Managing the School: Principals as Managers

Dijana Vican, Nikša Alfirević, and Renata Relja

Abstract Vican, Alfirevic and Relja present the history and an overview of educational management/administration as a separate and applicative field addressing the specific issues of managing an educational institution. This is contextualized in terms of educational objectives to be realized, as well as boundaries set by educational policies and the 'educational market', either explicit or implicit. From the pragmatic point of view, the field is explicated by referring to principals' activities and roles, as well as their influence to the 'fit' achieved by the school and its environment. The Anglo-American roots and the emerging 'regional knowledge-bases' and practices of educational management are discussed.

1 The Field of Educational Management and its Origins

The practice of management is as old as human society, since it concerns the coordination of individual efforts toward a shared objective. It has gained prominence with the rise of modern society (Buble, 2011/2015). Further transformation of management in the twentieth century has been described by Drucker (1989/2011), in terms of application of knowledge to work processes and the emergence of 'knowledge works'. This has spread the practice of management throughout society and made it a matter of modern life, i.e., *'a new social function'* (Drucker & Maciariello, 1973/2008, p. 21), enabling people in various types of organizations to

achieve high levels of performance. The same applies to *educational management* (EM), which focuses on education, i.e., schools. This field brings together the theory and practice of business management, psychology and political/administrative studies. As it is highly applicative, it is often criticized for an instrumentalist approach, i.e., lack of underlying social theory, as well as disconnectedness from pedagogical practice (Fitz, 1999).

> *Educational management/administration:* a separate and applicative field, addressing the specific issues of managing an educational institution; concerned with realization of educational objectives.

The differentiation of educational *management* and 'high-level' educational *policy* has been a blessing, since educational managers can and do address real-life problems without making too much ado (about nothing). On the other hand, the technical/applicable nature of the field is a curse as well, making it possible for principals to turn their heads from system-level issues of education and concentrate on narrowly defined issues of their own school's effectiveness (Glatter, 1987). Dilemmas about centralization vs. introduction of market principles (school choice) in education, as well as the (questionable) need for transfer of 'best managerial practices' are also sometimes viewed in this context and criticized as inappropriate (Glatter, 1999).

Since the beginning of the twentieth century, chairs of education administration have been appointed at US universities. Other signs of an emerging field have included the establishment of university professors' and researchers' professional associations in the USA—the *National Council of Professors of Educational Administration* (NCPEA) in 1947[1] (see a comprehensive account of its history in: Campbell, 1981) and the *University Council for Educational Administration* (hereinafter UCEA) in 1954.[2] US principals have been trying to have their profession recognized for almost 100 years, as evidenced by their professional associations: the *National Association of Elementary School Principals* (NAESP), founded in 1921, and the *National Association of Secondary School Principals* (NASSP), founded in 1916.[3] A sign that a specialized field is being formed is specialized academic publications, which included the first widely recognized book on *Administrative Behavior in Education* in 1957 (Campbell, 1981) and creation of an academic journal, the *Educational Administration Quarterly*

(hereinafter EAQ), by the UCEA in 1965. Academic journals in primarily applied fields, such as educational management, are multi-faceted beasts, torn in a procrustean manner between immediate needs for practical solutions and a wish for fundamental theory development. Such a conflict can be detected from the early days of the EAQ and UCEA, e.g., in the presidential address at the UCEA meeting in 1978 (Hoy, 1978) and the 'self-inflicted' criticism of the EAQ's founding editor (Campbell, 1979). Both of these self-questioning analyses concentrate on the need for theory-building and strengthening the scientific foundation of the field, so as to further 'legitimize' it both for internal (researchers, professors), and external stakeholders (practitioners, public-policy actors, etc.). The continuous re-thinking of EAQ's future and the impact of the field is widely shared and discussed (Pounder & Johnson, 2007), which demonstrates that educational administration/management is still heading toward a mature stage of development.

The most important topics covered in EAQ-published research are the roles and behavior of teachers and principals, school improvement and efficiency, as well as different organizational solutions (see: Haas et al., 2007). The topics of the papers published in this journal (1979–2003) include a variety of topics from organizational and management theory as applied to the educational setting (27.8 % of the published content), analysis of the field itself, i.e., the fundamentals of the profession, research, preparation programs, etc. (21.2 % of studies), and different educational topics (8.4 % of studies), including curriculum/instruction, school effectiveness and instructional management (Murphy, Vriesenga, & Storey, 2007).

