

SCOTT EACOTT

DISRUPTIONS IN PRODUCTION

Seeding the Practice of Questioning

INTRODUCTION

On a global scale, contemporary public policy formulations have placed education at the center of attention. Armed with research pinpointing schooling as a key policy lever to improve national prosperity, both economic and social, policies driving education reform are now focused on the improvement of schools and schooling in a way never before seen. At the heart of this global phenomenon is the use of education for both individual and collective social and economic advancement. How these notions of advancement and progress are defined varies from nation to nation and over time, but behind most are notions of overall increases in social and economic capacity with some official concern for the socially just distribution of that capacity.

In achieving the justice-oriented goals of this contemporary policy condition, the performance of institutions and their ‘leadership’ have emerged as serious problems in an age of global economic uncertainty and social inequity. This chapter focuses on how these problems are being redefined via policy models and experiments seeking to ‘improve’ educational leadership and leaders through credentializing preparation and development programs such as post-graduate coursework, higher degree research, and professional doctorates, such as the Doctor of Education (Educational Leadership) or Ed.D.. Research relating to educational leadership (management and administration), social justice and the Ed.D., is voluminous, but remains fragmented across a set of competing research traditions defined by theoretical framework, methodological stance and/or political interest. I build my argument on the belief that current mechanisms for achieving social justice through the Ed.D. in educational leadership have yet to actually change the status quo as they have merely relied on credentialing and auditable quantification to influence educational labor rather than taking serious the onto-epistemological preliminaries of knowledge production in the discipline. In particular, I argue these experiments articulate a professionalization of knowledge couched in the ordinary language of the everyday. However, without providing the intellectual resources to think anew the image of schooling and its ‘leadership’, the currently available drivers will continue to fail on their promise as incubators of social justice. Thus, the ambitious goal of this chapter is to break down perceived binaries (e.g. theoretical/practical; individual/collective; structure/agency) and to provide intellectual resources capable of reimaging educational leadership, social

SCOTT EACOTT

justice, and the Ed.D.. As a result, the scholarly significance of the argument is strong, and can provide *a*, not *the*, way of thinking differently and disrupting the production of the status quo.

THEORETICAL RESOURCES

This chapter mobilizes a *relational* approach to the study of educational leadership, management and administration that I am advancing both here and elsewhere (e.g. Eacott, 2015). The intellectual heritage of this *relational* approach is eclectic, drawing heavily on French social theory such as the work of sociologists Pierre Bourdieu and Luc Boltanski, management scholars such as Peter Dachler, Dian Marie Hoskings and Mary Uhl-Bien, also critical management studies, political science, organizational studies, and given my own disciplinary location, recognised educational administration thinkers such as Richard Bates, Colin Evers and Gabriele Lakowski, Thomas Greenfield, and contemporaries such as Helen Gunter, Pat Thomson, Eugenie Samier and Fenwick English. Significantly, in bringing critical pluralism to scholarship, I engage with what I see as the key theoretical problem of the legitimation of the social world and its empirical manifestation in the organizing of education and educational labor. Through this theoretical and empirical focus, a *relational* approach investigates how the production of knowledge of the legitimacy, effectiveness, efficiency, and morality of organizing is embedded and embodied in the practices of organizing. In doing so, questions are raised regarding the extent to which existing ways of thinking are generative or limiting of alternate ways of being. As a means of bringing this *relational* approach into conversation with Ed.D. programs, and in particular the pursuit of social justice, the key features of the *relational* approach are:

- The centrality of ‘organizing’ in the social world creates an ontological complicity in researchers (and others) that makes it difficult to epistemologically break from ordinary language;
- Rigorous social ‘scientific’ inquiry calls for questioning the very foundations on which labels such as social justice, professional doctorate and leadership are legitimized;
- The contemporary capitalist condition is constantly shaping and shaped by, the image of organizational labor;
- Foregrounding social relations enables the overcoming of the contemporary, and arguably enduring, organizing tensions of individualism and collectivism and structure and agency; and
- In doing so, there is a productive – rather than merely critical – space to theorise educational administration.

