

The Study of Educational Leadership and Management

Where Does the Field Stand Today?

Ronald H. Heck and Philip Hallinger

ABSTRACT

This article comments on the state of research in educational leadership and management as a field of study between 1990 and the present. We discuss the role of research reviews and compendia in the field as a means of identifying past trends, current dilemmas, and future directions for scholarship. We conclude five major points. First, today there is less agreement about the significant problems that scholars should address than in past years. Second, scholarly directions seem to be changing, as an increasing number of scholars are approaching educational leadership and management as a humanistic and moral endeavor rather than a scientific one. Third, although there are more diverse and robust methodological tools available for inquiry, programs of sustained empirical research are few in number. Fourth, a reluctance to evaluate the worth of contrasting conceptual and methodological approaches according to an accepted set of scholarly criteria leaves researchers, policy-makers and practitioners to fall back upon individual judgments of what is useful and valid knowledge. Finally, a lack of empirical rigor in the field continues to impact the development of a future generation of researchers.

KEYWORDS *educational administration scholarship, headteachers, principals, research on principals, school leaders*

Reviews of research are useful tools for identifying trends in knowledge development, understanding emerging issues in the field of practice, and critiquing methods used by scholars. Over the past five decades of its development as a theoretically informed domain of study, the field of educational management and leadership has benefited from a number of useful reviews of research (e.g. Bossert et al., 1982; Boyan, 1988; Bridges, 1982; Erickson, 1967; Getzels, 1973, 1980; Hallinger, 2003; Hallinger and Heck, 1996a, b, 1999; Haskew, 1964; Heck and Hallinger, 1999; Immegart, 1988; Leithwood and Montgomery, 1982; Leithwood et al., 1990; Lipham, 1988; Murphy, 1988; Ribbins and Gunter, 2002; Richmon and Allison, 2003; Southworth, 2002; Tatsuoka and

Silver, 1988; Willower and Forsyth, 1999). Although the topics of educational management and leadership have generated a great deal of scholarly interest internationally over the years, reviewers have generally suggested it has not been an area given to rigorous empirical investigation and knowledge accumulation (Bridges, 1982; Erickson, 1967).

The purpose of this article is to comment on educational leadership and management as a field of study, focusing especially on the past 10 years. We look at the field more broadly than in our past reviews of principal leadership. Our goals in this review are to describe changes in scholarly direction as well as to discuss whether cumulative progress noted in the principal effects literature that we documented previously (Hallinger and Heck, 1996a, b) reflects progress in the field more generally.¹

The State of Research in Educational Leadership and Management

Interest in what managers do (e.g. work activities, decision-making, problem solving, resource allocation) and what they do that makes a difference (e.g. leading change, promoting organizational learning, influencing organizational processes and outcomes) have long captured the attention of scholars (Bass and Avolio, 1994; Burns, 1978; Glatter and Kydd, 2003; Payne, 1875; Senge, 1990; Simon, 1945; Taylor, 1895; Yukl, 1994). Researchers in educational management and leadership have borrowed liberally from scholars who became identified with theories of scientific management, human relations, transformational leadership, and organizational learning during the 20th century. Prior to 1950, however, the knowledge base in administration generally and educational administration in particular was not derived from empirical studies. The field's disciplinary practices focused on stories told by former administrators and their prescriptions for practice based on personal experience. Concerns were raised in the 1930s and 1940s that educational management was faulty, unimaginative, and out of step with community desires (Moore, 1964).

Beginning in the 1950s, the 'theory movement in educational administration' focused attention on the need to improve scholarly activity through the application of scientific principles based on empiricism rather than ideological belief, personal experience, and prescription (Getzels et al., 1968; Griffiths et al., 1964; Halpin, 1958). Theoretically driven scientific inquiry would consist of well-delineated means of defining and addressing phenomena, sound research methods to support inquiry, and the creation of a comprehensive body of knowledge that could be applied to problems of practice and inform the initial preparation and professional development of school administrators (Griffiths et al., 1964).

The promise of a scientific knowledge base underlying the practice of educational administration, however, was not easily achieved. Over the ensuing decades, the intellectual underpinnings, methods of inquiry, and utility of

empirical results of the theory movement came under harsh criticism from scholars operating with a different paradigm (Bates, 1980; Greenfield, 1968, 1978). Bates and Greenfield claimed that behaviorist approaches based on quantitative analyses were ill-suited to understanding social constructions of school life. Moreover, they failed to consider how contextual, moral, and ethical issues influence administrators' thinking and actions.

