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CHAPTER I: TOWARD A THEORY OF PRACTICE

CHAPTER II: MAINSTREAMS OF ORGANIZATIONAL THOUGHT

**CHAPTER III: (Pages 58 to 107) ORGANIZATIONAL THEORY IN THE MODERN PERIOD** (LEARNING OBJ,2 MAJOR PERSPECTIVES—BUREAUCRACY VERSUS HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT, THEORY X AND Y, ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURES, GENERAL SYSTEMS THEORY, ROLE THEORY, SOCIOTECHNICAL THEORY, CONTINGENCY THEORY-systematic ways of thinking about people working in organizations(Getzels-Guba model)Introduction:1920’s--1970’s:organizational behavior-scholars-traditional methods of laboratory science drawn from logical positivism. Demanded **one way of thinking about organizations**. Then, school leaders-studied leadership strategies and behavior, interrelationships of individuals in organizations was focal point of understanding organizational behavior. **Organizational theory:** **Theory** is **systematically organized knowledge** **to explain observed phenomena. Theory useful provides** **a basis for thinking systematically about complex problems** **like educational organizations**. **Describe-what’s going on, we explain it, we predict future events under certain circumstances, we propose solutions to problems based upon research, and we think about ways to exercise control over events. *2 major perspectives***on educational organizations: ***1)*Traditional*: classical, bureaucratic, factory model of organization*** –machine metaphor Frederick Taylor (5 major characteristics in controlling individuals in bureaucratic organizations ( Maintain hierarchy of authority and close supervision; vertical communication of top-down decision makers and passive workers; rules, follow procedures to “letter of the law,” clear rigid inflexible schedules; span of control; and unity of command for problems). Then, people had to rethink their theory: **Technology and accelerated tempo of changes in politics, economics, and society which left rigidly bureaucratic organizations unresponsive; sudden increase in demands for democratic societies, personal freedom, individual respect and dignity: and opportunities for self-fulfillment.** Thru the Nation-At-Risk Assessment Report and subsequent reports, U.S. Government set out to take a look at the state of affairs in our schools. 1970’s **major theme in the public agenda on education was equality of opportunity. The 1980’s buzz words became effective schools**. The Educational Leaders supervised their schools similar to the traditional positivistic factory model or bureaucratic model, where teachers became workers on the assembly line, the students were the products, and the superintendent, BOE and taxpayers were the shareholder. ***(1).Traditional/Bureaucratic Model) (2.)Human Resources Development***--Doyle and Hartle proposed new shift in conceptual framework about organizational characteristics of schools. HRD--individuals were motivated to utilize their conscious thinking to commit their abilities in achieving the organizational goals. **Central** **mechanism of HRD is socialization of participants to the values and goals**. (not written rules and close supervision) **Culture is communicated via symbols**: stories, myths, legends, rituals that establish, nourish, and keep alive the enduring values and beliefs that give meaning. Personal identification with the values of organization’s culture is powerful motivation for dependable performance. (**3.)Theory x versus theory y:** X: person dislikes work; they must be supervised (or they will loaf), they will shirk responsibility and seek formal direction from boss, value job security, have little ambition.(motivation is done through the carrot and the stick, they accept top-down information and orders), Theory Y: employees view work like playing, they exercise initiative, self directions and self-control, accept and seek out responsibility on the job, they seek opportunities to be creative at work. (they like to collaborative, participative decision-making administrators who value their ideas).

