



The professoriate in the field of educational administration

Insights from an analysis of journal authors' curricula vitae

Izhar Oplatka
Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel

Abstract

Purpose – Based on a qualitative content analysis of 57 curricula vitae of authors who published their work in the major journals of the educational administration (EA) field, this paper seeks to display the career of EA authors and to suggest some epistemological implications for the field.

Design/methodology/approach – The analysis is based on both quantitative and qualitative modes of inquiry, according to which the curricula vitae is seen as a document that is susceptible to textual analysis.

Findings – EA authors receive their academic degrees in a host of disciplines from many countries and universities, usually work in the compulsory educational system, and hold many academic roles in their university. They teach courses, conduct research and publish works on a host of topics, three of which are very widespread: leadership, managerial processes, and organisational aspects.

Originality/value – The analysis acquaints the reader with some of many aspects of the professoriate in diverse countries, and helps probe the uncertainty and fragmented nature of the field of EA. It ends with scholarly implications for the recruitment of new field members.

Keywords Educational administration, Research, Curriculum vitae

Paper type Research paper

Introduction

Higher education is commonly characterised by a relatively open set of multiple goals, loose mechanisms of coercion, control and steering from above, a high degree of fragmentation, and a strong influence of the academic professionals (Enders, 2006). These professionals are expected to teach, counsel, lead, and conduct research in their everyday practice (Boyer, 1982; Gunter and Fitzgerald, 2007). Yet, the professoriate is differentiated, among many things, by the discipline (Hostaker, 2000), which in turn makes it necessary to examine its features in every field of study distinctively.

Since the establishment of the field of educational administration (EA) its members have paid relatively minor attention to its professoriate (e.g. Campbell and Newell, 1973; McCarthy, 1986; Pounder *et al.*, 2004); most of the reports on the EA professoriate were based on descriptive analyses of a limited number of aspects of such (e.g. education, career choice, productiveness), and centred almost entirely on American professors, thereby ignoring the professoriate in other parts of the world. A notable exception is the work of Campbell and his colleagues from the early 1970s.

In light of the belief that the full range of faculty talent and characteristics ought to be assessed (Boyer, 1982), the current paper aims to analyse the varied aspects of the professoriate in the field of EA nowadays through a qualitative content analysis of the



curricula vitae of authors who published their work in one of the field's three major journals. More specifically, the paper addresses four questions:

- (1) Who are the authors in the field of EA, and how are their careers structured?
- (2) What are the academic characteristics of the authors in the field of EA?
- (3) As academic promotion is tightly and almost solely related to publication and research (Boyer, 1982), what characterises the publications of the authors?
- (4) What are the epistemological implications of the authors' characteristics for EA as a field of study?

As faculty are the heart and soul of higher education and research (Enders, 2006), the examination of the professoriate in the field may increase our intellectual and theoretical understandings of the epistemological aspects of EA as a field of study (e.g. scholarly boundaries, theoretical backgrounds). The importance of studying the professoriate is well argued by Gunter and Fitzgerald (2007):

The professor's commitment needs to be recognised and uncovered. Consequently the challenge for the field is to ensure that these emerging researchers are acknowledged and their work celebrated because, importantly, it is with and through these colleagues that the field will be stimulated, nurtured and sustained (p. 2).

Understanding the characteristics of EA authors may, in turn, facilitate both faculty evaluation and faculty development practices and procedures in departments of EA (or "educational leadership", as it is now referred to in several countries).

Research on the professoriate in higher education

The roots of the professoriate can be traced back to Socrates and Plato and their ideas of academe as a source of wisdom that influenced the foundation of the first "modern" universities in medieval Europe (Caplow and McGee, 1958). The professional ethos of the modern English professor was formed in the nineteenth century and centred on the gentlemanly amateur (Hostaker, 2000).

A basic element in the university is that work planning and execution are decentralised to individual members (i.e. faculty) who maintain considerable control over low-level goals and the use of particular procedures (Whitley, 1984). Thus, the term "professoriate" implies a coherent and definable community (Stromquist, 2007), although it has become a large and complex profession with many faces (Enders, 2006).

The work of university faculty has long been devoted to teaching, research and service, although the extent and ratio of each role function varies from one university to another and from one discipline to another (Cardozier, 1987; Coser, 1971). Broadly, academics are expected to conduct research, publish the results of such, and then convey their knowledge to students through the design of new courses and participation in curricular innovations (Boyer, 1982; Veblen, 1971). Through their research professors create knowledge; through teaching and publishing they disseminate knowledge.

For many years tenure was bestowed on professors who had taught successfully for some years, had the highest recognised academic achievements (which implied many publications, research projects, etc.), and were recommended by tenured colleagues in their field (Wilke, 1979). To be promoted, one is usually reviewed on the basis of effectiveness in teaching, research (academic publications), and service. Some universities include "cooperation" or "collegiality" in their criteria for promotion,

meaning that other faculty find the person to be a tolerable colleague (Amacher and Meiners, 2004). However, the “service” the faculty should provide is more difficult to define, as it is related, at least in part, to academic cultures as well as to changing policies in and reforms of higher education. For example, some professors in the social sciences are also consultants to industry and government, and their advice is eagerly sought by powerful decision-makers (Coser, 1971). The “service” orientation is further highlighted by Mortimore (2000):

The professor has an important function as a public intellectual with responsibility to contribute to debates on matters of public policy. He or she should ask difficult questions, demand evidence rather than anecdote for answers, generate through research new knowledge, formulate new theories and speak up for what is right (p. 8).

Thus, the professoriate may more appropriately be conceptualised as a meta-profession that is built upon the foundation of a base profession by combining elements from a variety of several other different professional arenas (Arreola *et al.*, 2003). In fact, professors occupy two simultaneous roles: professionals and employees of large bureaucratic organisations (Stromquist, 2007).

It is worth noting, nevertheless, that the idea that there is a single type of professoriate is non-existent (Hostaker, 2000). In reality the structure, culture and practices of the professoriate are differentiated by the discipline, the institutional dividing line, the internal ranking system, and national differences (Enders, 2006). This differentiation is evident in much of the international research. Thus, for instance, while universities in the UK are chartered semi-independent institutions, universities in Sweden and Norway are state-owned and the teachers are civil servants (Hostaker, 2000). German university professors spend more time than other European colleagues on teaching, Dutch professors publish more than other Europeans, and English professors are considerably less satisfied with their role when compared with other professors from the continent (Enders and Teichler, 1997).

