History of Educational Leadership/Management

R Bates, University of Deakin, Waurn Ponds, VIC, Australia

In 1902, John Dewey warned that "it is easy to fall into the habit of regarding the mechanics of school organization and administration as something comparatively external and indifferent to educational ideals" (Dewey, 1902: 22, 23). The history of educational leadership and management as a field of study and practice bears out his misgivings for , despite some exceptions, the field is historically constructed around a strict separation of administrative theory from educational concerns and constituted by a focus on the mechanics of school organization.

The formal study and teaching of educational administration began in the United States in the early years of the twentieth century with the appointment of men such as George Strayer at Teachers College Columbia; Paul Hanus at Harvard; Edward Elliot at Wisconsin; Bobbit at Chicago; and, perhaps most importantly, Ellwood Cubberly at Stanford. Cubberly had little background in the study of education, his own education and profession being that of geology and physical science. This did not prevent him, however, from undertaking to teach "school administration, school problems, school organization, school statistics, secondary schools, history of education, relation of ignorance and crime to education etc." (Tyack and Hansot, 1982: 124). Partly, no doubt, these topics sprang to mind as a result of the 2 years he spent as superintendent of schools in San Diego, where he came to the conclusion that urban school boards should become nonpolitical. In this, his views coincided with those of the emerging Municipal Reform Movement, a movement that was devoted to the amalgamation of small public enterprises such as schools and school districts into large, hierarchically ordered, and centrally directed corporate systems. The model was that of the large industrial corporation informed by the newly emerging science of administration. When this new science of administration was applied to the public sphere, it isolated administrative questions from political questions: "...administration lies outside the proper sphere of politics. Administrative questions are not political questions" (Woodrow Wilson, 1887: 97).

By 1930, the transformation of American city management, along with the management of schools, had succeeded in displacing local political interests and creating a series of professionalized bureaucracies linked together into national organizations supported by systematic professional education and a national network of influential individuals. Strayer, for example, argued that "significant progress in the administration of city school systems during the past twenty-five years is due primarily to two causes. First, the application of the scientific method to the problems of administration, and, second, the professional training of school executives" (Tyack and Hansot, 1982: 152).

Carter Alexander, a colleague of Strayer's at Teachers College, outlined the administrative progressives' view of the purpose of educational research as being: "to discover, in the light of the purposes of education commonly acknowledged, the most efficient procedures in the organization, supervision, finance and evaluation of the program of educational service" (Tyack and Hansot, 1982: 153). Taken to extremes, this agenda led to what Callaghan (1962) called the cult of efficiency, a cult based on supposed agreement over the purposes of education commonly acknowledged, which were then set aside from the pursuit of efficient administration.

Based upon the *Principles of Scientific Management*, first advocated by Taylor (1911), leadership in education became defined as extracting the maximum efficiency from educational resources, both physical and human. Advocated and publicized widely by leading figures such as Strayer, Cubberly, and Bobbit, this business-managerial conception of educational leadership dominated the emerging university-based programs of training in educational administration. Moreover, while the new professional elite of university-trained administrators set about supplanting the Tammany Hall of local politics and cronyism, they created for themselves and their protégés a national "educational Tammany Hall that made the Strayer–Englehardt Tammany Hall in New York look very weak" (Tyack and Hansot, 1982: 141). This educational trust reformed education from the top down through new university programs, national associations (both public and private), and networks of political influence in key school districts through which the new meritocracy of the administrative progressives was established and sponsorship and patronage exercised in the creation of the new educational elite.

The result was a widespread transformation of leadership in American education that consolidated many small local districts into large systems; imposed the efficiencies of scientific management upon teachers; entrenched central administrative control over curriculum and assessment; and replaced educational ideals with managerial goals. Callaghan's judgment was that this constituted an American tragedy that was fourfold, one in which: "educational questions were subordinated to business considerations; ... administrators were produced who were not,

in any sense, educators; . . . a scientific label was put on some very unscientific and dubious methods and practices; and. . . an anti-intellectual climate, already prevalent, was strengthened" (1962: 246).

