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This preliminary study asked, "Who's the most exceptional living scholar in the field of educational leadership?" Four scholar-practitioners who were the most frequently nominated by fellow academicians from 2002 to 2003 were identified. The reasons given by nominators for their selections were analyzed, resulting in criteria that can be used for characterizing exceptional scholarship at this time or pursuing a more comprehensive study. The criteria—significant and broad impact on scholarship and the field, national spheres of public influence, and mentoring and multi-authoring systems—appear in table form, with representative quotes. Importantly, issues of context and tension are raised as different perspectives were offered on the survey question itself from both voting and non-voting respondents.

On the one hand, a survey respondent commented, "the impossible task of selecting the greatest living scholar in our field. Some are naturalistic methodologists rather than mainstream educational administration scholars, while others approach scholarship with very narrow or very broad perspectives."

On the other hand, another declared, "Some scholars do stand out. There is one who I think is simply the greatest "mover and shaker" in the profession. This individual has done more than any to shape the direction of the field—his work is widely read by both scholars and practitioners, and his contributions to educational leadership are widely recognized."

Introduction

For this study, academics in educational leadership and administration were asked, "Who's the most exceptional living scholar in the field of educational leadership?" The respondents (university faculty constituents) were encouraged to provide an explanation for their votes. The focus here is on the perceptions of nominators relative to outstanding scholarship in educational leadership. Not only the "who," but particularly the "why," served as the guiding framework for this analysis. Throughout this survey research spanning 2002 to 2003, four scholar-practitioners in particular were most frequently nominated, leading to their eventual identification. The reasons given by nominators for their selections were analyzed, resulting in criteria that are discussed here; these can be used for characterizing exceptional scholarship at this time or pursuing a more comprehensive study. The criteria—significant and broad impact on scholarship and the field, national spheres of public influence, and mentoring and multi-authoring systems—appear in Table 1, with representative quotes from the data.

Importantly, issues of context and tension were raised as different perspectives were offered on the survey question itself from both voting and non-voting respondents. The tension evident in the opening quotes signifies deep, unresolved issues that surfaced during the data analysis. The complexities of this picture are also briefly explored in this article and are open to further interpretation.

Conceptual Framework and Research Scaffolds

In addition to my own curiosity as a professor in this area, four sources inspired this preliminary exploration: (1) the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration's (NCPEA) Living Legend Awards, recognized annually since 1999 (http://www.ncpea.net); (2) Kiewra and Creswell’s (2000) study...
of highly productive educational psychologists, which identified living legends—Richard Anderson, Richard Meyer, Michael Pressley, and Ann Brown—through ‘nominees’ eyes; (3) Cubertson’s (1956) seminal work on the University Council for Educational Administration's (UCEA) history that led to the creation of this organizational inter-university system and these pioneering scholars involved; and (4) Murphy’s (1996) “self-portrait of the profession,” informed by product such as school administration programs. 

Kewra and Creswell’s (2000) study benefited from their ongoing research on productive scholars. They combined a field-based survey approach with dialogic case study methods, interviewing the "most successful" nominees. Adapting buffer modifying this approach to satisfy my own objectives, I surveyed practicing educational leadership professionals for their role of peer nominator. To obtain as many responses as possible and to dilute the influence of any particular "filter" on the outcomes, I did not seek sponsorship from an association or funding agency, instead accessing different venues over time.

Murphy’s (1999) study also explored professors’ concepts of important markers in the academy over one decade (e.g., reform efforts and publications and presentations within the field). Interestingly, those authors and works cited as seminal from 1987 to 1996 overlapped with the results of my own study carried out eleven years later.

Of the top four nominees in this study—in alphabetical order, John Goodlad (University of Washington, retired), John Hoyle (Texas A&M University), Joseph Murphy (Vanderbilt University), and Thomas Scigiovanni (Trinity University)—all but one (John Hoyle) were listed in Murphy’s results. Since my survey question did not specify what constitutes a “living legend,” the possibilities for naming new and different individuals extended beyond the use of publications and citations as a traditional marker of excellence in the academy. The results outlined in Table 1 support this perception, as criteria generated by nominators for making these decisions were much more comprehensive and showed value for theory/practice links. However, despite these differences between the two studies (e.g., the pool of participants was greater in this study, list of nominations longer, and survey question open-ended), the core selections of Murphy’s respondents mirrored my own. This suggests outcomes beyond the scope of either of the studies, each reinforcing the other and, perhaps, enhancing validity. However, neither Murphy’s study nor this study claim to have comprehensively sampled the discipline, opting instead for a purposeful sampling, consistent with a preliminary exploration. This is also the case for Kewra and Creswell’s study.

