PREFACE

NEW TO THIS EDITION

Four major goals of this new edition are the following:

1. We provide the reader with additional practical applications by adding "Voices From the Field" in appropriate chapters.
2. We update the treatment of the subject of organizational behavior in schools so that it includes new research and current trends.
3. We incorporate a better connection between organizational behavior, critical theory, and critical race theory.
4. We integrate theory and practice throughout the text by discussion and expansion on initial concepts in succeeding chapters to provide additional depth of analysis and synthesis.

The following are the specific major changes to this 11th edition of *Organizational Behavior in Education*:

- We have added "Voices From the Field" in appropriate chapters. We solicited examples from practicing administrators to show how concepts are being applied in the schools today. These "Voices" provide the reader with a connection between theory and practice as well as help the reader critically apply "book knowledge" to organizational behavior.
- Although we briefly defined critical theory in the 10th edition in the chapter on leadership, we have expanded the concept. We believe critical theory and critical race theory in education have been elevated to major theories since their initial introduction in the mid-1990s. We also believe it is important to focus on eliminating racism in schools and schooling through a focus on CRT at all levels in the organization.
- The Critical Incidents introduced in the previous edition are being updated and moved to the end of each chapter. Our reviewers felt that readers were not prepared to critically analyze the Critical Incident until after they read the chapter, and we agree with our reviewers. After reading each chapter, a Critical Incident presents the reader with practical issues based on the chapter content. The Critical Incident requires the reader to respond to decision-making questions based on the facts presented and the reader's own theory of practice. This approach is important to the reader because (a) it develops understanding of the practical application of the knowledge of organizational behavior to the practice of leadership, and (b) it helps the reader to develop and internalize a personal commitment to a practical and effective theory of practice.
- New charts and figures to support new and previously presented material have been added in several chapters. This material helps the visual learner by presenting research findings in easy-to-view displays. Several charts and figures were also removed as we and our reviewers did not believe these were helpful.
- The book has been updated to make it more current in today's fast-paced era of No Child Left Behind (NCLB), Race to the Top (RTTT), accountability, and high-stakes testing. New updated research and recent developments in the field have been added in most of the book's 12 chapters to replace older material. For example, we introduce the Common Core State Standards along with a discussion of the two new assessment consortia: Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium and Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College

and Careers (PARCC). In addition, we maintained the classical research and theories that have been the foundation of progress in educational leadership.

- Our reviewers provided us with many excellent ideas for additions and changes to this edition. Here are a few of the major changes in addition to some of those listed above:
  - We moved the chapter on motivation from the end of the book to its new location as Chapter 5. We made this change because the theory and practice of motivation underlies the implementation of good leadership.
  - We added back to this edition in Chapter 3 a discussion of Mary Parker Follett's contribution to management theory.
  - We have added to Chapter 8 some of the many contributions Michael Fullan has provided on organizational change.
  - The Marzano, Waters, and McNulty research on leadership has been included in the discussion on leadership in Chapter 9.
  - We added a discussion on data-based decision making to Chapter 10.
  - Also, new to Chapter 10 is the presentation of Total Quality Management concepts to assist in organizational decision making.
  - The name and content of the chapter related to conflict in organizations (Chapter 11) has been changed to reflect a better focus on the topic of communications: *Conflict and Communications in Organizations.* In addition, we added a discussion on how principals should deal with difficult teachers, using ideas from Todd Whitaker's work.
- Many of the Reflective Activities at the end of each chapter have been revised and updated. These activities further challenge each student to develop and internalize personal commitment to a defensible theory of practice in educational leadership. By studying this book and completing the activities, the learner will develop a thoughtful and well-grounded approach to the practice of leadership in any school setting.

The 11th edition also offers updated support to instructors via two supplements, a Test Bank and PowerPoint® presentations. Both of these supplements can be downloaded at www.pearsonhighered.com/educators. The supplements can be located within the Instructor's Resource Center, which you can access after a one-time registration.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful to those individuals who assisted us with information and reviews of the 11th edition: Heather Duncan, University of Wyoming; Maria Hinojosa, Texas A&M University–Commerce; Ricardo D. Rosa, University of Massachusetts–Dartmouth; and Rosemarye Taylor, University of Central Florida. This group of reviewers was particularly thorough and provided excellent guidance for revising this edition and future editions.

In addition, we want to acknowledge the following practicing administrators who add great meaning to many of the chapters through their "Voices From the Field," connecting the research, theory, and concepts in this book to the "real world" of schooling:

- Peggy Aune, Principal, Manatee Middle School, Naples, Florida
- Scot Croner, K-12 Instructional Coordinator, Marion Community Schools, Marion, Indiana
- James Gasparino, Principal, Pelican Marsh Elementary School, Naples, Florida

- Kevin Gordon, former Principal, Gibbs High School, St. Petersburg, Florida; currently Provost St. Petersburg College, St. Petersburg, Florida
- Kendall Hendricks, Director of Finance, Brownsburg Community Schools Corporation, Brownsburg, Indiana
- Rocky Killion, Superintendent, West Lafayette Community School Corporation, West Lafayette, Indiana
- Brain Mangan, former Principal, Mariner High School, Cape Coral, Florida; currently Principal East Lee County High School
- Jorge Nelson, former Head of School in Vienna, Austria; currently administrator for Myanmar International School, Burma
- LaSonya Moore, Assistant Principal, Pinellas County Schools, Florida
- Steve Ritter, Principal, Lakeland High School, Deepwater, Missouri

Finally, and most importantly, we wish to thank Christopher Parfitt, a doctoral graduate student and graduate assistant at Florida Gulf Coast University, for his research assistance, his help in assuring our references were accurate, his help in editing and proofreading, and for his assistance in revising the PowerPoint® slides.

R.G.O.
T.C.V.

CHAPTER 1

Organizational and Critical Theory

A school is a world in which people live and work. Like any other social organization, the world of the school has power, structure, logic, and values, which combine to exert strong influence on the ways in which individuals perceive the world, interpret it, and respond to it. In short, the behavior of people at work in an educational organization—individually as well as in a group—is not merely a reflection of their individual unique personalities but is powerfully shaped and molded by the social norms and expectations of the culture that prevail in the organization. This interplay between individuals and the social environment of their world at work is a powerful agent in the creation of organizational behavior, the behavior of people in the school organization. Those who want to be effective educational leaders must have a clear grasp of the essentials of organizational behavior in deciding how to engage in the practice of leadership. As you read this text, you should think about what you read, question it, challenge it, and ask yourself—and discuss with other people—how it all fits into the practical realities of your work, your experience, and your personal view of the world. By being a reflective practitioner, this text will be much more useful to you both now and in the future.

SCHOOLS AS EDUCATIVE ORGANIZATIONS

Although U.S. schools have tended throughout their history to reflect the values and views of industry, commerce, and the military, it is becoming increasingly clear that schools are in fact distinct, if not unique, kinds of organizations that differ in important ways from industrial, commercial, governmental, or military organizations. Because schools are unique among organizations, they require ways of thinking, styles of leadership, and approaches to administrative practice that are especially suited to them.

The uniqueness of educational organizations resides in their educative mission. Many organizations are created for the basic purpose of making money by manufacturing products, selling them, or providing for-profit ancillary services that support those activities. Governments create a vast array of organizations that, collectively, are intended to provide public order and security. The distinctive mission of the schools to educate requires organizations that, by their very nature, enhance the continuing growth and development of people to become more fully functioning individuals. Such organizations must foster the learning, personal growth, and development of *all participants, including student as well as adults at work in the school.*

Educative organizations seek to increase the personal and interpersonal competencies of their participants, to develop the skills of the group in collaborating, to make hidden assumptions explicit and to examine them for what they mean in terms of individual and group behavior, to enact cooperative group behavior that is caring and supportive of others, to manage conflict productively and without fear, and to share information and ideas fully. They place high value on and support openness, trust, caring, and sharing; they always strive for consensus but support and value those who think differently; and they prize human growth and development above all. Effective educational leaders, then, strive for a vision of the school as one that seeks to be engaged in a never-ending process of change and development, a "race without a finish line" (or *kaizen,* as the Japanese call constant growth achieved through small incremental steps), rather than one that seeks the big dramatic breakthrough, the mythical silver bullet, that will, supposedly, finally make everything right.

The processes of becoming (McGregor, 1960)—of people growing and developing as individuals and as group members, and of the organization doing so, too—combine to create the essence of enduring vitality in organizational life, while academic outcomes are transient, ephemeral evidence that the processes are working. The conundrum of power is a major concern in the environment of the educational organization: Hierarchy prevails. We have never found a substitute for hierarchy in organizational life, but there is much that we can ethically and honestly do to share power and distribute it more equitably in efforts to minimize its deleterious effects on the behavior of people in the organization. In the process, we can make the school a more growth-enhancing environment, which is a very different concept of organization from what one generally finds in industrial and business organizations, and it should be because the essential, unique mission of schools is educative.

ORGANIZATIONAL THEORY

Discussion of different perspectives that may be used in thinking about organizations, bureaucratic and nonbureaucratic, is really discussion of organizational theory. Practicing educational administrators are commonly skeptical of theory, often thinking of it as some ideal state or idle notion—commonly associated with the pejorative term *ivory tower*. This attitude is often rationalized by those who work in schools by stating they must deal with the tough practicalities of daily life in the "real world." Far from being removed from daily life, however, theory is crucial in shaping our everyday perception and understanding of commonplace events. School leaders need to know about organizational theory so that they can think more clearly about making better-informed choices in a world where things are characteristically ambiguous, uncertain, unclear, or unknown.

Theory Defined and Described

Theory is not a guess or a hunch. Theory is systematically organized knowledge thought to explain observed phenomena. Good theory is based on good research (we discuss research practices later in this chapter). Just as we have theories about the causes of disease, the forces that make it possible for airplanes to fly, and the nature of the solar system, we also have theories about organizations and how they work. Just as there are theoretical reasons that underlie the fact that we know we should wash our hands frequently, exercise regularly, and maintain a nutritionally sound diet, there should be theoretical underpinnings to our understanding of schools as organizations and how to make them more effective.

Theory is useful insofar as it provides a basis for thinking systematically about complex problems, such as understanding the nature of educational organizations. It is useful because it enables us to *describe* what is going on, *explain* it, *predict* future events under given circumstances, and—essential to the professional practitioner—think about ways to exercise *control* over events.

Two Major Perspectives on Educational Organizations

Since the dawn of organizational studies in the twentieth century, people have generally elected to conceptualize organizations in one of two ways. One way is traditional theory, usually called bureaucratic, though it is often sardonically referred to by staunch critics of public schooling as the factory model of organization. Whatever name is used, bureaucratic organization conjures in one's mind some well-worn stereotypes:

- The eighteenth-century army of Frederick the Great, with its characteristically robot like regimentation, top-down authority, all controlled by extensive written detailed rules and directives—the "book" by which the organization is run
- Franz Kafka's famously vivid, indelible images that depict bureaucracy as a nightmarish, maddeningly indecipherable, obtuse organization that creates bizarre unpredictable outcomes in the name of sweet reason

Nevertheless, bureaucratic organization remains by far the most common theory of organization worldwide. Indeed, to many people in the world, bureaucracy is the defining concept, the very essence, of what an organization is. However, as time passed and the world changed, a second way of understanding organizations arose.

The second way is the contemporary nonbureaucratic theory that developed in large part from the constant growth and accelerating tempo of change in today's world. The present-day acceleration in the development of technology and changes in politics, economics, and society have generally left rigid bureaucracies floundering and unresponsive. To thrive in today's rapidly changing world, schools must be nimble, adaptive to change, and constantly evolving. These are the kinds of organizations that Peter Senge (1990) called learning organizations. They are not only adaptable to new challenges emerging in the world but are also adaptable to the worldwide rise in expectations for increased democracy, personal freedom, individual respect and dignity, and opportunities for self-fulfillment.

BUREAUCRATIC THEORY The bureaucratic approach tends to emphasize the following five mechanisms in dealing with issues of controlling and coordinating the behavior of people in the organization:

1. ***Maintain firm hierarchical control of authority and close supervision of those in the lower ranks.*** The role of the administrator as inspector and evaluator is stressed in this concept.
2. ***Establish and maintain adequate vertical communication.*** This practice helps to ensure that good information will be transmitted up the hierarchy to the decision makers, and orders will be clearly and quickly transmitted down-the-line for implementation. Because the decision makers must have accurate information concerning the operating level in order to make high-quality decisions, the processing and communicating of information up-the-line is particularly important but often not especially effective. The use

of computers to facilitate this communication is highly attractive to adherents of bureaucratic concepts.

3. ***Develop clear written rules and procedures to set standards and guide actions.*** These include curriculum guides, policy handbooks, instructions, standard forms, duty rosters, rules and regulations, and standard operating procedures.
4. ***Promulgate clear plans and schedules for participants to follow.*** These include teachers' lesson plans, bell schedules, pull-out schedules, meeting schedules, budgets, lunch schedules, special teacher schedules, bus schedules, and many others.
5. ***Add supervisory and administrative positions to the hierarchy of the organization as necessary to meet problems that arise from changing conditions confronted by the organization.*** For example, as school districts and schools grew in size, positions such as assistant principal, chairperson, director, and coordinator appeared. As programs became more complex, positions for specialists (director of special education, coordinator of substance abuse programs, school psychologist, compliance officer, and school social worker, to name a few) appeared.

The widespread acceptance of these bureaucratic mechanisms as the preferred way for exercising control and coordination in schools is illustrated by the reform movement that emerged in 1983, when *A Nation at Risk* was published during the Reagan presidency. The effectiveness of schools became a major theme in the political agenda on education and joined the linked duo that had been inherited from the 1970s—equality and access. Although there had been a steadily growing body of research literature on effective schools and what they were like, a nearly unrelated reform movement suddenly erupted in 1983 that—in the popular press and electronic media, at least—seized the center stage and strongly influenced numerous efforts to improve the functioning of schools. This point is of interest to us here because it illustrates the very strong conviction of many political leaders that bureaucratic methods are appropriate in thinking about schools and how to improve them.

