1993

An Assessment of Productivity Among Professors and Schools of Education in Four Selected Fields of Education from 1971-1990

Joanne M. Frey
Loyola University Chicago

AN ASSESSMENT OF PRODUCTIVITY AMONG PROFESSORS AND SCHOOLS OF EDUCATION IN FOUR SELECTED FIELDS OF EDUCATION FROM 1971-1990

by

Joanne M. Frey

A Dissertation submitted to the Faculty
of the Graduate School of Loyola University of Chicago
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

January

1993

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my gratitude to the chair of my committee Dr. Allan Ornstein. Through his patience and guidance I was able to complete this endeavor. Thank you for being ever encouraging and supportive. It has meant a great deal to me.

I wish to also express my sincere gratitude to my advisor Dr. Barney Berlin. How do you thank a gracious gentleman and a scholar? Thank you for being my mentor and always being there for me.

I also wish to express my sincere appreciation to Dr. Ronald Morgan who was also on this committee. Thank you for your helpful suggestions and encouragement.

I want to thank my family for their support. I want to thank Diantha McJilton for her help and especially for proofreading this investigation.

I would like to express my appreciation and thanks to Jamie Burgess for her quick typing and turn around time.

And I would like also to thank the experts in the fields of Administration and Supervision, Curriculum Studies, Learning and Instruction, and Teacher and Teacher Education for taking time out of their busy schedule to answer my survey.

And, of course, Sam.

VITA

The author, Joanne Marie Frey, is the daughter of David J. Frey III and Lucille S. Frey. She was born in Oak Park, Illinois on July 5, 1953.

She was graduated from Rosary College, in River Forest, Illinois, earning a Bachelor of Arts degree in history and sociology in 1975. She received her Masters in Education degree from National-Louis University as an educational therapist in June 1981. This degree was in special education and combined a major in learning disabilities and behavioral disorders.

She was employed at the R.E.A.L. Learning Center, a public alternative high school located in Franklin Park, Illinois from 1977 to 1988. In 1986, she became the computer coordinator for the school.

In 1989 she enrolled at Loyola University as a full-time student and eventually became a graduate assistant. In the Spring of 1990, she became a supervisor of student teachers.

Publications: "Ralph Tyler: On Change" *Illinois School Research and Development*, (Fall 1989): 1-6 with G. Fahey, W. Flanagan, L. Easter, L. Hauser and B. Laros.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES (con't)

LIST OF TABLES (con't)

LIST OF TABLES (con't)

LIST OF TABLES (con't)

CONTENTS FOR APPENDICES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

An Overview of the Problem

The investigation reported herein was designed to survey scholars designated as experts in one of four fields of education: Administration and Supervision, Curriculum Studies, Learning and Instruction, and Teaching and Teacher Education. These experts were asked which journals they considered to be most influential in their particular fields of inquiry. The journals reported to be influential by the respondents were then systematically examined according to the authors of the articles and their institutional affiliation. A count was tallied to determine the most productive scholars and universities. It should be noted that only one aspect of scholarly productivity was assessed: publication in scholarly journals.

A twenty year period of scholarly productivity from 1971 to 1990 was examined. This time period was divided into four smaller periods (1971-1975, 1976-1980, 1981-1985, and 1986-1990). An attempt was made to document trends of productive scholars and Schools of Education across the four selected fields.

In conducting this investigation certain implications of publication were also observed. For example, a related factor was to determine if productive professors were editors or on editorial advisory boards and how this position may have influenced their publication rates. Morton and Price (1989) discussed the problem of peer reviewing. They contend that many scholars feel that the peer review system is biased. "Established researchers and those who use currently fashionable approaches are favored in this process" (p. 28). Another related factor was gender. What was the role of women? Were there any changes in women's roles from the beginning years of this investigation to the later years?

Nature of the Problem

Problem

To determine the scholarly publication of authors and Schools of Education from 1971 through 1990 in four selected fields (Administration and Supervision, Curriculum Studies, Learning and Instruction, and Teaching and Teacher Education).

Sub-Problems

1a. To determine which professors have published the largest number of articles in influential journals within and among the four selected fields.

Hypothesis 1a. There will be no significant differences among publication rates of professors who

have published the largest number of articles in influential journals within and among the four selected fields.

1b. To determine whether significant differences exist among professors who have published the largest number of articles in influential journals within and among all four selected fields across four time periods: (1971-1975), (1976-1980), (1981-1985), and (1986-1990).