Critics concluded that the functionalist and social psychological (behaviorist) paradigms used to understand educational management had yielded limited fruit. For example, Erickson (1967) reviewed empirical studies in educational administration conducted during the 1950s and 1960s and found no evidence of progress on important issues. Fifteen years later, Bridges sought to update Erickson's findings. He concluded:

Research on school administrators for the period 1967–1980 reminds one of the dictum: 'The more things change, the more they remain the same' . . . Although researchers apparently show a greater interest in outcomes than was the case in the earlier period, they continue their excessive reliance on survey designs, questionnaires of dubious reliability and validity, and relatively simplistic types of statistical analysis. Moreover these researchers persist in treating research problems in an ad hoc rather than a programmatic fashion. . . . Despite the rather loose definition of theory that was used in classifying the sample of research . . . , most of it proved to be atheoretical. Likewise the research seemed to have little or no practical utility. (1982: 24–5)

Coincidentally, this scathing critique on the field appeared in the same issue of the *Educational Administration Quarterly* as another, more narrowly focused, review on principal instructional management (Bossert et al., 1982). Where Bridges's (1982) review focused on describing approaches to research that characterized the field, the Bossert review laid out a conceptual framework for inquiry and drew a more optimistic set of conclusions concerning the possibilities of progress. The reviews documented the need to shift inquiry from descriptions of educational managers' work and explorations of the antecedents of their behavior to the effects and impact of what they do in managing and leading schools.

In the mid-1990s, we undertook a review of empirical research on principal leadership effects, with the broader goal of updating Bridges's and Bossert's reviews (Hallinger and Heck, 1996a, b). We found significantly more empirical research in this domain than in previous years, as well as evidence of progress towards higher levels of scientific quality. We concluded that at least some of the key weaknesses noted by the earlier reviewers were being addressed by researchers. This was especially apparent during the latter years covered by our reviews (i.e. the mid-1990s). For example, we noted the wider use of well-delineated conceptual models describing ways educational managers influence school processes and outcomes (e.g. Begley, 1996; Gronn and Ribbins, 1996; Hallinger et al., 1996; Heck et al., 1990; Leithwood, 1994; Leithwood and Stager, 1989; Marks and Printy, 2003; Ogawa and Bossert, 1995) and more sophisticated

methods of investigation. Although we found evidence of knowledge accumulation, our sample of studies focused solely on the subdomain of principal leadership effects. In the following section, we compare this progress with research trends in educational leadership and management that lie outside of this domain.

Conceptual and Methodological Developments from 1990 to 2004

The legacy of the theory movement lay in raising the importance of theoretically informed study of administrative practice. Theories and conceptual models provide structure to observations of life in schools. Theory is at the core of quality empirical study. Yet, research methodology provides the critical link to the development of a valid knowledge base underlying the practice of educational leadership and management. In this section, we discuss the current state of the field with respect to theory and research methodology.

The Status of Theory in Research on Educational Leadership and Management

During the late 1980s, Griffiths (1988) lamented the scarcity of empirical studies conducted from theoretical perspectives other than the rational, structural functionalist paradigm. More recently, scholarly direction in the field has been in flux. During the 1990s, there was a notable increase in scholarly inquiry from contrasting perspectives including critical theory, postmodernism, and feminism (Anderson, 2004; Dillard, 1995; Donmoyer et al., 1995; Foster, 1998; Gunter, 2001; Marshall, 2004; Ribbins and Gunter, 2002; Strachan, 1999). Much of this work built upon earlier critiques by scholars such as Bates (1980), Foster (1986), and Greenfield (1968, 1978). This inquiry began to produce a new body of empirical work that reflected a broader set of social concerns (e.g. Blackmore et al., 1993; Bloom and Erlandson, 2003; Dillard, 1995; Strachan, 1999) as well as increasing diversity in the methods of investigation (e.g. fieldwork, case study, quantitative modeling, discourse analysis, narrative, biography, social critique).

The trend towards greater scholarly diversity in frameworks and methods, however, has generated a new set of problems for scholarship in this field. Researchers employing different conceptual and methodological approaches often seem to pass each other blindly in the night. They ask different questions and base their inquiries on widely differing epistemological assumptions. For the field as a whole, greater diversity has not added up to a greater accumulation of knowledge. One unforeseen result has been the inability to integrate results of studies conducted from such diverse perspectives into concrete evidence that practitioners and policy-makers can use with confidence (Gunter, 2001; Richmon and Allison, 2003; Robinson, 1996).

As suggested in our introduction, there remains a gap between the promise of theoretically informed inquiry and the execution of research in our field. Notable critiques of research spanning over several decades persistently identified the inconsistent application of theory and research methods to empirical studies as a problem in our scholarship. The question of why this was the case leads in several directions.

First, the theory movement's promise may have been too ambitious in scope. Early pioneers aimed towards developing a grand theory of administration. In fact, theories can become problematic when seeking to investigate the actual detail and richness of leadership and management in organizations. Environmental and organizational complexity requires that we apply theory more flexibly than originally envisioned by theory movement proponents. A number of scholars (e.g. Greenfield, 1978; Immegart, 1988; Haskew, 1964) emphasized the limitations of scientific methods for studying social and educational phenomena. Immegart concluded that some aspects of educational leadership were neglected or avoided as objects of inquiry because they were highly subjective or elusive. Boyan (1988) summarized the problem of knowledge accumulation by questioning whether the field was one that actually lent itself to scientific study, or was merely a field *for* study.

This point is illustrated through examination of two recent compendia of research in educational leadership and management: the two editions of the *International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Administration* (Leithwood and Hallinger, 2002; Leithwood et al., 1996). These volumes sought to document important theoretical and empirically supported findings in the field that have emerged from research conducted internationally in educational leadership and management. The organization of these volumes implicitly suggests the difficulty scholars faced in attempting to construct a 'general theory of leadership' (Leithwood et al., 1996). The volumes illustrate the tension in the field among alternative disciplinary perspectives by presenting a wide diversity of international discourses about leadership in K-12 settings, rather than an accumulation of knowledge of leadership and management in schools.