Clearly, there is a strong tendency for some educational reformers to keep in mind bureaucratic methods or some other set of assumptions about the nature of schools on which the logic of their efforts pivots. Often those assumptions are the same as those underlying the traditional factory, in which management decides what is to be done, directs the workers to do it, then supervises them closely to be sure that the directives are followed in full. But as Doyle and Hartle (1985) observed:

> It simply doesn't work that way. The impulse to reform the schools from the top down is understandable: it is consistent with the history of management science. The explicit model for such reform was the factory; Frederick Taylor's scientific management revolution did for the schools the same thing that it did for business and industry—created an environment whose principal characteristics were pyramidal organization. . . . The teacher was the worker on the assembly line of education; the student, the product; the superintendent, the chief executive officer; the school trustees, the board of directors; and the taxpayer, the shareholder. (p. 24)

These beliefs seem to undergird the current reform strategy, as the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 demonstrates. At the time of this writing, a year into President Barack Obama's second term, it seemed clear that this trend would continue. It also seemed clear, based on Race to the Top (RTTT) foci, that the scope and power of the federal role in education policy would be

expanded on an unprecedented scale. Both NCLB and RTTT made extraordinary amounts of funding available to the states from Washington, DC. But the money awarded by RTTT to some states came with strict requirements, such as states must use common standards assessed by common assessments, and they must develop teacher and administrator accountability evaluation systems, in part based on student test scores.

Also, at the time of this writing, we were still awaiting the revision of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), delayed by the eruption of the overwhelming worldwide economic downturn in 2008 and 2009. We expect the ESEA to be reauthorized sometime in 2014. While it was recognized that the 2001 version of ESEA, which had been named the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, had been a major breakthrough in the history of U.S. public education, it had also given rise to significant problems. The outcome of the entire enterprise would unquestionably hinge on the extent to which the conviction of those with political power in Washington and the state capitals would remain unshakable about the following:

1. That they have the best ideas about how to bring about improvement in school outcomes in the classrooms of the 95,000 or so schools in the United States
2. That they have sufficient knowledge about the circumstances in the classrooms in those school districts to make the judgments necessary to draw up action plans and legal mandates to implement the top-down organizational strategy in the belief that it is incontestably the most promising option available to bring about the desired changes that are sought in the schools

The NCLB Act was—in the history of the Republic until that time—the boldest venture on the part of the federal government to redirect the schooling of children throughout the land. By 2013, federal participation continued to escalate on an unprecedented scale. It will take more time to see how well founded the beliefs so confidently held by politicians in Washington and in the state capitals actually were. We will discuss NCLB later in this chapter and refer to it throughout this book as it touches on many topics in the study of organizational behavior.

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT THEORY As we have suggested, there is a very different set of assumptions about the organizational characteristics of schools and the behavior of teachers in their classrooms. It is a view that places the teacher foremost in creating instructional change and therefore questions the wisdom of any change strategy that seeks to force change upon the teacher arbitrarily and without his or her participation in the processes of deciding what should be done. As we have seen, this is far from a new view of organization. But recent failures of bureaucratic methods to rectify severe organizational difficulties—especially in the corporate world—coupled with the emergence of newer organizational perspectives (such as the power of organizational cultures to influence behavior) has brought newer, nonbureaucratic concepts to the fore as a major way to think about organizational issues.

Bureaucratic organizations strive to create organizational cultures that place strong emphasis on the primacy of the organization's officially prescribed rules, and their enforcement, as the central means of influencing individual participants to perform dependably in predictable ways. Nonbureaucratic approaches, in contrast, emphasize developing a culture in the organization that harnesses the conscious thinking of individual persons about what they are doing as a means of involving their commitment, abilities, and energies in achieving the goals of the organization. The central mechanism through which the nonbureaucratic organization exercises coordination and control is the socialization of participants about the values and goals of the

organization, rather than through written rules and close supervision. Through this intense socialization, participants identify personally with the values and purposes of the organization and are motivated to see the organization's goals and needs as being closely congruent with their own. Thus, the culture of the organization epitomizes not only what the organization stands for and expects but also the core beliefs and aspirations of the individual participants themselves. The culture of an organization makes clear what the organization stands for—its values, its beliefs, its true (often as distinguished from its publicly stated) goals—and provides tangible ways by which individuals in the organization may personally identify with that culture. The culture of an organization is communicated through symbols: typically in the form of stories, myths, legends, and rituals that establish, nourish, and keep alive the enduring values and beliefs that give meaning to the organization and make clear how individuals become and continue to be part of the saga of the organization as it develops through time.

In this view, close inspection and supervision are far from the only means of ensuring the predictable performance of participants. Personal identification with and commitment to the values of the organization's culture can provide powerful motivation for dependable performance even under conditions of great uncertainty and stress. Consider, for example, what causes an individual to join an organization, stay in it, and work toward that organization's goals. For principles of human resources development theory to work, leaders need to believe in a particular philosophy of human behavior in the organization. Douglas McGregor helps us understand leader philosophy about people and the organization. His depiction of leader philosophy is called Theory X and Theory Y (McGregor, 1960).

THEORY X AND THEORY Y Theory X rests on four assumptions that the administrator may hold:

1. The average person inherently dislikes work and will avoid it whenever possible.
2. Because people dislike work, they must be supervised closely; they must be directed, coerced, or threatened with punishment in order for them to put forth adequate effort toward the achievement of organizational objectives.
3. The average worker will shirk responsibility and seek formal direction from those in charge.
4. Most workers value job security above other job-related factors and have little ambition.

Administrators who—tacitly or explicitly—think that these are basic facts of organizational life will, of course, use them as a guide when dealing with employees in the organization.

Theory Y embraces very different assumptions about the nature of people at work:

1. If it is satisfying to them, employees will view work as natural and as acceptable as play.
2. People at work will exercise initiative, self-direction, and self-control on the job if they are committed to the objectives of the organization.
3. The average person, under proper conditions, learns not only to accept responsibility on the job but also to seek it.
4. The average employee values creativity—that is, the ability to make good decisions—and seeks opportunities to be creative at work.

Administrators who—tacitly or explicitly—accept this explanation of the nature of human beings at work could reasonably be expected to deal with subordinates in ways that are quite different from those who hold Theory X views.

These theories are not something for you to accept or reject; they are merely a simple illustration of how theoretical views of the organization are actually used by practitioners of educational administration in their work—a guide to rational decisions and actions on the firing line. Those of us with administrative, management, or leadership responsibilities tend to believe that one of these theoretic statements more accurately represents the nature of reality in the organization than the other does. Leaders will generally act in ways that are harmonious with the theoretic statement that they think is true. Those who tend to hold a Theory X view of people, for example, tend to believe that motivation is basically a matter of the carrot and the stick; they tend to readily accept the necessity for close, detailed supervision of subordinates, and they tend to accept the inevitability of the need to exercise down-the-line decision making. Collegial approaches to organizational life tend to be viewed as perhaps a nice ideal in the abstract but not very practical in the real world of schools.

As Chris Argyris (1971) put it, Theory X views give rise to Behavior Pattern *A* on the part of leaders. This pattern of behavior may take one of two principal forms:

1. Behavior Pattern *A, hard,* is characterized by no-nonsense, strongly directive leadership, tight controls, and close supervision.
2. Behavior Pattern *A, soft,* involves a good deal of persuading, "buying" compliance from subordinates, benevolent paternalism, or so-called "good" (that is, manipulative) human relations.

In either case, Behavior Pattern *A,* whether acted out in its hard or its soft form, has the clear intention of motivating, controlling, and managing in the classical sense. It is based on Theory X assumptions about the nature of human beings at work.

Theory Y assumptions that leaders hold about people at work are very different. Theory Y assumptions give rise to Behavior Pattern *B* on the part of the leader. This style is characterized by commitment to mutually shared objectives, high levels of trust, mutual respect, and helping people in the organization to get satisfaction from the work itself. Pattern *B* leadership may well be demanding, explicit, and thoroughly realistic, but it is essentially collaborative. It is a pattern of leader behavior that is intended to be more effective and productive than Pattern *A* because it is thought to reflect a more accurate understanding of what people at work are really like.

In this discussion of the relationship between theory and understanding organizational behavior in schools, it should be emphasized—as Argyris cautioned—that Behavior Pattern *A, soft,* is often superficially mistaken for Behavior Pattern *B.* This ambiguity has caused considerable confusion among those trying to apply these theoretic ideas to schools:

> Behavior associated with Theory Y assumptions is basically developmental. Here supervisors focus on building identification of and commitment to worthwhile objectives in the work context and upon building mutual trust and respect in the interpersonal context. Success in the work and the interpersonal contexts are assumed interdependent, with important satisfactions for individuals being achieved within the context of accomplishing important work. (Siepert & Likert, 1973, p. 3)

But the Behavior Pattern *A, soft,* approach often used by supervisors to manipulate teachers into compliance with what is basically highly directive management—in the guise of "good human relations"—has done much in U.S. education to discredit the plausibility of Theory Y as applicable to the real world of schools and school systems. Siepert and Likert concluded that "by treating teachers in a kindly way it is assumed that they will become sufficiently satisfied and sufficiently passive so that supervisors and administrators can run the school with little resistance" (p. 4).

LIKERT'S FOUR SYSTEMS The practical usefulness of thinking in this way is illustrated by the work of Rensis Likert. In more than 30 years of research in schools as well as in industrial organizations, Likert identified a range of management styles, called Systems 1, 2, 3, and 4. The definitions of each system are explained in terms of leader behavior and how others in the organization are involved in decision-making processes: These systems range on a continuum from authoritarian leader behavior and no involvement by others in decision-making process in System 1, to collaborative leadership and broad involvement by others in decision making in System 4. Figure 1.1 defines each system and juxtaposes Likert's four systems with McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y. Likert's studies supported the hypothesis that the crucial variable that differentiates more effective from less effective organizations is human behavior in the organization. Blake and Mouton (1969) found that effective organizations involve individuals in important organizational decisions. They submitted that System 4 management is most effective and System 1 least effective. In examining extensive research on school organizations specifically, Gordon Lippitt (1969) agreed with Blake and Mouton's conclusions.

Both McGregor and Likert were basically concerned, not with being nice to people or making work pleasant, but with understanding how to make organizations more effective, which is as pressing a need in business and industry as it is in education. This general point of view is widely

THEORY X	*System 1*	*Management is seen as having no trust in subordinates.* a. Decision imposed—made at the top. b. Subordinates motivated by fear, threats, punishment. c. Control centered on top management. d. Little superior—subordinate interaction. e. People informally opposed to goal by management.
	System 2	*Management has condescending confidence and trust in subordinates.* a. Subordinates seldom involved in decision making. b. Rewards and punishment used to motivate. c. Interaction used with condescension. d. Fear and caution displayed by subordinates. e. Control centered on top management but some delegation.
	System 3	*Management is seen as having substantial but not complete trust in subordinates.* a. Subordinates make specific decisions at lower levels. b. Communication flows up and down the hierarchy. c. Rewards, occasional punishment, and some involvement are used to motivate. d. Moderate interaction and fair trust exist. e. Control is delegated downward.
THEORY Y	*System 4*	*Management is seen as having complete trust and confidence in subordinates.* a. Decision making is widely dispersed. b. Communication flows up and down and laterally. c. Motivation is by participation and rewards. d. Extensive, friendly, superior—subordinate interaction exists. e. High degree of confidence and trust exists. f. Widespread responsibility for the control process exists.

FIGURE 1.1 Likert's Management Systems Theory Related to McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y

and strongly supported by a vast amount of organizational research. Robert R. Blake's and Jane Srygley Mouton's (1969) organizational research, Gordon Lippitt's (1969) studies of organizational renewal, and Paul Berman's and Milbrey McLaughlin's (1978) extensive studies of change in U.S. schools are only a few of the many early studies that supported the general theoretic position that pioneers such as McGregor and Likert held.

Traditional classical organizational views (bureaucratic theory) would indicate the opposite practices: tighten up rules and procedures, exercise stronger discipline and tougher management, and demand more work from subordinates. In the parlance of neoclassical theory exemplified in NCLB, the focus is on teacher accountability, specified performance objectives, and market-based approaches to reform. Yet much of the best research in organizational behavior strongly suggests that this latter approach would be, at best, self-defeating. Throughout this book, we present evidence to support this claim.

A word of caution is in order here. Bureaucratic and human resources perspectives have been compared and contrasted as ideal cases for the purpose of clarifying and delineating the very real, basic differences between them. In the real world of schools, of course, one rarely encounters ideal cases, which is not to suggest that organizations cannot properly be classified as being bureaucratic or nonbureaucratic. Indeed, they can be and often are. Nor does it mean that, to be described as nonbureaucratic, an organization must be totally devoid of policies, regulations, and standard operating procedures, or that to be described as bureaucratic, an organization must be totally devoid of sensitivity to or respect for people. This fact is particularly true of schools, which are bureaucratic in some ways and nonbureaucratic in some very important ways. What it does suggest is that organizations may be properly described as *relatively* bureaucratic or *relatively* nonbureaucratic. It also suggests that schools are undoubtedly far more organizationally complex than is generally understood.

CRITICAL THEORY

A group of educational academicians who subscribe to a type of social criticism known as critical theory (CT) have had a major impact on how we view organizations and leadership. These theorists have been especially sensitive to and vociferous about shortcomings in the school hierarchy, particularly traditional bureaucratic institutions with top-down authority and limited allowances for typically marginalized groups to add their voices to organizational governance.

Critical theory holds that institutionalized oppression of groups of people in a society—cultural, ethnic, racial, and gender groups—is often supported by the oppressed peoples themselves, who believe the system to be in their own best interests. This coercion, critical theorists contend, is achieved by the manipulation of meaning by those in power to legitimate the values and beliefs of the power elite: "In essence, the oppressed groups work to support the interest of the dominant groups. By doing so, they consent to their own oppression" (Palmer & Maramba, 2011, p. 439). In that view, some critical theorists in the Marxian tradition would say—indeed have said—that workers in capitalist societies are oppressed by the powerful capitalist class but do not perceive it because, through control of the press, education, organized religion, and other social institutions, those in power systematically induce workers to believe that the values and beliefs of the capitalist class are legitimate and in the workers' best interests.

