

CHAPTER 1

BUILDING AN IDEOGRAPHY - THE NATURE AND PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Sometimes I feel an emptiness in my personal life and wonder if ... I have sacrificed it to the pursuit of visions and ideas. If so, this was never a deliberate choice on my part, but something that somehow just happened. We all have our karma, and we must all live it out. (Greenfield, private correspondence 18.5.91).

Thomas Barr Greenfield's pursuit of visions and ideas began controversially and as he recalled, unexpectedly (Greenfield interview, 4.10.90) at the Third International Intervisitation Program (IIP) in Bristol, England, in July, 1974. On a Thursday in summer (Greenfield, 1977/78:86), Associate Professor Thomas Barr Greenfield presented a paper entitled *Theory in the Study of Organisations and Administrative Structures: A New Perspective*. The revised version for publication was retitled *Theory about Organisation: A New Perspective and its Implications for Schools* (1975c). He was totally unprepared for the reaction. He had arrived late for this section of the conference and copies of the paper had already been distributed. Professor Dan Griffiths recalled:

papers were distributed and rumours about Greenfield started to circulate. One was that he had left Canada

without his passport ... I had read his paper by this time and was thoroughly annoyed by it. I read it as a personal attack on everyone that I respected, Simon, Barnard, Getzels, Guba, March, Halpin, and even me. In fifty years of academic meetings I have never experienced anything like it ... (Griffiths, 1995:154)

Greenfield later recalled that he "watched with surprise and fascination, the furore which began with the presentation" (1977/78:86). He remembered "Griffiths' brooding presence" (Greenfield & Ribbins, 1993:244), his "seething rage" and the "electric atmosphere" (Greenfield interview, 4.10.90) in the room even before the presentation began ... "it was like a time bomb waiting to go off and I walked into the session with many doubts and uncertainties" (Greenfield & Ribbins, 1993:244).

Greenfield spoke to the paper briefly. Alan Crane from the University of New England, Armidale, Australia responded - "his response was largely to ignore the paper and to seek to repair the damage ... there was a forest of hands and questions ... everyone, it seemed, wanted to say something" (Greenfield & Ribbins, 1993:244 ; a lively and full account appears in Ribbins, 1993:244-245) and although it was not consciously intended, the gauntlet was well and truly thrown down.

In 1974, Thomas Greenfield was forty four years old. He had been Associate Professor of Educational Administration at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE), Toronto, since 1965. From 1967 to 1970, he was Chair of the Department of Educational

Administration. His academic career, to this point, had been unspectacular. Like many other Associate Professors of Educational Administration in Canada and the USA at the time, Greenfield's attention was shared between research, teaching and writing. He had 27 papers published prior to 1974 (see Appendix A) and for a few years, had been busy with the practical administration of a university department. Prior to the late 1960s/early 1970s, all of Greenfield's work had been done from a positivist background. He was something of an administrative scientist in the tradition of educational academics of his time. His post-graduate studies had been at the University of Alberta, 1959-1963. Greenfield was one of the first students to participate in the graduate studies program when, in 1956, the newly formed Division of Educational Administration at the University of Alberta succeeded in attracting Kellogg Foundation finance (Bergen, 1991:3).

However, since 1970 and possibly even before then - there is some evidence in a 1968 paper that his thinking was shifting - Greenfield was experiencing fundamental change in both his personal and professional life. These years of the early 1970s were turbulent ones for Greenfield. They were for the field of educational administration too (see Erikson, 1967; Brown & House, 1967; Griffiths, 1979; Hoy, 1982;). The experience at IIP1974 changed Greenfield's life. Greenfield in turn became the catalyst for wholesale change and renewal in the field of

educational administration and brought about what Griffiths called, "the end of an epoch" (in Hughes, 1988:3). The work of Greenfield's mature years and turmoil in educational administration were undoubtedly interrelated.

The Nature and Purpose of the Study

Thomas Greenfield's life and work form the centre of the study and set the pattern for two emphases, one intellectual and the other, what Greenfield called, "the interconnectedly personal" (Personal correspondence, 18.5.91) and what the study calls ideography and biography. Ideography covers the history and evolution of ideas. Biography considers some significant life events and experiences and while the major focus is on ideography, the symbiotic relationship of experience and ideas is noted and discussed where relevant and appropriate, using the autobiographical details that appear in print and Greenfield's personal reflections as source material.

The study aims to tell a story. The main character in the story is Thomas Greenfield, scholar, thinker, theorist, teacher, writer, critic and at times, self-conscious iconoclast. It traces his life and work from early student days in the late 1950s, through years of certainty when scholarly work was based on "the common academic understanding of normal science" (Kuhn, 1970:viii) and research was dedicated to "rationality and empiricism" (Greenfield, 1991b:2). The IIP 1974 paper marked

Greenfield's public turning point. Years of intellectual (and personal) ferment followed when he repeatedly challenged the cultural norms of educational administration promulgated by the USA, and most particularly by the University Council of Educational Administration (UCEA), and internationalised by the Theory Movement. Greenfield's challenge to the established order paralleled his conversion to the "human and humane" (Greenfield, 1985:21) understanding of life in organisations and to the conception of organisation as moral order. Moral order and values in administrative life form the central theme of Greenfield's later papers, thinking on which was largely unfinished at the time of his death on December 19, 1992.

For the most part, the story is told as seen and understood by Greenfield himself. Through a chronological description of Greenfield's work, published and unpublished the study aims to show the evolution and development of his thinking. Greenfield's comments on his papers, made in print and interviews, are used to ensure the closest understanding of meaning and intention contained in the text. As far as possible, Greenfield is used to interpret Greenfield. No exhaustive attempt has been made to analyse Greenfield's work in detail. Many scholars have already done this (see Allison, 1994: Bates, 1988; 1994: Evers & Lakomski, 1991: Gronn, 1983;1985;1994;1995: Harris, 1996) Hodgkinson, 1993: Holmes, 1986: Samier, 1995: Tucker, 1994). However, some analysis inevitably occurs in the

selection of material for comment, in the arrangement of data and in the imposition of the writer's interpretation of the text.

Greenfield's ideas are also tested against opposing ideas, especially against the thinking of Professors Dan Griffiths and Don Willower and of other scholars in Canada (see Allison's work), Britain (see the British Symposium, 1976) and Australia (see Bates, Evers and Lakomski and Gronn). Interviews were conducted with scholars in each of these countries. To some of these assessments of his work Greenfield responded. His responses heightened the quality of intellectual dialogue and encouraged greater understanding.

The importance of the study lies in the sociology of knowledge perspective it adopts. It does more than chronicle ideas. The ideas are contextualised within the historical and cultural perspectives of the field of educational administration, and in this context, their significance is revealed. The context considers such questions as what was the prevailing wisdom of the day? What ideas were Greenfield's ideas in critique of? How were they received? What does this imply about the development of the field? What ideas are driving the field now? Where is it going? Is it able to look at the ideas of critique at all? and what does this cost the field? In seeking out Greenfield's responses to these questions and

related issues, the study seeks to present as accurate and as complete a picture as possible of Greenfield's "pursuit of visions and ideas". The 'visions' began in epistemological questions and progressed into axiological issues. The ideas "succeeded in shaking the foundations" (Hughes, 1990:25) of the basic tenets of the then dominant Theory Movement and its logical positivist foundations and created the possibility within educational administration theory of "a diversity of paradigms, not as a transient transitional phase but as a way of life" (p25).

Outline of the Study

Chapter One has outlined the nature and purpose of the study and briefly alluded to the research methodology and to the specific methods employed.

Chapter Two provides a detailed examination of the research methodology, describing the qualitative, interpretive nature of the research and detailing the specific methods used to collect and analyse the data. Some difficulties and problems that were encountered during the research process and over the years of the study are noted. Some of these remain contentious and unsolved.

Chapter Three considers the historical and cultural contexts of educational administration until 1975 and identifies five stages in the understanding of the study and practice of educational administration.

Parallelling changes in people's understanding of educational administration were their understanding and use of the term "science". Chapter Four describes the main changes in meaning associated with this term, their origins and effects on the nature of educational administration. Particular emphasis is placed on logical positivism and theoretical science until 1975.

Within the context provided in chapters three and four Thomas Greenfield lived and worked. He was a strident critic of science-based administrative theories and spent his mature years critiquing the field and developing an alternative perspective that was subjectively based and emphasised the place of values, human intention and choice in organisations and administrative life. Chapter Five combines biography and ideography. After briefly describing Greenfield's early years, it covers the period to 1971 interweaving biography and descriptions of Greenfield's papers in year by year sequence in an attempt to follow the focus and direction of his thinking.

Chapter Six concentrates on the period 1973-1976 and details some of the facets that made this period the crisis point of Greenfield's life. The year-by-year analysis of his papers continues in this chapter and throughout the study. This chapter dwells on the International Intervisitation Program 1974 and the first reactions and early published comment to Greenfield's

paper.

Chapter Seven focuses on 1976-1977 and the beginnings of the so-called (and erroneously named) Griffiths-Greenfield debate and the continuing fallout from and interest in, Greenfield's IIP presentation.

Chapter Eight details events, papers and presentations from 1977-1980. Through some of his most significant publications (1977/78;1979a;1979b;1979c), the development of Greenfield's thinking is traced. The Griffiths-Greenfield dialogue continues and Professor Don Willower's entry into the discussion is noted.