There were, of course, voices raised against this transformation, chief among them being that of John Dewey who insisted that the displacement of educational ideals from the discourse of educational leadership was unfortunate and that the transformation of educational leadership into an oligarchy was inappropriate in a democratic society (Dewey, 1902, 1916).

However, the clash was not a clash of ideas alone. The educational oligarchy developed through the appeal to scientific management and the creation of a professionally trained cadre of managers was overwhelmingly male. Indeed, while one of the objectives of scientific management was the separation of conception from execution and the enhancement of managerial prerogatives (Edwards, 1979), its application in education was designed to separate male managers from overwhelmingly female teachers. This separation was challenged by women such as Ella Flagg Young who, as superintendent of the Chicago School District, provided leadership to women unionists and was a strong champion of female leadership of the profession. One of the battlegrounds for the female challenge to the male oligarchy was the National Education Association (NEA) where Margaret Haley spearheaded an attack on the male old guard and its centralist tendencies arguing that its intention was "to make a despotism of our entire school system" (Tyack and Hansot, 1982: 186). Attempts by women teachers to broaden participatory structures within the NEA met with some success, but were eventually repulsed by male executive members such as Charles Eliot whose patronizing attitude was indicated in his comment that women such as Young and Haley exhibited "a general moral ignorance or incapacity which is apt to be in evidence whenever women get stirred in political, social or educational contexts" (Tyack and Hansot, 1982: 186).

Young and Haley, however, were arguing not simply for greater female participation in administration and leadership, but also for a style of leadership that was aligned with Dewey's observation that in order to sustain a democratic society, a democratic education was fundamental. Their call was for a kind of educational leadership that "would make education the great instrumentality helping children and youths grow into citizenship in a government intended to be of, by and for all" (Young, 1916: 6). In this, they were arguing for the reintroduction of politics into educational leadership and for an acknowledgment that educational ideals were indeed political and an inescapable part of educational leadership.

While the leaders of the Educational Trust were pursuing efficiencies in the management of increasingly large-scale urban school systems and insisting that education was an activity best left to the professionals, the inescapable links between politics and education were being demonstrated through the leadership of teachers such as Leonard Covello whose political agitation in East Harlem led to the establishment of and his appointment as the first principal of Benjamin Franklin High School in 1934. Covello believed that the school should adapt to the cultures of its students and be a place of mobilization of communities for social justice. Learning was to be through active participation in the community, and politics and learning, democracy, and social justice were to be articulated through action (Covello, 1936, 1958; Peebles, 1978). Leadership was not so much to be demonstrated through the application of principles of efficiency and scientific administration, but through assisting in the articulation of democratic claims through learning and social action in the pursuit of social justice: a very Deweyan perspective.

Meanwhile, in the academy, a new generation of professors, while continuing their studies of school finance and efficient administration through survey techniques, was increasingly concerned with the disparagement of colleagues in the real science departments who looked upon education and educational leadership as unscientific pursuits. The result was a shift toward importing ideas from the social sciences, especially psychology and sociology. By the 1950s, an influential cadre including Jacob Getzels (a psychologist at the University of Chicago), Andrew Halpin (a member of the Personnel Research Board at Ohio State University), and Daniel Griffiths (an iconoclastic professor of administration at Columbia Teachers College) began what became known as the Theory Movement in educational administration. Grounded in a commitment to logical positivism, these professors decried the atheoretical nature of research in educational administration and set about devising an approach both grounded in theory and articulated through research design derived from the emerging social sciences (Culbertson, 1988).

The Theory Movement took the depoliticization of educational leadership one step further through the pursuit of a value-free science of administration which would reveal, through the study of what is, rather than what ought to be, a series of empirically grounded hypothetico-deductive propositions that could form the basis of a proper positivist science of administration. This was seen as a general theory of administration of which educational administration was simply a specific instance.