Many reforms that have been introduced in higher education systems worldwide since the 1990s (e.g. accountability, privatisation, and marketisation), as well as ongoing shifts in university governance and structure, have brought about further diversification and new re-conceptualisations of the professor’s role (Stromquist, 2007). The “service” function has moved from academic aspects (e.g. service on academic committees, participation in organisational activities of the field) to more administrative-organisational ones (e.g. fund-raising, social activities). The need for income maximisation has driven universities to reappraise and multiply their functions and relationships, leading, among other things, to more demands for applied research (Henkel, 2005) and, in turn, to an increased sense of crisis in the professoriate (Enders, 2006). By way of contrast, in some institutions faculty focus more on their own individual work (research and teaching) and increasingly leave organisational decision-making to administrators (nevertheless, most academics still have administrative roles to perform, such as course directors, and this burden seems to be increasing) (Baruch and Hall, 2004).

In sum, the higher education reforms of the last two decades have raised fundamental questions as to what it means to be a university professor (Henkel, 2005). The functions of the academic profession are becoming more important and complex given the “scientification” of society and the expansion of highly qualified labour (Enders and Teichler, 1997). Needless to say, the professoriate in EA is not an exception to this development.

A historical account of the professoriate in EA

Since the foundation of EA as a field of study, some publications have identified the features of its professoriate (e.g. Hayes, 1966). A national survey conducted in the early 1970s by Campbell and Newell (1973) found 1,333 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 the *Journal of Educational Administration*, 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).

An interesting characteristic of EA professors in those days was their educational background. Significantly, as Willower (1983) maintained, individuals with disciplinary training (especially in one of the social sciences) were much sought after in the 1960s due the increase in EA departments. This practice had earlier been identified by Campbell (1981), who stated that:

Any recent appointments in schools of education and in departments of EA have been filled with persons prepared in social psychology, sociology, political science, and in other disciplines. Those appointments have been made with the conviction that such persons would bring new insights and help transform the field of EA. But, in many instances, representatives of the disciplines have simply used the schools as a convenient arena in which to continue investigations pertinent to their respective disciplines (pp. 12-13).

Regardless of educational background, a common feature of the professoriate in EA throughout these earlier years was the limited attention given to scholarly empirical work and writing (Willower, 1983). The departments of EA in the 1960s were bifurcated informally into two groups of professors. The older and more experienced “schoolmen” were more concerned with “how to do it”, while the younger academics focused on research and development of instructional and methodological competencies required from scholars in EA (Farquhar, 1974; Walker, 1984).

Besides, most of the research programs were field studies done by graduate students, dealing with problems specific to one situation and thus their potential for generalisation was limited (Campbell and Newell, 1973; Hoy, 1978). Significantly, 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), despite the weak scholarly skills of most professors, as was evident in the bulk of material submitted for publication in the *Educational Administration Quarterly (EAQ)*, an attitude that continued into the 1990s. McCarthy (1986) found that the typical EA professor in 1994 “taught two courses per term, chaired four doctoral committees in the preceding three years over two fifths of the work week teaching and advising graduate students and supervising doctoral work and 14% research activities” (p. 141), at least in part, because they received very little external funding and release time for research.

In the 2000s, the professoriate of the field has received revitalised attention from EA authors. Some articles have been published about the characteristics of the professoriate in our time, including attempts to identify the factors predicting academic career choice (Baker *et al.*, 2007; Pounder *et al.*, 2004), documents of professional biographies of field members (Gunter, 2002), the journals used by EA professors (Mayo *et al.*, 2006), and the particular factors affecting productive activities

in the professoriate (Tschannen-Moran *et al.*, 2000). Among the factors that affect the career choice of EA professors are teaching, extension of knowledge, professional influence and the desire to improve education (McCarthy, 1986). Yet, the pool from which professors are drawn continues to be overwhelmingly homogenous (88 per cent Caucasian in the USA) (Pounder *et al.*, 2004).

On both sides of the Atlantic Ocean the bulk of EA professors have received their academic positions after serving in the compulsory education system (as teachers, administrators, superintendents); therefore, they might not have been prepared to meet the scholarly expectations of faculty life. Evidently, productive American researchers have tended to have more theoretical and research orientations, whereas “typical” researchers leaned more toward an applied perspective (Tschannen-Moran *et al.*, 2000).

It is acknowledged that EA professors face contradictory expectations: they are members of an intellectual community that promotes “scholarly activity” and yet they are supposed to prepare practitioners who value a practice-oriented knowledge base (Mayo *et al.*, 2006). The “neo-liberal” political and economical climate further exacerbates this conflict, as it requires EA professors to generate applied knowledge aimed at improving the practice and informing the work of practitioners, while the current academic culture impels them to take a more critical view of educational “reality” (Gunter, 2002).

Evidence indicates that EA professors attach different emphases to each side of the continuum (Gunter and Ribbins, 2002). In research universities, nonetheless, where many productive professors (in terms of number of publications) work, the pendulum is skewed towards research programs and scholarly writing (Baker *et al.*, 2007), although an extensive collaboration with practitioners is also observed (Tschannen-Moran *et al.*, 2000). Thirty years after Campbell and Newell (1973) pointed to the small number of researchers who paid attention to scholarly work, the field is still bifurcated by professors who concentrate on practice and those who devote much of their time and efforts to promote the scholarly work of the field.

Method

The primary methodology employed in this study was qualitative content analysis (QCA), also called ethnographic content analysis, because the author’s CV is seen as a document receptive to textual analysis. A document can be defined as “any symbolic representation that can be recorded or retrieved for analysis” (Altheide, 1996, p.2).

Qualitative content analysis actually combines both quantitative and qualitative analyses. Thus, it provides a way of obtaining data to measure the frequency and extent of messages following a serial progression of category construction, sampling, data collection, and coding. In this sense it is used as a method to determine the objective content of messages within written documents. But, as opposed to traditional content analysis, in which the protocol is the instrument, the investigator is continually central in QCA, although a protocol may be used. Thus, QCA is oriented to documenting and understanding the communication of meaning and verifying theoretical relationships, but it is the reflexive and highly interactive nature of the investigator, concepts, data collection and analysis that is unique in this method.

Sample

The curricula vitae of 57 EA authors form the database of this article, guided by the underlying assumption that the professoriate of EA is also composed of authors who publish their works in the field’s journals rather than merely “being members” of EA

departments. After all, in some places EA professors are positioned in schools of management or in similar departments, while some professors in EA departments still focus on research in the discipline from which they received their doctorates.

The curricula vitae (CV) provides important information about the career and the scholarly works of an academic field's member. Sampling the CVs included two phases.

