Doctoral Programs in Educational Leadership: A Duality Framework of Commonality and Differences

Perry A. Zirkel
Lehigh University

Recommended Citation

Doctoral Programs in Educational Leadership: A Duality Framework of Commonality and Differences

Perry A. Zirkel

Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes reportedly characterized President Franklin Delano Roosevelt as having "a second-class intellect but a first-class temperament" (Ward 1989). The present state of, and the proposals to date for, doctoral programs in educational leadership do not sufficiently reflect this implicit recognition of a common core of competencies and this explicit differentiation for what Sergiovanni (1986, 17) and other leadership scholars (e.g., Sternberg and Wagner 1986) have termed "practical intelligence."

In recent years, doctoral programs in education leadership have been subject to notable criticism and proposals for reform. Starting with a synthesis of this criticism, this article focuses on the two primary constituencies—university faculty members who teach in such programs and school superintendents, who are the

Perry A. Zirkel is University Professor of Education and Law at Lehigh University, where he formerly served as Dean of the College of Education and more recently held the Iacocca Chair in Education for its five-year term. He has a Ph.D. in Educational Administration and a J.D. from the University of Connecticut, and a Master of Laws degree from Yale University. He has written more than 1,300 publications on various aspects of school law, with an emphasis on legal issues in special education. He writes a regular column for "Principal" magazine and did so previously for "Phi Delta Kappan" and "Teaching Exceptional Children." Past president of the Education Law Association and cochair of the Pennsylvania special education appeals panel from 1990 to 2007, he is the author of the CEC monograph "The Legal Meaning of Specific Learning Disability"; the recently published books, "A Digest of Supreme Court Decisions Affecting Education" and "Student Teaching and the Law"; and the two-volume reference "Section 504, the ADA and the Schools," now in its third edition. He recently received the Research into Practice Award from the American Educational Research Association (AERA) and the Excellence in Research Award from AERA's Division A (Administration, Organization, and Leadership).

leading practitioners such programs serve. Literature concerning other constituencies, e.g., school principals and certification programs in educational leadership, are included to a limited degree to help inform or sharpen this focus. The thematic lens for the foundational literature review is to determine the extent that education leadership faculty and school superintendents share a community of interest and, conversely, the scope of the remaining divide between these two groups in terms of shaping the appropriate approach at the doctoral level. The culminating vision is for doctoral study in education leadership that reflects both this commonality and differentiation.

More specifically, this article consists of three parts. The first part reviews the literature that contains the criticism, along with proposals and responses for reform. The second part canvasses the competencies jointly developed and separately assessed by faculty and school superintendents. The third part examines other relevant evidence as to the extent of common vs. divided interests between these two constituencies. The purpose is to provide a foundational framework for re-examining doctoral programs in educational leadership. As with other analyses (e.g., Murphy 1991), the focus on the pinnacles of the doctorate and the superintendent may incidentally but not necessarily result in more general lessons for practitioners and the professoriate in educational leadership.

Criticism

The recent criticism, centering on the national movement for school reform and blanketing schools of education generally, has extended to education leadership programs in particular. For example, despite extensive redesign efforts in educational leadership programs dating back more than a decade, the U.S. Department of Education (2005) has criticized these programs as lacking programmatic vision and coherence. At the same time, Levine's (2005, 23) well-publicized study of educational leadership programs characterized their trajectory during the most recent decades as "a race to the bottom," with the weaknesses including low admissions standards, inadequate clinical components, and "curricula ... disconnected from the needs of leaders and their schools." For example, he reported 2004 data from the Educational Testing Service showing that the mean Graduate Record Exam scores in education leadership were the second lowest for 16 reported fields, including elementary and secondary education. Echoing previous recommendations within the profession itself, specifically the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration in 1987 and the National Policy Board for Educational Administration in 1989 (McCarthy 1999), Levine called for drastic elimination of the many programs in educational leadership.

Most recently, the current head of the U.S. Department of Education, Arne Duncan, who came directly to this position from a school district superintendency, criticized schools of education for lack of rigor (Duncan 2009). Although his particular focus was teacher preparation, his criticism of schools of education was generic. Similarly, using the M.B.A. reform movement as the analogy, Maranto, Ritter, and Levine (2010, 25) criticized schools of education for "lack of sufficient academic rigor and applied acuity," recommending reorganization "around highly rigorous academic disciplines with well-established academic quality, and which seem likely to offer the skills and content teachers and administrators need."

The criticism specific to the doctoral level, like that of educational leadership preparations programs generally, is nothing new (McCarthy 2002). For example, Brown (1990) traced concerns about the quantity and quality of Ph.D. and Ed.D. programs in education back to the 1930s and 1940s. Focusing on prestigious universities, Clifford and Guthrie (1988) tracked back the lack of distinction of, and distinctiveness between, such programs even earlier.

Research supported such criticism. For example, Osguthorpe and Wong (1993) found—consistent with a string of earlier studies for education generally (Anderson 1983; Deering and Whitworth 1982; Dill and Morrison 1985; Moore, Russel, and Ferguson 1960; Robertson and Sistler 1971; Schneider et al. 1984) and educational leadership specifically (Davis and Spuck 1978; Norton 1992; Norton and Levan 1987)—that Ed.D. and Ph.D. programs in education were remarkably similar, including their research and statistics requirements. As a framework for the resulting proposals, Osguthorpe and Wong (1993, 60) outlined the following four basic options for schools of education:

(a) continue to offer both the Ed.D. and Ph.D. in their current undifferentiated state ...; (b) continue to offer both degrees, but differentiate between program requirements for each; (c) offer only one degree and define more clearly the expectations for the degree, specifically the role of the dissertation; or, (d) offer a degree with a title other than Ed.D. or Ph.D.

They characterized the first option as dangerous.

The Critics' Proposals

Predating the recent wave of criticism, the National Policy Board in Educational Administration (NPBEA 1989) advocated the second option, recommending that the preparation of educational leaders be limited to the doctoral level altogether. At about the same time, Courtenay (1988, 18) argued for the third option, more specifically suggesting "the various fields of education use the Ph.D. only, but with two tracks, one for scholars of practice and one for scholarly practitioners." Instead, Goodlad (1990) proposed the fourth option in the form of a Doctor of Pedagogy (D. Paed.) as the only terminal degree in education. Similarly, the education leadership faculty at Texas A&M University not only proposed but also implemented a Professional Studies Doctorate (PSD), including a cohort of mid-level school administrators, local superintendents as clinical professors, and a formal field component for reflective practice, as an alternative to the Ph.D. or Ed.D. (Bratlien et al. 1992). The more recent proposals have varied considerably.

Initially advocating the second option, Shulman (2004), the then president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, recommended differentiation between the Ed.D. for practitioners and the Ph.D. for scholars. Subsequently, the Carnegie Foundation and the Council of Academic Deans from Research Education Institutions launched an initiative among 21 universities nationwide to "reclaim" the Ed.D. by distinguishing it from the Ph.D. as specifically oriented to preparing practitioners rather than professors, including applied rather than academic research (Redden 2007).

In the meanwhile, however, Shulman and his Carnegie colleagues proffered their prescription for reclaiming and distinguishing the education doctorate under the rubric of the fourth option. More specifically, based on a Carnegie study of doctoral programs in six disciplines, Shulman and his colleagues characterized the problems of the education doctorate as "chronic and crippling" (Shulman et al. 2006, 25, 27) and proposed—instead of designing the prevailing Ed.D. by subtraction as a "Ph.D.-Lite"—development, on a "zero-base" approach, of a separate new Professional Practice Doctorate (P.P.D.) akin to the differentiation between the M.D. and the Ph.D. in medical sciences. Like the M.D., the P.P.D. would have a "rigorous" (29) substantive professional assessment but no dissertation requirement at the end. Although acknowledging that the name was not the primary issue and that "[t]here is real danger in taking to extremes the distinction between a professional practice degree and a research degree" (30), Shulman and colleagues did not explore the scope of the overlap.

More generally, Lagemann's (2008) advocacy of a distributed model of educational research provides indirect support for a separable doctoral program in education. She argued that universities should reserve clinical research, more specifically problem-finding and translational research, for schools of education whereas problem-solving research in education should be centered in the disciplines of arts and sciences.

