

Development of Administrative Thought: A Historical Overview

Fred C. Lunenburg
Sam Houston State University

Beverly J. Irby
Texas A & M University

Abstract

The development of administrative thought can be placed into a loose historical framework. In general, four models emerge: classical organizational theory, the human relations approach, the behavioral science approach, and the post-behavioral science era. The classical “rational” model evolved around the ideas of scientific and administrative management, including the study of administrative processes and managerial functions. The human relations “social” model was spurred by some early seminal social science research, including experimentation and analysis of the social and psychological aspects of people in the workplace and the study of group behavior. The behavioral science approach was an attempt to reconcile the basic incongruency between the rational–economic model and the social model. The more recent post-behavioral science era includes the interrelated concepts of school improvement, democratic community, and social justice, as well as emergent nontraditional perspectives (variously labeled neo-Marxist, critical theory, and postmodernism).

The development of administrative thought can be placed into a loose historical framework. In general, four models emerge: classical organizational theory, the human relations approach, the behavioral science approach, and the post-behavioral science era. No attempt is made to date the eras precisely. In fact, if we view the sequence of developments in organizational and administrative theory, we notice a correlational rather than a compensatory tendency. Traces of the past coexist with modern approaches to administration.

Classical Organizational Theory

Classical organizational theory emerged during the early years of the twentieth century. It includes two different management perspectives: scientific management and administrative management. Historically, scientific management focused on the management of work and workers. Administrative management addressed issues concerning how an overall organization should be structured.

Scientific Management

Prior to the turn of the twentieth century, there was almost no systematic study of management. The practice of management was based on experience and common sense. Frederick W. Taylor tried to change that view. An engineer, he pursued the idea that through careful scientific analysis the efficiency of work could be improved. His basic theme was that managers should study work scientifically to identify the “one best way” to perform a task.

Taylor’s (1911) *scientific management* consists of four principles:

1. *Scientific Job Analysis*. Through observation, data gathering, and careful measurement, management determines the “one best way” of performing each job. Such job analysis replaces the old rule-of-thumb method.
2. *Selection of Personnel*. Once the job is analyzed, the next step is to scientifically select and then train, teach, and develop workers. In the past, workers chose their own work and trained themselves.
3. *Management Cooperation*. Managers should cooperate with workers to ensure that all work being done is in accordance with the principles of the science that has been developed.
4. *Functional Supervising*. Managers assume planning, organizing, and decision-making activities, whereas workers perform their jobs. In the past, almost all work and the greater part of the responsibility were thrust on workers.

Taylor’s four principles of scientific management were designed to maximize worker productivity. In his early career as a laborer in the steel industry, he observed firsthand how workers performed well below their capacities. He referred to this activity as *soldiering*. Taylor felt that scientific management—time study for setting standards, separation of managerial and employee duties, and incentive systems—would correct the problem. Rather than relying on past practice or rules of thumb, he provided managers with explicit guidelines for improving production management, based on proven research and experimentation.

Administrative Management

Whereas scientific management focuses on jobs of individual workers, *administrative management* concentrates on the management of an entire organization. The primary contributors to the field of administrative management were Henri Fayol (1949), Luther Gulick and Lyndall Urwick (1937), and Max Weber (1947).

Henri Fayol (1949) was an engineer and French industrialist. For many years, he served as managing director of a large coal-mining firm in France. He attributed his success as a manager not to any personal qualities he may have possessed but, rather, to a set of management principles that he used. Fayol claimed that all managers perform five basic functions: planning, organizing, commanding, coordinating, and controlling.

Besides the five basic management functions, Fayol (1949) identified fourteen principles he felt should guide the management of organizations. He found them useful during his experience as a manager (see Table 1).

Table 1

Fayol's Fourteen Principles of Management

Component	Description
Division of work	The object of division of work is improved efficiency through a reduction of waste, increased output, and a simplification
Authority	Authority is the right to give orders and the power to extract obedience. Responsibility, a corollary of authority, is the obligation to carry out assigned duties.
Discipline	Discipline implies respect for the rules that govern the organization. Clear statements of agreements between the organization and its employees are necessary, and the state of discipline of any group depends on the quality of leadership.
Unity of command	An employee should receive orders from only one superior. Adherence to this principle avoids breakdowns in authority and discipline.
Unity of direction	Similar activities that are directed toward a singular goal should be grouped together under one manager.
Subordination of individual interest	The interests of individuals and groups within an organization should not take precedence over the interests of the organization as a whole
Remuneration	Compensation should be fair and satisfactory to both employees and the organization.
Centralization	Managers must retain final responsibility, but they should give subordinates enough authority to do the task successfully. The appropriate degree of centralization will vary depending on circumstances. It becomes a question of the proper amount of centralizing to use in each case.
Scalar chain	The scalar chain, or chain of command, is the chain of supervisors ranging from the ultimate authority to the lowest ranks. The exact lines of authority should be clear and followed at all times.
Order	Human and material resources should be coordinated to be in the right place at the right time.
Equity	A desire for equity and equality of treatment are aspirations managers should take into account in dealing with employees.
Stability of personnel	Successful organizations need a stable workforce. Managerial practices should encourage long-term commitment of employees to the organization.
Initiative	Employees should be encouraged to develop and carry out plans for improvement.
Esprit de corps	Managers should foster and maintain teamwork, team spirit, and a sense of unity and togetherness among employees.

Fayol's (1949) fourteen principles of management emphasize chain of command, allocation of authority, order, efficiency, equity, and stability. Max Weber (1947) also recognized the importance of these factors, but Fayol was the first to recognize management as a continuous process.