First, the names of the authors who published their work(s) in one of the field's major journals (Journal of Educational Administration, Educational Administration Quarterly, Educational Management, Leadership & Administration) during the years 2004-2007 were listed based on the authors' details provided by the journal. The total numbers of authors identified in these years was 235.

Next, an internet search using Google was conducted to find the authors' CVs based on the author's full name and his/her institutional affiliation. Sixty-six CVs were found, of which only 57 included sufficient information for this article and in which authors published at least half of his/her refereed journal articles in areas that are traditionally considered to be part of the field of EA (as they are reflected in major textbooks of the field). These CVs account for 24.2 per cent of the total authorship in 2004-2007 in the three major journals that constitute the database of this paper. It should be noted, however, that these CVs represent those authors who chose to upload their CVs onto the internet, a decision that may well have some influence on the sample. No attempt has been made to collect CVs through e-mail or postal correspondence due to the author's limited ability to analyse potentially hundreds of CVs as well as the assumption that the 57 CVs represents, by and large, the professoriate in the field. One must concede this as a possible limitation of this article.

Procedure

The analysis of the CVs was organised into several stages. First, each of the CVs was coded on three major themes:

- (1) the personal/career characteristics of each author (e.g. education, countries of current employment, previous employments);
- (2) the author's academic career (e.g. courses, consultation, honours, and grants); and
- (3) the author's lists of publications (e.g. books, edited books, book chapters, articles in refereed journals, book reviews, and research reports) from 1994 onwards.

Consistent with the method of QCA depicted above, the coding of "publications", in the first phase was based on common categories/themes in the study of EA (e.g. leadership, policy focus, organisational structure, etc.) provided by Swafford (1990), and later used by Oplatka (2007, 2008). With a list of these themes at hand, the author tried at the outset to match every publication title (including those presented at conferences) to the appropriate category. This entailed a process of recursive and reflexive movement between concept development, sampling, data-collection, coding-data, and analysis-interpretation.

It was important to adhere first to common themes prior to any attempt to devise new categories and topics – some of them, for example, could be new titles for existing themes. Categories and variables initially guided the study, but others were allowed and expected to emerge throughout the study, including the use of constant

comparison of relevant textual parts, image, meanings, and nuances (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). Thus, when a certain item did not match any of the common categories, it was categorised into a temporary, new sub-theme. An initial, inductive analysis of the CVs yielded several new categories that more accurately present the common topics published by the field's authors.

The open coding of the CVs was followed by a comparison of the CVs within every category and among the categories to verify clear boundaries between the categories and in order to trace inconsistencies. The author was aware, nevertheless, of the potential influence of the analyst upon the selection of the topics addressed in a conference. For this reason, two colleagues trained in qualitative analysis verified a sample of themes grounded from the data and provided useful comments for the analyst.

Results

QCA involves focusing on and collecting numerical and narrative data, i.e. the emphasis is on simultaneously obtaining categorical and unique data for every text studied. Hence, besides providing numerical information, it is important to expose the reader to descriptive, interpretive information, thereby illustrating the usefulness of constant comparisons for discovering emergent patterns, emphasises, and themes in an analysis of documents and texts (Gall *et al.*, 1996). Because of this, the current section displays the authors' personal and academic features, including their publications.

Personal/career characteristics of the authors

As the introduction of this article indicated, almost four decades ago, many EA scholars and researchers grew up in a host of disciplines and fields of study other than EA. Thus, to begin the "story" of the professoriate in EA it is interesting to examine the educational backgrounds of the authors.

Table I illustrates the shifts that have taken place in this area since the days of Campbell and Willower. While most authors studied a wide variety of subjects (as majors) in their first degree, half wrote their doctoral dissertation in EA. More encouraging is the focus of one third of them on educational studies at the BA level

Area of study	BA		MA		PhD	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Educational studies	17	29.8	18	31.5	5	8.7
Educational administration & policy	0	0	12	21.0	29	50.8
Psychology	11	19.2	12	21.0	7	12.2
Political science	10	17.5	6	10.5	2	3.5
English language & literature	6	10.5	0	0	0	0
Sociology	4	7.01	3	5.2	2	3.5
History	3	5.2	1	1.75	0	0
Math/statistics	4	7.01	0	0	0	0
Economics	1	1.75	0	0	1	1.75
Philosophy	1	1.75	0	0	0	0
Management studies	0	0	3	5.2	7	12.2
Counselling	0	0	2	3.5	0	0
N/A	0	0	1	1.75	5	8.75
Total	57	100	57	100	57	100

Table I.
Education (BA, MA, PhD)

(e.g. elementary education, math education, physical education, speech communication education, secondary education), and the focus of half of them on educational studies (e.g. sociology of education, reading, environmental education, higher and adult continuing education, science education, special education, and teaching) and EA in their second degree.

Of the “old” disciplines, “psychology” (including educational, experimental, clinical and developmental psychology at MA level) and “political science” (including Government Studies, Politics, Public Policy, and Public Administration) are dominant among the authors both at BA and MA levels. Far behind them are “sociology”, “history”, “math”, and “economics”. “Management studies” increased at the PhD level.

Examination of the doctoral level reveals two sorts of information. First, the vast majority of authors (41) received their PhD in the USA (including several working in other countries today), nine received them in Anglo-American countries (two in Canada, Australia, England and New-Zealand, and one in South Africa), two in Israel and one in Sweden. Four authors did not indicate the country of their doctoral studies. The authors received their doctorates from 38 universities around the globe, including Columbia, Harvard, Indiana, Michigan State, Technion, Alberta, Vanderbilt, and Sussex to name just a few.

Second, some authors provided the title of their dissertation, thus giving a glimpse into not only the department in which they received their doctorate, but also into the theme(s) of their dissertation. Some focused on teachers, supervisors and administrators, while others centred on topics that are not traditionally part of EA such as defensive processes or statistical network models. Appendix 1 presents 14 examples.

For many years (at least until the early 1970s) most of the authors in the field came from the USA (Oplatka, 2009). Even today, despite the extension of the field to many other countries, more than half of the authors in the field’s major journals between 2004 and 2007 were Americans (55.2 per cent). This is well reflected in the sample: 36 (63.1 per cent) of the CVs belong to American scholars as reflected in Table II. Far behind are authors from Australia (five), Israel (four), England (three), New Zealand (two), and one from each of Canada, The Netherlands, Sweden and Thailand. For reasons unknown, British scholars tend not to upload their full CV to the internet, thus making the sample a little more biased towards American authorship.

