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Study Purpose: This article examines the influence of Educational Administration Quarterly (EAQ) on the scholarly literature in education during the 25-year period 1979 to 2003. This article continues part of the first critique of EAQ conducted by Roald Campbell in 1979.

Study Methods: Two citation measures are used in this study to assess EAQ influence: (a) citation frequency, the total citations counts to EAQ articles found in the Web of Science database and (b) the impact factor, a ratio of citations to articles published that is calculated as part of the Journal Citation Reports.

Study Findings: The findings point to three conclusions: (a) EAQ’s substantive, ongoing influence on the scholarly education literature is limited to a small percentage of its published articles, which are cited predominantly by subsequent articles in EAQ; (b) this level of influence, though perhaps not the form, appears to be generally comparable to the level of other scholarly education journals with a solid academic reputation; and (c) EAQ appears to be statistically among the top tier of influential scholarly journals in education, but below the most influential. Overall, EAQ’s influence on the scholarly education literature has improved since the first critique published in 1979.
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This study examines how the articles appearing in *Educational Administration Quarterly (EAQ)* have influenced the scholarly literature in education. We assess influence by analyzing the frequency of citations in other journals to articles published in *EAQ* from 1979 to 2003. This study continues part of the first critique of *EAQ* conducted by Campbell (1979) and draws on the work of others who use citation analysis as a means to evaluate journal influence (e.g., Garfield, 1972, 1986; Katerattanakul & Han, 2003; McKechnie, Goodall, Lajoie-Paquette, & Julien, 2005; Tahai & Rigsby, 1998).

Assessments of journal influence, also referred to as quality, standing, impact, or prestige, are used in a number of ways. They provide information for scholars to determine where to publish for greatest likelihood of impact on the field (Tahai & Meyer, 1999). They are used by universities as part of their assessments of department, and even individual researcher, productivity (Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Bachrach, & Podsakoff, 2005). Libraries use them as part of their process of deciding on journal subscriptions (Altman & Gorman, 1998).

Journal editors and sponsoring organizations also are interested in the assessments of their own journal’s influence, for these assessments can provide formative data about the results of current journal policy and practice. They can provide information about the quality of the articles selected for publication (Chan, Fok, & Pan, 2000). They can show where a journal ranks among others in the field (e.g., Ma & Stern, 2006). Thus, the assessment of journal influence can provide data to guide changes in editorial policy and practice intended to increase the number of scholars who read and cite the articles that journals publish. Furthermore, published assessments of journal influence are believed to affect the quality and number of manuscript submissions, as well as subscription and advertising rates (McGhee, 2005; Podsakoff et al., 2005).

This study is intended as a formative assessment of *EAQ*’s influence, which is in keeping with the intent of the first critique of *EAQ* conducted by Campbell (1979). There is also a desire that this study might serve as a model for similar journal assessments in the field of education. For although the publication of assessments of journal influence is well established in some fields (e.g., accounting—Bonner, Hesford, Van der Stede, & Young, 2006; finance—Chan et al., 2000; marketing—Sivadas & Johnson, 2005; information systems—Katerattanakul & Han, 2003), it is rarely done in the field of education. Isolated studies by Campbell (1979; *EAQ*); Companario, Gonzalez, and Rodriguez (2006; 54 education journals); Luce and Johnson (1978; 74 educational psychology journals); Mayo, Zirkel, and Finger (2006; ranking of professional publications by educational leadership faculty); Orr
This study examines articles published in *EAQ* from 1979 through 2003, which continues directly from Campbell’s (1979) analysis of the influence of *EAQ* on the literature of the field during the first years of its operation, 1965 to 1978. In part of his assessment, Campbell conducted a citation analysis. He chose two peer-reviewed administration journals, *Journal of Educational Administration* and *Administrative Science Quarterly*, and searched the citations of hard copies of all the articles during 4 years, 1969, 1972, 1975, and 1978. Campbell found it “a little embarrassing” (p. 10) that *EAQ* was not cited once in 4,000 references in the *Journal of Educational Administration*. *EAQ* fared little better in *Administrative Science Quarterly*. In articles pertaining strictly to educational administration in *Administrative Science Quarterly*, references to *EAQ* accounted for only 3.2% of the total (75 citations to *EAQ* out of 2,342 total citations). Campbell concluded,