Luther Gulick, another classical theorist, augmented Fayol's five basic management functions while serving on Franklin D. Roosevelt's committee on Government Administration. He coined the acronym POSDCoRB, which identified seven functions of management: planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, and budgeting (Gulick & Urwick, 1937).

1. *Planning* involves developing an outline of the things that must be accomplished and the methods for accomplishing them. It attempts to forecast future actions and directions of the organization.
2. *Organizing* establishes the formal structure of authority through which work subdivisions are arranged, defined, and coordinated to implement the plan.
3. *Staffing* involves the whole personnel function of selecting, training, and developing the staff and maintaining favorable working conditions.
4. *Directing*, closely related to leading, includes the continuous task of making decisions, communicating and implementing decisions, and evaluating subordinates properly.
5. *Coordinating* involves all activities and efforts needed to bind together the organization in order to achieve a common goal.
6. *Reporting* verifies progress through records, research, and inspection; ensures that things happen according to plan; takes any corrective action when necessary; and keeps those to whom the chief executive is responsible informed.
7. *Budgeting* concerns all activities that accompany budgeting, including fiscal planning, accounting, and control.

One of the most influential contributors to classical organizational theory was German sociologist Max Weber (1947), who first described the concept of bureaucracy. Weber's contributions were not recognized until years after his death. Weber's concept of bureaucracy is based on a comprehensive set of rational guidelines. Similar in concept to many of Fayol's fourteen principles, Weber's guidelines were believed to constitute an ideal structure for organizational effectiveness. Weber's ideal bureaucracy and Fayol's fourteen principles of management laid the foundation for contemporary organizational theory.

Classical organizational theories and their derived principles have many critics. An emphasis on efficiency characterized the classical approach to management. To these theorists, an efficiently designed job and organization were of prime importance. Psychological and social factors in the workplace were ignored. The critics claim that when managers ignore the social and psychological needs of workers, organizations do not provide adequate motivation to their employees. The classicists assumed that financial incentives would ensure worker motivation. In short, the focus of classical organizational theory was on the task, with little attention given to the individual or group in the workplace. This flaw was primarily responsible for the emergence of the second approach to management thought: the human relations approach.

Human Relations Approach

The *human relations approach* is considered to have started with a series of studies conducted at the Hawthorne Plant of Western Electric near Chicago by Elton Mayo (1933) and his associates (Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1939) between 1927 and 1933. These studies, widely known as the *Hawthorne studies*, have strongly influenced administrative theory.

The Hawthorne Studies

The Hawthorne studies consisted of several experiments (Mayo, 1933; Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1939). They included the first Relay Assembly Test Room, the second Relay Assembly Group, the Mica-Splitting Group, the Typewriting Group, and the Bank Wiring Observation Room experiment. In addition, an interview program involving 21,126 employees was conducted to learn what workers liked and disliked about their work environment.

Two experiments in particular are noteworthy. In the Relay Assembly Test Room experiments, the research began with the designation of two groups of female workers. Each group performed the same task, and the groups were located in two separate rooms, each of which was equally lighted. One group, designated the control group, was to have no changes made in lighting or other work-environment factors. The other was the experimental group in which lighting and other environmental factors were varied. Changes in the productivity of the two groups were subsequently measure and analyzed. Regardless of the light level or various changes in rest periods and lengths of workdays and workweeks, productivity in both the control and the experimental groups improved; in fact, the worse things got, the higher the productivity rose.

In the Bank Wiring Observation Room Experiments, a group of nine men were paid on a piecework incentives pay system. That is, their pay increased as their productivity increased. Researchers expected that worker productivity would rise over time. As in the Relay Assembly Test Room experiments, researchers found an unexpected pattern of results. They discovered that the group informally established an acceptable level of output for its members. Most workers, the “regulars,” ignored the incentive system and voluntarily conformed to the group’s standard level of acceptable output, called a *group norm*. Those who did not conform, the “deviants,” were disciplined by the group to bring their output in line with the group’s standard output. Workers who produce too much were called “rate-busters” and sometimes were physically threatened to make them conform to the rest of the group. On the other hand, employees who underproduced were labeled “chislers” and were pressured by the group to increase their productivity.

To understand the complex and baffling pattern of results, Mayo (1933) and his associates (Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1939) interviewed over 20,000 employees who had participated in the experiments during the six-year study. The interviews and observations during the experiments suggested that a human-social element operated in the workplace. Increases in productivity were more of an outgrowth of group dynamics and effective management than any set of employer demands or physical factors. In the lighting experiment, for example, the results were attributed to the fact that the test group began to be noticed and to feel important. Researchers discovered that the improvement in productivity was due to such human-social factors as morale, a feeling of belonging, and effective management in which such interpersonal skill as motivating, leading, participative decision making, and effective communications were

used. Researchers concluded, from the results of the incentive pay-system experiment, that informal work groups emerged with their own norms for the appropriate behavior of group members. In short, the importance of understanding human behavior, especially group behavior, from the perspective of management was firmly established.

Other Contributors to the Human Relations Approach

Mayo and his associates were not the only contributors to the human relations approach. There were several strong intellectual currents which influenced the human relations movement during this period. Kurt Lewin (1951) emphasized field theory and research known as group dynamics. Noteworthy is his work on *democratic* and *authoritarian* groups. Lewin and his associates generally concluded that democratic groups, in which members actively participate in decisions, are more productive in terms of both human satisfaction and the achievement of group goals than are authoritarian groups (Lewin, Lippitt, & White, 1939). Furthermore, much of the current work on individual and organizational approaches to change through group dynamics (sensitivity training, team building, Alcoholics Anonymous, and Weight Watchers) and the action-research approach to organizational development is based on Lewin's pioneering work.