Supported by the Kellogg Foundation through the Cooperative Program in Educational Administration, eight university-based centers were established at Chicago, Teachers College (Columbia), Harvard, George Peabody, Texas, Oregon, Stanford, and Ohio State in the United States, and at Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) and Alberta in Canada. These centers were charged with developing scientifically based programs for the preparation of

educational administrators, producing a new literature on educational administration, and supporting the establishment of professional organizations committed to the new approach to educational administration and leadership (Moore, 1964). The effect was to instantiate systems theory and behavioral science as the theoretical foundations of educational administration and leadership.

In essence, the Theory Movement was built on the appropriation of Parsonian systems theory through Getzels' 'A psycho-sociological framework for the study of educational administration' (1952). Here, the abstractions of the social system, nomothetic and ideographic dimensions of social behavior, and those of institution, role, expectation, and individual, personality, and need disposition were elaborated into a theoretical set of systematic relationships for exploration through empiricist methodologies. The 1964 National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) yearbook (*Behavioural Science and Educational Administration*; Griffiths, 1964) showed how pervasive systems theory and its associated abstractions had become. Leadership was thus further stripped of its normative concerns and the study of leadership became the study and classification of how leaders behave, divorced from the ethical concerns of what they ought to do (Halpin, 1958: 6).

While the Theory Movement pursued its theoretical abstractions on which a science of administrative and leadership behavior was to be built, educational leaders in the United States were being confronted by the Civil Rights Movement and with the aftermath of Brown versus Board of Education, that is, the landmark legal decision intended to bring to an end the provision of segregated schooling in the United States. The 1964 NSSE Yearbook was published a decade after Brown versus Board of Education; however, there is not a single reference to the impact of Brown versus Board of Education on the field of educational administration and leadership in it. Nor is there a mention of the leadership of education in the Southern states that closed virtually all black schools and sacked 38 000 black teachers and administrators (Hudson and Holmes, 1994; Anderson, 2006). Nor is there the name of a single member of the Theory Movement on the list of social scientists who signed the report prepared by the Black psychologist, Kenneth B. Clark, which was so influential in the Brown versus Board of Education decision.

This disconnection of administrative theory from the world of school leadership was noted as early as 1960 by Andrew Halpin when he observed, with regard to the Theory Movement, that: "There is indeed something missing. The fault is that the scientist's theoretical models of administration are to rational, too tidy, too aseptic. . .we had better examine afresh our current perspectives" (1960: 284). This was a sentiment echoed by Schwab (1964) in his assessment ". . .that the theory movement reflected a false model both for inquiry and training" and that hypothetico-deductive systems were viciously abstract (in Culbertson, 1988: 19).

Despite this disconnection, however, there was an increasing demand for university courses in educational administration – at least in part because of the enormous growth in the numbers and size of secondary schools during the postwar period. This was not simply the case in North America, but also throughout the world. In Britain, courses in educational administration were established at the Institute of Education (London University), Bristol, Birmingham, and Oxford, led by men such as Ray Bolam, Meredydd Hughes, Eric Hoyle, Len Watson, William Taylor, and George Baron; in Australia, they were led by Bill Walker at the University of New England and Bill Bassett and Mac Grassie at the University of Queensland; and in Canada, they were led by Robin Farquhar at OISE and Art Reeves at Alberta.

While there was general agreement in the Commonwealth that the social sciences were a useful source of theory and methodology for educational administration (Walker *et al.*, 1973; Baron and Taylor, 1969; Greenfield, 1968), the traditions of analysis in the Commonwealth were somewhat different from those in the United States. For instance, in Great Britain, the historical traditions and political and religious roles of the headmaster were important influences. Given the role played by the great public schools in England, this is not surprising (Baron, 1970; Bernbaum, 1976). Indeed, in many cases, the fate of not only schools, but also whole communities was dependent upon the success or failure of the headmaster (Bamford, 1957). Even today, Marlborough College, for instance, enrols some 800 pupils and generates some 22 million pounds a year income in a town of less than 8000 inhabitants. Rugby School generates some 18 million pounds a year for the town of the same name.