Chapter Nine, entitled *Anti-Organisation Organizational Theory*, describes the period 1981-1990. The early 1980s were depressing and frustrating years in Greenfield's academic life. He isolated himself increasingly from his colleagues at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) and opted out of ordinary administrative routines like attending meetings and completing out paper work. This period began Greenfield's highly productive relationship with Australian scholars and saw a significant changing emphasis in his thinking. By 1984, he had ceased his preoccupation with self-defence in the face of criticism and was strongly and clearly proclaiming his critique and beliefs to all who would listen. Griffiths and Willower continued to refute his claims for a subjectivist approach to theory but with less

frequency and vehemence. Chapter Nine groups the relevant Griffiths and Willower papers in five year bands and notes the nature and focus of their comments on Greenfield's work.

Greenfield retired from the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) in December, 1990. Chapter Ten begins with Greenfield's retirement and then focuses upon his last two papers (1991b;1991c) both of which were written for conferences and which, taken together, provide a calm and clearly argued synthesis of his life work. Griffiths' and Willower's work up to 1995 and 1996 respectively is summarised and the chapter concludes with dialogues compiled from interview notes between Griffiths and Greenfield; and Willower and Greenfield on issues of importance to all three scholars.

Chapter Eleven considers Greenfield 's contribution to the field as seen by a number of scholars from differing educational administration cultures around the world. The chapter concludes with Greenfield's own reflection on his legacy to educational administration.

Finally, Chapter Twelve addresses the implications of the Greenfield story for the field of educational administration as seen by the author of the study. Against the background of the whole corpus of Greenfield's work, five significant issues are selected and discussed. The study concludes with the author wondering why all the fuss.

CHAPTER 2

METHODOLOGY

*All research is guided by a single principle:
use only those methods of inquiry that yield
reliable or truthful knowledge.*

(Greenfield, 1987:10)

This study began in doubt and uncertainty. Years of practice as an administrator in secondary schools had caused me to question the essence of organisational life and the nature of change within educational institutions. In the work-a-day world I was constantly faced with situations where individuals came into conflict with structures, with administration and with one another and had few clues about the nature of the unease they were feeling or how to calm those feelings within them and give their main energies to achieving the purposes of the school. I began to question and to ponder upon the real nature of life within organisations. Why were there so many differences among people who were intent upon the same goals? How is the fit between individual and organisation achieved? How does one achieve change in organisations? I wondered where I should look to quieten the misgivings within me. Then I discovered the work of Thomas Greenfield. In an article that was the precursor of his famous 1974 IIP paper, Greenfield questioned two critical

assumptions that appeared to underlie the then well-held view of organisations:

1) organisations exist apart from people. You can modify organisations or design new ones without changing people.

and

2) the goals of an organisation are independent of those held by individuals within it (Greenfield, 1973b:552).

Greenfield's view was that individuals and organisation are "inextricably intertwined" (p552); it is people who create organisations - " individuals not only create the organisation; they ARE the organisation" (p561), and, following Weber, the kinds of organisations we live in derive not from their structure but from the attitudes and experiences we bring to organisation from the wider society in which we live (p558). Greenfield's emphasis was on the meaning and intention of people. His view was that anyone setting out to change organisations must focus upon changing people. Greenfield contended that:

organisational change ... requires change in the meanings and purposes that individuals learn within their society (p559).

This was provocative thinking and touched upon beliefs that I already held but had been unable to articulate. Over a few years I collected and reflected upon any of the Greenfield articles I could manage to find. Unfortunately, they were hard to come by.

In 1984 the Catholic Education Office of Victoria and the Principals' Association of Victorian Catholic Secondary Schools sponsored a national conference entitled, *Axiology and Catholic Education - You, The Leader*. Professor Thomas Greenfield was the keynote speaker and I was there. Later, in a small group session, I met him and listened to him musing about the issues raised and urging people to think beyond their own parameters of thought and my curiosity and excitement at the radically different and provocative ideas he was sharing were stirred. What he was saying gave voice to my own experience and practice and helped me find words to describe and explain them. For the next five years, I read what I could of Greenfield and stored it away somewhere in my consciousness.

In 1989, I contacted Greenfield again. When I first mentioned to him the possibility of a doctoral study into his theory, he replied:

I really do wonder if there is a doctoral study in my theories - if theories they can be called. I do not see that I have added that much substantively to the field. I helped to shake it up, possibly, and to make it easier for new ideas to replace the barren and threadbare, but hegemonic old (Personal correspondence, 22.5.89).

I wondered was this false modesty or did he really mean this. I was later to learn that Greenfield did not say what he did not mean. The nub of the matter was, was there room and need for such an inquiry and could it make a contribution to the field? I persevered and gained

acquiescence for a study based on the nature of the ideas he had contributed. I discussed with him the possibility of attempting "to trace [his] intellectual long march in terms of a biographical approach" (Personal correspondence, 10.3.90). He would have none of it. He wrote:

Biography is a difficult and demanding art at best, and it requires skilled and experienced practitioners. There are those who would argue it is best pursued after the subject is dead. Until such time as a cooler assessment might be made as to whether there is anything in my life worth writing about, I have no interest in abetting work that is simply curious about me as a person. Nor do I think any sound academic purpose would be served in satisfying such a motive.

I grant you there is an intellectual issue in the relationship of biography and idea. But it is a complex and difficult one, and not easily forced into a method for the explication of text. I am not convinced that the ideas I have struggled to express are opaque to the reader without biographical explanation of them. Indeed, my struggle has been to write with clarity and to make my ideas accessible from the text alone. I believe moreover, that I have been more open than most writers in the field in exposing the inner struggle by which ideas are formed and in declaring their foundation in personal interest and experience.... Transparency to the idea itself is a quality I have striven to give my writing. If I have succeeded in that purpose it is only in limited measure, for it seems to me now that most of my writings could be jettisoned with little loss. Recently, however, a former student wrote me to say that a student of his compared reading one of my articles to "gliding on ice", by which I think he meant that movement through it could hardly be stopped once it was started. I take that as a great compliment (Personal correspondence 22.3.90).

Initially then, I felt bound to what Greenfield called "the necessary separation of idea and person in scholarly inquiry" (Personal correspondence, 17.3.90). He believed that:

ideas and free access to them are the basic stuff of scholarship. To provide and foster access to them is an ethical requirement of anyone engaged in scholarship.

He would assist in provision of documents and discussion of ideas which I would initiate - at least at the beginning of the study.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

In 1990/1991, the study aimed to interpret Greenfield's thinking using Greenfield's ideas about research and appropriate methodology. The focus was on the following questions:

- * What is the administrative/educational world of Thomas Greenfield?
- * What are the building blocks of his theory of educational administration?
- * How did he interpret his experience of administration/education?
- * What have been his contributions to the growth of educational administration as a field of study?
- * What is the significance of his ideas for the development of theory and practice in both education and educational administration?
- * What has been/is his role in this current "dialectical struggle"?
- * Why has Greenfield been at the centre of much controversy and sometimes acrimonious debate (most passionately between 1974 and 1984)?

The framework of the study is two-pronged, following what Greenfield called, "the intellectual and the interconnectedly personal" (Personal correspondence, 18.5.91). It chronicles the history of Greenfield's ideas

within the context of the wider field and it considers the interplay of biography and idea in Greenfield's journey to greater understanding of himself, the world and other people - what Gronn called "the close relationship between biographies of people and the theory of knowledge they have" (Gronn interview, 10.4.91). Using these two interrelated approaches, the study attempts to build an ideography of Thomas Greenfield, using Greenfield to interpret Greenfield.

THE NATURE OF THE RESEARCH

The research focuses upon a person, the evolution of his thinking, the growth of his knowledge, the development of his ideas; in sum, his intellectual journey over three decades. At the centre lie the complex issues of the formation and interpretation of his ideas and the understanding of meaning, as this meaning is influenced by and found in, almost created by, the significant experiences of life. Such emphases place this inquiry naturally within the category of qualitative research. Greenfield is a strong advocate of qualitative research as opposed to quantitative, objective, scientific, positivistic methods. Given this fact, the methodology and framework for this study are based on Greenfield's own assertions and convictions about research.

To begin, Greenfield makes the distinction between RE-search and reSEARCH:

... i.e. to discover truth or a new sense of it; to avoid saying in different words what others had already said, likely in clearer and more apt words (1987:9).

He argued that research has to do with truth-making and with the development of reliable and truthful knowledge. For him all research is guided by a single principle, use only those methods of inquiry that yield reliable or truthful knowledge (p10).

It follows that the nature of the knowledge sought influences the methods to be used and, since truth is complex, there can be no reduction to a single answer, a single formula. The acceptance of the truth of an inquiry rests, therefore, on the fulfilment of an appropriate methodology. Methodology is defined as:

a process not a technique or set of techniques - a logic that justifies the methods / procedures of the research (1987:11).

The crux of the matter is an appropriate match between modes of inquiry and questions addressed: between the researcher's view of the nature of knowledge and the means chosen to generate and analyse data. This research seeks to interpret and clarify the meaning of Greenfield's thinking. The underlying epistemology assumes that knowledge develops out of the unique experience of the individual in interaction with other individuals and ideas, and from the individual's reflection on this experience. The appropriate mode of inquiry, therefore, given this

purpose and these epistemological assumptions, is interpretivist.

