

The period of institutionalization: An historical observation of the state of educational administration as a field of study in the 1960s and 1970sⁱ

Izhar Oplatka

Ben Gurion University, Beer Sheva, Israel

Purpose: Based on journal articles that focused on epistemological issues in the field (e.g., the field's nature, purposes, borders, knowledge base, uniqueness, etc.), the current paper outlines the intellectual discussions in the field of educational administration (EA) in the 1960s and 1970s and suggests some lessons for the state of the field at the present time.

Approach: The review is based on papers, scholarly, historical or empirical, that observed philosophical, epistemological and methodological issues and concerns or explored the professoriate in this field that have been published in three journals - *Journal of Educational Administration* (JEA), *Educational Administration Quarterly* (EAQ), *Educational Management, Administration & Leadership* (EMAL) until 1980. The papers were analyzed and coded by their purposes, arguments, epistemological questions, criticism, findings and insights.

Findings: In light of contextual events and developments in the observed period, four concerns were highlighted in the debate on EA as a field of study in those years: The place of Social Sciences in the field, the scope and nature of the knowledge base in the field, the scientific-applied controversy, and the nature of the professoriate in EA.

In spite of some minor changes and innovative 'discoveries' since the 1970s, field members observe similar features and contradictions (e.g., a focus on theory or practice, the relationship with social sciences) even today, without sufficiently suggesting ways to cope with weaknesses, uncertainties, and contradictions.

Value: This historical overview is likely to both acquaint us with the historical scholarly streams, trends and debates in knowledge development of EA as a field of study in its emergent years, and help international field members understand and mold their professional identity.

Introduction

Knowledge production in the modern society takes place in disciplines and fields of study demarcated by institutional and scholarly boundaries within which intellectual work is conducted (English, 2001; Gunter, 2002). Each field (and discipline) has its own special interests, structured activities, rules of access, meanings and positions (Fitz, 1999; Gunter, 2000) that provide "the intellectual lenses through which problems are defined and their solutions sought" (English, 2001, p. 32).

Yet fields are also dynamic arenas of struggles, "as their occupants seek to determine what knowledge and practices are to be regarded as legitimate and in what knowledge forms and practices they are prepared to invest" (Fitz, 1999, p. 313). Social and political forces of their times influence the scholarship, structure, power relations and resources of a field, and field members engage in the practice of differentiation (i.e., how their field is differentiated from other fields, what are the boundaries of their own field) and, through it, recognize just who they are and what they do (Messer-Davidow, Shumway & Sylvan, 1993).

As *educational administration* (EA) is considered to be a field of study concerned with the management and operation of educational organizations (Bush, 1999), its intellectual history is replete with intellectual struggles and ferments as well as reflections over the nature, methodologies, purposes, boundaries, knowledge base and so forth of the field.ⁱⁱ Since the

establishment of EA as an academic field of study scholars have narrated its intellectual history (e.g., Callahan, 1962; Culbertson, 1988; Donmoyer, 1999; Heck & Hallinger, 2005; Murphy & Forsyth, 1999), sought to understand the theoretical and practical nature of the field (e.g., Boyan, 1981; Erickson, 1979; Heck, 2006; Ribbins, 2006), and reviewed the knowledgebase to obtain an overview of the dominant concerns and trends within the field of EA using textbooks, curricula, course syllabi, proceedings of major international conferences, doctoral dissertation and journal articles (e.g., Baker, Wolf-Wendel & Twombly, 2007; Fitz, 1999; Haller & Knapp, 1985; Oplatka, 2007; Swafford, 1990).

From a historical standpoint, the current paper suggests insights into the prevailing intellectual concerns and trends of scholarly work in the field during the 1960s and 1970s, the first decades in which the field refereed journals first appeared. More specifically, several questions are posited here: What have been the main lines of scholarly work in the field about the field itself during the 1960s-1970s? What insights have been gained from these lines of work? What are the lessons of this scholarly debate for our time?

This kind of overview is likely to both acquaint us with the historical scholarly streams, trends and debates in knowledge development, and help field members understand and mold their professional identity.