Paulo Freire (1970) is often credited with bringing CT to education in his famous work *Pedagogy of the Oppressed,* in which he analyzed educational practices and their impact on the poor and other marginalized groups. He contended that education should not treat children as empty, passive vessels into which teachers implant knowledge, which he called *banking*; education

in his view should be *problem-posing* in which teachers and students engage in dialogue and students are proactive learners in their own knowledge acquisition. These concepts gave rise to the term *critical pedagogy*. In this way, he believed that education could mobilize social transformation. Freire was from Brazil, and although his work had an impact in the United States, CT was firmly planted in the United States by the works of Michael Apple (1971, 1986) and Henry Giroux (1983). Other notables in their field are Derek Bell (1992), Richard Delgado (1995), and Peter McLauren (1998), among others. Often Jonathan Kozol (1991, 1995, 2005) is considered a critical theorist for exposing the problems of poverty on children in U.S. schools, beginning with *Savage Inequalities* in 1991; his research brought to light the effects of poverty on schools and children to many in mainstream education circles. Kozol showed how students living in poverty were typically in schools with insufficient funding and fewer highly qualified teachers; this condition, Kozol showed, hindered students' ability to meet educational standards set by states and school districts.

Critical Race Theory

When CT is applied to race, and specifically in education to the achievement gap, it is also termed Critical Race Theory (CRT), which is defined by Solórzano (1997) as scholarship and discourse on race and racism in an attempt to eliminate racism and racial stereotypes from society, including laws, social policy, and organizational cultures. Box 1.1 presents the tenets of CRT as defined by DeCuir and Dixson (2004).

A major contributor in bringing CRT to education is Gloria Ladson-Billings who credited others with its origins: "Our work owes an intellectual debt to both Carter G. Woodson and W. E. B. DuBois, who, although marginalized by the mainstream academic community, used race as a theoretical lens for assessing social inequality" (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995, p. 50). Ladson-

BOX 1.1

Tenets of CRT (DeCuir & Dixson, 2004)

1. *Counter-storytelling*—gives a voice to people of color as "a means of exposing and critiquing normalized dialogues that perpetuate racial stereotypes" (p. 27).
2. *The permanence of racism*—racism exists and this fact suggests "that racist hierarchical structures govern all political, economic, and social domains" (p. 27).
3. *Whiteness as property*—this stems from the historical view of Whites having exclusive privileges, such that Whiteness is much like having a property right. For example, "tracking, honors, and/or gifted programs and advanced placement courses are but the myriad ways that schools have essentially been re-segregated" (p. 28).
4. *Interest convergence*—decisions by the majority power structure will favor people of color only when it is also in the interest of the majority.
5. *The critique of liberalism*—"arguing that society should be colorblind ignores the fact that inequity, inopportunity, and oppression are historical artifacts that will not easily be remedied by ignoring race in the contemporary society. Moreover, adopting a colorblind ideology does not eliminate the possibility that racism and racist acts will persist" (p. 29). In addition, liberal ideology supports incremental change and "those most satisfied with incremental change are those less likely to be directly affected by oppressive and marginalizing conditions" (p. 29).

Billings also credited the more recent work of Jonathan Kozol. She wrote: "Kozol's research did give voice to people of color. His analysis of funding inequities provides insight into the impact of racism and White self-interest on school funding policies" (1998, p. 20). Ladson-Billings, among others (e.g., Bell, 1992; Brookfield, 2013; Closson, 2010; Delgado, 1995; DeCuir & Dixson, 2004; Smith & Colin, 2001; Solórzano, 1997), proffered that if we are to use CRT in education successfully, it must begin with understanding that racism exists, and it is normal. We should not deny it exists or shy away from discussing it; we accept its existence and try to understand it and expose it in an attempt to eliminate it. To do this is to foster antiracist practices and perspectives among everyone in the organization, and it cannot be done without using the lived experiences of African Americans. Although Whites and other non-Black individuals cannot fully empathize with the Africentric view (the term Smith and Colin preferred) because they have not lived it, they need to be aware of it and understand how it impacts schools in terms of curriculum, students' views on themselves and other races, as well as school and district culture in terms of how minorities are viewed and treated. Smith and Colin (2001) wrote that we should use Africentric views to "make the invisible visible" (p. 65).

The authors of this text, Owens and Valesky, do not share an Africentric experience, but this fact does not mean we cannot reflect on, discourse about, and empathize with the Africentric experience and use it analytically to examine and improve practices in schools. Giving people of color a voice through counter-story-telling regarding their lived experiences with racism helps heal their wounds, allows the oppressor to understand, and "is required for a deep understanding of the education system" (Ladson-Billings, 1998, p. 14). Giving people of color a voice is a major tenant of CRT supported throughout the literature (e.g., DeCuir & Dixson, 2004; Ladson-Billings, 1998). There have been some rather successful large-scale events in our recent history that gave voice to people of color and some of these are listed in Box 1.2.

BOX 1.2

Large-Scale Events in the United States to Give Voice to People of Color

Some large-scale attempts nationally in the United States to uncover and stop racism, and to give a voice to people of color, began most importantly with the August 28, 1963, Great March on Washington, led by Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. where he gave his famous "I Have a Dream" speech. Second, an annual march across the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, Alabama, attracts many prominent politicians and marks the anniversary of March 7, 1965—Bloody Sunday—when Alabama state troopers viciously beat the voting rights marchers attempting to go from Selma to the state capital of Montgomery. Third, the Million Man March of October 16, 1995, took place on the National Mall in Washington, DC, and was a major event to bring voice to people of color who continued to face racial problems in the United States. Fourth, one of the more important permanent structures giving a voice to the African-American population is the Martin Luther King Jr. memorial on the National Mall, which opened in 2011. Fifth, another important structure was placed in the U.S. Capitol Building in 2013—a statue of Rosa Parks, one of the female heroines of the civil rights movement, and now the first Black woman to have a statue in the Capitol's Statuary Hall. Finally, we would be remiss if we did not highlight the historical election in November 2008 and again in 2012 of the first U.S. president of African descent, Barack Obama, who became the 44th president of the United States.

What specifically can we do to implement CRT in schools? Solórzano (1997) provided four activities to combat racism:

1. Identify Examples—give specific examples of racism and racial stereotyping as well as the effects on both minorities and nonminorities.
2. Identify Media Stereotypes—"identify racial stereotypes in the popular media such as film, television, and print and show how they are used to justify attitudes and behavior toward Students of Color" (p. 14).
3. Identify Professional Stereotypes—we need to find ways to challenge the standard curricula and textbooks, which do not portray many professional people of color in quality professional roles.
4. Find Examples That Challenge—expose students to positive examples of people of color, challenging racial stereotypes: "There are rich sources of material in individual and family oral and pictorial histories, institutional and community studies, and artistic and cultural artifacts and ideologies that would change the racial stereotyping found in the popular and professional media" (p. 15).

These are the things school leaders and teachers must do if critical theory and critical race theory are to have any impact in schools.

What is the legacy of CT and CRT in education? Will it make an impact? Will educational researchers use CT and CRT to make improvements—not incremental improvements but radical improvements—for students of color? Will educators use CRT "to expose racism in education *and* propose radical solutions for addressing it" (Ladson-Billings, 1998, p. 22)? The practical impact on what we do in education based on CT and CRT, however, has not been as successful as most critical theorists would have hoped. In 1998, Ladson-Billings wrote the following:

> What, then, might happen to CRT in the hands of educational researchers and school personnel? Well to be honest, . . . I doubt if it will go very far into the mainstream. Rather, CRT in education is likely to become the "darling" of the radical left, continue to generate scholarly papers and debate, and never penetrate the classrooms and daily experiences of students of color. (p. 22)

As of 2013, it seems that Ladson-Billing's prophecy was correct. We do not see much to challenge racism in our schools in the way CRT would imagine. Yet, liberalism has brought a focus on multicultural curriculum and the concept of diversity is clearly a topic of interest in classroom instruction, among faculty and administrators when discussing school and district mission and vision, and with school policy in hiring practices. Since mid-1990s, when Ladson-Billings and Kozol presented their work to educators, some progress has been made, such as improved equity in school funding across school districts in many states, yet funding equity among schools within school districts still remains a question. Maybe multicultural education, a focus on diversity, and some funding equity are steps in the right direction, but are they enough to meet the goals of CRT?

The Concept of Social Justice

Multiculturalism, according to Ladson-Billings and Tate, is insufficient and "a liberal ideology offering no radical change in the current order" (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995, p. 56). However,

perhaps the focus on *social justice* takes us a step toward the goals of CRT. The concept of social justice, which seems to be taking root in U.S. schools and in colleges of education, is part of the CRT framework in its attempt to eliminate racism (Solórzano, 1997). Social justice takes on broad categories of issues as described by Dantley and Tillman (2010):

> Discussion about social justice in the field of education generally, and in educational leadership more specifically, have typically framed the concept of social justice around several issues (e.g., race, diversity, marginalization, gender, spirituality). Although these areas are vitally important to any discussion of social justice, we add the formidable issues of age, ability, and sexual orientation to this discourse. (pp. 19–20)

THE RELEVANCE TO SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TODAY

One may well question how relevant the ideas that have been discussed thus far are to the practice of educational leadership in schools. Are these ideas merely the playthings of academics and philosophers, or do they have real meaning to those who seek to make a difference as leaders in education?

The key to understanding how and why these ideas are important to educational leaders lies first in understanding that the processes of developing educational leadership are highly dynamic with constant, ongoing change and development. They have been changing and developing over the course of many years and will continue this dynamic process in the future. Knowing and accepting this evolution as an enduring characteristic of the education enterprise is basic to preparing oneself to be an educational leader. Of the many wellsprings from which the dynamic processes of change and development in education are shaped and molded, two are of foremost importance:

- ***The emergence of new knowledge about how people function in organizations*** Research and study are constantly modifying our understanding of the human experience in educational organizations, which is why it is necessary for the educational leader to stay abreast of current relevant studies of organizational behavior.
- ***The dynamic impact of changes in the larger society in which the schools exist*** The affairs of humankind possess an unremitting ebb and flow of overarching changes that challenge all social institutions to adapt to new conditions, and schools are no exception. War and peace, economic prosperity and recession, the evolution of social values and beliefs, and sweeping technological-industrial changes are obvious among them. Some are more subtle, such as the worldwide rise of conservative thought—economic, political, religious—that emerged in the waning years of the twentieth century and swept across the globe as the twenty-first century unfolded. This ideology may appear to have little to do with educational leadership, but in fact, as we shall describe, it may have at least as much impact as all the discoveries or inventions of new knowledge by scholars.

The relentless, ceaseless interplay between the search for a better understanding of human nature and human behavior, on the one hand, and the evolutionary development of social and political beliefs and values in our culture, on the other, creates a dynamic environment in which the basic concepts of education and educational leadership are endlessly incomplete, always works in progress. This can be an uncomfortable environment for those who seek certitude and finality in the ideas that guide their professional work. But this versatility is hardly unique to

educational leadership: the need to be nimble, adaptable, and flexible is a central characteristic of all kinds of effective organizations in every profession today.

To react to changing environments, to be nimble, and to adapt, leaders need to work with others to examine the organizational vision and mission to ensure the organization is on track for success. We examine these ideas in the next section.

VISION AND EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

The vision that leaders seek to share with followers is a protean thing, continually being revised and annotated by changing values, emerging developments, and events that vindicate or repudiate aspects of the worldview previously held by leaders, followers, or both. Indeed, one of the pivotal activities of leaders is to engage constantly in the dynamic process of stating a vision of things to come; then revising in light of emerging events, ideas, and beliefs; and restating the vision of "where we are and where we are going" that binds the members of the organization in mutual purpose and resolve. But in all its iterations, the vision of a leader is always uplifting, pointing to new directions, calling for progress from where followers are to where they want to be, and describing how they will get there. Dramatic examples abound in the realm of politics and social movements: one thinks of Churchill's magnificent rallying cry to the British facing almost certain defeat in World War II, "We shall fight on"; the stirring inspiration of Lincoln's low-key "Gettysburg Address"; and the immortal vision of King's speech, "I Have a Dream." Educational leaders rarely have opportunities to exercise such dramatic flair and personal charisma, yet they must always be prepared to articulate their personal vision for the organization as a rallying cry for the daily work to be done.

The purpose of the ongoing process of stating and discussing the vision is to buttress and develop the most critical factors in the development of organizational culture: the web of shared assumptions, beliefs, and values that unites the group in mutual solidarity. In the ordinary bureaucratic organization, these factors are rarely examined and discussed, rarely made explicit and public, rarely challenged. Indeed, in ordinary organizations, there is little even in the way of vocabulary for talking about such things, and the time-consuming minutiae of professional meetings usually drives such conversation out so that the norm in the organization's culture is to avoid such discussion altogether.

The goal of forging agreement on the vision or mission of the organization is, ideally, to seek consensus as nearly as it can be practically achieved, but always consensus on a new and better state in the future. We define a *vision* for an organization as the ideal toward which the organization is focused, whereas the *mission* is how the organization will achieve the vision, that is, a clear statement of the methods and strategies to be used, which contain the beliefs and values of the organizational culture. Throughout the process of developing or revising a vision and mission, the leader strives always to marshal consensus in support of something better: a higher plane of functioning, an elevated sense of motivation and commitment, an organization that is constantly metamorphosing into something better than it was. The point to remember is that the ongoing discussion of the organizational vision is a crucial dialogue through which the leader and the followers mutually engage in the process of forging the destiny that unites them in common cause. Therefore, it is a powerful engine for the empowerment of teachers. By participating in the never-ending process of creating, maintaining, and evolving a vision of the future of the school, teachers are themselves involved in a process of self-development and growth. Because the process is open, ongoing, and collaborative, the principal is also engaged in personal self-development and growth: The process engages the leader as much as anyone and in the end helps to forge and refine the leader's own vision.

Engaging in the give and take of the ongoing colloquy required to forge and maintain an evolving vision and mission of the organization requires one to rethink assumptions, beliefs, and values that previously guided behavior at work. One must either reaffirm them or modify them in the light of this reflection, as well as in the light of newly emerging realities. The process has a name—reflective practice—and many believe that it is essential if one is to continue to develop and improve one's professional practice over the years rather than stagnate and become increasingly irrelevant.

Whose Vision Is It Anyway?

At a time when school reform cries out for leadership rather than bureaucratic command, schools should be evolving from top-down hierarchical management toward a more collaborative, collegial, participative form of leadership. Because the new form of organization facilitates and encourages the active participation of people who are on the lower rungs of the organizational hierarchy, it is sometimes popularly referred to as bottom-up organization. In such an organization, the glue that binds the organization's participants together, that motivates them to unite in common purpose, is a vision of a different school, new and better, in the future. But whose vision is it anyway?