Some space is given in the CVs to the scholars’ current and previous patterns of employment. From Table III it can be seen that EA authors have filled many

Country	<i>n</i>	Per cent
USA	36	63.1
Australia	5	8.7
Israel	4	7.1
England	3	5.2
New Zealand	2	3.5
Canada	1	1.75
The Netherlands	1	1.75
Sweden	1	1.75
Thailand	1	1.75
N/A	3	5.2
Total	57	100

Table II.
Countries of current
employment

Type of previous employment	Number of cases
<i>University level</i>	
Dean of faculty (including assistant)	12
Department head/chair – university	7
Professors (lecturer, assistant, associate, full)	57
Teaching assistance	8
Research assistance	11
Graduate assistance	6
Teacher fellow	1
Research fellow (including one Fulbright)	5
Director of program – university	9
<i>School level</i>	
Superintendent/supervisor	1
Director of education/LEA director	1
School principal/head teacher	11
School teacher	28
Instructional coordinator	3
School counsellor	4
School psychologist	2
Consultant (any)	4
Department head/chair (in schools)	6
Director of programs in school	14

Table III.
Types of previous
employment

occupational roles during their career, both in higher and compulsory (school) education as well as other occupational sectors. Twelve authors are/were Deans or assistant Deans, seven had assumed Departmental headships at their universities, most had a rank in the academic tenure-track, eight were teaching assistants, 11 were research assistants, and six were graduate assistants.

Many EA authors had career experience in the compulsory educational system, an occupational history similar to that of many of the first EA professors (Campbell and Newell, 1973). In total, 28 had been schoolteachers, 11 were school principals, and many took on middle management roles in schools (e.g. coordinator, department head, program director), as well as support staff roles (e.g. counselling, school psychology).

In addition to their roles in the educational system, the EA authors' CVs are replete with details of many other jobs. Among these are "clinician", "regional reading specialist", "manager of Triumph Construction", "policy analyst", "technology integration specialist", and "professional development officer". In other cases, EA authors had taken part in professional teams organised by education agencies or districts.

The academic features of the authors' careers

A major part of any professor's career refers to instruction and research. Therefore, tracing the courses taught by EA authors, the awards they receive for effective teaching and research, and the research grants they managed to obtain was warranted. In addition, as an applied field of study, the knowledge produced by EA professors may be utilised by practitioners. One way to disseminate this knowledge is through the involvement of EA professors in consultation work.

Courses taught by EA authors. A central part of every professor's career is teaching courses in his/her areas of study, and EA professors are no exception. Table IV

Topic	Frequency	Percentage
Managerial skills	72	20.0
Leadership	53	14.7
Essentials of EA	34	9.4
Organisational change	28	7.7
Policy	24	6.6
Instruction	21	5.8
Reforms	7	1.9
Ethics	4	1.1
Other educational studies	33	9.1
Methodology	50	13.9
Non-education	33	9.1
Undefined topic	0	
Total	359	100

Table IV.
Courses taught by EA
authors

indicates the wide variety of courses taught by EA authors in their institutions. These courses reflect, by and large, the scholarly content of the field, and corroborate, as will be seen below, with the publications of the authors. Fourteen authors, unfortunately, did not provide information regarding their courses.

Much attention is given by EA authors to the teaching of “managerial skills” – the heart of EA in its incipient stages. They teach courses focused on basic managerial skills (e.g. planning, decision-making, school personnel, school effectiveness), and guide students in internship programs (see Appendix 2 for a sample of courses in this category). A total of 53 courses deal with “leadership” (e.g. effective leadership, managing schools, critical issues in superintendency, leadership for learning, middle leadership), and 34 are a type of basic course in EA (e.g. organisational behaviour in schools, organisation theory, introduction to EA, management theory and organisational behaviour)[1].

To a lesser extent, EA authors teach courses about organisational change and development, policy, instruction, and educational reforms. Four courses centre on ethics in leadership (e.g. Politics of Equity and Social Justice in Educational Leadership, Ethics in Education; see Appendix 3 for a sample of courses in these categories.) Worthy of note is that many EA authors teach courses in the various research methodologies, while some teach courses focused on higher education or technology. Others teach courses in psychology or sociology.

Awards. A revealing question regarding professors in EA identifies the awards received during their academic careers. Indications of 106 awards were gleaned from the CVs, of which 54 were endowed by academic institutions. For instance, EA authors received Teaching Excellence Awards, Graduate Student Teaching Awards, Outstanding Mentor Award, Probationary Faculty Research Award, Recognised for Distinguished Achievement in Teaching, Research, and Service, Outstanding Civic Engagement Award, and Teacher Who Made a Difference Award.

In total, 31 awards were endowed by academic associations such as AERA, The Canadian Association for the Study of Educational Administration, UCEA, Phi Kappa Phi, and the New Zealand Educational Administration and Leadership Society. Authors received awards for significant contributions to educational administration, outstanding papers at AERA, distinguished service, and excellent doctoral dissertation research.

Other awards were endowed by journals for extraordinary papers (e.g. Emerald Highly Commended Award for Outstanding Paper, Outstanding Reviewer for the *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Editor's Award for Best Paper). The wide variety of awards conferred on EA authors from such a variety of institutions/associations reflect, in the author's view, the academic legitimacy of the field and its ongoing vitality in many countries.

Research grants. Since the 1990s, neo-liberal ideologies have penetrated the discourse of higher education, leading, among other things, to a greater importance placed on fund-raising in an academic career. From most of the CVs (only eight omitted information about grants) one learns that EA authors obtained grants for conducting research in a host of areas, including leadership, school finance, school structure, school culture, policy, evaluation, reforms, gender, leadership development, educator's career educational change, and so forth.

Some grants were given by the professor's institution (e.g. The Faculty of Education in Haifa University, The University of Georgia College of Education ATLAS Project, Oklahoma State University Research Foundation), national foundations (e.g. Australian Research Council, the National Science Foundation, Washington, DC), or education agencies (e.g. St. Louis Public Schools Amount, Virginia Department of Education, The United States Office of Education, Canadian Teachers' Federation). They also receive grants from foundations supporting various types of research (e.g. Hemingway Foundation, Ford Foundation). This illustrates, in the author's view, the high value attached by foundations and academic institutions to the work conducted in the field of EA. Spencer Foundation, for example, funded a research on productive scholars in the field of EA, a grant that indicates the respect given by the academic world to the field of EA.