Hypothesis 1b. There will be no significant differences among professors who have published the largest number of articles in influential journals within and among the four selected fields across four time periods: (1971-1975), (1976-1980), (1981-1985), and (1986-1990).

Rationale

Guba and Clark (1978) concluded that eighty percent of the professional population are not actively involved in research. However, the segments of the population that are involved in research activity tend to exert a considerable amount of influence in their respective fields.

Luce and Johnson (1978) conducted an assessment of educational and psychological journals. The results of this investigation suggest that "there is no 'top ten' list of educational and psychological journals" (p. 10). However, Luce and Johnson did establish a "top ten" journal list for each of the specialty areas or divisions of the American

Educational Research Association (AERA).

Smart and McLaughlin (1982) utilized the data collected by Luce and Johnson to conclude that: "The field of education is more a mosaic of specialty areas than a unified whole" (p. 12). They maintained that there is little integration of knowledge within the general field of education. In other words, each specialty area is forging and building upon its own knowledge base, and each area has its own influential journals.

Saunier (1985) concluded that publication rates correlated highly with reputation ratings of graduate departments. Many variables were taken into consideration such as: numbers of faculty and students, library size, grant and research money received, and faculty publications. Faculty who published added to the reputation of the department.

2a. To determine which Schools of Education have published the largest number of articles in influential journals within and among the four selected fields.

Hypothesis 2a. There are no significant differences between Schools of Education which have published the largest number of articles in influential journals within and among the four selected fields.

2b. To determine whether significant differences exist among Schools of Education which have published the

largest number of articles in influential journals within and among the four selected fields across four time periods: (1971-1975), (1976-1980), (1981-1985), and (1986-1990).

Hypothesis 2b. There are no significant differences among Schools of Education which have published the largest number of articles in influential journals within and among the four selected fields across four time periods: (1971-1975), (1976-1980), (1981-1985), and (1986-1990).

Rationale

Blackburn, Behymer and Hall (1978) concluded that university faculty are generally more productive than their counterparts at four year colleges and that faculty employed at so called "high prestige" institutions publish considerably more than those employed at lower prestige institutions. Jalongo (1985) stated that only the top departments at the most prominent institutions demand extensive publication. That is to say that the "publish or perish" controversy may be a myth at most institutions of higher learning.

Braxton and Bayer (1986) concluded that "peer review or ratings of journals provide an objective method for making differentiations among journals. An article published in a refereed journal is assessed and certified as a contribution to knowledge" (p. 31).

3a. To determine whether significant relationships exist among productive professors and productive Schools of Education (who) which have published the largest number of articles in influential journals within the four selected fields.

Hypothesis 3a. There will be no significant relationships among productive professors and productive Schools of Education (who) which have published the largest number of articles in influential journals within the four selected fields.

3b. To determine whether significant relationships exist between productive professors and productive Schools of Education (who) which have published the largest number of articles in influential journals across four selected time periods: (1971-1975), (1976-1980), (1981-1985), and (1986-1990).

Hypothesis 3b. There will be no significant relationships between productive professors and productive Schools of Education (who) which have published the largest number of articles in influential journals across four selected time periods: (1971-1975), (1976-1980), (1981-1985), and (1986-1990).

Rationale

Blau and Margulies (1979) stated that regardless of the

methodology employed the same particular cluster of universities will be rated highly despite variation in the criteria employed. Although the distribution of educational research is widely spread throughout the United States, a few universities appear to dominate the field.

Kroc (1984) stated that "the link between scholarly productivity and reputation in Schools of Education is not always certain" (p. 17). A halo effect around institutions also influences factors concerning the determining of a rating or reputation. There is evidence that productivity varies among different departments within the same School of Education. King and Wolfe (1987) concur with Kroc; apparently some departments are rated highly because of past ratings. A history of high productivity can influence and inflate current reputations. Eash (1983) found that an "institution can either decline or ascend for several years before opinions will change" (p. 11).

Stark (1986) stated that administrators such as college deans play a broad role in facilitating faculty scholarship. Therefore, the perception of the dean influences the faculty viewpoint on the need to publish. The stress on research is greatly influenced by the dean. At most research universities, administrative decisions such as to what proportion of time is devoted to research versus classroom teaching assignments is frequently decided by the dean. These decisions are reported to affect scholarly

productivity (Dill, 1986).