Specifically in educational leadership, Levine (2005) recommended a combination of the third and fourth options—eliminating the Ed.D. degree as being academically inadequate for practitioners and retooling the master's curriculum into a new terminal Master's in Educational Administration (M.E.A.) analogous to the M.B.A. At the same time, he recommended reserving the Ph.D. in educational leadership for the nation's most research-oriented universities and exclusively for academic careers as scholars of school leadership, resulting in reduction to one-quarter of the present expansive doctoral enrollments in educational leadership.

The Reactions and Counterproposals

Assessing the response to this criticism, Levine and Dean (2007) noted major differences among the stakeholders, with the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) being partially supportive and the University Council on Educational Administration (UCEA) providing a negative response. More specifically, the excerpted AASA response, issued jointly with the two national principals' organizations, affirmed the disconnect between the scholarly preparation and practical needs; however, they did not support replacing the Ed.D. with a M.E.A., reasoning as follows: "Changing a label will not solve a problem; changing the rigor the programs will" (67). The UCEA similarly supported Levine's recommendation for rigorous standards but criticized the quality of his research. Moreover, with regard to the Ed.D., the UCEA representatives endorsed distinctively redefining the Ed.D. but along the lines of the Carnegie initiative rather than Levine's proposed reduction to a Master's level professional degree (Young et al. 2005).

The other views within academia have been diverse with regard to the doctoral level. For example, agreeing with Levine's recommendation for elimination of the Ed.D. and specifically targeting "general managers" (e.g., superintendents), Murphy (2006b, 533) acknowledged that "one could imagine a renamed doctoral degree, as suggested by Lee Shulman, that addresses the muddled distinction between the Ph.D. and the Ed.D.," but he concluded that "[c]reating an entirely new master's degree such as the MEL [Master of Educational Leadership] would make the most sense because it would have the cachet of something special."

Agreeing with the indistinctiveness problem but not the programmatic solution, Evans (2007, 555) argued for the opposite of Shulman et al.'s proposal for a P.P.D—namely, a single Ph.D. program in educational leadership based on a "unitary scholar-educator class or set of activities to which people make differential contributions according to time, talents, interest, and abilities." In his view, a separate practitioner's degree, whether the traditional Ed.D. or the proposed M.E.A. or P.P.D., "institutionalized a philosophical and practical separation that would contribute to a flawed conception of both." Counterarguing that the disagreement was largely a matter of semantics, Shulman (2007, 561) responded that the P.P.D. has a broad basis composed of a "wisdom of practice," which is "deeply theoretical," and other sources, such as "values, visions of the possible, … and equity." Thus, while agreeing that the worlds of the scholar and the practitioner overlap, each of them fused the two into their respective program polarities.

Similar to Evans, Bredeson (2006, 21) argued for "integrated Ph.D. programs" in educational leadership, characterized by "flexibility to address individual specialization needs while not sacrificing the substantive dialog between scholar/researchers and educational practitioners that comes in commonly shared seminars and learning activities where there is substantial overlap in professional knowledge." Reaching the same conclusion via advocating the elimination of the Ed.D., Deering (1998, 247) argued: "By offering two terminal degrees that are more similar than different, colleges and departments of education unwittingly cause confusion among students and faculties, undermining the standing of all terminal degrees in education." Using the nursing profession as the analogy, he recommended strengthening the Ed.S. to replace the Ed.D.

In contrast, pointing out the lack of distinction both between and for the Ph.D. and the Ed.D. and reiterating the conclusion of his earlier coauthored book (Clifford and Guthrie 1988), Guthrie (2006) argued for entirely separate tracks with respective rigor for practitioners and researchers. Selecting the health and engineering professions as the appropriate analogy, he argued that a "dual purpose single track program" (24) woefully compromised research preparation and practitioner training. Similarly agreeing with Levine's "mission muddle" criticism, Shepard, as the president of the National Academy of Education, was quoted by *Education Week* as follows: "By blending both programs, you serve neither purpose well" (Viadero 2008, 6). Taking the matter a step further, Young (2006) outlined, as a working model, the potential differentiation between the Ed.D. and Ph.D. in educational leadership. More specifically, she proposed the following differential features for the Ed.D.: the use or portfolios (rather than exams) for comprehensive assessment; a field (rather than teaching/research) internship, which includes program evaluation experience/proficiency (rather than, for example, a professional conference presentation); and applied (in contrast to original) research for the dissertation with at least one practicing professional (in contrast to a faculty scholar from a related discipline or another institution) as a member of the dissertation committee. The proposed coursework differed in both titles and amount for the leadership and research cores, with the Ph.D. having the additions of a specialized concentration and a cognate area. However, she did not address any purposeful commonality in the design or in the specific competencies at the entry and exit levels.

Similarly, the debate concerning the Ed.D. has gone in diverse directions more specifically in terms of the doctoral dissertation. Representing the integrative view with respect to the dissertation, Malen and Prestine (2005, 7) advocated "blurring the distinction between scholars and practitioners, 'producers' and 'consumers' of research, and professional (Ed.D.) and research (Ph.D.) degrees" by retaining yet revitalizing inclusive but rigorous dissertation requirements. Representing a moderate step in the opposite, new direction, Duke and Beck (1999) advocated expansion, not replacement, of the traditional dissertation in education via alternative formats, such as a series of publishable articles, based on precedents in various fields in arts and sciences. As another variation in the differentiated direction, Andrews and Grogan (2005)—using the analogy of other professional doctoral degrees, such as the J.D. and the M.D.—argued for a differentiated Ed.D. dissertation, replacing the traditional arts and science scholarly study with a portfolio that included not only reflection papers but also a capstone action research project. Implementation of these proposals has been uneven. Describing the dissertation as "an artifact of the arts and science model that is conspicuous by its absence in nearly every other professional school (e.g., law schools, college of veterinary medicine)," Murphy and Vriesenga (2005, 33) traced the contours of the rare—i.e., four of 161—Ed.D. programs that appeared to have truly alternative, professionally-anchored dissertations. The key characteristics included a practice, rather than theory, orientation; integrated activities; collaborative grounding; and a client, rather than faculty, focus. However, they admitted that these programs were only "inchoate initiatives" that thus far lacked "evaluation information" (50). Reporting more recent developments in this differentiated direction, Imig (2011), as director of the Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate (CPED), recounted movement toward a capstone project to replace the traditional dissertation among Ed.D. programs. Exemplifying their efforts, the various member institutions of the CPED are considering alternatives to a written product, and, according to Imig (2011, 12), "there is preliminary agreement … that more than one candidate may work on a single capstone." Imig predicted "we will continue to have multiple forms of the capstone or culminating project for the foreseeable future, but through studying these variations, a collective understanding of effective outcomes will emerge."

Explaining that the redesign of a differential Ed.D. will require changes in the organizational structures of and faculty roles in schools of education, Perry (2011) reported that the second phase of the CPED consortium will facilitate this process. More specifically, armed with a $700,000 FIPSE grant for 2010-2013, the focus is to document, evaluate, and disseminate the implementation of these "professional practice doctorates" (Perry 2011, 4). She cautioned, however, that this period is not sufficient to reverse and resolve the "century of confusion" concerning the Ed.D.

Finally and most broadly, various respected sources within the education leadership professoriate have recommended improvements in educational leadership preparation programs generally, ranging, for example, from Bredeson's (1991) call for reflective incorporation of personal experience to more recent emphases on adopting the transformative model of leadership (Brown 2006a, 2006b; Leithwood et al. 2005), focusing this transformation on social justice (Brown 2008; Cambron-McCabe and McCarthy 2005),

or focusing it more narrowly on student achievement (Hale and Moorman 2003).

The Recent Trends

During earlier decades, doctoral degrees in educational leadership proliferated, with the rate of growth higher for the more prestigious Ph.D. than for the Ed.D., as universities reduced or waived the foreign language requirement and the two programs became more similar to each other. For example, Nelson and Coorough (1994) reported that the field of educational administration accounted for 40 Ph.D. dissertations and 221 Ed.D. dissertations in 1960 as compared to 494 Ph.D. dissertations and 802 Ed.D. dissertations in 1990.