The term "interpretivism" is employed in the specialised sense to mean an exclusive focus on understanding the insider's perspective (Howe and Eisenhart, 1990:8). This term, however, is sometimes used in a much more expansive sense to indicate that:

all scientific observation, analysis and theorising unavoidably involve acts of interpretation by researchers. All observation is theory-laden (p8).

Burrell and Morgan (1979:ix) declared that all theories of organisation were based upon a philosophy of science and a theory of society. Their conceptualisation (p22) was created by contrasting two concerns: Is the nature of society real or subjective? Should theory exhibit a sociology of regulation or a sociology of change? Four possible positions were presented: radical humanist, radical structuralist, interpretivist, and functional. Morgan, in his categorisation of paradigms, asserted that the interpretive paradigm was:

based on the view that the social world has a very precarious, ontological status, and that what passes as social reality does not exist in any concrete sense, but is the product of the subjective and intersubjective experience of individuals. Society understood from the standpoint of the participant in action rather than the observer. The interpretive social theorist attempts to understand the process through which shared multiple realities arise, are sustained and are changed (1980:608-609).

He defined "paradigm" as "an implicit or explicit view of reality", and remarked that:

the interpretivist paradigm invokes the subjectivist paradigm, and implies ethnographic methods, such as interviews, participant observation etc (1980:606).

Early reading suggested strongly that Greenfield's work cohered with the interpretive paradigm. Some of his later work, it has been argued (see Gronn,1983:18) placed him in the "radical humanist" paradigm.

Greenfield was not comfortable with the Burrell/Morgan conceptualisation. The "orthogonal, Cartesian dimensions" disturbed him. He wrote:

This four-fold conceptualisation is otherwise unfortunate, for it diverts attention from the conceptual differences among the paradigms and places it upon a structure of simplistic and ambiguous dimensionality where complex and diverse notions are forced into an artificial and ill-fitting unity (Greenfield, 1991b:6).

He preferred Ribbins's (1985:223-261) notion of three paradigms proposed upon a continuum extending from chaos at one extreme to harmony at the other. Chaos was characterised as a condition of total disorder, conflict and discord. Harmony was a condition of order, consensus and cooperation. In between were conditions characterised by greater or lesser conflict or consensus, discord or cooperation. Ribbins's continuum (1985:227) was in reaction to the stress Burrell and Morgan placed on "dichotomous paradigms". In this analysis, Greenfield's

work may be located in the interpretive or action paradigm (p243) although a strictly partitionist categorisation cannot be defended. It is my contention that Greenfield's thinking was still actively evolving up to the time that his illness rendered him incapable of further academic involvement. For some time, his long-held interest in values and their role and influence in organisations had been deepening and he was writing more and more in this vein. He never accepted that educational administration was value-free and was pondering upon the meaning for educational administrators of schools as value-laden organisations. Greenfield's thinking cannot be captured in any static analysis of organisational theory. However, Greenfield did ascribe to the underlying assumptions of Ribbins's interpretive or action paradigm, that is that the individual is an active producer of his/her world, rather than a passive product of it; subjective interpretations of reality are the foundation block of organisation theory; and Greenfield's own conviction (1975c:4) that human life is built upon the placing of meaning upon experience.

Owens classified this kind of research as naturalistic, based on the hypothesis that:

one cannot understand human behaviour without understanding the framework within which the individuals under study interpret their environment. This can best be understood through understanding their thoughts, feelings, values, perceptions and their actions (Owens, 1982:30).

For Owens, naturalistic inquiry involved direct contact between the researcher and subject, in order to gather data; the use of emergent strategies to design the study rather than *a priori* specification; and the development of data categories from examination of the data themselves, after collection. Findings must not be generalised, in this view, to a universe beyond that bounded by the study.

Naturalistic inquiry assumes a variety of forms represented by a number of sub-schools in which, within common understandings, different emphases are made. Symbolic interactionism focuses upon the processes through which people come to construe their actions. Ethnomethodology explores the rules of social interaction. Phenomenological sociology seeks to provide a description of what people think they know with all their attendant meanings. Hermeneutics is a branch of German social philosophy devoted to the theory and practice of the interpretation of texts. A hermeneutic epistemology considers the problems of "human intentionality, rationality and subjectivity as well as the making and apprehension of meaning, as these notions are fundamental to the interpretation of any text" (Olson, 1986:159). It draws attention to the necessity and importance of people's interpretations of their everyday reality, through "the medium of ordinary language" (Lakomski, 1987:121). Greenfield (1980b; 1981b; 1984) supported hermeneutic analysis as a means to clearer interpretation.

The quest for meaning is critical for understanding Greenfield's work and is central to this project. What is meaning? For whom is it meaningful? In seeking to explain meaning, interpretation is necessary. At this point, a crucial distinction must be made. This project seeks to clarify meaning in thinking, not in behaviour. The study connects person and ideas. Person, experience, ways of thinking and articulating thought are part of a single whole. We are what we think. Gadamer, one of the principal protagonists of hermeneutic theory, focused on the text itself and the subject and the ideas which it communicates. He declared that:

the interpreter must recover and make [his] own then, not the personality or the worldview of the author, but the fundamental concern that motivates the text - the question that it seeks to answer, and that it poses again and again to its interpreters (Gadamer, 1976:xxi)

He assumed that misunderstandings arise inevitably both from changes in the meanings of words over time and also in our views and presuppositions. He paid particular attention to the disclosing and concealing power of language. For Gadamer, to interpret meant to understand, and only through language was understanding possible. On the use of hermeneutics, Greenfield wrote:

I believe that it is possible to mediate between frames of subjective meaning in somewhat the same way that we translate from one language to another. It *is* done, it *is* accomplished, though it is hard to lay down rules for doing so. The method is that of hermeneutical analysis that demands as perhaps its only unequivocal rule 'a respect for the authenticity of the mediated

frames of meaning', that is respect for other minds and meanings (Original emphasis). (Greenfield, 1980b:49)

Later he declared:

[The facts of organisational life] rest upon the interpretation and upon the interpretation of interpretations in a process that continues without end and without ever reaching the definitive statement, the final judgment, or the ultimate social truth (1981b:9).

Evers and Lakomski consider that herein lies the strength of subjectivist methodology:

What is required for understanding and sense-making is a subjective apprehension of interpretations and a successful embedding of these into explanatory frameworks that invoke an agent's reasons and inner motivations (1991:90).

This "apprehension" also provides its great problem. How can we distinguish between interpretations? What distinguishes between "noninsightful and insightful interpretations" (p92)? Evers and Lakomski (p96) contend that the answer lies in "the criteria of coherence justification". Greenfield seriously questions this reasoning. For him it is the ultimate positivism, utterly devoid of any value basis.

With reference to the interpretation of text, Greenfield was on firmer ground. He declared that "life itself is, in effect, a text, which to be understood, must be interpreted (1990:363). With regard to the written word, he stated:

The moment meaning is encoded, some doubt, some leeway, some ambiguity exists as to its interpretation, as to

its present meaning. A shadow falls between what was intended as meaning, what was encoded, and what readers later draw as meaning from the text (p361).

Finally, and most challengingly, Greenfield asked:

What then is the meaning of any text ? The answer is that it means what we want it to mean. The text and its meaning lie out there, waiting to be discovered. Its meaning to me lies in here, requiring my knowing and understanding. And so there is no end of inquiry into the meaning of text; nor is there an end to its interpretation or to the implications for action that flow from such interpretation (pp366-367).

The meaning rests with the reader, the researcher. The text has a life of its own, independent of the author. Or does it? Smith and Heshusius (1986:9) talked about "a circularity to this interpretive process that one cannot break out of, even by methodological prescriptions" and declared that "it is a never-ending process of interpreting the interpretations of others". This research seeks to interpret accurately Greenfield's interpretations of his own thinking and to seek coherence for these interpretations within the interpretations of others.

To sum up: the nature of the knowledge sought suggests a qualitative, naturalistic, interpretive (subjective) orientation in the research approach. Bernstein's advice was to overcome "the tyranny of method" (1983:xi) and Rorty (1979:6-9) urged the abandonment of an Archimedian point which might serve as a fail-safe criterion against which to evaluate standards. This has meant that I have become a kind of intellectual tourist, travelling around the professional life, thoughts

and ideas of Professor Thomas Greenfield. I have learned that what counts as good educational research will not necessarily match what counts, at any given point in time, as orthodox methodology. But then, what is orthodox methodology? Flexible methodology in response to the different purposes and contexts of research seems to be more appropriate.

RESEARCH METHODS

Data Collection and Analysis

Six strategies have been used for the collection of data.

1. Documentary evidence.

I have read and summarised, traced themes and patterns of thought, emphases and changes in focus and direction in the corpus of Greenfield's work - in all seventy plus articles, beginning with his Masters thesis (1961a) and extending to his last article (1991c). These articles I read in chronological order as far as possible. I wanted to get a sense of progression and, I assumed, growth and change in thinking. This seemed particularly important in view of Greenfield's changing theoretical stance, made public in his 1974 International Intervisitation Program (IIP) paper.

Using the bibliographies of these articles and the indexes of texts on educational administration, I have read and analysed the nature of the critique aimed at Greenfield, its repercussions up to the present and its influence on the field as a whole. In an extensive review

of literature, from the early 60s to the present, I have noted any reference whatever to Greenfield's work and its nature and context. I have searched out, read and analysed as many of the texts that support Greenfield's thinking, and/or use his theoretical stance as either the foundation of or launching pad for, their own viewpoints. In 1994 I obtained access to the Greenfield archives, stored in the Archive Department of the University of Toronto. These files contain letters, papers, notes, articles, memos, mainly from the late 1970s to the early 1990s. There were several reject slips from prominent American educational journals to some of Greenfield's articles. Greenfield had kept them over the years.