> The impact of *EAQ* on the literature of the field appears to be limited. I am convinced that *EAQ* articles are of such quality that they deserve far more attention than their impact on the literature of the field suggests they are getting. (p. 10)

Campbell may have been prescient. *EAQ* is now prominently cited in education journals and thus it appears that *EAQ*’s impact on the scholarly education literature has improved since 1978. Using the Web of Science database, we found that *EAQ* was referenced by 1,717 articles in more than 340 journals from 1979 to 2005, including international journals published in Canada, England, Australia, Germany, and Japan. Only 15 of these journals, however, averaged more than one citation per year to articles in *EAQ*. *EAQ*’s citation influence was widespread but superficial, as well as concentrated and ongoing.

**METHODS**

Two citation measures are used in this study: (a) citation frequency, the total citations counts to *EAQ* articles found in the Web of Science database and (b) the impact factor, a ratio of citations to articles published that is calculated as part of the *Journal Citation Reports* (Garfield, 1994). Both are accepted and commonly employed as key indicators of journal influence (Brainerd, 2006; Companario et al., 2006; Glanzel & Moed, 2002).
Citation Frequency: Searching the Web of Science

To determine the citation frequency, the Web of Science database was searched for all citations to *EAQ* articles published during the period 1979 to 2003 and cited during the period 1979 to June 2005. The difference between the publication period and the citation period allowed for an 18-month citation period beyond the final publication date in December 2003.

The Web of Science database contains approximately 8,700 journals, as it links the Social Science Citation Index, Science Citation Index Expanded, and Arts & Humanities Citation Index (Web of Science, 2005). Still, it does not contain some prominent education journals (e.g., does not include *Journal of Educational Administration* and *Educational Researcher*) and it has gaps in its coverage (e.g., missing *Alberta Journal of Education*, 1981; *Peabody Journal of Education*, 1988). Thus, this citation analysis, both the citation frequency and the impact factor (examined below), is more accurate as an indicator of general influence and less so as an indicator of individual relationship and accomplishment.

Although journal citation measures can be a valuable source of information for determining the influence journals exert on their discipline or field, they are not a perfect measure and potential biases and limitations exist (Kostoff, 2002). Gratuitous citations (citations of the journal of submission to gain acceptance) and self-citations may inflate journal citation rates. “The practice of self-citation can be considered at many levels, including author self-citation, journals self-citation, and subject category self-citation” (Thomson Corporation, 2004, p. 1). Theoretical and methodological “super-cited” papers (e.g., Lincoln & Guba, 1985) may skew long-term citation calculations because of their foundational nature (Garfield, 2000). Likewise, when a journal includes reviews of articles or the field, which *EAQ* does, these reviews may be “cited more frequently because they serve as surrogates for earlier literature” (Garfield, 1994, p. 4). An article also may receive an unusually high number of citations because many authors believe it to be wrong and cite it as a negative example. Other variables affecting citations to a journal article include an author’s reputation; the controversial nature of the subject matter; a journal’s circulation and its cost; reprint (or Internet) dissemination; its coverage by current-awareness, indexing, and abstracting services; society memberships; the availability and extent of libraries’ journal collections; and national research priorities (Thomson Corporation, 1985, p. 8A). In sum, citation measures may very well be a function of influences other than the merit of the research reported within a journal’s covers.

To attenuate the potential problems discussed above, our citation frequency analysis focused only on *EAQ* pieces listed as “articles” and only on
citations to *EAQ* articles in journals other than *EAQ* that are not self-citations. We excluded citations to *EAQ* articles in other articles in *EAQ*, and we did not count citations to invited commentaries, book reviews, and editor introductions. Less than one quarter of these later pieces were cited (83/351). In total, there were 483 articles within the 834 pieces published in the 106 issues of *EAQ* from 1979 to 2003.

