Fifteen Years of Publication: *Leadership and Policy in Schools* and Its Scholarly Contribution Since Its Foundation

Izhar Oplatka

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Fifteen Years of Publication: *Leadership and Policy in Schools* and Its Scholarly Contribution Since Its Foundation

Izhar Oplatka

Department of Educational Policy and Administration, School of Education, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the current article is to reflect systematically on articles published in Leadership and Policy in Schools (LPS) since its foundation in 2002 to the present time (2016). Based on qualitative content analysis of the journal's articles, it was found that *LPS* has published articles about clear and demarcated areas of study, such as policy, reforms, educational change, leadership, middle management, managerial procedures in schools, and school–community relationships. Particularly, *LPS* seems to be distinctive compared to other journals in the field in that it combines knowledge about policy (including education districts) with knowledge about educational administration in schools.

Most of the knowledge-production processes take place in university-based disciplines since their establishment in the late-19th and early-20th century in many countries (Hashem, 2007; Whitley, 1984). Disciplines perform the essential function of systematizing, regulating and unifying the flow of social and technical practices at the heart of knowledge production, employment structures, and training programs (Lenoir, 1993), and have recognizable identities, demarcated areas of academic territory, and particular cultural attributes, underpinned by common norms of enquiry, familiar educational training, and shared rules of function and technical procedure (Becher, 1989; Bridges, 2006; Lenoir, 1993).

Similar to major features of tribes or akin to social communities, disciplines struggle to develop distinctive identities and procedures appropriate to their concerns (Whitley, 1983), and are related to the intellectual tasks in which they are engaged. A discipline is also manifested by a lack of inter-relationship among scholars from different disciplines, various languages and discourses (Becher, 1989), and is characterized by the relative fullness of communication within the group as well as by the relative unanimity of the group's judgment in professional matters (Kuhn, 1977).

Part of the field's intellectual identity and boundaries is simply generated by what its members publish and where they do so (Rodgers & Rodgers, 2000)—both in books and academic journals. Such journals present an arena where dialogue about knowledge production and the nature of the field takes place (Gunter, 2002), as well as reflecting and defining lines of inquiry developed by those in the field (Immegart, 1990; Thomas, 2010). The journals, in turn, "renew" the field's discourse and "tell" us the story of the field's historical development.

The journal *Leadership and Policy in Schools (LPS)* pertains to a field of study with many names—educational administration (EA), educational leadership, and educational management—that are concerned with the management and operation of educational organizations (Bush, 1999), and it is considered to be distinctive within the education sciences (Glatter, 2014). According to its editors, "*LPS* aims to provide a high-quality forum for educational researchers, practitioners and policymakers to publish analyses and research about how school leaders and educational policies utilize fiscal, material, and human resources to bring about change in education and effectiveness in schools." The editors further invite articles about leadership in diverse elementary and secondary schools as well as in higher education. In doing so, they allow EA researchers not only to present their work in a legitimate outlet but also to reflect and define lines of inquiry that, in turn, enrich the field's knowledge base.

The purpose of the current article is to reflect systematically on articles published in *LPS* since its foundation in 2002 to the present time (2016) and to understand the sorts of works it contained in terms of topics addressed and types of articles. Based on a conceptual framework I developed elsewhere (see Oplatka, 2010), I pose two questions: (1) what are the legacies of *LPS* since its foundation and (2) what are its unique contributions to the field of EA?

Notably, I conduct here a meta-epistemological reflection on the articles published in *LPS* in an attempt to unearth what kind of EA scholarship has been pursued in the last 15 years. This approach has already been adopted in the EA field (e.g., Fitz, 1999; Murphy, Vriesenga, & Storey, 2007; Oplatka, 2008, 2012; Swafford, 1990) to provide an opportunity to glean information about the distinctive intellectual identity of the field. Likewise, reviewing existing research and scholarship in *LPS* may provide an opportunity to glean information about the distinctive intellectual identity of the field and the reshaping of its boundaries, and to reveal what the field has become during the last years.

Past reviews of the knowledge base of EA

The rapid growth of school districts coupled with the search for efficiency in education during the last quarter of the 19th century spurred the

development of EA preparation programs intended to prepare the growing number of principal-candidates in the U.S. for their impending role (Callahan, 1962; Culbertson, 1988). This brought about in later years the institutionalization of EA programs and departments whose main concerns were managerial skills (e.g., finance, staffing) and school law. Between 1875 and 1900, for example, concepts of speculative science were dominant, and pioneers (e.g., William Payne and William Harris) emphasized the need for a scientific approach to school administration in order to understand the art of "running" school systems and schools (English, 2003; Heck, 2006).

It was not until the early 1960s, nevertheless, that the field's "scientification" was expressed not only by a substantial body of textbook literature written specifically for school administrators by EA professors (Glass, 2004), but also by the establishment of refereed journals (Oplatka, 2010). Ever since, the field's knowledge base has extended markedly as more and more journals were founded to allow the field's members to publish their works in varied outlets. *LPS* is one of them.

Some scholars, though, reviewed the content of the articles published in the field's journals in order to shed light on its major foci, streams of research, and scholarly deficiencies. Campbell (1979), for instance, found that of all the articles published in the American journal *Educational Administration Quarterly (EAQ)* from 1965 to 1978, most-mentioned topics were: politics/policymaking, school finance, decision making, motivation/satisfaction, preparation programs, leadership, administrative behavior, authority/bureaucracy, collective bargaining, and organizational structure. He concluded that *EAQ* had published articles representing a wide variety of topics, and that the field had developed several foci of interest around which scholarly interests might be more specifically grouped.

In 1990, Swafford analyzed the articles published during the first 25 years of the *Journal of Educational Administration (JEA)* and found the following topics predominated in the examined period: the field of EA, organizational structure, the principalship, leadership, organizational climate, philosophy of EA, politics of education change and innovation, participatory decision-making, the inspectorate, and other minor subjects. Similar topics were published in the British journal, *Educational Management, Administration and Leadership (EMAL,* in the form of articles about management training, the relation between the professional and educational roles inherent in head-ship, and in-school evaluation (Hughes, 1997).

Several reviews of the field's content, both in journals and conferences, have been published during the 2000s. A review of *EAQ*'s content from 1979 through 2003 pointed to a discernible upturn in the share of empirical work in this journal since the late 1980s, including a noticeable increase in the percentage of naturalistic studies (Murphy et al., 2007). By way of contrast, only very few articles fitted into the general category of

theoretical and conceptual analysis. There appears to be a slight decrease in the total number of qualitative studies each year, whereas the total number of quantitative studies (utilizing mainly analysis of variance followed by descriptive analyses) was on an upward trend, as another reviewer of *EAQ* content summarized (Byrd, 2007). Bush and Crawford (2012) mapped the articles published in *Educational Management, Administration and Leadership (EMAL)* during four decades and found that administration at service level, organization at institutional level, culture and values, leadership theory/practice/development, curriculum, teaching and learning, appraisal and conditions of service, and resource management were among the major topics published in this journal. From a different point of view, Oplatka (2012) traced the legacies of *JEA* in every decade since its foundation and highlighted the dynamic nature of this publication. The dominance of the empirical legacy, as compared to the practical and critical legacies, is emphasised, and the rise and fall of different topics and perspectives throughout the years are illuminated.