The 'Americanized' field in the 1960s was diversified by developments in the UK, as the *British Educational Administration Society* (the predecessor of the contemporary *The British Educational Leadership Management and Administration Society*—hereafter BELMAS) was founded in London in 1971. Their research journal *Educational Management & Administration* (renamed *Educational Management Administration & Leadership,* hereafter EMAL, in 2002) developed from the society's bulletin and covered a range of topics, including educational-management techniques and development issues. (For a historical account, see papers by the founding editor and a critical review of EMA/EMAL content in: Hughes, 1997; Strain, 1997.)

Another significant publication for the educational-management community was the first such journal, the Australian *Journal of Educational Administration* (JEA), today hosted by Emerald Group Publishing (as opposed to ASQ and EMAL, which are hosted by Sage). The first issue

was published in 1963 at the University of New England, with the aim of analyzing the interactions and synergies of administrative and teaching processes in educational settings, with the most important topics related to the fields of development, organizational structures, headship, educational leadership, and so forth (Ross Thomas, 2012). Its knowledge-base and legacies, as analyzed by Oplatka (2012), could even be generalized to represent divisions within the field, and include the empirical, practical, evaluative (as evolved by educational-evaluation practices and actors), principal-training, school-leadership and critical-theory dimensions.

Even from an analysis of published studies in major journals and their diversity, the fragmentation of the field is clearly visible, and this applies even more to the professors of educational management, the topics in which their PhDs were received and their preferred publication outlets. Educational management is, even today, highly interdisciplinary and applicative, as well as associated with public agencies and other educational administrations (Oplatka, 2010).

Regional developments in South-East Europe (SEE) build upon the legacy of a centralized, socialist system, with the role of school principals being restricted to enforcing the decisions from the levels of the former Yugoslav federation and its federal units (Sentočnik & Rupar, 2009). Development of contemporary school leadership in the post-socialist context seems to be context-sensitive (Magno, 2009), which requires the development of a relevant 'regional knowledge-base'.

2   Educational Administration, Management and Leadership: Confusing Practices…

Generic management theory deals with the successful contribution of individuals to the organization and the responsibility of managers to ensure organizational functioning. Managers work 'with' people by developing them and ensuring their contribution to an organization (Drucker & Maciariello, 1973/2008). Business management, especially its strategic branch, argues that the key to organizational success is found in achieving a successful 'fit' with an organizational environment (Venkatraman & Camillus, 1984). This area of managerial research is reflected in one of the more popular definitions of educational administration/management (hereinafter EA/EM) adopted by an influential textbook (Bush, 2007a). In this context, EA/EM concerns the internal aspects of an educational institution's functioning, so as to achieve a successful 'fit' with stakeholders from the environment, i.e., the community, governing bodies, etc.

Such a definition fits well within the generic management school of thought, which has encouraged many discussions of comparability of managerial processes in different sectors (business, public and nonprofit), as well as specific social forces shaping managerial reality (Murray, 1975; Fottler, 1981). Bush's (2007a) popular introductory text on EM/EA introduces almost the same concepts covered by similar texts in business management (see, e.g., Robbins & Coulter, 2013; Daft, 2015): organizational-structure hierarchy and authority, schools (in terms of organizational theory) as open systems, rationality of managerial actions as being directed toward goals, etc. Most of these principles/constructs are associated with the need to keep the school (educational institution) running smoothly in a given environment and accomplish objectives usually decided by an external governing body.

Another term often found in the literature is *educational leadership*. According to Dembowski (2012), the *fundamental difference between management and leadership* is related to the inherent ability of leaders to question the viability of the existing environmental fit and introduce a required change into the functioning of a system. He associates management with the *'hard skills'*, i.e., structures, plans, tools and approaches, required to 'handle' the organizational process according to a predetermined plan and achieve required objectives efficiently. On the other hand are *'soft skills'* related to motivating, influencing and leading people toward shared objectives. Leaders need to have a vision of the future which takes into account the requirements of the environment, as well as organizational changes needed to meet challenges and enable an organization to achieve a vision.

It seems the entire field of EA/EM almost tried to 'rebrand' itself by referring to itself as *educational leadership* (Bush, 2008), which can be, once again, determined by analyzing the content of academic journals (Ross Thomas, 2012, p. 17), or even observing a simple insertion of 'leadership' into the names of EA/EM institutions, journals, etc. (such as BELMAS and EMAL in the UK). The drive toward the research and application of leadership in the field has been so strong that the idea of *educational administration* (as is still reflected in the title of the AEQ journal) is considered outdated, with *educational leadership and management* becoming the preferred name of the field (Hallinger & Chen, 2014)—just as in the case of personnel vs. human-resource management. It should also be noted that the 'proliferation' of the notion of leadership might become counter-productive, being applied to 'nothing and everything' and used as a generic answer to shortcomings at the policy level (Oplatka, 2007).