Consultation. Educational Administration is considered to be an applied field of study, i.e. a field whose knowledge base is intended to improve practice and help practitioners in their work (Keedy, 2005). Perhaps this accounts for the reference to consultancy work in one third of the CVs. Most of the consultations are conducted for education agencies (e.g. Hawaii State Department of Education, Littleton School District, Colorado Department of Human Services, Virginia School Boards Association, Middle States Association of Colleges, Delaware Public Schools, Haifa Municipality) for varied purposes. For example, some EA authors consulted in areas of design and computer simulation, school violence, questionnaire development, and personnel selection and evaluation analysis. The authors were also involved in statistical service for local task forces, organisational consultancy for schools, evaluations of local educational reforms (e.g. school choice, teacher quality), and even forensic evaluations of legislation. It is likely that district officials, school boards, and managers of educational agencies/departments consider EA professors as experts who can help them manage the organisation/institution, implement changes and launch improvements in many educational aspects.

The authors' publications

While every author published work in one of the field's major journals, some of their work was on a variety of topics outside the EA field. It is informative, first, to examine the many areas of study the authors explore both in and out of the scholarly boundaries of EA (as they are reflected in the common topics addressed in textbooks of the field), while at the same time, to learn of the different forms of writing used by the authors.

Books and edited books. Since they are seen as members of the social sciences, EA professors are expected to write books and edit anthologies as part of their career. Nevertheless, 20 authors did not include mention of such in their CVs. In accord with recent scholarly reflections on the field (e.g. Ribbins, 2004), the majority of the books referred to in the CVs (as Table V shows) focus on educational leadership (e.g. *Handbook of Instructional Leadership, Leadership at a Crossroad*). Of these, seven books refer to “leadership development” (e.g. *Preparing School Leaders*), three to “ethical aspects of leadership” (e.g. *Ethics for School Business*), and two focus on “supervision”.

The study of “organisational aspects” also garners much attention in the authors’ books. Of the 19 books, 11 focused on school structure (e.g. *Rethinking Effective Schools, Understanding and Assessing Charter Schools*), six on school culture (e.g. *Building a Professional Community*), one on school finance, and one on school politics. This category was followed by 12 books on educational reforms (e.g. *Pathways to Privatisation in Education, Experiencing Educational Reforms*), and 12 other books address varied managerial processes in school, such as change and improvement, decision making, law, and instruction (e.g. *A Guide for Improving Classrooms and Schools*).

To a lesser extent, the field’s authors wrote about gender (e.g. *Mentoring Women in Educational Administration*), policy (e.g. *New Directions in Educational Policy*), and the field itself (e.g. *Theory and Research in Educational Administration*). But some, probably those positioned in related departments, wrote about issues pertaining to sociology of education, counselling, higher education, and even some administrative and instructional aspects of gifted education. Of the non-educational books are references to creativity, public administration, organisational politics, and human innovation, all of which may relate to EA implicitly but not directly.

Educational administration authors publish books with many and varied publishing companies, an indication, perhaps, of the academic legitimacy of the field. Among the publishers are the well-known and well-respected Teachers College Press, Sage Publications, SUNY Press, Routledge, Springer, Jossey-Bass, McGraw-Hill, Allyn & Bacon, Open University Press, and many others. Nevertheless, major university presses, like Harvard and Princeton, are not represented in the authors’ book list.

Book chapters. An invitation to contribute a chapter to an edited book is part of a senior scholar’s work life. In total, 46 authors’ CVs included details of book chapters. Table VI illustrates the frequency of book chapters.

Topic	Frequency	Percentage
Leadership	40	31.2
Organisational aspects	19	14.8
Educational reform	12	9.3
Managerial processes	12	9.3
Gender issues	6	4.6
Policy	4	3.1
The field of EA	5	3.9
Other educational studies	12	9.3
Non-education	11	8.5
Undefined topic	7	5.4
Total	128	100

Table V.
Topics of books and
edited books

Table VI.
Topics of book chapters

Topic	Frequency	Percentage
Leadership	82	22.4
Managerial processes	51	13.9
Organisational aspects	39	10.6
Educational reform	28	7.6
Gender issues	26	7.1
Policy	14	3.8
Teachers' career	13	3.5
The field of EA	4	1.09
Other educational studies	60	16.4
Non-education	26	7.1
Undefined topic	22	6.02
Total	365	100

Book chapters enable one to look more deeply into the varied topics addressed in the field. Thus, "leadership" includes teacher leadership, creative leadership, leadership and politics, leader mistreatment, productive leadership, distributed leadership, the development of leadership thought, moral aspects of leadership and so forth. Twenty-four book chapters address leader development and principal preparation programs.

"Managerial process" refers to aspects of school management, including school finance, law, change initiation and implementation (e.g. a case study of school improvement, change and conflict, unions and school change), and leading instruction and learning in school (e.g. support of student achievement). The category "organisational aspects" encompasses books chapters about school environment (e.g. linkages between school and families, school-community relations), structure (e.g. public versus private schools, the school of the future) and school culture (e.g. team building, collaboration, assessing school culture).

Of the other topics identified in the book chapters, two categories merit highlighting. First, 13 works (although a very small proportion of all the book chapters) consider teachers and their careers (e.g. professional development of teachers, teacher satisfaction, extra-role behaviours) – a commonly addressed by researchers in teacher education and related areas. Second, EA authors write many book chapters in areas of study that are not considered traditionally to be part of the field of EA, such as sociology of education (19 works), higher education (nine works), educational technology (ten works), and students' issues (22 works). The last area refers to students' life and achievements in schools (e.g. increasing students' voice, juvenile commitment and violence). "Non-education" is usually addressed by a small group of authors (four) in this sample who combine research both in EA and other fields of study (e.g. general management, psychology).

Book reviews. Book reviews are considered to reflect any academic field's development and critical debates and seem to contribute to the vitality of the professoriate. Unfortunately, only 17 authors provided information about book reviews they had published about the field and/or other fields of study such as general management, sociology of education, gifted education, and psychology.

Authors wrote reviews of books about educational change (e.g. *The Future of Educational Change*), educational leadership (e.g. *Sustainable Leadership, Leadership in*

Empowered Schools), gender (e.g. *Women Principals at Work*), educational reform (e.g. *School Vouchers and Public Opinion*), instruction (e.g. *An Imaginative Approach to Teaching*), policy (e.g. *Policy Analysis in Education*), educational law (e.g. *School Law and Public Education*), and school structure (e.g. *The Evolution of an Excellent School System*). Other areas of interest, such as higher education, supervision, environments, school culture, school violence and the epistemology of EA as a field of study, were reviewed each on only one occasion.

Papers in refereed journals. Refereed journals in which external reviewers are appointed to judge the paper's quality and relevance to the field are, arguably, the most respected channel for disseminating research findings and scholarly work in the academic world. From Table VII it can be seen that a great deal of research in the field, just as shown in the previous categories, is devoted to "leadership" (including leadership development and the principal's career), "managerial process" (including change management, law, school finance, and instruction management), and "organisational aspects" (including culture, structure, politics and environments). The other topics receive relatively minor attention by the authors.