For this historical overview I read and analyzed scholarly articles written about EA as a field of study published in the three oldest and most dominant refereed journals – *Journal of Educational Administration* (JEA), *Educational Administration Quarterly* (EAQ), *Educational Management, Administration & Leadership* (EMALⁱⁱⁱ) from their first volume to the last issue of 1979. Thus, the review is based on most papers, scholarly, historical or empirical, that observe philosophical, epistemological and methodological issues and concerns or explore the professoriate in the field of EA. The papers were analyzed and coded by their purposes, arguments, epistemological questions, criticism, findings and insights. I decided to include articles about the professoriate in EA because they implicitly tell us a lot about the epistemological nature of the field. The reference list contains the papers chosen for this overview from the three journals indicated above.

Two notes are warranted here. Firstly, the decision to base this overview on journal articles emanated from the assumption that academic journals are an arena where dialogue about knowledge production and the nature of the field takes place (Gunter, 2002), as well as reflecting lines of inquiry developed by those in the field (Immegart, 1990). Yet, my purpose was not to conduct an exhaustive and conclusive study of the scholarly literature in EA.

Secondly, my selection carries with it some limitations: I searched for documents published in three journals only; thus the insights provided in this review do not represent writings compiled in handbooks on EA. I am also aware that my literature review, as any review, according to English (2001), assumes that the topics under publication are linear, have a beginning and an end, thereby providing the researcher with chronological borders (patterns) or periods in a progression of development. This is a potential weakness the reader should take into account.

The Theory movement: A spur for the academisation of the field

Historical accounts of the field (e.g., Callahan, 1962; Campbell, 1981; Culbertson, 1988) have seen the last quarter of the nineteenth century as the beginning of EA as a profession and later on as a field of study in universities. The search for efficiency in education encouraged

many educators to participate in administrator preparation programs, leading in later years to the institutionalization of EA programs and departments.

Before the mid-1950, however, EA was substantially oriented to normative concerns, taught by senior educators (superintendents, senior principals) who had retired and delivered their practical knowledge and wisdom to prospective administrators. The spirit of logical positivism originated in Social Sciences coupled with common dissatisfaction with the prescriptive nature of the field led to the emergence of the theory movement at the 1954 meeting of the National Conference of Professors of EA (NCPEA) in Denver, chaired by Daniel Griffiths (Griffiths, 1983). This ideological stream defined the knowledge in EA in accordance with conventions of a modernist, positivistic, rational-empiricist approach to science (Culbertson, 1988; Willower, 1996). In its proponents' optimistic view (e.g., Andrew Halpin, Daniel Griffiths), an improvement in the administrative practice of educational institutions would be brought about when a prescriptive knowledge was replaced by a stable, cumulative, empirical and generalizable knowledge base.

Despite much criticism of this movement,^{iv} it helped the field gain an academic legitimacy as an area of study underpinned by scientific principles, and therefore it was granted a place in the ivory tower. Indeed, many universities, first in US and later in other western countries, established graduate programs in EA, research grew in volume and quality, and researchers linked themselves to government agencies which agreed to fund their work (Riffel, 1986).

The 1960s, where our historical review is focused, were marked by events, processes and paradigms that influenced the generation of the field at that time, such as a growing distrust of societal institutions, including schools and universities (Willower, 1993), and increasing Federal funding for administrator training programs and for facilitating the study of EA (Culbertson, 1974). This was the time of the welfare state and the civil rights movements in many western nations which constructed the principal's role in terms of leader of welfare reforms who is autonomous in using his expertise to devise the best means of implementing governmental programs and legislations (Bottery, 2006).

In this period, the field's first academic and refereed journals (JEA, EAQ, EMAL) were created in this period. Their aims were manifold: to facilitate the dissemination of knowledge about research, training and practice in EA, to provide a forum for the intellectual and empirical discussions, to meet the needs of practitioners, to promote high standards in the teaching of, and research into EA, to encourage the formation of local groups in the association, and the like (Thomas, 1987). J.A. Richardson, a founding member of the JEA's editorial board, hoped that this journal would help to widen the vision of those who administered schools and colleges in spite of a lack of academic background in the area of administration itself (Thomas, 1982). Yet, the editors and editorial board members of those years had to make their journal more influential and appealing to professors and practitioners, which in turn would contribute to reflective and intellectual debate in the field (Campbell, 1979; Hughes, 1997). Many years later, two editors felt this purpose had been well met (Campbell, 1979; Thomas, 1982).