Bureaucrats assume that experts high in the hierarchy are especially qualified to set the goals of the organization and determine how to reach them. The experts may or may not consult those on the lower levels of the organization when they set goals. Leaders, on the other hand, assume that those on the lower levels of the organization have valuable knowledge about and insights into what the organization is about and that must be an integral part of the mix that we call a vision of the organization.

Leaders assume that the ability to lead is widely distributed throughout the organization and often manifests itself when participants express new ideas, challenge traditional practices, and synthesize and express the ideas of a collegial group. That is why it is important for leaders to empower others to participate fully in the unending processes of creating and refining a vision of the school's mission. But leadership is not a spectator sport: leaders do not stand passively on the sidelines hoping that others will lead the way and shape the future.

Leaders are not merely catalysts of the ideas of others, much as they encourage and facilitate participation; they have their own clearly thought-out vision of the future, their own sense of direction. Leaders have something important to say in the dialogue about where we are going, something that engages the aspirations of others and raises their hopes about what can and should be achieved in their work. Leaders move them forward to engage vigorously with others in building a new and better future in the organization. But leadership is not a solo performance. The leader's role in the process of developing a vision of the school, in addition to offering ideas and participating in discussion, emphasizes facilitating the involvement of others in an ongoing dialogue about the direction for the future.

Therefore, vision building is not always a placid process but also often requires engagement with different worldviews of people in the group, different temperaments, different personal agendas, different levels of understanding, different hopes and aspirations, and different pedagogical approaches to the future. Whereas the school principal, for example, must avoid imposing a prepared vision or mission statement on the teachers for ratification by them, he or she must have developed a clearly thought-out position from which to contribute, unhesitatingly and convincingly, to the discussion.

Perhaps the leader can do nothing more important in empowering teachers to create a process for forging and reworking the vision, or mission, of the school than to signal that this

process is not only important but also acceptable. Traditionally, schools have not been places where adults can easily share the collegial relationships that are essential to leadership (as distinct from management) and teacher empowerment. The school leader, then, must demonstrate convincingly an interest in promoting collegiality and shared leadership, an interest in shifting the norms of the school's culture from the traditional to more collaborative ways of working together. Making this shift in the cultural norms of the school, translating the intent into daily practices that reduce the sense of isolation that is typical teaching, will more than likely be gradual because teachers have learned, through experience, to be cautious in talking about their work. In traditional schools, teachers rarely see one another practice their craft; rarely discuss pedagogy in a serious way; and almost never deal with such matters in staff meetings, which are ordinarily filled with minor routine matters.

The educational leader—like leaders in all fields of human endeavor—inevitably faces a career in which new, resilient responses are constantly required to meet the challenges that will inescapably and unremittingly arise in the future. These challenges are likely to occur in cycles, as they have for over a century. Rest assured: The problems that seem overwhelming to us now will in time recede into the background as new and apparently more demanding challenges emerge in the future. In view of this unyielding progression, educational leaders not only need to develop responses to the urgencies of the moment but also to develop a set of values, beliefs, and principles to guide them in developing effective strategies and actions in the uncertain future. Taken together, these values, beliefs, and principles mold and shape the educational leader's vision of what the school ought to be like, the direction in which it should be going, and the end state for which it should be striving. A core element in such a vision must be the ability to see the school as a nimble, adaptive organization that is able to proactively detect problems as they are emerging and create effective solutions to them before the problems develop into crises. It is generally agreed today that a school administrator who does not have a clear and well-developed vision will find it difficult, if not impossible, to be an effective educational leader in the days ahead.

This incessant social-political process of change has been commented upon many times as being characteristic of the American approach to educational problems: New solutions to problems are invented, rise in popularity, and are enthusiastically tried for a few years. Then, when they fail to solve the problems, Americans grow impatient and cast them aside in favor of applying a new fad to a fresh set of different problems. The chronicle of schooling in the United States since the mid-twentieth century clearly supports the view that this pattern has been an enduring characteristic of the American approach to educational problems. It seems certain to be repeated in the future, and the debate and contention that accompany each new proposed quick fix invariably involve clashes concerning assumptions about people, values, and beliefs about human nature. The current iteration of this peculiarly American approach was launched with the passage by Congress in 2001 and the signing by the president in 2002 of the NCLB Act.

THE NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT

The power of the ideas that have been briefly discussed here to forge and give direction to practical matters in the tough world of educational leadership is clearly demonstrated in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act, an omnibus bill on education that became the law of the land in 1965. The law was then reauthorized with major revisions and given the new moniker of NCLB in January 2002. All the ideas that have been discussed here were contested in the rough-and-tumble world of national politics. Parties and players battled for dominance in shaping and molding new rules and new dynamics in educational policy and practice. Clearly,

in the process, one set of values and beliefs won the day in that legislative process; competing values and beliefs did not prevail. And yet in the give and take of the democratic process, losers seek to become winners, and we would be naïve to assume that the pendulum might not, in due course, swing back. But that is not the situation at this moment, although it is a possibility in the future. By any measure, the passage of the historic NCLB Act demonstrates that the ideas discussed here are not merely academic fluff but are at the heart of the need to make practical decisions about education.

When signed by President George W. Bush on January 8, 2002, the act reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in ways intended to be the most far-reaching reform of the nation's public education system since the creation of the Department of Education in 1979 (Kiely & Henry, 2001). It can be seen as "perhaps the greatest achievement of the U.S. Department of Education in its then 29-year history [because] it signified a clear shift from the department's early role as data keeper and dispenser of student-aid funds to its emergent role as leading education policy maker and reformer" (Dodge, Putallaz, & Malone, 2002, p. 674). Conversely, it has also been described as a historic, even breathtaking, intrusion by the federal government into the rights of states to control the education enterprise within their borders. At any rate, either as an intrusion or as an achievement, it marked a tectonic shift in the roles and the relationships between the federal and the state governments in the arena of public schooling.

The NCLB Act promised to increase federal expenditures in education by 20% over the previous year, and it had three major goals:

- Improving the preparation of teachers and increasing their compensation so that every classroom in the United States would be staffed by a "highly qualified" teacher by the end of the 2005–2006 school year
- Closing the achievement gap for disadvantaged students by having all children at proficient levels or better in reading and math by 2014
- Instituting closely monitored systems of accountability for students, teachers, and schools

By 2013, the first of these goals had fallen well short of its target; the second goal seemed, at best, unlikely to be achieved; and the third eluded the best of intentions. It had been envisioned that these goals would be accomplished by a number of federally issued mandates. For example, a centerpiece of the effort to close the achievement gap was a provision in the act creating the Early Reading Initiative. It pledged $900 million per year over a 6-year period to bolster reading instruction primarily in schools in poverty-stricken areas and an additional $75 million per year for preschool instruction in reading. The funding was not to be doled out automatically to the states, but it had to be applied for by proposals from the then cash-starved states that described in detail the programs they would develop with the money from Washington to achieve the initiative's intention of raising the achievement of disadvantaged students in learning to read.

But the language of the act, some 1,184 pages long, bristles with 246 references to the word *research* and 116 references to the terms *scientific* and *scientifically* in describing the kinds of approaches to instruction that were desired by Congress in enacting the law. It was clear that what Congress wanted to accomplish was to support instruction based on evidence from scientific research, but this quickly gave rise to a controversy over what exactly "scientifically based" research or instruction means. Since the beginning of NCLB, the U.S. Department of Education (ED) has worked to define what this means, which has resulted in an ED website containing information to assist educators in researching "scientifically-based" programs. This is called the *What Works Clearinghouse* (ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/). We discuss this in more detail in Chapter 12. In the next

section, we will discuss research in education to identify key elements in good research, and we provide some examples from both education and medicine.

RESEARCH IN EDUCATION

Some advocates for improving educational research seemed to insist that only controlled laboratory experimentation in the tradition of double-blind studies used in medical and pharmaceutical research could be the *gold standard* for judging the scientific adequacy of the research on instructional methods. Studies may properly be called controlled laboratory experiments if they use two basic techniques:

- They employ a control group, whose members would unknowingly receive a placebo, and an experimental group, whose members, also unknowingly, receive the medication under study. If neither the researcher nor the subjects know who is getting which treatment, it is usually called a double-blind study.
- They include systematic efforts to control or minimize other variables that might be confusing such as the age of the subjects, sex, race, financial status, and even variables that are unknowable.

Research in elementary and secondary education has, for over a century, been generally scorned in the academic community as being trivial, shallow, and largely lacking what is usually called scientific or academic rigor. Indeed, many academics contend that, because they perceive the field as lacking rigorous theoretical and scientific underpinnings, education cannot properly be called an academic discipline at all. It is also a major reason why educational research does not attract the financial support that is common in many other disciplines such as agriculture, medicine, physics, and business.

It cannot be denied that the quality of research in education has been and still is uneven. Research in education is hampered by the fact that education is not recognized as a bona fide scholarly discipline. By definition, a scholarly discipline includes the following:

- A well-defined body of knowledge that arises from recognized theory
- The use of research methods accepted as being appropriate to study the questions under investigation

This, of course, refers to what Thomas Kuhn called a scientific paradigm, which we will address in more detail later in this text. History is a typical example of a well-recognized academic discipline: it has well-defined body of knowledge that we call history, and that body of knowledge is constantly under development and expansion by researchers who investigate interesting questions by using systematic methods of study and recognized rules of evidence. Historians, for example, employ theory unique to their discipline and well-recognized methods of historical research such as historiography. Education, on the other hand, must draw its knowledge as well as its theory and research methods from a number of related disciplines, including psychology, sociology, anthropology, political science, and economics.

The quality of educational research has been rapidly improving since the middle of the twentieth century, as have the academic qualifications of those who are engaged in educational research. However, in academic circles, it takes time, sometimes a lot of time, to painstakingly bring an emerging discipline to maturity and recognition. Psychology went through this process

as it began to develop from biology; sociology required a long time to become accepted as an academic discipline, and so on.

The Framingham Heart Study—A Medical Example

Studies in education lack the strong support of their institutions as well as commitment from external sources of funding. Not surprisingly, few rigorous, large-scale, breakthrough studies exist in education comparable to, say, the legendary Framingham Heart Study, which has been so powerful in shaping the modern practice of medicine and, indeed, the way most of us live today. The study began collecting data in 1948 from 5,209 men and women between the ages of 30 and 62 and continues today, having now enrolled 5,124 of the adult children of the original participants and their spouses. Consider a few of the major findings of that research—the year of the findings are in parentheses (Arruda, 2013):

- Cigarette smoking was found to increase the risk of heart disease (1960).
- Cholesterol level and hypertension were found to increase the risk of heart disease (1961).
- The level of physical activity was found to be correlated with the risk of heart disease (1967).
- High blood pressure was found to increase the risk of stroke (1970).
- Menopause was found to be related to the risk of heart disease (1976).
- Sociopsychological factors were found to be related to the risk of heart disease (1978).
- High levels of high density lipid (HDL) cholesterol were found to reduce the risk of death (1988).
- Obesity was found to be a risk factor for heart failure (2002).
- Fat around the abdomen has been associated with smaller, older brains in middle-aged adults (2010).

This extraordinary program of research has directly contributed to more than a thousand articles published in refereed medical journals and has transformed, in important ways, the curriculum in medical schools and the practice of medicine itself. This is indeed powerful research by any standard. But notice: There was no control group, no laboratory controls, none of the arcane mystery that is popularly thought to be inherent in good medical research. Conceptually, the design of the Framingham Heart Study was classically simple: Data were systematically collected from a large, stratified random sample of individuals over the course of many years and examined for statistical relationships. Carrying out the research, however, has been complex, expensive, and difficult. This was a large-scale longitudinal study whose execution included two basic steps:

- Gathering data from a selected population using repeated questionnaires, interviews, and tests over time
- Seeing how, over time, selected factors (e.g., diet, exercise, genetic inheritance, smoking habits) correlated with the incidence of the onset of heart disease

It is a truly elegant research design, simple and straightforward, and executed with remarkable precision and fidelity. Of course, being a large and long-lasting study, it has required careful and highly competent management. But the point to be noted in the present discussion is that it is a classic correlational study. The Framingham Heart Study has great power to inform us, on the

one hand, of certain associations between cardiovascular health and selected lifestyle practices and, on the other hand, to suggest new and important questions for researchers to explore more fully using equally rigorous, though perhaps different, research designs.

The Tennessee STAR Study—An Education Example

Education research has few well-designed, large-scale studies similar to the Framingham study. One example that most educational researchers can agree meets the gold standard for research is the longitudinal study done in Tennessee entitled Student-Teacher Achievement Ratio, popularly known as the STAR study. We also present this study as it has been one of the most widely cited studies and has impacted a good deal of legislation and education policy across the United States. This was a legislated study that was conducted by the Tennessee State Department of Education and was carried out by representatives from four state universities. From 1985 to 1989, 79 elementary schools—stratified by inner city, urban, suburban, and rural settings with approximately 7,500 students in 300 kindergarten through third-grade classes—were involved in this research (Tennessee State Department of Education, 1990).

In the STAR study (Finn & Achilles, 1999), some students were randomly assigned to small classes ranging from 13 to 17 students, others to regular classes ranging from 22 to 26 students, and a third group to regular classes ranging from 22 to 26 students with a full-time aide. Findings from standardized test measures of math and reading indicated that students in small classes benefited significantly among all types of schools when compared to regular classes or regular classes with aides. Regular classes with aides showed some increased achievement results when compared to regular classes, but these results were not significant. The most striking findings were that gains made in small classes in kindergarten and first grade were maintained over the four years of the study, that low socioeconomic status (SES) student gains outpaced high SES student gains, and that small class sizes reduced grade retention. Because significant differences can be found statistically with small gains, the researchers were also interested in knowing how large the gains actually were. To do this, they calculated the effect size. Effect sizes were found to range from .15 to .34 for all students across the 4 years of the study, which means that students in small classes gained from 15% to 34% of one standard deviation compared to the larger classes.

What this study found to be not significant is also important. There were no differences found in levels of in-service training that teachers had had, teacher grouping practices, and parent volunteer interaction with classes. In other words, small class size made the difference in achievement, not these other variables. Due to its research design, the STAR study is perhaps the best known, large-scale longitudinal study in U.S. education, and befitting this stature, STAR has been influential in many education policy decisions.