The analysis of the journal papers enables one to probe the field's topics more sharply and profoundly, since professors are capable of submitting more journal papers than book proposals. Examination of the topic of "leadership" exposes a wide variety of research conducted by EA authors, such as successful leadership, principal work behaviour, leadership for organisational learning, academic leadership, leader-follower relations, cultural leadership, superintendency, African-American leadership, the principalship at a crossroads, middle management and historical aspects of educational leadership.

The study of "school culture", for instance, is replete with many areas of interest, such as trust, teacher teams, managing the staffroom community, organisational health, and the like. The study of "change" includes papers on leading changes in schools, instructional improvement, restructuring, organisational learning, and so forth. "Teachers' career" is also a target for research by some EA authors. They write about teacher professional development, teacher empowerment, teacher perceptions, and the like, all of which focus on "the teacher" as a unit of analysis without connecting it necessarily to EA or educational leadership.

Topic	Frequency	Percentage
Leadership	194	28.1
Managerial processes	113	16.4
Organisational aspects	99	14.3
Teachers' career	38	5.5
Gender issues	32	4.6
Educational reform	31	4.4
Policy	27	3.9
The field of EA	13	1.8
Other educational studies	67	9.7
Non-education	53	7.6
Undefined topic	22	(3.1
Total	689	100

Table VII.
Topics of papers in
refereed journals

Educational administration authors are less likely to write about educational reform or educational policy, perhaps because of the conceptual, and in recent years, structural distinction between the field of educational policy and the field of EA, a distinction that Glatter (1987) lamented about two decades ago. Even when these two issues are addressed, the foci of many papers is on the implementation of the policy/reform within a school's context rather than on the initiation and institutionalisation of the policy/reform. The "black box" in the district or state level is left untouched.

Where do EA professors choose to publish their works? Apart from the journals specific to the field, it was remarkable to see the wide variety of publications in journals of non-education fields in which EA authors published their work. Included were journals in general management and related areas of studies (e.g. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, *Journal of Management*, *Leading & Managing*, *School Business Affairs*, *Journal of Leadership Studies*), in psychology (e.g. *Journal of Emotional Abuse*, *Group Dynamics*, *Journal of Psychology*), and in other fields of study (e.g. *Journal of Thought*).

Educational administration authors also publish in journals oriented to other fields of the education discipline, such as *Teacher Education Quarterly*, *Teacher College Record*, *Education and Urban Society*, *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, *Peabody Journal of Education*, *American Journal of Education*, *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, and in the eclectic *Review of Educational Research*.

It may be argued that the variety of journals identified here illustrate the unclear intellectual boundaries of the field. Educational administration journals are "open", on one hand, to authors from related fields of study, and, on the other, enable EA researchers to publish on diversified research topics. Nevertheless, one should also acknowledge that the openness of journals from other fields to EA researchers indicates not only some interest in the field, but also the ascription of an academic legitimacy to its values and contribution.

Research reports and projects. As research is the core activity of scholars and faculty members in the academic world, any examination of the professoriate requires some attention to research reports and projects in which EA authors are engaged. It should be noted, however, that 172 citations for research reports and projects appear in the CVs of only 32 authors sampled for this analysis; 26 omitted (or could not contribute to) this important aspect of their work in their CVs.

While the topics of the research reports written by EA authors are similar to those identified above, it is informative to look at the funding bodies associated with such. Thus, EA authors publish reports for governmental agencies (e.g. the Missouri State Legislature, Ontario Royal Commission on Learning, Government of Ontario), school districts or local education agencies (e.g. Saskatoon Catholic School Division; Council on Postsecondary Education, Frankfort, KY; the State of Indiana School Finance Committee, Lake City School District and Westminster College, Oakland Unified School District), professional associations (e.g. Victorian Primary Principals Association), and even school boards (e.g. Education Council of the Kitigan Zibi School Board; Boulder Valley Schools, Colorado).

They also publish reports in academic centres (e.g. National College for School Leadership; Centre on Educational Governance, Manchester University; USC Rossier School of Education, Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk, Johns Hopkins University; Ontario Institute for Studies in Education), or in centres belonging to their own universities.

It is quite clear that EA authors conduct research mostly for public agencies that are focused on education at national, state/provincial, and local arenas and in all levels of education (e.g. primary, secondary, higher). Only the very few authors in the sample whose areas of study included non-education topics were found to be related to other public or private agencies such as municipalities or other governmental ministries. None, however, worked with private companies – in stark contrast to professors in the sciences or business administration, for example.

Discussion

The professoriate of EA is unlikely to be a coherent and definable community, yet its members share some common lines. Educational administration authors received their graduate degrees in the field from many universities around the globe. But, a large portion of EA authors still receive their education in the disciplines or in related fields of study, arguably a sign of the field's insufficient scholarly maturity and/or a lack of clear conceptual boundaries. One may wonder why it is almost impossible for EA doctoral graduates to find positions in (for example) psychology or sociology departments and yet the reverse is possible. The answer probably lies in the undoubtedly interdisciplinary nature of EA and its consequential weak knowledge base.

Notably, EA authors hold numerous roles, many of which are associated with the compulsory educational (school) system. This, in turn, might imply a strong practical orientation in the field and thus a larger emphasis on instruction. Like social sciences scholars (Coser, 1971), some EA authors are consultants to public and governmental agencies (but not to industries), appointments that demonstrate practitioners and policy-makers do value the knowledge base produced in the field. Additionally, despite recent structural changes in higher education (Baruch and Hall, 2004), EA authors still occupy many academic roles in their institutions. It has been noted in this study that many have held a host of roles inside and outside the higher education system, perhaps because more highly educated employees are likely to perceive fewer obstacles in finding alternative employment, as Joiner and Bakalis (2006) maintain.

Similar to other university professors (Cardozier, 1987), EA authors devote much time to teaching, research and service. Based on Arreola *et al.*'s (2003) typology, the EA professoriate is composed of proficiency (EA authors seem to be experts in specific areas of study such as managerial processes in schools, leadership, school change, educational reforms, and organisational aspects of the school), discovery (EA authors conduct a great deal of research in specific areas for diverse public and governmental agencies), and dissemination (EA authors promulgate the results of research via publications in varied mediums). These themes of expertise have also been found in past reviews of the field (e.g. Murphy *et al.*, 2007; Oplatka, 2008).