The type of analysis made possible by this *relational* approach offers a means of crafting theoretically charged narratives illuminating the situated nature of knowledge production and organizing. The work of institutional actors is the ongoing construction of the social world through the embedding and embodying of

it with meaning centred on what is considered legitimate action. Therefore, change in institutions can only take place through shifts in the logics whereby legitimacy is assessed, or, in other words, shifts in the standards whereby alternatives are deemed to be appropriate. For the purpose of this chapter – arguing for the Ed.D. as an incubator for social justice – a *relational* approach provides an analytical lens for interrogating the social relations that define the ongoing work of organizing educational labor. Specifically, this *relational* approach opens up analysis that brings to the level of discourse the underlying generative features of knowledge production. In doing so, this approach provides a means of sketching an alternate narrative, or logic, whereby the legitimacy of what it means to work for social justice.

SOCIAL JUSTICE?

Social justice has been an enduring pursuit of educational administration. The University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) flagship journal *Educational Administration Quarterly*, one of the three foundation journals of the discipline,¹ identifies itself as ‘the journal for effective and equitable organizations’ (eaq.sagepub.com). However, as with ‘neo-liberalism’, the concept of ‘social justice’ is used so frequently and in justification of so many different causes, that it has become a broad brushstroke somewhat devoid of meaning. What remains is the mobilization of social justice as though it is an objective empirical fact and the narrative of interest is its empirical manifestation in a particular context. This misses the epistemic construction of the concept. The use of the term frequently, if not always, serves the classifiers purposes more than reflects a naturally occurring phenomenon. The orthodox use of social justice is an ideological position based on the equitable distribution of (e.g. social, economic) resources – something that is put forth as contrasting to the contemporary capitalist condition.

To work with this idea for a moment, social justice is constructed as contrary to the capitalist agenda. Social justice is thought of as a collective agenda, with a common good, whereas the capitalist ideal is an individualistic pursuit built upon competition and the desire of advantage. To some extent, this plays out in the two major schools of thought on the role of education and social outcomes. First, there is the reproduction school, those that see schooling perpetuating or exacerbating familial backgrounds (e.g. Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990[1970]). Second are the compensatory, who view schooling serving as a ‘great equalizer’ in reducing inequalities between social classes (Alexander, Entwisle, & Olsen, 2001; Downey, von Hippel, & Broh, 2004). Contemporary education policy holds an underlying compensatory assumption, where schools and school systems assume responsibility for eliminating differences in attainment frequently linked to racial and economic backgrounds (Jennings, Deming, Jencks, Lopuch, & Schueler, 2015). The contemporary upper echelon of this agenda is the ‘turnaround’ principal or district. This is supported, and enhanced, through the production of constant data streams reporting on the achievement of various sub-groups created by the constant

SCOTT EACOTT

partitioning of the social world in data generation strategies – those serving to create distinctions in production.

The unsatisfactory nature of this discussion in the mainstream literatures of educational administration is the grounding in the ordinary language of the everyday. This gives the impression that knowledge production is apolitical, something that few scholars hold to be true. As Helen Gunter and Tanya Fitzgerald (2008) argue, ‘the self-reverence of a person’s story of their victory in turning around a failing school does little to explain who determines whether a school is failing and for what purposes’ (p. 7). The everyday use of social justice creates an ontological complicity with the label. We do not become just by rejecting the capitalist condition and embracing an alternate master narrative, our construction of social justice is based on a set of underlying epistemological preliminaries. A concern for educational administration scholars is that when social justice takes a moral guise, telling people how they ought to be, it is done from an unjust position – one that imposes one narrative upon another.

If we are to take the challenge of social justice serious, then we need the intellectual resources that acknowledge the messiness of the social world without submitting to a normative account of how things ought to be. That is, the pursuit of social justice may very well require acceptance that others are consciously realising purposes defined otherwise to your own. This is not to suggest a shift to a relativist version of the world. Instead, I argue that the role of the Ed.D. for pursuing social justice is concerned with raising the level of argument – or more specifically, justification in the face of criticism. Alternatively, as Pierre Bourdieu (1988[1988]) argues:

I would like writers, artists, philosophers and scientists to be able to make their voices heard directly in all the areas of public life in which they are competent. I think that everyone would have a lot to gain if the logic of intellectual life, that of argument and refutation, were extended to public life (p. 7).