Research and NCLB

In light of the role of research in school improvement, and the many competing claims being made for research "evidence" that advocates proffer in support of the use of particular, commercially produced instructional methods and materials, the educational leader should remember to examine the research designs and procedures on which the claims are based, as well as the statistical treatments given to the data reported, instead of taking the evidence reported by the press or, worse, book publishers at face value. The NCLB Act ushered in a new era for educational leaders, one in which school leadership was expected to be driven by data concerning educational

outcomes to an unprecedented degree, an era in which one increasingly needed statistical evidence to support claims and beliefs about instructional practices, much as the Framingham Heart Study guides us today in dealing with choices about diet and exercise.

Indeed, these two emphases immediately raised a storm of questioning, debate, and argument because it was not clear what either of those provisions meant: Did they mean that phonics drill was now to be the order of the day to the exclusion of other methods of early reading instruction? And what did "scientifically based" instructional methods mean? To some, it appeared that quantitative laboratory research methods were being emphasized as a base for professional knowledge to the exclusion of knowledge obtained through other research methods. To some, it seemed evident that the emphasis on phonics in the provisions concerning reading instruction was an effort by a political majority to dictate the outcome of the long-running controversy over what constituted appropriate pedagogical strategies and techniques in the teaching of reading. Thus, it seemed manifest that the federal government was, for the first time in history, dictating how reading should be taught in the kindergartens and primary grades of schools throughout the land. Similarly, to others, it seemed equally manifest that the Washington bureaucracy had decided to back quantitative laboratory research in the study of teaching methods as the only acceptable form of research, despite the fact that research in the social and behavioral sciences had generally, over the years, stressed the importance of qualitative field studies, too.

Clearly, the writing of the NCLB Act, and the debate and disputation that led to its final passage by Congress, had involved a battle in which modernist (who believe in quantitative research), and postmodernist (who accept and value qualitative research in addition to quantitative) beliefs, values, and understandings had clashed and the modernist view of the world had won the political battle. This was hardly some unfathomable academic discussion by intellectuals that had little to do with the hard realities of leadership and day-to-day life in schools. It was a struggle between people with different understandings of human nature, human behavior, values, and beliefs about the human condition.

The political struggle to control unfolding events is not over. These issues will be revisited many times in the twenty-first century as the application of the law unfolds and the effects are experienced with all their ramifications. The contention over the NCLB Act is a political struggle for the heart and soul of schooling in the United States, a struggle to wrest control of the direction in which schools had been going from those who had been in control and to force a change of course in a strikingly new and hopefully more successful direction. But, more important, it was and continues to be, a political struggle. It involves educational issues and problems, but, nevertheless, it continues to be a political struggle.

States, education associations, and parent groups successfully flexed their own political muscles, and, in 2005, the Bush administration eased up on some accountability measures. For example, some, though not all, special education children were permitted to take alternative state achievement tests if individualized educational plan (IEP) teams decided that a student was making progress, but his or her disability was preventing him or her from reaching grade level in the same time frame as other students. By the spring of 2005, 21 states sought some changes to NCLB resulting in lawsuits, state legislation, resolutions, and other actions such as requests for waivers from NCLB requirements. Connecticut became the first state to sue the federal government for not providing sufficient funding to support the mandates of NCLB, and the National Education Association (NEA) sued (in *Pontiac School District v. Spellings*) on behalf of nine school districts in Vermont, Texas, and Michigan, asking for exemptions from all NCLB requirements that were not funded by the federal government. The NEA (2005) claimed that from the inception of NCLB in 2002 to early 2005, states had to pay a $28 billion shortfall between the required costs

of NCLB and federal funding. They cited the law's own words in its reasoning (No Child Left Behind, 2002):

> Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize an officer or employee of the Federal Government to mandate, direct, or control a State, local education agency, or school's curriculum, program of instruction, or allocation of State or local resources, or mandate a State or any subdivision thereof to spend any funds or incur any costs not paid for under this Act. (Section 9527)

In November 2005, the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan granted the federal government's motion to dismiss *Pontiac v. Spellings*. It ruled that the federal government has the authority to require states to spend their own money to comply with the law. Education associations such as the NEA, American Association of School Administrators (AASA), the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP), the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP), the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC), and the National Parent-Teacher Association (NPTA) became strong advocates for school districts in their lobbying efforts for changes to NCLB. It was an attempt to establish a new scientific paradigm in education by political action rather than by scientific revolution. It has everything to do with the day-to-day realities of being a leader in the schools. Anyone who would be an effective leader in U.S. schools of the future must have a clear understanding of the assumptions and beliefs that underlie the arguments on both sides of this confrontation.

VOICES FROM THE FIELD

Rise Above the Mark

Public Education Reforms That Work

Rocky Killion, Superintendent of Schools, West Lafayette Community School Corporation, West Lafayette, Indiana

West Lafayette Community School Corporation (WLCSC), located in West Lafayette, Indiana, is one of the highest achieving school districts in the nation. Despite its success, Indiana legislators, driven by "corporate education reforms" are diverting the school district's tax-supported revenues to charter and private schools. In essence, these "reforms" are leading to the dismantling of public schools under the guise of providing "school choice." This dismantling then paves the way for national privatization of public schools by state legislatures whose efforts are often supported and rewarded by large corporations and foundations. Note the absence of educators in this process. Superintendent of Schools Rocky Killion, supported by the Board of School Trustees, the West Lafayette Schools Education Foundation, administration, and staff, are working together to produce an education documentary that will give public school educators a voice about what this process is doing to public schools.

Purpose

The purpose of *Rise Above the Mark*, narrated by Peter Coyote, is to educate the general public about the "corporate takeover" of Indiana public schools and what parents, community members, and educators can do to protect their local public schools. Legislators are calling the shots and putting public schools in an ever-shrinking box. WLCSC Board of School Trustees and Superintendent of Schools, Rocky Killion, want to secure resources and legislative relief necessary to achieve the school district's mission of creating a world-class educational system for all children. The school district's strategic plan will introduce a model of

education that puts decision making back into the hands of local communities and public school teachers, rather than leaving it in the hands of legislators and ultimately lining the pockets of corporations.

Documentary Themes

Major participants who have been interviewed for this documentary will address the following:

1. The corporate takeover of public schools and diversion of public funds to private entities
2. The dismantling of public schools disguised as "school choice" and "school vouchers"
3. The adverse impact standardized testing and using test scores to evaluate teachers is having on the teaching profession and public school students
4. The money grab of private companies that benefit from the so-called reform, which are not required to play by the same rules as public schools
5. The research on the best education systems in the world and what we can learn from them
6. A blueprint for parent, community member, and educator involvement in the "reform"
7. A request for support and resources to achieve our school district's mission which is *to engage our students in a world-class educational experience that prepares them to be well-rounded, innovative, creative, productive, and adaptive citizens who will shape our global society*

National Message

This scenario is not limited to Indiana. Nationally, legislators and policymakers are trying to privatize public schools by offering "school choice." With this mechanism, they are diverting public tax dollars from public schools and giving it to corporations. If public schools are dismantled, equal educational access for all children will disappear. The end result, if unchallenged, will cripple our society, destroy our economy, and create generations of impoverished children. WLCSC School Board members, staff, and administrators are ready to take on this fight so that all children can have equal access to an educational model in which educators, not legislators, are making the decisions. To view the current trailers for *Rise Above the Mark*, go to riseabovethemark.com.

The current educational reforms being used throughout the United States are based on competition, standardized test scores, and are being mandated by U.S. legislators and policy makers. As a nation, if we are interested in reforming public education, all Americans must first consider if the aforementioned mechanism really works. The National Center on Education and Economy indicates that the problem we face in public education is caused by the political system, not by the educators: "We have built a bureaucracy in our schools in which, apart from the superintendent of schools, the people who have the responsibility do not have the power, and the people who have the power do not have the responsibility" (National Center on Education and the Economy, 2008, p. xxvi). Legislators craft and pass educational legislation. Then, they direct school boards and administrators to implement their legislation. When their legislation doesn't work, school boards, educators, and administrators are generally blamed for the failure.

If the United States is to have the best education system in world, then the influence of political agendas must be removed from the equation, which does not mean that politics will never play a role in supporting the education system. What it does mean is politicians and policy makers must allow a public education system that empowers local school boards, administrators, and educators to make educational decisions for their respective communities and then hold them accountable for their decisions. When this type of governance is truly embedded within the U.S. public education system, then and only then will true education reform begin to work because those working closest with the students, educators, are making the educational decisions and not some political or special interest group hundreds of miles away from the classroom.

In order for U.S. public schools to become competitive with the world's best education systems, educational reforms that include early childhood education, equitable education opportunities for all students, raising requirements for entrance into the teaching profession, and paying beginning teachers' salaries comparable with other professions must be considered. The countries that have implemented these kinds of reforms have risen above the mark.

Major Participants

The Creative Team of the WLCSC has garnered the support of the following experts and supporters of public education to participate in this documentary:

Dr. Diane Ravitch—former U.S. Assistant Secretary of Education and Education Historian (dianeravitch.com)

Dr. Marc Tucker—President and CEO of the National Center on Education and the Economy (ncee.org)

Dr. Pasi Sahlberg—Director General of National Centre for International Mobility and Cooperation in the Ministry of Education in Helsinki, Finland (pasisahlberg.com/blog/)

Mr. Jamie Vollmer—Author, speaker, and supporter of public schools—former CEO of the Great Midwestern Ice Cream Company and former critic of public schools. (jamievollmer.com/about.html)

Dr. Linda Darling-Hammond—Charles Ducommun Professor of Education, Stanford University (ed.stanford.edu/faculty/ldh)

Mr. Peter Coyote—Award winning actor and narrator, appearing in more than 100 films and narrating over 165 documentaries (petercoyote.com)

Source: The National Center on Education and the Economy, 2008.

ASSUMPTIONS, BELIEFS, BEHAVIORS

Everyone in every culture accepts certain implicit, basic assumptions about people, their human nature, the nature of human relationships, the nature of human activity, and the nature of the relationships between people and their physical and social environments. These assumptions are called basic assumptions because they give rise to our beliefs and values and, ultimately, the way we behave toward others (Schein, 1985). Basic assumptions are learned beginning in infancy and develop as we mature and are educated. Over time, they become so thoroughly internalized that they are taken for granted and are shared with and supported by others around us. The assumptions become an invisible part of the warp and woof of organizational life, and they are rarely thought about enough to be considered or discussed. These basic assumptions become "the way we do things around here."

These basic assumptions—invisible and so taken for granted as to be rarely thought about, much less talked about—give rise to values and beliefs that we are more readily aware of. Because we may discuss those values and beliefs from time to time, they are more public than the basic assumptions from which they arise. For example, one of the marvels of the *Declaration of Independence* is that it publicly articulated the clear linkage between basic assumptions about the nature of humankind held by the founding fathers and the political beliefs and human values that, in their view, ultimately arose from those assumptions. In a similar vein, but in more commonplace examples, this concept explains why we unquestioningly adopt one set of behaviors when we go to church and a remarkably different set of behaviors when we are at a ball game.

Actions—that is, behaviors—flow from the values and beliefs that we embrace. In the case of the founding fathers, the compelling logic of their assumptions about human nature, that all men are created equal, led them to the treasonable acts of declaring independence from and ultimately taking up arms against arguably the mightiest kingdom of the time. Few of us

have the intellectual or the moral integrity of the founding fathers, however, and sometimes a peculiar dissonance separates the beliefs and values we publicly espouse and the organizational behavior in which we engage. In the case of the founding fathers, an example of this dissonance is easily seen in the discrepancy between the soaring pronouncement in the *Declaration of Independence* that all men are created equal and the fact that slavery was an accepted institution in the new Republic. As we know, this contradiction was the fountainhead of seemingly endless political struggles and compromises that began at the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia and has wracked the nation through generations until this very day, more than two centuries later. Indeed, the contradiction nearly destroyed the nation in the bloody Civil War. Yet some 87 years after the writing of the *Declaration of Independence*, in his celebrated "Gettysburg Address," Abraham Lincoln restated the proposition that all men are created equal and made clear to Americans that the purpose of the Civil War was to finally achieve that reality in practice. But while the basic assumption that all men are created equal endured and was thus powerfully reinforced, resistance also persisted, and the struggle to achieve equality in daily human behavior and political practice has endured as well. The low point of this saga was the Jim Crow period in the South. That period began in the 1870s and was finally broken by the enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, after the great civil rights struggles that wracked the nation in the 1950s. This dissonance between underlying assumptions about the nature of humanity, on the one hand, and the things that we do—our behaviors—on the other hand, continues to exist in our own time.

Examples of dissonance abound in education, as they do everywhere in our culture. Much is said about the need for children to get an early start in schooling with a rich and diverse program to lay a strong foundation for success in later years, yet we persist in spending minimal amounts for preschool and early childhood education. Women's rights activists, people of color, the growing impoverished underclass, and oppressed racial and ethnic minorities in our culture discomfit many by pointing to similar discrepancies between espoused beliefs and values in the schooling enterprise, on the one hand, and actual schooling practices, on the other. If we want to make a difference in the organization we call school, it is first necessary to carefully make our basic assumptions manifest and consider how logical the connections are between those assumptions, our publicly espoused values and beliefs, and the organizational behavior that we use in professional practice.

Certainly, at least until the mid-twentieth century, the pervasive assumption in Western cultures was that the world we live in must be characterized by some underlying patterns of logic, system, and order. This assumption is called structuralism, which is

> a pervasive and often unacknowledged way of thinking [that] has influenced twentieth-century thinking in important ways. It promises order, organization, and certainty. Structuralism is consistent with teaching for objectives, standardized educational assessment, quantitative empirical research, systematic instruction, rationalized bureaucracies, and scientific management. As long as structural assumptions remain unacknowledged, they are immunized against criticism. (Cherryholmes, 1988, p. 30)

However that is not the way things work in the real world of schools. There is often an obvious disjunction between publicly espoused values and what we do in schools. We say, for example, that we believe in equity and equality, but many women, people of color, and poor people find inequality and inequity to be dominant characteristics of their lives in schools. But it is difficult

for members of minority groups to raise questions about that issue because those who control the schools are usually able to suppress, sidetrack, redefine, or otherwise control the colloquy. There is an invisible web of power in the culture that controls our aspirations, how we think of ourselves, and how we deal with those issues in our lives (Foucault, 1980). Through that invisible web of power, those who control the culture decide what may be discussed, who is credible, and who is allowed to speak.