In recent years, Hallinger and Bryand (2013) mapped the terrain of knowledge production in EA in East Asia since the year 2000. Based on an analysis of trends in publication of articles about and/or from East Asia in eight core EA journals, they indicated that the volume of knowledge production from this region consisted of less than 6% of total output in the relevant journals and a substantial majority of the publications not only came from a few societies, but from a small number of universities.

In a series of articles about the works presented at conferences, the field's knowledge base has been reviewed worldwide. Thus, although the 2006 Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration and Management (CCEAM) conference held in Cyprus was embedded with a mixture of ideas and topics with no clear connections among them, it was apparent that certain topics received more attention than others, among them leadership, and career and policy (Oplatka, 2007). These topics were very common also at the British Educational Leadership Management and Administration Society (BELMAS) conference a year later—but not only these. A review of work presented at this conference revealed a wide variety of content debated by field members, such as educational change and improvement, career issues, partnership, leadership and collaboration, leaders' attitudes, leadership development, and headship (Oplatka, 2008).

A review of the CCEAM conference held in Durban, South Africa, in 2008, revealed similar topics and epistemological trends. The typical paper was authored by one individual, was empirical, and was based on traditional methodologies (e.g., survey, interviews) (Oplatka, 2009). The conferences mentioned shared similar topics (e.g., leadership, policy, principal preparation, educational change, partnership), a resemblance that may derive from the globalization of the field and the high ratio of authors from Anglo-

American nations. The papers from both conferences support, to a certain extent, recent models of instructional and participative leadership, with some emphasis being given to schools' external relations and principal-teacher interactions.

Mode of analysis

The method employed in analyzing the journal's articles was qualitative content analysis based on principles of qualitative data collection and analysis (see Altheide, 1996). This type of analysis illustrates the usefulness of constant comparison for discovering patterns, emphases, and themes in an array of documents. In the current review, the first stage included extensive reading, sorting, and searching through the journal's abstracts, resulting in the coding of categories, keywords, and themes. This led to the second stage, in which themes and categories were identified and compared until main themes and subcategories in each abstract were identified. "Extreme" and "key" differences within each category were also compared and contrasted. In the final step, the data were contextualized and compared with the purposes of their respective articles, and themes were then compared among the abstracts. The themes were coded and integrated with the author's interpretation of the key concepts. When needed, information was gleaned from the other parts of the text.

Consistent with the method of qualitative content analysis depicted above, topic analysis, at the first phase, was based on common categories/themes in the study of EA (e.g., leadership, policy focus, organizational features, etc.) provided by Swafford (1990) and Oplatka (2010). With a list of these themes at hand, I attempted at the outset to match every abstract's purpose/topic to the appropriate category. I found it very important to adhere first to common themes prior to any attempt to devise new categories and topics, lest some of them be new titles for existing themes. When a particular abstract did not match any of the common categories it was placed into a temporary, new subtheme. An initial, inductive analysis of the abstracts yielded several new categories to present more accurately the common topics discussed in the journal.

The open coding of the abstracts was followed by a comparison of the abstracts within every category and among the categories to verify clear boundaries between the categories and also to trace inconsistencies. I am aware, nevertheless, of the potential influence of the analyst upon the selection of the topics addressed in journals. For this reason, the reader is provided with abstracts' research questions, purposes, or topics to enable him/her to judge the selection process. In addition, one colleague trained in qualitative analysis verified the themes grounded from the data and provided useful comments for the analyst. Types of articles and methods were borrowed from Swafford's (1990) content analysis of the papers published in *JEA*, assuming that they encompassed the number of types appearing in the field of EA.

Results

The analysis of the journal's articles yielded information about authorship patterns, the country of the first author, types of articles, subjects, methods, and topics.

Authorship patterns

Of the 238 works published in *LPS*, 85 (35.71%) were authored by one person, 86 (36.13%) were authored by two, 40 (16.8%) had three authors, 18 (7.56%) had four authors, and 9 (3.78%) were written by five or more authors. This corresponds, by and large, to the authorship style in journals and conferences in the field (Oplatka, 2008; Swafford, 1990). It also reflects the dual nature of the field of EA in that it draws on paradigms and scholarship from both arts and social sciences. Table 1 depicts the authorship patterns.

The country of the first author

As one can see in Table 2, most of the first authors in *LPS* (64.28%) work in American educational institutions (e.g., university, college, research institute), followed by 26 authors from Canada (10.92%), 12 from New Zealand (5.04%) and 10 (4.2%) each from Israel and the UK. In contrast, the representation of first authors from the rest of the world falls dramatically, ranging from one first author only from countries such as China, Turkey, South

Table 1. Authorship Pattern.

Authorship pattern	No. of papers	Percentage
One author	85	35.71
Two authors	86	36.13
Three authors	40	16.80
Four authors	18	7.56
Five authors & above	9	3.78
Total	238	100

Table 2. Countries of the First Authors.

Authors' countries	No.	Percentage
USA	153	64.28
Canada	26	10.92
New Zealand	12	5.04
Israel	10	4.20
UK	10	4.20
Australia	5	2.10
Finland, Hong- Kong, Cyprus	3 (from each country)	1.26
Thailand, Sweden, Norway	2 (from each country)	0.84
China, Turkey, Spain, Greece, The Nederland, Brunei, South Africa	1 (from each country)	0.42
Total presenters	238	100

Africa, Spain, Greece, Brunei, and the Netherland, through two (0.84%) first authors from countries such as Norway, Sweden, and Thailand, to three authors (1.26%) from Finland, Hong Kong, and Cyprus. Five (2.1%) first authors came from Australia. To wit, although *LPS* invites international authors to publish their works in its outlet, only very few out of the English-speaking countries choose or manage to publish in this journal (Israeli authors seem to be an exception). Perhaps the fact that so many developing countries have yet to establish mature programs of EA research partially explains why *LPS* has published very few works from these countries. Thus, as we will see later on, many of the topics published in *LPS* are deeply contextualized within the American educational system.

Types of articles

Clearly, any attempt to allocate an article to any one category is somewhat arbitrary, at least in part because the categories themselves are not mutually exclusive, and due to the mixture of foci embedded in any article. Still, the identification of the types of articles published in *LPS* may shed light on the nature of works with which members of the field of EA are usually concerned.

Looking at Table 3, it is clear that many of the articles were based on empirical work (161, 67.64%). By 'empirical work' I mean articles reporting on any type of research undertaken by the author(s). Sixty-seven (28.15%) studies used quantitative methodologies, 76 (31.93%) employed naturalistic-qualitative methodologies, and 11 (4.62%) only were based on triangulated research designs.

Forty (16.8%) works were conceptual, i.e., works that either developed theoretical hypotheses or reviewed an area of study by covering the main contributors to the development of a topic and exploring their various views (e.g., a framework for inclusive leadership, a framework for school leadership accomplishments). Sixteen (6.72%) works were descriptive, i.e., a description of program, system, or processes (e.g., The Kentucky Principalship: Model of

Table 3. Type of Papers.