Serving in effect as a baseline for the more recent period, Hackmann and Price's (1995) national survey found rather wide variety within a common template for doctoral programs in educational leadership. For example, entry requirements for almost all of the responding 127 institutions (representing a 68% response rate) used grade point average (GPA) as an admissions criterion, but they varied notably in terms of whether the GPA was at the undergraduate and/or graduate level and what the minimum was for either one. Similarly, the number of credit hours varied widely from 28 to 67 for coursework and from zero to 30 for the dissertation. At the exit end, only three institutions reported no comprehensive examination, and three programs reported having the following respective replacements for a dissertation: a field research project, an executive position paper, or a portfolio that includes a synthesis exercise. As for the clinical side, the majority of the programs did not require prior teaching (52%) or administrative experience (73%), but half of the programs reported requiring completion of an administrative internship. However, none of these analyses differentiated Ed.D. from Ph.D. programs.

Since then, as Orr (2006) observed, of the approximately 200 institutions offering doctoral programs in educational leadership, a handful has redesigned the Ed.D. in educational leadership as distinguishably practitioner-oriented compared with the more scholarly Ph.D. Baker, Orr, and Young (2007) determined that the number of doctorates granted in educational leadership increased 31% from 1993 to 2003, with most of the growth attributable to less selective institutions newer to the field that had far more limited graduate resources and yet no more likelihood for innovation. In addition, Orr (2007) also noted a movement at a few institutions away from the traditional dissertation to a project-based study by an individual doctoral student or a team of them.

Other efforts at reform have surfaced as well. For example, Hoyle, English, and Steffy (1998, 181) advocated a "professional studies model" that starts with mapping the various sets of standards, such as those of AASA and ISLLC. However, while parenthetically noting that "[a] review of current standards reveals an eighty to ninety percent overlap between indicators," they did not present the particulars of this review. Moreover, their model is not specific to the doctoral level, much less the distinction between an Ed.D. and a Ph.D. The program that they cite as illustrative of the doctoral version of their model is the Ed.D. program in educational leadership at Duquesne University, which had the reported features of a cohort of practicing administrators, concentrated monthly and summer classes, university-district learning communities, problem-based learning, and portfolios. Separately and without any specified evaluative framework, Hoyle and Torres (2010) recommended

model status for Seton Hall University's executive "fast track" Ed.D. program along with the contrasting University of Wisconsin's Ph.D. program in educational leadership and policy analysis,

Similarly, Everson (2006, 7) promoted the Ed.D. program at St. Louis University as including cohort-based teams of three to four doctoral students who are mid-level school leaders who conduct "field-based or field focused" projects as their culminating activity. She reported positive perceptions among the participants as preliminary evidence of successful progress. In a follow-up article, Everson (2009) reported that the program currently had 242 participants, compared to 28 in the Ph.D. program in educational leadership, and further explained the emphasis on problem-based learning and team-based culminating projects, including individual analysis reports and oral examinations. However, the only additional assessment information was reported enhancement of the evaluation design "to address specific areas of interest to the faculty regarding the practices of program graduates" (97).

A separate, although overlapping, example in the literature is the Ed.D. at Arizona State University. In accordance with the Carnegie recommendation (Golde 2007; Shulman 2005) for developing "signature pedagogies" akin to those in medicine, law, and neuroscience, Olson and Clark (2009) described the invention and refinement of a "leaders-scholar community" approach in the Ed.D. program in educational leadership at Arizona State University. This signature pedagogy includes cohort subgroups of five to seven students assigned to one faculty member as their collective doctoral adviser and "culminating in action research dissertation defenses and degree completion by all student members" (217). Although the effectiveness of such a program is not settled, Olson and Clark (2009, 218) presented the preliminary results of their ongoing qualitative research evaluation in terms of the "testimony" of the participating faculty and students.

Thus, similar to the common characteristics of "promising" principal preparation programs (Jackson and Kelley 2002, 197), these innovative doctoral programs in educational leadership tend to include problem-based learning, cohorts, and collaborative partnerships, and "a clear, well-defined curriculum focus reflecting agreement on the relevant knowledge base" (208). Also similar to the research concerning educational leadership preparation programs more generally, the studies of the combined effect of these best-practice doctoral components is scant. As McCarthy and Forsyth (2009, 117) have pointed out, the prevalent "perception studies" are not sufficient to establish effectiveness. Hoyle and Torres' (2008) interview study of current program faculty and their selected graduates of six top-ranked education leadership doctoral programs serves as an example. Instead of limiting the study to participant perceptions, the ultimate dependent variables would appear to include, for example, superintendent renewal and student achievement. However, as Hoyle's (2007) case study of the first of these two variables showed, the research to date has been largely limited to initial explorations. Similarly, the research to date that uses student achievement as the dependent variable is either based on varying broad conceptions of leadership (e.g., Leithwood, Patten, and Jantzi 2010; Robinson, Lloyd, and Rowe 2008) or an insufficiently clear conception of superintendent effectiveness (e.g., Waters and Marzano 2006). More promising would be a mediated model—akin to Kottkamp's (2010) longitudinal evaluation model

that included, along with mediating variables, doctoral program characteristics, graduates' leadership effectiveness, and student learning.

Overall, in the absence of more objective data and in light of the institutional drift to less selective colleges and universities, the innovations do not seem to have provided a net elevation of the doctoral programs in education leadership. Murphy's (2006a, 490) assessment would appear to be on target: "While a number of programs are better than [Levine] suggests, far too many are inadequate and, with the heightened pressures [among administrators] for high-status credentials and fast-track programs, may be getting worse."

Competencies

The reconfiguration of the terminal degree structure in educational leadership ultimately depends on the "competencies"—used here as a generic rubric for the various content areas of the standards, including knowledge, dispositions and performances—that programs seek to target and nurture. During the past three decades, superintendents and professors have led collaborative groups in developing successive sets of standards for educational leaders. Although other organizations led the parallel development of competency inventories for principals (Jackson and Kelley 2002), the two major sets specific to the focus here are those developed under the rubric of AASA and the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC).

The Development of Standards

In 1982, the AASA, which is the national organization that represents superintendents and other central office school administrators, published *Guidelines for the Preparation of School Administrators*. One of the purposes for the guidelines was to "assist … training institutions in refining … doctoral programs in educational administration" (AASA 1982, 2). The development included the input of education leadership professors (Hoyle 1985; Hoyle 1987). The 1982 guidelines consisted of seven performance goal areas—each with identified competency and related skills, for a total of 43 skills—concerning the learning climate, governmental support, curriculum, instructional management, evaluation/improvement, resource allocation, and research (AASA 1982; Hoyle 1985). Subsequently, the AASA published successive texts based on these standards (Hoyle, English, and Steffy 1985, 1998). Further, in 1993 the AASA published more specialized guidelines specific to the preparation of superintendents, *Professional Standards for the Superintendency*, which were the basis for a textbook that the UCEA Center for the Study of the Superintendency developed in 2005 (Hoyle et al. 2005).

In 1996, the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA), which represents ten major organizations including the AASA and UCEA, developed the ISLLC standards for educational leaders. Designed as a new foundation from both the academic and practice domains and deliberately left as broad, evolving conceptions (Murphy 2005), these six standards, which each have from three to nine more specific functions, concern a shared vision; effective school culture/curriculum; efficient management; school/community relations; ethical conduct; and advocacy/responsiveness (CCSSO 2008). More than 40 states use the ISLLC standards as the platform for their certification programs for educational leaders (Roach, Smith, and Boutin 2010; Toye et al. 2007).

In 2002, the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) adopted the Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) program standards, which are an adapted version of the ISSLC standards that includes a seventh standard for a culminating internship, for its review of educational leadership programs (NPBEA 2002). NCATE's ELCC implemented these standards for accreditation reviews (Jackson and Kelley 2002). Recently, Young (2011, 7) reported, "over half of the 500 programs nationwide have revised their leadership programs to align with ELCC standards and have been reviewed by the ELCC on behalf of NCATE."

At about the same time as NCATE's adoption of ELCC standards, the Educational Testing Service developed the School Leaders Licensure Assessment based on the ISLLC standards (Murphy et al. 2009). As of 2006, despite Anderson's (2001) criticism of this examination from a social justice perspective, approximately 25 states required its use for initial certification (Toye et al. 2007).

