# ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR AND MANAGEMENT ISSUES IN EDUCATION

**Adina Eleonora Sturz**[102]
**Radu Cureteanu**[103]
**Anton Ilica**[104]

**Abstract:** *In this article, we want to clarify the issue of the relation management applied to the education system. With this occasion, expressed the opinion related to the impact it has intersection of terms and concepts of the different areas, in this case economic - educational. It is a theoretical research of speculative type to give those interested a view for implementation in school practice an interdisciplinary element in order to increase the efficiency of managing educational institutions.*

**Keywords:** *education system, organizational behavior, knowledge organization*

### Organization and institution

In a modern sense, the word organization is increasingly used indiscriminately to any coherent group, regardless of social or economic functioning area. Moreover, if the economic area use terms like company, factory, company, corporation, etc., now theorists of **organizational behavior**[105] come exactly from this sphere of productive activity. Any human phenomenon, organized on the basis of principles, rules, hierarchies fall within the concept. Furthermore, the organization is redefined as a "field" or

---

[102] Teaching Assistant., Aurel Vlaicu University Arad: e-mail: adinasturz@yahoo.com
[103] Assistant Professor Ph.D., Aurel Vlaicu University Arad: e-mail: radu.cureteanu@uav.ro
[104] Full Professor Ph.D., Aurel Vlaicu University Arad: e-mail: anton.ilica@yahoo.com
[105] **Behavior** is the observable activity of an organism interaction with its environment. The term can refer to activity in general or a certain activity, so a particular case. The term began to be used in the psychology of JB Watson and H Pieroni, in the psychological paradigm called Behaviorism, apud Wikipedia.org

"network." At one point, the question is of possible confusion between the institution and organization.

According to M. Vlăsceanu[106] (2003), institutions are normative, being subordinate constraint of rules, both behavioral and action. The institution has formal rules (laws, jurisdiction) and the informal "rules" (conventions, rituals, traditions), which induces the idea that accommodation with them requires reward and non-compliance entails punishment. The institution includes in itself a complex relationship between the physical environment (material base, non-human resources) and human environment of a production company, valuing the bureaucratic behavior, performance of strictly professional "duties" a kind of accommodation human behavior to regulations and rules. Competition and the need to increase efficiency led to attachment for rigid sense of this concept of new meanings. As they are obviously more prevalent and important concept was substituted by **organization**.

An organization is based on the existence of an institution (promoting rules, constraints, rules), but it is mainly to obtain performance by stimulating and motivating people by stimulating their level of satisfaction. Likening to a *field* (K. Lewin, P. Bourdieu, 1980), the organization has a "hierarchical space" positions and functions, each with specific responsibilities and interests with capital (material or scientific ex. recognition, accreditation, publications, authority), is capable of self-regulation, change, adaptation, stimulating relations of competition and flexing boundaries between hierarchical levels and power relations. It is however difficult to determine a satisfactory definition of the organization, so we resort to accepted opinion of E. Păun (1999): „*system of activities structured around finalities (goals, objectives) explicitly formulated, which involves a large number of individuals who own statuses and roles defined within a differentiated structure, with leading positions and coordinating activities*"[107]. Looking at the definition we can summarize organization characteristics to four coordinates:

- *organizational structure* (complexity, size, roles and statuses, relationships, differentiating activities);
- *organizational control* (hierarchical structure, authority and power relations, staff, bureaucracy);
- *organizational behavior* (goals, organizational climate and culture);
- *organizational change* (flexibility, promote innovation, staff development).

---

[106]**Mihaela Vlăsceanu**, b. 1949, professor at Faculty of Political Sciences, Bucharest. Volumes published: *Conştiinţă şi cauzalitate* (1985), *Psihosociologia organizaţiilor şi conducerii* (1993), *Organizaţii şi comportament organizaţional* (2003).
[107]Emil Păun, *Şcoala, o abordare sociologică*, Editura Polirom, Iaşi, 1999.

According to Mary Jo Hatch[108] (1997), can be identified four "metaphorical" moments in the analytic development of organization as reality phenomenon and concept:

- classical vision or machine metaphor ("imagine individuals in the position of robots / machines built by the manager in order to achieve predetermined objectives. In organizations where this "cars" works the manager is organizational engineer in the state whose concern is to designed, developed and ensure full functionality of these "machines") that is a kind of "organizations without people",
- modern vision or organic metaphor ("organization is a living organism that in order to function, is dependent on the environment and the resources it finds to survive"),
- symbolic vision interpretative or cultural metaphor ("emphasizes aspects related to what we might call the ethos of an organization: customs and traditions, myths, legends, beliefs, values and symbols. All this constitutes the organization culture and understanding the mechanisms of building organizational culture is relevant in building managerial strategy ") and
- postmodern vision or collage metaphor ("the analysis of an organization cannot make a clear separation between subject and object - these cannot be separated - postmodern theorists considered representative of the collage metaphor as an art form in which objects are rearranged to obtain a new object. it recognizes the existence of different perspectives and approach to building organizations explanatory theories").