Carl Rogers deserves mention here as well. Not only did he develop a procedure for industrial counseling (Rogers, 1942) while working with Mayo and his associates at Western Electric, but the metapsychological assumptions on which his client-centered therapy (Rogers, 1951) is based also provide the skeletal framework on which the human relations approach is built. For example, according to Rogers, the best vantage point for understanding behavior is from the internal frame of reference of the individual, who exists in a continually changing world of experience; who perceives the field of experience as reality for her; and who strives to actualize, maintain, and enhance her own human condition.

The writings of Jacob Moreno (1953) made a substantial contribution to the human relations movement. Like Lewin, Moreno was interested in interpersonal relations within groups. He developed a sociometric technique: people develop selective affinities for other people. Groups composed of individuals with similar affinities for one another will likely perform better than groups lacking such affective preferences.

Additional contributors to the human relations school of thought include William Whyte and George Homans. Using a field study methodology similar to the one used by Mayo, Whyte (1949) studied the nature and functioning of work group behavior in the restaurant industry. He examined intergroup conflict, status within groups, workflow, and the like. Consistent with Moreno's sociometric theory, Whyte found that selective preferences among group members are associated with such factors as similarities in age, sex, and outside interests. His study is significant because the findings are based on observations of real-life situations rather than isolated laboratory conditions. George Homans's (1950) general theory of small groups was a major landmark. Homans conceptualized the totality of group structure and functioning that has received wide attention among organizational theorists and practitioners alike.

The major assumptions of the human relations approach include the following ideas:

1. Employees are motivated by social and psychological needs and by economic incentives.

2. These needs, including but not limited to recognition, belongingness, and security, are more important in determining worker morale and productivity than the physical conditions of the work environment.
3. An individual's perceptions, beliefs, motivations, cognition, responses to frustration, values, and similar factors may affect behavior in the work setting.
4. People in all types of organizations tend to develop informal social organizations that work along with the formal organization and can help or hinder management.
5. Informal social groups within the workplace create and enforce their own norms and codes of behavior. Team effort, conflict between groups, social conformity, group loyalty, communication patterns, and emergent leadership are important concepts for determining individual and group behavior.
6. Employees have higher morale and work harder under supportive management. Increased morale results in increased productivity.
7. Communication, power, influence, authority, motivation, and manipulation are all important relationships within an organization, especially between superior and subordinate. Effective communication channels should be developed between the various levels in the hierarchy, emphasizing democratic rather than authoritarian leadership.

The human relationists used field study methods extensively, as well as laboratory experiments, to study the work environment. These social scientists made important contributions to our understanding of employee behavior in the workplace.

Behavioral Science Approach

Behavioral scientists considered both the classicists' rational-economic model and the human relationists' social model to be incomplete representations of employees in the work setting. A number of authors attempted to reconcile or show points of conflict between classical and human relations theory; thus, the *behavioral science approach* was born.

Barnard: Effectiveness/Efficiency

Although a contemporary of many human relationists, Chester Barnard was one of the first authors to take the behavioral science approach. For many years, Barnard served as president of the New Jersey Bell Telephone Company. His executive experience and extensive readings in sociology and organizational psychology resulted in one of management's few classic textbooks (Barnard, 1938).

His best-known idea is the *cooperative system*, an attempt to integrate, in a single framework, human relations and classical management principles. Barnard (1938) argues that the executive must meet two conditions if cooperation and financial success are to be attained. First, the executive must emphasize the importance of *effectiveness*, which is the degree to which the common purpose of the organization is achieved. Second, the executive must be aware of *efficiency*, which is the satisfaction of "individual motives" of employees. His main point is that an organization can operate and survive only when both the organization's goals and the goals of

the individuals working for it are kept in equilibrium. Thus, managers must have both human and technical skills.

Bakke: Fusion Process

Another major contributor to the behavioral science approach was E. Wight Bakke of the Yale University Labor and Management Center. He views the organization as embodying a *fusion process* (Bakke, 1955). The individual, he argues, attempts to use the organization to further his own goals, whereas the organization uses the individual to further its own goals. In the fusion process, the organization to some degree remakes the individual and the individual to some degree remakes the organization. The fusion of the *personalizing process* of the individual and the *socializing process* of the organization is accomplished through the *bonds of organization*, such as the formal organization, the informal organization, the workflow, the task(s) to be completed, and the system of rewards and punishments.

Argyris: Individual/Organization Conflict

Holding views similar to Bakke's, Chris Argyris (1993) argues that there is an inherent conflict between the individual and the organization. This conflict results from the incompatibility between the growth and development of the individual's maturing personality and the repressive nature of the formal organization. Argyris believes that people progress from a state of psychological immaturity and dependence to maturity and independence and that many modern organizations keep their employees in a dependent state, preventing them from achieving their full potential.

Further, Argyris (1993) believes that some of the basic principles of management are inconsistent with the mature adult personality. The resulting incongruence between individual personality and the organization causes conflict, frustration, and failure for people at work. People learn to adapt to the failure, frustration, and conflict resulting from the incongruency by ascending the organizational hierarchy, by using defense mechanisms, or by developing apathy toward their work that ultimately leads to the dysfunction of the organization's goals. This trend to conformity has been espoused in such popular books as Whyte's (1956) *The Organization Man* and Harrington's (1960) *Life in the Crystal Palace*.

Getzels and Guba: Nomothetic/Idiographic

A useful theoretical formulation for studying administrative behavior is the social systems analysis developed for educators by Jacob Getzels and Egon Guba (1957). Getzels and Guba conceive of the social system as involving two classes of phenomena that are independent and interactive. First are institutions with certain roles and expectations that together constitute the *nomothetic dimension* of activity in the social system. Second are the individuals with certain personalities and need-dispositions inhabiting the system who together constitute the *idiographic dimension* of activity in the social system.