In a two-year project starting in 2006, a national panel revised the original, 1996 version to tie each function to "research-based pedagogical practices as well as empirical knowledge" (Young 2008, 1). In 2008, the NPBEA issued the resulting revision, renamed the Educational Leadership Policy Standards (NPBEA 2008). NCATE adopted these standards as the benchmarks for evaluating educational leadership program and licensure exams for aspiring school administrators (Hoyle and Torres 2010). As the latest phase in the updating process, NPBEA (2010) issued draft ELCC standards for building-level leaders, including principals, and district-level leaders, including superintendents. The two sets both consisted of eight standards and subparts, called "elements," that are in parallel but customized to their respective organizational level in both the wording and supporting, updated research and commentary. After a consultation process for review, comment, and revision, the ELCC Standards Revision Steering Committee submitted the final versions to NCATE (Mawhinney and Young 2010).

The Perspectives of the Constituencies

Although the various surveys from the single perspective of professors or superintendents at the state or national level seem to show general endorsement of these overlapping sets of standards, the surveys that measure multiple perspectives reveal that these two constituencies also differ in significant respects in their assessments of the relevance and importance of the standards.

Single perspective. Two successive clusters of educational leadership dissertations provided single constituency perspectives of the 1982 AASA guidelines. First, a cluster of dissertations at Texas A&M University in the mid-1980s assessed the extent of support within separate constituencies for this set of competencies. More specifically, these successive surveys found general endorsement of the AASA list among the representatives of the UCEA and the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration (Edgell 1983); a national sample of school superintendents (McClellan 1985); a random sample of members of the National Association of Secondary School Principals (Fluth 1986); and, more peripherally in terms of constituencies, Texas junior/community college administrators (Voelter 1985).

However, despite the relatively defensible sampling design and response rates of these studies, a final study revealed that the results from the professoriate could be merely politically correct "lip service" to this significant practitioner organization's document.

More specifically, in a national survey of educational leadership department heads conducted by Piper (as cited in Hoyle 1985), 69% endorsed the 1982 AASA guidelines, but 54% opposed NCATE's adopting them for use as criteria in accrediting educational leadership programs.

Second and less relevant here, a cluster of dissertations toward the end of the same decade focused on prioritization of the 1982 AASA goals and skills by national and state samples of superintendents. More specifically, Sclafani's (1987) national sampling—which consisted not only of a representative sample but also a separate sample of superintendents whom peers in their state had nominated as highly effective—and the follow-up state samples of superintendents in Texas (Collier 1987) and Tennessee (Douglas 1990) found various significant differences in priorities within and among these groups of superintendents. However, the instrument in these three dissertations consisted of a revised version of the AASA list; for example, based on pilot testing with small groups of superintendents in three states, school finance became an additional performance goal area for management, and an additional 13 skills replaced five of the original total of 43.

In a follow-up to the Sclafani study, Sass's 1989 dissertation revealed limited significant differences for various demographic variables, including prior superintendency experience, among a national sample of educational leadership professors with regard to their rankings of the AASA goals and skills. On the limitations side, his response rate was 42.5%, and he performed an excessive number of analyses of statistical significance.

A pair of peripherally pertinent studies focused on single perspectives related to the ISLLC standards. First, in a study intended to determine to the extent to which superintendent search announcements reflected the perspective of school boards, Ramirez, Carpenter, and Guzman (2007) found general but not completely consistent alignment between the ISLLC standards and the selection criteria of these announcements. However, the sample was not random, and the authors acknowledged that such criteria result from a broad-based, multiple-constituency process rather than a single board perspective. Second, in a survey of 500 principals who worked in specially designated urban districts in New Jersey, the respondents identified topics that fit within standards two and three, but their response rate was limited to 16% of this relatively restricted population, and the congruence between the responses to their open-ended survey item and these broad categories was unclear (Friedland, Fleres, and Hill 2007).

Multiple perspectives. The corresponding studies that compared the assessments of more than one constituency, however, found not only commonalities but also significant differences. Although the focus here is on superintendents' and professors' perspectives of these successive sets of standards, findings are also included for other constituencies.

Although the Ed.D. dissertation of Sass (1989) collected rankings of AASA standards from educational leadership professors, he cautiously compared his results with those Sclafani had obtained two years earlier for superintendents. Upon doing so, he observed that both groups ranked climate first and research last, but they appeared to differ in terms of some of the other goals and skills.

In another Ed.D. dissertation the same year, which was based on the eight competency domains of California's principal licensure, education leadership professors gave significantly higher ratings than did school principals with regard to the relevance (two of the eight domains) and effectiveness (six of the eight domains) of their preparation programs; however, the limited size and scope of the sample and the unsophisticated statistical analysis left the generalizability of these findings in question (Lem 1989).

Similarly, the conference paper of Gousha and Mannon (1991) reported no significant difference among large-city superintendents, administrator preparation faculty, and state education agency personnel with regard to their perceived importance of eleven of thirteen competencies, but their report had several serious limitations. First, their paper provided only cryptic information about the subjects and instrument of the study. Second, the authors reported using the entire population of these three groups, which did not square with their use of inferential statistics. Third, the superintendent group was limited to large city superintendents, and only eleven members of this group responded to the survey. Fourth, some of the competency items were vague and without elaboration or example, such as "foundational knowledge" and "specific knowledge," and their relationship to the established sets of standards was unclear.

Subsequently, a pair of doctoral dissertations examined multiple constituencies' prioritization of the ISLLC standards. First, in a study of four stakeholder groups in Alabama—teachers, parents, administrators, and professors—administrators differed significantly from professors with regard to the perceived importance of one of the six ISLLC standards; specifically, administrators perceived management as more important than the professors did (Marshall and Spencer 1995). Yet, the limitation of the study to one state, the difference in sampling procedure for the education leadership professors from that for the other three constituencies, and the brief presentation of the data analysis warn against overreliance on the results.

Second and less relevant in the absence of a sample of professors, a study of three stakeholder groups in Missouri— superintendents, principals, and school board presidents— determined that superintendents significantly differed from the principals with regard to the perceived importance of five of the six ISLLC standards, although their ratings did not significantly differ from board presidents (Ray 2003). The response rates, especially the 34% for school board presidents, and the failure to reach the threshold sample size for representativeness for each of these three populations limited the generalizability of the results even for a single state.

In sum, the evolving standards represented most recently by the revised ELCC standards provide a common core developed by both practitioners and professors and largely accepted by both constituencies. Despite limitations in the various research studies to date, their cumulative and rather comprehensive extent suggests a common foundation for parallel but differentiated extensions.

Complementarity

Other sources of evidence of the extent of the commonality of, yet differences between, superintendents and educational leadership faculty include research findings regarding their respective demographics and their interests or values. The rather consistent theme that emerges from these various sources is the substantial overlap, or shared foundation with distinguishable orientation and applications.

Demographics of the Superintendency and the Professoriate

A series of 10-year studies has provided successive snapshots of the characteristics of school superintendents. For example, Bjork, Glass, and Brunner (2005) synthesized the results of the survey for the year 2000 along with that of various other studies of the superintendency, reporting that, despite variation in relation to district size and decade, superintendents continued to perceive management and instructional leadership as key competency areas. They also concluded that, on average, superintendents in the 2000 study had spent more time moving through "the chairs" than those in the 1992 study. According to the accompanying synthesis, superintendents reported general satisfaction with their preparation programs, with the primary perceived weakness being insufficient connections and applications to practice, leading to the recommendation of Bjork, Kowalski, and Browne-Ferrigno's (2005, 87) for more emphasis on "tacit knowledge (practical intelligence)." Various other sources have also concluded that communication is increasingly a core competency for successful superintendents (e.g., Kowalski and Keedy 2005).

The more recent study (Glass and Franceschini 2007) revealed the increased importance of the instructional leader competency area in terms of the school boards' hiring expectations. Other notable findings were that the proportion of females and minorities had increased to 21.7% and 6.2% respectively while white males continued to be the dominant demographic group of superintendents; and the proportion of superintendents with doctorates increased from 46% to 51% in the six years since the previous survey, with the majority being particularly predominant (i.e., more than 75%) in districts with more than 5,000 students. The responding superintendents, like those in the 2000 survey, continued to rate their preparation programs as effective or very effective, although the total percentage for these two categories together was lower for doctoral than master's level programs.