Type of papers		No.	Percentage
Empirical	Quantitative	67	28.15
	Qualitative	76	31.93
	Mixed	11	4.62
	Unknown	7	2.94
Conceptual/review		40	16.8
Historical		11	4.62
Description of programs		16	6.72
Viewpoint (comment)		6	2.52
N/A		4	1.68
Total works		238	100

School Leadership Reconfigured by ISLLC Standards and Reform Policy Implementation), and six (2.52%) were a viewpoint, i.e., an article in which content was dependent on the author's opinion and interpretation is included in this category (e.g., who is framing the national understanding of educational leadership preparation, the millennium leaders). Interestingly, eight articles drew on historical views to illuminate leadership and administrative phenomena (e.g., "culturally responsive leadership" through a historical case study of the life of Gertrude Elise MacDougald Ayer).

Subjects (in empirical papers only)

Focusing on the 161 empirical articles, they included a wide variety of subject groups (173 in total), the majority of which were school principals (75) and schoolteachers (44), and to a lesser extent pupils (21), supervisors/superintendents (11), and parents (7). Interestingly, middle managers, principal candidates in leadership development programs, school board members, bursars, and business officials received very scant attention in the journal. Notably, *LPS* authors focused mainly on two traditional subject groups in the EA field, principals and teachers, while subjects such as university students, school counselors, and other education professionals have been marginalized. Table 4 presents the subjects in the reviewed papers.

Methods (in empirical papers only)

Other aspects of empirical papers are the methods used by researchers to create the knowledge base in their field, as depicted in Table 5. Questionnaires (68, 39.08%) and interviews (41, 23.56%) constituted the main methodological techniques used by *LPS* authors, followed by document analysis (8, 4.59%), focus group (7, 4.02%), and observation (6, 3.44%). Forty-one (23.56%) articles were based on case studies in which the researcher(s) used different methods in a well-defined site.

Table 4. Subjects (of Empirical and Evaluative Presentations).

Subject	No.	Percentage
School principals	75	43.35
School teachers	44	25.43
Pupils	21	12.13
Supervisors/Superintendents	11	6.35
Parents	7	4.04
Middle managers (school)	3	1.734
Others	12	6.93
Total	173	100

Table 5. Methods (in Empirical and Evaluative Presentations).

Methods	No.	Percentage
Questionnaire	68	39.08
Interview	41	23.56
Document analysis	8	4.59
Focus group	7	4.02
Observation	6	3.44
Case study	41	23.56
N/A	3	1.72
Total	174	100

Topics

An inductive analysis of the topics that have been published in *LPS* since its foundation reveals 10 topics; some received much attention (e.g., policy, leadership) while others have been relatively marginalized (e.g., managerial process in educational leadership, school–community relations). Several articles, though, have handled issues that pertain to other educational fields, such as sociology of education and educational technology. Each of the topics is discussed and exemplified by quotations from the articles' abstracts. See Table 6.

Educational policy

Before the American Educational Research Association decided to bifurcate formally the section on (educational) administration and policy into two different sections—"Administration" and "Policy"—the major journals of the field had tended to publish articles from both the policy and the school levels (Oplatka, 2010). Although both fields seem to develop separately and distinctively, *LPS* published 24 articles on the policy level as part of the journal's attempt to combine policy and leadership in its title and purposes. They ranged from a description of instructional policies, through issues of policy initiation and implications, to analyses of districts' policies, mainly in the U. S. Thus, two articles aimed to delineate instructional policies implemented in

Table 6. Topics Addressed.

Topic	No.	Percentage
Education policy	24	10.08
Educational reforms/changes	38	15.96
Educational leadership	84	35.29
The principal's career	9	3.78
Managerial processes	18	7.56
Leadership development programs	14	5.88
Role incumbents	25	1.50
School-community relations	11	4.62
The field itself	3	1.26
General education	12	5.05
Total	238	100

education districts, examining whether instructional policies at the local level are becoming standardized as a result of state and federal accountability initiatives (Duke et al., 2008), and to what extent capacity-building policy encourages school leaders to engage in professional development that will increase their focus on student achievement (Firestone, Hayes, Robinson, & Shalaby, 2008).

Some articles focused on policy development and initiation, explored factors affecting policy development (e.g., local culture, community-based organizations, teacher unions), and examined the impact of accountability policies and the influence of the standards on state policy, as exemplified in the following sample of research purposes/questions:

Three community-based organizations, one in Canada and two in the U.S., were analyzed to determine if and how the groups engaged with research in their efforts to influence education policy. (Winton & Evans, 2016)

(Given) that the capacity, beliefs, and values of local actors affect the relative success or failure of policy implementation, this article examines stakeholders' perceptions of education policy in South Carolina to consider the relationship between interpretations of education policy and attitudes of advocacy. (Werts et al., 2013)

This qualitative case study explores the political and leadership challenges imbedded within the implementation of a district-wide resource reallocation policy. (Halverson & Plecki, 2015)

Five works explored schools' responses to education policies, in general, and of school principals' responses, in particular, in the UK and the U.S. Thus, quantitative and qualitative studies examined schools' responses to accountability mandates, test-based accountability policy, and state incentive policies. This is illustrated in the following works:

This article draws on interview and focus-group data from multilevel case studies of teacher policy to better understand how principals and teachers function in the current teacher policy context. (Roellke & Rice, 2008)

This meta-synthesis explores the literature surrounding sensemaking by which building principals adapt and transform policy as they enact it in their schools. (Sumbera, Pazey, & Lashley, 2014)

Notably, the research on the education district gained some attention in the journal. Authors explored the expanding support and funding through district education foundations, policy implications for social justice, school district consolidation, district resources capacity, district responses to No Child Left Behind, and so forth. The district was the unit of analysis:

This article identifies characteristics of school districts that have been exceptionally successful in closing gaps in achievement among diverse groups of students, including students in challenging circumstances. (Leithwood, 2010)

In a study of Ontario, Canada's province-wide Primary Class Size Reduction (PCS) Initiative, school districts' ability to direct and support schools was related to their experience with planning and monitoring, interest in innovation, and its human and fiscal resource base.

> This study sought to understand the relationship between district characteristics, district finances, levy characteristics, and campaign expenditures with new operating levy outcomes. (Ingle, Johnson, Givens, & Rampelt, 2013)

Focusing almost entirely on North American educational systems, these articles increased our understanding of district management and policy initiation at this organizational level and of the large impact of districts upon educational leadership and school effectiveness.

Educational reforms

Since the 1990s, much attention has been given in the education literature to education reforms and to their consecutive educational changes and school improvement. Congruent with these streams of research, *LPS* published 38 articles about education reforms/changes, of which 10 focused on school change and improvement.

Some articles provided insights into varied reforms in different countries and broadened our knowledge of the impact of stakeholders upon reform implementation in educational systems (e.g., unions, communities) or the historical growth of different reforms. More specifically, two kinds of reforms received more attention by *LPS* authors than others—leadership standards in the U.S. and reforms directed mainly toward higher student achievement.