In light of these contextual events and developments, four concerns were highlighted in the debate on EA as a field of study in those years.

The place of the Social Sciences in the field

Under the supreme of the social science disciplines in the field, EA borrowed relevant concepts and theories from these disciplines, and its programs became more specialized and

increasingly theoretical and quantitative (Walker, 1984). Two decades later Willower (1996) commented:

The optimism of those days included the notion that if schools were studied using ideas and methods from developed and relevant specialties, it would be possible to bring about positive changes in education (p. 346).

The belief of many members of the field in those days was that a knowledge base produced in the disciplines and 'translated' into the world of educational practitioners would help them in their work. This belief, however, engendered an intellectual controversy.

In 1968, Haller examined which of the social science disciplines had the greatest impact on researchers in EA, and how old the ideas borrowed by these investigators were. He found that education was the most influential discipline for the authors who had written for EAQ, followed by sociology (32 percent of all citations and 49 percent of all social science citations), mainly due to the interest in organization theory among researchers of EA at that time. Much further behind were psychology and social psychology, which led Haller to assert that "when one considers that administration is often defined as 'decision making' or 'resource allocating' the scarcity of psychological, social psychological, economic, and political science citations stands out sharply" (p. 70).

Yet, consistent with the growing dissatisfaction from the theory movement, three scholars at that time criticized "the trend toward a discipline-based approach to the study of EA" (Culbertson, 1974, p. 7), suggesting to replace it by trends toward the use of more applied bodies of knowledge. In their view, the field could not be grounded in the disciplines because they were themselves in the process of development, and therefore what they had to offer was not well-validated theoretical principles or well-established empirical laws on which to base applied procedures, but more or less fragmentary analytical frameworks in which to analyze clinical problems (Campbell, 1972; Hills, 1978). Campbell (1972) added:

...We also failed to take concepts and methodologies and reshape them to fit our world...we realize that many of the concepts have little utility in the study of administration and those that do may have to be adapted and modified to our purpose. We are more problem oriented and we continue to ask what light the respective disciplines can shed on the problems... (p. 14).

Their thoughts illuminate issues such as the nature of the knowledge base in EA and the practical orientation of the field.

The scope and nature of the knowledge base

Scholars of that time highlighted the lack of clear boundaries and cumulative knowledge base in the field, reviewing the content of the papers published in journals in order to shed light on the field's major focuses and deficiencies. Hills (1978), for instance, claimed that "EA is clearly not a unified profession" (p. 6) and Farquhar (1974) pointed to the common disagreement over the most appropriate content for administrator preparation programs. Both topics of articles and programs in EA were claimed to be too varied and widespread (Campbell, 1979; Campbell & Newell, 1973). Following a review of the first 14 issues of EAQ, Campbell (1979) noted:

The published articles [in EAQ] deal with such a wide range of articles that one is led to conclude that (1) there has been little cumulative building of knowledge in the field, and (2) that the editors, for the most part, dealt with the manuscripts submitted, with little or no conscious effort to secure manuscripts that might have contributed to the building

of cumulative knowledge (p.16).

The search for understanding the field's boundaries included commentaries and systematic reviews of the field's new journals, especially EAQ. To begin with the former, a change of emphasis in the field was observed from school administration in local settings to EA in diverse settings, including nonpublic schools, college settings, state agency settings (Campbell, 1972) and higher education institutions (Culbertson, 1974). Burlingame (1979) identified several major areas of interest, among them democratic leadership, planning, and a vision of knowledge as power.