In the findings of the most recent study in this series (Kowalski et al. 2011), respondents expressed a generally high level of job satisfaction, but that only half of them expected to be in a superintendency in the year 2015. Additionally, the proportion of female superintendents had reached 24.1%. Consistent with earlier AASA studies, a substantial majority of the respondents rated their academic preparation as good (53.9 %) or excellent (24.8%). The proportion of respondents who reported having a doctoral degree (45.3%) was identical to that found in the Glass, Bjork, and Brunner (2000) study; yet, the ratings of their former professors as good or excellent was 80% compared to 65.9% in the 2000 study.

For the education leadership professoriate, following an early survey (Campbell and Newell 1973), McCarthy and her colleagues provided a corresponding series of snapshots that reveals both commonality with, and differences from, superintendents. First, for the intervening period of the later 1970s and early 1980s, McCarthy (1999) noted the development of subspecialties in education law, finance, and politics, as evidenced by the growth of specialized organizations for each of these fields. More specifically, from the survey in 1986 (McCarthy et al. 1988) to the one in 1994 (McCarthy and Kuh 1997), significant turnover in the educational leadership professoriate was found, but most of the "new breed" of faculty members were not at the research and doctoral universities (McCarthy and Kuh 1998, 361). Additionally, as McCarthy and Kuh (1998) noted, the 1994 new faculty members were far less

likely than their 1986 counterparts to list research as their primary strength. Similarly, the proportion with significant experience as K-12 administrators had increased from 28% to 45%, but this priority was much less pronounced at research and doctoral universities. As a result, they observed that the most critical need cited by the largest percentage of faculty had evolved from "a more extensive knowledge base" in 1972 to "curricular reform" in 1986 to "more attention to problems of practice" in 1994. Viewing this shift to a "field sensitive" orientation as part of a historical "pendulum-like propensity in responding to criticism" (McCarthy and Kuh 1998, 368), they warned against "an unintended over-correction toward praxis" (469).

The preliminary results from the most recent survey, conducted in 2008, revealed a dramatic overall shift in the proportion of females—45% compared to 2% in 1972—and minorities—17% as compared with 3% in 1972—in the education leadership professoriate, which largely parallels the overall composition of the faculty in higher education nationally (McCarthy and Hackmann 2009). They also reported an increase from 1% to 3% in 1972 to 17% of nontenure-line faculty in educational leadership, presumably not only visiting or part-time lines but also clinical faculty increasingly referred to as "professors of practice." In terms of the faculty's listings of their primary strengths, they found a pendulum-like reverse cycle for research. (See Table.) Thus, only a minority of education leadership faculty self-reported research as a primary strength during this 36-year period, with the initial stronger emphasis in UCEA institutions re-emerging even more strongly in 2008 after a merging movement with non-UCEA member institutions at the half-way point. In contrast, there was a general decline in the faculty-respondents' listing of service/outreach as the primary strength for the faculty in both UCEA and non-UCEA programs, a trend that was even more pronounced among tenure-line faculty. One may speculate that a two-track system similar to that of clinical faculty at law schools may be developing.

Interests and Values in Professional Reading

The overlapping interests and values of superintendents and educational leadership faculty are also evident in terms of their choices of professional periodicals. More specifically, in Zirkel's (2007) comparison of the respective ratings and usage of super-intendents (Mayo and Zirkel, 2002) and educational leadership faculty (Mayo, Zirkel, and Finger 2006), both constituencies highly ranked and regularly read *Educational Leadership* and *Phi Delta Kappan*. Yet, the two groups notably differed in their other choices, with professors choosing refereed journals, such as *Educational Administration Quarterly* and the *American Education Research Journal*, and superintendents selecting practitioner magazines, such as *School*

Table
***Percentage of Faculty Reporting Research
as a Primary Strength***

Institutions	Year		
	1986	*1994*	*2008*
UCEA Member	24%	16%	33%
Non-UCEA Member	11%	15%	11%

Administrator and the *American School Board Journal*. Observing that "[s]uperintendents and their counterparts in academe work in different contexts, but the connections need to be strong and interactive," Zirkel (2007, 589) concluded that "if educational leadership is to become a fully realized and preeminent profession, then *Educational Leadership* or some other journal will ultimately have to become the effective equivalent of the *New England Journal of Medicine*." More recently, Goodyear et al. (2009) found that various scholars in the broad field of education perceived that only two of the eleven core journals—again, *Educational Leadership* and *Phi Delta Kappan*—had a greater effect on policy and practice than on scholarship.

Other Differences beyond the Common Core

More generally, a recent review noted the gap and tension between the perceptions of education leadership faculty and practitioners in terms of the content and delivery of preparation programs (Hackmann et al. 2009). Similarly, Murphy (1999) reported a separation and mutual suspicion between AASA and UCEA that reflected the different values and orientations of their respective constituencies. In a personal account of a professor at a nationally acclaimed school of education, who was the only former superintendent on the faculty, Davis (2007, 570-571) noted "a growing sense of disconnection" between the research and practice that he attributed to the "arrogance of academe," the careless consumerism of practitioners, and the gap in journals and language between these two groups. In an accompanying analysis, Murphy (2007, 582) suggested that "the cottage industry of criticism of administrator preparation" missed the fatal flaw of education leadership programs—the marginalization of practice. Reporting his sense of a "palpable, though quite civilized, presumption of superiority embedded in the culture of university preparation programs" (583), he urged making administrators' practice, rather than overintellectualized theory, the organizing force for such programs.

On a more abstract and indirect level, a set of position papers in the October 2008 issue of the *Educational Researcher* recognized and responded to "the Divide" (Noffke 2008, 430) between practitioner and scholar. In his paper, Labaree (2008, 421) viewed the separation as inevitable based on "the division of educational labor structured by the institutional settings, occupational constrains, daily work demands, and provisional incentives" of these two role realms. At the opposite pole, Bulterman-Bos (2008) called for a unifying approach, based on the medical model, of clinical research, which would require extensive and continuing experience in the world of practice for all research in education. Both sides recognized that the two worlds overlap rather than being mutually exclusive or coterminous. However, their polar positions have two limitations as applied to the focus here. First, each perspective was at the respective extremes of separation or integration without tailoring to the extent of commonality and difference. Second, the worldview that they both identified on the practice side is the role of classroom teacher, which is significantly different from the position of school district superintendent.

The root duality is between "academic knowledge" and "practice knowledge" (Murphy 2002, 184). As an advocate for "reculturing" the educational leadership profession, Murphy suggested alternative metaphors of moral steward (i.e., social justice), educator (i.e., school improvement), and community builder (i.e., democratic community) as providing the synthesizing paradigm. In doing so, he suggested the futility of the traditional metaphor of bridge-building as follows: "Trying to link theory and practice in school administration has been for the past 30 years a little like attempting to start a car with a dead battery. The odds are fairly long that the engine will ever turn over" (Murphy 2002,181). More comprehensively, McCarthy and Forsyth (2009, 88) elaborated the poles as "technical-rational knowledge" and "practice knowledge/artistry" while adding the mediating constructs, such as context and valuation, as a model for analyzing educational leadership preparation. These successive conceptions further reveal the commonality and differences between the professoriate and the superintendency.

Conclusion

At first glance, the current quality standards for preparation of educational leaders (e.g., Young 2011) make sense in terms of the superintendency as the chief educational leader at the local level, but stand in stark contrast to the enduring conception of the Ph.D., as "the monarch of the academic community" and as "the academy's own means of reproduction" (Shulman 2008, x-xi). For example, the common elements of intensive internships and cohort structures are obviously intended for practitioners whereas for professors the missing components are subject specializations and sophisticated research skills.

Yet, a unifying vision provides a way of harmonizing the commonalities and the differences between the practitioners, as led by the superintendents, and the professoriate, as marked by academia's doctoral degree, in education leadership. This three-part review will help inform the design debate and decisions for providing more effective doctoral programs that align more closely with overlapping but differentiating duality of these primary groups of leadership practitioners and scholars.