To begin with the former stream of research, six papers debated issues of professional standards for school principals, assessment of the leader's performance, and principal licensing, probing into the historical development of these assessment tools and their influence (e.g., clearer performance expectations, better feedback, student learning), as is echoed in the following purposes:

> This study used hierarchical multivariate linear models to investigate relationships between principals' behaviors and district principal evaluation, purpose, focus, and assessed leadership activities in 13 school districts in Michigan. (Sun & Youngs, 2009)
>
> This article provides perspectives about influences on the principalship following a state's 1998 adoption—without modification—of the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium *Standards for School Leaders*. (Browne-Ferrigno & Fusarelli, 2005)

The latter stream of research (four papers) dealt with issues of Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), testing, achievement data, school federation, and the like, and their implication for principalship (e.g., principals' responses to the demands of education reforms to raise student test scores on achievement tests, curriculum-building in school, and student achievement).

Most of the articles, though, focused on the impact of education reforms on different aspects of school and educational leadership. Thus, *LPS* authors examined the extent to which students with disabilities are accessing charter schools in one nation, a reconstitution reform in one district and its implications for the capacity of schools for improvement, the influence of a privately funded scholarship program on strategic adaptations within urban public and private schools, and so on. Nir and Ben-Ami's (2005) particle reflects this sort of works:

> The following study explores how the increase in schools' authority following the introduction of School-Based Management (SBM) in schools and involvement with the community schools' ideology provoke parents' militant behaviors against schools.

Some of the articles centered directly on the impact of a certain reform on the school principal:

> This article, based on a case study of a high school leader in a reform setting, identifies the professional identities negotiated by the leader with various constituencies and how these identities are used to build trust and gain political capital in order to achieve reform. (Scribner & Crow, 2012)
>
> The article analyzes principals' perspectives on the constraints of middle management under the implementation of Primary Class Size Reduction (PCS) Initiative in Ontario, Canada. (Flessa, 2012)

Finally, 10 articles debated issues related to educational change and improvement on the school level. *LPS* authors analyzed the process of systematic changes in schools, the actions taken by the principal and middle managers during school change, organizational learning and student achievement, and the relationship between varied elements and school improvement. The last topic is manifested through the following works:

> This article describes how Kentucky aligned externally mandated school reform with internally determined school renewal through implementation of its Standards and Indicators for School Improvement. (Browne-Ferrigno, Allen, & Hurt, 2008)
>
> How do teachers and administrators interpret the task demands represented in instructional materials? How does task demand relate to a school's improvement process? (Szczesiul, Nehring, & Carey, 2015)

LPS further connected school improvement to distributive leadership, democracy, turnaround schools, and urban renewal. School improvement was a desirable result and researchers examined ways to promote it in schools.

Educational leadership

The topic that received most attention in *LPS* is leadership, the first word in the journal's name. Eighty-four articles presented this organizational phenomenon from multiple aspects (i.e., leaders' perceptions, principal-teacher

relations, the influence of educational leadership) and perspectives (e.g., shared, transformational, instructional). Five articles traced leaders' perceptions toward prekindergarten education, inclusive education, academic climate, language schools, and the principal's desirable role, a kind of research that dominated the field of EA many years ago (Oplatka, 2010).

More articles (15), though, explored the followers, in general, and principal-teacher relations, in particular, including the issue of trust in educational institutions. *LPS* authors debated the concept of "followership"; explored views toward and constructions of educational leadership and its effectiveness among prospective and current teachers; examined educational leadership and teacher motivation; and provided insight into the principal's role in the teacher's career, including professional development:

> The current study aimed to understand the principal's role in promoting or inhibiting the appearance of teacher organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB) in safety education. (Oplatka, 2013)
>
> The purpose of this article is to identify how principals shape the adoption and implementation of professional learning communities. (Buttram & Farley-Ripple, 2016)

Principal-teacher relations are related to the concept of trust. Very few authors paid attention to its expressions, development, and conditions in schools. Hallinger, Lee, and Ko (2014), for example, examined the means by which principal quality, leadership, and organizational trust impact the strength of teacher professional community.

Another aspect of leadership that received attention in 11 articles refers to the consequences of this organizational phenomenon, and especially its successful ones. Some authors attempted to understand the educational leader's unique contribution to student achievement, while the majority probed into the complex issue of successful leadership and it measurement, probably in light of the International Successful School Leadership Project (Jacobson & Day, 2007). They described cases of successful leaders in varied countries, analyzed success factors of school principals, and explored how principals and teachers construct successful leadership. This stream of research is exemplified as follows:

> The purpose of this case study was to observe successful leadership and the principal's strategies both in her previous and present school, and how she applied some of the same practices in the new school to establish an exemplary campus. (Carza, Murakami-Ramalho, & Merchant, 2011)
>
> This article examines how Southern Arizona principals conceptualize and enact successful leadership in border schools with shifting demographics and high percentages of colonized populations. (Ylimaki, Bennett, Fan, & Villasenor, 2012)

Very reasonably, given the current literature about educational leadership, most of the articles published in *LPS* about this organizational phenomenom

proposed or examined a certain kind of leadership model. For example, authors explored the characteristics of strategic leadership and dual leadership teams. Yet, very few works focused on the old model of transformational leadership and the relatively new model of teacher leadership (three works in each topic). A sample of these works is presented below:

> This article uses evidence about transformational forms of leadership in schools provided by 32 empirical studies published between 1996 and 2005 to answer questions about the nature of such leadership, its antecedents, and the variables that both moderate and mediate its effects on students. (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005)
>
> This article provides a critical analysis of the teacher leadership literature. It considers teacher leadership within the context of contemporary leadership theory, focusing particularly upon distributed leadership. (Harris, 2005)

Most attention, however, was given by *LPS* authors to instructional leadership (16 papers), distributed leadership (12), moral leadership (10), and shared/democratic leadership (6).

To begin with the instructional model of educational leadership, *LPS* authors explored teachers' perceptions of principals' instructional leadership, examined the impact of current reading policies on instructional leaders' beliefs and practices, proposed a tentative model of the leadership capabilities required to engage in effective instructional leadership, or examined the impact of instructional leadership on collective teacher efficacy to improve student achievement. Some examples transmit the spirit of these works:

> The review will identify the defining characteristics of instructional leadership as it has evolved, elaborate on the predominant model in use for studying instructional leadership, and report the empirical evidence about its effects. (Hallinger, 2005)
>
> The purpose of this article is to demonstrate how school principals combine instructional and entrepreneurial aspects of leadership in their effort to build capacity for student learning. (Pashiardis & Savvides, 2011)

Although not always mentioning the concept of instructional leadership, some articles extended our knowledge about principals' concerns about instructional issues, instructional expectations in schools, key leadership practices to promote and sustain student achievement, principals' learning mechanisms, and the like.

Another model of educational leadership that was relatively popular among *LPS* authors is distributed leadership. Putative scholars in EA chose *LPS* as a proper outlet for publishing reviews and essays about the model of distributed leadership. Spillane and Orlina's (2005) article is an example of that:

> This article examines two questions: What does it mean to take a distributed perspective on leadership in schools? What are the entailments of taking a distributed perspective for research on school leadership? Arguing that the practice of leadership should be a key concern in scholarship on school leadership, the authors

explore the leader-plus and the practice aspects of taking a distributed perspective…

The patterns of distributed leadership and the factors promoting or inhibiting the appearance of this leadership were explored in varied studies published in the journal. Some studies were informed by redesign theory and organizational learning. Some were conducted in schools or education districts and some focused on the impact of distributed leadership on organizational procedures (e.g., decision making, school-site strategy). One article merits highlighting, as it explores an unusual type of distributed leadership: co-principalship.