In our judgment, a clearer picture of *EAQ*’s importance to the field of education is obtained by examining the influence of its articles on journals other than *EAQ* and its use by other authors. Limiting our citation frequency analysis in this manner avoids inflated citation counts. Unless otherwise stated, all citation frequency counts refer to *EAQ* article citations in journals other than *EAQ* that are not self-citations.

### Impact Factor

The impact factor, calculated annually in the *Journal Citation Reports* (*JCR*), was originally created to help identify “the most significant journals” in science (Garfield, 1998, p. 1). There are just over 1,700 journals for which there is an impact factor calculation and within the *JCR* category related to education, *Education and Educational Research*, there are 98 journals. Several well-known journals in educational administration, including the *Journal of Educational Administration*, the *Journal of School Leadership*, and the *Journal of Leadership and Policy in Schools* are not included. This restricts the comparison that can be made between *EAQ* and other similar journals.

The impact factor is a frequency measure of how often the average piece in a journal, whether article, commentary, book review, editor introduction, or other published piece, has been cited by creating a “ratio between citations and recent citable items published” (Garfield, 1994, p. 1). The impact factor compares two elements: the number of citations in the current year to any pieces published in the previous 2 years divided by the number of pieces published during the same 2-year period (Garfield, 2000). For example, to determine the 2003 impact factor for a journal, the number of pieces published by the journal during the 2 previous years, 2002 and 2001, would be divided into the number of citations to those pieces in the current year, 2003. So, if a journal published 40 pieces in 2002 and 2001 and those pieces were cited 30 times during 2003, then the journal’s 2003 impact factor would be 0.75 (30/40). Using these measures for the impact factor helps to even the playing field between journals with differences related to size, publication frequency, and age—all of which may affect the citable body of literature and, therefore, the number of cites the journal receives (Garfield, 1994).
For the impact factor, the more citations found in the 2 years after publication, the higher its value. Thus, higher impact factor values are an indicator of greater journal impact. In terms of actual impact factor numbers, the leading journals in most disciplines are those which manage to achieve an impact score over or reasonably close to 1. This means that on average each of their published papers is referred to at least once in two years by some other paper in one of the journals included in the analysis. Any journal with an average citation score of more than 0.5 is also doing relatively well. Many perfectly reputable journals may have citation scores of below 0.25, meaning that papers there have a less than one-in-four chance of being referenced by anyone else. (Dunleavy, 2003, p. 230)

There are clear limitations to the impact factor. It only includes citations during the 2 years immediately following publication of the articles. This quick period of citation will exclude many journals with extended periods of review prior to publication and “may be biased toward journals that follow ‘hot’ topics or fads that are briefly popular, then quickly forgotten” (Borokhovich, Bricker, & Simkins, 2000, p. 1458). Despite this concern, Borokhovich et al. (2000), in a study of three finance journals, found that impact factors “are good indicators of longer-term influence” (p. 1468). Hoeffel (1998) concurs:

Impact Factor is not a perfect tool to measure the quality of articles but there is nothing better and it has the advantage of already being in existence and is, therefore, a good technique for scientific evaluation. Experience has shown that in each specialty the best journals are those in which it is most difficult to have an article accepted, and these are the journals that have a high impact factor. These journals existed long before the impact factor was devised. The use of impact factor as a measure of quality is widespread because it fits well with the opinion we have in each field of the best journals in our specialty. (p. 1225)

In this study, we use impact factor as one method of examining trends in EAQ influence and to compare EAQ to other similar journals. We intend to use this comparison as a means to provide a meaningful context for understanding impact factor as a measure of influence (Kostoff, 2002).

FINDINGS

The findings are presented in two categories. The first category sets forth measures that provide evidence of the influence of EAQ as an entire journal. These are total citations to EAQ as a journal and the impact factor,
which is only a journal measure. The second category sets forth total citations to individual articles published by EAQ.

Influence of EAQ as a Journal

Citations in other journals. As a journal, EAQ may be characterized as having a broad, but mostly shallow, influence on many academic journals, primarily in the United States but also on some international journals. EAQ also appeared to have an ongoing, deeper influence on a small number of education journals. By far, EAQ had the greatest influence on subsequent EAQ articles.