Two systematic reviews aimed at understanding the dynamic nature of the articles published in journals of EA by the 1970s (Campbell, 1979; Hills, 1978). Campbell (1979) found that the most mentioned topics of articles published in EAQ from 1965 to 1978 were: politics-policy-making (23.1%), school finance (18.8%), decision-making (14.6%), motivation-satisfaction (14.6%), preparation programs (14.6%), leadership (12.5%), administrative behavior (10.4%), authority-bureaucracy (10.4%), collective bargaining (10.4%), and organizational structure (10.4%). He concluded that EAQ had published articles representing a very wide range of topics, and any attempt to classify the articles by type proved to be extremely difficult, at least in part because the field had developed few foci of interest around which scholarly interests might be grouped (Campbell, 1979). Similar topics appeared in EMA, as two English writers showed two decades later (Hughes, 1997; Strain, 1997). The parallel English journal contained articles about management training, the relation between the professional and educational roles inherent in headship, and in-school evaluation (Hughes, 1997).

Scholars, though, called to pay more empirical attention to issues of school effects on student achievements (Erickson, 1979), comparative EA (Farquhar, 1974), politics of education, and superintendency (Campbell, 1976). For Campbell (1976), "training in our field should prepare persons for a wide range of other positions as well...[such as] heads of non-public schools, directors of education for business firms and other organizations, and leadership posts in state and federal agencies..." (p.13), an illuminative call given the attention accorded in the field today to school-based educational leadership research.

The scientific-applied debate

Since the foundation of EA as a field of study, much debate has concerned the scientific versus applied (practical) nature of the field. A very central paper in this respect (Hills, 1978) analyzed the knowledge base of applied fields in terms of problem-oriented bodies of knowledge and relevance to practitioners, suggesting that EA professors should pay careful attention to the kinds of problems encountered by practitioners. In this vein, Willower (1964) argued for bringing the work of the practitioner and scholar closer together, and Thomas (1987) notified a decade later that the editors of JEA were prepared to consider for publication articles of interest to administrators, emphasizing in this way the field's commitment to practice in those days. Hughes (1997) found that nearly a third of the articles published in EMA between 1972 and 1975 came from principals and staff of schools and colleges.

In this sense, for many scholars, including those who pressed for a more scientific knowledge base in the field (e.g., Hoy, 1978), the purpose of EA as an applied field of study was to transmit and develop theoretically-grounded knowledge organized around the problems of practice (Hills, 1978), as well as to "inform thoughtful administrative practice

and assist the implementation of values in practice" (Willower, 1979, p. 37). Hoy (1978), an advocate of the scientific study in EA, expressed his awareness of practice, relevance and utility in light of public pressure to make teaching and research in EA more useful and pragmatic:

The 1970s bear witness to the vitality of practice orientation. There is a visible press to focus on practice – a press to train leaders to practice, to perform research to inform practice, and to make decisions to shape practice; a press for development and for practical research (p. 3).

Many scholars in that period believed that the field ought to help educational institutions to change (e.g., Culbertson, 1974; Hills, 1978). Nevertheless, they were aware of the difficulty to devise a knowledge base that provided practitioners with practical procedures either for diagnosing administrative problems or for coping with those diagnosed. Hoy (1978) emphatically claimed that most research did not lead directly to improvement in administrative practice, a common belief shared by professors of EA at that time. This resulted, at least in part, from the nature of universities and schools as social systems, their distinctive environments and the manner by which these institutions adapted to them, and the divergent languages and values characteristic of theorists and practitioners, as Willower (1975) noted.

Whereas the applied nature of the field was not contested, two scholars of that time, Willower (1975; 1979) and Hoy (1978), highlighted the significant place of scientific inquiry in the field and the need to reaffirm the field's commitment to it in order to understand a great deal about organizations. In their view, the field's main purpose was "the free search for ideas and their critical examination" (Willower, 1979, p. 37), consistently and permanently, mainly, as Hoy (1978) believed, through a systematic and critical empirical inquiry of hypothetical propositions (i.e., positivistic methodologies).^v Reviews of journal papers from those years (e.g., Campbell, 1979; Hughes, 1997; Willower, 1975) supported this line of thought, providing evidence for some increase in the proportion of theoretical, conceptual and empirical articles at the second half of the 1970s as compared to earlier decades.

In spite of this increase, the two scholars seemed to lament the tenor of their times which was "practice, action and immediate results, not theory, research and reflection" (Hoy, 1978, p. 7), explaining this situation both by the decline of the theory movement and by the search among practitioners for plain and rapid solutions:

Such disenchantment with theory as may exist seems to stem from unrealistically high expectations for quick infusions of new knowledge via theory based research, on the one hand, and from concern about the difficulties of applying theory to practice, on the other hand (Willower, 1975, p. 77).