But what does this mean for Ed.D. programs and the pursuit of social justice? Fenwick English (2006) argues that as an applied field, new knowledge in educational administration is being generated all the time. He goes on to argue that the ‘most vibrant educational leadership programs in a research university would be characterized by internal contradictions, antinomies, circularities, and contested intersections’ (p. 466), those reflective of the contested knowledge dynamic of which they speak. The significant point here is that social justice, as with any concept, is far from static. You cannot be taught how to be socially just as if it were a technical competence, rather it involves what Richard Bates (2006), following Michael Oakeshott (1967), calls joining the ‘conversation of the world’ (p. 283). It is only within this broad, and borderless, conversation that large-scale social issues – such as social justice – can be understood. This breadth of exposure encourages reflection, and to some extent reflexivity, leading to what Max Weber (1958) labels ‘self-clarity’ and particularly in the context of pursuing social justice and the engagement with inequities of any sort, a ‘sense of responsibility’.

THE SCHOOL AS THE SOLUTION

Any sense of clarity is brought about by bringing to the level of discourse the underlying generative principles of practice. Observation, that which is frequently labelled 'experience', is insufficient alone for knowledge production. To do so leaves understanding within the ordinary language of the everyday and common-sense rather than the systemic production of knowledge through social scientific enquiry.² While empirically defensible positions can be grounded in direct observation, namely in the principle of verifiability from a logical empiricist position, limiting to such methods of knowledge production runs the risk of describing actions literally and overlooking the conditions in which those actions take place and they were thought to be possible.

Somewhat paradoxically, a sense of clarity directly engages with the fuzziness of the social world. It is not necessarily the discovery or revelation of truth or an objective empirical reality. The clarity comes from (difficult) intellectual work at the intersection of the theoretical and empirical problem. That is, the theoretical and the empirical (or practical) do not exist as separate entities, but co-exist in relations. It is through attention to the epistemological preliminaries of various accounts of practice that we can begin to purposefully engage with the underlying principles of practice.

As noted earlier, the hegemonic position in the discipline regarding social justice is a compensatory approach, where schooling is the solution to social woes by equalizing inequities in society. This position is very much rooted in the dominant epistemologies of the discipline. While epistemological reviews and debates have been enduring in educational administration,³ the dominant school of thought remains systems thinking – best embodied in Wayne Hoy and Cecil Miskel's (1978) classic textbook, *Educational Administration: Theory, Research and Practice*, now in its ninth edition.⁴ Systems thinking is grounded in an entity-based approach. The entity-based, or substantialist, approach is consistent with the partitioning of the social world into discrete entities (often referred to as variables). This separate entity perspective is central to Frederick Winslow Taylor's (1911) *Principles of Scientific Management*,⁵ and it is what makes it possible for claims that differences in outcomes can be conceived as 'environmental' factors. A compensatory approach therefore conceives of inequities in schooling as a result of deficiencies in a variable – usually separate to the school but also individual choices/behaviours – and seeks to recalibrate that through additional investment. This is frequently the logic of equity based funding initiatives within the contemporary managerialist project.

While an entity based perspective, such as systems thinking, fits within the broader relational schools of thought, it is not the only. An entity based approach focuses on identifying attributes of individuals and organizations as they engage in relationships with other individuals and organizations. This includes partitioning students and schools into classification (e.g. ranking) systems and the proposal of interventions built around the incremental manipulation of variables. An alternate, and I argue more appropriate, epistemology for educational administration is a relational based one – concerning itself with the social construction of knowledge.