Universities predominate when scholarly productivity is measured. In addition, faculty and library size are considered to be a determining factor. Several large research universities have high publication rates. Institutions with large libraries provide faculty with more access to academic resources (Blau & Margulies, 1974; King & Wolfe, 1987; Saunier, 1985; Schubert, 1979).

According to Walberg, Strykowski, Rovai and Hung (1984), "colleges vary considerably in their productivity" (p. 101). Different variables have been studied such as the number of students obtaining a Doctor of Philosophy degree. The actual number of students who received PhDs were higher at large universities while small private colleges produced a higher percentage of students who eventually received PhDs. Kroc (1984) indicated that colleges within a university vary considerably with respect to their productivity. In other words, because a particular department within a university is productive does not mean that the entire university can be called productive. According to Kroc, educational psychology departments produced many more articles than other departments in the field of education.

Muffo, Mead and Bayer (1987) stated one of the greatest drawbacks of most studies of faculty research performance has been the emphasis placed upon individual faculty members

or departments, rather than on the institution. They claimed that a macro view rather than a micro view would be beneficial when studying this situation.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Influential Journal. An influential journal extended the knowledge base of a field and was respected by other scholars in the field. An influential journal for purposes of this investigation has been in existence for at least a twenty year period. It has been selected by other scholars in the field and most scholars would like to be published in this journal.

Judges/Experts. These two terms were used interchangeably throughout this investigation. Judges or experts in the field of education were determined by their having written at least one text in their respective field. They were asked to select influential journals in their fields.

Productive Professor/Scholar. Professors were identified by the number of articles published in influential journals. Those with the most published articles in influential journals were considered productive professors or scholars.

Published Article. A published article contained a title and an author's byline. It was listed in the journal's table of contents or index. A news item, short column, interview, or book review was not considered an

article.

SIGNIFICANCE

1. The overall purpose of this investigation was to further the knowledge base of four selected areas of education (Administration and Supervision, Curriculum Studies, Learning and Instruction, and Teaching and Teacher Education). Documenting the productivity of education professors and Schools of Education will help us with our efforts to indicate how the knowledge base of the four selected fields is evolving.
2. This investigation was designed to identify which journals were considered by judges (experts) to be most influential in four selected fields of education (Administration and Supervision, Curriculum Studies, Learning and Instruction, and Teaching and Teacher Education).
3. Data were tabulated to ascertain which authors have published the largest number of influential journal articles within four time periods (1971-1975, 1976-1980, 1981-1985, and 1986-1990). These authors were identified as being productive professors or scholars within the four respective fields.
4. Data were tabulated to ascertain the affiliation of the authors to determine which institutions of higher learning have published the most articles in influential journals within four time periods (1971-

1975, 1976-1980, 1981-1985, and 1986-1990). This information will help determine the reputation and influence of Schools of Education.

In short, the findings from this investigation will allow us to systematically document those scholars and institutions of higher learning (who) that are foremost in extending the knowledge base of the four selected fields of inquiry over a twenty year time period.

LIMITATIONS

This investigation was limited by the following:

1. Productive professors may write books rather than articles.
2. The instrument used to measure the influential journals was not a standardized measurement tool.
3. Judges are human with their own biases. The bias of the selected judges influenced the selection of the influential journals. Selection of other journals might have produced other productive professors and Schools of Education.
4. The time and scope of this investigation may have skewed the results. A different time period could designate a different productive professor and/or institution of higher learning. For example, research suggests that age is an influential determinant of a professor's productivity (Kyvik, 1990; Lawrence & Blackburn, 1980; Over, 1982).

5. This investigation focused upon only one dimension of faculty productivity, publication in journals. Other criteria that could have been used are: number of books published; books edited; citations; presentations given at national conventions; and grants and research funding received (Blau & Margulies, 1974; Margulies & Blau, 1973; Walberg, Vukosavich, and Tsai, 1981).
6. Only four fields of education were studied in this investigation. However, there are eleven American Educational Research Association (AERA) divisions. These particular four fields appeared to be more practitioner orientated. Therefore, this sampling was considered to represent a limited view of the field of education.
7. Large universities dominated the publishing rate due to their faculty size. This investigation did not utilize any equalization factor concerning faculty size.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

Initially, this investigation coincided with four of the AERA's established divisions of educational research (Administration, Curriculum Studies, Learning and Instruction, and Teaching and Teacher Education). However, as the investigation proceeded it was noted that AERA's category of Administration seemed to imply the inclusion of Supervision. In order to clarify the parameter of the category, Supervision was listed along with Administration. Another reason for this inclusion was that Schools of Education often listed Supervision and Administration together as one distinct department.