References

American Association of School Administrators (AASA). 1982. *Guidelines for the Preparation of School Administrators*. Arlington, VA: AASA. ED 229825.

_____. *Professional Standards for the Superintendency*. 1993. Arlington, VA: AASA.

Anderson, Dale G. 1983. "Differentiation of the Ed.D. and Ph.D. in Education." *Journal of Teacher Education* 34 (3): 55-58.

Anderson, Gary L. "Disciplining Leaders: A Critical Discourse Analysis of the ISLLC National Examination and Performance Standards in Educational Administration." 2001. *International Journal of Leadership in Education* 4 (3): 199-216.

Andrews, Richard, and Margaret Grogan. "Form Should Follow Function: Removing the Ed.D. Dissertation from the Ph.D. Straight Jacket." 2005. *UCEA Review* 46 (2): 10-13.

Baker, Bruce D., Margaret Terry Orr, and Michelle D. Young. 2007. "Academic Drift, Institutional Production, and Professional Distribution of Graduate Degrees in Educational Leadership." *Educational Administration Quarterly* 43 (3): 279-318.

Bjork, Lars G., Thomas E. Glass, and C. Cryss Brunner. 2005. "Characteristics of American School Superintendents." In *The Contemporary Superintendent: Preparation, Practice, and Development*, edited by Lars G. Bjork and Theodore J. Kowalski, 19-44. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Bjork, Lars G., Theodore J. Kowalski, and Tricia Browne-Ferrigno. 2005. "Learning Theory and Research." In *The Contemporary Superintendent: Preparation, Practice, and Development*, edited by Lars G. Bjork and Theodore J. Kowalski, 71-106. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Bratlien, Maynard J., Susan M. Genzer, John R. Hoyle, and Arnold D. Oates. 1992. "The Professional Studies Doctorate: Leaders for Learning." *Journal of School Leadership* 2 (1): 75-89.

Bredeson, Paul V. 2006. "Integrated Doctoral Programs in Educational Leadership: The Case for Preparing Practitioners and Researchers Together." *UCEA Review* 45 (2): 20-23.

_____. 1991. "Reappraising Personal Experience in the Preparation of School Administrators." *Journal of School Leadership* 1 (2): 176-189.

Brown, Kathleen M. 2008. *Preparing Future Leaders for Social Justice, Equity, and Excellence: Bridging Theory and Practice Through a Transformative Andragogy*. Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon.

_____. 2006a. "A Transformative Andragogy for Principal Preparation Programs." *UCEA Review* 45 (2): 1-5.

_____. 2006b. "Leadership for Social Justice and Equity: Evaluating a Transformative Framework and Andragogy." *Educational Administration Quarterly* 42 (5): 700-745.

Brown, Laurence D. *A Perspective on the Ph.D.-Ed.D. Discussion in Schools of Education*. 1990. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, April. ED 320882.

Bulterman-Bos, Jacquelien A. 2008. "Will a Clinical Approach Make Education Research More Relevant for Practice?" *Educational Researcher* 37 (7): 412-420.

Cambron-McCabe, Nelda, and Martha McCarthy. 2005. "Educating School Leaders for Social Justice." *Educational Policy* 19 (1): 201-222.

Campbell, Roald F., and L. Jackson Newell. 1973. "A Study of Professors of Educational Administration." *Educational Administration Quarterly* 9 (3): 3-27.

Clifford, Geraldine J., and James W. Guthrie. 1988. *Ed School*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Collier, Virginia Sue Lester. 1987. "Identification of Skills Perceived by Texas Superintendents as Necessary for Successful Job Performance." PhD diss., University of Texas at Austin. ProQuest (AAT 8717390).

CCSSO (Council of Chief State School Officers). *Educational Leadership Policy Standards: ISLLC 2008*. 2008. As Adopted by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration. Washington DC. http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/2008/Educational_Leadership_Policy_Standards_2008.pdf.

Courtenay, Bradley C. 1998. "Eliminating the Confusion over the Ed.D. and Ph.D. in Colleges and Schools of Education." *Innovative Higher Education* 13 (1): 11-20.

Davis, Stephen H. 2007. "Bridging the Gap Between Research and Practice: What's Good, What's Bad, and How Can One Be Sure?" *Phi Delta Kappa* 88 (8): 569-578.

Davis, W. Jeremy, and Dennis W. Spuck. 1978. "A Comparative Analysis of Masters, Certification, Specialist and Doctoral Programs." In *Preparatory Programs for Educational Administrators in the United States*, edited by Paula F. Silver and Dennis W. Spuck, 151-177. Columbus, OH: UCEA.

Deering, Thomas E. 1998. "Eliminating the Doctor of Education Degree: It's the Right Thing to Do." *Educational Forum* 62 (3): 243-248.

Deering, Thomas E., and Jerry Whitworth. 1982. "The Doctoral Degree in Education: The Ed.D. versus the Ph.D." *Eastern Education Journal* 15 (2): 21-24.

Dill, David D., and James L. Morrison. 1985. "Ed.D. and Ph.D. Research Training in the Field of Education: A Survey and a Proposal." *Review of Higher Education* 8 (2): 169-182.

Douglas, Betty Jo. 1990. "Skills Perceived by Tennessee Superintendents as Necessary for Successful Job Performance." EdD diss., Memphis State University. ProQuest. (AAT 9102954).

Duke, Nell K., and Sarah W. Beck. 1999. "Education Should Consider Alternative Formats for the Dissertation." *Educational Researcher* 28 (3): 31-36.

Duncan, Arne. 2009. "Teacher Preparation: Reforming the Uncertain Profession." Remarks of [U.S. Department of Education] Secretary Arne Duncan at Teachers College, Columbia University." New York, October 22. http://www.ed.gov/news/speeches/teacher-preparation-reforming-uncertain-profession.

Edgell, Wallace Alan. 1983. "Educational Administration Professors' Perceptions of the Importance of the Competencies and Related Skills in the 'Guidelines for the Preparation of School Administrators.'" PhD diss., Texas A&M University. ProQuest (AAT 8408426).

Evans, Rodney. 2007. "Comments on Shulman, Golde, Bueschel, and Garabedian: Existing Practice is Not the Template." *Educational Researcher* 36 (9): 553-559.

Everson, Susan T. 2006. "The Role of Partnerships in the Professional Doctorate in Education: A Program Application in Educational Leadership." *Educational Considerations* 33 (2): 5-9.

_____. 2009. "A Professional Doctorate in Educational Leadership: Saint Louis University's Ed.D. Program." *Peabody Journal of Education* 84 (1): 86-99.

Fluth, John Adam. 1986. "Senior High School Principals' Perception of the Importance of the Competencies and Related Skills in the 'Guidelines for the Preparation of School Administrators.'" PhD diss., Texas A&M University. ProQuest (AAT 8614952)

Friedland, Helen A., Carol Fleres, and Frederick Hill. 2007. "The Efficacy of School Leadership Programs." In *At the Tipping Point: Navigating the Course for the Preparation of Educational Administrators*. 2007 Yearbook of the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration, edited by Linda K. LeMasters and Rosemary Papa, 319-328. Lancaster, PA: Pro-Active.

Glass, Thomas E., and Louis A. Franceschini. 2007. *The State of the American Superintendency: A Mid-Decade Study*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Golde, Chris M. 2007. "Signature Pedagogies in Doctoral Education." *Educational Researcher* 36 (6): 344-351.

Goodlad, John I. 1990. *Teachers for Our Nation's Schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Goodyear, Rodney K., Dominic J. Brewer, Karen Symms Gallagher, Terence J. G. Tracey, Charles D. Claiborn, James W. Lichtenberg, and Bruce E. Wampold. 2009. "The Intellectual Foundations of Education: Core Journals and Their Impacts on Scholarship and Practice." *Educational Researcher* 38 (9): 700-706.

Gousha, Richard P., and Golam Mannan. 1991. *Analysis of Selected Competencies: Components, Acquisition and Measurement Perceptions of Three Groups of Stakeholders in Education*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration, Fargo, ND, August. ED336850.