SCOTT EACOTT

The *relational* approach I am advancing challenges the notion of ‘the school’ and in doing so asks serious questions of the compensatory approach (Eacott, 2015). This is not to denounce the physical presence of buildings, students, faculty, but that the partitioning and labelling of ‘the school’ as though it is a coherent whole, not to mention static, entity is an epistemic construct. What we have come to know as the school, schooling, and educational leaders is constructed on the relations they hold with other social institutions (e.g. the state, family, and so on) and individuals as much as any other. Therefore, they cannot be known separate to others elements of the social fabric. Unlike the entity perspective, where borders and boundaries are clearly defined, this *relational* approach embodies the messiness of the world in which it is embedded. The reproduction perspective embraces the complexity of the social world, yet frequently mobilise the school in such a way that it essentializes the status quo. Distinctions between entity, relational, and any other perspective are subtle and not readily accessible during under-graduate teacher education or mainstream professional learning.

To engage with the epistemologies of educational administration requires attention to what is often considered more academic and somewhat removed from the everyday work of educators. However, if Ed.D. programs shy away from scholarly discourse in the name of practicality and relevance – apart from proliferating an unproductive (and false) theory and practice binary – there is a risk of creating programs which are theoretically narrow, insular and self-referential. Pierre Bourdieu (2005[2000]) labels these ‘native theories’. He cites management theory as a native (or naïve) theory, one written by management scholars for management schools to educate (aspiring) managers. My argument is that thinking based on a practice and theory binary is unproductive and incapable of providing alternate images of how things can be. If the desire is for graduates (and faculty) who challenge, if not change, the status quo, then we need the intellectual resources to think anew. That is, to change the world we arguably need new ways of seeing, knowing and being in the world. Mainstream literatures (both popular and populous) in educational administration are conservative and more concerned with doing well within the existing image of schooling than asking questions of the image and for whom it serves. Programs privileging – as my argument is not for their removal but de-centering of – hegemonic discourse are unable to go beyond it, and by virtue cannot destabilise the status quo.

SEEDING QUESTIONING

Debates regarding the design of doctoral programs, namely the Ed.D., in educational administration concern the role of research and research training (Archbald, 2008; Murphy & Vriesega, 2005). For the most part, this is based on the perceived division of candidates pursuing careers as academic researchers and those planning to continue in schools and school systems (Riehl, Larson, Short, & Reitzug, 2000), consolidating the theory and practice divide. However, the doctorate remains an internationally respected credential because it represents the highest level of formal tertiary qualification. The intellectual standards and values

of the doctorate are central to the qualification structure of higher education globally. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching contends:

The purpose of doctoral education, taken broadly, is to educate and prepare those who can be entrusted with the rigor, quality, and integrity of the field. This person is a scholar first and foremost, in the fullest sense of the term – someone who will creatively generate new knowledge, critically conserve valuable and useful ideas, and responsibly transform those understandings through writing, teaching, and application (Golde, Bueschel, Jones & Walkern, 2006, p. 2).

Yet multiple researchers have noted that very few Ed.D. theses are ever published, and most fall well short of publishable quality (Archbald, 2008; Anderson & Jones, 2000; Duke & Beck, 1999; Levine, 2005; McCarthy, 1999; Riehl *et al.*, 2000). This creates, and sustains, a very particular tension in the Ed.D.. If the work produced during an Ed.D. is not publishable, therefore not of sufficient quality for those in the academy, peers, to believe it contributes to knowledge in the discipline, what is being produced and for what purposes? The prestige of the doctorate is built on the legitimizing of the degree through hard work and independent intellectual initiative not an entitlement for paying fees, enrolling in a program and accumulating credits (Gardner, Hayes, & Neider, 2007; Isaac, Quinlan, & Walker, 1992). It is not just a professional learning activity for the candidate because it should contribute to the knowledge of the discipline (Archbald, 2008).