> The article reports research at College A, a Catholic all-girls' secondary school owned by a religious order, which for some years has had a male and female co-principalship. The argument is that co-principalship is a form of shared role space inhabited by a distributed mind. (Gronn & Hamilton, 2004)

LPS has been an outlet also for works about moral leadership and leadership for social justice, two dominant interrelated models in the current discourse about educational leadership. Thus, *LPS* published articles about inclusive leadership and social justice, emotions and leadership for social justice, levels of moral judgement among school principals, equity and leadership, and diversity. Some examples are presented below:

> This article presents a qualitative case study of an elementary school principal in an urban setting and how she led to create a more inclusive school (DeMatthews, 2015)
> This article focuses on the leadership styles of one principal who enacts social-justice practices to benefit marginalized students, especially migrant and poor students. (Zembylas & Iasonos, 2016).

Finally, six articles explored shared or democratic forms of leadership in schools. Issues such as collaboration, democratic governance, participatory democracy, leadership of democratic schools, and democratic schooling were discussed in light of dilemmas and contradiction for educational leadership.

The principal's career

Nine papers were devoted to the understanding of the principal's lives and career. Apart from works about the principal's role and expertise, *LPS* authors uncovered the factors aspiring principals consider as important when deciding whether to apply for a specific post, and explored the career issues and experiences of principals in the preretirement working years. More attention was given to principal turnover and retention, as manifested in the articles' purposes:

This study uses multivariate analysis of a large panel data set to examine the determinants of principal retention (and, thus, the determinants of attracting a principal away from her current position). (Papa, 2007)

We conducted a three-level Generalized Multilevel Model to estimate variations in school and district characteristics impacting principals' career departure and mobility intentions, based on data from the School and Staffing Survey. (Tekleselassie & Vilarreal, 2011)

Other works examined the impact of principal turnover on schools and the extent to which there is a typology of principals who depart from their schools. An interesting article that examined emotions among school leaders following a severe earthquake demonstrates the journal's policy to allow the publication of a wide variety of issues:

This article takes the form of a research report which examines personal resiliency and a sense of hope among educational leaders in times of extreme crises. Findings indicated that, despite the trauma of an earthquake in Christchurch, New Zealand, school leaders were still able to find satisfying aspects in their jobs, and to display a range of coping strategies and positivity as their schools transition toward a state of "new normal." (Notman, 2015)

Managerial processes

Eighteen papers focused on managerial processes within schools such as financial management, problem-solving processes (e.g., putting expert aspiring-principal differences in problem-solving processes to the test), and teacher recruitment and selection (e.g., hiring teachers in public schools). The last topic is echoed in the following abstract:

While much has been written about the process of employee selection in other occupations, there has been little discussion on the process and tools of teacher selection and why it occurs as it does. To understand this question, we conduct an extensive literature review in which we compare teacher hiring with hiring in other occupations. We also present findings from a study of school principals and district administrators in a midsized Florida school district. (Rutledge, Harris, Thompson, & Ingle, 2008)

In contrast, more attention was given in recent years to data use and systematic inquiry and to the conditions influencing data use by principals and teachers, probably due to the great emphasis given to "rational" administrative procedures in our era of standardization and accountability. Some examples are presented below:

This article integrates largely unsynthesized literature to advance a schema for school leader diagnosis and intervention as a central mechanism for supporting the ongoing development of collaborative data practices. (Cosner, 2012)

Through comparative case study, we seek to understand the ways in which actors in high schools use and think about performance data. In particular, we

compare data use in higher and lower value-added schools. (Cohen-Vogel & Harrison, 2013)

Related concepts such as data-driven practices and performance data were also debated in *LPS*. The issue of teacher/performance appraisal received also some attention by *LPS* authors. They investigated the goals set by experienced principals during their performance evaluations, proposed a model for improving teacher evaluation, or examined the extent to which teacher appraisal policies and procedures promote teachers' self-reflections about teaching and students' learning.

Leadership development programs

Very reasonably, *LPS* was an outlet for works about principal preparation programs and professional in-service trainings for educational leaders (*N* = 14), one of the oldest topic in the field of EA (Oplatka, 2010). *LPS* authors reviewed the histories of principal preparation programs, reviewed current debates on "proper" leadership development programs, challenged traditional preparation programs, and analyzed major components of successful programs (e.g., feedback, knowledge base, faculty learning). Two conceptual/ review articles merit highlighting in this area:

> In this article, we examine the current national conversation on educational leadership preparation and practice and the implications of these conversations for educational leadership preparation. We focus specifically on the rhetoric and research concerning two issues identified as major contributors to our current leadership crisis: the shortage of qualified administrators and leadership preparation. (Young & Creighton, 2002)
>
> This article is anchored in the assumption that the preparation of school principals has, as one of several other factors and however indirectly, an impact on student achievement in schools. It suggests that the recently proposed outcome-based leadership standards constitute a useful tool with which to operationalize this assumption. The article examines two well-known and respected leadership conceptual frameworks which are commonly used in leadership preparation programs… (Gonzalez, Glasman, & Glasman, 2002)

LPS authors explored leadership preparation programs from multiple conceptual frameworks, analyzing professors' narratives about reforms in these programs, discussing the role of principal preparation programs to prevent workplace mistreatment and unethical behaviors, or describing curriculum modules for educational leadership preparation produced by professional associations.

Three works only focused on in-service professional development programs for educational leaders. *LPS* authors investigated what middle-level principals need to learn during a certain reform, presented a framework for school leadership accomplishments through learning centers, and examined

the perceived influence of these centers upon student achievement. Only one work dealt with the mentoring of newly appointed principals.

Role incumbents in education

Twenty-five articles revolved mostly around the role and career of superintendents and teachers. In contrast, very few works explored the roles of the assistant principal (two articles), department headship (one article), and school boards (one article). They illuminated the job realities and complexities of beginning and senior assistant principals, the influence of department heads upon student achievement and school improvement, and the role of school board social capital in district governance.

Most of the works about role incumbents in education and schools, though, studied superintendents and schoolteachers. To begin with the former, 11 articles explored the desirable preparation of superintendents and its inherent dilemmas and difficulties, superintendent turnover and its influence on student achievement, the superintendent in the policy stream, superintendents' assessment of minority candidates for principalship, or perceptions of superintendents towards varied educational issues. The next research's purposes express the notion of this works explicitly:

> The purpose of this study was to explore the relationship between superintendent leadership and the operational processes of school improvement. (Bird, Dunaway, Hancock, & Wang, 2013)
>
> This article presents an analysis of discursive stages in the evolution of the American superintendency in response to external and internal change forces within school systems. (Bjork, Browne-Ferrigno, & Kowalski, 2014)

LPS even devoted a special issue in 2014 to the office of superintendency in different countries (e.g., Sweden, Norway, the U.S.).