In light of the phenomenological revolution several years before, Hoy (1978) stated that security, respectability and stability in EA could only be achieved if the field strictly adhered to a traditional (positivistic) model of natural sciences and conduct scientific research rather than focusing on policy research or seeking to solve human or social problems.^{vi}

The professoriate in EA

As an emerging field at that time, some reference was elucidated as to the features of its professoriate as well as to their organizations (e.g., Hayes, 1966). Thus, a national survey conducted by Campbell and Newell (1973) found 1333 persons who could legitimately be

called professors of EA, most of them white, middle-class males (there were only 23 Afro-American persons among them). Additionally, Walker (1984), the founder of JEA, retrospectively and grudgingly indicated that "almost without exception the professors of EA in the 1960s were Americocentric to a fault...[most] apparently cared little about the massive literature on education in their own language that had emanated from Britain and elsewhere" (p. 10).

The departments of EA in Canada and US had been bifurcated informally into two groups of professors. The older and more experienced schoolmen who were more concerned with 'how to do it' and the younger academics who focused on research and development of instructional and methodological competencies required for scholars in EA rather than on the practice solely (Farquhar, 1974; Walker, 1984). It is noteworthy to remember, however, that most professors at that time, as different writers showed, invested most of their time in teaching and advising graduate students rather than engaging in scholarly research and writing activity.

Besides, most of the research programs were of the kind of field studies, dealing with problems specific to one situation and thus their power for generalization was limited, and done by graduate students (Campbell & Newell, 1973; Hoy, 1978). Interestingly, despite the weak scholarly skills of most professors, evidently in the bulk of material submitted for publication in EAQ, as a former editor emphatically concluded (Immegart, 1990), only a small group of professors expressed concerns about inferior scholarly meetings and a lack of competence standards (Campbell, 1976). Under these circumstances, it is hardly surprising that the field's coherent, well-developed scholarly and empirical work at that time had been developed by very few field members (Immegart, 1990).

Some lessons for our time

What does such a historical review amount to? What conclusions can be drawn? What implications for the field of EA emerge from this review?

Firstly, the scholars of 1960s-1970s have highlighted the field's unclear boundaries, lack of distinguished profile and cumulative knowledge, and its diversification and fragmentation, a characteristic of the field even nowadays. They continuously searched for a common knowledge base in the field's programs, debate the purpose of research in the field (informing the profession or the practice? prescriptive or empirical knowledge?), mull over the place of theory in an applied field, and attempted to define the 'proper' clients of it. The scholars have also emphasized the difficulty to utilize the field's knowledge (either theoretical or practical) to improve the practice and help practitioners solve their problems, without suggesting solutions or new directions in an adequate manner. Do we have solutions for these and related problems today? I doubt it. But, we no longer work in an emergent field that need academic justification. Thus, many of the issues raised by early scholars receive lesser attention today, when the field is well-institutionalised in the academy.

This brings me to raise a second point. Due to the implausibility of answering these questions adequately thus far, field members have consistently searched for 'big,' 'central' issues to which to adhere. This, in turn, has enabled them to juxtapose the field with a popular area of study, and thereby artificially define and demarcate its intellectual borders and knowledge. Thus, in the 1960s, it was the glorification of Social Sciences and their methodologies which gave justification for the field. Topics such as rational planning,

democratic leadership and school finance were in conjunction with this prevailing notion. Leadership became the leading topic in the spirit of our times. In doing so, we 'converted' the focus on strict methodologies as the 'theory movement' encouraged us to do to 'educational leadership' as a panacea to the weaknesses and uncertainties of our field of study. Can we really juxtapose 'leadership' with 'administration' and change the name of our field to educational leadership? What implications does it have, then, for the inclusion of 'administrative' topics in the discourse of our field?

Thirdly, similar to scholars and researchers from the 1960s, we continue 'importing' theories and concepts developed in the disciplines of social sciences, such as psychology, sociology, politics and even economics. However, as the field has grown considerably during the last four decades, we produce sufficient volumes of research and commentaries to enable us make the original, imported concepts suitable to the domain of EA, thereby incorporating them into the field as natural parts of our discourse. Sometimes, we give these concepts new names and add some new elements to create a seemingly new concept in the educational context.