Indeed, the editors explicitly avoided this as their charge. Instead, they asserted that scholars would be better advised to 'focus on building middle-level or domain-specific theories of leadership. When this is done, we find concepts of leadership that are actually quite concrete and sufficiently precise to offer significant guidance for practice' (Leithwood et al., 1996: 1-2). The international handbooks offer evidence of theoretically informed progress in several topical domains, but on a moderate scale.

It is important, however, to note that the knowledge development has not been equally potent across all domains. It has been most evident in instances when there has been programmatic testing of specific theoretical or conceptual frameworks regarding school management. This seemed to occur primarily in domains where there were externally driven demands for school accountability and improvement.

Another explanation for the field's inability to fulfill the promise of clear, cumulative knowledge may lie in another characteristic of social research. Social research is influenced not only by the dominant research questions and rules regarding the construction of knowledge, but also by the historical and cultural contexts in which inquiry is situated. During the current era, science as a descriptor of the field's inquiry has become 'contested space'. Various metaphors now compete to situate the field's disciplinary practices (Anderson and Grinberg, 1998; Foster, 1998; Ribbins and Gunter, 2002; Richmon and Allison, 2003; Sackney and Mitchell, 2002; Walker and Dimmock, 2002). Other aspects of educational management and leadership have attracted scholars' attention (e.g. values, cognitive perspectives, strategies for improving outcomes, documenting realities and dilemmas of management, social justice). These wider concerns require different means of investigation.

Today we find increasingly widespread disagreement over the field's proper direction. The dominance of scholarship focused on the goal of improving educational practices is increasingly contested. In the late 1990s, ideologically driven perspectives achieved greater acceptability and voice in the scholarly community. Numerous scholars now argue that the field's central questions concern the role of school leaders in guiding the educational system towards the goal of achieving social justice (e.g. Anderson, 2004; Foster, 1998; Marshall, 2004; Sackney and Mitchell, 2002; Smyth, 1996). Such scholars argue that traditional research has too narrowly focused on administrative processes and improvement while accepting the premises of an unjust educational system. Instead, they advocate using different intellectual tools to understand and challenge basic inequities of the system. As opposed to cumulative empirical research, this scholarship rests primarily on the critique of existing relations and a call for action to move the existing state to a more desired one.

Scholars pursuing these ends do not focus on the study of leadership and management as science or craft, but as *moral* endeavor. Furman (2002) argued that scholarship in the field is increasingly driven by the question, 'What is leadership for?' This reflects a changing concern with the *ends* of leadership. Some ends may focus on improving student achievement while others some focus on increasing social justice.

Marshall (2004: 5) described the goal of this type of scholarship: 'we can use our research, status, and power to transform our profession to take leadership for social justice in schools and even society'. Scholars following this perspective 'see social justice efforts as more important than traditional research concerns' (Marshall, 2004: 5). Focused inquiry is still needed, however, demonstrating the efficacy of leadership actions taken that result in the type of social transformation that is desired (Anderson, 2004; Robinson, 1996).

Leading journals in educational leadership and management have provided ample space for debates over this issue. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, for example, has given substantial coverage to alternative conceptualizations of educational leadership and management including postmodernism (1998),

community building (2001), and social justice (2004). The *Journal of Educational Administration* (1996) has given attention to cross-cultural leadership and *Educational Management Administration & Leadership* to conceptual frameworks for inquiry and knowledge (2001–3).

We suggest that these topics implicitly frame key issues quite differently from past eras. These emerging topics reflect an interest in different purposes towards which scholars believe that research and inquiry ought to be directed. The diversity of approaches calls into question our ability to construct a grand theory of administration as envisioned during the previous era.

Methodology and Method

The trend in methodology also runs in several different directions. As noted earlier, reviews of research conducted in the 1980s drew pessimistic conclusions concerning the quality of research methods in use. Considerable discussion also concerned the validity of different methodological approaches (qualitative vs quantitative) used in research (e.g. see Donmoyer, 1999; Everhart, 1988; Evers and Lakomski, 1996; Foster, 1986). Everhart argued that the evolution of several process-oriented methods of inquiry (e.g. case study, ethnography, phenomenology) represented a response to diminished faith in the quantitative paradigm that had underpinned the theory movement. Fieldwork methods focused on understanding educational processes within their contexts from the perspectives of the participants. In contrast to attempts to create an overarching science of administration, scholars using naturalistic inquiry sought to describe educational processes up close and over time.

The debates over method appear to have subsided somewhat over the past few years. The optimistic view of this is that researchers have begun to make better use of more diverse analytical tools. In the aftermath of these debates, there is considerable evidence to suggest that we have ample methodological tools and techniques to study the complexity of educational management with sensitivity to contexts. Exemplars range from quantitative models describing leadership's influence on school process and outcomes to critiques of social inequities that marginalize some students and identify ways that conventional school leadership supports these social constructions. Approaches such as critical ethnography, discourse analysis, and radical feminism have begun to advance our understanding of how leadership processes are constructed, as well as what is needed to make schools more democratic and socially just.