Although the study on teachers and teaching has been published mostly in special journals about this topic (and about teacher education), *LPS* was an outlet for 10 works about teachers and student achievement and the teacher's career. Thus, *LPS* readers have been exposed to the factors affecting a teacher's commitment to student learning, the relationship of collective teacher efficacy and student achievement, the qualifications of public secondary school teachers, the role of teachers' collective sense of efficacy, the mentoring of novice teachers, performance-based compensation systems in public schools, and teacher job satisfaction.

School-community relations

One of the topics discussed by researchers in the field of EA refers to the school's organizational environments, in general, and to school-community relations, in particular. Thus, the authors of 11 articles attempted to illuminate varied aspects of the school's environment and the nature of its

relationship with the local community. Issues related to environment brought up in *LPS* were motivating environments, parents-school relationships in loosely coupled systems, teachers' self-efficacy, university-school partnerships, and parental involvement. The relationships between school leaders and parents gained specific attention:

> This article is concerned with the leadership of parent involvement as a capacity-building strategy for improving teaching and learning. (Giles, 2006)
>
> In this article we critically examine how teachers and administrators in an urban high school identify and consider the challenges to parent involvement without either engaging in or disrupting normative constructions of the term *parent involvement*. (Watson & Bogotch, 2015)

Creating partnerships between schools and their communities to improve student achievement were rarely discussed, however, despite their positive impact on the schooling process.

The field of EA

Since the establishment of the field of EA, let alone since the appearance of its academic journals in the 1960s, field members have published scholarly works about its epistemological characteristics and intellectual boundaries (Oplatka, 2009). Unfortunately, however, it seems they have not considered *LPS* as a proper outlet for this kind of works, as only three articles provided reviews of research on educational leadership or educational research. They compared educational leadership research and argued in favor of including historical accounts in the study of EA, or focused on the study about educational leadership in a particular geographical area:

> A recent study of scholarship on educational leadership and management in East Asia identified a rapidly growing corpus of published studies focusing on educational leadership and management in Hong Kong. This article undertakes a "topographical analysis" of this literature with the aim of describing the nature of topics and research methods employed over the past decade. The authors analyze the body of articles published in a "core" set of eight educational leadership and management journals between 1995 and 2012. (Hallinger, Lee, & Szeto, 2013)
>
> In this article, we mobilize an emerging research program (relational administration) to argue that contemporary discourses of school leadership in Australia have a hybrid—part normative part rational—management rhetoric as a result of the unique economic conditions compared with many developed nations. (Eacott & Norris, 2014)

General education

Surprisingly, *LPS* allowed the publication of topics that are unlikely to pertain to the fields of EA or education policy, but rather to other education fields. For example, *LPS* published works about gifted education, student engagement and its quality, the evolving nature of American high school, the levels

of security in schools, school decline, and bilingual education. Some articles seem to be related to sociology of education, as they illuminated achievement gaps in schools, critical race theory, educational diversity, school segregation, and privatization of educational systems. Brown's (2006) article illustrates the "alien" academic territories in which these articles are located:

> This article reviews the rationale behind the recent U.S. Supreme Court ruling in the University of Michigan's Grutter v. Bollinger case. It describes the educational benefits of diversity as documented by research and argued by the seventy-five amicus briefs filed in support of the law school's race-based admissions policies…

Discussion

In this review, I traced the legacies of *LPS* and its unique contributions to the field of EA since its foundation. Based on the review of the articles published in this journal, several insights can be provided. First, consistent with past reviews of journals and conference papers in the field of EA (e.g., Bush & Crawford, 2012; Campbell, 1979; Hallinger & Bryand, 2013; Murphy et al., 2007; Oplatka, 2008; Swafford, 1990), *LPS* has published articles about demarcated areas of study, such as educational change, leadership, leadership development programs, middle management, managerial procedures in schools (e.g., teacher appraisal, human resource management), teachers and teaching, and school-community relationships. Inconsistent with the majority of the journals in the field that focused, by and large, on administration and leadership, however, *LPS* was an outlet also for a host of works about education policy (on the district level) and reform initiation, topics that appeared usually at the field's conferences (Oplatka, 2007, 2009). In this sense, *LPS* seems to be distinctive among current journals in the EA field.

The topics have been explored and examined by *LPS* authors through varied methods, the most prominent of which were questionnaires and semi-structured interviews used among school leaders and teachers. In this sense, *LPS* strengthens and follows the common norms of inquiry and shared rules of function and technical procedures in the "academic tribe," to use Becher's (1989) term, called EA. Likewise, as journals allow dialogues about knowledge production (Gunter, 2002), *LPS* reflects the epistemological heterogeneity and conflicting epistemologies in the field of EA. But, as Park (2015) noted, it is this variation and critical engagement that are conducive to new frontiers in the field.

Second, using the typology of legacies proposed by Oplatka (2010), *LPS* has contributed much to the empirical, practical, evaluative, and training legacies of the field of EA by publishing articles that reported on empirical studies, presented programs and notes from schools and districts as well as from principal preparation programs in higher education institutions, and

analyzed the influence of policies and reforms on schools and educational leadership. Particularly, and consistent with the editors' aims as indicated at the outset of this article, *LPS* seems to be distinctive compared to other journals in the field in that it combines knowledge about policy and education districts with knowledge about educational administration in schools. Put differently, the knowledge produced in and disseminated by *LPS* draws on theories and models from education policy and EA. In this respect, *LPS* "resists" the artificial distinction between policy and administration that appears in the American Educational Research Association and allows the publication of works that are unlikely to demarcate a clear line between both units of analysis. This allows researchers to publish new and evocative works (e.g., principalship after an earthquake) grounded in varied paradigms and epistemologies.

Third, compared to other journals in the field of EA reviewed in the past (see the introduction of this article), *LPS* has published very few works (if any) about emotion in educational leadership, the teacher's career cycle, decision making, organizational behavior, higher-education administration, and the like. Additionally, and consistent with other reviews of journals in the EA field (e.g., Murphy et al., 2007), *LPS* lacks sufficient systematic reviews and critical essays, two elements important in any field of study, let alone for its scholarly evolution (Kuhn, 1977; Lenoir, 1993). *LPS* editors are suggested to develop a new section of critical essays to promote evocative and scholarly challenging debates on education policy and educational leadership in terms of theory, streams of research, and pragmatism. The editors' decision to add a section called Research Notes written by putative scholars in the field from a critical and meta-analysis point of view coincides with my suggestion.

Finally, *LPS* is an American journal that publishes mostly knowledge that is produced by American researchers in American educational arenas. It presents many concepts and procedures that are grounded within the American contexts, sometimes without taking into account international readers. Yet, it publishes works that have been produced by international researchers (although very few from developing countries, a finding that corroborates Hallinger and Bryant's (2013) conclusion), and, consequently, allows cross-national fertilization of knowledge. More interaction between these types of works is welcomed.

References

(*) represents articles reviewed from *LPS*.

Altheide, D. L. (1996). *Qualitative media analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage.

Becher, T. (1989). *Academic tribes and territories: Intellectual enquiry and the cultures of disciplines*. London, UK: The Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.