Historically, the role of the head in such schools (Peters, 1976) provided the foundation for the great man theory of leadership where autonomy, authority, religion, and morals jointly defined an omnipotent role for the headmaster, perhaps best put by Thring of Uppingham: "I am supreme here and will brook no interference" (quoted in Bernbaum, 1976: 34). Issues of religion, class, and politics were brought together in the headship in ways that influenced ideas of educational administration and leadership (Cannon, 1970). Central to this vision was control of the curriculum and its relationship to religion and to class stratification. As Gordon (1974) pointed out, the history of schooling in England was a history of class warfare: "No scheme of education will be accepted as satisfactory by the middle class which does not provide for the entire separation of their children from those of a lower grade, a separation as complete as that which exists between them and the children of the upper classes. . .One of two things only can relieve the pressure felt by the middle class: either

the curriculum of the secondary schools must be raised, or that the Board and Voluntary Schools be reduced to a more elementary standard" (quoted in Gordon, 1974: 292).

The politics of class warfare inevitably, therefore, shaped the study of educational administration in England, as did the policies of successive twentieth century governments directed toward increasing access to both primary and secondary schooling for a greater and greater proportion of the population (Baron, 1969). As Hoyle (1986) pointed out, in such a context, the politics of school management were central to the understanding of educational administration and management. A similar view was taken in Canada (Robinson and Elliott, 1973) and in Australia (Partridge, 1968). In New Zealand, such a perspective had been long established (Webb, 1937; Parkyn, 1954) and influential (Currie, 1962).

It was hardly surprising that, in 1974, when Thom Greenfield delivered his address to the International Intervisitation Program in Bristol, those from the Commonwealth were largely supportive of his view that organizational theory as it stood on the twin supports of behaviorist theory and systems theory was an inadequate and misleading explanation of schools as organizations (Greenfield, 1975). The furor among those from the United States was, however, quite patent. The very foundations of the Theory Movement were under attack and were to be defended in strident terms.

The ensuing decade can be seen both as an attempt to shore up the remnants of the Theory Movement through texts such as Hoy and Miskel (1978) and Silver (1983), which continued to separate education from administration and pursue a science of the latter, and as setting the groundwork for exploration of alternative theoretical approaches as a basis for the teaching of educational administration as well as an attempt to redress the feeling among educational administrators (especially in the United States) that contemporary courses were ". . .too abstract and remote from real administrative conditions" (Glatter, 1970: 66).

That Glatter's observation was justified was confirmed by the publication, in 1988, of the *Handbook of Research on Educational Administration* (Boyan, 1988) which displayed both an obsession with abstract theorizing and an astonishing parochialism which ignored the increasing volume of work being produced in the Commonwealth. As Bill Walker observed, despite UCEA support for the establishment of the British, Australian, Canadian, and New Zealand educational administration societies and their umbrella organization the Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration and its outreach to Africa, the Caribbean, and Cyprus, and the outpouring of research and writing that ensued, the Americans continued to pursue scholarship in educational administration that was characterized by "narcissism and the tyranny of isolation" (Walker, 1984; in Boyan, 1988: 12).

During the 1980s, a variety of new perspectives made an appearance. Sergiovanni did his best to encourage a cultural approach to educational organizations (Sergiovanni and Corbally, 1984). Greenfield further developed his subjectivist perspective (Greenfield and Ribbins, 1993; Macmillan, 2003). Foster (1987) articulated an approach based on the critical theory which was followed up by Smyth and his colleagues (Smyth, 1989). Bates (1980, 1983, 1987) developed an approach based on the new sociology of education and called for the redress of the separation of educational and administrative ideas along with calling for educational administration to be informed by ideas of social justice. Gronn (1986) was advocating the application of micropolitical theory and psychosocial perspectives to the management of schools. Leithwood (1982)was linking educational leadership to curriculum decision making. Fullan (1982) was linking leadership to educational change. Stephen Jacobsen and his colleagues were arguing for educational leadership to be seen within the context of educational reform (Jacobsen and Conway, 1990).

There was, in fact, an outpouring of ideas and, by the early 1990s, a wholly new postpositivist perspective was being developed in the United States by Donmoyer, Scheurich, and their colleagues, a perspective which sought to build a new approach to theory, construct a quite different knowledge base for educational administration, and include previously excluded voices – particularly those concerned with gender and race (Donmoyer *et al.*, 1995).