***(4):Rensis Likert Management systems theory***:**4 systems of management styles** that differentiates types of effectiveness in organizations as a result of the interactions of individuals behaviors in the schools, & describes main causal factors of organizational effectiveness. as the organizational climate and leadership behavior which affects how individuals behave in the work groups. **System 1**: punitive authoritarian **System 2:** paternalistic authoritarian style supervision in a competitive or isolative environment. **System 3**: person-to-person consultative pattern of operation. **System 4:** participative or group interaction model***. (5):Likert Management systems theory related to mcGregor’s theory X and theory Y:* Theory X/System 1**: management is seen as having **NO TRUST IN SUBORDINATES**: decisions are imposed, subordinates are motivated by fear, control over workers centered on top management, little superior communication (top-down), people informally opposed to goals by management **Theory X /System 2:** Management has condescending confidence and Trust: subordinates seldom involved in decision making, rewards and punishment used to motivate, interaction used with condescension, fear and caution displayed by subordinates, control centered on top management but some delegation **Theory X /System 3:** Management seen as having substantial but not complete trust in subordinates: subordinates make specific decisions at lower level, communication flows up and down hierarchy, rewards, occasional punishment, and some involvement are used to motivate, moderate interaction and fair trust exist, and control is delegated downward.**Theory Y//system 4: MANAGEMENT IS SEEN AS HAVING COMPLETE TRUST AND CONFIDENCE IN SUBORDINATES:-**decision making is widely dispersed, communication flows up and down and laterally (vertically and horizontally), motivation is by participation and rewards, extensive, friendly, superior-subordinate interaction exist, high degree of confidence and trust exists, widespread responsibility for the control process exists. **NO ONE SCHOOL OF THOUGHT OR ORGANIZATION MODEL IS COMPLETELY ONE WAY OR THE OTHER—EVERY SCHOOL HAS SOME OF EACH. Organizational Structure and People**: major theme over the last half-century is interactions between organizational structure and people. There is a general complaint that organizations do not have the capability to employ and sustain motivated and productive workers because of too little education, holdover-simplified views about people, tend to be punitive, and believe that order and discipline can solve all problems.” Today there is much literature of the view that people in organizations shape the structure of the organization. **Impact of behavior of people in processes of making decision, leading, and dealing with conflict on the structure, values, and customs of organizations.** Improving organizations can be done by means of changing the structure as a way of inducing more effective organizational behavior. Training participants in more effective group processes is one way of bringing about desirable changes in organizational structure. **(6)** **General systems theory: attempts to describe, explain, and predict organizational behavior depends on systems theory.** 1950:***Biologist, Ludwig von Bertalanffy, the notion of what is now known as general systems theory. “ an organism is an integrated system of interdependent structures and functions,*** **constituted of cells and a cell consists of molecules, which must work in harmony. Each molecule must know what the others are doing.” Today we substitute organization for organism, group for cell, and person for molecule.** **“An organization is an integrated system of interdependent structures and functions. An organization is constituted of groups and a group consists of persons who must work in harmony. Each person must know what the others are doing. Each one must be capable of receiving messages and must be sufficiently disciplined to obey.” *Basic concepts of general systems theory: think of a nearby Pond as a system of livings things, all of which are interdependent in many ways, and all of which are dependent on the larger environment in which the pond exists. (air, sunlight, etc.). In terms of understanding the pond and being able to describe it, it is obvious that we are dealing with different levels of insight***. (fisherman, farmer). Dealing with causes and effects has made systems theory so attractive to those concerned with organizational behavior. Systems theory puts us on guard against ascribing one causative factor. **General Systems Theory** has 2 concepts of: S**ubsystems** and (interdependence) **Multiple Causation** (not a single reason for problems or changes).