Educational leadership: a managerial function, supposed to ensure voluntary involvement in achieving the organizational objectives of an educational environment. Nevertheless, the notion is often used as a synonym for the educational management (administration).

So as to avoid fundamental misunderstandings, it is important to note that, in the majority of business-management texts (cf. Robbins & Coulter, 2013; Daft, 2015), leadership is traditionally considered part of the managerial process. Its tenet is to replace the command-and-control principle of employee behavior, practiced throughout the industrial age, by influencing values, attitudes, opinions and, ultimately, behavior itself, so as to *secure voluntary involvement in achieving organizational objectives.* This fact is clearly illustrated by a quote from the integrative definition of leadership, proposed by Winston and Patterson (2006, p. 7): "*A leader is one or more people who selects, equips, trains, and influences one or more follower(s) who have diverse gifts, abilities, and skills and focuses the follower(s) to the organization's mission and objectives causing the follower(s) to willingly and enthusiastically expend spiritual, emotional, and physical energy in a concerted coordinated effort to achieve the organizational mission and objectives.* " Many other dimensions of educational leadership have been developed, and are discussed in a separate chapter within this volume. However, in many cases, even a simple differentiation of leadership, as a form of humanistic management, versus the traditional, 'command-and-control' approach of structural-rational management (Dembowski, 2012), might be theoretical background enough for a practicing principal.

Principals may not be even able to recognize their own job as a 'managerial' one, due to their educational and professional background, although their daily routine might fit into the theoretical characteristics of a managerial career. For revered management theorist Drucker (Drucker & Maciariello, 1973/2008), management is all about *practice, which makes managers responsible for the work of organizational members and their results.* This is achieved by setting objectives, organizing work, motivating/communicating, measuring performance and developing people (including oneself). Those actions can be described as *generic,* i.e., applicable to all kinds of organizations and organizational contexts, and are often referred to as managerial tasks/functions. Fundamental introductory texts describe them

in terms of the planning-organizing-leading-controlling cycle (Robbins & Coulter, 2013; Daft, 2015), with organizing denoting 'hard', and leading 'soft', factors for implementation of previously devised plans.

There is a long tradition of fostering managers' functions as the 'only right way' to think about the managerial work (Carroll & Gillen, 1987). The notion of a generic and orderly nature of management, which can be boiled down to planning-implementing-controlling, has a long tradition going back to H. Fayol. This nineteenth-century French engineer is the true 'father of management', as his ideas of the structural-rational paradigm required to manage a modern organization still represent the core of 'traditional' managerial thinking. Planning and goal-setting (*prévoyance*) represent the rational foundations for organizing (i.e., provision of required resource for the implementation of the plan), and directing and supervising (*commander/diriger*) operative activities and controlling performance (Wren & Bedeian, 2009).

Managerial roles (practices): actual managerial activities, performed by school principals, often conceptualized in terms of inter-personal, informational and decision-making roles (as described in H. Mintzberg's framework).

Although useful for academic purposes, the functional approach is not entirely helpful once the complexity of the job and its busy schedules are also considered. H. Mintzberg (1975) wrote about the disorganized, hectic and action-oriented nature of managerial work, which does not leave much space for systematic consideration. Challenged by the quick pace of their work environment, managers mix various roles (action-oriented and ceremonial) and prefer quick and informal communication, enabling them to take and remain in control. A certain order can be found in the taxonomy of three different roles—inter-personal, informational and decision-making—which are 'liberally' mixed-and-matched in managerial practice, in accordance with the type of managerial position and hierarchical level occupied. Textbook authors seem to accept this framework without hesitation, and often use it as a secondary tool to describe the nature of managerial work (Carroll & Gillen, 1987).