The influential educational journals were determined by a committee of eight or more judges from each of the four designated fields of study. (See Appendix A) The criteria for the selection of the judges was determined by their having written a text in their respective fields. The selected judges were also highly visible in the field of education. Twelve of the selected judges served as either division president or president of AERA (past or present) during the 1971-1990 time period; four served as deans of

Schools of Education; and thirty four served as members of various editorial boards of influential educational journals. An effort was made to select judges who represented different geographic areas throughout the country.

These experts (judges) were asked to list the influential journals in their respective fields. They were asked to rank the five top journals which they considered important for extending the knowledge base in their particular area or field of study. (See Appendix B) Journals that appeared the most times among the experts' rankings were selected as the most influential journals. (In the event of a tie vote both journals were given equal weight and were selected for the investigation. However, journals that received only one vote were not counted as being influential.)

Only journals that had been in existence for at least a twenty year period could qualify as potentially influential. Some journals received enough votes to be identified as influential, but were not counted because they had been published for less than twenty years. The following journals did not meet the longevity qualification: in the field of Administration and Supervision, the *Journal of Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*; in the field of Curriculum Studies, the *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*; and in the field of Teaching and Teacher Education, *Teaching and Teacher Education*. The top five ranked journals for each

field became the basis for the selection of the influential journals.

The field of Administration and Supervision contained only four journals due to the one vote criteria. After the influential journals were established for each field of inquiry, a list of authors published in these journals was conducted. The criteria established for selection constituted a published article in one of the influential journals. (A news item, short column, letters to the editor, interview, or a book review was not considered in the tally.)

A data set was compiled for each of the influential journals in each of the four selected fields and divided into the four time periods. The twenty year time period of this investigation was arbitrarily divided into four time periods of five years each: 1971-1975, 1976-1980, 1981-1985, and 1986-1990. This procedure was established to closely observe interactions within these particular time periods. Comparisons could also be made of the activity occurring in each of the four selected fields. It was assumed that trends could more easily be documented when scrutinized in smaller time periods, as opposed to examining a larger time frame. First the smaller time periods were examined for trends, then the entire twenty year period was examined for trends. This investigation proceeded from a micro view of the four selected fields to a macro view of the four

selected fields.

Each single published author was assigned one point. In the case of multiple authors, a fraction of one was prorated and assigned depending upon the number of authors. In the event that there were two authors, each received one half of a point. If there were three authors, each author received one third of a point. Placement as second or third author had no bearing on the prorated point score. For example, if there were two authors, each received one half of a point regardless of which was the first listed author. All points were prorated.

A tally was conducted to find the authors with the highest total points. The professors with the most points were viewed as the most productive professors or scholars. In order to find the most productive Schools of Education, the author(s) was identified by the institution at which he or she was affiliated at the time of the publication. The same criteria established to identify individual productive scholars and the prorating of one point, was again used to identify productive Schools of Education. For example, if two authors had different affiliations, each affiliation or school would receive one half of a point.

The content of the journal articles were not analyzed in this investigation. A simple count of author's points based on publication in the journals selected for each of the fields was then tabulated. However, the particular

field of the four selected fields of inquiry in which an article was included, based on the experts' journal selections, was the field that was assumed to be influenced by these author's articles.

The data set was compiled to show various trends from the four time periods studied (1971-1975, 1976-1980, 1981-1985, and 1986-1990). Each of the four selected fields of inquiry was examined, as well as the entire twenty years time period, to determine the most productive professors and Schools of Education during each of the four selected time periods.

An investigation of this scope has not been undertaken to date. There have been investigations concerning journal publication rates and citation analysis of journals (Eash, 1984; Gordon, Nucci, West, Hoerr, Uguroglu, Vukosavich, and Tsai, 1984; Guba & Clark, 1978; Luce & Johnson 1979; Walberg, Strykowski, Ravai, and Hung, 1984).

Finally, it should be noted that this investigation differed markedly in methodology from previous investigations. The identification of influential journals by experts in the field was a different approach to the problem. In the past the majority of ranking techniques have dealt with: 1. deans of education ranking the institutions (Blau & Margulies 1974; Margulies & Blau 1973); 2. faculty members ranking the institutions (Cartter, 1966; Ladd & Lipset 1979); or 3. a combination of the above. (Denton,

Tsai & Cloud, 1986; Guba & Clark 1978).