The EA professoriate is also composed of modes of translation (translating research findings into practical, applied knowledge in leadership development programs and consultancy work). Some of the EA authors in this study have won awards, either for distinguished teaching or extra-ordinary contributions to research in the field. It must be acknowledged that much more empirical work is done in the field today compared to the times of Donald Willower (1983), who lamented the lack of a strong empirical orientation in the field.

What are the epistemological implications of the authors' characteristics for the field of EA? First, although EA authors focus, by and large, on several areas of study, the

weak scholarly boundaries of the field are reflected, explicitly and implicitly, in its authors' CVs; they are replete with many publications that do not traditionally fall within the scholarly boundaries of EA. Furthermore, the lack of a common educational background makes it hard for EA authors to produce a relatively agreed-upon and cumulative knowledge base. To wit, EA authors are not constrained to research that contributes to the practice of EA (e.g. problems of EA practitioners), but rather feel "allowed" to navigate many (alien?) areas of study. Under this condition, policy-makers may wonder about the contribution of the field to practice. Yet, in the name of the academic freedom, some pluralism may engender creative writings and discoveries. There ought to be a consistent balance between the field's "major" areas of study (that provide its distinguished nature and content), and its individual members' personal and intellectual propensities.

Second, the wide variety of topics addressed by authors both in research and publications indicates not only the pluralism of the field, but also the lack of a unified theoretical background for those engaged in understanding EA and leadership. The area of "leadership" that became dominant in the field during the 2000s (Ribbins, 2004) is no longer seen as a main area of study when the authors' CVs are analysed. It seems unlikely that EA authors will forego research and publication in the traditional areas of the field (e.g. school structure).

Third, five decades after the institutionalisation of the field in the academic world, the field's ancestors could feel well satisfied to see the legitimacy it has gained both in the academic and the educational arena. The field's authors are invited to consult with public education agencies, submit research proposals, and are rewarded for their research, teaching and service. Professors no longer need to justify their academic value and utility in terms of robust methodology or strong adherence to theoretical paradigms. They are also able to focus on applied knowledge and still are considered experts who provide valuable and useful knowledge for the educational system.

Although it is difficult to generalise from a small sample of CVs, the current paper provides some insights into the recruitment of new faculty into the field. In addition to the need to ensure a supply of future professors with outstanding scholarly ability, as Willower (1983) suggested many years ago, it is necessary to achieve balance between candidates holding doctorates in EA with those holding doctorates from related areas of study, with priority given to candidates from the former group. Otherwise, the field will forever remain fragmented, drawing on myriad models with weak connections between them. The question of the balance between candidates from general management and EA remains open. In any case, there will always be professors who study practice and those who do practice, as Gunter and Fitzgerald (2007) suggested, and this is reflected in the current analysis of authors' CVs. Many current EA authors seem to have done both throughout their career cycles.

Note

1. Note, the obvious (and surprising) absence of courses in organisational theory (as well as in other theoretical aspects of the field) may derive either from EA professors' tendency not to include courses in their CVs, or from professors' inclination nowadays to focus more on practical contents. In any case, this is left for further investigation.

References

- Altheide, D.L. (1996), *Qualitative Media Analysis*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Amacher, R.C. and Meiners, R.E. (2004), *Faculty Towers: Tenure and the Structure of Higher Education*, The Independent Institute, Oakland, CA.
- Arreola, R.A., Theall, M. and Aleamoni, L.M. (2003), "Beyond scholarship: recognising the multiple roles of the professoriate", paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.
- Baker, B.D., Wolf-Wendel, L. and Twombly, S. (2007), "Exploring the faculty pipeline in educational administration: evidence from the survey of earned doctorates, 1999-2000", *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 43 No. 2, pp. 189-220.
- Baruch, Y. and Hall, D.T. (2004), "The academic career: a model for future careers in other sectors?", *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, Vol. 64, pp. 241-62.
- Boyer, E.L. (1982), *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Princeton, NJ.
- Campbell, R.F. (1976), "The state and the professor", *Journal of Educational Administration*, Vol. 14 No. 1, pp. 5-15.
- Campbell, R.F. (1981), "The professorship in educational administration: a personal view", *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 17 No. 1, pp. 1-24.
- Campbell, R.F. and Newell, L.J. (1973), "A study of professors of educational administration: a summary", *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 9 No. 1, pp. 3-27.
- Caplow, T. and McGee, R.J. (1958), *The Academic Marketplace*, Anchor Books, Garden City, NJ.
- Cardozier, V.R. (1987), *American Higher Education: An International Perspective*, Avebury, Aldershot.
- Coser, L. (1971), "Teachers and professors: subject-matter areas", in Anderson, C.H. and Murray, J.D. (Eds), *The Professors: Work and Life Styles among Academicians*, Schenkman Publishing Company, Cambridge, MA.
- Enders, J. (2006), "The academic profession", in Forest, J.F. and Altbach, G. (Eds), *International Handbook of Higher Education*, Springer, Dordrecht, pp. 5-21.
- Enders, J. and Teichler, U. (1997), "A victim of their own success? Employment and working conditions of academic staff in comparative perspective", *Higher Education*, Vol. 34, pp. 347-72.
- Farquhar, R.H.F. (1974), "Educational administration in Canada: some distinctions and tendencies", *Educational Management & Administration*, Vol. 2 No. 2, pp. 9-18.
- Gall, M.D., Borg, W.R. and Gall, J.P. (1996), "Collecting research data through observation and content analysis", *Educational Research: An Introduction*, Longman, New York, NY, pp. 357-65.
- Glaser, G. and Strauss, A. (1967), *The Discovery of Grounded Theory*, Aldine, Chicago, IL.
- Glatter, R. (1987), "Towards an agenda for education management", *Educational Management & Administration*, Vol. 15, pp. 5-12.
- Gunter, H.M. (2002), "Purposes and positions in the field of educational management", *Educational Management & Administration*, Vol. 30 No. 1, pp. 7-26.
- Gunter, H. and Fitzgerald, T. (2007), "The contribution of researching professionals to field development: introduction to a Special Edition", *Journal of Educational Administration & History*, Vol. 39 No. 1, pp. 1-16.
- Gunter, H.M. and Ribbins, P. (2002), "Leadership studies in education: towards a map of the field", *Educational Management, Administration & Leadership*, Vol. 30 No. 4, pp. 387-416.