Behavior then in any social system can be seen as a function of the interaction between personal needs and institutional goals. Conformity to the institution, its roles, and its expectations results in organizational effectiveness, whereas conformity to individuals, their personalities, and

their need-dispositions results in individual efficiency. (Note the similarity between Getzels and Guba's framework and those of Barnard, Bakke, and Argyris.)

Maslow: Need Hierarchy

The behavioral science approach has drawn heavily on the work of Abraham Maslow (1970), who developed a need hierarchy that an individual attempts to satisfy. Maslow's theory suggests that an administrator's job is to provide avenues for the satisfaction of an employee's needs that also support organizational goals and to remove impediments that block need satisfaction and cause frustration, negative attitudes, or dysfunctional behavior.

McGregor: Theory X and Theory Y

Based on the work of Maslow, Douglas McGregor (1960) formulated two contrasting sets of assumptions about people and the management strategies suggested by each. He called these *Theory X* and *Theory Y*. McGregor believed that the classical approach was based on Theory X assumptions about people. He also thought that a modified version of Theory X was consistent with the human relations perspective. That is, human relations concepts did not go far enough in explaining people's needs and management's strategies to accommodate them. McGregor viewed Theory Y as a more appropriate foundation for guiding management thinking.

Herzberg: Hygiene-Motivation

Extending the work of Maslow, Frederick Herzberg (1993) developed a two-factor theory of motivation. Herzberg makes a distinction between factors that cause or prevent job dissatisfaction (hygiene factors) and factors that cause job satisfaction (motivation factors). Only the latter group of factors can lead to motivation. Herzberg's hygiene factors relate closely to Maslow's lower-level needs: physiological, safety, and social; his motivation factors relate to the needs at the top of Maslow's hierarchy: esteem and self-actualization. Recognition of motivation factors calls for different style of management from that proposed by the classical or human relations advocates.

Likert: Systems 1-4

Another writer concerned with the way in which the goals of individuals and those of the organization can coincide is Rensis Likert. Likert conducted extensive empirical research at the Institute for Social Research-University of Michigan to examine the effect of management systems on employees' attitudes and behavior. He developed four management systems, ranging from *System 1*, Exploitive Authoritative, to *System 4*, Participative Group (Likert, 1979). Each system characterizes an organizational climate based on several key dimensions of effectiveness, including leadership, motivation, communications, interaction/influence, decision making, goal setting, control, and performance goals.

Likert posits the participative group system (System 4) as coming closest to the ideal. The essence of System 4 theory is based on three key propositions: supportive relationships, group decision making in an overlapping group structure, which he calls *linking-pins*, and high-

performance goals of the leader (Likert, 1987). (Note the parallel here to McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y dichotomy.) Likert, however, provides more categories and more specificity. His Systems 1-4 represent four different leadership styles.

Blake and Mouton: Managerial Grid

In the area of leadership, Robert Blake and Jane Mouton (1994) assess managerial behavior on two dimensions: concern for production and concern for people. Managers can plot their scores on an eighty-one-celled managerial grid. The grid is designed to help managers identify their own leadership styles, to understand how subordinates are affected by their leadership style, and to explore the use of alternative leadership styles consistent with employees' needs.

Fiedler: Contingency Theory

Contingency theories of leadership have come into vogue in recent years. Fred Fiedler (1967) developed a contingency theory of leadership effectiveness. The basic premise is that in some situations relationship-motivated leaders perform better, while other conditions make it more likely that task-motivated leaders will be more effective. Three variables determine the situations under which one or the other type of leader will be most effective: leader-member relations (the degree to which leaders feel accepted by their followers), task structure (the degree to which the work to be done is clearly outlined), and position power (the extent to which the leader has control over rewards and punishments the followers receive; Fiedler, p. 168).

A key contribution of the contingency perspective may best be summarized in the observation that there is no one best way to administer an organization. There are no motivation strategies, organizational structures, decision-making patterns, communication techniques, change approaches, or leadership styles that will fit all situations. Rather, school administrators must find different ways that fit different situations.

Hersey and Blanchard: Situational Leadership

Another popular leadership theory is situational leadership developed by Paul Hersey and Kenneth Blanchard (2007). *Situational leadership theory* is based primarily on the relationship between follower maturity, leader task behavior, and leader relationship behavior. In general terms, the theory suggests that the style of leadership will be effective only if it is appropriate for the maturity level of the followers. Hersey and Blanchard see two types of maturity as particularly important: job maturity (a person's maturity to perform the job) and psychological maturity (the person's level of motivation as reflected in achievement needs and willingness to accept responsibility).

Other Important Contributors

The great diversity of perspectives in the behavioral science school makes it impossible to discuss all of its contributors here. Social scientists like Victor Vroom and Arthur Yago (1988), William Reddin (1970), and Amitai Etzioni (1975) did much to assist its development.

Warren Bennis (1990), in his best-selling book on leadership, identifies bureaucracy and other classical management principles as the “unconscious conspiracy” that prevents leaders from leading.

Post-Behavioral Science Era

The behavioral science approach influenced the preparation and practice of school administrators for some time, but it has lost much of its original appeal recently with challenges to modernist views of organizations and leadership. Building on the strengths and shortcomings of the past, three powerful, interrelated concepts of school improvement, democratic community, and social justice emerge (Murphy, 2002), which form the development of the next era of the profession: the *post-behavioral science era*. This view is reinforced with increased emphasis on emergent nontraditional perspectives (variously labeled neo-Marxist, critical theory, and postmodernism).