The 1990s saw a further broadening of perspective, including considerable work around the local management of schools as a practical response to concerns in educational management (Caldwell and Spinks, 1992; Wallace, 1992) as well as a renewed attempt to reassert the centrality of educational issues as a central focus for educational leadership (Duignan and Macpherson, 1992). Crump (1993) and his associates placed school-centered leadership within the context of turbulent social and political change in both national and international contexts. Hodgkinson (1991) further developed his ideas of educational leadership as a moral art. Ribbins and Marland (1994) renewed biography as a means of understanding leadership. Starratt (1990) applied dramaturgical analysis to leadership. Evers and Lakomski (1995) advocated a coherentist approach to theory. Blackmore, Kenway, and Hall articulated a feminist perspective on educational leadership (Blackmore, 1999; Blackmore and Kenway, 1993; Hall, 1996). Begley and his colleagues articulated a values base for educational administration (Begley and Leonard, 1999). Grace (1995) presented a policy scholarship approach to school leadership. Gronn (1999) presented an analysis of educational leadership located in the demands of the new world order. Sergiovanni (1999) once again rethought about educational leadership and the school as a covenantal community.

Schmuck and Runkel (1995) consolidated an organizational development approach to schools, one earlier pioneered in Australia by Mulford and his associates (Mulford and Kendall, 1975; Mulford *et al.*, 1977; Mulford, 1978).

What is noticeable about this diversity of approaches is the shift of emphasis from administration to management and from management to leadership. Historically, the roots of the field began in administration, moved through management, and now focus on leadership. This transition is exemplified by the changed titles of the British Educational Administration Society and its journals: *Educational Administration* in the 1970s; *Educational Management and Administration* in the 1980s and 1990s, and *Educational Management, Administration and Leadership* now, in the 2000s. The shift of focus has been significant as currently, leadership has become the dominant theme.

While, for instance, Tomlinson's (2004) encyclopedic collection of papers is called *Educational Management*, its categorization of those papers is shaped by four key ideas: educational values, theory, leadership, and change. In this, its organization is markedly different, for instance, from Boyan's *Handbook of Research on Educational Administration* of 1988. While Tomlinson's collection is retrospective, other collections such as those edited by Davies and West-Burnham (2003) and English (2005) herald the entry of significant new voices in the field and a diversity of themes that is markedly different from past decades. Perhaps stimulated by the kind of concerns elaborated by Murphy (2002, 2006), there is a significant concern with the transformation of the context of education; the impact of globalization and the demands of the new economy; the social purposes of schools and the impact of the market economy; the management of learning; school improvement and change; the role of leadership in professional development; the impact of technology; and the micropolitics of school leadership. Other collections, such as Brent-Davies (2005), display the variety of approaches to leadership (strategic, transformational, invitational, ethical, learning centered, constructivist, poetical, emotional, entrepreneurial, distributed, and sustainable), now part of the discourse in the field. New texts such as Starratt (2003) display a focus on meaning, community, and responsibility, absent from earlier work. Marshall (2004), Larson and Murtadha (2002), and Bates (2006) relate educational leadership to social justice. Lingard *et al.* (2003) place a renewed emphasis on leadership and learning as do Mulford and his colleagues (Mulford *et al.*, 2004; Mulford, 2005). Starratt (2004) and Samier (2003) examine anew the ethical foundations of leadership. Gunter (2001, 2005) explores the responsibilities of leading teachers within a Bourdieuian framework. Gronn (2003) examines the idea of designer leadership and the new (greedy) work of teachers. Samier and Bates (2006) renew interest in the role of esthetics in leadership. Walker and Dimmock (2002) espouse a cross-cultural perspective. Bottery (2004) places educational leadership within the context of the global crisis. Beare (2000) argues for leadership to be concerned with the future of the school as an institution. Ribbins (2006) and his colleagues revisit the place of history in the study of educational leadership.