Fourthly, as most professors of EA in the 1960s grew up in the disciplines, the field of EA today is populated in many places by professors whose academic background is education, in general, and EA, in particular. Thus, a community of researchers with common language and discourse has developed since then, whose members tend both to publish their work mostly in the field's many journals, and to attend academic conferences devoted particularly to issues of EA and educational leadership.

In sum, although we have experienced some sort of disillusionment from the plausibility to develop well-established universal empirical laws and theories on which to base applied procedures, the field's main focus and central aim are still uncertain, and the field's boundaries are much more ample and unclear than in the 1960s. Many new areas of study penetrated the field, and old, traditional topics likely receive much lesser attention nowadays. Additionally, instead on paying more attention to the kinds of knowledge encountered by practitioners in EA, many of us prefer to adhere to the generation of theoretical scholarship underpinned by tough methodologies, a propensity reflected considerably in many of the field's journals.

References

- Baker, B.D., Wolf-Wendel, L., & Twombly, S. (2007). Exploring the faculty pipeline in educational administration: Evidence from the survey of earned doctorates, 1999-2000. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 43(2), 189-220.
- Boyan, N.J. (1981). Follow the leader: Commentary on research in educational administration. *Educational Research*, 10(2), 6-13.
- Bottery, M. (2006). Context in the study and practice of leadership in education: A historical perspective. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 38(2), 169-183.
- Burlingame, M. (1979). Some neglected dimensions in the study of educational administration. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 15(1), 1-18.
- Bush, T. (1999). Crisis or crossroads? The discipline of educational management in the late 1990s. *Educational Management and Administration*, 27(3), 239-252.
- Callahan, R.E. (1962). *Education and the cult of efficiency*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Campbell, R.F. (1981). The professorship in educational administration: A personal view. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 17(1), 1-24.
- Campbell, R.F. (1979). A critique of the Educational Administration Quarterly. *Educational*

- Administration Quarterly*, 15(3), 1-19.
- Campbell, R.F. (1976). The state and the professor. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 14(1), 5-15.
- Campbell, R.F. (1972). Educational administration: A twenty-five year perspective. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 8(1), 1-15.
- Campbell, R.F., & Newell, L.J. (1973). A study of professors of educational administration: A summary. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 9(1), 3-27.
- Culbertson, J.A. (1988). A century's quest for a knowledge base. In N.J. Boyan (eds.), *Handbook of research on educational administration* (pp. 3-26). New York: Longman.
- Culbertson, J.A. (1974). Trends in educational administration in the United States. *Educational Management & Administration*, 2(2), 1-8.
- Donmoyer, R. (1999). The continuing quest for a knowledge base: 1976-1998. In J. Murphy & K. Seashore Louis (eds.) *Handbook of research on educational administration* (pp. 25-43). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- English, F.W. (2001). What paradigm shift? An interrogation of Kuhn's idea of normalcy in the research practice of educational administration. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 4(1), 29-38.
- Erickson, D.A. (1979). Research on educational administration: The state of art. *Educational Researcher*, XXX, 9-14.
- Ewing, J.L. (1975). The first five years: A progress report on the CCEA. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 13(1), 70-75.
- Farquhar, R.H.F. (1974). Educational administration in Canada: Some distinctions and tendencies. *Educational Management & Administration*, 2(2), 9-18.
- Fitz, J. (1999). Reflections on the field of educational management studies. *Educational Management & Administration*, 27(3), 313-321.
- Griffiths, D.E. (1983). Evolution in research and theory: A study of prominent researchers. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 19(3), 201-221.
- Gunter, H.M. (2002). Purposes and positions in the field of educational management. *Educational Management & Administration*, 30(1), 7-26.
- Gunter, H.M. (2000). Thinking theory: The field of education management in England and Wales. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 21(4), 623-635.
- Haller, E.J. (1968). The interdisciplinary ideology in educational administration: Some preliminary notes on the sociology of knowledge. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 4(1), 61-77.
- Haller, E.J. & Knapp, T.R. (1985). Problems and methodology in educational administration. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 21(3), 157-168.
- Hayes, D.K. (1966). The national conference of professors of educational administration: A stimulator and forum for professors. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 4(1), 3-11.
- Heck, R.H. (2006). Scholarship in educational administration: At a crossroads or dead end. In D.E. Mitchell (eds.), *New foundations for knowledge in educational administration, policy, and politics* (pp. 101-127). Mahwah, N.J: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Heck, R.H., & Hallinger, P. (2005). The study of educational leadership and management. *Educational Management, Administration & Leadership*, 33(2), 229-244.
- Hills, J. (1978). Problems in the production and utilization of knowledge in educational administration. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 14(1), 1-12.
- Hoy, W.K. (1978). Scientific research in educational administration. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 14(3), 1-12.
- Hughes, M. (1997). From bulleting to journal: Metamorphosis and new vistas. *Educational Management & Administration*, 25(3), 243-263.
- Immegart, G.L. (1990). What is truly missing in advanced preparation in educational administration? *Journal of Educational Administration*, 28(3), 5-13.