It is interesting to note that the two *International Handbooks* had relatively little to say about the role of methodology in advancing the study of educational leadership and management. While our own chapter in the 1996 edition addressed qualitative and quantitative methods for studying school leadership (Hallinger and Heck, 1996b), the second edition (2002) omitted any specific chapter devoted to methodology. In fact, the keywords *methodology* and *method* are not found in the subject index of the two-volume set.

Our reviews in 1996 acknowledged that increasing sophistication of model and method could produce cumulative knowledge. Examples of excellent empirical inquiry have emerged in recent years (e.g. Marks and Printy, 2003; Wiley, 2001). Yet these and other empirical studies of school leadership were conducted from the dominant perspective in leadership research—rationalist or functionalist types of studies focused on the impact of school leaders on achievement and effectiveness. Indeed, the criteria used in our own reviews of the field clouded:

... potentially important discourse about the normative purposes of administrative behavior. We have seen within this body of literature how conceptual progress can 'work its way into' empirical investigation over a period of time. Thus, we would explicitly urge researchers to undertake studies that are conceived from alternative philosophical frameworks that are gaining currency in this era (critical and feminist theory, postmodernism, chaos and complexity theory). (Hallinger and Heck, 1996b: 773)

Over the past decade these new alternative methodological approaches (e.g. critical ethnography, feminist critique, problem-based methodology) have arisen to address the broader questions scholars are asking about leadership and management in schools (e.g. Anderson, 2004; Blackmore, 1996; Robinson, 1996; Strachan, 1999). Ribbins and Gunter (2002) provided one typology of knowledge domains in the field (ranging from scientific and evaluative to humanist and critical). Dillard's (1995) and Bloom and Erlandson's (2003) studies of African American principals are examples of powerful insights gained about educational leadership from advocacy perspectives (i.e. radical feminist theory, standpoint theory). Additional sustained empirical research should be encouraged, however, to establish the utility of numerous alternative perspectives in understanding educational leadership.

A more pessimistic view is that scholars have agreed to disagree and simply conduct their work in different spaces within the intellectual universe of school leadership and management. Researchers operating from alternative paradigms have questioned the underlying assumptions of dominant methods—or their results—sometimes incorrectly. Critics of the theory movement typically argued that it was positivist oriented, although in years following there were numerous examples of theory-driven case studies and narratives in the literature on educational management and leadership. The increased diversity of questions asked by scholars in recent years has been accompanied by a de-emphasis on the value of 'scientific' study.

Ironically, this puts empirical researchers using diverse methodological perspectives on the same side of the fence. From our perspective, much more attention is currently being given to comment and critique than to progressive empirical study that demonstrates the impact of strategies to alleviate educational problems, regardless of methodological perspective. We also note less willingness to judge what qualifies as new knowledge or to evaluate the

worth of scholarship by a commonly set of agreed-upon standards (e.g. Donmoyer, 1999).

Future Training of Researchers

Our assessment of the field also has implications for the graduate training of future researchers. Although it is evident that researchers are beginning to undertake studies from more diverse methodological perspectives, we have reason to question whether adequate research skills are being transferred to the next generation of researchers. We refer here to Hallinger's (2001) review of doctoral dissertations that used his Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS) conducted between 1982 and 2000. This review covered over 80 doctoral dissertations from seven countries (USA, Philippines, Canada, Thailand, Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Cameroon).

Hallinger's conclusions mirror the earlier concerns expressed by Bridges (1982) and Erickson (1967). Hallinger found that, despite the use of a validated instrument, as a group the studies contributed little to the literature on principal management and leadership. The studies continued to demonstrate many features of poor research highlighted by Bridges two decades earlier. These included the following:

- The studies often focused on research questions of personal interest to the researchers but of limited significance to the field at large (e.g. demographics and traits of the principals). This reflected the studies' weak connection to the general literature.
- Although the PIMRS instrument was developed to reflect a clear conceptual leadership framework, distressingly few of the studies situated the instructional leadership model within a broader theoretical framework of principal leadership of the school.
- These conceptual limitations led the researchers towards the use of weak research designs and statistical tools for analysis of their data (e.g. bivariate statistics).
- It is interesting to note that high-quality research designs and methods were concentrated in only a handful of the 57 universities at which the doctoral studies were conducted.

Bridges (1982) observed two decades ago that doctoral research is the primary source of empirical knowledge development in our field. Internationally, there was a proliferation of doctoral programs in educational administration during the period covered by the PIMRS review (1982–2000). Despite possessing a database of studies that used an instrument of proven reliability, there was little knowledge accumulation from these doctoral studies. We wonder if lower standards of research training may have been an unanticipated outcome of this growth.²

It is beyond the scope of this article to analyze this issue at length, never mind to offer recommendations for its solution. We do note the finding in passing, however, as a potentially important one that warrants more systematic investigation and discussion. Progress in knowledge accumulation within our field depends upon the conduct of quality research by doctoral students as well as the next generation of professors.

Where is Research in Educational Leadership and Management Heading?

The purpose of this review was to comment on recent trends in research in educational leadership and management. In this last section, we offer a few remarks about where the field might be headed.