That is why most people today believe that it matters very much what kind of climate or culture prevails in a school. As teachers know well, many schools tend to evoke behavior that is conventional, conforming, submissive, and controlled—many would describe such schools as oppressive (students tend to say "jails")—by emphasizing powerful social norms and expectations that support and reward such behavior. Conversely, the norms of such schools discourage behavior that questions the established order and proposes changes that challenge the conventional ways of the past. It is essential for principals and others who want to be leaders in schools to explore ways of understanding the extraordinarily powerful relationship between the school as an organization and the behavior of people who work in it, and what implications for professional practice these understandings suggest about the behavior of leaders.

Knowledge of organizational behavior is very powerful and is arguably central to the most pressing issues in educational leadership today. This is a time of great intellectual turmoil in the field of education, a time of great epistemological skepticism in which all ideas rooted in the past are suspect. Indeed, some people seek to reject all theory and insist on a pragmatic approach to understanding organizational life in schools without seeming to understand that pragmatism is, in itself, a theory and an epistemological philosophy. Although we take a pragmatic approach to understanding behavior in education, it is based on understanding and accepting the fact that pragmatism is both an epistemological theory and a philosophy. Because of the epistemological skepticism that is rampant today and the antitheory bias that is sweeping through all the behavioral sciences, let us consider at least the essence of the growing intellectual heritage that underlies this book.

THE NATURE OF SCIENTIFIC PROGRESS

Dissatisfaction with public schooling has deepened over time, but the search for simple direct solutions has not borne fruit in the sense of an emerging broad national consensus that points the way to effective school reform. Rather, efforts to improve the performance of schools have produced not widespread agreement as to how to bring about improvement, but a frustratingly broad array of very different concepts, proposals, and programs, some of which are in conflict. By the time the NCLB Act came before Congress for consideration, many people who wished to bring order out of seeming chaos seized the notion that what was needed was a more scientific, or evidence-based, approach to deciding what to do. They wanted, in other words, to see the emergence of a consensus on what should be done to make schools more effective. Apparently, the hope was to legislate a simpler, more transparent understanding of what the problems were and therefore of what the solutions were. The prevailing view at the time of the debate and adoption of the act by Congress was that an infusion of more rigorous scientific thought and methods would be instrumental in improving the performance of schools. However, this view embodies some critically important assumptions about the nature of science and scientific progress. *It requires those who would be educational leaders to think more carefully about those assumptions and about the nature of science and scientific progress.*

People used to think, and many still do, that science brings about a steady cumulative acquisition of knowledge over the course of time. This view assumes that the nature of scientific inquiry is to use the discoveries of earlier investigations to explore further and thus extend our knowledge and understanding in an orderly and systematic way. This view envisions the growth and development of a science as a continuous, ever-expanding, increasingly certain understanding of the world.

This view of science and scientific methods was challenged by Thomas S. Kuhn (1962) with the publication of a 180-page essay entitled *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions.* Clearly "a profoundly influential landmark of twentieth-century intellectual history" (Van Gelder, 1996, p. B7), it has been translated into 16 languages and has sold well over one million copies—a remarkable number for such an intellectually rigorous book. Still in print today, Kuhn's work is studied not only by those in the so-called mature sciences (such as physics, chemistry, and astronomy) but also by those in the less-mature sciences (such as economics, history, education, and sociology) as well. As the demand for increased use of scientifically rigorous approaches to improving teaching and learning rises, it becomes important for educational leaders to understand the issues that Kuhn discussed.

Central to Kuhn's thesis was the recognition that science—contrary to conventional belief—does not produce a steady cumulative acquisition of knowledge. Rather, the history of science is characterized by a pattern consisting of tranquil periods during which "normal science" is practiced, punctuated occasionally by intellectually vigorous—or even, at times, intellectually violent—scientific revolutions. These scientific revolutions bring to the fore whole new conceptual understandings about the world.

During periods of normal science, the basic task of scientists is to apply established theory to explain and understand the mysteries that abound in our universe, to grapple with the confounding intricacies, and to discern patterns in the apparent muddle of the world. In the conduct of normal science, there is wide general agreement within the profession as to what theory is acceptable and what methods are appropriate to use in conducting studies and investigations. Thus, during periods of normal science, the work of scientists consists largely of using currently accepted theory to frame explorations of questions that the theory has not yet explained. Usually, this work results in strengthening and extending the currently accepted theories, ideas, and practices.

Kuhn described scientific work during periods of normal science as being rather routine, what he called puzzle solving: filling in the remaining pieces of the puzzle to further demonstrate and support the currently accepted theory. Such scientists are neither breaking new ground to extend scientific knowledge nor being objective, independent thinkers in the popular stereotype of scientific work. They are generally conservative individuals who accept what they have been taught and seek to apply it to solving the problems that prevailing theory dictates.

Kuhn used the term *paradigm* to describe this worldview shared by scientists, this intertwined set of theoretical and methodological beliefs and values that is accepted as being fundamental to a field of science. This scientific paradigm then establishes a set of agreed-upon understandings—the rules of the game, if you will—subscribed to by those in the profession as accepted and approved ways that problems are to be understood and explained. But a paradigm is more than merely a set of understandings and agreements arising from objective facts. A paradigm, even a scientific paradigm, is a system of beliefs that exists within a larger ideological context: it consists of interlocking scientific, social, as well as political views and commitments. Thus, it is not simply some esoteric scientific phenomenon isolated from the rest of the world; it is closely entwined with the realities of the social and political world. These realities of time and place are powerful players in shaping and molding a scientific paradigm.

A classic example of this—one that Kuhn used—is in the realm of astronomy, which had for centuries been dominated by the Ptolemaic paradigm that described the Earth as the center of the universe around which the sun and the planets revolve, which was of practical importance because the calendar was based on celestial activity. Yet as time passed, astronomers encountered ever-increasing difficulties in resolving the escalating number of awkward discrepancies between their observations and the dictates of the well-accepted Ptolemaic paradigm. During the sixteenth century, as the need for calendar reform made it vital to resolve these discrepancies, a great furor was stirred by the swelling debate over the revolutionary, new paradigm arising from the work of Copernicus. His was a heliocentric theory whose evidence showed that Ptolemy had been wrong, that in fact the sun was at the center of the solar system; around it, the Earth and other planets revolved. Thus arose what was indeed a paradigmatic crisis; it finally resulted in a scientific revolution that brought about the downfall of the time-honored Ptolemaic paradigm and gave rise to the then-new Copernican paradigm that still prevails today in astronomy.

Many other examples have been used to illustrate the concept of paradigms, scientific revolutions, and scientific progress. Four main points should be emphasized here:

- Scientific progress is characterized by periods of normal science, during which the established paradigm is refined and strengthened, followed by the emergence of a new paradigm to replace the old.
- In a scientific revolution, the new paradigm is very different from the old. It is not a modification of what went before, and it takes the science in a new direction. It renders the old paradigm incorrect and replaces it.
- The emergence of a revolutionary paradigm is strongly resisted and denied by the established "normal" science community. Thus, a scientific revolution is inevitably turbulent, volatile, and even intellectually violent. This is not a peaceful process, though, at its best, it may well be a civil process.
- Like a political revolution, a scientific revolution can succeed only when it wins the approval and acceptance not only of those in the scientific community but also of other relevant constituents.

The presence of a scientific paradigm is the most critical criterion that identifies a field as a mature science because it guides the research efforts of those who work in that scientific community. An immature science, on the other hand, lacks such an overarching paradigm to unify the efforts of the members of its community. In other words, the paradigm identifies and defines a field of science. As an immature science, education has no overarching paradigm. This is a fundamental reason that the effort to improve schools, teaching, and learning is currently characterized by many different theories, ideas, programs, and approaches—all of which are said by their adherents to work, but none of which has unified the relevant constituencies in acceptance and endorsement. The last paradigm in American schooling was progressive education, which is currently maligned by many critics.

Progressive education was not overthrown as incorrect by the breakthrough discovery of a new and different scientific paradigm; it was never demonstrated to be wrong or ineffectual through clinical trials or other scientific research. Rather, many of the basic pedagogical practices developed under progressive education continue to be widely in evidence and lauded as exemplary in American classrooms today, even as vigorous efforts to stamp them out persist. The drive to force a pedagogical shift away from progressive pedagogy is fueled not by any scientific breakthrough, but by a rising conservative social and political outlook that chooses to

reject the essence of the ideas about human nature and human behavior on which progressive education was built. In this context, American educational leaders may correctly understand the bold changes in direction embodied in the NCLB Act as an attempt to legislate the establishment of a new paradigm in teaching and learning, rather than as a result of a scientific revolution. In fact, the legislation called for scientific work to be done to justify the new paradigm after the fact instead of establishing a new paradigm based upon new knowledge arising from a scientific revolution, which effectively turns Kuhn's analysis on its head.

But do not be misled: Paradigm shifts and scientific revolutions occur from time to time in all sciences, no matter how mature they may be. This is the very nature of scientific progress. It is also why we continually witness previously well-established ideas and practices being challenged and overthrown either by the discovery of new scientific insights or by mounting evidence that the established ways are not producing the results that were predicted. In our modern scientific age, these changes have become the stuff of daily newspaper headlines. For almost three decades, for example, menopausal women were routinely advised by their doctors to take hormones, which were thought to ease the problems normally associated with the onset of menopause. Medical practitioners thought their advice was based on a well-developed body of solid scientific, clinical evidence. Yet early in the twenty-first century, this practice was thrown into great doubt and confusion; accumulating evidence clearly contradicted earlier beliefs and expectations held by medical practitioners and underscored the potential dangers of hormone therapy that had been largely unknown. The earlier scientific studies had not been badly done; however, accumulating experience with the use of hormones produced unanticipated outcomes for many patients, which constituted new evidence that could not ethically be ignored.

IMPACT OF BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE

William Wundt established the first psychology laboratory at the University of Leipzig in 1879, which was the dawn of the science of psychology. Similar laboratories were quickly established in other European universities, many of them by Wundt's students. Among these were American students, who commonly pursued graduate studies in Europe at that time, seeking the cutting-edge teaching and scholarship that did not exist then in American universities. Upon returning, many of them quickly established psychology laboratories in their universities and began teaching experimental psychology as the new scientific paradigm. This school of thought became known as behaviorism, which took root in American higher education and flourished well into the twentieth century.

Behaviorism emphasizes the scientific study of behavior using apparatus under the controlled conditions of a laboratory that permitted the experimenter to reinforce desired behaviors by controlling rewards such as food or gentle unpleasant consequences such as mild electric shocks. The experiments always focused on behavior that could be observed and quantified, excluding the consideration of possible internal states of the subject such as motivation or other mental activity such as thinking. Ivan Pavlov conditioned the reflexes of dogs so that he could cause them to involuntarily salivate when he wished. Edward L. Thorndike conditioned cats so that they could escape from puzzle boxes only by selecting and pressing the correct lever. Similarly, a popular experimental approach was to condition rats so that they could improve their abilities to navigate out of the laboratory mazes in which they had been placed.

B. F. Skinner invented a simple yet sophisticated piece of equipment for the psychology laboratory when he was a graduate student in the 1930s. It is called an operant conditioning chamber and has been and still is widely used in laboratory research work. Skinner went on to

produce a prodigious body of research, much of which used the operant conditioning chamber (or Skinner Box, as it was often sardonically called).

After William James established an early laboratory at Harvard, the discipline of psychology developed rapidly in American universities and, in the process, has produced a number of scientific paradigms that are very different from behaviorism. Five of these paradigms are briefly described here because they are particularly germane to the study of organizational behavior in education.

Behaviorism had clearly emerged by 1933 as the definitional approach to understanding human behavior in academic departments of psychology in U.S. universities. Skinner is undoubtedly the practitioner best known to U.S. teachers and educators for his widely practiced proposals for applying behaviorism to schooling, especially the pedagogical methods for teaching children with maladaptive behavior. Behaviorism was very popular among those in business and industrial management for many years because it supported the idea that management had the moral and ethical right to control and dominate people. Employees were, in this view, more or less passive objects that should be controlled and manipulated by management using behaviorist techniques. This procedure, it was reasoned, would be done in the best interests of the employees—whether or not they believed in or understood what they were doing.

By the 1970s, behaviorism, and particularly its Skinnerian form, had mushroomed into a large-scale movement in U.S. schooling and remained so well into the 1980s. Behaviorism still remains influential in curriculum and instruction circles. It has been embraced, knowingly or otherwise, by many advocates of school reform. Such pedagogical notions as programmed instruction, scripted teaching, diagnostic-prescriptive teaching, and behavior modification (e.g., the popular program called Positive Behavior Support [PBS]) draw upon behaviorist ideas familiar to many U.S. teachers. Much of the use of computers in the classroom is based on behaviorist understandings of pedagogy: "The technology of behaviorism that Skinner [advocated] for the schools is to decide on goals, to find the reinforcers to produce those responses, to implement a program of reinforcers that will produce the desired behaviors, and finally to measure very carefully the effects of the reinforcers and to change them accordingly" (Schmuck & Schmuck, 1974, p. 45). Thus, behaviorism, especially Skinner's brand, was far from some idle academic theory that had little relevance to the real world of schools; in fact, it has been a powerful force in defining how U.S. teachers, administrators, reformers, and others think about students, teaching methods, and the organization and leadership of schools. In the behaviorist view, "Evidence of learning consists of prescribed responses to stimuli presented in a program, on a standardized test, or by the teacher's question. In a good [behaviorist] program, the objectives are behaviorally defined, the information is presented in a logical and sequential manner" (Schmuck & Schmuck, 1974, p. 49), and there are systematic methods for evaluating behaviors to be used as evidence of reaching the program's objectives. Systematic methods for evaluating the outcomes of instruction should be, in the behaviorist view, *objective* and tend to emphasize standardized testing. Skinner made it very clear that, because the processes of learning are neither directly visible nor quantifiable, the pedagogical techniques of behaviorism "are not designed to 'develop the mind' or to further some vague 'understanding' . . . they are designed on the contrary to establish the very behaviors which are taken to be *evidence of learning* [italics added]" (Skinner, 1968, p. 26).