**Systems can be divided into 2 classes; open systems and closed systems**: Within the social system process, schooling involving inputs from larger societal environment. There are subsystems of organizational structure; people, technology, and work tasks resulting from the processes to create outputs to society (students become changed individuals as a result of their classes and their educational experiences). It is impossible for a school to be closed. (Page 74-92 (Contextual Appoach:ineffective) input-output concept is called a “linear model,” that explains how things are described in the real world.” A seductive concept—logical, rational, and orderly; linked to concepts of efficiency, effectiveness, technologies. However, this theoretical model gave us limited understanding of how effective school organizations function. (Example: dominant concerns of students and teachers during a school day is their formal, official goals of the school, but these people bring with them a host of their own beliefs, goals, hopes, etc). Therefore, a more useful approach to understanding educative organizations and their behavior and the context (environment or ecology) is to pay attention to inner workings of whole system that creates the setting, the context, in which the whole pattern of human behavior where they maintain environments in which complex sets of human interactions with some regularity and predictability. **(7)Andrew Helping and Don Croft, organizational climate of schools”** said that internal organizational characteristics operated independently from external influences, so that when they described a phenomenon, they did not include the effects of interaction of behavior, which causes a different set of circumstances; instead, they separated internal from external operations which gives the impression of schools having a closed system. (example: a burning candle as open system affected by environment (door) flame flickering by wind self-regulating thereby retaining its identity by retaining its straight flame. **Daniel Griffiths:** organization **(system)** as existing in an **environment (suprasystem)** and having within it a subsystem **(administration)** diagram **of boundaries of system and subsystems by tangential circles---boundaries are permeable, permitting interaction between the systems and their environments.** **(page 77:** small circle **(administration subsystem surrounded be another circle (organization system of school, with both circles surrounded by a huge circle (environment suprasystem).** Administrative Theory and Change in Organizations,” **Application of this to schools in this system would entail three more circles: smallest is school surrounded by district** **surrounded by community**. **These circles are social systems view of the school.** The **individual would be described with five 5 tangential circles with permeable boundaries smallest individual, the Role, the work group, the organization, and then the culture as engulfing all of the other circles.**

**(8)Role theory: Erving Goffman, The preservation of Self in Everyday Life:** analogy between real life situations and unfolding of a play on the stage. People have definite roles to perform, many interactive factors determine performance each role will receive. Each actor must interpret his or her role, and this interpretation depends on what the individual brings to the role. Other factors include what other people bring to their roles. Other factors include what the director do to control the situation, and the interplay of audience. Goffman emphasizes that formal roles on stage are different than informal roles backstage (faculty lounge- teachers act differently). Role theory predicts organizational behavior. Role: behavior Enactment arising from interactions with other human beings. Role description: actual behavior of individual Performing a role. Role prescription: abstract dead of what is the general norm the role should entail. Role expectation; expectation that one person has of the role behavior. Role perception: manifest role: obvious role. Latent role: hidden role teacher has to perform some of the functions but if that person Is union president he has another role not necessarily known by all. Role conflict: role ambiguity: in an attempt to preserve distinction of administration: line authority and supervision: staff responsibility. Role set: clarifies concepts of role theory and the consideration of the ecology of the social setting in which individual makes his or her contribution to the organization. Interpersonal behavior in work groups. Kenneth Benne and Paul Sheats: groups carry out roles in 3 ways: group task roles, group building and maintenance roles, and individual roles. (84) Role related to social systems theory: Jason Getzels and Egon Guba described this view: social system as involved two major classes of phenomenon, which were at once conceptually independent and interactive. There are first, the institutions with certain roles and expectations that fulfill the roles of the organizations, The, second inhabiting the system are the individuals with certain personalities and need dispositions. Needs and expectations may both be thought of the motives for behavior in an organization. The one deriving from personal propensities, the other from institutional requirements. The social behavior may be conceived as deriving from interaction between the two sets of motives. The Getzels-Guba model shows organizational axis on the top having the institution, roles, and expectations and on the bottom we have the personal dimensions having individual, personality, and need disposition. When a person acts, he derives simultaneously