I have a stack of email messages on significant discussion points, both from my own collection over three years and from the collection of some of Greenfield's own students. I have gathered the texts of testimonials delivered at Greenfield's farewell dinner from OISE in December 1991, and finally, I have obtained a number of eulogies delivered on the occasion of the Memorial Service for him at OISE, January 1993.

In my searching I discovered three video interviews that featured Greenfield. One is a discussion with Griffiths, filmed in 1979: another was made at the University of Alberta, in 1983 and features Greenfield and interviewer, Doctor Al Mackay and the third is an interview

conducted by Doctor R.J.S. Macpherson at Monash University in 1981. This became the text of Macpherson's monograph, *A Hitchhiker's Guide to Tom Greenfield* (1984).

2. *Weekly Paper*

In 1990-1991, I was a Visiting Scholar at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) and in the last term, 1990, over a period of fifteen weeks, I submitted weekly paper to Greenfield for comment and revision. These papers were critical analyses of his most significant articles. Many of the issues raised therein formed the basis for discussion at our weekly interview sessions. Greenfield was very particular about the interpretations and/or assumptions I made in these papers and "corrected" them meticulously.

3. *Weekly Interviews with Greenfield*

Ten interviews of differing time spans were conducted with Greenfield over the course of fifteen weeks. Each of these interviews was taped and subsequently transcribed. The interviews focus on significant events in his life, on issues reflected in the papers and/or raised in class, on what I considered were his most meaningful and provocative publications and, often, on issues raised by Greenfield himself. At the end of the fall semester, 1990, I conducted intensive interviews with Greenfield in which we discussed the scripts of the role-set interviews (see below) I had completed. These discussions became wide-

ranging, often lasting for hours and only concluding when I begged for some relief because of my "brain overload". During these sessions, Greenfield was very serious, driven, it seemed, to cover every minute detail and to clarify every 'fuzzy' area that still remained in my mind. He seemed to want to leave nothing unfinished.

4. *Participant Observation*

Greenfield's class in the Fall, 1990, was entitled *People and Power in Organisations - 3040*. It was his last teaching class at OISE, pending his retirement in December. The course focused on the foundation of administrative knowledge in organisation theory and its paradigms of inquiry; the aims, theory and assumptions of administrative studies in education and contemporary issues in administrative studies. I audited this course and became an active member of the student group. There were twelve students in the group, from Ontario, Newfoundland, Guyana, Hong Kong and Australia. I was able to observe Greenfield closely in class and to interact with him and with the other students. An added dimension to my observation was provided by the fact that he occasionally socialised with us, and we saw an urbane, witty and entertaining side to him, another facet of the rather dour, extremely punctual, always highly prepared and academically demanding professor we encountered every Thursday.

5. *Role-set Interviews*

During late 1990-91 I interviewed six of Greenfield's colleagues who were on staff at OISE - Ed Hickcox, Mark Holmes, Alan Brown, Stephen Lawton, Don Musella and Rouleen Wignall. Three of these interviews were conversational and did not reach any significant depth. Three interviews were extensive and wide ranging. Two of these academics had been long-standing colleagues of Greenfield and were able to reflect on their knowledge and relationships with him over many years. I also interviewed three of Greenfield's former students, Martin Barlosky, Mary Carnahan and Elizabeth Campbell, all of whom were in teaching positions either in universities or in schools. I also interviewed the fifteen members of the 3040 class as to their views on Greenfield, the teacher. This provided a basis for comparison with my own perceptions and with those of some of his former students. These role set-interviews also involved seven of Greenfield's colleagues and peers in other Canadian universities - at the University of Victoria, Christopher Hodgkinson and Yvonne Martin; at the University of Alberta, Erwin Miklos and Margaret Haughey; and at the University of Western Ontario, Derek Allison, Rod Dolmage and Jerry Paquette. At the University of British Columbia, I contacted Jean Hills. In the United States, I interviewed two of Greenfield's most vocal critics, Dean Dan Griffiths at New York University and Professor Don Willower at Pennsylvania State University. I

interviewed Professor Robert Owens during his stay at the University of New England in 1991. In the United Kingdom I spoke with Professor Meredydd Hughes and Doctor Peter Ribbins at the University of Birmingham. The Australian contingent of interviewees consisted of Richard Bates, Fazal Rizvi and Jill Blackmore at Deakin University; Colin Evers and Peter Gronn at Monash University; Gabriele Lakomski at the University of Melbourne and R.J.S. MacPherson and A. Ross-Thomas at the University of New England.

In 1994, in Canada, I spoke with Glenn Scott, Jack House, Carol Harris and Benjamin Levin, and, at the Canadian Teachers' Federation headquarters in Ottawa, I met Doctors Wilfred Brown and Geraldine Gilliss, who had been research assistants of Greenfield's in the 1960s. The majority of the interviews were taped and subsequently transcribed.

6. Continuing Contact

The electronic media gave me the opportunity to continue close contact with Greenfield during late 1991-1992. I sent him the text of my British and Australian interviews and received valuable comments and reflections, as well as the odd witticism or two. Over the airways we discussed issues that occurred in the composition of my thesis, in my teaching life and in social, personal and world affairs. So, the contact continued. Greenfield communicated some

reflections on his last two papers, *Phoenix* (1991b) and *Science and Service* (1991c) and his disappointment at having to cancel his proposed Australian trip in January, 1992. My last communication with him was by fax 28 June, 1992. His health had been deteriorating since the previous winter, and soon after this date, suddenly became much worse making any further contact with friends at a distance impossible.

REFLECTION ON THE PROCESS

Data analysis was a continuous process of selecting, focusing, simplifying and abstracting information, checking interpretations and perceptions against those of others in an attempt to triangulate and so, to some extent, validate the data. In that process, the analysis occurred naturally as I sorted, summarised, categorised themes and patterns and looked for evidence of interconnections between biography and ideas generation and progression of thinking and drew conclusions. It was an interactive, spiralling process.

Owens (1982:34) commented on this interaction. He noted the importance of checking and verifying data and warned the researcher to look for "unanticipated perceptions arising from the data". He observed that it is only over the course of the research that one discovers what it is really about. My experience attests to the truth of this statement.

I was aware of some of the issues which I wanted to discuss with Greenfield before I left Australia. The articles that I wished to refer to were chosen in advance. Yet, within the specific context at OISE, I had to rethink, change direction and decide again. This rethinking was influenced largely by what was happening in class or by the direction of the previous interview or even by something I had read during the last week or so. Nothing was fixed and immutable.

The sheer volume of data was staggering and I puzzled long over ways to organise and to articulate what became the touchstone of the account that is "the intellectual and the interconnectedly personal" (Personal correspondence, 17.5.91). After months of wondering and questioning, I came to a simple conclusion. The pivotal professional experience of Greenfield's life was the thinking, writing, presentation, discord and aftermath of the IIP 1974 paper. The central, binding idea in his thinking and writing throughout his career has been the nature of organisation. The years, 1974-1991, evidence the interplay of this experience and this idea in his life.

Design of the interviews

The exact subject for the interviews with Greenfield varied. Sometimes the interviews focused upon issues raised in the previous class, sometimes on articles chosen beforehand. In a sense, the subject matter of each

interview depended on the preceding interview and/or on the preceding class. There was always some pre-planning involved. Miles and Huberman (1984:17) call this "anticipatory data reduction". The interviews were semi-structured in the sense that "all interviews, like any other kind of social interaction are structured by both researcher and informant" (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1983:113); but also in the sense that the subject for the interviews with Greenfield was generally known in advance. That did not preclude, however, much spontaneous sharing of ideas.

Role set interviews were also semi-structured, using open-ended questions to cover three broad areas: Greenfield's contributions to the field of educational administration; paradigms and paradigm shift in educational administration and the future of educational administration. They were also reasonably free flowing, with interviewees encouraged to discuss their own particular areas of research and/or interest. Prior to these interviews, I had read selectively the work of the interviewees and so I was able to raise other significant issues for discussion. Every person interviewed was generous in sharing thoughts and opinions and there was no hesitation in the sharing of academic interests. Some people approached for interview declined. Some who refused in 1990/91, were willing to be interviewed in 1994. Some academics replied in the negative to my written requests

for information, citing the number of years that had passed and mistrusting the accuracy of their memories now. Others preferred not to be involved in recalling events which they had chosen to forget. Some did not reply at all.

The choice of interviewees was purposive. Interviewees were, for the most part, selected beforehand because of the nature of their writings about Greenfield. It seemed imperative to have a holistic picture, one that involved both critique and endorsement of Greenfield's work so I chose to visit both long-standing critics and staunch supporters. Those most sharply critical tended to be American. Those who were appreciatively critical were Canadian, British and Australian. No requested interview was refused. On the contrary, there was much curiosity, interest, encouragement and bemused questioning about my chosen subject.

The Nature of Questioning

The style of questioning varied. Some questions were very directive and specific. Others were mostly non-directive and acted as triggers that stimulated the interviewee into talking about a particular broad area. There was no fixed sequence of questions. Each interview was unique. Each interviewee had different interests and no particular sequence would have suited all respondents. However, all interviewees responded to three common areas of interest and therein lies material for the comparison of points of

view.