There are different conceptualizations of principals' work, which use either a single or mix of concepts from business management. In his

conceptual paper, Lunenberg (2010) referred to 'leadership functions' (instead of to managerial ones), administrative roles (i.e., Mintzberg's framework), management skills and task-dimensions frameworks. In the early 1980s, Martin and Willower (1981) studied high-school principals, and a year later Kmetz and Willower (1982) conducted a similar study on elementary-school principals—both based on the Mintzberg's (1970) methodology of structured observation and his role framework. In both cases, principals' managerial practice was empirically confirmed as hectic and characterized by multiple contacts, preferred verbal contact and similar interruptions/emergencies, just like the practice of managers in a business enterprise. These initial studies were quite simplistic, as they did not take into account either resulting performance or any contingency variables, such as personal or environmental characteristics. A later study by Martinko and Gardner (1990) tried to address these deficiencies and arrived at similar conclusions, confirming the validity of Mintzberg's findings. These authors also found dependencies of managerial behavior on contingency variables, but were not able to confirm the relationship between managerial patterns and performance. Nevertheless, this line of research proved to be a fruitful ground for studies in the (sub-)fields of educational leadership and school effectiveness, as discussed in other chapters in this volume.

In this context, some early, from today's perspective, papers, such as the study by Treider and Leithwood (1988), introducing mediators between principals' behavior and performance at the classroom and school levels, proved especially useful. The same applies to a comprehensive model linking all influences on principals to their practices and resulting staff effects and learning outcomes, proposed 25 years ago by Leithwood, Begley and Cousins (1990).

Some contemporary studies have used more sophisticated methods to address sometimes confusing principals' practices. Spillane and Hunt (2010) used the mixed-methods (qualitative and quantitative) approach to determine principal archetypes (including 'administrative types', 'firefighters', 'lone cowboys'). In addition, a range of international studies on educational outcomes and their potential sources has proliferated. Although this stream of literature does not seem to be much concerned with the role of a principal in the school environment, a chapter in the TALIS 2013 research project report (OECD, 2014) provides an international comparison of principals' demographic and professional characteristics and details related to their work activities. The snapshot of an average

principal's workday includes 41 % of working time spent on administrative and leadership tasks, 21 % on curriculum and teaching-related activities, 15 % on interactions with students, 11 % on interacting with parents/guardians, 7 % on tasks related to the local community and 4 % on all other activities.[4]

The discussed studies are quite useful in understanding what principals do, but may not be very useful in normative terms, i.e., advising on what they are supposed to do so as to achieve educational goals. In addition, the majority of these studies draw from models established in business, instead of addressing the specific environment of educational organizations. This is why it might be useful to segment the educational environment and related principals' activities. It is very difficult to completely avoid the metaphors of business management, which has arrived at a generic representation of an organizational environment. Referring to such business studies (cf. Robbins & Coulter, 2013; Daft, 2015), we derive the following model:

- the *external 'macro-environment'*, i.e., general determinants of the social context (often conceptualized in terms of the political-economic-social-technical forces);
- the *external 'micro-environment'*, consisting of the immediate organizational stakeholders; and
- the *internal environment*, encompassing organizational resources and core operative processes.

This is why one might draw a direct comparison between generic organizational-environment analysis and Foskett and Lumby's (2003) dimensions of developing strategy/resources and leading learning processes within the internal school environment, and subsequently managing relationships with the people and local community (i.e., actors within the external micro-environment). Once again, the issue of EA/EM disconnectedness from the policy level comes into play (Glatter, 1987), which refers to activities performed in the external macro-environment. These three levels of managerial activity could serve as an excellent starting point for development of best practices and, potentially, even normative guidelines/standards for managerial development for principals. This is not a completely new concept, since it has already been applied by the authors of the *PISA (Programme for International Student Assessment) survey,* which tries to uncover the relationships between educational resources, policies, practices and student outcomes (OECD, 2013), although public

perception of this study may be restricted to the dimensions of rank lists and international comparisons.

3   …AND THE (MANAGEMENT) THEORY JUNGLE

As previously discussed, the research and interpretation of managerial practices can be a contested territory. Nor is management theory is transparent. More than fifty years ago, H. Koontz (1961) named his review of applicable theories *'the management theory jungle'*. He recognized several waves of managerial theory development, starting with H. Fayol and F. W. Taylor, an American engineer well-known for his *scientific-management* effort to analyze traditional work policies, tools and processes, in search of labor-saving opportunities. Opposing conventional ways of organizing work, Taylor sought efficiency by introducing the most contemporary technology and motivating employees to contribute by using an incentive payment system designed to maximize physical effort. Taylor and his followers are often criticized and 'accused' for an overly bureaucratic, technical and even inhumane approach to managing (Spender & Kijne, 1996). The subsequent *'human-behavior'* school of management (also referred to as the human-relations or leadership school) even today sets forth one of the fundamental dichotomies between 'traditional vs. contemporary', 'hard vs. soft', 'management vs. leadership' approaches in management theory. This school of thought started with the intention to analyze inter-personal relationships and dynamics as determinants of organizational behavior and performance (Koontz, 1961), but its consequences went above and beyond this. Based on the idea of people as *human resources,* with vast, untapped sources of motivation/ inspiration and creativity, this dichotomy can be appropriated as a source of the contemporary human-resource management practices (although such a simplification should be taken *cum grano salis*—see, e.g., Guest, 1987).