First, greater diversity and flexibility in conceptual models and methods have brought a sense of contested space about the field's direction. Epistemology, conceptual frameworks, and methodology all are at the core of how we construct knowledge. Conflicts over their use in research should draw the attention of scholars in our field.

We noted progress in the use of quantitative methods for studying selected domains in school leadership and management over the past decade. We also observed significant progress with respect to the acceptance of selected qualitative methods over the past 20 years in examining a broader range of issues in educational leadership and management. Case studies, ethnography, and naturalistic inquiry have gained reasonably widespread, if not unanimous, acceptance within the academy. The underlying epistemologies have been explicated, techniques described and debated, and technologies have been developed by which to assess the quality of the research process and outcomes. Scholars employing other 'new methodologies' have a similar responsibility to explicate their methods fully, gain acceptance within the academic community on their execution, and then to train future researchers in their use.

As a field, possessing alternative ways of situating leadership is advantageous in addressing blind spots in our knowledge and disciplinary practice (e.g. Alston, 2000; Anderson, 2004; Bloom and Erlandson, 2003; Dillard, 1995; Grogan, 1999; Gronn, 2002; Gunter, 1999; Spillane et al., 2001; Strachen, 1999). Interest in leadership today is focused on the ends of leadership (e.g. moral, ethical), not only on the effects of leadership. Other approaches have alerted us to the importance of how the macro-level context—either policy or cultural—interacts with school leadership and management. Some perspectives have the potential to alter our conceptualizations of leadership and work in schools radically. One consequence of increased diversity without corresponding evidence of utility in solving important problems to the field, however, is that less useful ways of thinking about problems and forms of conducting research have not disappeared. They just crowd in under a 'big tent' that accepts contrary conceptualizations uncritically (Donmoyer, 1999).

Journals within educational leadership and management contribute to the fragmented nature of scholarship. While they may advance excellent examples of individual scholarly work, journal contributors tend to treat those with whom they disagree with benign neglect, as opposed to debating and discussing their differences (Donmoyer, 1999). At worst, they publish work related to perspectives that were mined and abandoned years ago. Readers are left to try to make their own sense out of the patchwork quilt of work presented.

It is clear that the scientific metaphor has less hold on the field than Griffiths (1964) and his contemporaries envisioned in calling for a change in the orientation of the field. We also noted less emphasis on empirical work and more space given to ideological arguments focused on what 'we should do'. Debate over how to situate the field as a discipline has led to increased attention to defining problems from multiple perspectives, but too little focus on either description of the problems in practice or on their solution. Bjork and colleagues (1999) suggested that this trend represents a type of anti-empiricism; that is, discussions are grounded in topical arguments instead of empirical research. There is currently less emphasis on knowing how to do something, as opposed to knowing the interests and values that underlie why the changes should be made (Robinson, 2002).

We must be able to separate what moves the field intellectually from what continues to spin it in ideological or methodological circles. Otherwise, the field will revert back to the times of folklore and alchemy. It is one thing to celebrate the diversity of approaches and legitimacy of all ideas. It is another, however, to judge the worth of those ideas in providing solutions to persistent problems and enhancing understandings of our disciplinary practices. Refusal to define the significant problems that should be studied and to demand rigorous investigation before granting legitimacy makes it difficult to determine if the field is moving intellectually on the wheels of increased conceptual and methodological diversity. New intellectual approaches should also demonstrate their worth through viable means of argument and inquiry. If science has no more privilege than ideological belief, intuition, myth, or alchemy in commenting on human endeavors, then it calls into question the whole meaning of scholarship. If this is the case, then there will be few lasting disciplinary outcomes from the 'study' of educational leadership and management.

Second, and more important to the future of the field, researchers continue to be largely oblivious of the important problems that concern practitioners. Moreover, when they do address such problems, they often frame them very differently from practitioners. The result is that researchers, policy-makers, and practitioners often talk past each other. In recent years, the field has been long on intellectual critique, but short on sustained action (and demonstrated results) about alternatives that will enhance schooling for children. This has created a crisis of credibility. While scholars debate the knowledge base and methods of investigation, they should be most centrally concerned with the meaning of these differences for contributing to our understanding of

educational practice (Gunter, 1999; Leithwood and Duke, 1999; Scribner et al., 1999). Theory remains a significant influence on practice even when it is disavowed (Bush, 1999). Researchers adopting new intellectual perspectives have a responsibility to promote programs of disciplined scholarship.

We conclude with the thought that the prognosis for the future is by no means wholly optimistic. We have identified a number of threats that could quite easily undo the progress that we have observed over the past four decades in the field's intellectual development. These will require proactive responses not only from professors and their associations, but also from educational policy-makers and practitioners who are key stakeholders in the system of knowledge generation within the field of educational leadership and management.

Notes

1. The authors would like to thank Edwin Bridges, Geoff Southworth, and two anonymous reviewers for their insightful comments on earlier versions of this article.
2. The authors recognize that the terms management, administration, and leadership are not universally applied. In this article we refer to management and administration as the managerial processes that maintain stability in organizations such as planning, organizing, coordinating, and controlling. We refer to leadership as change-related functions such as setting a vision and goals for the school and motivating stakeholders to move towards their achievement. This distinction became more pronounced during the past two decades as part of school accountability.
3. This conclusion, though tentative, would apply at least in the USA where the majority of the studies were conducted.