In contributing to the discipline there is an implicit assumption that the work will make a difference. But what does, or more importantly can, this difference look like? Consistent with my argument throughout this chapter, I contend that the difference is in the formation of a scholarly disposition in the candidate, not the mere production of a thesis. This does not mean the candidate becomes a scholar – e.g. a professor, mindful that not all professors are scholarly just as those outside the academy can be scholars – rather, that through the candidature they become scholarly. It would be inconsistent with my argument to prescribe what this scholarly looks like once and for all, but I can articulate two key distinctive features of a scholarly disposition. First, the pursuit of answers or solutions (e.g. what works) is less important than the pursuit of questions. This comes from a dissatisfaction with the status quo, an unwillingness to accept the existing power structures and distribution of resources. It is about accepting responsibility for the role one plays in the shaping of the social world.⁶ Second is the increased importance of justification in the face of critique. This is more than simply defending your position. Instead, it is based on having an empirically defensible position (not just rhetoric but enacted – a coherence between what is said and actioned) that stands up to argument and refutation from one's critics. It is an acceptance of the dynamics of the social world and that your position can change overtime as knowledge is constantly updated and challenged. The things that cannot be defended are dropped and those that can remain, albeit in a different form as the dynamics change. This position is not separate from the world but one and the same, in a symbiotic relationship. This is why I argue for a *relational* approach to scholarship (and being) in educational leadership, management and administration.

SCOTT EACOTT

Questioning everything means explicitly engaging with our own ontological complicity with orthodoxy. This is a significant challenge for educational leaders for whom there is a deeply held investment in leadership and its ability to deliver social justice. S/he who is embedded and embodies educational administration rarely calls into question the value of educational administration. To challenge the value of educational administration would be to not only question the very core of the domain, but to question the value of the self and one's role in the social fabric. The individual actor is therefore implicated in the world and unable to withdraw from the world in order to construct an apolitical (objective) re-construction of it. More so, failure to ask questions of the status quo and our role in its production is to submit to the orthodoxy of the contemporary world and the inertia of the technicist problems of the 'what works' agenda.

As incubators for social justice, the level of reflexivity required to epistemologically break with our own ontological complicity also requires greater clarity concerning the hegemonic labels of the issue at hand. In the case of this chapter, that means 'social justice', 'leadership' and 'the Ed.D.' or 'professional doctorate'. Despite the serious attention to illuminating what is meant by these labels – those which reside in the ordinary language of the everyday – it is not desirable to generate operational definitions. To do so would require an *a priori* static social world. Instead, the construction of knowledge is an ongoing project – one that is forever incomplete. This is what makes knowledge production such an intellectually stimulating environment. Labels such as 'social justice', 'leadership', and so on, are given life when grounded in particular temporal and socio-spatial conditions. In other, perhaps better, words, 'social justice' or inequities come to mean something only when describing the empirical world. The sense of clarity generated through engaging with labels, concepts, issues, enables meaningful dialogue across (research) traditions as the label becomes a touchstone for complementary/competing discourses – rather than epistemological blocks that see scholars talking past each other. This is not about bringing unity to the discipline, but facilitating the conditions in which alternate ways of being are brought into conversation and debate. The centrality of knowledge production and how the world *is*, as opposed to evaluation based on an orientating normative assumption and how it *ought* to be, moves the discussion beyond the essentialized structuralist accounts of the reproductionists without succumbing to the individualistic agentic narratives of the managerialist agenda. Just as the theory and practice divide is overcome, so too is the structural/agency and individual/collective (or private/public purposes). Such binaries are epistemic constructions which serve a classificatory function but are not necessarily useful in overcoming the complexity of social problems. Importantly, while the binaries are useful in critique or the aspirational tone of the instrumental compensatory approach, the blurring of categories and engagement with the spaces in-between enables the *relational* approach to productively theorize the social world. It is not about overlaying a new meta-narrative on an existing terrain but instead rethinking the very terrain. In doing so, there is the possibility of alternatives.

There is little doubt that the Ed.D. sits in a space in-between. In a mapping of credentials, the Ed.D. is located between postgraduate coursework programs (namely the master's degree) and the traditional scholarly preparation program, the Ph.D.. This location is frequently conceptualized using hegemonic tools of entity thinking (degrees as discrete entities) with a linear trajectory and tied to a specific socio-spatial location (notably systems). However, with credential creep as part of the licensing and registration for school leadership requirements achieved through various policy changes, this space in-between is in constant flux. Pursuing an Ed.D. for the credential, often leads to an instrumental approach to study, the production of a thesis and the generation of new knowledge. Conservative program resources work in this space, yet fail to acknowledge the temporal and socio-spatial dynamics in which the work embodies and is embedded. This limits the possibilities for thinking anew. The *relational* approach I am advancing, and located within a broader intellectual shift, provides *a*, not *the*, means of engaging with the fuzziness of the social world. Importantly, it serves as an incubator for the conditions in which the possibility of social justice can be thought and enacted.