form both the organizational (nomothic)dimension and the personal (idiographic) dimension, in other words social behavior results as the individual attempts to cope with the environment composed of patterns of expectations for his behavior in ways consistent with his own independent pattern of needs. B=f(RxP) where B=observed behavior, R=institutional role and P=personality of the role incumbent. Getzels equation to figure out the interaction between the organizational behaviors. ((page 86) the shaping of the institutional role, the development of a climate within the social system and the very personality of the participants all dynamically interact with one another. Organizational behavior can be viewed as the product of this interaction. (dimensions of a school as a social system: on page 90 from Jacob E. Getzels and Herbert A. Thelen, “The Classroom Group as a Unique Social System,” In The Dynamics of Instructional Groups: Sociopsychological Aspects of Teaching and Learning, ed. Nelson B Henry, N.S.S.E.E.E Yearbook LIX, pat II (Chicago: National Society for the study of Educations 1960), p. 80) equilibrium, Homeostasis (open system in regulating itself), maintain a constant temperature and maintain blood pressure by repairing a break in the circulatory through coagulation. Homeostatic mechanisms in schools sytems and schools such as well-developed communications systems and decision-making processes, enable them to adapt to a deal effectively with changes in their environment. Feedback:

So far: there are two subsystems in the concept that systems are highly interactive and mutually interdependent. Organizational and human system. But there are two more. Sociotechnical with 4 internal organizational factors task, structure, technology and people, on **page 95** there is a chart with four primary organizational subsystems characterize the internal arrangements of schools systems and schools. there are four tangential circles with permeable boundaries with title of human subsystem, structure subsystem, tasks subsystems, and technology subsystem. A bigger circle surrounds the four and it is called the school as a sociological organizational system. On the bottom of this larger and then four smaller circles is an arrow directed toward another smaller circle which reads simply goal achievement. A huge circle then surrounds the school as an organizational system. The big circle. It represents eh larger external system such as social political economic, technological, legal, demographic, ecological. Ad cultural systems. (96) Contingency Theory: rational planning models: these models such as Planning, Programming and Budgeting Systems (PPBS), Program Evaluation and Reviw Technique (PERT), Management by Objectives MBO and Zero-Based Budgeting (ZBB) are adapted from massive, military-industrial enterprises that were created for building and maintaining huge fleets of enormous, technologically complex systems of weapons. The approach characterized by use of modern rational systems concepts and technology (different form social systems concepts) is traditional, classical, in viewpoint, and mechanical in operation. Organizations are mechanical primary basis for managing the system features the following: 1. Highly specialized tasks with precise specifications of responsibilities, 2. Coordination and control through hierarchical supervision, 3. Communication with the external environment controlled by the top offices of the hierarchical, 4. Strong, downward-oriented line of command or top-down. 5. One-to-one leadership style emphasizing authority-obedience relationships, 6. Decision-making authority reserved for top levels of theihierarchy. The concepts of mechanical and Organic systems are widely discussed. Organic organizational systems are recognizable by the fact that they emphasize a different approach to manageing the system: 1. Continuous reassessment of tasks and rsponsibilities through interaction of those involved, coordination and control through interaction of those involved, reuiring shared responsibility and interdependence, 3. Communication with external environment relatively extensive and open at all levels of the organization, 4. Emphasis on mutual confidence, consultation, and information sharing—up and down, laterally, and diagonally across the organization, 5. Team leadership style, high levels of trust and group problem solving, 6. Wide sharing of responsibility for decision-making at all levels of the organization> \*\****(organizations have several themes in common—assessment of tasks and responsibilities of members and leadership, coordination and control through interaction, communication along lines of membership, how information is shared, leadership style, and decision-making ability\*\*)*** John Goodlad writes that these two views are irreconcilable modes of thought that have struggled for dominance.Contingency theory and organizational behavior in Schools: John Goodlad in Schools. Theory doesn’t make any difference. This is not only a gross misreading of what organizational studies have to teach us, but it also offers mo hope whatever of setting educational administration of a solid foundation of knowledge form which systemic administrative practice may be developed. A contingency approach to organization takes a different view: although there is no one best way to organize and manage people in all circumstances, there are certain designs of organizational structure and describable management methods that can be identified as being most effective under specific situational contingencies. The key is to analyze the critical variables in given situation. effective administrator behavior is not seen as characterized by a universal fixed system but reveals a repertoire of behavioral styles tailored to the contingencies of the situation. in sum, 3 basic propositions underlie the contingency approach to organizational behavior in schools: 1. No one best universal way to organize and administer school districts or schools, 2, not all ways of organizing and administering are equally effective in a given **situation,** 3. Selection of organizational design and administrative style should be based on careful analysis of significant contingencies in the situation. contingency represents a middle ground between the view that there are universal principles of organization and management and the view that each organization is unique and that each situation must be analyzed separately. 