References

- Alston, J. (2000) 'Missing in Action: Where are the Black Female School Superintendents?', *Urban Education* 35(5): 525–31.
- Anderson, G.L. (2004) 'William Foster's Legacy: Learning from the Past and Reconstructing the Future', *Educational Administration Quarterly* 40(2): 240–58.
- Anderson, G.L. and Grinberg, J. (1998) 'Educational Administration as Disciplinary Practice: Appropriating Foucault's View of Power, Discourse, and Method', *Educational Administration Quarterly* 34(3): 329–53.
- Bass, B. and Avolio, B. (1994) *Improving Organizational Effectiveness through Transformational Leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Bates, R. (1980) 'Educational Administration, the Sociology of Science, and the Management of Knowledge', *Educational Administration Quarterly* 16(2): 1–20.
- Begley, P. (1996) 'Cognitive Perspectives on Values in Administration: A Quest for Coherence and Relevance', *Educational Administration Quarterly* 32(3): 403–26.
- Bjork, L.G., Lindle, J.C. and Van Meter, E.J. (1999) 'A Summing up', *Educational Administration Quarterly* 35(4): 658–64.
- Blackmore, J. (1996) '"Breaking the Silence": Feminist Contributions to Educational Administration and Policy', in K. Leithwood, J. Chapman, D. Corson, P. Hallinger and A. Hart (eds) *International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Administration*, pp. 997–1042. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.
- Blackmore, J., Kenway, J., Willis, S. and Rennie, L. (1993) 'What's Working for Girls? The Reception of Gender Equity Policy in Two Australian Schools', in C. Marshall (ed.) *The New Politics of Race and Gender*, pp. 183–202. London: Falmer Press.

- Bloom, C.M. and Erlandson, D.A. (2003) 'African American Women Principals in Urban Schools: Realities, (Re)Constructions, and Resolutions', *Educational Administration Quarterly* 39(3): 339–69.
- Bossert, S., Dwyer, D., Rowan, B. and Lee, G. (1982) 'The Instructional Management Role of the Principal', *Educational Administration Quarterly* 18(3): 34–64.
- Boyan, N. (1988) 'Administrative Behavior', in N. Boyan (ed.) *Handbook of Research on Educational Administration*, pp. 77–97. New York: Longman.
- Bridges, E. (1982) 'Research on the School Administrator: The State of the Art, 1967–1980', *Educational Administration Quarterly* 18(3): 12–33.
- Burns, J. (1978) *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Bush, T. (1999) 'Introduction: Setting the Scene', in T. Bush, L. Bell, R. Bolam, R. Glatter and P. Ribbins (eds) *Educational Management: Redefining Theory, Policy, and Practice*, pp. 1–12. London: Paul Chapman.
- Dillard, C. (1995) 'Leading with her Life: An African American Feminist (Re)Interpretation of Leadership for an Urban High School Principal', *Educational Administration Quarterly* 31(4): 539–63.
- Donmoyer, R. (1999) 'The Continuing Quest for a Knowledge Base, 1976–1998', in J. Murphy and K. Seashore Louis (eds) *Handbook of Research on Educational Administration* (2nd edn), pp. 25–43. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Donmoyer, R., Imber, M. and Scheurich, J., eds (1995) *The Knowledge Base in Educational Administration*. Ithaca, NY: SUNY Press.
- Erickson, D.A. (1967) 'The School Administrator', *Review of Educational Research* 37(4): 417–32.
- Everhart, R. (1988) 'Fieldwork Methodology in Educational Administration', in N. Boyan (ed.) *Handbook of Research on Educational Administration*, pp. 703–26. New York: Longman.
- Evers, C.W. and Lakomski, G. (1996) 'Science in Educational Administration: A Postpositivist Conception', *Educational Administration Quarterly* 32(3): 379–402.
- Foster, W.P. (1986) *Paradigms and Promises: New Approaches to Educational Administration*. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus.
- Foster, W.P. (1998) 'Editor's foreword', *Educational Administration Quarterly* 34(3): 294–7.
- Furman, G. (2002) 'The 2002 UCEA Presidential Address', *UCEA Review* 45(1): 1–6.
- Getzels, J.W. (1973) 'Theory and Research on Leadership: Some Comments and Some Alternatives', in L.L. Cunningham and W.J. Gephart (eds) *Leadership: The Science and the Art Today*, pp. 16–25. Itasca, IL: Peacock.
- Getzels, J.W. (1980) 'Alternative Directions for Research in Educational Administration', in R.H. Farquar and I.E. Housego (eds) *Canadian and Comparative Educational Administration*, pp. 354–78. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Centre for Continuing Education.
- Getzels, J., Lipham, J. and Campbell, R. (1968) *Educational Administration as a Social Process*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Glatter, R. and Kydd, L. (2003) '"Best Practice" in Educational Leadership and Management: Can we Identify it and Learn from it?', *Educational Management & Administration* 31(3): 231–43.
- Greenfield, T.B. (1968) 'Research on the Behavior of Educational Leaders: Critique of a Tradition', *Alberta Journal of Educational Research* 14(1): 55–76.
- Greenfield, T.B. (1978) 'Reflections on Organizational Theory and the Truths of Irreconcilable Realities', *Educational Administration Quarterly* 14(2): 1–23.
- Griffiths, D.E., ed. (1964) *Behavioral Science and Educational Administration: The Sixty-Third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, part 2. Chicago: NSSE.
- Griffiths, D.E. (1988) 'Administrative Theory', in N. Boyan (ed.) *Handbook of Research on Educational Administration*, pp. 27–51. New York: Longman.