CONCLUSION

Educational administration, as with many professions, has traditionally not given priority to research skills in preparation programs (Kuh & McCarthy, 1980) and with the professional standards movement there has been a de-legitimation of the research university in the preparation of educational administrators (English, 2006). However, Fred Kerlinger (1965) argues, 'the basic purpose of any doctoral program is to train intellectual leaders who are highly skilled in objective critical inquiry and dedicated to its importance (p. 222). Within schools and school systems, doctorate holding faculty are expected to demonstrate commitment and dedication to critical inquiry.

The achievement of social justice is about getting beyond the domination of any one group (e.g. the elite) or discourse (e.g. capitalism). An inherent tension in the pursuit of social justice is that it can never be hegemonic – at least in the singular sense. Notions of justice and social equity are not static. Similarly, the aspiration of a utopian just society is somewhat naïve and very much removed from the day-to-day experience of the contemporary capitalist condition. Therefore, the pursuit of social justice cannot rely on popular and/or mainstream work to break the orthodoxy. To replace the dominant narrative with another narrative does little more than shift the narrative. The underlying generative principles of domination, market share and competition, those which are central to the capitalist condition, remain. Stepping outside this orthodoxy is not necessarily about the martyrdom of working on the periphery, as there is already substantive critical work on the edges while the centre changes little. To serve as incubators for social justice, candidates in Ed.D. programs require exposure to more than any single narrative of what it means to be just. The work of the program is arguably to have the candidate reach a point where they have an articulated position that they can defend in the face of

SCOTT EACOTT

criticism. This works for both candidates and faculty. As Michel Foucault (1980), argues:

The role of an intellectual is not to tell others what they have to ... The work of an intellectual is not to shape others' political will; it is, through the analyses that he carries out in his field, to question over and over again what is postulated as self-evident, to disturb people's mental habits, the way they do and think things, to dissipate what is familiar and accepted, to reexamine rules and institution and on the basis of this reproblemization (in which he carries out this specific task as an intellectual) to participate in the formation of political will (in which he has his role as citizen to play) (p. 265).

The argument I have built in this chapter operates at multiple levels: i) *theoretically* I have articulated an alternate lens through which to conceive of the production of knowledge, rethinking the Ed.D. in relation to other forms of knowledge production and historicizing it within a broader set of discourses in the discipline of educational leadership, management and administration; and ii) *empirically*, the theoretical focus on legitimation (or legitimate courses of action) creates a, not the, space for thinking anew the Ed.D. program structure and its purposes. In what may seem to be a contradictory move, I contend it is through grounding programs even more in research and scholarship we find a path to making the Ed.D. more impactful on practice. Such an argument goes beyond the binaries of theory and practice – that rather fabled, but I contend false, binary in the discipline – and brings both into meaningful conversation and debate. This debate and dialogue is not scientifically valid proof of ‘what works’, but rather robust description of the reciprocal relations of policy and practice. Any apparent distance between practice and theory becomes redundant in such an approach.

Contemporary public policy seeks to use schooling as leverage for achieving social justice. Within this mindset, leaders are thought of as those responsible for facilitating the compensatory actions that equalise opportunity for all. This thinking, and arguably common-sense argument, has led to the proliferation and privileging of ‘turnaround’ discourses, and the obsession with ‘what works’. These approaches mobilise a particular entity-based approach conceiving of the social world through a series of independent entities. Although this makes it possible to develop targeted interventions they have failed to achieve the promise of a more socially just education system. I contend that this is the result of existing programs, for the most part, not going beyond the existing conditions. That is, they are more concerned with doing well within existing ways of thinking than rethinking the possibilities of actions. The credential creep that is embracing education systems internationally, and particularly in the centers of power in the global north – the US and England – has suffered the same limitations. Competition and market forces have reduced innovation and diversity in programs as they seek to not compromise market share and are increasingly regulated by professional standards and accreditation requirements. The pursuit of social justice is a complex problem. It is not one that can be solved once and for all. It is an enduring and ongoing project. To serve as an incubator for social justice, Ed.D. programs need to cultivate new ways of knowing and being educational leadership, management and

administration. If we are to disrupt the reproduction of the status quo then Ed.D. programs need to create a dis-satisfaction with the orthodoxy of our time and to do this, I argue for the need to plant the seeds of questioning. It is only through a failure to accept the world as it is that we can overcome the orthodoxy and bring about an alternate.