Guthrie, James W. 2006. "Multi-Purpose Education Doctorate No Longer Palatable." *UCEA Review* 45 (2): 24-26.

Hackmann, Donald G., Scott C. Bauer, Nelda H. Cambron-McCabe, and David M. Quinn. 2009. "Characteristics, Preparation, and Professional Development of Educational Leadership Faculty." In *Handbook of Research on the Education of School Leaders*, edited by Michelle D. Young, Gary M. Crow, Joseph Murphy, and Rodney T. Ogawa, 225-268. New York: Routledge.

Hackmann, Donald G., and William J. Price. 1995. *Preparing School Leaders for the 21st Century: Results of a National Survey of Educational Leadership Doctoral Programs*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration, New Orleans. February. ERIC, ED 378863.

Hale, Elizabeth L., and Hunter N. Moorman. 2003. *Preparing School Principals: A National Perspective on Policy and Program Innovations*. Washington, DC, and Edwardsville, IL: Institute for Educational Leadership and Illinois Education Research Council.

Hoyle, John R. 2007. "A Preparation Mystery: Why Some Succeed and Others Fail." *Planning and Changing* 38 (3-4): 148-163.

_____. 1987. "The AASA Model for Preparing School Leaders." In *Approaches to Administrative Training in Education*, edited by Joseph Murphy and Philip Hallinger, 83-95. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

_____. 1985. "Programs in Educational Administration and the AASA Preparation Guidelines." *Educational Administration Quarterly* 21 (1): 71-93.

Hoyle, John R., Lars G. Bjork, Virginia Collier, and Thomas Glass. 2005. *The Superintendent as CEO*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin.

Hoyle, John R., Fenwick English, and Betty Steffy. 1998. *Skills for Successful 21st Century School Leaders: Standards for Peak Performance*. Arlington, VA: AASA. ERIC, ED 420911.

_____. 1985. *Skills for Successful School Leaders*. Arlington, VA: AASA. ERIC, ED 264654.

Hoyle, John R., and Mario S. Torres. 2010. *Six Steps to Preparing Exemplary Principals and Superintendents: Leadership Education at Its Best*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

_____. 2008. "Exploring the Link between School Leadership Preparation and Practice." *Planning and Changing* 39 (3/4): 213-239.

Imig, David. 2011. "Dissertations or Capstones: The Conundrum Facing Ed.D. Programs." *UCEA Review* 52 (3): 12-13.

Jackson, Barbara L., and Carolyn Kelley. 2002. "Exceptional and Innovative Programs in Educational Leadership." *Educational Administration Quarterly* 38 (2): 192-212.

Kottkamp, Robert B. 2010. "Introduction: Leadership Preparation in Education." *Educational Administration Quarterly* 47 (1): 3-17.

Kowalski, Theodore J., and John L. Keedy. 2005 "Preparing Superintendents to Be Effective Communicators." In *The Contemporary Superintendent: Preparation, Practice, and Development*, edited by Lars G. Bjork and Theodore J. Kowalski, 207-226. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Kowalski, Theodore J., Robert S. McCord, George J. Petersen, I. Phillip Young, and Noelle M. Ellerson. 2011. *The American School Superintendent: 2010 Decennial Study*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield.

Labaree, David F. 2008. "Comments on Bulterman-Bos: The Dysfunctional Pursuit of Relevance in Education Research." *Educational Researcher* 37 (7): 421-423.

Lagemann, Ellen C. 2008. "Education Research as Distributed Activity across Universities." *Educational Researcher* 37 (7): 424-428.

Leithwood, Kenneth, Karen Seashore Louis, Stephen Anderson, and Kyla Wahlstrom. 2005. *How Leadership Influences Students Learning*. New York: Wallace Foundation.

Leithwood, Kenneth, Sara Patten, and Doris Jantzi. 2010. "Testing a Conception of How School Leadership Influences Student Learning." *Educational Administration Quarterly* 46 (5): 671-706.

Lem, Robert W. 1989. "Perceptions of School Administrators and Professors of Educational Administration Regarding the Relevance and Effectiveness of Administrator Preparation Programs." EdD diss., University of San Francisco. ProQuest (AAT 9023841)

Levine, Arthur. 2005. *Educating School Leaders*. Washington, DC: Education Schools Project.

Levine, Arthur, and Diane R. Dean. 2007. "Deleting the Doctorate (and Other Vestiges of Outmoded Preparation)." *School Administrator* 7 (64): 10-13.

Malen, Betty, and Nona A. Prestine. 2005. "The Case for Revitalizing the Dissertation." *UCEA Review* 44 (2): 7-9.

Maranto, Robert, Gary Ritter, and Arthur E. Levine. 2010. "The Future of Ed. Schools." *Education Week*, January 6. http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2010/01/06/16maranto_ep.h29.html.

Marshall, Mark E., and William A. Spencer. 1999. *Public School Administrator Competencies: A Comparison of the Perceptions of Stakeholders in Alabama*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Boston, November. ERIC, ED 439516.

Mawhinney, Hanne, and Michelle D. Young. 2010. "Anchoring the ELCC Standards to the Existing Research Base in Educational Leadership." *UCEA Review* 51 (3): 9.

Mayo, C. Russell, Perry A. Zirkel, and Brian A. Finger. 2006. "Which Journals Are Education Leadership Professors Choosing?" *Educational Administration Quarterly* 42 (5): 806-811.

Mayo, C. Russell, and Perry A. Zirkel. 2002. "School Superintendents' Choices of Professional Periodicals." *Journal of School Leadership* 12 (4): 397-410.

McCarthy, Martha M. 2002. "Educational Leadership Preparation Programs: A Glance at the Past with an Eye to the Future." *Leadership and Policy in the Schools* 1 (3): 201-221.

_____. 1999. "The Evolution of Educational Leadership Preparation Programs." In *Handbook of Research on Educational Administration*, edited by Joseph Murphy and Karen Seashore Louis, 119-139. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

McCarthy, Martha M., and Patrick B. Forsyth. 2009. "An Historical Review of Research and Development Activities Pertaining to the Preparation of School Leaders." In *Handbook of Research on the Education of School Leaders*, edited by Michelle D. Young, Gary M. Crow, Joseph Murphy and Rodney T. Ogawa, 1-22. New York: Routledge,.

McCarthy, Martha M., and Donald G. Hackmann. 2009. "Demographic Trends in the Educational Leadership Professoriate, 1972-2008." *UCEA Review* 50 (2): 24-26.

McCarthy, Martha M., and George D. Kuh. 1997. Continuity and Change: The Educational Administration Professoriate. Columbia, MO: University Council of Educational Administration.

McCarthy, Martha M., and George D. Kuh. 1998. "A New Breed of Educational Leadership Faculty Members." *Journal of School Leadership*, 8 (4): 360-373.

McCarthy, Martha M., George D. Kuh, Jackson Newell, and Carla M. Iaconi. 1998. *Under Scrutiny: The Educational Administration Professoriate*. Tempe, AZ: University Council of Educational Administration.

McClellan, Michael Joseph. 1984. "A National Study of Public School Superintendents' Perceptions of the Relevancy of the Competencies and Related Skills Outlined in the 'Guidelines for the Preparation of School Administrators.'" PhD diss., Texas A&M University. ProQuest (AAT 8428789)

Moore, Harold Emerson, John H. Russel, and Donald G. Ferguson. 1990. *The Doctorate in Education: An Inquiry into the Conditions Affecting Pursuit of the Doctoral Degree in the Field of Education*, vol. 2. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Murphy, Jerome T. 2006a. "Dancing Lessons for Elephants: Reforming Ed School Leadership Programs." *Phi Delta Kappan* 87 (7): 489-491.

_____. 2006b. "Elephants or Dinosaurs? A Call to Action for Ed Schools." *Phi Delta Kappan* 87 (7): 529-535.

_____. 1991. "Superintendents as Saviors: From the Terminator to Pogo." *Phi Delta Kappan* 73 (7): 507-513.

Murphy, Joseph. 2007. "Questioning the Core of University-Based Programs for Preparing School Leaders." *Phi Delta Kappan* 88 (8): 582-584.