100 INTERACTION with External Environment: the school system as a sociotechnical system , in in constant dynamic interaction with the larger external environment in which it exists (soc, pol, ec, systems of our culture). Environment is suprasystem in which school exists. (so demographic shifts results in enrollment changes, women’s rights, social mobility, increased taxes, teachers into labor unions, and even mounting distrust of authority and institutions in our society are among the many environmental contingencies to which public school organizations have had to adapt in recent years. Internal arrangements are contingent upoin environmental shifts, changes in environment cause organ. To repond with changes in its internal arrangements. Four dynamically interactive subsystems: tasks to be performed, structure of the organization, technology utilized to perform the tasks, and the human social system. First, goals must be set: schools have goals, but first and foremost it is the body politic, like establishing minimum competency shtatndards for graduation and/or promotion. Federal initiative have had a widespread, direct effect on school goals. Other pol.processes, like budgets, taxes, electing board members, serve as a means for influencing the goals of the schools. 101 courts, too, have had a role; especially in large issues such as desegregation, and have required changes in curriculum, testing procedures, and methods of selecting and assigning staff. Allof these represent s some ways that the environment of the school organization affects the internal functioning of the school. Not infrequently, schools have attempted to keep the status quo, almost regardless of the degree or power of the new environmental contingencies. Our history with regard to desegregation, equal rights, and nondiscriminatory practices-even in the face of concentrated, massive, statutory, judicial and political action-makes it clear that there are many occasions when schools attempt to close off the organizational system in order to deflect the impact of changes in the larger environment, rather than seek ways of making appropriate internal rearrangemetns so as to adapt to them. From a contingency standpoint, this puts the school system out of touch with real-world contingencies. A negative result will be the leadership and administrative styles. Contingency theory and organizational behavior in schools; chapter 7 repeats more fully but contingency theory on the power of the leader in terms of the critical contingencies in a given situation the quality of the relationships with subordinates, clarity of the structure of the task, degree of cooperation required to implement decisions. Match leadership style to contingencies of situation.C***HAPTER 4: THE HUMAN DIMENSION OF ORGANIZATION:*** chapter 3 is about the bureaucratic organizational structure and control over the humal realities in organizations. Chapter 4 describes shipf in organizational theory from Traditional modernism: with perfecting and refining bureaucratic management strategies and techniques To a POSTMODERn APPROACH, improving org. performance from within from the bottom up, by building HUMAN CAPITAL. 110 RECONCEPTUALIZING THE NATURE OF ORGANIZATONS**: this book addresses the problem of understanding the behavior of people at work in ed. Org. this is central problem of ed. Adm. Which is the best and most effective ways of working with and through other people?** This is a tough question because people are complex, idiosyncratic, full of contradictions, and that their behavior is baffling and difficult to grasp oftentimes. Schools are complex organizations also. For many years, ed. Adm. Have concentrated on technical solutions to the problems of education: page 111“The educational standards movement in chapter 1 is just a technical approach, which relies on the technology of norm-referenced objective tests to produce the results desired. Essentially, those who back the standards movement believe that establishing new detailed curriculum standards at the state level that are directly linked to required statewide high stakes objective achievement tests that must be taken by children at the local level will force local administrators and teachers to revamp practices in their schools in order to achieve the demanded results.” Other populare technical approaches: using computer, internet as well as structural technology, such as the creation of magnet schools, charter schools, and other forms of school choice, as well as instructional technology, like invention of new pedagogical techniques in the classroom. (this perspective advocate technologies which routinizes labor, which, if properly systemiatized and subjected to bureaucratic controls, will lead logically to desired outcomes. Teachers can learn through formal training, directed by experts. BUT BUT educational problems, are messy, ill defined, ill u nderstood, and