School Improvement

Accountability for school improvement is a central theme of state policies. The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 (Public Law 107-110) sets demanding accountability standards for schools, school districts, and states, including new state testing requirements designed to improve education. For example, the law requires that states develop both content standards in reading and mathematics and tests that are linked to the standards for grades three through eight, with science standards and assessments to follow. States must identify adequate yearly progress (AYP) objectives and disaggregate test results for all students and subgroups of students based on socioeconomic status, race/ethnicity, English language proficiency, and disability. Moreover, the law mandates that 100 percent of students must score at the proficient level on state tests by 2014. Furthermore, the NCLB Act requires states to participate every other year in the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) in reading and mathematics.

Will schools, school districts, and states be able to respond to the demand? In an ideal system, school improvement efforts focus educational policy, administration, and practices directly on teaching and learning. This will require districtwide leadership focused directly on learning. School leaders can accomplish this by (a) clarifying purpose, (b) encouraging collective learning, (c) aligning with state standards, (d) providing support, and (e) making data-driven decisions. Taken together, these five dimensions provide a compelling framework for accomplishing sustained districtwide success for all children.

Clarifying purpose. The school district and the administrators and teachers who work in it are accountable for student learning. This assertion has strong economic, political, and social appeal; its logic is clear. What teachers teach and students learn is a matter of public inspection and subject to direct measurement. Superintendents need to develop a practical rationale for school improvement. Clearly and jointly held purposes help give teachers and administrators an increased sense of certainty, security, coherence, and accountability. Purposes cannot remain static for all time, however. They must be constantly adapted to changing circumstances and the needs of the system. Few really successful schools lack purpose.

Encouraging collective learning. A key task for school administrators is to create a collective expectation among teachers concerning the state's accountability criteria. That is, administrators need to raise teachers' collective sense about state standards. Then administrators must work to ensure that teacher expectations are aligned with the state's accountability criteria. Furthermore, administrators need to eliminate teacher isolation, so that discussions about state standards become a collective mission of the school and school district.

Aligning with state standards. Most states are attempting to align their tests with their standards. States need to consider three principles in this endeavor. First, tests not based on the standards are neither fair nor helpful to parents or students. States that have developed their own tests have done a good job of ensuring that the content of the test can be found in the standards. That is, children will not be tested on knowledge and skills they have not been taught. However, the same is not true when states use generic, off-the-shelf standardized tests. Such tests cannot measure the breadth and depth of each state's standards. Second, when the standards are rich and rigorous, the tests must be as well. Tests must tap both the breadth and depth of the content and skills in the standards. Third, tests must become more challenging in each successive grade. The solid foundation of knowledge and skills developed in the early grades should evolve into more complex skills in the later grades.

Providing support. One of the biggest challenges in advancing state standards and tests, and the accountability provisions tied to them, is providing teachers with the training, teaching tools, and support they need to help all students reach high standards. Specifically, teachers need access to curriculum guides, textbooks, or specific training connected to state standards. They need access to lessons or teaching units that match state standards. They need training on using state tests results to diagnose learning gaps. Teachers must know how each student performed on every multiple-choice item or other question on the state test. Schools need to provide additional help to students who lag behind in core subjects. This involves creating an environment that supports school improvement efforts.

Making data-driven decisions. How can school districts gauge their progress in achieving high state standards? Three factors can increase a school district's progress in meeting state standards. The primary factor is the availability of performance data connected to each student, broken down by specific objectives and target levels in the state standards. Then schools across the district and across the state are able to connect what is taught to what is learned.

The second factor is the public nature of the measurement system. Assuming the school district has a system of rating schools, the district should publish annually a matrix of schools and honor those schools that have performed at high levels. This provides an impetus for low-performing schools to improve their performance. At the school and classroom levels, it provides a blueprint of those areas where teachers should focus their individual education plans and where grade levels or schools should focus the school's professional development plans.

The third factor is the specifically targeted assistance provided to schools that are performing at low levels. Each targeted school is paired with a team of principals, curriculum specialists/instructional coaches, and researchers to observe current practices, discuss student performance data with the staff, and assist in the development and implementation of an improvement plan.

In sum, the new framework for school improvement that we have described here provides a powerful and useful model for achieving school success. Sustained district wide school improvement is not possible without a strong connection across levels of organization (school, school district, community, and state). Internal school development is necessary from principals, teachers, and parents, but school improvement cannot occur unless each school is supported by a strong external infrastructure; stable political environments; and resources outside the school, including leadership from the superintendent and school board as well as leadership from the state.

Democratic Community

The concept of democratic community is not new. Much of the current work is grounded in Dewey's (1900) ideas promulgated more than 100 years ago. For example, at the turn of the twentieth century, John Dewey argued that schools should embody the kind of community that combined the best aspects of classic liberalism and communitarianism or, in Dewey's works, of "individualism and socialism" (Dewey, 6. 7)—a place that could prepare people to live within and to maintain a healthy, democratic society. However, Dewey's vision was relatively uninfluential throughout much of the twentieth century. A resurgence of interest in Dewey and his concept of a democratic community as it relates to schooling has emerged in education in recent years (Jenlink, 2009).

Critiques concerning the meaning of democracy in our time have proliferated over the last two decades. And a number of publications have addressed the various meanings of community. For example, community is described in multiple ways in the education literature (Calderwood, 2000; Furman, 2003; Osterman, 2001; Shields, 2003). Community is referred to as "professional community" among educators, "learning community" among students, "school-community" addressing school-community relations, and "community of difference" in multicultural settings.

Furman and Starratt (2002) advocate the definition of community of difference as more compatible with contemporary postmodernism. Thinking about a community of difference requires a reconceptualization of the concept of community itself, moving away from homogeneity toward a new center in which diverse groups negotiate a commitment to the common good. According to Shields, Larocque, and Oberg (2002), "a *community of difference* begins, not with an assumption of shared norms, beliefs, and values; but with the need for respect, dialogue, and understanding" (p. 132). Educational leaders who want to move toward a community of difference will be informed by research on race and ethnicity.