In all this recent writing, there are several connections of great importance. First, the importance of leadership in the promotion of learning is being reestablished; second, such leadership is increasingly connected with the social, economic, and political changes and demands of societies that are becoming both localized and globalized; third, leadership is seen to be no longer focused on a single person, but distributed throughout educational institutions as a shared responsibility; and fourth, and perhaps most importantly, the mechanics of school organization and administration can no longer be seen to be something comparatively external and indifferent to educational ideals. Dewey would have approved. A 100 years of effort in the study and practice of educational leadership has not been a wasted one after all.

Bibliography

Anderson, J. D. (2006). A tale of two Browns: Constitutional equality and unequal education. In Ball, A. F. (ed.) *With More Deliberate Speed. 105th Yearbook of the NSSE*, pp 14–35. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Bamford, T. W. (1957). The public school town in the nineteenth century. *British Journal of Educational Studies* **6**, 25–36.

Baron, G. (1969). The study of educational administration in England. In Baron, G. and Taylor, W. (eds.) *Educational Administration and the Social Sciences*, pp 3–17. London: Athlone.

Baron, G. (1970). Some aspects of the headmaster tradition. In Musgrave, P. W. (ed.) *Sociology, History and Education*, pp 183–192. London: Methuen.

Baron, G. and Taylor, W. (eds.) (1969). *Educational Administration and the Social Sciences.* London: Athlone.

Bates, R. (1980). Educational administration, the sociology of science and the management of knowledge. *Educational Administration Quarterly* **16**, 1–20.

Bates, R. (1983). *Educational Administration and the Management of Knowledge*. Geelong, VIC: Deakin University Press.

Bates, R. (1987). Corporate culture, schooling and educational administration. *Educational Administration Quarterly* **23**, 79–115.

Bates, R. (2006). Educational administration and social justice. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice* **1**, 141–156.

Beare, H. (2000). *Creating the Future School*. London: Routledge Falmer.

Begley, P. and Leonard, P. (1999). *The Values of Educational Administration*. London: Falmer.

Bernbaum, G. (1976). The role of the head. In Peters, R. S. (ed.) *The Role of the Head*, pp 9–36. London: Routledge Kegan Paul.

Blackmore, J. (1999). *Troubling Women: Feminism, Leadership and Educational Change*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Blackmore, J. and Kenway, J. (eds.) (1994). *Gender Matters in Educational Administration and Policy.* London: Falmer.

Bottery, M. (2004). *The Challenges of Educational Leadership*. London: Paul Chapman.

Boyan, N. J. (ed.) (1988). *Handbook of Research on Educational Administration.* New York: Longman.

Caldwell, B. and Spinks, J. (1992). *Leading the Self-managing School*. London: Falmer.

Callaghan, R. (1962). *Education and the Cult of Efficiency*. Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press.

Cannon, C. (1964). The influence of religion on educational policy, 1902–1944. *British Journal of Educational Studies* **12**, 143–160.

Covello, L. (1936). A high school and its immigrant community. *Journal of Educational Sociology* **9**, 331–346.

Covello, L. (1958). *The Heart is the Teacher*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Crump, S. (1993). *School Centred Leadership*. Melbourne, VIC: Nelson.

Culbertson, J. A. (1988). A century's quest for a knowledge base. In Boyan, N. J. (ed.) *Handbook of Research on Educational Administration*, pp 3–26. New York: Longman.

Currie, G. (1962). *The Report of the Commission on Education in New Zealand (The Currie Report)*. Wellington: Government Printer.

Davies, B. (ed.) (2005). *The Essentials of School Leadership.* London: Paul Chapman.

Davies, B. and West-Burnham, J. (eds.) (2003). *Handbook of Educational Leadership and Management.* London: Pearson–Longman.

Dewey, J. (1902). *The Educational Situation*. Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Education and Democracy*. New York: Macmillan.

Donmoyer, R., Imber, M., and Scheurich, J. (eds.) (1995). *The Knowledge Base in Educational Administration.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Duignan, P. and Macpherson, R. (1992). *Educative Leadership*. London: Falmer.

Edwards, R. (1979). *Contested Terrain: The Transformation of the Workplace in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Harper.