Some widely accepted introductions to the history of EA/EM also try to mirror fundamental developments in the generic management field and link it to relevant theories and studies in related areas, including sociology, public administration, nonprofit management and so forth. For instance, Campbell (1987) traces the theoretical development of EA by progressing from scientific-management and human relations/democratic-administration dichotomy toward the bureaucratic model of organizations, as created by May Weber and discussed in the American school of sociological structural functionalism. The discussion is further developed by

using generic open-systems theory and, finally, some education-specific issues and drivers. This is a typical application-driven approach, contested by Tony Bush (2007b, p. 391): *"The author's view is clear and consistent, having been articulated for more than 20 years. While education can learn from other settings, educational leadership and management has to be centrally concerned with the purpose or aims of education. These purposes or goals provide the crucial sense of direction to underpin school management. Unless this link between purpose and management is clear and close, there is a danger of 'managerialism'."*

> *Educational management models:* conceptualizations of an educational organization and variables relevant for managing/leading such an organization.

Conceding to a much earlier call to link administrative/managerial styles to underlying (or, at least, supportive) educational theories (Newton, 1980), Bush (2007a) uncovers a range of educational-management and leadership models, with the latter being outside of the scope of this chapter. The EM/EA models, singled out by Bush (op. cit.) are as follows:

- *Formal models* encompass all the structural-rational approaches, prominently advancing the notion of formalized and hierarchical work relationships, under the assumption that rational managerial processes will lead to the realization of school effectiveness and/or other objectives. This strictly positivist approach has many practical inconsistencies, arising from the complexity of the educational environment, increased professionalism of school staff and multiplicity of educational goals.
- *Collegial models* are supposed to alleviate some of the structural-rational notions of EM/EA, as the bottom-up processes of collegial discussion and consensus-forming seem to be helpful with complex and multi-faceted environments and goals. They are also quite effective within small groups, as found in typical schools, which share most of their values, as well as a similar level of professionalism. In a way, this model is also normative, since it firmly stands for the superiority of democratic management and leadership over a bureaucratic, structural paradigm. Nevertheless, the implicit variable for the

achievement of school goals, which might not be addressed by the model, is related to the support and the attitude of the principal, who is still held accountable by the school governing body.

- *Political models,* in general, look into organizations in terms of individuals' and groups' interests and negotiating processes, which lead to outcomes based on actors' power and negotiating competencies. The political dimension of administration is a well-established fact within the research of other sectors, especially when informal networks (Krackhardt, 1990) and strategy-formulation (Pettigrew, 1977) are considered. A complex and ambiguous educational environment, dependent on public policies and their implementation, provides some support to this dimension of analyzing EM/EA processes.

- *Subjective models* build upon the social constructivist view in social sciences, understanding organizations in terms of stakeholders' subjective interpretations created by social interactions. In this way, organizations are divested from their institutional dimension and interpreted in terms of individual meanings, beliefs and cultural backgrounds. Whatever one may think about such a postmodern approach, educational institutions can be compared (and many of them even belong) to non-profit organizations, whose effectiveness is socially constructed according to the interpretations of their stakeholders (Herman & Renz, 1997). What arises from well-established research on non-profit sector effectiveness is that the work and performance of such organizations are so complex that each of their stakeholders usually only looks at one small part of the big picture and interprets it according to his/her viewpoints and interests. Nevertheless, there are managerial practices which seem to be widely accepted and held as effective by a whole range of stakeholders (Herman & Renz, 1998; 1999; 2008). This comparison seriously undermines the relativizing arguments which might be applied by a postmodern thinker to the EA/EM field.