Similarly, democracy is subject to many interpretations in education. Its most common meaning is usually tied to the idea of the nation-state and the American version of democracy. According to Mitchell (2001), democratic community cannot be limited to such a narrow view of democracy in a world characterized by diversity, fragmentation, and globalization. National boundaries are permeated by regional and global alliances. Children should be educated within an increasingly global context (Rennie, 2011).

Democratic community and leadership. Our version of democratic community resembles more the ideas promulgated by Gail Furman and Robert Starratt (2002). They extend the emerging work on democratic community through a deeper analysis of the linkages between

democratic community and leadership in schools. Furman and Starratt's model places democratic community in a context of postmodernism, characterized by inclusiveness, interdependence, and transnationalism. In their view and ours, professional community, learning community, school-community, and community of difference, and the American version of democracy, along with Dewey's progressivism, laid much of the groundwork for the concept of democratic community.

Some common themes are beginning to emerge regarding the concept of democratic community derived from Dewey's progressivism and its more contemporary, postmodern interpretations. Furman and Starratt discuss the nature and character of democratic community and how it might be enacted in schools. The central tenets of democratic schools include the following (Furman & Starratt, 2002):

1. Democratic community is based on the open flow of ideas that enables people to be as fully informed as possible.
2. Democratic community involves the use of critical reflection and analysis to evaluate ideas, problems, and policies.
3. Democratic community places responsibility on individuals to participate in open inquiry, collective choices, and actions in the interest of the common good.
4. Democratic community involves acting for others as well as with others in the interest of the common good.
5. Democratic community is based on the acceptance and celebration of deference, and focuses on the integral linkages between the school, the surrounding community, and the larger global community.
6. Creating democratic community in schools involves systematic attention to structure, process, and curriculum and instruction. (pp. 106-107)

Social Justice

A concern for social justice is at the core of democracy. The United State prides itself on being a fair and just democracy, a nation in which every citizen is to be treated equally in social, economic, political, and educational arenas (Corning, 2012). According to its Constitution, the United States seeks to establish "liberty and justice for all." In spite of these goals, U.S. society is composed of many inequities: rich and poor, educated and illiterate, powerful and powerless (Schutz, 2012). Now in the second decade of the twenty-first century, educational leaders must continue to question whether they have an obligation to create a nation whose words are supported by the experiences of its citizens.

Excellence and equity. Educational leadership for social justice is founded on the belief that schooling must be democratic, and an understanding that schooling is not democratic unless its practices are excellent and equitable. Educational equity is a precondition for excellence (Darling-Hammond, 2010; Howard, 2011; Paige, 2011). Gordon (1999) linked social justice to excellence and equity by arguing:

The Failure to achieve universally effective education in our society is known to be a correlate of our failure to achieve social justice. By almost any measure, there continue to be serious differences between the level and quality of educational achievement for

children coming from rich or from poor families, and from ethnic-majority or from some ethnic-minority group families. Low status ethnic-minority groups continue to be overrepresented in the low achievement groups in our schools and are correspondingly underrepresented in high academic achievement groups. (p. XII)

We must achieve equal educational results for all children. Failure to do so will hamper specific groups from attaining the fundamental, primary goods and services distributed by society—rights, liberties, self-respect, power, opportunities, income, and wealth. Education is a social institution, controlling access to important opportunities and resource.

Emergent Nontraditional Perspectives

Positivism was the dominant orthodoxy in educational administration until the late 1970s. Positivism is a view of knowledge as objective, absolutely true, and independent of other conditions such as time, circumstances, societies, cultures, communities, and geography (Compte, 2011). Another tradition of positivism is *empiricism*, which maintains that knowledge of the world can only be acquired through the senses and through experience. This view of science came to be known as *logical empiricism* or *logical positivism* (deVries, 2011). From these philosophies there developed positivism—the view that any investigation in the natural or social sciences must be derived from empiricist postulates in order to be considered academically acceptable. Simply stated, positivism is a world-view that all knowledge of the world comes to us from sense experience and observation.

The positivist approach to research consists of several functions; (a) the observation and description of perceptual data coming to us from the world through our senses, (b) the development of theories inferred from such observations and descriptions of perceptual data, (c) the testing of hypotheses derived from theories, and (d) the verification of hypotheses that are then used to verify the theories derived from the observation and description of perceptual data. The approach evolved from an empiricist model of science that involves observation and description, theory building, and hypothesis testing and verification. Quantitative methods using large samples with the objective of statistical inferences was the predominant tool used. The positivist approach to the generation of knowledge dominated research in educational administration until the late 1970s (Willower, 1988).

At that time, objections began to surface regarding the dominant (positivist) orthodoxy. Alternative paradigms began to appear and continued to be refined through the 1980s. These emerging nontraditional perspectives came under the general heading of *subjectivist* and *interpretivist* approaches. Subjectivist and interpretivist views refer to perspectives that look inward to the mind rather than outward to experience and that connect to philosophical idealism and, more recently, to phenomenology and existentialism (Stewart, 2011). Subjectivist and interpretivist perspectives are illustrated by the early work of scholars such as T.B. Greenfield in Canada; by the work of new-Marxist and critical theorists such as Richard Bates and others; and by the early work of postmodernists such as Jacques Derrida, Michel Foucault, and Francois Lyotard (Butler, 2011; Fendler, 2011). The scholars in this tradition have attempted to expand the traditional knowledge domains that define educational administration.