English, F. (ed.) (2005). *The SAGE Handbook of Educational Leadership: Advances in Theory, Research and Practice.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Evers, C. and Lakomski, G. (1995). Towards coherence in administrative theory. In Evers, C. and Chapman, J. (eds.) *Educational Administration: An Australian Perspective*, pp 97–110. Sydney, NSW: Allen and Unwin.

Foster, W. (1987). *Paradigms and Promises: New Approaches to Educational Administration*. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books.

Fullan, M. (1982). *The Meaning of Educational Change*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Getzels, J. W. (1952). A psycho-sociological framework for the study of educational administration. *Harvard Educational Review* **22**, 235–246.

Glatter, R. (1970). *Management Development for the Education Profession*. London: London University Institute of Education.

Gordon, P. (1974). *The Victorian School Manager*. London: Woburn.

Grace, G. (1995). *School Leadership: Beyond Educational Management*. London: Falmer.

Greenfield, T. B. (1968). *Systems Analysis for Educational Management*. Toronto, ON: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Greenfield, T. B. (1975). Theory about organization: A new perspective and its implications for schools. In Greenfield, T. and Ribbins, P. (eds.) *Greenfield on Educational Administration*, pp 1–25. London: Routledge.

Gronn, P. (1986). Politics, power and the management of schools. In Hoyle, E. and McMahon, A. (eds.) *The Management of Schools: World Yearbook of Education,* London: Kogan Page.

Gronn, P. (1999). *The Making of Educational Leaders*. London: Cassell.

Gronn, P. (2003). *The New Work of Educational Leaders*. London: Paul Chapman.

Gunter, H. (2001). *Leaders and Leadership in Education*. London: Paul Chapman.

Gunter, H. (2005). *Leading Teachers*. London: Continuum.

Hall, V. (1996). *Dancing on the Ceiling: A Study of Women Managers in Education*. London: Paul Chapman.

Halpin, A. W. (ed.) (1958). *Administrative Theory in Education.* Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press.

Halpin, A. W. (1960). Ways of knowing. In Cambell, R. F. and Lipham, J. M. (eds.) *Administrative Theory as a Guide to Action.* Chicago, IL: Mid-west Center University of Chicago.

Hodgkinson, C. (1991). *Educational Leadership: The Moral Art*. Albany, NY: SUNY.

Hoy, W. and Miskel, C. (1978). *Educational Administration: Theory, Research and Practice*. New York: Random House.

Hoyle, E. (1986). *The Politics of School Management*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Hudson, M. J. and Holmes, B. J. (1994). Missing teachers, impaired communities: The unanticipated consequences of 'Brown vs Board of Education' on the Afro-American teaching force at pre-collegiate level. *Journal of Negro Education* **63**, 388–393.

Jacobsen, S. L. and Conway, J. A. (eds.) (1990). *Educational Leadership in an Age of Reform.* New York: Longman.

Larson, C. and Murtadha, K. (2002). Leadership for social justice. In Murphy, J. (ed.) *The Educational Leadership Challenge: Redefining Leadership for the 21st Century*, pp 134–161. Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press.

Leithwood, K. (1982). *Studies in Curriculum Decision-making*. Toronto, ON: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Lingard, R., Hayes, D., Mills, M., and Christie, P. (2003). *Leading Learning*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Macmillan, R. B. (ed.) (2003). *Questioning Leadership: The Greenfield Legacy.* London: Althouse.

Marshall, C. (ed.) (2004). *Educational Administration Quarterly* **40**(1).

Moore, H. A. (1964). The ferment in school administration. In Griffiths, D. E. (ed.) *Behavioural Science and Educational Administration: NSSE Yearbook*, pp 11–32. Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press.

Mulford, B. (1978). Organisational development in schools: An octet of dilemmas. *Educational Change and Development* **1**(2), 13–25.

Mulford, B. (2005). Quality evidence about leadership for organisational and student learning in schools. *School Leadership and Management* **25**, 321–330.

Mulford, B., Conabere, T., and Keller, J. (1977). Organisational development in schools: Early data from the Australian experience. *Journal of Educational Administration* **15**(2), 210–237.