To what extent the school is an organization? School as we stated earlier, has the attributes of both an institution and an organization. It is an institution that has legal status, director, students and teaching staff, is an organization that provides human resources (network relationships between individuals belonging to these communities), material resources - technology - (means, communication system, curriculum aimed at achieving the finalities of education at school level) and organizational culture. School gets in the areas of evolutionary "metaphors", such as that of car, according to the ideas of Ivan Ilich, describing "unschooled school" or "society without school" organic metaphor and cultural metaphor, specific to current school and postmodern collage metaphor, according to that the school that does not suit the bureaucratic requirements, but show attraction towards disintegration, to medium and for immediate utility.

---

[108]**Mary Jo Hatch,** management professor at Virginia Universit. Wrote: *Organization theory: modern, symbolic, and postmodern perspectives (Oxford, 2006).*

### Knowledge organization

In one study, more essayistic, called **Knowledge-based organizations**, Professor H. Dragomirescu[109] states that when the society properly combined ("into a flagship design") knowledge of with organizing when it reached full maturity. Such a status allows the manifestation of society in three processes: innovation (creating new knowledge), learning (assimilate new knowledge) and interaction partners (capable of relationships with the same companies). Representing an organizational model of the 21st century, such an organization is an alternative to those based on authority and control, identifying signs of such an organization being notified after 1995. For example, "organization-brain" essence of a self-conscious organization, able to take on goals and materialize them in projects to develop and use their knowledge treasures creatively defying thus primacy conception over action"[110]. As a procedure, organizations can focus - for knowledge - towards:

- technology (equipment, IT, learning);
- projects (action, consistency, efficiency);
- organization (research, source of knowledge).

**In organizations theory *hierarchy paradigm* (as rigid and authoritarian pyramid structure) is promoted *network paradigm*.** According to the network organizing, each individual is in his own way and in its tasks a manager that turns information into knowledge and action. Recipes involving groups, and they are manifested through projects that promote cooperation rules, common representations and even cognitive maps. This implies that all actors, all human to have proactive behaviors related to co-development (knowledge generation), co-learning (mutual validation of purchases) and co-management (efficient use of knowledge).

To what extent schools through teaching and administrative staff, through students qualify as knowledge-based society? Unfortunately, **streets metaphor** (Emil Paun) remains for school a form of expression, making it still rigid, conservative and progressive ineffective. Education is a powerful bureaucratic and hierarchical organization and **the core group (school) becomes a performer of the decisions**.

Knowledge-based organizations[111] determine the change of management projects as separation efficiency of leadership by implementing measure is

---

[109]H. Dragomirescu, *Knowledge based organizations,* www.rocai.ro, p.3.
[110] Ibidem.
[111] Knowledge based organizations need a different leadership style, under the name of Manecognitiva. As a new discipline in the Europe of knowledge means knowledge management (L. Gherasim, 2007), aimed at organizing different societies as expected by "Manecognitiva club" discovering tolerances in the intellectual field, process, technology.

zero. Manager declines the administration and get "an architect of systems and processes." Its role is enriched with attributes of "facilitator, mentor, facilitator and promoter", which means "special management tasks such as *strategic concept, interpersonal, leadership and change management projects*. In other words, the manager handles 'collective competence', that is "what an organization knows and is able to do, in relation to their goals and environmental conditions determined based on the individual skills of their members treated systemically and strategically mobilized"[112].

As an appeal to the inability of educational institutions to contribute to the formation of such powers, the economic environment has organized its own "knowledge centers", "organizational systems", "and corporate universities". We know what happens beyond the existing products on the shelves of a supermarket? We see order, effects of marketing, product promotion, discounts, promotions, offers, design, computing, market exploration, exhibitions etc. In universities, there is no concern for a coherent vision of the entire management process specific major economic core.

Theories describe the history of a process and its effects. Knowledge is not as humane as it says. There is a form of imperialization of it and often it becomes "public good" in the form of pills. It is a consequence of the efficiency of an organization, which - obviously - targeting a profit of image, prestige and culture. Company X does not reveal "secrets" from their own creativity only when they are replaced with more efficient ones. "Knowledge" is "sold" or becomes "public" only when no more represents the organization ambition that created it and is likely to be replaced by a more advanced knowledge and more effective than previous. For example, secrets of a mobile telephony program can be "sold" or distributed to another organization when creative knowledge generated another program effective and efficient that ensures customers greater satisfaction.