*Bird, J. J., Dunaway, D. M., Hancock, D. R., & Wang, C. (2013). The superintendent's leadership role in school improvement: Relationships between authenticity and best practices. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *12*(1), 77–99. doi:10.1080/15700763.2013.766348

*Bjork, L. G., Browne-Ferrigno, T., & Kowalski, T. J. (2014). The superintendent and educational reform in the United States of America. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *13*(4), 444–465. doi:10.1080/15700763.2014.945656

Bridges, D. (2006). The disciplines and discipline of educational research. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, *40*(2), 259–272. doi:10.1111/jope.2006.40.issue-2

*Brown, K. M. (2006). The educational benefits of diversity: The unfinished journey from "mandate" in *Brown* to "choice" in *Grutter* and *Comfort*. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *5*(4), 325–354. doi:10.1080/15700760600968390

*Browne-Ferrigno, T., Allen, L. W., & Hurt, P. (2008). Longitudinal reform and renewal efforts to improve public schools: Kentucky's standards and indicators for school improvement. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *7*(4), 401–427. doi:10.1080/15700760701748477

*Browne-Ferrigno, T., & Fusarelli, B. J. (2005). The Kentucky principalship: Model of school leadership reconfigured by ISLLC *Standards* and reform policy implementation. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *4*(2), 127–156. doi:10.1080/15700760590965587

Bush, T. (1999). Crisis or crossroads? The discipline of educational management in the late 1990s. *Educational Management and Administration*, *27*(3), 239–252.

Bush, T., & Crawford, M. (2012). Mapping the field over 40 years: A historical review. *Educational Management, Administration & Leadership*, *40*(5), 537–543. doi:10.1177/1741143212451827

*Buttram, J. L., & Farley-Ripple, E. N. (2016). The role of principals in professional learning communities. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *16*(2), 192–222. doi:10.1080/15700763.2015.1039136

Byrd, J. K. (2007). A call for statistical reform in EAQ. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *43*(3), 381–391. doi:10.1177/0013161X06297137

Callahan, R. E. (1962). *Education and the cult of efficiency*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Campbell, R. F. (1979). A critique of the *Educational Administration Quarterly*. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *15*(3), 1–19. doi:10.1177/0013131X7901500303

*Carza, E., Murakami-Ramalho, E., & Merchant, B. (2011). Leadership succession and successful leadership: The case of Laure Martinez. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *10*(4), 428–443. doi:10.1080/15700763.2011.610558

*Cohen-Vogel, L., & Harrison, C. (2013). Leading with data: Evidence from the National Center on Scaling Up Effective Schools. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *12*(2), 122–145. doi:10.1080/15700763.2013.792934

*Cosner, S. (2012). Leading the ongoing development of collaborative data practices: Advancing a schema for diagnosis and intervention. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *11*(1), 26–65. doi:10.1080/15700763.2011.577926

Culbertson, J. A. (1988). A century's quest for a knowledge base. In N. J. Boyan (Ed.), *Handbook of research on educational administration* (pp. 3–26). New York, NY: Longman.

*DeMatthews, D. (2015). Making sense of social justice leadership. A case study of principal's experiences to create a more inclusive school. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *14*(2), 139–166. doi:10.1080/15700763.2014.997939

*Duke, D. L., Tucker, P. D., Higgins, J., Lanphear, L., Levy, M. K., & Salmonowicz, M. J. (2008). Are local policies supporting instruction becoming standardized? *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *7*(1), 1–29. doi:10.1080/15700760701655466

*Eacott, S., & Norris, J. (2014). Managerial rhetoric, accountability, and school leadership in contemporary Australia. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *13*(2), 169–187. doi:10.1080/15700763.2014.901395

English, F. W. (2003). *The postmodern challenge to the theory and practice of educational administration*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

*Firestone, W. A., Hayes, B. F., Robinson, M. N., & Shalaby, C. (2008). Professional development for instruction and student learning? A new state policy for administrators. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *7*(2), 119–153. doi:10.1080/15700760701682130

Fitz, J. (1999). Reflections on the field of educational management studies. *Educational Management & Administration*, *27*(3), 313–321. doi:10.1177/0263211X990273007

*Flessa, J. J. (2012). Principals as middle managers: School leadership during the implementation of primary class size reduction policy in Ontario. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *11*(3), 325–343. doi:10.1080/15700763.2012.692429

*Giles, C. (2006). Transformational leadership in challenging urban elementary schools: A role for parent involvement? *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *5*(3), 257–282. doi:10.1080/15700760600805865

Glass, T. (2004). *The history of educational administration viewed through its textbooks*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Education.

Glatter, R. (2014). Educational administration 1969–2014: Reflections on pragmatism, agency and reform. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, *46*(3), 351–366. doi:10.1080/00220620.2014.919904

*Gonzalez, M., Glasman, N. S., & Glasman, L. D. (2002). Daring to link principal preparation programs to student achievement in schools. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *1*(3), 265–283. doi:10.1076/lpos.1.3.265.7889

*Gronn, P., & Hamilton, A. (2004). "A bit more life in the leadership": Co-principalship as distributed leadership practice. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *3*(1), 3–35.

Gunter, H. M. (2002). Purposes and positions in the field of educational management. *Educational Management & Administration*, *30*(1), 7–26. doi:10.1177/0263211X020301005

*Hallinger, P. (2005). Instructional leadership and the school principal: A passing fancy that refuses to fade away. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *4*(3), 221–239. doi:10.1080/15700760500244793

Hallinger, P., & Bryand, D. (2013). Mapping the terrain of educational leadership and management in East Asia. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *51*(5), 618–637. doi:10.1108/JEA-05-2012-0066

*Hallinger, P., Lee, M., & Ko, J. (2014). Exploring the impact of school principals on teacher professional communities in Hong Kong. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *13*(3), 229–259. doi:10.1080/15700763.2014.901396

*Hallinger, P., Lee, T. H. T., & Szeto, E. (2013). Review of research on educational leadership and management in Hong Kong, 1995–2012: Topographical analysis of an emergent knowledge base. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *12*(3), 256–281. doi:10.1080/15700763.2013.826809

*Halverson, T. J., & Plecki, M. L. (2015). Exploring the politics of differential resource allocation: Implications for policy design and leadership practice. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *14*(1), 42–66. doi:10.1080/15700763.2014.983129

*Harris, A. (2005). Teacher leadership: More than just a feel-good factor? *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *4*(3), 201–219. doi:10.1080/15700760500244777

Hashem, M. (2007). Becoming an independent field: Societal pressures, state, and professions. *Higher Education*, *54*, 181–205. doi:10.1007/s10734-005-2295-5

Heck, R. H. (2006). Scholarship in educational administration: At a crossroads or dead end? In D. E. Mitchell (Ed.), *New foundations for knowledge in educational administration, policy, and politics* (pp. 101–127). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hughes, M. (1997). From bulleting to journal: Metamorphosis and new vistas. *Educational Management & Administration*, *25*(3), 243–263. doi:10.1177/0263211X97253003

Immegart, G. L. (1990). What is truly missing in advanced preparation in educational administration? *Journal of Educational Administration*, *28*(3), 5–13. doi:10.1108/09578239010136448

*Ingle, W. K., Johnson, P. A., Givens, M. R., & Rampelt, J. (2013). Campaign expenditures in school levy referenda and their relationship to voter approval: Evidence from Ohio, 2007-2010. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *12*(1), 41–76. doi:10.1080/15700763.2013.766347

Jacobson, S., & Day, C. (2007). The international successful school principalship project (ISSPP). *International Studies in Educational Administration*, *35*(3), 3–10.