- Griffiths, D.E., Carlson, R.O., Culbertson, J. and Lonsdale, R.C. (1964) 'The Theme', in D.E. Griffiths (ed.) *Behavioral Science and Educational Administration: The Sixty-Third Yearbook of The National Society for the Study of Education*, part 2, 1–7. Chicago: NSSE.
- Grogan, M. (1999) 'Equity/Equality Issues of Gender, Race and Class', *Education Administration Quarterly* 35(4): 518–36.
- Gronn, P. (2002) 'Distributed Leadership', in K. Leithwood and P. Hallinger (eds) *Second International Handbook of Leadership and Administration*, pp. 653–96. London: Kluwer Academic.
- Gronn, P. and Ribbins, P. (1996) 'Leaders in Context: Postpositivist Approaches to Understanding Educational Leadership', *Education Administration Quarterly* 32(3): 452–73.
- Gunter, H. (1999) 'Researching and Constructing Histories of the Field of Education Management', in T. Bush, R. Glatter, R. Bolam, P. Ribbins and L. Bell (eds) *Redefining Educational Management*, pp. 229–42. London: Paul Chapman.
- Gunter, H. (2001) 'Critical Approaches to Leadership in Education', *Journal of Educational Inquiry* 2(2): 94–108.
- Hallinger, P. (1982, 1983, 1990) *Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale*. Version 2.3. Sarasota, FL: Leading Development Associates.
- Hallinger, P. (2001) 'The Principal's Role as Instructional Leader: A Review of Studies Using the *Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale*', paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seattle.
- Hallinger, P. (2003) 'Leading Educational Change: Reflections on the Practice of Instructional and Transformational Leadership', *Cambridge Journal of Education* 33(3): 329–51.
- Hallinger, P. and Heck, R.H. (1996a) 'Reassessing the Principal's Role in School Effectiveness: A Review of Empirical Research, 1980–1995', *Educational Administration Quarterly* 32(1): 5–44.
- Hallinger, P. and Heck, R.H. (1996b) 'The Principal's Role In School Effectiveness: An Assessment of the Methodological Progress, 1980–1995', in K. Leithwood, J. Chapman, D. Corson, P. Hallinger and A. Hart (eds) *International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Administration*, pp. 723–83. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Hallinger, P. and Heck, P. (1999) 'Can Leadership Enhance School Effectiveness?', in T. Bush, R. Glatter, R. Bolam, P. Ribbins and L. Bell (eds) *Redefining Educational Management*, pp. 178–90. London: Paul Chapman.
- Hallinger, P., Bickman, L. and Davis, K. (1996) 'School Context, Principal Leadership and Student Achievement', *Elementary School Journal* 96(5): 498–518.
- Halpin, A.W., ed. (1958) *Administrative Theory in Education*. Chicago: Midwest Center, University of Chicago.
- Haskew, L.D. (1964) 'A Projective Appraisal', in D.E. Griffiths (ed.) *Behavioral Science and Educational Administration: The Sixty-Third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, part 2, pp. 333–48. Chicago: NSSE.
- Heck, R.H. and Hallinger, P. (1999) 'Next Generation Methods for the Study of Leadership and School Improvement', in J. Murphy and K. Seashore Louis (eds) *Handbook of Research on Educational Administration* (2nd edn), pp. 141–62. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Heck, R., Larson, T. and Marcoulides, G. (1990) 'Principal Instructional Leadership and School Achievement: Validation of a Causal Model', *Educational Administration Quarterly* 26: 94–125.
- Immegart, G.L. (1988) 'Leadership and Leader Behavior', in N. Boyan (ed.) *Handbook of Research on Educational Administration*, pp. 259–77. New York: Longman.
- Leithwood, K. (1994) 'Leadership for School Restructuring', *Educational Administration Quarterly* 30(4): 498–518.