I tried to be an active listener and to take my cues from the interviewee. Woods (1986:67) called this "an open, democratic, two-way, informal, free-flowing process" Burgess (1984:63) stated that the interviewer must stay "critically aware ... must keep antennae up for pointers which lead into the meaning of what is being said, and for data that fit the themes of the research". But inevitably, we rambled and sometimes I lost control over the interview. Burgess (p67) believed that rambling is important. The interviewee is moving onto areas which most interest him/her. He said that this is yielding to the client and advised going along with the movement because that data is central to the client and one can always note what is missed and go back. My intuitive reaction was that the responses were real and not deeply influenced by an unnatural interviewer/interviewee situation. The volume of data gathered through these interviews was often overwhelming and left me perplexed as to how to organise so much material. I simply could not use everything.

Participant Observation

The role of participant observer is complex. From time to time I was aware of myself assuming different roles which ranged from complete participant to complete observer. Sometimes, subjectivity and involvement were to the fore; at others, objectivity and detachment. I was

careful to note my own responses and reactions. Hammersley and Atkinson (1983:16) declared that "all social research takes the form of participant observation" and that "the observer inferring meanings by understanding the context through participation is in a better position to get an account". Woods (1986:33) asserted that "the central idea is to penetrate the experiences of others within a group or institution".

I shared the work and experiences of the 3040 class and I observed Greenfield as teacher. I noted a number of things: the choice of material; the application of theory to current social and educational issues and problems; the sequence of material and his emphasis on certain issues and on the work of particular theorists. I observed his preparation for class, the interactions with students - the extra time he gave, the personal support and thoughtfulness he extended in times of trouble and distress; his easy availability; and his relationships with colleagues - with some these were relaxed and comfortable; with others, they were uneasy and awkward. From the very beginning, I enjoyed his fluent and eloquent use of language and literature.

It seemed that Greenfield was able to combine the highly specialised and technical language of administrative theory with the expressive and poetic language of literature. His writings indicate this ability

and so too did his lecturing style. Finally, in the course of each class, I was able to note inflections and tone of voice. - it was quite apparent when he felt strongly about some issue or point of view; his handling of questions and of views counter to his own. Some of his very firmly held stances on oft-repeated administrative and social issues soon became very clear. There was no doubt as to Greenfield's convictions.

As I began to "fit" into the Canadian scene, I found it difficult to maintain an academic detachment and an objectivity of judgment. I became more and more involved with people and with Greenfield himself, and I wanted to know more about him. And not simply out of idle curiosity. At that time I had to keep reminding myself that the focus of my study was not biography. My interest lay in mapping his ideas; what I have called "ideography". It would be another year before I began to consider one influencing and being influenced by the other.

THE NATURE OF THE DATA

Data which depend on somebody's perception, expressed usually in words, Greenfield (1979a:165) considered "hard", as opposed to "cheap" data. Researchers, he asserted, obtain "cheap" data in large quantities at minimal cost:

Such data can be herded into a computer with little difficulty; there they can be analysed in the twinkling of a solid state system and disgorged in forms ready-

made for presentation to annual conferences or scholarly publications (p168).

Hard data are difficult to identify, handle and interpret.

They speak meaningfully and powerfully for individuals in specific situations. Yet they find a larger significance as well. They show how individuals' sense of themselves and their world has consequences in that world, and they suggest how these meanings and consequences can be expressed in typifications, symbols or theories that provide fresh insights into social reality (p168).

By these definitions, the data in this research are obviously hard. Greenfield stressed again the interdependence of the researcher's assumptions and perceptions and the selection of data and methods of inquiry:

our ideas about the world determine what procedures we will use for creating data, and what facts we will see as important and meaningful (p187).

This suggests that all investigation, in the interpretive mode, is theory-laden and values-laden and that the interpretive researcher sees what his/her experience of the world allows to be seen. There is no possibility of neutrality of judgment. One can only describe and interpret through the framework of one's own pre-determined network of perceptions. The impact of the knower can, therefore, never be 'cleansed' from that which is known (Greenfield,1980:30-31). One's subjectivity needs to be understood since it is a critical variable in the research process. The reflective researcher will be sensitive to

this fact and aware of the need for some form of justification of research methods.

SOME THOUGHTS ON JUSTIFICATION

Current developments in thinking (Garrison, 1986; Howe, 1985; 1988) suggest that theorists have moved into a post-positivistic era in which positivism is no longer a tenable epistemological position. The term "positivism" is used here to mean both a philosophy of empiricism and a set of rules for determining what constitutes truth, namely facts based upon objective and empirical observation. So, positivism should not serve as the foil against which standards for qualitative research should be developed (Howe and Eisenhart, 1990:3). What, then, about standards of research within an interpretive perspective? It was asserted (p3) that standards must be anchored wholly within the process of inquiry. According to this reasoning, there are many legitimate research methodologies because methodology is ultimately tied to research purposes and legitimacy of the research rests with the purpose of the research. One must then question the legitimacy of the purpose. Greenfield's view was that:

the researcher's claim to speak the truth rests on the justification that his procedures and methods tell us something that cannot be known by other methods. Therefore, what he asserts as knowledge must be accepted as true, because it is demonstrably true. Thus, the researcher's claim that his knowledge is to be preferred over other kinds, rests on the researcher's way of knowing the truth - upon methodology (1987:10-11).

Guba (1978:61) also raised the question of the authenticity of qualitative research, stating that the three major criteria typically used to evaluate the rigor of research, namely, reliability, internal and external validity, were inappropriate. He suggested that the "bases for trust" be defined in terms of "authenticity, intrinsic adequacy, extrinsic adequacy, replicability and neutrality".

Using Guba and Lincoln (1983) Crowther and Gibson present a convincing framework to accommodate the recognition of the researcher's subjective role and to help maintain credible standards of naturalistic research (Table 1).

Howe and Eisenhart (1990:4) argued that the standards for assessing the quality and rigour of research are related to the theoretical orientation of the author(s). To evaluate such standards they advocated the following four measures:

- * a fit between the research question and data collection and analysis techniques (coherence);
- * an effective application of specific data collection and analysis techniques (the competent application of techniques);
- * alertness to and coherence of background assumptions
- * and an overall warrant triangulation (pp6 -7).

Table 1

Criteria for the Conduct of Naturalistic Research

SCIENTIFIC CRITERION	NATURALISTIC CRITERION
<u>Internal validity</u>	<u>Credibility</u> (Do research subjects find the researcher's view of his/her own role in the research process to be credible? Are interpretations of subjects' responses clarified by prolonged probing during interviews? Have the researchers returned to the data source for confirmation of categories produced during data analysis?)
<u>External validity</u>	<u>Transferability</u> (Does the researcher, in interpreting and reporting data, make significant quantities of 'thick description' public?)
<u>Reliability</u>	<u>Dependability</u> (Are procedures like 'investigator triangulation' employed to ensure that the researcher's values, beliefs and actions can be subjected to close scrutiny and questioning?)
<u>Objectivity</u>	<u>Confirmability</u> (As conclusions are derived, are original data re-examined to ascertain consistency or to stimulate further analysis? Is there a clear 'audit' trail between raw data and conclusions?)

(Crowther and Gibson, 1990:46).

This study aims to satisfy these four conditions. Although there are few agreed-upon canons for the analysis of qualitative data, a high level of trustworthiness and authenticity is considered vital for the credibility of the research. Multiple perspectives and a variety of procedures have been used to ensure, as far as possible, the soundness of data selection and analysis. Greenfield had different views on validity. He believed that:

Validity requires a value judgment to establish it: a judgment that can never be grounded in fact. Validity is a choice not something that is measured or logically established. Or as Weber says, every rational life stands on a non-rational choice. This great truth is so threatening to social scientists that they cannot or will not recognise it. In the way they are used, the terms, "the validity of IQ tests" or "the validity of standardised achievement tests" are quite arbitrary and the best statisticians of course, recognise this. Guba seems to think that in paralleling criteria of subjectivist study to measures of validity in quantitative analysis he somehow avoids the problems that beset the notion of validity in that realm. 'Description first, prescription later' should be the standard in all realms of inquiry. Would the objectivists followed it! When I used to teach the research course, I quoted Bacon: 'God forbid that we mistake a dream of the imagination for the world.' I have to tell you that the only answer lies in struggle, the struggle to distinguish what is 'real' and what is 'only' a dream of the imagination (Personal correspondence, 18.5.91).

I have tried to be faithful to the struggle.

SOME LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

In this type of research the onus on 'the researcher as the instrument' (Everhart, 1988:704) is great. I am aware of the possibility of limitations in the research due to the researcher. The major limitation is myself, the researcher. Peshkin argued that:

subjectivity is the basis for the researchers' making a distinctive contribution, one that results from the unique configuration of their personal qualities joined to the data they have collected (Peshkin, 1988:18).

However, the degree of subjectivity can create problems. To minimise this difficulty I resolved to question constantly: the effects of the researcher on the nature of the data -

bias, prejudices, filters, openness, unconscious selective perception of the facts, consistency of observation; the quality of inferences and interpretations; the interaction of personal involvement and a measure of detachment; researcher fatigue; the quality of researcher performance; researcher reliability; and distortion by respondents. I also allowed some two years to elapse before I seriously began to write. It seemed at the time that this distance was important to help me gain a little more objectivity and clarity in perception and interpretation. The timing of my visit to OISE may have presented some unforeseen difficulties. It was Greenfield's last teaching term before retirement and in that sense, may not have been representative. He mentioned on a number of occasions that my presence and questions were helping him be "reflective" and were challenging him to think more deeply than he sometimes wanted to. However, with Greenfield in reflective mode, much material was covered in a depth that might otherwise not have been the case.