Within the Web of Science database, 349 journals—EAQ plus 348 other journals—cited at least one EAQ article that was not a self-citation. A total of 31% (773/2,490) of these citations were in subsequent articles in EAQ. The remaining 1,717 citations (69%) were in 348 other journals. Excluding EAQ, 315 journals or 90.5% were published in the United States (e.g., Teachers College Record and Disability & Society), whereas 33 journals were published in other countries (e.g., Zeitschrift Für Padagogik [Germany]) and Journal of the Operations Research Society of Japan). Interestingly, only 96 of the 348 journals (27.6%) concerned education primarily (e.g., Oxford Review of Education and Urban Education), whereas 252 (72.4%) did not (e.g., American Psychologist and Harvard Journal on Legislation).

More than half of these journals, 57.8% (201/348), cited EAQ articles only once. Figure 1 shows that the vast majority of the journals (83.6%, 291/348) cited EAQ articles 5 or fewer times in 25 years. Only 15 of the 348 journals (4.3%) averaged more than 1 citation per year or more than 25 total citations.

The majority of EAQ's influence appeared to be rather random and short-lived. It appears that authors from a number of journals in different disciplines cited EAQ when a specific article happened to coincide with their writing.

Not surprisingly, the journals that cited EAQ more regularly were education journals. Excluding citations in subsequent articles in EAQ, 15 journals accounted for nearly half of the 1,717 citations (more than 45%). In Figure 2, the names of the top 15 citing journals were rank ordered on a linear scale based on number of citations. Overall, these 15 journals were responsible for 780 citations, ranging from a high of 85 citations to a low of 28. The mean and median number of citations was 52 and 49, respectively, and the standard deviation was 16.4.

Thus, as a journal, EAQ had a consistent, ongoing reach to about 15 core journals. Within the top 15 journals, there appears to be two groups:
a high-activity group (highest citing journals) and a lower activity group (those that cited at somewhat lower levels). The break point between the two groups is at about 60 citations. Using this break point, the top four journals (1.1%) were responsible for about 38% of citations (higher activity group median number of citations = 73) and the remaining 11 journals (3.2%) were responsible for 62% of citations (lower activity group median number of citations = 43). In any case, the 15 journals that appear in Figure 2 constitute EAQ’s core citation audience.

**Impact factor.** The second column of Table 1 presents 25 years of impact factor calculations for EAQ as well as the American Journal of Education, Educational Policy, and Teachers College Record. These journals were chosen for comparison because there were impact data available for each, they publish articles on educational administration, and they are arguably considered to be well-established and influential journals in the field of education.

The range of EAQ impact factors varies widely for the 25 years reviewed, from 0.228 to 0.826. Following the guidelines of Dunleavy (2003), EAQ is doing “relatively well” when its impact factor is at or above 0.500 and can be viewed as a “leading journal” when its impact factor approaches or exceeds 1.000 (p. 230). Over the entire 25 years, EAQ had an average impact factor of 0.537 for a rating of relatively well. Year by year, EAQ achieved a
rating of *relatively well* 15 times, with 3 of those years being above 0.800. At the same time, *EAQ* had 10 years of ratings of lesser influence.

Over the past 7 years, *EAQ* had 5 years of lesser influence ratings, including its two lowest ratings, and had 2 years of ratings of *relatively well*. This
is a reversal from the previous 16 years (1981-1996), when EAQ had ratings of relatively well 13 times, including the three ratings above 0.800. During these past 7 years, EAQ had an average impact factor of 0.415.

These numbers can be more meaningful when compared to other journals within the discipline for which the impact factor is available (Thomson Corporation, 2004). For example, the comparison of the 25 years of impact factors of EAQ with those of American Journal of Education, Educational Policy, and Teachers College Record in Table 1 and Figure 3 illustrates EAQ’s relative position.