- *Ambiguity models* emphasize uncertainty of the environment and problems experienced by institutions and their managers when placed in an unstable context. The fluidity of both objectives and associated managerial processes leads to fragmented structures and constantly changing patterns of organizational action. The inspiration for this EM/EA model clearly emanates from the work of Cohen, March and Olsen (1972) on the 'garbage-can' theory of decision-making and Weick's (1976) notion of the 'loosely coupled' organizational

approach as applied in education. The educational environment seems to be ideal for the application of such theories, due to its complexity and the relative independence of organizational actors. The advantage of such a model might be an extreme form of adaptability, due to the lack of central-organizational control. Nevertheless, it is argued that the actual applicability of models that presume extreme decentralization might be limited, and that a mix of different models is required to successfully describe an educational organization (Ellström, 1983). A certain level of structural coherence is also required, both from the theoretical (Tyler, 1987) and the practical viewpoints of implementing public educational policies, as discussed by Lutz (1982) in the case of higher education, but applicable to all levels of education.

- *Cultural models* concentrate on the notion of organizational culture, which represents the deeper, underlying ideology of organizations, consisting of values, beliefs, expectations, etc., as well as their social representations through stories, material artefacts and rituals (Hoy, 1990). A school culture leads to the establishment of norms which informally direct staff behavior, although different subgroups (such as teachers, administrative staff, school management, external stakeholders involved into the work of a school, etc.) with particular subcultures may exist. While shared organizational ideology may be a strong ground for a principal's leadership, a potential problem could be generated by an attempt to achieve domination by instilling homogeneity into an organization.

4   Toward a Global and a Local Synthesis

A range of different literature traditions has been discussed as (at least partially) relevant for understanding and fostering a principal's managerial competences. The stream of literature related to the experiences of generic non-profit organizations (see, e.g., Anheier, 2005) seems to be the most neglected. It might provide interesting insights, since non-profits function in a very similar, complex environment, with many stakeholders who might have different or even conflicting perspectives on an organization's characteristics and requirements. The analysis of generic business management still influences specific, applied contexts in which the individual disciplines are developed. This also applies to EA/EM, which struggles to find its own rightful place in the arena of educational research and scholarship,

but still needs to be practically relevant for the obvious purpose of developing successful school leaders.

The international context of the field is a topic in itself, as Anglo-American roots still dominate many of the fundamental aspects of EA/EM. Even with all of these major professional journals and fora providing an ample space for discussion of global experiences, the production of an applicable global knowledge-base remains unbalanced. In the case of Asia, for example, 'positive outliers' were highly developed Hong Kong and Israel, while many studies, such as the Chinese national literature (Hallinger & Chen, 2014), remain 'locked' from the view of the international professional public.

The authors of this chapter could not identify a systematic movement in South-East Europe which could be described as an EA/EM 'regional knowledge-base'. Along with other individuals affiliated with the Croatian Education and Teacher Training Agency (Croatian acronym: AZOO),[5] the National Centre for External Evaluation of Education (Croatian acronym: NCVVO)[6] and the Scientific Center of Excellence for School Effectiveness and Management,[7] the authors of this volume have produced several empirical studies and practical handbooks during the last several years. A national program for the preparation of principals has not yet been developed, although a consortium, headed by the University of Zadar and funded by the European Social Fund, is currently working on this task. A somewhat more developed context, both in terms of theory coverage and principal preparation, can be found in Slovenia, where a national school for leadership in education was established[8] in 1995. It is engaged in a range of activities, including organizing professional events, publishing a specialized journal in English,[9] and so forth. Some European training organizations have been active throughout the region, with an example of good practice for headship preparation in Bulgaria available in the literature (Kastanje & Webber, 2008).

Based on additional literature and Internet searches, additional studies and webpages of national principals' associations can be found, although the knowledge of local languages seems to be of paramount importance for such a task. The majority of information is fragmented and requires an understanding of the local social and political context as well. Countries that have already started to integrate into the global EA/EM community of researchers and practitioners, such as Slovenia and Croatia, could try to develop wider regional initiatives. In addition, it would be of extreme importance for educational administration/management/leadership

authors and practitioners from this as well as other peripheral regions, to assume a more active role in major journals, conferences, and events, which would help the transfer of the best global and regional practices. The authors hope that this volume is one step in that direction.

NOTES

1. The association is still active and its website can be perused at: http://ncpeaprofessor.org.
2. See website http://www.ucea.org/
3. See websites http://www.naesp.org/ and http://www.nassp.org/.
4. Raw statistical data, with international comparisons of principals' workday activities, is available from the following OECD code: http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933041231
5. See: http://www.azoo.hr (most of the content is in Croatian).
6. See: http://www.ncvvo.hr/drzavnamatura/c/portal/layout?p_l_id=PUB.1001.23 (some downloadable studies available in English).
7. See: http://zci-sem.eu
8. See: http://en.solazaravnatelje.si
9. The journal *Leadership in Education* is partially available in open access. See: http://en.solazaravnatelje.si/publishing/leadership/leadership-31/.