Such organizations generate knowledge because are open to learning and creativity. There are kind of organizations that do not complain about money but time and quality human resources. They are "learning organizations" because "learning is a management tool specific to institutional culture"[113]. According to F. Kofman and P. M. Senge, "learning institutions are those in which people permanently develops ability to achieve desired results, where thinking and communication are promoted". They have three fundamentals elements that characterize them:
• culture based on curiosity, humility, understanding;
• practice for dialogue and coordinated action;
• ability to identify activity as a system.

---

[112] *Ibidem,* p. 13.
[113] T. Coşeriu, *Instituţia care învaţă*, www.design.ro (17. 09. 2008), p.1.

Also in each organization there are actors with different potentials and not motivational implications:
• uninvolved, those who do not learn;
• potential, those who want but seek personal motivation;
• involved, those who are committed and have organizational motivation
• proactive, meaning volunteers, dynamic, capable of change and the challenge of change.

For each category of the above, it promotes a specific strategy that is a custom operational plan able to determine a procedural efficiency (efficiency expresses "the relationship between performance and time invested"). Through strategy is aims differentiated global assimilation of concepts, learning the rules, training and development of skills, abilities, skills and behaviors.

The above considerations support a comment that we advance in the form of opinion. The first refers to the name: knowledge organization. What do you mean? We ask ourselves, is there any organization to structures its existence without "knowledge"?

Every organization has a life responsible and effective processual, based structurally on quality "inputs" in the system: the inputs to a system (organization) are based on knowledge with both outputs are more relevant. An organization "works" like a body. If swallowed food quality will generate energy. If an organization is able to learn and generate knowledge it makes up their personality and gives satisfaction. Propensity of schools will give high quality knowledge and will be requested by students. A school that runs only provisions, operating at idle, that is the limit of its functions will preserve the condition of anonymity. Therefore the phrase "knowledge organization" does not represent a category, but a quality. Without knowledge - knowledge as power source - an organization restricts its existence and functions.

Furthermore, each system - hence a society or a school - has a appropriation to be autopoietic. We understand by autopoiectic the ability of a system to be self-regulating, to find resources for stimulating and balancing when they are drifting. A school unable to respond appropriately and proactively to threats (permanent) from other systems loses its status of organization. Situation in which so many schools in Romania remained not only a board with symbols, walls and closed doors etc. is relevant. A recent example is illustrative. Abolition of pedagogical high schools put these organizations the problem of "to be". For almost two hundred years, these schools have created personality, organizational culture, an efficient structure and unquestionable authority. Ministerial decision to abolish the pedagogy and passage teacher training attributions for primary and pre-school to college led most important pedagogical profile shock. Faced with this challenge, some pedagogical schools have found autopoietic solutions, adapting quickly and exceeding personality crisis. They assumed the additional roles have adopted

dynamic specialization, giving the satisfaction of all human persons that animates organizations. Others were overwhelmed by the crisis, did not anticipate changes nor their motivation, even lost their authority and organizational culture built over time and involve more generations.

### References

Coşeriu, T., *Instituţia care învaţă*, www.design.ro (17. 09. 2011).
De Visscher, Pierre, Neculau, Adrian (coordonator), *Dinamica grupurilor. Texte de bază*, Editura Polirom, Iaşi, 2001.
Dragomirescu, H., *Organizaţii bazate pe cunoaştere,* www.rocai.ro.
Ilica, Anton, *Comportament comunicativ şi cultura organizaţională*, Editura Universităţii "Aurel Vlaicu", Arad, 2011.
Ilica, Anton, *Filosofia comunicării*, Editura Universităţii "Aurel Vlaicu", Arad, 2007.
Ivan Ilich *Descolarizarea societăţii*. www.rocai.ro (08.07.2011)
Neculau, A. (coord.), *Psihologia câmpului social. Reprezentările sociale,* Editura Polirom, Iaşi, 1997.
Păun Emil, *Şcoala, o abordare sociologică*, Editura Polirom, Iaşi, 1999.
Perin, Jean - Pierre, *La Metacognition*, http.perso. wanadoo.fr/ais, htm (10 martie 2011).
Petrescu, Paloma, Şirinian, Lucreţia, *Management educaţional*, Editura Dacia, Cluj-Napoca,  2002.
Vattimo, G., *Societatea transparentă*, Editura Pontica, Constanţa, 1995.
Vlăsceanu Mihaela, *Organizaţii şi comportament organizaţional*, Editura Polirom, Iaşi, 2003.