complicated. Messy problems are understood or frmed by things we notice, from our background etc. Donald schon: a nutritionist may convert a vague worry about malnourishment among children in developing countries into the problem of selecting a diet, agronomists may frame the problem in food prod, epidemiologist frame it in diseases, etc) 112: as admin. deal with ed. Probl. Their approach depends primarily on how they conceptualize their options, how they frame the problem, etc. Historically, the educational problems were understood from a structural perspective: hierarchical control, bureaucratic offices, rules and regulations, after 1975, a major turn away from formal theorizing, away from machinelike characteristics and towards the human dimensions of organizations. Collapse of organizational theory: 1950’s into 1970’s scholars research was dominated by the logical-positivist assumptions—there was some rational, logical, systematic, order underlying the organizational reality. They thought discovery was approach to inquiry that emphasizes measurement, sampling, quasi-experimental methods, and quantification. Wayne Hoy and Cecil Miskel claimed “the road to generalized knowledge can lie ony in tough-minded scientific research, not in introspection and subjective experience.”Page 112 (hoy and miskel educational administration 2nd edition: ny random house, 1982—page 82). The problem was that these perspectives had come to think of organizations as tangible, concrete entities that existed independently and that are governed by systematic laws and principles, “in common parlance,” T. Barr Greenfield said, “we speak of organizations as if they were real. But they are not real, they are invented social realities.” (113) Rise of Qualitative Research Methods: James Bryant Conant-edu. Prob. Was so different from scientific problems. Arthur Blumberg suggested that it is useful to think of school administration as a craft rather than as a science. Learned day-by-day, practice with tools and materials in which the practitioner develops a “a nose for things,” an itimate feel for the nature of the materials being worked with a sense of what constitutes acceptable results, sense of process, an understanding of what to do and when to do it, and a feel for the need for action. 1980’s researches, went into schools instead of sending questionnaires and compiling stats, to see what was going on and to talk to school individuals. 115: the results of these inquiries were rich narrative descriptions of ed. Life. That illuminated the confusions, inconsistencies, ambiguities, and general messiness so characteristic of schools’ organizational life. 1980’s qualitative or ethnographic methods were intellectual backbone of educational reform movement. P. 115. Educational organizations as Loosely Coupled systems: Commonly, we describe school system in classical or structural terms: pyramid of units, strong central control and command, (structuaral looseness has to do with autonomy and direction of principal) Charles Biddell “this is a functional necessary arrangement, given the nature of school’s task, clients, and technology.” Karl Weick wrote about it and credited James G. March: Imagine you’re referee, coach, player, or spectator in unconventional soccer match. Field is round, several goals scattered haphazardly around circular field, people leave and enter at will, they can say that’s my goal, enrie game is on sloped field, game is played as if it makes sense, NOW SUBSTITUTE in that example Principals for referreees, teachers for coaches, studens for players, parents for spectators, and schooling for soccer, you have an eqully unconventional depiction fo school organizations through tenets of bureaucratic theory. NOW Contrast this image with conventional explanation of how schools do things: namely, planning, goal setting, applying rational processes as cost-benefit analyses, division of labor, job descriptions.116 authority, and consistent evaluation and reward systems. The problem is that this is not how schools are run. NOW: loose coupling means although subsystems of organizations are related to one another, each preserves its own identity and individuality. (coupling or “glue” that holds organization togethtermay be described as loose. Educations as dual systems: by mid-1980’s educational organizations are loosely coupled in some ways, and are highly bureaurcratic in other ways. this is important in understanding how people behave. Control may be exerted by means other than direct inspection (which is called supervision) evaluating student learning, maintaining close and detailed specification of curriculum, and ensuring that studens have mastered the work of a prevous grade before being promoted to the next are among the ways of controlling teaching. Thus central core activity of school ---instruction---is loosely coupled because it is not DIRECTLY CONTROLLED under authority of administrators (especially with collective barganing). Administrators can influence INDIRECTLY instructional behavior by control of 1.time (time schedules, frequency of interruptions with announcements, burden of paperwork required of teachers) 2. Grouping (heterogeneously or homogeneously) 3. Control of resources, (teacher space, equipment, copying machine, etc. BUT TEACHERS are getting good at getting these things. So principals increasingly constrained by their ability to dictate teaching schedules, class size, and even their ability to demand paperwork of teachers. Whereas the technical aspect of school is loosely coupled, (not bureaucratic) issue of paychecks, deployment buses, money, pupil accounting, and non-instructional activities are often tightly coupled.117. Looseness