- Leithwood, K. and Duke, D. (1999) 'A Century's Quest to Understand School Leadership', in J. Murphy and K. Seashore Louis (eds) *Handbook of Research on Educational Administration* (2nd edn), pp. 45–72. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Leithwood, K. and Hallinger, P., eds (2002) *Second International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Administration*. London: Kluwer Academic.
- Leithwood, K. and Montgomery, D. (1982) 'The Role of the Elementary Principal in Program Improvement', *Review of Educational Research* 52(3): 309–39.
- Leithwood, K. and Stager, F. (1989) 'Expertise in Principals' Problem Solving', *Educational Administration Quarterly* 25(2): 126–61.
- Leithwood, K., Begley, P. and Cousins, B. (1990) 'The Nature, Causes and Consequences of Principals' Practices: An Agenda for Future Research', *Journal of Educational Administration* 28(4): 5–31.
- Leithwood, K., Chapman, J., Corson, D., Hallinger, P. and Hart, A., eds (1996) *International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Administration*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.
- Lipham, J.M. (1988) 'Getzel's Models in Educational Administration', in N. Boyan (ed.) *Handbook of Research on Educational Administration*, pp. 171–84. New York: Longman.
- Marks, H.M. and Printy, S.M. (2003) 'Principal Leadership and School Performance: An Integration of Transformational and Instructional Leadership', *Educational Administration Quarterly* 39(3): 370–97.
- Marshall, C. (2004) 'Social Justice Challenges to Educational Administration: Introduction to a Special Issue', *Educational Administration Quarterly* 40(1): 5–15.
- Moore, H.B. (1964) 'The Ferment in School Administration', *Behavioral Science and Educational Administration: The Sixty-Third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, part 2, pp. 11–32. Chicago: NSSE.
- Murphy, J. (1988) 'Methodological, Measurement, and Conceptual Problems in the Study of Instructional Leadership', *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 10(2): 117–39.
- Payne, W.H. (1875) *Chapters on School Supervision*. New York: Wilson, Hinkle.
- Ogawa, R. and Bossert, S. (1995) 'Leadership as an Organizational Quality', *Educational Administration Quarterly* 27(1): 30–60.
- Ribbins, P. and Gunter, H. (2002) 'Mapping Leadership Studies in Education: Towards a Typology of Knowledge Domains', *Educational Management & Administration* 30(4): 359–85.
- Richmon, M.J. and Allison, D.J. (2003) 'Toward a Conceptual Framework for Leadership Inquiry', *Educational Management & Administration* 31(1): 31–50.
- Robinson, V. (1996) 'Critical Theory and the Social Psychology of Change', in K. Leithwood, J. Chapman, D. Corson, P. Hallinger and A. Hart (eds) *International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Administration*, pp. 1069–96. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.
- Robinson, V. (2002) 'Organizational Learning, Organizational Problem Solving and Models of Mind', in K. Leithwood and P. Hallinger (eds) *Second International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Administration*, pp. 775–812. London: Kluwer Academic.
- Sackney, L. and Mitchell, C. (2002) 'Postmodern Expressions of Educational Leadership', in K. Leithwood and P. Hallinger (eds) *Second International Handbook of Leadership and Administration*, pp. 881–913. London: Kluwer Academic.
- Scribner, J.D., López, G.R., Koschoreck, J.W., Mahitivanichcha, K. and Scheurich, J.J. (1999) 'The Building Blocks of Educational Administration: A Dialogic Review of the First Three Chapters of the *Handbook*', *Educational Administration Quarterly* 35(4): 477–99.
- Senge, P. (1990) *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization*. New York: Doubleday.

- Simon, H. (1945) *Administrative Behavior*. New York: Macmillan.
- Smyth, J. (1996) 'The Socially Just Alternative to the "Self Managing" School', in K. Leithwood, J. Chapman, D. Corson, P. Hallinger and A. Hart (eds) *International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Administration*, pp. 1069–96. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.
- Southworth, G. (2002) 'Instructional Leadership in Schools: Reflections and Empirical Evidence', *School Leadership and Management* 22(1): 73–92.
- Spillane, J.P., Halverson, R. and Drummond, J.B. (2001) 'Investigating School Leadership Practice: A Distributed Perspective', *Educational Researcher* 30(3): 23–8.
- Strachan, J. (1999) 'Feminist Educational Leadership in a New Zealand Neo-Liberal Context', *Journal of Educational Administration* 37(2): 121–38.
- Tatsuoka, M. and Silver, P. (1988) 'Quantitative Research Methods in Educational Administration', in N. Boyan (ed.) *Handbook of Research on Educational Administration*, pp. 677–701. New York: Longman.
- Taylor, F.W. (1895) 'A Piece-Rate System, Being a Step toward a Partial Solution of the Labor Problem', *Transactions of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers* 16: 856–92.
- Walker, A. and Dimmock, C. (2002) 'Moving School Leadership beyond its Narrow Boundaries: Developing a Cross-Cultural Approach', in K. Leithwood and P. Hallinger (eds) *Second International Handbook of Leadership and Administration*, pp. 167–202. London: Kluwer Academic.
- Wiley, S. (2001) 'Contextual Effects on Student Achievement: School Leadership and Professional Community', *Journal of Educational Change* 2(1): 1–33.
- Willower, D.J. and Forsyth, P.B. (1999) 'A Brief History of Scholarship in Educational Administration', in J. Murphy and K. Seashore Louis (eds) *Handbook of Research on Educational Administration* (2nd edn), pp. 1–23. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Yukl, G. (1994) *Leadership in Organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Biographical notes

DR PHILIP HALLINGER is Professor and Executive Director at the College of Management, Mahidol University, Bangkok.

RONALD HECK is Professor of educational administration and policy at the University of Hawaii at Manoa.

Correspondence to:

RONALD HECK, College of Education, EDEA, 1776 University Avenue, Honolulu, HI 96822, USA. [email: rheck@hawaii.edu]