REFERENCES

Anheier, H. K. (2005). *Nonprofit organizations: Theory, management, policy.* London: Routledge.

Buble, M. (2011/2015). Tendencies in evolution of 21st century management. Translated and reprinted in *Management – Journal of Contemporary Management Issues, 20*, 1–17

Bush, T. (2007a). *Theories of educational leadership and management* (3rd ed.). London: Sage.

Bush, T. (2007b). Educational leadership and management: Theory, policy and practice. *South African Journal of Education, 27*(3), 391–406.

Bush, T. (2008). From management to leadership: Semantic or meaningful change? *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 36*(2), 271–288.

Campbell, R. F. (1979). Fifteenth anniversary perspective: A critique of the educational administration quarterly. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 15*(3), 1–19.

Campbell, R. F. (1981). The professorship in educational administration—A personal view. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 17*(1), 1–24.

Campbell, R. F. (1987). *A history of thought and practice in educational administration*. New York: Teachers College Press/Columbia University.

Carroll, S. J., & Gillen, D. I. (1987). Are the classical management functions useful in describing managerial work? *Academy of Management Review, 12*(1), 38–51.

Cohen, M. D., March, J. G., & Olsen, J. P. (1972). A garbage can model of organizational choice. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 17*(1), 1–25.

Daft, R. (2015). *Management* (12th ed.). Mason, IA: South-Western College Pub/Cengage.

Dembowski, F. L. (2012). The changing roles of leadership and management in educational administration. In F. L. Dembowski (Ed.), *Educational administration: The roles of leadership and management.* Houston, TX: National Council of Professors of Educational Administration/Connexion. Retrieved October 13, 2015, from http://cnx.org/content/m14280/latest/Dembowski.pdf.pdf.

Drucker, P. F. (1989/2011). *The new realities*. London: Routledge.

Drucker, P. F., & Maciariello, J. A. (1973/2008). *Management* (Revised Edition). New York: Harper Collins

Ellström, P. E. (1983). Four faces of educational organizations. *Higher Education, 12*(2), 231–241.

Fitz, J. (1999). Reflections on the field of educational management studies. *Educational Management & Administration, 27*(3), 313–321.

Foskett, N., & Lumby, J. (2003). *Leading and managing education: International dimensions.* London: Paul Chapman Publishing/SAGE.

Fottler, M. D. (1981). Is management really generic? *Academy of Management Review, 6*(1), 1–12.

Glatter, R. (1987). Towards an agenda for educational management. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 15*(1), 5–12.

Glatter, R. (1999). From struggling to juggling towards a redefinition of the field of educational leadership and management. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 27*(3), 253–266.

Guest, D. E. (1987). Human resource management and industrial relations. *Journal of Management Studies, 24*(5), 503–521.

Haas, E., Wilson, G. Y., Cobb, C. D., Hyle, A. E., Jordan, K., & Kearney, K. S. (2007). Assessing influence on the field: An analysis of citations to educational administration quarterly, 1979–2003. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 43*(4), 494–512.

Hallinger, P., & Chen, J. J. (2014). Review of research on educational leadership and management in Asia: A comparative analysis of research topics and methods, 1995–2012. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 43*(1), 5–27.

Herman, R. D., & Renz, D. O. (1997). Multiple constituencies and the social construction of nonprofit organization effectiveness. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly., 26*(2), 185–206.

Herman, R. D., & Renz, D. O. (1998). Nonprofit organizational effectiveness: Contrasts between especially effective and less effective organizations. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership., 9*(1), 23–38.

Herman, R. D., & Renz, D. O. (1999). Theses on nonprofit organizational effectiveness. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly., 28*(2), 107–126.

Herman, R. D., & Renz, D. O. (2008). Advancing nonprofit organizational effectiveness research and theory: Nine theses. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership., 18*(4), 399–415.

Hoy, W. K. (1978). Scientific research in educational administration. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 14*(3), 1–12.

Hoy, W. K. (1990). Organizational climate and culture: A conceptual analysis of the school workplace. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 1*(2), 149–168.

Hughes, M. (1997). From bulletin to journal metamorphosis and new vistas. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 25*(3), 243–263.

Kastanje, P., & Webber, C. F. (2008). Programs for school principal preparation in East Europe. *Journal of Educational Administration, 46*(6), 739–751.