These alternative nontraditional perspectives have spawned scholarship on *ethics and values* by researchers such as Christopher Hodgkinson, Jackie Stefkovich, Joan Shapiro, Lynn

Beck, and Jerry Starratt; *gender, race/ethnicity, and class* by such scholars as Carol Gilligan, Sonia Nieto, Lisa Delpit, Charol Shakeshaft, Margaret Grogan, Cryss Brunner, Marilyn Tallerico, Beverly Irby, Genevieve Brown, Linda Skrla, Flora Ida Ortiz, Catherine Marshall, Kofi Lomotey, Barbara Jackson, Diana Pounder, Norma Mertz, Cynthia Dillard, and Gretchen Rossman; and *critical theory and postmodernism* by analysts such as T.B. Greenfield, Henry Giroux, Richard Bates, Peter McLaren, William Foster, Fenwick English, Colleen Capper, Spencer Maxcy, James Scheurich, Michael Dantley, Cornel West, Michelle Young, Colleen Larson, Gary Anderson, Carolyn Shields, Patti Lather, and Paulo Freire. The subjectivist perspectives led to the increased popularity of qualitative research methods under various labels: qualitative methods, ethnography, participant observation, case studies, fieldwork, and naturalistic inquiry. These approaches are attempts to understand educational processes within local situations. Societies; cultures; communities; unique circumstances; gender, race, class; and geography serve as important analytical categories in such inquiry. There seems to be an increasing interest in bringing together positivist and interpretive paradigms that may prove valuable to both the researcher and the practitioner (Lunenburg & Irby, 2008).

Table 2 provides an overview of the four major developments in administrative thought.

Table 2

Overview of the Four Major Developments in Administrative Thought

Period	<i>Management Elements</i>	<i>Procedures</i>	<i>Contributors and Basic Concepts</i>
Classical organizational theory	Leadership Organization Production Process Authority Administration Reward Structure	Top to bottom Machine Individual Anticipated consequences Rules; coercive Leader separate Economic Formal	Time - and - motion study, functional supervisor, piece rate (Taylor); five basic functions, fourteen principles of management (Fayol); POSDCoRB (Gulick); ideal bureaucracy (Weber)
Human relations approach	Leadership Organization Production Process Authority Administration Reward Structure	All Directions Organism Group Unanticipated consequences Group norms Participative Social and psychological Informal	Hawthorne studies (Mayo, Roethlisberger, and Dickson); intellectual undercurrents; group dynamics leadership studies (Lewin, Lippitt, and White); client-centered therapy (Rogers); sociometric technique (Moreno); human relations in the restaurant industry (Whyte); small groups (Homans)
Behavioral science approach	Consideration of all major elements with heavy emphasis on contingency leadership, culture, transformational leadership, and systems theory	Cooperative systems (Barnard); fusion process (Bakke); optimal actualization-organization and individual (Argyris); social systems theory-nomothetic and idiographic (Getzels and Guba); need hierarchy (Maslow); Theory X and Y (McGregor); hygiene-motivation (Herzberg); System 1-4 (Likert); open-closed climates (Halpin and Croft); managerial grid (Blake and Mouton); contingency theory (Fiedler); situational leadership (Hersey and Blanchard); expectancy theory (Vroom); 3-D leadership (Reddin); compliance theory (Etzioni); structure of organizations (Mintzberg); Leadership-unconscious conspiracy (Bennis)	
Post-behavioral science approach	Interrelated concepts of school improvement, democratic community, and social justice with heavy emphasis on leadership; and emergent nontraditional perspectives	School improvement, democratic community, and social justice (Murphy); transformational leadership (Bass); learning organization (Senge); reframing organizations (Bolman and Deal); TQM (Deming); synergistic leadership theory (Irby, Brown, Duffy, and Trautman); values and ethics (Hodgkinson, Stefkovich, Shapiro, Beck, and Starratt); gender, race/ethnicity, and class (Gilligan, Nieto, Delpit, Shakeshaft, Grogan, Brunner, Tallerico, Irby, Brown, Skrla, Ortiz, Marshall, Lomotey, Jackson, Pounder, Mertz, Dillard, Rossman); critical theory and postmodernism (T.B. Greenfield, Derrida, Foucault, Lyotard, Giroux, Bates, McLaren, Foster, English, Capper, Maxcy, Scheurich, Dantley, West, Young, Larson, Furman, Anderson, Shields, Lather, Freire)	

As shown in Table 2, differences in leadership, organization, production, process, power, administration, reward, and structure are important distinguishing characteristics of the four approaches. We can see how organization and administrative theory have evolved from a concern for efficiency and the basic principles of management to an emphasis on human and psychological factors, to social systems and contingency theory, and finally, to a concern for school improvement, democratic community, social justice, and postmodernism. While we have not included all people who have made contributions in the evolution of administrative thought, we have highlighted major contributors and basic concepts and primary eras in the evolution. Furthermore, no attempt is made to date the eras precisely. In fact, if we view the sequence of developments in organizational and administrative theory, we notice a correlational rather than a compensatory tendency.

Traces of the past coexist with modern approaches to administration. For example, while the classical “rational” model has been modified somewhat since its emergence during the 1900s, views of the school as a rational-technical system remain firmly embedded in the minds of policy makers and pervade most educational reforms proposed since the publication of *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on excellence in Education, 1983) and the many reports that followed. Indeed, this view of schooling is in place today with current accountability policy to assess student, teacher, and school performance. Implicit in the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110 (2002) is the concomitant expectation that school administrators and teachers will adjust instructional strategies to yield more effective learning outcomes for all children.

