, Doctor Glenn Scott, Assistant Coordinator of Graduate Studies, Professor Tom Williams, Chairman, Department of Educational Administration and Greenfield. Compared with the Wellington County Report, this is a very slim volume. The purpose was "to analyse the effectiveness of the administrative and decision-making structure" (Greenfield et al. 1976e:5) of the Lakehead

Board of Education. Consequently, an examination was also made of the relationships between the Board and its senior administrators. The context of the study was similar to the other field studies. The Board had been created by the 1969 amalgamation and had a very complex structure which impacted on many other levels of organisation and on relationships throughout the Board and school system. The foci of the study were very prescribed namely, organisational structure, administrative practices and relationships between and among Board, administrative and supervisory personnel.

The data gathering techniques were interviews, with emphasis upon individual, in-depth interviews (of trustees, administrators, supervisors and principals), observation of group meetings and document analysis. Some preparatory work had to be done by the team in order to clarify expectations and to allay the fears that various groups seemed to entertain regarding the team. The study began in February 1976 and concluded mid May 1976. The team made three separate data-gathering trips to Thunder Bay during this time.

The report noted some interesting qualifications in the description of the context and issues involved. In identifying problems, perceptions of different people were dealt with and widely-shared perceptions were sufficient to label an issue as a concern needing attention. A number of

generalisations were reflected. Exceptions and different points of view were expected and acknowledged. Observations were based on numerous repetitions of the same basic concerns and the focus was on issues rather than on personalities (p10). Five major problems were identified (p11) and the report discussed each in turn and related each to one central cause, that is the fact that the Lakehead trustees had set themselves up as a "shadow administration" to encourage the "short circuiting" of normal administrative channels and procedures (p19). The report, in effect, recommended a complete reorganisation of administrative structures. "Tinkering" (p28) was not sufficient, since the dysfunction was ubiquitous and was largely a matter of personalities and attitudes. A major challenge was to work to change these attitudes and to build a new foundation of trust and mutual respect throughout the system. Such a conclusion dealt with tangibles, that is the reorganisation of structures and intangibles, that is with values and value-directed action. This latter theme is one which Greenfield develops in much of his later work but the seeds of thought were already present in much of his earlier work.

When the last two field studies were being completed, Greenfield was starting to take a different direction in his thinking and writing. His positivist years were at an end and his subjectivist years were just beginning. Disquiet and turmoil were ahead for him. In a

sense the change was dramatic and sudden and marked by one critical event, the presentation of the IIP74 paper. In another sense, the change was gradual and progressive and for those who could see, the signs were present in many of Greenfield's papers of the late 1960s and early 1970s. From being the highly visible Head of the department Greenfield was to become an equally visible recalcitrant, isolated from colleagues and uncooperative in OISE affairs. Chapter Six concentrates on Greenfield's transition years from 1973 to 1976 and emphasises Greenfield's IIP74 experience and its immediate aftermath.