That was in 1968, but it is not some academic babble that has been rendered obsolete with the passage of time and the advancement of knowledge. Clearly, this view of teaching and learning is alive and well in our own time of school reform: many who advocate the standards movement and high-stakes testing in education reform today are comfortable with it. It is one of two recurring themes in the debate and discussion of schooling that have clashed repeatedly for well over a century.

Psychoanalytic Psychology

A 180-degree turn away from the behaviorist approach was the psychology of psychoanalysis. It was founded around the year 1900 by Sigmund Freud and a group of followers, notably Carl Jung. Whereas behaviorism was often spoken of as first-force psychology, psychoanalytic psychology emerged as the second force.

Psychoanalysis was the key method of choice to explore the unconscious drives and internal instincts that were thought to motivate people and thus were the causes of behavior. In fact, it was Freud who introduced the revolutionary notion of psychic energy: a previously overlooked source of energy, different from physical energy, from which human thoughts, feelings, and actions arose. Both Freudian and Jungian psychoanalytic approaches tended to focus on the need to diagnose and treat what was thought to be deviant or at least problematic behavior and tended to concentrate on issues such as social maladjustment and behavior disorders. The preferred method of treatment of perceived behavioral disorders was, and still is, psychotherapy.

Jungian psychology also gave us the terminology and concepts that are used in many organizations, including schools, to help us understand ourselves and others. Jung distinguished between two major psychological types, extravert and introvert, and he indicated that each person has four basic psychological functions: sensation, intuition, thinking, and feeling. These concepts were later used by Isabel Myers and Katherine Briggs to develop their famous personality instrument called the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), which will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 5. This instrument and other similar personality profile measures are used extensively in business organizations.

Sociological and Psychological Points of View

Psychoanalysts and psychotherapists of various types were important actors in some academic departments of psychology in U.S. universities in 1933, but they were far from dominant in the field because their research methods had little to do with ideas such as the design and execution of laboratory experiments, objective measurement, and mathematical analyses—all of which had become the hallmark of the scientific method and academic respectability among the status-conscious denizens of the upwardly mobile U.S. academy of the time. Nevertheless, the psychoanalytic/psychotherapeutic concepts of psychology were—as they still are—a widely known and influential force in the development of psychology.

Today, many U.S. teachers have studied the application of psychotherapeutic concepts to schooling through the work of practical psychoanalysts such as Bruno Bettelheim. Bettelheim's writing has been very popular among the general public as well, especially among parents and others interested in his chosen field of children with emotional disturbances.

Cognitive Psychology

Cognitive psychology is generally acknowledged as having begun in the 1960s as a major paradigm shift away from the then-dominant behaviorism. An important factor that triggered the paradigm shift was a devastating review by Noam Chomsky of some of Skinner's work on verbal behavior. Chomsky's work made it clear that the creative use of language cannot be explained by behaviorist theories.

Cognitive psychologists concentrate on what part the following phenomena play in generating human behavior:

- Attention
- Motivation

- Perception
- Memory
- Learning
- Information processing
- Reasoning
- Problem solving
- Judgment
- Decision making
- Language processing
- Sensation

They often apply their theories and paradigms to matters such as the following:

- *Critical thinking,* for example, how we apply these cognitive phenomena to evaluating arguments and analyzing complex discussions
- *Creative thinking,* for example, how we generate new insights, understandings, and alternatives that are different from the norm

Those who trigger scientific or artistic revolutions by inventing new paradigms (such as Einstein, Mozart, and Monet) are typically skilled in thinking critically and creatively. This area of cognitive psychology opens up consideration of the contrasts between convergent thinking and divergent thinking. It is also closely related to the currently popular concept of left-brain and right-brain orientation in thinking.

Cognitive psychology, having been widely accepted as a principal component of the scientific paradigm of education, has had considerable impact on the practice of teaching and learning in school classrooms. Thus, of course, excellent instruction is seen as emphasizing outcomes such as the perception of relationships between and among the elements of a problem, in contrast with emphasis on rote memorization. Contemporary teachers who are considered excellent tend to strive to develop the motivations of students as well as to incorporate a variety of ways of knowing and understanding in their teaching and thus the learning of their students. Therefore, considerable emphasis is given to the teaching of ideas such as study skills, social skills, problem solving, and organizational skills along with subject-matter mastery. This perspective clashes remarkably with the views of many who are active in the political realm of school reform, as is evident in much of the NCLB Act.

Social Psychology

Social psychology is particularly useful in informing the educational leader about organizational behavior. Behaviorism focused on the study of observations of manifest behavior and assumed nothing about possible inner factors that might influence it, and psychoanalytic psychology and cognitive psychology sought to study the cognitive and thought processes of individuals as causes of behavior. But social psychology interprets behavior as arising from an interaction between two factors: (a) the distinctive personality characteristics of the individual and (b) the distinctive social characteristics of the group or the organization in which the behavioral action occurs.

FIELD THEORY OF BEHAVIOR This insight is largely credited to Kurt Lewin, who is widely regarded as the founder of social psychology. It may be expressed in equation form as $B = f(p \cdot e)$,

meaning that behavior is a function of the person in the context of the social environment. This simple yet powerful concept was a major breakthrough, and it is called the *field theory* of human behavior. Social psychology encompasses a wide range of human behavior, including the following:

- Leadership
- Socialization
- Motivation
- Social interaction
- Interpersonal relations
- Group processes
- Group dynamics
- The formation and role of attitudes
- Public opinion
- Group behavior
- Intercultural behavior

It is part of the core of organization studies and has been very influential in the development of sociological and anthropological concepts of organizational life. Many social-psychological concepts underlie modern approaches to classroom management and teaching-learning practices as well. An understanding of the basics of social psychology is indispensable to the educational leader.

When working in schools, as in any organization, an extraordinarily powerful aspect of the environment in shaping and molding the behavior of participants is the culture and the climate provided by the organization. Although educational leaders have scant influence over the temperaments or personalities of the individuals whom they lead, they have a wide range of possibilities for influencing the characteristics of the culture and the climate of the organization. Because the organization has no independent physical reality but exists only as a socially constructed reality, and because our construction of reality is dependent on our perception of what is real, we can easily see how the organization emerges as a primary factor in evoking the behavior of people in it. This web of interactions between people and organization, and its implications for leadership, is not simple, but it is powerful in influencing and shaping the behavior of people at work in educational organizations.

In its early years, sociology developed with almost no reference to schools other than as institutions that were involved in issues such as social class, the effects of desegregation, and the role in society. By the late 1970s, however, a small number of sociologists began to take interest in applying sociological concepts and research methods to the study of organizations, including educational organizations. Their groundbreaking view was that every organization constitutes a distinctive culture. They began to pick up on some of the ideas that had been explored by the sociologists who conducted studies in industrial settings, notably in units of the Western Electric Company, and to extend that field of inquiry. As the school reform movement of the 1980s unfolded, educators became disenchanted with many of the proposals coming from psychologists—for example, proposals for more testing, increased emphasis on basic skills, and refinement of pedagogical techniques—and they began to listen more carefully to the thoughts of sociologists.

In thinking about schooling, psychologists and sociologists generally agree that the goals of schooling are as follows:

- Academic achievement
- Effective work habits

- Civic values
- Social behavior
- Self-esteem
- Self-reliance (Wells, 1989, p. 17)

But they disagree on what must be emphasized to achieve these outcomes effectively. Psychologists tend to focus on the ways in which individuals learn, including their learning styles, motivation, and relationships with both the teacher and classmates. "Sociologists," on the other hand, "look at the entire school and how its organization affects the individuals within it" (Wells, 1989, p. 17). Thus, to achieve the goals of schooling, social psychologists tend to focus on the following:

- The expectations that teachers have for the achievement of students
- The relationships between students and teachers
- The motivation of students
- Time spent on teaching and learning
- The relationships between individual students and their peers

To achieve the same goals, organizational and educational sociologists tend to emphasize the following:

- How schools are led and managed
- How students are grouped
- How parents and community people are involved
- How students and teachers are assigned to work together
- How important decisions are made in the school

We should be careful about emphasizing the apparent dichotomy of these two different points of view. It is not a new idea in psychology that behavior is heavily influenced by the characteristics of the organizational environment on which organizational sociologists tend to focus. Working independently, both Kurt Lewin (1935) and Henry A. Murray (1938), each a giant in the founding of modern psychology, accepted the premise as early as the 1930s that behavior is a function of the interaction between the person and the environment. This remains a basic concept in understanding organizational behavior. In this book, that idea is expressed as follows:

$$B = f(p \cdot e)$$

This formula represents a powerful understanding that has informed and inspired much of the study of organizational culture and the organizational climate in schools. The study of organizational behavior is, in fact, the study of the internal needs and personality characteristics of individuals and groups in dynamic interaction with the environment of the organization.

The emphasis increasingly given to the restructuring of schools to achieve school reform comes largely, but by no means exclusively, from the contemporary thought of organizational sociologists. Many currently popular buzzwords in school reform reflect the renewed understanding that the interface of people with the organization is the nexus of school reform efforts. Thus, the vernacular of school reform resounds with calls for empowerment and power sharing, "reinventing" the school, school site management, restructuring the school, participative decision making, humanizing the school, and organizational culture and organizational climate. All

of these terms suggest the need for major changes in the organization of the schools to improve the growth-enhancing characteristics of their environments.

LEADERSHIP AS COACHING

Since the 1980s, as we have discussed, much has been said in the literature on school reform and school leadership about the importance of educational leaders having a vision of what schools should ideally be like and how they can be changed from their present imperfect state to more nearly achieve the ideal that the leader and, presumably, the people in the school community envision. This evolution is, of course, offered as an antidote to the popular received wisdom that school administrators have traditionally been mindless bureaucrats who blindly follow the dictates of the frequently demonized "educational bureaucracy" that some critics claim is the organizational bane of public schooling.

Coaching as a Method of Teaching

Coaching is a time-honored and respected method of teaching, and it is one that school leaders must master. Mortimer Adler (1982) pointed out that there are three principal methods of teaching well, and each method is distinctive.

- ***Didactic instruction*** This method of teaching relies on clearly presenting information to students, often through lectures by teachers and activities such as having students read books, watch films, and do practice exercises. These instructional techniques are commonly supplemented by techniques such as discussions, demonstrations, the use of examples, and field trips—all intended to link new concepts to previously learned concepts to build and strengthen learning. Most readers of this book are skilled in didactic instruction, but as they assume the role of educational leaders, they will find that it is a way of working with teachers that is generally not productive. Many in-service programs intended to improve the instructional skills of teachers flounder because they emphasize didactic teaching methods, which are not always well received by adult learners.
- ***Socratic teaching method*** This method is often useful when the students have already learned a great deal of information but the goal is to get them to connect relevant ideas, to think critically, to analyze, to hypothesize about and explore the pros and cons of ideas, to assess the quality of countervailing claims, and to internalize new learning so that they will be applied in daily life. In using the Socratic method, the teacher often poses a conceptual conundrum and encourages the students to explore and discuss the issues that the conundrum raises. This teaching method has limited but sometimes useful applications for the school leader when he or she is working with teachers.
- ***Coaching*** Coaching assumes that the learners have a basic understanding of what they are doing, which has been previously imparted by both didactic and Socratic teaching. The coach "stands back to observe performance and then offers guidance, identifies weaknesses, points up principles, offers guiding and often inspiring imagery, and decides what kind of practice to emphasize" (Perkins, 1982, p. 55). As former teachers, school leaders learn that coaching is a familiar basic teaching method that they find very useful in working with teachers.

To many readers, the coaching metaphor immediately conjures up the imagery of sports. It is quite true that coaching is front and center in football, basketball, gymnastics, and other

sports. However, coaching is also a basic approach to leadership and teaching that is widely used in many situations where one is dealing with advanced students or professional colleagues. High schools that are successful in teaching advanced students, such as those who are preparing to enter challenging competitions in fields as diverse as science, music, dance, and mathematics, usually find coaching to be the method of choice. University professors normally use coaching techniques in working with advanced graduate students, and it is commonly the method of choice in working with students at the doctoral level. Coaching is often sought by many accomplished professionals with proven track records—among them presidents, opera stars, world-class athletes, and international luminaries of the theater—many of whom routinely seek the help of coaches even as they are recognized as masters of their professions. In contemporary business management, which emphasizes leadership as does educational administration, coaching is also widely accepted as an effective way to motivate and enhance the competencies of others—that is, to lead.

Final Thoughts

We have described some of the different perspectives and paradigms that are commonly used in thinking about and trying to understand issues of human behavior in educational organizations. The fact that various people use different paradigms in trying to understand human behavior in organizations inevitably means that educational leaders will be confronted with conflict and controversy as a normal part of their work. We emphasize that there is no *single* paradigm that will unify and give direction to the diverse ways of thinking about schools, teaching, and learning.

Precisely because there is no overarching paradigm, it becomes especially important for educational leaders to think through the issues and develop a clear understanding of their own position on the different, often conflicting, points of view. It is vital for the educational leader to develop a clear vision for change in the school, and of teaching and learning, and how that vision can be implemented in the schools. It is equally crucial for the leader not only to share this vision for change with others—particularly teachers and parents—but to encourage their collegial participation in developing it and adopting it as their own vision for the future, which we call the school's game plan. The vision for change—which, in the corporate world, would be called the *strategic vision* for the school—is crucial to developing this game plan.

A contribution from athletic coaching to the language of American English is the concept of a game plan, and it is very useful in dealing with the problem of turning an educational vision into effective leader behavior that brings about improvement in the learning of all the students in the school. By developing a game plan and supervising its implementation in the midst of the uncertainties, confusion, and stress of the game, the coach transforms the vision of the game into a coherent plan of action that is intended not only to achieve results but to motivate and enhance the abilities of the players as well.

This is precisely what effective educational leaders do, too. While it is unarguable that a clear, articulate, well-grounded vision of learning in the school is absolutely necessary for effective instructional leadership, it is also clear that it is not sufficient. To be effective (to get results), the vision must be developed into a workable implementation plan. Let us repeat: The game plan must not only get results in terms of improved student learning but, at the same time, it must motivate and enhance the competencies of the teachers. It is the responsibility of the school leader, the coach, to develop and supervise the implementation of that plan.

This is a theme you will encounter in each chapter as we encourage you to think more deeply about your educational vision and the game plan you need to make it happen. In the next chapter, this theme is further discussed and its relationship to the concept of theory of practice, the well-accepted

academic term for this concept, is explained. In succeeding chapters, you will find opportunities and, we hope, challenges for you to examine your own beliefs and values about leading people and coaching them to improve the instructional outcomes of the students in the school.