NOTES

- ¹ The other two being: *Journal of Educational Administration* and *Educational Management, Administration and Leadership*.
- ² I am well aware of the numerous critiques of science as a mode of inquiry, both generally and specifically within educational administration. However, as with Colin Evers and Gabriele Lakomski (1996), I contend that these critiques are limited to a specific type of science – notably logical empiricism – rather than science as an intellectual activity. For further articulation of Evers and Lakomski’s position, see their book *Knowing educational administration: Contemporaries methodologies*. For further articulation of my own position, see *Educational leadership relationally: A theory and methodology for educational leadership, management and administration* (Eacott, 2015).
- ³ The most famed is the tension between the conservative ‘Theory Movement’ – primarily of US origins – and the scathing critique of logical empiricism by Thomas Barr Greenfield (e.g. Greenfield & Ribbins, 1993), later by the critical theorists (Bates, 1980; Foster, 1986) and then many others (e.g. Evers & Lakomski, 1996). For many this is perceived as a dichotomy between objectivists (Theory movement) and subjectivists (the humanists) and consistent with the ‘paradigms wars’ in education research. Alternate approaches, and arguably more appropriate for the social sciences, are based on research traditions (Gunter, 2001). In short, debate and dialogue concerning epistemologies is not new, but in the contemporary academy, it remains at the margins and peripheral at best. Significantly though, there is a well-recognised lack of dialogue across traditions based very much on a benign neglect of those we do not agree (Donmoyer, 2001)
- ⁴ Interestingly, as an Australian scholar, previous work by Richard Bates and I (2008) shows that the use of Hoy and Miskel is reducing, if not removed, in Australian educational administration and leadership programs.
- ⁵ Taylorism was timely and a significant factor in the work of early professors of educational administration during the early years of separate departments in the early 1900s in the US universities. Leading figures at the time, including George Strayer at Teachers College Columbia, Franklin Bobbit at Chicago, and Ellwood Cubberly at Stanford advocated and publicized Tayloristic approaches to management (Tynack & Hansot, 1982).
- ⁶ This removes the idea of a ‘passive participant’, arguing that passivity is in actuality a complicity with the status quo rather than a distant observer. In this sense, we all contribute to what is taking place.

REFERENCES

- Alexander, K., Entwisle, D.R., & Olsen, L.S. (2001). Schools, achievement, and inequality: A seasonal perspective. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 23(2), 171-191.
- Anderson, G.L., & Jones, F. (2000). Knowledge generation in educational administration from the inside out: The promise and perils of site-based, administrator research. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 36(3), 428-464.
- Archbald, D. (2008). Research versus problem solving for the educational leadership doctoral thesis: Implications for form and function. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(5), 704-739.