For the 20 years when data were available for at least three of these journals (1982-1988, 1990-2000, 2002, 2003), EAQ held the top impact factor for 3 years, one of the middle two impact factors for 17 years, and the bottom impact factor once. By contrast, American Journal of Education held the top impact factor 10 times, Teachers College Record held it 7 times, and Educational Policy never held it. Table 1 shows that EAQ placed second in average impact factor, behind American Journal of Education. Overall, it appears that EAQ clearly out “impact”-ed Educational Policy, was generally comparable with Teachers College Record, and was out “impact”-ed by American Journal of Education. Taking the impact factor trends of EAQ together with the journal comparisons, EAQ appears to have had a solid level of influence that would place it among the second tier of leading journals in education over the 25-year period. Over the most recent 7 years, however, EAQ appears to have had a lower overall influence as its impact factors have been mostly in the low range.

**Influence of Individual Articles**

Individually, the majority of articles published in EAQ from 1979 through 2003 had little or no influence on the field based on the total number of their citations and the duration of their citation histories. Of the 483 articles published from 1979 through 2003, 85 (17.6%) were never cited, not even within EAQ or as self-citations. Eliminating citations within EAQ and self-citations, the number of articles that were not cited in a journal in the Web of Science database rises to 159 (32.9%). Of these 159 articles, 104 (65.4%) were published in 1999 or earlier. An additional 92 articles (19.0%) were only cited once outside of EAQ and author self-citations; of these, 67 (72.8%) were published in 1999 or earlier. Thus, the vast majority of these uncited and single-cited articles have been in the field for more than 4 years. Four years has been found to be more than sufficient time for an article to be cited by other journal articles (e.g., Brainerd, 2006...
[2-year publication minimum in analysis]; Franks, Simoes, Singh, & Gray, 2006 [3-year publication minimum in analysis]).

Only a small percentage of EAQ articles had more extensive, longer lasting influence on the field as determined by the number of citations. Table 2 displays the top 11 most cited EAQ articles, 2.3% of the total articles published, between 1979 and 2005. These 11 articles accounted for 25.4% of the total citations beyond EAQ.

Date of publication appears to play a role in making the list, as all articles were published around the early 1980s. This is to be expected in that...
the longer an article is in circulation, the greater the opportunity it has to be cited.

SUMMARY

EAQ had its strongest influence on a core of 15 education journals with which it had ongoing dialogues. Journals such as School Effectiveness and School Improvement, Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, and Educational Policy regularly cited articles in EAQ. A review of the references listed in the EAQ articles shows that the articles in EAQ cited them as well. Still, EAQ articles cited previous EAQ articles nearly 9 times as often as the next most citing journal. EAQ’s greatest influence was within EAQ itself.

With this scope of influence, EAQ had an average impact factor rating slightly above 0.500 during the entire 25-year period. This put its average journal impact at the level of “doing relatively well” (Dunleavy, 2003, p. 230). In 5 of the past 7 years, however, EAQ’s impact factors were below 0.500, which put its average journal impact for those years below the “doing relatively well” minimum.
A pattern of concentrated influence also appears at the level of individual articles published in *EAQ*. Just over 2% of the articles accounted for one quarter of the total citations beyond *EAQ*. At the same time, more than half of all articles published in *EAQ* have never been cited by journals in the Web of Science beyond subsequent articles in *EAQ* and author self-citations. Overall, *EAQ* has published a handful of high-citation articles as well as a large number of articles that have made little or no splash in academia.

The unevenness of the article citation rates, the recent decrease in impact factor scores, and the limited number of journals that consistently cite *EAQ* give us pause. The significance of these statistics is difficult to assess in