- Hayes, D.K. (1966), "The national conference of professors of educational administration: a stimulator and forum for professors", *Journal of Educational Administration*, Vol. 4 No. 1, pp. 3-11.
- Henkel, M. (2005), "Academic identity and autonomy in a changing policy environment", *Higher Education*, Vol. 49, pp. 155-76.
- Hostaker, R. (2000), "Policy change and the academic profession", in Kogan, M., Bauer, M., Bleiklie, I. and Henkel, M. (Eds), *Transforming Higher Education*, Jessica Kingsley Publishers, London, pp. 131-58.
- Hoy, W.K. (1978), "Scientific research in educational administration", *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 14 No. 3, pp. 1-12.
- Immegart, G.L. (1990), "What is truly missing in advanced preparation in educational administration?", *Journal of Educational Administration*, Vol. 28 No. 3, pp. 5-13.
- Joiner, T.A. and Bakalis, S. (2006), "The antecedents of organisational commitment: the case of Australian casual academics", *International Journal of Educational Management*, Vol. 20 No. 6, pp. 439-52.
- Keedy, J.L. (2005), "Reconciling the theory and practice schism in educational administration through practitioner-developed theories in practice", *Journal of Educational Administration*, Vol. 43 No. 2, pp. 134-53.
- McCarthy, M.M. (1986), "Research in educational administration: promising signs for the future", *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 22 No. 3, pp. 3-20.
- Mayo, C.R., Zirkel, P.A. and Finger, B.A. (2006), "Which journals are educational leadership professors choosing?", *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 42 No. 5, pp. 806-11.
- Mortimore, P. (2000), "Does educational research matter?", *British Educational Research Journal*, Vol. 26 No. 1, pp. 5-24.
- Murphy, J., Vriessenga, M. and Storey, V. (2007), "Educational Administration Quarterly, 1979-2003: an analysis of types of work, methods of investigation, and influences", *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 43 No. 5, pp. 612-28.
- Oplatka, I. (2007), "The scholarship of educational management: reflections from the 2006 CCEAM Conference", *International Studies in Educational Administration*, Vol. 35 No. 1, pp. 92-104.
- Oplatka, I. (2008), "The field of educational management: some intellectual insights from the 2007 BELMAS Conference", *Management in Education*, Vol. 22 No. 3, pp. 4-10.
- Oplatka, I. (2009), "The field of educational administration: a historical overview of scholarly attempts to recognize epistemological identities, meanings and boundaries from 1960s onwards", *Journal of Educational Administration*, Vol. 47 No. 1, pp. 8-35.
- Pounder, D.G., Crow, G.M. and Bergerson, A.A. (2004), "Job desirability of the university professoriate in the field of educational leadership", *Journal of School Leadership*, Vol. 14, pp. 497-529.
- Ribbins, P. (2004), "Knowing and knowing more on education and its administration: two cheers for reviews and reviewers of research", paper presented at the BELMAS/SCRELM Research Conference, St Catherine's College, Oxford.
- Stromquist, N. (2007), *The Professoriate in the Age of Globalisation*, Sense Publishers, Rotterdam.
- 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*, Vol. 28 No. 1, pp. 5-23.

- Tschannen-Moran, M., Firestone, W.A., Hoy, W.K. and Johnson, S.M. (2000), "The write stuff: a study of productive scholars in educational administration", *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 36 No. 3, pp. 358-90.
- Veblen, T. (1971), "The academic personnel", in Anderson, C.H. and Murray, J.D. (Eds), *The Professors: Work and Life Styles among Academicians*, Schenkman Publishing Company, Cambridge, MA, pp. 43-61.
- Walker, W.G. (1984), "Administrative narcissism and the tyranny of isolation: its decline and fall, 1954-1984", *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 20 No. 4, pp. 6-23.
- Whitley, R. (1984), *The Intellectual and Social Organisation of the Sciences*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Wilke, A.S. (1979), *The Hidden Professoriate: Credentialism, Professionalism, and the Tenure Crisis*, Greenwood Press, Westport, CT.
- Willower, D.J. (1983), "Evolution in the professoriate: past, philosophy, future", *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 19 No. 3, pp. 179-200.

Appendix 1. The topics of authors' dissertations

- (1) Constructing professional individuality – on the teacher speaking within the discourse of self determination.
- (2) Academic researchers and funding sources: a resource dependence analysis.
- (3) The use of the Delphi technique in determining what supervisors can do to improve the quality of classroom instruction.
- (4) School governance and leadership at the intersection of public school choice and performance-based accountability.
- (5) Black female school superintendents and success: a study of perceptions regarding constraints and facilitators encountered en route to the superintendency.
- (6) Norm setting as a component of principal effectiveness.
- (7) Profiles of administrator stress in Colorado public metropolitan schools.
- (8) Faculty sense making of the impending change in principal in an elementary school.
- (9) Hegemony, "common sense" and compromise: a neo-Gramscian analysis of multilateralism in South Africa's post-apartheid foreign policy.
- (10) Mexican American superintendents in South Texas: toward a critical race analysis of school finance policy.
- (11) "Makin' it real: involving youth in school reform".
- (12) A comparison of statistical and neural network models for forecasting educational spending.
- (13) The effects of motives and ego-defences on defensive processes in person perception. Areas of specialisation: personality, clinical psychology.
- (14) Making sense of teacher agency: linking theory to school reform policy.

Appendix 2. A sample of courses in managerial skills

- (1) Analysis of administrative problems.
- (2) School resource management.
- (3) Personnel administration in education (Master's).
- (4) Analytic methods for decision-making (Master's).

- (5) Politics of education.
- (6) School finance and budgets.
- (7) Educational economics and school finance.
- (8) Planning and goal setting in educational organisations.
- (9) Managing educational organisations in a diverse society.
- (10) Law and ethical decision making.
- (11) Personnel management and contract administration.
- (12) Administrative practicum.
- (13) Collaborative problem solving.
- (14) Staff development.
- (15) Special problems.
- (16) Internship in EDUL.
- (17) Teacher observation.

Appendix 3. A sample of courses in less common categories

- (1) Organisational development & counselling processes.
- (2) Organisational change in schools.
- (3) System-oriented assessment & intervention in schools.
- (4) Managing change in educational organisations.
- (5) Managing instructional improvement.
- (6) Managing change in educational organisations. Course developed to meet school finance policy.
- (7) District business management.
- (8) Human resource policy seminar (doctoral).
- (9) Latina/os and educational policy.
- (10) Educational politics and policy.
- (11) Educational planning and policy development/policy analysis.
- (12) Supervision of instruction.
- (13) Principles of curriculum design & instruction.
- (14) Instructional supervision.
- (15) Reform of American public education.
- (16) Restructuring America's school.
- (17) Instructional leadership and school reform.
- (18) Organisational theory.

Corresponding author

Izhar Oplatka can be contacted at: oplatka@post.tau.ac.il