There were several ethical questions that had to be addressed given the personal nature of some parts of the research design. The possible sensitivity of some issues covered during role-set interviews and the fact that the interviews were taped, raised the question of confidentiality. Occasionally, during interviews, people would remark: "Don't quote me but ..". This was not a common request and had to be honored. I tended to use the

sense of the claim in generalised terms rather than in any specific form. No interviewee requested anonymity. All the necessary permission for the use of interview material was given. Nevertheless, decisions had to be made regarding the exact use of the interview material, whether sections would be quoted verbatim or whether the intent of the comment only, would be communicated. The choice of material rested with the researcher and, in any controversial situation, the guide to inclusion or not, to exact, verbatim quoting or not, was the degree to which the purpose of the thesis was achieved. It is significant that some people were much less guarded in their comments in 1994 than they were in 1990-1991.

CONCLUSION

Research, theory and methodology were seen by Greenfield to be closely related. The purpose of research is not to confirm theory. On the contrary, he declared (Greenfield, 1975c:84) that theory should arise out of the process of inquiry and be intimately connected with the data under investigation. He argued (1979a:179) for research that attempts to look at social reality from a variety of perspectives and particularly from the perspective of different actors. This study, in attempting to focus on the interplay of biography and ideography at significant times in the life of Thomas Greenfield, and that from a variety of perspectives, also questions a number of hitherto firmly held beliefs about the nature of

organisations and the roles and substance of individuals within organisations. Greenfield emerges as critic and reformer, neither of which he consciously set out to be. Perhaps it was his "karma" after all. He wanted to be considered a serious scholar not merely a "straw man". And he wanted to be understood. Much of this research makes that patently clear.

From a number of different viewpoints, the research examines the critique levelled against Greenfield, its context, the personalities involved and the nature of the critique against the background of the American hegemony in educational administration and the feeling of cultural and scholarly inferiority experienced by the Canadians.

In his *Phoenix* paper (1991b), Greenfield wondered where to find the form and substance of the new phoenix in administrative studies. It is the contention of this study that the basis of this form and substance is within the work of Greenfield himself. His has been the experience of the mythical phoenix, both personally and academically. Many of his articles of the late 1970s and early 1980s attest the existence of the ashes. This research considers the reasons for the ashes, their nature and essence and the possibilities therein for the present and future growth of the discipline of educational administration; indeed, for the rise of the phoenix anew.

CHAPTER 3

EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION: A BRIEF HISTORY

*Our perception of the past shapes our
interpretation of the present; our
interpretation of the present informs
our work and aspiration for the future.*

(Getzels. 1993:150)

History has a way of clarifying dilemmas and sharpening understanding. Time and space, distance from events, study and reflection can realise perceptions and validate initial interpretation of events and personalities. This is particularly significant in analysing, however briefly, the development of educational administration over the hundred or so years of its growth as a discrete area of scholarship and practice. A hybrid discipline, applied as well as academic, struggling with increasing complexity and an uncertain identity, educational administration blends together the traditions, values, literature, knowledge and research bases of two separate, yet related, areas of study and reflects a wide range of perspectives and emphases. These are, sometimes, only tenuously linked. A coherent and wholistic view of the historical development of educational administration is difficult. There are too many influences. There is too much fragmentation.

The brief history that follows is an interpretation

and a description, written from one perspective out of the many that could be chosen. The issues and personalities who have some significant bearing on the thought and work of Thomas Barr Greenfield form its focus. History paints the scenery against which Greenfield lived his professional life, from the beginning of his undergraduate study in British Columbia, Canada, to the presentation and publication of his last paper in 1991 at the University of Alberta.

This paper (1991c) argued that the history and development of educational administration as a profession and an academic study rest upon changing understandings of, and differing emphases on science and service. The title quoted Mary Parker Follett, that any profession must rest on "a foundation of science and a motive of service" (Greenfield and Ribbins, 1993:199). Over the last century or so, a series of themes or emphases focussing either on the science or the service elements of educational administration have marked out stages in the evolution of administrative thought. Each lasted about twenty years and then was superseded as practitioners and professors sought to justify and explain what an administrator should know and be and do and why. There was, of course, never a strict linear progression from one emphasis to another. The preceding view does not give way entirely to the succeeding one and as emphases change, views that have disappeared for a time may reappear in particular intellectual and

social environments. After all professions develop in response to their environments and ideas and practices that have seemed dead may suddenly rise again, for example Gronn's neo-Taylorism and the current emphasis on TQM, perhaps a resurrected form of scientific management in another age.

This chapter briefly examines the evolution of administrative thought with particular emphasis on science and service, until 1974, the year in which Doctor Thomas Greenfield, at the Third International Intervisitation Program in Bristol, England, "fired a critique...which was heard around the world" (Culbertson, 1981:25). Five stages are delineated, stages largely determined by historical and social influences that resulted in particular perceptions of education and administration. These stages emphasise the beginnings of educational administration in practice and its gradual development as an academic discipline with consequent growth in sophistication and complexity and an increasing separation of academics from practitioners: of those who study educational administration and those who do it.

In the beginning, the geographic focus was totally the USA, "the Mother Church" of educational administration (Greenfield, 1991b:2). Here, educational administration first became a professional, discrete discipline and undoubtedly, American universities

dominated the early academic study of educational administration until the late 1950s. Some would argue that this dominating influence is still present throughout the academic world.

THE EARLY DECADES: to 1885

Administration as Supervision

The beginnings are somewhere in the latter part of the 19th century when, after the turmoil of the American Civil War, the texture of American society changed. For most of this century, education in USA was rural, chiefly unbureaucratic in structure and exhibited only rudimentary professionalism (Tyack & Hansot, 1982:17). An 1890 survey of education departments in 20 leading universities uncovered only two courses in educational administration (p18). Teachers were mostly young, poorly paid and rarely educated beyond the elementary subjects (Campbell et al., 1987:76-78). Then, towards the end of the 19th century, a major transformation in American society occurred. Public schools multiplied. Small, rural schools serving country communities were superseded by large urban school systems in regionalised industrial centres. The number of administrators increased and with this came processes of bureaucratisation and incipient professionalisation. The administration of school systems began to replace the management of any one particular school (Culbertson, 1988:3; Button, 1966:217; Tyack & Hansot, 1982: 17-18). The Department of Superintendence, forerunner of the American

Association of School Administrators (AASA) was organised in 1866. Spokesmen like E.E. White, Francis W. Parker and Thomas H. Balliet, considered the superintendent to be a teacher of teachers at a time when teachers were part-time educational evangelists who rarely made education a life-long career (Tyack & Hansot, 1982:106). Administration was supervision. It was not common for the States to require specialised credentials and substantial training for administrators until the 1930s. This idea never won complete acceptance but it was "the kernel of an ideal concerning the way a superintendent could improve instruction" (Button, 1966:217) and remained in prominence until about 1885. The change from individual, rural school unit to urban, school system required better teaching expertise and a variety of management and leadership skills. Expert teachers became school leaders charged with the supervision of staff and accountable for the quality of instruction.

ADMINISTRATION AS APPLIED PHILOSOPHY: 1885-1905

As social contexts changed and as matters other than teaching demanded attention, for example finance, staffing, the development of the physical plant of schools, so the understanding of educational administration changed. The period 1885 - 1905 was the era of the concept of administration as applied philosophy (Button, 1966:218). This was also the era of the two distinguished "practitioner scholars" in education in USA, W.T.Harris and

W.H.Payne (Culbertson, 1988:4).

Harris was a social philosopher and an advocate for a phenomenological approach to inquiry. His university career blossomed in the Concord School of Philosophy where he launched the first journal on philosophy, *The Journal of Speculative Philosophy* and edited it for a quarter of a century. He was US Commissioner of Education from 1889-1907 and long time member and president of the National Education Association (NEA). As a speculative philosopher, Harris looked to Plato in his belief that reason arrives at conclusions " without the aid of [sensuous] images but solely through ideas themselves" (Harris in Culbertson, 1988:4). As the foremost American interpreter of Hegelian thought, Harris emphasised that reason, through the logical analysis of opposing or contradictory ideas must:

produce higher-order generalisations directed at wholes and not, as in the case of narrowly defined science, at parts (Culbertson, 1988:4).

Payne became the first Professor of Education at the University of Michigan, wrote the first book on school administration (published in 1875) in which he describes school administration as an art (Culbertson, 1988:5) and text books and training courses for Principals and Superintendents. In 1887, Payne became Chancellor of the University of Nashville and was President of Peabody Normal School for fourteen years. He tried to distinguish educational administration from teaching and was confident

that a science of administration could be developed to advance understanding of the new management and provide a more rational base for the practice of educational administration. Harris was not at all convinced that there was a difference and in fact, warned against the danger of separating education and administration, since for him, administration was found in addressing the fundamental issues of teaching.