### TABLE 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Citations (rank)a</th>
<th>Authors (date of publication)</th>
<th>Article Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80 (1) Schwab &amp; Iwanicki (1982)</td>
<td>Perceived role conflict, role ambiguity, and teacher burnout</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 (2) Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan, &amp; Lee (1982)</td>
<td>The instructional management role of the principal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 (3) Bessent &amp; Bessent (1980)</td>
<td>Determining the comparative efficiency of schools through data envelopment analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 (4) Whetten (1981)</td>
<td>Organizational responses to scarcity: Exploring the obstacles to innovative approaches to retrenchment in education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 (9) Bessent, Bessent, Charnes, Cooper, &amp; Thorogood (1983)</td>
<td>Evaluation of educational program proposals by means of DEA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 (11) Miskel, Fevurly, &amp; Stewart (1979)</td>
<td>Organizational structures and processes, perceived school effectiveness, loyalty, and job satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Total number and rank are derived from citations in non-*Educational Administration Quarterly* journals that are not author self-citations.
isolation. Uncertain as to what these patterns tell about overall influence, we used the impact factor as a means to compare EAQ to similar journals. From this comparison, EAQ appears to have an influence on the education literature that is less than that of American Journal of Education and generally comparable to that of Teachers College Record. It nearly always had an impact factor higher than Educational Policy. Taken altogether, the above statistics point to three conclusions: (a) EAQ’s substantive, ongoing influence on the scholarly education literature is limited to a small percentage of articles and consists predominantly of a dialogue within its own pages; (b) this level of influence, though perhaps not the form, appears to be generally comparable to the level of other scholarly education journals with a solid academic reputation; and (c) EAQ appears to be statistically among the top tier of influential scholarly journals in education but below the most influential.

RECOMMENDATIONS

One of the goals of EAQ since its last published analysis has been to become more influential on the literature of the field of education and educational administration (Campbell, 1979). EAQ has achieved this goal; our analysis shows that it is clearly more prominent in the literature now than it was 25 years ago. That influence, however, remains limited in scope and duration. In the spirit of formative assessment, we provide the following two recommendations on how EAQ might publish more articles with greater influence.

First, EAQ could enhance its efforts to attract high-quality manuscripts. One method would be to actively seek out individuals with new ideas, research, and analyses. Campbell (1979) made a similar recommendation. Although editors cannot promise publication, they can become a driving force in the field of education by actively encouraging “those who have something to say to prepare appropriate manuscripts” (p. 18). This could include emerging scholars as well as prominent, established academics, both within education and in related fields.

In addition, knowledge that a journal has been deemed to have a high level of influence within the field also has been found to attract more and higher quality manuscript submissions (McGhee, 2005; Podsakoff et al., 2005). Thus, EAQ might consider promoting its solid standing among journals in the field as well as its efforts to increase its impact. Increasing the quality of the articles published can begin with increasing the number and quality of manuscripts submitted.
Second, *EAQ* could work to increase the quality of its own internal dialogue. *EAQ* can build on the high level of internal citations it already has by developing and promoting direct critique and responses between articles and even across themed issues. This explicit scholarly debate is one means by which *EAQ* can continually identify, update, and evaluate trends in research related to educational administration. This direct, ongoing dialogue of article critique has appeared to a limited degree in some journals in other disciplines (e.g., in business, Juran, 1986, 1987; Kume, 1985, 1986; and Schneiderman, 1986; in sociology of law, McCann, 1996; and Rosenberg, 1996). It appears to be rare in scholarly education journals.

Jane Clark Lindle, at the end of her tenure as editor of *EAQ*, made a similar recommendation after seeing the lack of scholarly debate within the journal’s pages (Lindle, 2004):

In the fifth issue of *EAQ* around 1965, Editor Roald Campbell lamented that no one had written any commentary reacting to any of the articles in *EAQ* through that point. . . . Surely a multidisciplinary field provides opportunities for creative intellectual debate over its espoused theories and even more assuredly such debates could be over the role of leadership in addressing educational policies. Even though *EAQ* articles are well vetted before publication, they are not without flaws. Certainly those flaws should be exposed, and certainly *EAQ* should serve as the public forum for such commentary.

Although I expect no more success than Editor Campbell had in his call to readers to react, I still throw down the gauntlet. Surely the pages of *EAQ* are expansive enough to enclose hotly contested ideas and positions in our diverse and applied field. Amazingly 40 years from *EAQ*’s inception, I share Campbell’s frustration that the journal’s legacy is not more openly conflicted. (p. 4)

This desire for more direct debate between articles highlights the larger role that scholarly journals can play within a discipline. Journals are, at a minimum, a mechanism for scholars to post their knowledge, a form of external documentation that universities can use to assess productivity. Without more, an academic journal may become little more than a knowledge posting board or “cul de sac” (McKenzie, Wright, Ball, & Baron, 2002, p. 1207), where the “cult of the individual study” prevails (Hubbard & Lindsay, 2002, p. 381).