It is generally accepted today that school leaders are administrators whose professional practice is dedicated to promoting the success of all students, regardless of their race; family background; gender; or any other social, financial, or personal characteristics. As a basis for developing such a practice, it is essential for leaders to create, articulate, and implement a vision of learning in the school that they seek to make a reality. This vision of learning gives direction and shape to the leader's day-to-day activities and priorities. By sharing the vision with others—teachers, students, and parents—the leader engages them to unite in the effort to make it happen. Quite simply, the vision of learning in the school—having been thought through and embraced as the organizing core for exercising leadership—becomes the way in which the central issues of learning, teaching, and school improvement are constantly held in the foreground as the administrator confronts the never-ending necessity to make choices in a world where resources, such as time and money, are never enough, and expectations are always beyond our full grasp.

In this book, that vision for learning is called a game plan because it is not just wishful thinking or an idle dream: The vision becomes a plan that will guide you in choosing effective strategies and ways of implementing them in the real world of schools. The metaphor of the game plan is taken from sports, of course. The vision becomes a plan that organizes the work of the leader and establishes priorities for action. In other words, where do you want to go and how do you intend to get there? When communicated to others in a way they can embrace it as their own, the vision organizes their work and establishes the priorities of everyone on the school's team. No serious coach would take an athlete into an arena or send a team into a game without a strategy and a plan for implementing it, and no serious school leader should try to lead a faculty and staff in making the school more effective without a game plan either. You will find more about the concept of a game plan in Chapter 2.

However, to get started, focus now on the notion of a vision for the school that you would like to lead. The vision is the end state, the intentions of where you want to go with the school. Perhaps nothing is more important than educational leaders lifting their eyes from the mundane world of the present and envisioning the future possibilities—not a dream—of what a school really should be. The vision that you have of the school you would like to lead will express not merely the direction in which the school should be moving but what, in the end, such a school would be like. Free yourself now from the fetters of past practice, custom, or the way in which things are done in your school district. Think afresh: How do you envision what a school should be like? What really should be going on in such a school? How would you describe an effective school to others? What values and beliefs about learning in schools do you think are very important to address? What vision do you have for a really effective school?

Reflective Activities

1. Revisit the three main theories presented at the beginning of this chapter: (a) bureaucratic theory, (b) human resources development theory, and (c) critical theory. How do you see each of these being implemented in your organization—whether it be from the perspective of the school district level, the school level, a district department, a university, or some other organizational entity in which you work. State the organizational entity, and then how you would use, or not use, these concepts. These ideas will be the beginning of your game plan, which is discussed at the end of this chapter. Dream a little. Write freely. This is not the end; this is the beginning.
2. Kurt Lewin, in his *Field Theory of Behavior*, gave us the expression $B = f(p \cdot e)$. Define this expression in your own words and describe what this means to you in terms of organizational behavior.

CRITICAL INCIDENT The Vision for South Shore High School

Ran Nordhoff, professor of educational leadership at a major state university, had been compiling a series of studies of the work life of U.S. school principals. His research method was, essentially, to follow and observe a school principal at work all day, every day, for a period of several months in order to develop a case study. Doing this required that he first develop a comfortable relationship with the principal, one that was characterized by mutual trust and ease with one another, which in turn required time before the observational study began, time that was spent both during and outside school hours, in developing that relationship. That phase of the current study was over now, and today was the day that Ran would begin the data-gathering phase: going into the school and actually "shadowing" Bill Johnson, the principal of South Shore High School. Bill and Ran had agreed to start by having breakfast together at a local diner, which had been Bill's longtime custom, then driving to the school to start the day.

The two men had finished breakfast and were leaving the diner to drive to the school in Bill's car to begin the day's work. Ran felt a surge of quiet anticipation: Weeks of carefully cultivating Bill's trust and confidence were about to be put to the test. Today he would accompany Bill to the school to begin the task that the two had agreed on: The professor would shadow the principal throughout every school day for a period of five months. He had invested a lot of time and effort to get this far, and now he must be very careful. He had come to learn that Bill Johnson, while always projecting the very image of confidence and self-assuredness, also felt vulnerable. Bill was keenly aware that, as school principal, he was an important actor with a number of audiences: students, staff members, parents, and most important of all certain members of the ever-watchful school board.

Bill parked the car in his reserved space near the front doors of the school. Just as the two men were opening the car doors, Bill turned to Ran, saying, "Now, from this minute on, I expect you to 'shadow' me but we can't be friends while I am on the job. Don't talk to me during the day. Don't ask me questions while I am on the job. Because right now I am stepping on the stage and my role is that of principal of this school. And I am principal 100% of the time while I'm in that school. Okay?"

Ran said, "Sure, okay. But before we do that, tell me, what are your plans for the day? Can you give me an idea of what you are trying to accomplish today?"

Bill replied, "Oh, I don't make a lot of plans for each day. When I enter that building, there will be more than enough to keep me busy every minute of the day. The problems come to me. I don't have to go looking for them. Come on. You'll see."

With that Bill stepped out of the car, stood to his full six-foot height, and strode purposefully toward the school. He could see a small clutch of teachers, perhaps two or three, waiting behind the glass doors for him, the principal, to arrive.

1. What are the strengths of Bill Johnson's approach to the job? What are the drawbacks?
2. Do you think that you would approach the job differently? If so, in what ways?
3. You may have already observed the principals at work where you have been a teacher. In what ways would you say that Bill Johnson's approach was typical of (or different from) those principals?

Suggested Reading

Acker-Hocevar, M. A., Ballenger, J., Place, A. W., & Ivory, G. (Eds.). (2012). *Snapshots of school leadership in the 21st century: Perils and promises of leading for social justice, school improvement, and democratic community (The UCEA Voices from the Field Project)*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

This book is the third stage of a series of studies called *Voices From the Field* sponsored by the University Council on Educational Administration that began in the mid-1990s. Based on interviews of 81 superintendents and 85 principals from across the United States, researchers used the data to conduct a series of qualitative research studies on a number of topics in the field of organizational behavior. These topics include such areas as NCLB, leadership practices, assessment, decision making, and social justice. Some of these studies have been referenced in this textbook in subsequent chapters.

Educational Researcher. (2002). *31*(8).

The theme of this issue of *Educational Researcher* is "scientific research in education." It contains six articles, by nine distinguished authors, that discuss aspects of the report *Scientific Inquiry in Education* (which is listed in this section). This discussion was triggered by the emphasis in the No Child Left Behind Act on the importance of using scientific research methods in designing programs for improving instruction. The articles contained in this issue of *Educational Researcher,* together with the original report, *Scientific Inquiry in Education,* provide the educational

leader with an invaluable guide to the issues and problems that comprise the current controversy about educational research. These readings are strongly recommended to anyone who hopes to be an educational leader.

Hamilton, L. S., Stecher, B. M., & Yuan, K. (2008). *Standards-based reform in the United States: History, research, and future directions.* Palo Alto, CA: The RAND Corporation.

This book is *must* reading for anyone studying school leadership in the United States today. It is a well-researched study of where we are and where we are likely to be going with standards-based school reform in the United States, from a highly reliable and well-respected research organization. It is a very accessible report: clearly written in straightforward English.

Kuhn, T. S. (1962). *The structure of scientific revolutions.* Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

This important book is must reading for educational leaders today. It not only helps us to understand how scientific progress is shaped and developed but also explains some of the difficulties that immature sciences—such as education—have in increasing their scientific credibility. Given the recent attempts to legislate a paradigm for teaching in the United States, instead of encouraging a scientific paradigm, the issues discussed by Kuhn take on new importance for educational leaders.

National Policy Board for Educational Administration. (2008). *Educational leadership policy standards: ISLLC 2008.* Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.

This publication is the source for the ISLLC Standards that are described elsewhere in this textbook. Having been adopted for use in some 40 states, they are highly influential in the training of school leaders. It gives some history of how the standards came to be, with particular emphasis on the recent research used as their base. A well-written presentation that we think should be on the shelf of every future school leader.

Shavelson, R. J., & Towne, L. (Eds.), National Research Council Committee on Scientific Principles for Education Research. (2002). *Scientific inquiry in education.* Washington, DC: National Research Council, National Academy Press.

One of the most powerful and controversial provisions of the No Child Left Behind Act requires those who receive federal funds under the act to use evidence-based strategies in their school reform efforts. This requirement put education research at center stage as questions arose about what the term *evidence-based strategies* means. In an effort to clarify this issue, the National Research Council convened a committee that produced this report, which defines and discusses issues in scientific inquiry in education and what standards are appropriate to use in judging its quality. The main thrust of the report is to encourage the development of a scientific culture in the education profession. It is a landmark document that promises to have a long-term impact on the much-delayed development of research in education. Some practitioners may think that such dull stuff is best left to those in the ivory tower, but that would be wrong: Of all the provisions in the No Child Left Behind Act, this one has the greatest promise, over time, of finally moving education into the ranks of a full-fledged profession.

References

Adler, M. (1982). *The Paedeia Proposal: An educational manifesto.* New York, NY: Macmillan.

Apple, M. (1971). The hidden curriculum and the nature of conflict. *Interchange, 2*(4), 27–40.

Apple, M. (1986). *Teachers and text: A political economy of class and gender relations in education.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Argyris, C. (1971). *Management and organizational development.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Arruda, H. (Ed.). (2013). Framingham Heart Study: A project of the National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute of Boston University. Retrieved from http://www.framinghamheartstudy.org/about/milestones.html.1713

Bell, D. (1992). *Faces at the bottom of the well.* New York, NY: Basic Books.

Berman, P., & McLaughlin, M. W. (1978). *Federal programs supporting educational change: Implementing and sustaining innovations* (Vol. VIII). Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.

Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1969). *Building a dynamic corporation through grid organization development.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Brookfield, S. (2013). Racializing criticality in adult education. *Adult Education Quarterly*, *53*(3), 154–169. doi:10.1177/0741713603251212

Cherryholmes, C. H. (1988). *Power and criticism: Poststructural investigations in education.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Closson, R. B. (2010). Critical race theory and adult education. *Adult Education Quarterly*, *60*(3), 261–283. doi:10.1177/0741713609358445

Dantley, M. E., & Tillman, L. C. (2010). Social justice and moral transformative leadership. In C. Marshall & M. Oliva (Eds.), *Leadership for social justice: Making revolutions in education* (pp. 19–34). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

DeCuir, J. T., & Dixson, A. D. (2004). "So when it comes out, they aren't that surprised that it is there": Using critical race theory as a tool of analysis of race and racism in education. *Educational Researcher, 33*(5), 26–31.

Delgado, R. (1995). *Critical race theory: The cutting edge.* Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Dodge, K. A., Putallaz, M., & Malone, D. (2002, May). Coming of age: The Department of Education. *Phi Delta Kappan, 83*(9), 674.

Doyle, D. P., & Hartle, T. W. (1985, September). Leadership in education: Governors, legislators, and teachers. *Phi Delta Kappan, 67*(1), 21–27.

Finn, J., & Achilles, C. M. (1999). Tennessee's class size study: Findings, implications, misconceptions. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 21*, 97–109.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge.* New York, NY: Pantheon Books.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* New York, NY: The Continuum International Publishing Group.

Giroux, H. (1983). *Theory and resistance: A pedagogy for the opposition.* South Hadley, MA: J. F. Bergin.

Kiely, K., & Henry, T. (2001, December 17). Will no child be left behind? *USA Today,* p. D4.

Kozol, J. (1991). *Savage inequalities.* New York, NY: Crown.

Kozol, J. (1995). *Amazing grace.* New York, NY: Crown.

Kozol, J. (2005). *The shame of the nation.* New York, NY: Crown.

Kuhn, T. S. (1962). *The structure of scientific revolutions.* Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1998). Just what is critical race theory and what's it doing in a nice field like education? *Qualitative Studies in Education*, *11*(1), 7–24.

Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. F., IV. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Teachers College Record*, *97*(1), 47–68.

Lewin, K. (1935). *A dynamic theory of personality.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Lippitt, G. L. (1969). *Organizational renewal: Achieving viability in a changing world.* New York, NY: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

McGregor, D. M. (1960). *The human side of enterprise.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

McLauren, P. (1998). *Life in schools.* Boston, MA: Pearson.

Murray, H. A., et al. (1938). *Explorations in personality.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

National Center on Education and the Economy. (2008). *Tough choices or tough times: The report of the New Commission on the Skills of the American Workforce.* San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.

National Education Association. (2005). NEA stands up for children and parents, files first-ever national lawsuit against administration for not paying for education regulations. Retrieved from http://www.nea.org/home/17497.htm

No Child Left Behind Act. 20 U.S.C. 7907 Section 9527(a) (2001).

Palmer, R. T., & Maramba, D. C. (2011). African American male achievement: Using a tenet of critical theory to explain the African American male achievement disparity. *Education and Urban Society*, *43*(4), 431–450. doi:10.1177/0013124510380715

Perkins, D. (1982). *Smart schools: Better thinking and learning for every child.* New York, NY: Free Press.

Schein, E. H. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Schmuck, R. A., & Schmuck, P. A. (1974). *A humanistic psychology of education: Making the school everybody's house.* Palo Alto, CA: National Press Books.

Senge, P. (1990). *The fifth discipline.* New York, NY: Doubleday.

Siepert, A. F., & Likert, R. (1973, February 27). *The Likert school profile measurements of the human organization.* Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association National Convention, New Orleans, LA.

Skinner, B. F. (1968). *The technology of teaching.* New York, NY: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Smith, S. E., & Colin, S. A. J., III. (2001). An invisible presence, silenced voices: African Americans in the adult education professoriate. In V. Sheared & P. A. Sissel (Eds.), *Making space: Merging theory and practice in adult education* (pp. 57–69). Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Solórzano, D. G. (1997). Images and words that wound: Critical race theory, racial stereotypes, and teacher education. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, *24*(3), 5–19.

Tennessee State Department of Education. (1990). *The State of Tennessee's Student/Teacher Achievement Ratio (STAR) project: Final summary report 1985–1990.*

Van Gelder, L. (1996, June 19). Thomas Kuhn, 73. Devised science paradigm [Obituary]. *The New York Times,* p. B7.

Wells, A. S. (1989, January 4). Backers of school change turn to sociologists. *The New York Times Education Supplement*, p. 17.