Harris and Payne were scholar-practitioners, teachers, principals and superintendents of school systems and then, academics. For them, the first problem of the superintendent was to discover by philosophical or scholarly inquiry, the appropriate purposes and methods for education (Griffiths (ed.) 1964:75). Both had illustrious university careers and published extensively. Payne concentrated on educational subjects but Harris ranged more widely, particularly in the area of social issues such as unemployment, socialism and peace. Both were part of the five-member committee, set up by the National Council on Education in the 1880s, to address the issue of the "Science of Pedagogics". The National Council on Education (NCE) report developed 28 propositions, all with their origin in speculative philosophy. (For a fuller account, see Culbertson's article in Boyan, 1988:3-6). Both believed that a science of education and management was needed, a kind of "philosophical science" (Culbertson, 1988:6) that would borrow principles and material from

whatever disciplines would guide students' growth, for example psychology, physiology, ethics, history and sociology. The trend to an academic social science already identifiable in the 1880s, constrained the influence of Harris and Payne's philosophical science yet their influence on educational administration lasted well into the 20th century.

By the turn of the century there were no departments or professors of educational administration in the USA. The available literature was sparse. Harris and Payne, however, had built a sturdy foundation for both the practical and academic world of educational administration.

ADMINISTRATION AS BUSINESS MANAGEMENT: 1905-1930

Every point has its counterpoint and around 1905 administration-as-philosophy was superseded by a new emphasis. The rise in manufacturing industries (with the rapid change in the nature of work), large numbers of immigrants entering the USA, the huge expansion of markets, the growth of corporations and the emergence of a very wealthy middle class, along with a belief in maximum efficiency at minimum cost encouraged a similar attitude towards social institutions. The economic philosophies of free enterprise and capitalism effected structural changes in American society and in the ideologies through which people explained their lives. The strength of business values in America, at the time, was enormous. Inevitably,

educational administration was influenced.

Fayol's five functions (planning, organising, coordinating, commanding, controlling) and fourteen principles of administration were helping to define and streamline both the techniques and understanding of administration. Taylor's Scientific Management was the spirit of the times. This philosophy required that managers knew exactly what they wanted to get done and saw that workers did it in the best and cheapest way. The emphasis was on the latter concept, what Gross called "the gospel of efficiency" (in Griffiths, 1964:34). The best education became the most efficient and financially viable. Schools were reshaped according to the canons of business efficiency and scientific expertise. Teachers and school administrators were being called to accountability by a public that was becoming accustomed to look critically at all their institutions. The growing public consciousness of the problems caused by rapid industrialisation encouraged an increasing public criticism against schools. Schools as businesses or factories became the common metaphor. Children were perceived at once as raw materials and products and teachers as processors and schools as factories (Button, 1966:19). Administrators were increasingly vulnerable to public opinion and administrative progressives talked increasingly of problems to be solved by experts. Administrators were problem solvers, not philosophers.

Educational administration as an academic study took great steps forward during this era. Some scholars (Campbell et al., 1987:4; Culbertson in Farquhar & Housego, 1980:322) place the roots of professionalisation of the discipline during this period, with the awarding of the first doctorates in educational administration in 1905 at Columbia, Teachers College. Cubberley and Strayer, "the first high priests of academic educational administration" (Allison, 1989:6) were among these awardees and are often credited with initiating the formal study of educational administration (Campbell et al. 1987 :8) and professionalising school administration (Tyack & Hansot, 1982:121).

Cubberley, with a background in Maths/Science, practitioner and later academic and a prodigious author of educational texts, that were the standard texts in school administration throughout the US, became professor of educational administration at Stanford and was intent on building a science of education which extended far beyond the classroom. He and his colleagues sought, with some success, to professionalise educational leadership. By 1918 the idea of a separate profession of school administration was firmly established (Callahan, 1962: 219). He also wanted to transform the American school into the image of the business enterprise (Campbell et al.1987 :8). Callahan (1962:7-8) however, saw Cubberley's "great creative period" as "an American tragedy", because

schoolmen emulated business to save their own skins. What Cubberley had applauded as signs of scientific management in education, for example cost accounting, pupil accounting and various statistical measures of efficiency, Callahan saw as "capitulation" to a "business orientation" and a betrayal of real education. Cubberley, on the other hand, considered scientific management as "the logical corollary of the corporate model of school governance" (Cunningham, Hack, Nystrand, 1977:448). Increasingly, school work was being seen as appealing to ambitious educators as a career with a distinct trajectory, one that required training, planning, specialisation and identification with a cohort of peers (Tyack & Hansot, 1982:118). The speciality of educational administration was being created and science was the source of certainty.

Strayer's background was in Maths/Accounting and later, as Professor of Educational Administration at Teachers College, his work on educational accounting systems, enrolment projections and student test data reflected the new quantitative direction in inquiry. Strayer exerted his influence in a more direct way than Cubberley, through his teaching and research (Callahan, 1962:181). Where Cubberley was renowned for his text books, Strayer was well known for his many scientific surveys. His interest was in the practical, immediate problems of the field and his most important contribution was in his ideas about the kind of professional preparation

he believed a school administrator should have.

Both Cubberley and Strayer advocated the use of social science - science as a method and as a world view, more than a body of knowledge - but did not delineate its potential (Culbertson, 1988:9). Franklin Spaulding, Professor of Educational Administration at Yale and Edward Elliott were also considering the place of the social sciences in educational administration. At this stage, both educational administration and social science were fledgling academic disciplines, struggling to lay firm foundations of knowledge and methods of inquiry; and teaching and school administration were becoming increasingly separate professions. In educational administration, the areas of administration, for example budgetting, accounting and purchasing were being developed and refined and the number of professors in the new field of school administration was growing. However, until the 1950s, most came from the ranks of school administrators and, by their own reports, taught by anecdote and prescription (Campbell et al., 1987:4).

This was also the time when university departments of educational administration and their professors were highly influential in both scholarship and practice. Strayer and another of the "Columbia barons", Paul Mort, were considered "masterful talent brokers" who moved their former students into key positions around the country with

apparent ease" (Campbell et al., 1987:180). Webs of influence and networks of mentors and their former students were established. They promulgated similar approaches to knowledge and inquiry. Tyack and Hansot noted that, "canny graduates emulated their sponsors" (1982:143). The University of Chicago and Ohio State University soon had barons of their own and the strong and almost unbreakable influence and learning culture of the significant American universities began to be felt in the new field.

ADMINISTRATION AS SERVANT OF DEMOCRACY: 1930-1950

During the Depression and New Deal, business lost public credibility and concepts of administration began to change. The traumas of two world wars, the rise of the great corporations, the collapse of Europe and increasing attention on the American ideal of democracy had profound influence upon social attitudes and life styles. Ideas about administration began to turn from efficiency and economy to the essence and purpose of education and administration and the concept of schools-as-servants-of-democracy came to the fore. The Human Relations school of organisational theory was then strong and people in organisations were encouraged to interact with one another, to share ideas and value one another's views and to integrate their viewpoints in pursuit of the common good. Schools, too, needed to be democratically organised and controlled. Decision making by consensus was favored and processes devised that respected the democratic ideal of

American society.

Some years earlier in 1916, John Dewey, the father of American progressive education, had published his *Democracy in Education*, which blended a new democratic social vision with new techniques of instruction. Dewey derided the continuing popularity of scientific management techniques and ideology among school leaders and emphasised the need for educational managers to discard top-down management practices and secure the consent of both teachers and students in a democratic education system. Giving teachers opportunities for greater participation would change both the character of the school organisation and the quality and kind of relationships between teachers and administrators (Campbell et al., 1987:51). Dewey advocated linking learning with living. Individual differences were to be respected and built upon (p9). He believed that every school must be an embryonic community (Tyack & Hansot, 1982:202). Students were being prepared to participate fully in a free society, thinking creatively by habit and disciplining themselves as necessary.

Dewey encouraged professors of educational administration and leading practitioners to speak about and practise democratic administration, particularly in the years following World War 1, and progressive education and democratic administration were advocated for the schools throughout the 1930s and 1940s and into the 1950s. Paul

Mort of Teachers College, Jesse Sears of Stanford and Arthur Moehlman of Michigan were significant among these academics. Moehlman particularly considered democratic and educational ideals and elaborated on their implications for "executive activity" (Culbertson, 1988:13). The 1946 Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (NSSE) was entitled, *Changing Conceptions of Educational Administration*. Its basic theme was democratic administration and that was a carry over from the 1930s (Griffiths, 1964:1).

Chester Barnard's work began to have great influence during this period. He seems to have been the first to relate administration to the behavioral sciences (Campbell et al., 1987:73). His *Functions of the Executive* appeared in 1938 but was generally not discovered by professors of education until the 1950s. He himself suggested that his book had two parts, an exposition of a theory of cooperation and organisation and a study of the functions of executives in formal organisations. Barnard concluded that neither scientific nor democratic management would suffice alone. Good administration required a graceful balance of individual and institutional needs, what Barnard called the concept of effectiveness (person oriented) and efficiency (system oriented).

In the interwar years and after, democratic management in schools was also promoted by assorted

professional bodies and through the publications of various departments and committees within the National Education Association (NEA) (Campbell et al., 1987:52). The professoriate's endorsement of a democratic style of management reflected widely held beliefs about the nature and character of school administration and something of Dewey's belief that the school is a cooperative community. The popularity of democratic administration also contributed to the greater openness of professors to human relations ideas when they began to circulate outside industry in the 1940s and 1950s. Both approaches appeared to be alike in many important respects (Campbell et al., 1987:53).