*EAQ* is taking some steps to address these concerns with the “From the Field” section of the journal. This section invites works that “highlight timely issues in the field,” including “highlights of award-winning dissertations, book reviews, policy commentaries or updates, brief updates on longitudinal research in progress, and other shorter pieces” (EAQ Manuscript Guidelines,
To date, however, these and other nonarticle pieces published in *EAQ* have received few citations; less than one quarter of the nonarticle pieces were ever cited (83/351). Furthermore, one in six articles published in *EAQ* were uncited anywhere at the time of this study. These low citation levels for a large percentage of the *EAQ* publications suggest that more can and should be done to develop *EAQ*, and likely other education journals, as a mechanism for the development, accumulation, and flow of knowledge for the field as a whole. More active promotion of direct debate between articles, as well as more active solicitation of high-quality manuscript submissions, would appear to be necessary steps in that direction.

Some journals are experimenting with new review and publication formats to expand the dissemination of scientific knowledge. For example, the online journal *Working Papers on Culture, Education and Human Development* uses an “open review” process “as part of an effort to find new ways of disseminating scientific knowledge” (*Working Papers*, 2006, para. 3). In their open review process, manuscripts that meet the basic content and format review guidelines are immediately placed on the journal Web site in the section “papers in review” (para. 4). Two outside reviewers will evaluate the manuscript. Simultaneously, readers may submit their own reviews of the manuscript. Both the outside reviews and the reader reviews are published next to the manuscript as soon as they are received with the process being monitored by the editorial committee to ensure that the dialogue is “constructive and respectful” (para. 5). When the review period is over, the editorial committee makes a decision on the manuscript based on all the reviews. Rejected manuscripts are erased from the Web site. Accepted manuscripts are moved to the corresponding volume and issue once any required changes are made (para. 7). This example suggests that the active promotion of interarticle dialogue, including the continued expansion of publication and review formats, might yield an important future role for *EAQ* in the field of education.

Beyond the analysis of *EAQ* itself, we also recommend that critical analyses of education journals occur more often. What if the focus were *Teachers College Record* or *Educational Policy* or several journals together? How might we better understand not just these journals individually but the relationship between journals and, more important, the impact that they have individually and collectively on the field of education or educational administration? Journal analyses could be another promising means for identifying key areas of education research and deepening the analyses therein.
CONCLUSION

The patterns observed through this review of EAQ could be recognized as anomalies or emerging and repeating trends within education journals. Because published journal analyses are not common in education, their significance is not completely clear. The high concentration of citations within EAQ itself appears to suggest that scholarly dialogue will occur to some degree on its own within a journal. EAQ’s external citation pattern suggests that this dialogue can also occur to a lesser degree between a limited number of journals within education. The current dialogue is indirect and somewhat incomplete; articles were cited, but very few directly responded to or critiqued an entire article. Expanding this scholarly dialogue, including direct engagement between articles, might improve EAQ’s influence on the literature and possibly the field of educational administration.

NOTES

1. The 1,717 citations are those in journals other than Educational Administration Quarterly (EAQ) that are not self-citations by one or more of the authors of the EAQ article being cited. Adding citations in subsequent EAQ articles and self-citations, both within and out of EAQ, the total number of citations is 2,790. The total number of journals citing EAQ articles where the citation is not a self-citation is 349, EAQ and 348 other journals. Adding self-citations, the total number of journals citing EAQ is 356. As discussed in the article, we chose to use the lower counts (1,717 citations that are not self-citations in 348 non-EAQ journals) as being a more rigorous assessment of influence on the field.

2. An article can also influence the field by simply being read, even though it is not cited (see, e.g., Mayo, Zirkel, & Finger, 2006).

3. Please note that impact factor calculations include all published pieces by a journal regardless of type. Our citation frequency analysis, however, focuses on citations to pieces listed as “articles” by EAQ and not invited commentaries, book reviews, and editor introductions. The difference in citation counts had no effect on the overall analysis as the impact factor was not compared to our citation frequency counts but only to the impact factor of other journals.

4. Recall that the citation period for the EAQ articles published during 1979 to 2003 was 1979 to 2005.
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