Participant Pool and Study Method
Nominated Scholars
The many persons forwarded as exceptional by faculty peers may all qualify as “scholar-practitioners” for whom their academic productivity inextricably links to impact and application within the field. While most can be described as full-fledged scholars who have significantly influenced national trends and policy in addition to local contexts, others were selected for their leadership roles within school districts and the community. However, the majority of exceptional scholars nominated work within the academy in various disciplines, primarily educational administration, in one of two respects: (1) broadly representing educational studies within such areas as business, politics, humanities, and philosophy; or (2) specializing in educational leadership with a focus on school leadership, higher education, or teacher education, and in such areas as supervision, school-university collaborative, leadership preparation, policy, and reform.

Survey Methods
Pilot group Discourse. For the survey “The Greatest! Living Scholars of Our Time” (that some quipped to be a “tough assignment!”) recipients were asked to “take a moment to make a difference by answering this question,” to nominate one person, and to “briefly jot down the reason(s) for your choice.” The form alluded to the necessity of being able to make an informed judgment (this survey assumes that you’re in the field of educational leadership). It was established that any feedback would be anonymously reported. A pilot sampling conducted in 2002 at a doctoral research-research metropolitan university in Florida, involved eight educational leadership professors. The question was openly treated and the interest level gauged. This process further verified the value/importance of the question itself, so I broadened my data collection efforts. I also learned that some faculty wanted either to nominate more than one person or to vote with reservations, an outcome that foreshadowed an emerging pattern on a larger scale for some respondents.

Fuller sampling and distribution. Turning to listservs of professional associations, I accessed those most relevant to my study, including university-based educational leadership departments located through Internet searches. Conference councils and educational leadership editorial teams also received the survey. My goal was to obtain 201 surveys—214 (6%) complete responses were received; additionally, 19 electronic messages were returned explaining why a nomination was not possible. In all, 233 (7%) responses were
analyzed. Approximately 3,500 individuals would have received the survey (some more than once), but this number proved impossible to accurately track.

While the goal set for the completed surveys was met, the very low return rate needs to be addressed, especially when one considers that a good response rate of 50 to 60% is generally considered acceptable for survey research (Diam, 2002). However, at least one social science research team has found that its traditional paper survey yielded a higher response rate (60%) than the same questionnaire distributed electronically, which dropped significantly to 27%, this led them to question whether e-surveys are a reliable means of collecting data from a targeted population (Faze, Hardin, Brashears, Smith, & Lockaby, 2003).

In a long list provided by Newman (2002) for increasing one’s response rate from surveys in general, I used most of the suggestions — provide a salient question, indicate why the respondent’s answer matters, keep the survey short and simple, use universally identifiable and a personalized note, and follow up with a reminder. I did not make many telephone calls or offer monetary incentives, both optional strategies for maximizing one’s response rate.

While I do not know for certain why the response rate was low, several possibilities do come to mind. For one thing, the tension evident in some of the responses (and non-responds) received suggest that the nature of the topic itself is controversial. Asking who the most exceptional scholar in educational leadership is today may seem confounded for those who question the very notion of “greatness,” especially among one’s living contemporaries, or those who can think of more than one person, or those who can think of no one at all deserving of such status. As Renzetti and Lert (1993) acknowledge, researching sensitive topics poses conceptual, methodological, and interpretative challenges, an explanation that describes my own experience.

As another possibility, there is little control that can be exerted over a study that is conducted electronically and where the recipients, although from a targeted population, may question the survey focus or the researcher’s motives. This is why I spent additional time collecting the data, re-stating the purpose of the study, eliciting some responses in-person, and emailing reminders to non-respondents, all as strategies for seeking a higher response rate.

Specifically, the survey was electronically circulated to the American Educational Research Association’s (AERA) Division A (Administration), which had 620 members in 2012, and AERA’s Division K (Teaching & Teacher Education), which had 1,004 (http://www.aera.net), Additionally, representatives of UCEA’s executive council and member institutes were recipients (http://www.ucea.org), along with NCPEA’s 720 members (http://www.ncpea.net). Thirty-five leadership professors also represented the Florida Association of Professors of Educational Leadership Association (FAPEL).