World War Two had precipitated sweeping changes. By the mid 1950s, the problems of postwar readjustment gave the social sciences new status in American universities. Sociologists and psychologists were recognised as never before for their knowledge of societal change and their ability to help understand and resolve social problems. Professors of educational administration turned to the social sciences in their quest to understand and improve schools and colleges. The demand for new knowledge far exceeded the inherited wisdom (see March's belief in Greenfield, 1986:58). By the 1950s this gap had attracted the attention of many scholars resulting in a wave of new research and theory.

ADMINISTRATION AS SCIENCE: 1950-1975

This period in administrative thought is variously called "the theoretical era, the social science era, the behavioural science era, the social systems era or the social psychological era" (Getzels, 1977:9). Whatever the term, the essential shift was from conceiving educational administration as a domain of action only to a domain of study as well (Griffiths, 1964:11). In this era the social science disciplines came into wide use in the study of educational administration in an attempt to integrate the impersonal, and personal aspects of organisations and administration. To illustrate this, Getzels (1977:7) declared that virtually no text in educational administration before the 1950s mentioned Barnard's work; by the 1960s hardly a text did not mention it. The isolation and insularity enforced by World War Two had ended in the immediate post-war years. Social ferment and cultural change impacted on every area of life. The middle to late 1960s were times of social unrest in America, with Vietnam, the civil rights struggle, high inflation and widespread inequality of opportunity. Education and educational administration were profoundly affected. Both the social sciences and the behavioral sciences were in stages of growth and the cross fertilisation of ideas into the discipline of educational administration was easily achieved.

In 1945 Herbert Simon's *Administrative Behavior* was

published. Culbertson (1988:14) dubbed this work "the most influential of all the social science books of the 1940s" and declared that it "provided the most direct conduit in the 1940s for the flow of administrative science into educational administration" (p15). Greenfield too commented that:

Self-conscious science entered administrative studies through the work of Herbert Simon.... His thinking transformed the field. Simon offered a totally new conception of the nature of administration, and, more importantly, a new set of rules for inquiry into administrative realities. From that time forward, his vision, his *Weltanschauung* of the world of administration, has dominated the field (1986a:57-58).

In the public arena, the role of the physical and behavioral scientist was gathering esteem. In educational administration there was a greater and more intense need to establish a knowledge foundation for the discipline and to improve the status of the administrator.

1947 marked for some, the beginning of a ferment in school administration (Moore,1964:11). In that summer, born as an idea during the American Association of School Administrators' (AASA) convention, fifty six professors and practitioners led by Walter Cocking, then editor of *The School Executive*, met to consider the status of the field. As a result of this meeting, the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA) was formed to provide a forum for both scholars and practitioners to exchange knowledge of teaching and

research practices and to share concerns and ideas that impinged upon the nature of the field. The summer meetings became a yearly event and were held all over the country. Numbers of participants increased and networks of scholars were formed (Moore, 1964:18-20). New ideas and programs were created and disseminated and a strong and unified (one might be excused from believing that a fairly 'uniform') culture of learning was being founded anew.

The NCPEA was influential in convincing the W.K. Kellogg Foundation (discussions began in 1947 shortly after the publication of Simon's book) to finance regional efforts to improve the study and practice of educational administration over a period of five years (Griffiths, 1964:15; Culbertson, 1981:37-39; Campbell et al., 1987:14). During the next ten years, more than \$6 million of Kellogg money funded projects for the improvement and study of school administration. The Cooperative Program in Educational Administration (CPEA) (Moore, 1964:20-23) was launched in 1950/51 and aimed at improving preparatory programs for educational administrators. Firstly in USA, George Peabody College for Teachers, Harvard, Teachers College, University of Chicago and University of Texas, then a year later, Ohio State, Stanford and the University of Oregon and later still, the University of Alberta in Canada were chosen to host Kellogg centres and in the process activated what has come to be called "The Theory Movement". From its inception, Andrew Halpin of Ohio

State, Jacob Getzels of Chicago and Dan Griffiths of Teachers College were leading lights of the Movement. Each of these scholars was involved in CPEA centres and each, in his distinctive way, was significant in disseminating ideas about theory and administrative science. Three hundred publications emanated directly from these CPEA centres and many other manuscripts were published by regional and national associations, including NCPEA. In the judgment of Hollis Moore (1957) and others, CPEA projects also attracted significant new talent to the field of educational administration, built new bridges between study and practice, and stimulated the growth of inservice training.

In 1954 at one of the forums (for a vivid description, see Getzels, 1977:3-4) held by the NCPEA where scholars could challenge existing research and advocate theory-based norms to professors in attendance from across the nation:

the first 'real' confrontation between behavioural scientists and professors of educational administration took place. Coladarci (of Stanford), Getzels (of Chicago) and Halpin (then of Ohio State) pointed out to the group - and not gently - that what the CPEA Centres and members of NCPEA were doing in the name of research was distinctly a-theoretical in character and sloppy in quality. The reception that these three behavioral scientists received at the meeting can scarcely be described as cordial (Halpin, 1970:161).

At this same meeting, the NCPEA committee approved a plan for a book titled *Administrative Behavior in Education*

(Campbell & Gregg, 1957). Greenfield used this text as the framework for his 1991c paper, a text he first encountered as a Masters student in the Department of Educational Administration at the University of Alberta; a text he called "that fecund catalogue of new thinking for educational administration" (Greenfield and Ribbins, 1993:199) and a text that took him back "to a point near the origin of the field in its consciously modern form" (p200). Halpin and Griffiths both had chapters in this text. Halpin's chapter, *A Paradigm for Research on Administrator Behaviour*, Greenfield declared "a statement well worth reading today" (p206). Griffiths's chapter *Towards a Theory of Administrative Behaviour*, set out the tenets of positivistic inquiry and provided clues about the new directions in research and thinking. Virtually none of the texts written before 1954 referred to theory.

In 1956 representatives of CPEA universities and about twenty five others gathered to form a consortium of universities that had leading departments of educational administration. This consortium, called the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA), was clearly an offspring of Kellogg grants (Moore, 1964:23). UCEA had three particular goals: to improve the pre-service and in-service training of school administrators; to stimulate and produce research in educational administration; and to disseminate materials growing out of research and training practices (Campbell et al., 1969:81). UCEA with Kellogg

Foundation backing and an executive committee that included many prominent figures in the field became the dominant influence on the development of study and teaching in educational administration in the 1960s and 1970s and four decades later, UCEA affiliated universities remain a powerful force in scholarship and practice in educational administration, certainly in USA and to some degree, beyond.

The headquarters of UCEA were located at Teachers College, Columbia University until 1959 and then moved on to Ohio State. Culbertson then assumed the Executive Directorship and held this position for over twenty years. In the words of one scholar UCEA was generated as a response to an attempted revolution:

The revolution was a grand design to establish a science of educational administration in place of the folklorish base which predominated prior to 1950. It was part of a movement to improve the quality of administration.... (Goldhammer, in Cunningham et al. 1977:147)

The University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) in fact, nurtured the Theory Movement or the "New Movement" as it was sometimes called (Greenfield, 1979:208; 1991:7; Halpin, 1970:159; 1977:262). The goal was to build an administrative science (Culbertson, 1988:15). The first UCEA seminar was held at the University of Chicago in 1957 and the topic was *Administrative Theory*. Halpin later (1958) published *Administrative Theory in Education*, a

collection of new administrative thinking and later still (1966), *Theory and Research in Administration*, which contained some materials representing the revolutionary and optimistic view of the 1950s (Greenfield,1979:212). Coladarci and Getzels had published *The Use of Theory in Educational Administration* in 1955, stimulated - at least in part - by the authors' participation as consultants in the 1954 NCPEA meeting in Denver, calling attention to the dearth of theory in educational administration, emphasising the integrity of theory and practice and proposing one approach to a theory of educational administration (Halpin, 1966:5). In Halpin's words:

The current gloomy side of the theory picture ... is of less importance than what they herald for future, more constructive efforts to develop better theory ... (1966:5)

The University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) at this time, placed high priority on theory building and on new directions in research, both towards the creation of a science of administration.

The perceived importance and wide support for the mission of UCEA meant that stringent standards for institutional membership were set and an elitism among universities became a reality. The UCEA-affiliated universities were the most prestigious and influential in the country. To gain UCEA membership was no small victory. At its height in 1970, nearly 60 of the most prestigious

departments of educational administration in the USA and Canada held membership in the consortium. For most professors in member universities, UCEA became the professional association with which they identified and through which they forged professional ties with colleagues. UCEA's leadership was expressed through the initiation and sponsorship of the *Educational Administration Quarterly* (1965) and *Educational Administration Abstracts* (1966) and through annual or semi-annual career development seminars for professors and graduate students, participation in large scale research projects in schools and school districts, the setting up of task forces to handle particular problems in administration and many commission reports and publications. Through these projects, standards were set, ideas generated and innovations disseminated. High levels of prestige, strong circles of influence and unquestioned dominance of the academic study of educational administration were associated with UCEA until around the mid-1970s and have continued into the 1990s, with varying degrees of intensity during the intervening two decades.

Greenfield's critique of the field and its institutions began to be noticed around the mid 1970s, most definitely after the Bristol International Intervisitation Program (IIP) in 1974. One of Greenfield's focal areas of critique was the Theory Movement and its consequent promise of a science of administration. For

Greenfield there was no such science. However, his concept of science must be explored and understood against the background of perceptions of science as these have evolved to the present.

This study moves on to consider the development and understanding of the science of administration against the background of thinking and changing ideas that have influenced this puzzling and chameleon-like concept.