Survey Results

The four fields of education selected for investigation were: Administration and Supervision, Curriculum Studies, Learning and Instruction, and Teaching and Teacher Education. These four fields were investigated over a twenty year period from 1971-1990. This twenty year time period was arbitrarily divided into four time periods of five years: 1971-1975, 1976-1980, 1981-1985, and 1986-1990.

A survey was mailed to the selected judges in each of the four selected fields. The judges were asked to determine which journals they considered to be influential in their respective field. A list of the selected judges, who were mailed surveys appear in Appendix A. The actual letter and survey appear in Appendix B.

The survey results yielded the following: the field of Administration and Supervision had nine responses out of eleven judges surveyed; Curriculum Studies had ten responses from the twelve judges surveyed; Learning and Instruction had twelve responses from the thirteen judges surveyed; and Teaching and Teacher Education had eight responses out of eight judges surveyed. A response was identified as a judge (1) sending back the survey and; (2) writing down those journals he or she perceived to be influential in his or her field. These responses were then tallied to determine the influential journals in each field. It should be noted that

the responses were weighted. For example, if one judge wrote down two journal choices instead of listing five journals, the vote was weighted accordingly to give more weight to those journals appearing on shorter lists. This may be considered a weakness in the survey research because it was not known if judges meant to give these particular journals the greater weight that was later assigned. The results of this survey appear in Tables 10, 11, 12, and 13. Forty four survey requests were mailed to the judges listed in Appendix A. Thirty nine survey replies were used. The survey had an 88.6% response rate.

Administration and Supervision

In the field of Administration and Supervision, the following journals received the most votes from the judges: *Educational Leadership*, followed by *Phi Delta Kappan* and *Educational Administration Quarterly*. Tied for fourth place, the influential journals identified were the *Journal of Educational Administration* and the *Journal of Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*. Since the *Journal of Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* did not meet the established criterion of being in existence for at least twenty years, this journal was eliminated from the list. Since there were no other journals that received more than one vote, only the four journals listed above were scrutinized for this field. (See Table 10) The field of Administration and Supervision was dominated by *Educational*

Table 10

Journals Selected as Influential by Judges in the Field of Administration and Supervision

	Total Number of Votes
* *Educational Leadership*	9.00
* *Phi Delta Kappan*	7.75
* *Educational Administration Quarterly*	6.25
* *Journal of Education Administration*	3.25
Journal of Educational Evaluation & Policy Analysis	3.25
Instructor	1.25
Journal of Curriculum and Supervision	1.25
Journal of Teacher Education	1.25
NASSP Bulletin	1.25
National Staff Development Journal	1.25
Principal	1.25
Administrative Science Quarterly	1.00
ASCD Publications	1.00
Harvard Business Review	1.00
Journal of Curriculum Studies	1.00
Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education	1.00
Journal of Supervision	1.00
National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervision Journal	1.00
Public Policy	1.00

* included in this investigation

Leadership and *Phi Delta Kappan*. These general educational journals heavily influenced the outcome of the survey in this field.

Curriculum Studies

In the field of Curriculum Studies, the following journals received the most votes from the judges: *Curriculum Inquiry* followed by *Journal of Curriculum Studies*. The *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision* was selected as the third most influential journal. However, the *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision* did not meet the established criterion of being in existence for twenty years. Therefore, the *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision* was eliminated from the list. *Educational Leadership* was identified as the fourth most influential journal followed by the *Harvard Educational Review* in fifth place. *Phi Delta Kappan* was selected as the sixth most influential journal in this field. Since *Phi Delta Kappan* received the next largest number of votes, it was included in the list in place of the *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*. (See Table 11) The field of Curriculum Studies was dominated by specialty journals. However, due to the sheer volume of *Educational Leadership*, *Phi Delta Kappan*, and *Harvard Educational Review* these journals exerted extreme influence over this field.