- Messer-Davidow, E., Shumway, D.R., & Sylvan, D.J. (eds.) (1993). *Knowledges: Historical and critical studies in disciplinarity*. Charlottesville and London: University Press of Virginia.
- Murphy, J. & Forsyth, P.B. (eds.) (1999). *Educational administration: A decade of reform*. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.
- Oplatka, I. (2007). The scholarship of educational management: Reflections from the 2006 CCEAM conference. *International Studies in Educational Administration*, 35(1), 92-104.
- Ribbins, P. (2006). History and the study of administration and leadership in education: Introduction to a special issue. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 38(2), 113-124.
- Riffel, J.A. (1986). The study of educational administration: A developmental point of view. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 24(2), 152-172.
- Swafford, G.L. (1990). Window or mirror? A content analysis of the first 25 years of the journal of educational administration. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 28(1), 5-23.
- Thomas, A.R. (1987). The journal of educational administration: The first twenty five years. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 25(1), 5-11.
- Thomas, A.R. (1982). Twenty years a journal: An anniversary statement. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 20(1), 5-11.
- Thomas, A.R. (1971). Commonwealth council for educational administration: A new centre for educational leadership. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 9(2), 128-134.
- Walker, W.G. (1984). Administrative narcissism and the tyranny of isolation: Its decline and fall, 1954-1984. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 20(4), 6-23.
- Willower, D.J. (1996). Inquiry in educational administration and the spirit of the times. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 32(3), 344-365.
- Willower, D.J. (1993). Explaining and improving educational administration. *Educational Management and Administration*, 21(3), 153-159.
- Willower, D.J. (1979). Ideology and science in organization theory. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 15(3), 20-42.
- Willower, D.J. (1975). Theory in educational administration. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 13(1), 77-91.
- Willower, D.J. (1964). The professorship in educational administration: A rationale. In D.J. Willower & J.A. Culbertson (eds.), *The professorship in educational administration* (pp. 87-105). Columbus: UCEA and Pennsylvania State University.

ⁱ A larger version of this paper is about to be published in *Journal of Educational Administration*.

ⁱⁱ The field refers to 'The field of Educational Administration.'

ⁱⁱⁱ Until 2002 EMAL was EMA - 'L' which stands for 'leadership' was added then.

^{iv} For insufficient space and due to many books and papers written about the debates over the theory movement, I do not elaborate on this issue here. Briefly, in a lecture delivered by Thomas Greenfield at the University of Bristol in 1974, he claimed that the conception of science underlying the theory movement is inadequate and, therefore, scholars in EA had produced theories which represented superficial and distorted conceptions of educational organizations. He further called for the adoption of phenomenological and hermeneutic approaches into the study of EA.

^v Note that Hoy (1978) seemed to respond to the attempts of Greenfield and his supporters to challenge the positivistic paradigm rather than challenging the applied nature of the field.

^{vi} Griffiths (1983), one of the prominent supporters of the theory movement, claimed retrospectively that in spite of the prevalent scientific philosophy in the 1950s-1960s, no study or line of studies was done completely in the positivist model.