Mulford, B. and Kendall, L. (1975). *Organisational Development for Australian Schools*. Canberra, ACT: ACEA Bulletin 3.

Mulford, B., Silins, H., and Leithwood, K. (2004). *Leadership for Organisational Learning and Student Outcomes: A Problem-based Learning Approach*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Murphy, J. (ed.) (2002). *The Educational Leadership Challenge: NSSE Yearbook.* Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press.

Murphy, J. (2006). *Preparing School Leaders*. Toronto, ON: Rowman and Littlefield.

Parkyn, G. W. (ed.) (1954). *The Administration of Education in New Zealand.* Wellington: New Zealand Institute of Public Administration.

Partridge, P. H. (1968). *Society, Schools and Progress in Australia*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Peebles, R. (1978). *Leonard Covello: A Study of an Immigrant's Contribution to New York City*. New York: Arno Press.

Peters, R. S. (ed.) (1976). *The Role of the Head.* London: Routledge Kegan Paul.

Ribbins, P. (2006). Administration and leadership in education: A case for history? *Special Issue. Journal of Educational Administration and History* **38**(2).

Ribbins, P. and Marland, M. (1994). *Headship Matters: Conversations with Seven Secondary School Headteachers*. London: Longman.

Robinson, N. and Elliott, J. (eds.) (1973). *The Politics of Education: Current Issues.* Burnaby, BC: Simon Fraser University.

Samier, E. (ed.) (2003). *Ethical Foundations for Educational Administration.* London: Routledge.

Samier, E. and Bates, R. (eds.) (2006). *Aesthetic Dimensions of Educational Administration and Leadership.* London: Routledge.

Schmuck, R. and Runkel, P. (1995). *The Handbook of Organization Development in Schools and Colleges*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Schwab, J. (1964). Theory-art-practice. In Willower, D. and Culbertson, J. (eds.) *The Professorship in Educational Administration*, pp 47–70. Columbus, OH: University Council for Educational Administration.

Sergiovanni, T. (1999). *Rethinking Leadership*. Arlington Heights, IL: Skylight Professional Development.
Sergiovanni, T. and Corbally, J. (eds.) (1984). *Leadership and Organizational Culture: New Perspectives on Administrative Theory and Practice.* Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
Silver, P. (1983). *Educational Administration: Theoretical Perspectives on Practice and Research*. New York: Harper and Row.
Smyth, J. (ed.) (1989). *Critical Perspectives on Educational Leadership.* London: Falmer.
Starratt, R. J. (1990). *The Drama of Schooling*. New York: Falmer.
Starratt, R. J. (2003). *Centering Educational Administration*. London: Erlbaum.
Starratt, R. J. (2004). *Ethical Leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
Taylor, F. W. (1911). *The Principles of Scientific Management*. New York: Harper.
Tomlinson, H. (ed.) (2004). *Educational Management* (4 vols). London: Routledge.
Tyack, D. and Hansot, E. (1982). *Managers of Virtue: Public School Leadership in America, 1820–1980*. New York: Basic Books.
Wallace, G. (ed.) (1992). *Local Management of Schools.* Adelaide, SA: Multilingual Matters.
Walker, A. and Dimmock, C. (eds.) (2002). *School Leadership and Administration: Adopting a Cultural Perspective.* London: Routledge Falmer.
Walker, W. G., Crane, A. R., and Ross-Thomas, A. (eds.) (1973). *Explorations in Educational Administration.* St Lucia, QLD: University of Queensland Press.
Webb, L. (1937). *The Control of Education in New Zealand*. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
Wilson, W. (1887). *The study of administration*. *Political Science Quarterly* **2**, 197–222.
Young, E. F. (1916). Democracy and education. *Journal of Education* **84**, 5–6.

Further Reading

Culbertson, J. A. (1983). Theory in educational administration: Echoes from critical thinkers. *Educational Researcher* **34**, 15–22.
Hoyle, E. and McMahon, A. (1986). *The Management of Schools*. London: Kogan Page.