Table 11

Journals Selected as Influential by Judges in the Field of Curriculum Studies

	Total Number of Votes
* *Curriculum Inquiry*	10.95
* *Journal of Curriculum Studies*	7.45
Journal of Curriculum and Supervision	6.20
* *Educational Leadership*	4.95
* *Harvard Educational Review*	4.25
* *Phi Delta Kappan*	3.95
Journal of Curriculum Theorizing	2.25
Teachers College Record	2.25
NASSP Bulletin	1.70
Educational Researcher	1.25
American Educational Research Journal	1.00
Clearing House	1.00
Educational Theory	1.00
High School Journal	1.00
Review of Educational Research	1.00
Review of Research in Education	1.00
Theory into Practice	.70

* included in this investigation

Learning and Instruction

In the field of Learning and Instruction, the following journals received the most votes from the judges. The *Journal of Educational Psychology* received the largest number of votes, followed by the *American Educational Research Journal*. The *Review of Educational Research* was selected as the third most influential journal. *Educational Psychologist* was identified as the fourth most influential journal and *Educational Leadership* was selected as the fifth most influential journal. (See Table 12) The field of Learning and Instruction was the least affected by the generalist journals. The only generalist journal voted influential in this field was *Educational Leadership*. The remaining journals were specialty journals.

Teaching and Teacher Education

In the field of Teaching and Teacher Education, the following journals received the most votes: The *Journal of Teacher Education* was first. There was a three way tie for second place (in alphabetical order *Elementary School Journal, Harvard Educational Review*, and *Phi Delta Kappan*). *Teaching and Teacher Education* was selected as the fifth most influential journal. Since *Teaching and Teacher Education* did not meet the established criterion of being in existence for at least twenty years, this journal was not included in the list. *Educational Leadership* (6) was

Table 12

Journals Selected as Influential by Judges in the Field of Learning and Instruction

	Total Number of Votes
* *Journal of Educational Psychology*	9.04
* *American Educational Research Journal*	5.70
* *Review of Educational Research*	5.37
* *Educational Psychologist*	4.25
* *Educational Leadership*	3.95
Cognition and Instruction	3.67
Elementary School Journal	3.37
Journal of Educational Research	3.00
Phi Delta Kappan	2.95
Reading Research Quarterly	2.67
Educational Researcher	1.95
Teaching K-8	1.00
NASSP Bulletin	1.00
Instructional Science	1.00
Teaching and Teacher Education	1.00
Journal of Applied Psychology	1.00
American Psychologist	1.00
School Review	1.00
Educational Psychology Review	1.00
Journal of Experimental Education	1.00

* included in this investigation

selected because it received the next largest amount of votes and met the twenty year existence criteria. (See Table 13) Like the field of Curriculum Studies, the field of Teaching and Teacher Education was influenced by the following journals: *Educational Leadership*, *Phi Delta Kappan*, and *Harvard Educational Review*.

An Examination of Highly Rated Journals

According to this investigation, *Educational Leadership* received the most overall recognition because of its placement near the top of each of the four selected fields. *Phi Delta Kappan* was the second most recommended journal. *Phi Delta Kappan* was rated highly in three out of the four selected fields. *Educational Leadership* and *Phi Delta Kappan* may be classified as general educational journals while other journals such as *Journal of Curriculum Studies* or *Journal of Teacher Education* would be classified as specialty journals.

Educational Leadership and *Phi Delta Kappan* are published ten and eight times a year respectively, as opposed to a quarterly publication. Authors that succeeded in publishing frequently in these journals usually were identified as productive scholars. Of the productive scholars, thirty four professors out of a possible seventy five professors (or forty five percent of the professors) were published predominantly in either *Educational Leadership* or

Table 13

Journals Selected as Influential by Judges in the Field of Teaching and Teacher Education

	Total Number of Votes
* *Journal of Teacher Education*	5.67
* *Elementary School Journal*	4.00
* *Harvard Educational Review*	4.00
* *Phi Delta Kappan*	4.00
Teaching and Teacher Education	3.67
* *Educational Leadership*	3.00
Action in Teacher Education	2.67
Teachers College Record	2.00
American Educational Research Journal	2.00
Review of Educational Research	2.00
Educational Researcher	1.00
Educational Supplement & Sunday New York Times	1.00
Education Week	1.00
NEA Today	1.00
Journal of Educational Psychology	1.00
American Journal of Education	1.00
Educational Theory	1.00

* included in this investigation

Phi Delta Kappan or a combination of of both journals. This finding indicates that a generalist tended to be rated as a productive scholar more frequently than a specialist who was limited to fewer journals in which he or she might be published. *Educational Leadership* has developed a different editorial philosophy than most of the journals analyzed in this investigation. Its publication committee has become predominantly a practitioner based board with a heavy emphasis placed upon supervisors and administrators. In this instance, a practitioner was defined as a person working directly in the field of education such as an administrator, supervisor, teacher, or a consultant; that is, individuals in the field of education without a college or university affiliation. In the 1970s the advisory board of the publication committee was dominated by members with university affiliations. In the 1980s publication advisory board members with university affiliations became the minority and practitioners or school-based people tended to dominate the publication advisory board. Most other journals studied in this investigation, including *Phi Delta Kappan*, have retained an editorial board dominated by professors throughout the time periods investigated.