_____. 2005. "Unpacking the Foundations of ISLLC Standards and Addressing Concerns in the Academic Community." *Educational Administration Quarterly* 41 (1): 154-191.

_____. 2002. "Reculturing the Profession of Educational Leadership: New Blueprints." *Educational Administration Quarterly* 38 (2): 176-191.

_____. 1999. "The Reform of the Profession: A Self Portrait." In *Educational Administration: A Decade of Reform*, edited by Joseph Murphy and Patrick B. Forsyth, 39-68. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Murphy, Joseph, and Michael Vriesenga. 2005. "Developing Professionally Anchored Dissertations: Lessons from Innovative Programs." *School Leadership Review* 1 (1): 33-57.

Murphy, Joseph, Michelle D. Young, Gary M. Crow, and Rodney T. Ogawa. 2009. "Introduction: Exploring the Broad Terrain of Leadership Preparation Programs in Education." In *Handbook of Research on the Education of School Leaders*, edited by Michelle D. Young, Gary M. Crow, Joseph Murphy, and Rodney T. Ogawa, 1-22. New York: Routledge.

National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NBPEA). 2010. *Educational Leadership Program Standards: ELCC District-Level Standards*. Charlottesville, VA. http://www.npbea.org/projects.php.

_____. 2008. *National Leadership Standards*. Charlottesville, VA. http://www.npbea.org/projects.php.

_____. 2002. *Standards for Advanced Programs in Educational Leadership*. Charlottesville, VA. http://www.ncate.org/public/programStandards.asp?ch=4#ELCC.

_____. 1989. *Improving the Preparation of School Administrators: An Agenda for Reform*. Charlottesville, VA.

Nelson, Jack K., and Callen Coorough. 1994. "Content Analysis of the PhD Versus Ed.D. Dissertation." *Journal of Experimental Education* 62 (2): 158-168.

Noffke, Susan E. 2008. "Comments on Bulterman-Bos: Research Relevancy or Research for Change?" *Educational Researcher* 37 (7): 429-431.

Norton, M. Scott. 1992. "Doctoral Studies of Students in Educational Administration Programs in Non-Member UCEA Institutions." *Educational Considerations* 20 (1): 37-41.

Norton, M. Scott, and Frederick D. Levan. 1987. "Doctoral Studies of Students in Educational Administration Programs in UCEA Member Institutions." *Educational Considerations* 14 (1): 21-24.

Olson, Kate, and Christopher M. Clark. 2009. "A Signature Pedagogy in Doctoral Education: The Leader-Scholar Community." *Educational Researcher* 38 (3): 216-221.

Orr, Margaret Terry. 2007. "The Doctoral Debate." *School Administrator* 64 (7): 16-19.

_____. 2006. "Mapping Innovation in Leadership Preparation in Our Nation's Schools of Education." *Phi Delta Kappan* 87 (7): 492-500.

Osguthorpe, Russell T., and Mei Jiuan Wong. 1993. "The Ph.D. Versus the Ed.D.: Time for a Decision." *Innovative Higher Education* 18 (1): 47-63.

Perry, Jill Alex. 2011. "The Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate: Phase II—A Quest for Change." *UCEA Review* 52 (3): 1-4.

Ramirez, Al, Dick Carpenter, and Nadyne Guzman. 2007. "Analysis of Superintendent Search Criteria and the Standards for Administration Preparation Programs." In LeMasters and Papa, *At the Tipping Point*, 266-278.

Ray, Huba Ann. 2003. "ISLLC Administrator Competencies: A Comparison of Perceptions among Superintendents, School Board Presidents, and Principals." EdD diss., St. Louis University. ProQuest (AAT 3102922)

Redden, Elizabeth. 2007. "Envisioning a New Ed.D." *Inside Higher Education*, April 10. http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2007/04/10/education.

Roach, Virginia, L. Wes Smith, and James Boutin. 2010. "School Leadership Policy Trends and Developments: Policy Expediency or Policy Excellence." *Educational Administration Quarterly* 47 (1): 71-113.

Robertson, Neville, and Jack K. Sistler. 1971. *The Doctorate in Education*. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.

Robinson, Viviane M. J., Claire A. Lloyd, and Kenneth J. Rowe. 2008. "The Impact of Leadership on Student Outcomes: An Analysis of the Differential Effects of Leadership Types." *Educational Administration Quarterly* 44 (5): 635-674.

Sass, Michael William. 1989. "The AASA Performance Goal and Skill Areas' Importance to Effective Superintendency Performance as Viewed by Professors of Educational Administration and Practicing Superintendents." EdD diss., Northern Illinois University. ProQuest (AAT 9006076)

Schneider, Barbara L., Laurence Brown, Terry Denny, B. Claude Mathis, and William Schmidt. 1984. "The Deans' Perspective on the Status of Doctoral Programs in Schools of Education." *Phi Delta Kappan* 65 (9): 617-620.

Sclafani, Susan B. Krouner. 1987. "AASA Guidelines for the Preparation of School Administrators: Do They Represent the Important Job Behaviors of Superintendents?" PhD diss., the University of Texas at Austin. ProQuest (AAT 8717530)

Sergiovanni, Thomas. 1989. "Mystics, Neats, and Scruffies: Informing Professional Practice in Educational Administration." *Journal of Educational Administration* 27 (2): 7-21.

Shulman, Lee S. 2008. Foreword to *The Formation of Scholars: Rethinking Doctoral Education for the Twenty-First Century,* by George E. Walker, Chris M. Golde, Laura Jones, Andrea Conklin Bueschel, and Pat Hutchings. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

_____. 2007. "Response to Comments: Practical Wisdom in the Service of Professional Practice." *Educational Researcher* 36 (9): 560-563.

_____. 2005. "Signature Pedagogies in the Professions." *Daedalus* 134 (3): 52-59.

_____. 2004. *A New Vision for the Doctorate in Education*. Symposium conducted at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, April.

Shulman, Lee S., Chris M. Golde, Andrea Conklin Bueschel, and Kriten J. Garabedian. 2006. "Reclaiming Education's Doctorates: A Critique and a Proposal." *Educational Researcher* 35 (3): 25-32.

Sternberg, Robert J., and Richard K. Wagner, eds. 1986. *Practical Intelligence: Nature and Origins of Competence in the Everyday World*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Toye, Carla, Rolf Blank, Nancy Sanders, and Andra Williams. 2007. *Key State Education Policies on P-12 Education, 2006: Results of a 50-State Survey*. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.

U.S. Department of Education. 2005. *Innovative Pathways to School Leadership*. Washington, DC.

Viadero, Debra. 2008. "Study Will Size Up Doctoral Programs for Education Researchers." *Education Week*, October 24. http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2008/10/24/10aera.h28.html.

Voelter, Donald Edward. 1985. "Perceptions of Selected Junior/Community College Administrators Regarding the Relevancy of the Competencies and Related Skills of the 'Guidelines for the Preparation of School Administrators.'" PhD diss., Texas A&M University. ProQuest (AAT 8514304)

Ward, Geoffrey C. 1989. *A First-Class Temperament: The Emergence of Franklin Delano Roosevelt*. New York: Harper & Row.

Waters, J. Timothy, and Robert J. Marzano. 2006. "School District Leadership that Works: The Effect of Superintendent Leadership on Student Achievement." Working Paper. Denver, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning, September. https://www.cosa.k12.or.us/downloads/profdev/SuperintendentLeadership.pdf.

Young, Michelle D. 2011. "From the Director: Quality Assurance in Educational Leadership Preparation." *UCEA Review* 52 (2): 6-9.

_____. 2008. "Programs Are Making Progress in Providing Research-Based Preparation that Supports Student Learning." *UCEA Review* 50 (2): 9-10.

_____. 2006. "From the Director: The M.Ed., Ed.D. and Ph.D. in Educational Leadership." *UCEA Review* 45 (2): 6-9.

Young, Michelle D., Gary M. Crow, Margaret Terry Orr, Rodney T. Ogawa, and Ted Creighton. 2005. "An Education Look at 'Education School Leaders.'" *UCEA Review* 47 (2): 1-4.

Zirkel, Perry A. 2007. "The Professoriate, the Practitioners, and 'Their' Periodicals." *Phi Delta Kappan* 88 (8): 586-588.