Conclusion

The development of administrative thought can be placed into a loose historical framework. In general, four models emerge: classical organizational theory, the human relations approach, the behavioral science approach, and the post-behavioral science era. The classical “rational” model evolved around the ideas of scientific and administrative management, including the study of administrative processes and managerial functions. The human relations “social” model was spurred by some early seminal social science research, including experimentation and analysis of the social and psychological aspects of people in the workplace and the study of group behavior. The behavioral science approach was an attempt to reconcile the basic incongruency between the rational–economic model and the social model. The more recent post-behavioral science era includes the interrelated concepts of school improvement, democratic community, and social justice, as well as emergent nontraditional perspectives (variously labeled neo-Marxist, critical theory, and postmodernism).

References

- Argyris, C. (1993). *The individual and the organization: Some problems of mutual adjustment*. New York, NY: Irvington.
- Bakke, E. W. (1955). *The fusion process*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Barnard, C. I. (1938). *The functions of the executive*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Bennis, W. G. (1990). *Why leaders can't lead: The unconscious conspiracy continues*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1994). *The managerial grid: Leadership styles for achieving production through people*. Houston, TX: Gulf.
- Butler, C. (2011). *Postmodernism*. New York, NY: Sterling.
- Calderwood, P. E. (2000). *Learning community: Finding common ground in difference*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Compte, A. (2011). *A general view of positivism*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Corning, P. A. (2012). *The fair society: The science of human nature and the pursuit of social justice*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). *The flat world and education: How America's commitment to equity will determine our future*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- deVries, W. A. (2011). *Empiricism, perceptual knowledge, normality, and realism*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1900). *The school and society*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Etzioni, A. (1975). *A comparative analysis of complex organizations* (rev. ed.). New York, NY: Free Press.
- Fayol, H. (1949). *General and industrial administration*. New York, NY: Pitman.
- Fendler, L. (2011). *Michel Foucault*. London, UK: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Fiedler, F. E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Furman, G. C. (2003). *School as community: From promise to practice*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Furman, G. C., & Starratt, R. J. (2002). Leadership for democratic community in schools. In J. Murphy (Ed.), *The educational leadership challenge: Redefining leadership for the 21st century* (pp. 105-133). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Getzels, J. W., & Guba, E. G. (1957). Social behavior and the administrative process. *School Review*, 65(4), 423-441.
- Gordon, E. W. (1999). *Education and justice: A view from the back of the bus*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Gulick, L., & Urwick, L. (1937). *Papers on the science of administration*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Harrington, A. (1960). *Life in the crystal palace*. London, UK: Jonathan Cape.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. (2007). *Management of organizational behavior* (8th ed.). Paramus, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Herzberg, F. (1993). *The motivation to work*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Homans, G. C. (1950). *The human group*. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace, & World.
- Howard, T. G. (2011). *Why race and culture matter in schools: Closing the achievement gap in America's classrooms*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Jenkink, P. M. (2009). *Dewey's democracy and education revisited: Contemporary discourses for democratic education and leadership*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Lewin, K. (1951). *Field theory in social science*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Lewin, K., Lippitt, R., & White, R. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created social climates. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 10(2), 271-299.
- Likert, R. (1979). From production- and employee-centeredness to systems 1-4. *Journal of Management*, 5(2), 147-156.

- Likert, R. (1987). *New patterns of management*. New York, NY: Garland.
- Lunenburg, F. C., & Irby, B. J. (2008). *Writing a successful thesis or dissertation: Tips and strategies for students in the social and behavioral sciences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Maslow, A. (1970). *Motivation and personality* (rev. ed.). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Mayo, E. (1933). *The human problems of an industrial civilization*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- McGregor, D. (1960). *The human side of enterprise*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Mitchell, K. (2001). Education for democratic citizenship: Transnationalism, multiculturalism, and the limits of liberalism. *Harvard Educational Review*, 71(1), 51-79.
- Moreno, J. L. (1953). *Who shall overcome?* New York, NY: Beacon House.
- Murphy, J. (2002). Reculturing the profession of educational leadership: New blueprints. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(2), 176-191.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110 (2002).
- Osterman, K. F. (2001). Students' need for belonging in the school community. *Review of Educational Research*, 70(3), 323-367.
- Paige, R. (2011). *The black-white achievement gap: Why closing it is the greatest civil rights issue of our time*. New York, NY: Amacom.
- Reddin, W. (1970). *Managerial effectiveness*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Rennie, L. J., & Wallace, J. (2011). *Knowledge that counts in a global community: Exploring the contribution of integrated curriculum*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Roethlisberger, F. J., & Dickson, W. J. (1939). *Management and the worker*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Rogers, C. R. (1942). *Counseling and psychotherapy*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Rogers, C. R. (1951). *Client-centered therapy*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Schutz, E. A. (2012). *Inequality and power: The economics of class*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Shields, C. M. (2003). Thinking about community from a student perspective. In G. Furman (Ed.), *School as community: From promise to practice* (pp. 227-245). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Shields, C. M., Larocque, L. J., & Oberg, S. L. (2001). A dialogue about race and ethnicity in education: Struggling to understand issues in cross-cultural leadership. *Journal of School Leadership*, 12(2), 116-137.
- Stewart, J. (2011). *Idealism and existentialism: Hegel and nineteenth- and twentieth-century philosophy*. London, UK: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Taylor, F. W. (1911). *Principles of scientific management*. New York, NY: Harper.
- Vroom, V., & Yago, A. (1988). *The new leadership: Managing participation in organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organization* (T. Parsons, Trans). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Whyte, W. F. (1949). *Human relations in the restaurant industry*. London, UK: Pitman.
- Whyte, W. H. (1956). *The organization man*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Willower, D. J. (1988). Synthesis and projection. In N.J. Boyan (Ed.). *Handbook of research on educational administration* (pp. 729-947). New York, NY: Longman.