Deviation from Kiewra–Creswell study. Unlike Kiewra and Creswell (2000), who generated a list of names based on AERA’s Division C (Learning and Instruction) membership, I did not preselect scholars to be rated. I strove to avoid rating the results to particular associations and their “star” leaders, which could be limited and even biased the data. And I did not want to presume what “living scholar” might mean to others, so I avoided defining this term. Those respondents who forwarded the names of two exceptional scholars, explaining their reasoning for this decision, had both votes counted. Also, in contrast with Kiewra and Creswell’s focus on cognition and learning for their survey and recipient pool, my own form provided no pre-mapping or compartmentalization relative to educational leadership. Reasons for selecting any particular area, such as supervision or policy, seemed arbitrary, serving only to privilege one at the expense of another. I opted for openness, hoping this would promote greater inclusion or representation of the educational leadership field and hence provide a rich data set of interest to readers.

Finally, the Kiewra and Creswell results were based on 41 (out of 113) responses. The 233 responses I received from nominees also compares with the 106 that Murphy (1999) collected.

Saturation and data analysis. The scholars recognized as exceptional in this study achieved this status once the data (i.e., votes cast and reasons provided) revealed clear patterns. Also, the response data (wouns given for selections) were coded, and key words and phrases highlighted, in search of potential themes, applying Miles and Huberman’s (1994) qualitative procedures for data management and analysis.

Discussion of Survey Results
In supplying the reason(s) for their choice, respondents generally emphasized areas of importance, specific contributions, and lines of work, even areas that seemingly influenced their own scholarship. Others noted publications and other scholarly contributions. Four scholars have been identified as exceptional in this article. Although many more names were forwarded, some with obvious and consistent support by the voting body, a demarcation became evident based on the sheer number of tallies over time. A top tier consisting of four individuals had emerged in addition to a second and third tier.

Those few names identified here are all white males. A number of females and a few minorities were nominated (and some were nominees), but not to the point of selection. Although there has been a dramatic
increase of women in educational leadership, school leadership certification programs, and leadership positions in national and local associations (e.g., UCEA, NCPEA, and AERA), male scholars may be publishing more frequently (Engstrom, 1999). As McCarthy (1999) speculated, women as a group have been faculty in this field for over 100 years, and “so they’ve not hit their stride” in terms of scholarly productivity and impact (p. 202). As another possibility, male scholars may be receiving greater recognition for works disseminated and scholarly efforts might. The same trend probably applies to minority scholars. Obviously, such trends and possibilities should be closely examined in the context of equity, ethics, and policy development in academia, as recommended by Flairing (1998) and other scholars.

Different Readings of the Question

The survey question was interpreted in various ways. While some viewed it from a national policy perspective, others considered contribution to the scholarly field, schools, or novice leaders.

Selection Criteria and Reasons

The criteria for selecting reasons given were numerous; these are summarized in Table 1. The entries (appearing on the left) represent the themes that emerged from the responses and each quote (on the right) is from one of the four respondents who provided responses for the corresponding theme: these all characterize the “typical” comments received.

The four scholars selected as leading academics did not ever fully fulfill all of the criteria listed, perhaps because each is known for particular spheres of influence (e.g., leadership standards, administrator program preparation, reform, ethics and moral leadership, K-12 institutional partnership). Nonetheless, all were associated with such dimensions as significant and broad impact on scholarship and the field, national spheres of public influence, and mentoring and multi-authoring systems. The reasons provided extend beyond the traditional association with publication rates and impact via frequency of citation as markers of scholarly excellence. The proliferating criteria also fit with some of the emerging contemporary trends in our field, such as the increase since 1986 of university faculty committing to improving relationships with schools and practitioners, developing field-based components in preparation programs, and focusing more on ethics in professional practice (McCarthy, 1999; Muller, Gordon, Greenlee, & Anderson, 2002).

However, the recurring reasons that were forwarded virtually bypassed contributions in the areas of diversity and social justice as well as alternative paradigms, such as feminism, critical theory, and postmodernism. Perhaps these and other philosophically critical locations will emerge in a more exhaustive sampling or a future one. A critical reader of a draft version of this article asserted that the results “reflect a bias in this field, which is still very traditional while moving ahead.”

Going Wide/Deep as Reformers

Going “wide” is typically a salient pattern, though associated with “living legend.” Generally speaking, the respondents had appeared to construct their own meaning of “exceptional.” Seeking this as a comprehensive effort that is closely related to particular reform agendas. Fulian (1999) explained that “large scaleiness” is only possible where human contact has been established and a “multilevel system” has been managed on a “continuous basis” (p. 74). Although Fulian was addressing broad-scale reforms per se rather than particular reformers, these can be linked as I have discussed in this discussion.