Kuhn, T. (1977). *The Essential Tension*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

*Leithwood, K. (2010). Characteristics of school districts that are exceptionally effective in closing the achievement gap. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *9*(3), 245–291. doi:10.1080/15700761003731500

*Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2005). A review of transformational school leadership research, 1996–2005. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *4*(3), 177–199. doi:10.1080/15700760500244769

Lenoir, T. (1993). The discipline of nature and the nature of disciplines. In E. Messer-Davidow, D. R. Shumway, & D. J. Sylvan (Eds.), *Knowledges: Historical and critical studies in disciplinarity* (pp. 70–102). Charlottesville, VA: University Press of Virginia.

Murphy, J., Vriesenga, M., & Storey, V. (2007). *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 1979–2003: An analysis of types of work, methods of investigation, and influences. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *43*(5), 612–628. doi:10.1177/0013161X07307796

*Nir, A. E., & Ben-Ami, T. (2005). School-parents relationship in the era of school-based management: Harmony or conflict? *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *4*(1), 55–72. doi:10.1080/15700760590924627

*Notman, R. (2015). Seismic leadership, hope, and resiliency: Stories of two Christchurch schools post-earthquake. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *14*(4), 437–459. doi:10.1080/15700763.2015.1039137

Oplatka, I. (2007). The scholarship of educational management: Reflections from the 2006 CCEAM conference. *International Studies in Educational Administration*, *35*(1), 92–104.

Oplatka, I. (2008). The field of educational management: Some intellectual insights from the 2007 BELMAS Conference. *Management in Education*, *22*(3), 4–10. doi:10.1177/0892020608093256

Oplatka, I. (2009). The field of educational administration: An historical overview of scholarly attempts to recognise epistemological identities, meanings and boundaries from 1960s onwards. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *47*(1), 8–35. doi:10.1108/09578230910928061

Oplatka, I. (2010). *The legacy of educational administration: A historical analysis of an academic field*. Berlin, Germany: Peter Lang.

Oplatka, I. (2012). "Fifty years of publication": Ponderings into the legacies of the *Journal of Educational Administration*. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *50*(1), 34–56. doi:10.1108/09578231211196050

*Oplatka, I. (2013). The principal's role in promotion teachers' extra-role behaviors: Some insights from road-safety education. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *12*(4), 420–439. doi:10.1080/15700763.2013.847461

*Papa, F. (2007). Why do principals change schools? A multivariate analysis of principal retention. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 6(3), 267–290. doi:10.1080/15700760701263725

Park, J. (2015). Thematic approach to theoretical speculations in the field of educational administration. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 47(4), 359–371. doi:10.1080/00131857.2014.976929

*Pashiardis, P., & Savvides, V. (2011). The interplay between instructional and entrepreneurial leadership styles in Cyprus rural primary schools. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 10(4), 412–427. doi:10.1080/15700763.2011.610557

Rodgers, R., & Rodgers, N. (2000). Defining the boundaries of public administration: Undisciplined mongrels versus disciplined purists. *Public Administration Review*, 60(5), 435–445. doi:10.1111/puar.2000.60.issue-5

*Roellke, C., & Rice, J. K. (2008). Responding to teacher quality and accountability mandates: The perspective of school administrators and classroom teachers. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 7(3), 264–295. doi:10.1080/15700760701822124

*Rutledge, S. A., Harris, D. N., Thompson, C. T., & Ingle, W. K. (2008). Certify, blink, hire: An examination of the process and tools of teacher screening and selection. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 7(3), 237–263. doi:10.1080/15700760701822132

*Scribner, S. P., & Crow, G. M. (2012). Employing professional identities: Case study of a high school principal in a reform setting. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 11(3), 243–274. doi:10.1080/15700763.2012.654885

*Spillane, J. P., & Orlina, E. C. (2005). Investigating leadership practice: Exploring the entailments of taking a distributed perspective. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 4(3), 157–176. doi:10.1080/15700760500244728

*Sumbera, M. J., Pazey, B. L., & Lashley, C. (2014). How building principals made sense of free and appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 13(3), 297–333. doi:10.1080/15700763.2014.922995

*Sun, M., & Youngs, P. (2009). How does district principal evaluation affect learning-centered principal leadership? Evidence from Michigan school districts. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 8(4), 411–445. doi:10.1080/15700760902890490

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. doi:10.1108/09578239010140632

*Szczesiul, S. A., Nehring, J., & Carey, T. (2015). Academic task demand in the 21st-century, high-stakes accountability school: Mapping the journey from poor [to fair to good to great] to excellent? *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 14(4), 460–489. doi:10.1080/15700763.2015.1026448

*Tekleselassie, A. A., & Vilarreal, P. (2011). Career mobility and departure intentions among school principals in the United States: Incentives and disincentives. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 10(3), 251–293. doi:10.1080/15700763.2011.585536

Thomas, A. R. (2010). Educational leadership as a field of study: Professional journals 1994-2006. In P. Peterson, E. Baker, & B. McGraw (Eds.), *International encyclopaedia of education* (Vol. 4, pp. 731–739). Oxford, UK: Elsevier.

*Watson, T. N., & Bogotch, I. (2015). Reframing parent involvement: What should urban school leaders do differently? *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 14(3), 257–278. doi:10.1080/15700763.2015.1024327

*Werts, A. B., Sala, M. D., Lindle, J., Horace, J. M., Brewer, C., & Knoeppel, R. (2013). Education stakeholders' translation and sense-making of accountability policies. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 12(4), 397–419. doi:10.1080/15700763.2013.860464

Whitley, R. (1983). The rise and decline of university disciplines in the sciences. In R. Jurkovich, & J. H. P. Paelinck (Eds.), *Problems in interdisciplinary studies* (pp. 11–25). Brookfield, VT: Gower.

Whitley, R. (1984). *The intellectual and social organisation of the sciences*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press.

*Winton, S., & Evans, M. P. (2016). Consulting, mediating, conducting, and supporting: How community-based organizations engage with research to influence policy. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *15*(1), 4–25. doi:10.1080/15700763.2015.1052522

*Ylimaki, R. M., Bennett, J. V., Fan, J., & Villasenor, E. (2012). Notions of "success" In Southern Arizona schools: Principal leadership in changing demographic and border contexts. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *11*(2), 168–193. doi:10.1080/15700763.2011.585539

*Young, M. D., & Creighton, T. (2002). Who is framing the national understanding of educational leadership preparation and practice? *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *1*(3), 222–241. doi:10.1076/lpos.1.3.222.7894

*Zembylas, M., & Iasonos, S. (2016). The entanglement of leadership styles and social justice leadership: A case study from Cyprus. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *15*(3), 297–322. doi:10.1080/15700763.2015.1044540