Kmetz, J. T., & Willower, D. J. (1982). Elementary school principals' work behavior. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 18*(4), 62–78.

Koontz, H. (1961). The management theory jungle. *Academy of Management Journal, 4*(3), 174–188.

Krackhardt, D. (1990). Assessing the political landscape: Structure, cognition, and power in organizations. *Administrative science quarterly, 35*, 342–369.

Leithwood, K. A., Begley, P. T., & Cousins, J. B. (1990). The nature, causes and consequences of principals' practices: An agenda for future research. *Journal of Educational Administration, 28*(4), 5–31.

Lunenburg, F. C. (2010). The principal and the school: What do principals do? *National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervision Journal, 27*(4), 1–13.

Lutz, F. W. (1982). Tightening up loose coupling in organizations of higher education. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 27*(4), 653–669.

Magno, C. (2009). Reimagining the school leadership paradigm in a postsocialist context. *European Education, 41*(3), 23–41.

Martin, W. J., & Wilower, D. J. (1981). The managerial behavior of high school principals. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 17*(1), 69–90.

Martinko, M. J., & Gardner, W. L. (1990). Structured observation of managerial work: A replication and synthesis. *Journal of Management Studies, 27*(3), 329–357.

Mintzberg, H. (1970). Structured observation as a method to study managerial work. *Journal of Management Studies, 7*(1), 87–104.

Mintzberg, H. (1975). The manager's job: Folklore and fact. *Harvard Business Review, 53*(4), 49–61.

Murphy, J., Vriesenga, M., & Storey, V. (2007). Educational administration quarterly, 1979–2003: An analysis of types of work, methods of investigation, and influences. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 43*(5), 612–628.

Murray, M. A. (1975). Comparing public and private management: An exploratory essay. *Public Administration Review, 364–371.*

Newton, R. R. (1980). Educational theories and administrative styles. *NASSP Bulletin, 64*(434), 76–86.

OECD. (2013). *PISA 2012 results: What makes schools successful? resources, policies and practices* (Vol. IV). Paris: PISA/OECD Publishing.

OECD. (2014). *TALIS 2013 results: An international perspective on teaching and learning.* Paris: OECD Publishing.

Oplatka, I. (2007). The field of educational management: Some intellectual insights from the 2007 BELMAS national conference. *Management in Education, 22*(3), 4–10.

Oplatka, I. (2010). The professoriate in the field of educational administration: Insights from an analysis of journal authors' curricula vitae. *Journal of Educational Administration, 48*(3), 392–412.

Oplatka, I. (2012). Fifty years of publication: Pondering the legacies of the Journal of Educational Administration. *Journal of Educational Administration, 50*(1), 34–56.

Pettigrew, A. M. (1977). Strategy formulation as a political process. *International Studies of Management & Organization, 7*(2), 78–87.

Pounder, D. G., & Johnson, B. L. (2007). Editor commentary: Reflections on EAQ's past, present, and future. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 43*(2), 259–272.

Robbins, S. P., & Coulter, M. (2013). *Management* (12th ed.). London: Pearson Education.

Ross Thomas, A. (2012). Succeed or else!: Reflections on the 50th anniversary of the Journal of Educational Administration. *Journal of Educational Administration, 50*(1), 12–33.

Sentočnik, S., & Rupar, S. (2009). School leadership of the future. *European Education, 41*(3), 7–22.

Spender, J. C., & Kijne, H. J. (Eds.). (1996). *Scientific management: Frederick Winslow Taylor's gift to the world?* Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Spillane, J. P., & Hunt, B. R. (2010). Days of their lives: A mixed methods, descriptive analysis of the men and women at work in the principal's office. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 42*(3), 293–331.

Strain, M. (1997). Records of achievement: A critical review of educational management & administration. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 25*(3), 213–242.

Trider, D. M., & Leithwood, K. A. (1988). Exploring the influences on principal behavior. *Curriculum Inquiry, 18*(3), 289–311.

Tyler, W. (1987). 'Loosely Coupled' schools: A structuralist critique. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 8*(3), 313–326.

Venkatraman, N., & Camillus, J. C. (1984). Exploring the concept of "Fit" in strategic management. *Academy of Management Review, 9*(3), 513–525.

Weick, K. E. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. *Administrative science quarterly, 21*(1), 1–19.

Winston, B. E., & Patterson, K. (2006). An integrative definition of leadership. *International Journal of Leadership Studies, 1*(2), 6–66.

Wren, D. A., & Bedeian, A. G. (2009). *The evolution of management thought* (6th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.