Tensions in the Data Analysis

As is evident from Table 1, the results proved productive for identifying criteria that some academics currently associate with outstanding scholarship. In contrast, a minority (19 individuals) offered powerful insights into why nominations were simply not feasible to them. For a few, the very “use of ‘field’ in the survey question was problematic. ‘I see a problem with your question vis-a-vis your use of the label ‘field.’” Respondents doubtless thought about the heroes in their own areas of study.

Granted, the concept of “field” is very tricky. English (2003) critiques “field” and its cousin “knowledge base” at leftovers from modernism, denying a plurality of realities, truths, and interpretations. Postmodernism brings context, human agency, and multiplicity into the foreground; Educational leadership, similar to leadership studies, incorporates “a broad range of perspectives,” from descriptive to social scientists’ humanistic and drawing upon the interpretive methods of history, literature, philosophy, and education (Johnson, 1996, p. 13). Another perception is that educational leaderships changing: “The intent to bring theory with practice has created an ‘emerging discipline that transcends the academy precisely because it is more than mere scholarship; it is scholarship plus’” (Born, 1996, p. 47).

The hybrid or “borrowing” nature of educational administration has produced a composite field, arousing concern. Someone shared, “I’ve been deeply troubled
by the many contradictions between American democratic ideals and the theories and notions borrowed from business, the military, and the social sciences being subsumed within the field of education administration with little scrutiny." Because of the increasingly amorphous nature of educational leadership, another argued in favor of actually creating a "field" that has boundaries and a distinct identity; "Without clear, substantive differences from other academic departments, education administration as a field of serious scholarly inquiry has no legitimate grounds on which to defend as continued existence within academia, particularly while higher education is being downsized."

For still others, the use of "living scholar" understandably invited confusion and controversy, as thoughtfully articulated: "In good conscience I must say that I find the term living scholar something of an oxymoron. My definition may be out of style these days, but I believe before one can be considered a scholar that person's writings or opinions must have withstood the tests of time." Interestingly, this decision evoked "considerable difficulty. Every time I use your email the same question prevent an answer—does 'greatest living' mean most frequently cited by other scholars? Most followed by practitioners? Contributed the greatest theoretical insights about leadership? Done most to redirect the field of study? Or, added most to the empirical base for understanding leadership?"

My reaction to all of these pivotal concerns is that while the survey question is laden with data, slippery concepts (i.e., "the field," "living scholar," "exceptional," and even "educational leadership"), so is the profession itself. Further, the question solicited valuable information—it is useful to see the multiple, disjointed, and even contradictory viewpoints taken. Areas of consensus also surfaced from this mixed response, as captured in Table 1. Accounting for the feedback of non-voting members as I have done here has made visible issues of contention. Those who provided critiques about the nominating process and suggestively about its validity performed a probing hermeneutic deconstruction that was treated as data and thematically analyzed, with some attention given here.

**Contextual Influences and Background Issues**

One crucial insight of survey respondents was, "Who is outstanding in educational leadership and administration or any scholarly field is really framed by the times and the needs," in many respects, this resounding message has greater worth than the criteria and even the participative selections. Certainly, context matters, a reality that keeps the idea of "living legend" and practice of hero-worshiping in perspective. This admission of temporality and contextuality contrasts with the view that the living legendarium "realists" represent a static, noncontroversial choice.

The results, inevitably debatable from almost any angle, were also influenced by the methods selected and the venues surveyed. Regardless of my attempt to appraise the educational leadership field as comprehensively as possible, a disjointedly configured domain required peremptory, "pick and shovel" sampling. Because no single "repository" exists to which all leadership professors belong, it is currently not possible to communicate with the complete constituency and at one time. Such systematic barriers make it clear that any such study should not be construed as the last word on the subject of exceptional scholarship.

In addition to systemic barriers to data collection, other contextual issues included political alliances, decision-making challenges, and generational biases. Some scholarly communities hold tight allegiances, making it difficult to know the extent to which nominations were influenced by loyalty rather than informed judgment. In a few instances, junior professors "confessed" that they had nominated their former major professors. Perhaps more exhaustive sampling procedures would have better monitored the influence of political entanglements; on the other hand, these seem inherent in the psyche of any discipline. Other contextual influences underscore how challenging it proved for some respondents to make a single selection. This struggle emphasizes just how demanding this decision-making process can be as well as—this is the good news—the high number of outstanding leaders from which to select. A few participants even postulated that no such scholars currently exist, except as experts within their own domain. But most persons did provide a nomination, even where disclaimers had been announced, an admission that supports the contentious notion that leading scholars for contemporary times can in fact be identified, even where tensions and uncertainty are embedded in the conclusions and where debate is inevitable and ongoing.