SCOTT EACOTT

- Bates, R.J. (1980). Educational administration, the sociology of science, and the management of knowledge. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 16(2), 1-20.
- Bates, R.J. (2006). Presidential address: Public education, social justice and teacher education. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 34(3), 275-286.
- Bates, R.J. & Eacott, S. (2008). Teaching educational leadership and administration in Australia. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 40(2), 149-160.
- Bourdieu, P. (1998[1988]). *Acts of resistance: Against the tyranny of the market* (R. Nice, Trans.). New York, NY: New Press. [Originally published as *Contre-feux* (Paris: Editions Liber-Raisons d'Agri).]
- Bourdieu, P. (2005[2000]). *The social structures of the economy* (C. Turner, Trans.). Cambridge, UK: Polity. [Originally published as *Les structures sociales de l'économie* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil).]
- Bourdieu, P. & Passeron, J.C. (1990[1970]). *Reproduction in education, society and culture* (R. Nice, Trans.). London: SAGE. [Originally published as *La reproduction* (Paris: Les Editions de Minuit).]
- Bradbury, H., & Lichtenstein, B. (2000). Relationality in organizational research: Exploring the 'space between'. *Organization Science*, 11(5), 551-564.
- Donmoyer, R. (2001). Evers and Lakomski's search for leadership's holy grail (and the intriguing ideas they encountered along the way). *Journal of Educational Administration*, 39(6), 554-572.
- Downey, D.B., von Hippel, P.T., & Broh, B. (2004). Are schools the great equalizer? Cognitive inequality during the summer months and the school year. *American Sociological Review*, 69(5), 613-635.
- Duke, D., & Beck, S. (1999). Education should consider alternative formats for the dissertation. *Educational Researcher*, 28(3), 31-36.
- Eacott, S. (2015). *Educational leadership relationally: A theory and methodology for educational leadership, management and administration*. Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- English, F.W. (2006). The unintended consequences of a standardized knowledge base in advancing educational leadership preparation. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 42(3), 461-472.
- Evers, C.W. & Lakomski, G. (1996). *Knowing educational administration: Contemporary methodological controversies in educational research*. London: Pergamon Press.
- Foster, W. (1986). *Paradigms and promises*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings by Michel Foucault, 1972-1977*. New York, NY: Pantheon.
- Gardner, S., Hayes, M., & Neider, X. (2007). The dispositions and skills of a Ph.D. in education: Perspectives of faculty and graduate students in one college of education. *Innovative Higher Education*, 31(5), 287-299.
- Golde, C., Bueschel, A., Jones, L., & Walkern, G. (2006). *Apprenticeship and intellectual community: Lessons from the Carnegie initiative on the doctorate*. New York: Carnegie Foundation.
- Greenfield, T.B. & Ribbins, P. (Eds.) (1993). *Greenfield on educational administration*. London: Routledge.
- Gunter, H.M. (2001). Critical approaches to leadership in education. *Journal of Educational Enquiry*, 2(2), 94-108.
- Gunter, H. & Fitzgerald, T. (2008). Educational administration and history part 1: Debating the agenda. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 40(1), 5-21.
- Hoy, W.K. & Miskel, C.G. (1978). *Educational administration: Theory, research and practice*. New York, NY: Random House.
- Isaac, P., Quinlan, S., & Walker, M. (1992). Faculty perceptions of the doctoral dissertation. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 63(3), 241-268.
- Jennings, J.L., Deming, D., Jencks, C., Lopuch, M., & Schueler, B.E. (2015). Do differences in school quality matter more than we thought? New evidence on educational opportunity in the twenty-first century. *Sociology of Education*, 88(1), 56-82.
- Kerlinger, F.N. (1965). The mythology of educational research: the descriptive approach. *School and Society*, 93 (April), 222.
- Kuh, G.D. & McCarthy, M.M. (1980). Research orientation of doctoral students in educational administration. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 16(2), 101-121.

DISRUPTIONS IN PRODUCTION

- Levine, A. (2005). *Educating school leaders*. New York: Columbia University Teachers' College, The Education Schools Project.
- McCarthy, M. (1999). The evolution of educational leadership preparation programs. In J. Murphy & K. Seashore Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of research on educational administration* (2nd ed., pp. 119-139). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Murphy, J., & Vriesenga, M. (2005). Developing professionally anchored dissertations. *School Leadership Review*, 1(1), 33-57.
- Oakeshott, M. (1967). Learning and teaching. In R.S. Peters (Eds.), *The concept of education* (pp. 156-176). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Riehl, C., Larson, C., Short, P., & Reitzug, U. (2000, August). Reconceptualizing research and scholarship in educational administration: Learning to know, knowing to do, doing to learn. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 36(3), 391-427.
- Tynack, D. & Hansot, E. (1982). *Managers of virtue: Public school leadership in America, 1820-1980*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Weber, M. (1958). *From Max Weber: Essays in sociology* (H.H. Gerth & C. Wright Mills, Trans.). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.