is controlled by instructional behavior of teachers. BUILDING HUMAN CAPITAL: tangible assets as cash, raw materials, real estate. But human capital is knowledge that people have, their skills, attitudes, social skills, to any human enterprise. This can explain why other nations with rich materials are still less productive. Those societies in whichpeoplehave levels of education and well-developed work skills, are favorably disposed toward the disciplilne of the workplace, and have a social tradition tha tplaceshgh value on hard work and productivity tend to become wealthier than those that do not. The concept of builldilng human capital underlies much of the historic effort to improve the lot of societies through the spread of education, development of social infrastructures as well as the physical nd economic infractutures of third world nations through international aid. US schools need to reform through lens of human capital, often referring the reform of educaton as an investment in human capital. Administrators are customarily held accountable for financial and physical assets of school district, such as buildilngs, equipment, and money. Only in 1970’s did accountants and organizational theorists begin to realize extent of mismanagement of human resources on organizational effectiveness. One form of mismanagement is spending too much on human resources: this has led to downsizing, outsourcing, contracting, 120 to reduce payroll costs. ANOTHER FORM OF MISMANAGEMENt HUMAN RESOURCES: more important because it is less obvioius and often unseen it is failing to place adequate Value on skills,abilities, motivations, and commitment of the people in the organization. People should be managed so that their skills etc. develop,improve andincrase over time, rather than level off at a steady pace or worse, decline. This way of managing, so as o develp andincrease the value of the organizations human resources, is the process of building human capital. The process of building and administering the budget are often handele in ways to create pressure on individuals and groups, which lead to strife, apathy, tension, strain, aggression, and pervasive feelling of failure, these responses, ive rise to counterproducative behaviors tha are directly related, not to budget decisions, but to the leadership processes that leaders choose to embloy in dealillng with the budget. As Rensis Likert observed,”if bickering, distrust, and irreconcilable conflict become greater, the human enterprise is worth less, if capacith to use fiffereences constructively and engage in cooperative teamwork improves, the human organization is m ore valuable asset. Internal problems bring the organization down. Behavior of administrators needlessly cause the dysfunctional feeling and behaviors commonly observed in struggling or faililng organizations. 121. Human resources are valuable to create and maintain a high-performing organization. People, the human resources form which human capital is formed are expected to have greated value in future than in present. This is essential nature of assts. Recruiting and hiring new people, training and supporting them, encouraging their professional growth and development, an managing them sensitively and skillfully as investment in people other eventual higher PRODUCTIVITY. 122 culutre of educational org.shapes and molds assumptions and perceptions that are basic to understanding what it means to be a teacher. Culture informs teachers as to what it means toteach. What teaching methods are available and approved, what the pupls are like, what is possible. Sulture plays a role indefining fro teachers their commitment. Toth e task it evokes energy of teacher to perform, task, loyalty and commitment to the orgnaizatins. These give rise to rules and norms governing their behavior in org. but also to accept ideals of org. as their own personal values, and to work energetically to acheiv the espoused goasl. THE SINGLE <OST CRITICAL FACTOR in improving performance of organizations is to change its CULTURE. (TERRANCE DEAL SAID THA TSTRONG ORGNAIZATON CULTURE THAT DISTINGUISHED HIGH-PEFORMING COMPANIES FROM LESS SUCCESSFUL ONES.;; PETERS AND WATERMAN ARGUED THAT SUCCESSFUL U.S. CORPORATIONS ARFE CHARACTERIZED BY PRESENCE OF SPECIFIC, DESCRIBBLE CULTURES THAT CLEARLY DIFFERNTIATE THEM FROM OTHERS;;;Kanter argued that companies of “open culture”are more innovative and molre successful than others;;; Schein: described relationship between organizational culture and ability of administrators to exercise leadership. NONTHEORETICAL influences on organizational thought: 2 influlences have ignored traditional organizational theory yet have buttressed their kind of thinking: 1241. Effective school research and 2. School reform movement which gathered momentum in 1980’s. Effective school research: writing case studies. Influencing our understaning of organizational characteristics and work behaviors of popele in effective schools. 5 characteristics> 1. Central purpose is to teach. Success is measured in students’ progress in knowledge, skills, attitudes, 124. 2. School responsible for p oroviding overall environment of teaching and learning. 3. Schools treated holistically, 4. Attitudes and behaviors of teachers. 5. School accepts responsibility of rsuccess or failure not children. All children can learn.they do not need a different curriculum. Purkey and smitt. Increased involvement of teachers in decision-making, planning and flexivle change strategies. : strong leadership by principal, high expectations for studens, basic skills, orderly environment, frequent and systematic evaluation of students, increased time on teaching and learning tasks. >