As mentioned, a generational bias entered into the results but once again the degree of influence is unknown. More senior professors generally know the older or more established generation of scholars, whereas those younger have familiarity with the newer "stars." Several nominators addressed this phenomenon, as in: "The more scholarly respondents might tend to select someone who is measured within their field for the writing they have done. Personally, I am not as up-to-date with names because my own heroes are mostly retirees, in fact, I am ignorant of the mid-career hotshots who are making good waves."
Final Remark

The issues of complexity raised suggest that while nominations of "living legands" seem possible, especially where constituencies have formulated criteria, deeper issues prevail. Nominating forwards/useful and revealing criteria supporting their decision making—a process thoughtfully undertaken by those sharing reflections and caveats. And the dissenting critiques proved invaluable and well. Nominators provided clues about the patterns of educational leadership they most value, the individuals to whom they have looked for guidance, the status of the field, and emergent trends.

Further research is needed that continues work on the controversial topic of exceptional scholarship in educational leadership. Debate is also encouraged about the topics of significance raised: The critical tensions explored herein that capture the thinking of some university faculty in addition to the self-identifying criteria for the votes cast would benefit from a community-wide response.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salient Criteria Provided</th>
<th>Typical Survey Quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actively creates national level discussion about scholarship and the field, connecting</td>
<td>The historical studies of the principalship, studies of leadership of school improvement,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research productivity to discourse in the field</td>
<td>publication on the core work of educational administration, and the follow-up discussions that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>were led around that work have all contributed to pulling the field together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraises, critiques, or develops professional standards that guide the field (e.g.,</td>
<td>The writings and conference papers produced have been key to my leadership of program development at the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>principalship administration preparation, applied theory of education)</td>
<td>master’s level. The honest appraisal of our field has been a most refreshing aspect of the work because we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cannot approve (or “protect”) our field by ignoring our glaring weaknesses. We have been given a base upon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>which we can begin genuinely restructuring programs that might just prepare principals and not just fulfill the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>usual political “necessities” that are more about protection and monetary gain than leadership of leaders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges the practitioner community of school administrators with colleagues in the academy</td>
<td>The works are widely read by scholars and practitioners alike, and the contributions to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and broadly influences the thinking of both cultural groups</td>
<td>the field of educational leadership are widely recognized. The personal rapport with the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>practitioner community is unparalleled, and this person is particularly impressive in the ability to link the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>practitioner community of the administrator associations with colleagues in the academy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporates most comprehensive and deepest reach in educational administration or a related</td>
<td>Has the broadest and deepest grasp of the research and theory on educational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discipline</td>
<td>administration of any scholar I know and works tirelessly on writing and speaking about it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career accomplishments highly impressive</td>
<td>Although this person teaches every semester, time is found for significant professional activity in the areas of consultations, speaking engagements, publishing, and other scholarly pursuits. Has a lot of big studies—is a very prolific author whose work and impact spans teacher preparation, higher education, and K–12 leadership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges assumptions, informs at a heightened level, and produces reflection and personal</td>
<td>The sheer volume of work, combined with the quality of ideas, challenges me to think about the profession in new ways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commit to ethical, humane concepts and practices</td>
<td>I appreciate this individual’s understanding of both the human and task dimensions of leadership and the intelligence to select and prioritize on the side of ethical humane behaviors. Has consistently demonstrated a sensitivity to the phenomenological and moral aspects of school leadership and written about these in a challenging way for the larger audience of practicing public school administrators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draws together multiple scholars in major works (e.g., handbook or yearbook)</td>
<td>The editorial leadership of the Second Edition of the Handbook on Administrative Leadership and the more recent NSSE Yearbook on Leadership for the 21st Century were seminal efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focuses on change process and school reform on a large scale</td>
<td>I believe this individual’s work has impacted scholars and practitioners on school improvement and effectiveness beyond anyone living. The work done on the change process is first rate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Looks forward and is innovative in times of risk

Guides others in a mentoring/collegial capacity

Achieved international reputation and worldwide impact in schools, scholarship, and policy

Leads the standards movement in educational leadership and learning, impacting the preparation of prospective school administrators

 Publishes widely and is highly recognized and cited

Promotes national policy perspectives in various contexts and venues

Visionary capacity shapes the direction of the field
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National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)
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