The *Harvard Educational Review* (*HER*) was designated as an influential journal in two fields (Curriculum Studies and Teaching and Teacher Education). Because *HER* publishes primarily authors from Harvard University, this publication

tended to skew the findings in these two fields. In the 1970s and early 1980s, Harvard scholars published mainly in *HER*. However, in this investigation it appears that Harvard professors in the last ten years have expanded into other journals, especially the *Phi Delta Kappan*. Throughout the four time periods studied, the *HER* editorial board consisted of Harvard graduate students.

Additional information about year first published, subscription numbers, and times per year published for these journals is provided in Appendix C.

A count was taken of journal articles. The criteria for a journal article was that the piece contained a title with an author's byline, and was listed in the journal's table of contents or index. A news item, short column, interview, or book review was not considered an article. The content or topic of the article was not examined. A count of accumulated author points was tabulated as previously explained in Chapter III.

Several of the influential journals named in this investigation were named in previous studies. Guba and Clark used the following journals in their 1978 study: *Educational Leadership*, *Phi Delta Kappan*, *Educational Administration Quarterly*, the *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *American Educational Research Journal*, and the *Review of Educational Research*. Luce and Johnson (1978) identified the following journals in their study, *Phi Delta*

Kappan, *Harvard Educational Review*, *American Educational Research Journal*, and *Review of Educational Research*. In 1983, Eash used the *American Educational Review*, the *Harvard Educational Review*, the *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *Phi Delta Kappan*, and *Review of Educational Research*, in his investigation of productivity.

HYPOTHESES

Hypothesis 1a. There will be no significant differences among professors in the number of published articles in influential journals within and among the four selected fields.

A Two-Way Anova test was computed to measure the analysis of variance to compare the means. (See Table 14)

A P-value of .911 was obtained. In order for any significance to have occurred a value of less than .05 must have been obtained. No significant difference was found. Therefore, null Hypothesis 1a was not rejected.

Hypothesis 1b. There will be no significant differences among professors in the number of published articles in influential journals within and among all four selected fields across four time periods: (1971-1975), (1976-1980), (1981-1985), and (1986-1990).

A Two-Way Anova test was computed to compare the means across groups. (See Table 14) A P-value of .021 was obtained. In order for significance to have occurred a value of less than .05 must have been obtained. Therefore,

Table 14

Two-Way Anova Testing the Hypotheses Relating to Productive Scholars

Two-Way Anova Chart

Source	ss	df	MS	F	P
Field	2.033	3	.678	.179	.911
Time	38.079	3	12.693	3.345	.021 *
Field x Time	5.079	9	.564	.149	.998

Note: * significant at .02 level

Field= Administration and Supervision x Curriculum Studies x Learning and Instruction x Teaching and Teacher Education

Time= (1971-1975) x (1976-1980) x (1981-1985) x (1986-1990)

null Hypothesis 1b was rejected.

Hypothesis 2a. There will be no significant differences among Schools of Education which have published the largest number of articles in influential journals within and among among the four selected fields.

A Two-Way Anova test was computed to compare the means across groups. A P-value of .001 was obtained. (See Table 15) In order for significance to have occurred a value of less than .05 must have been found. Therefore, null Hypothesis 2a was rejected.

Hypothesis 2b. There will be no significant differences between Schools of Education which have published the largest number of articles in influential journals

Table 15

Two-Way Anova Testing the Hypotheses Relating to Productive Universities

Two-Way Anova Chart

Source	ss	df	MS	F	P
Field	1329.993	3	443.331	6.372	.001 *
Time	166.994	3	55.665	.800	.496
Field x Time	163.417	9	18.157	.261	.984

Note: * significant at .05 level

Field= Administration and Supervision x Curriculum Studies x Learning and Instruction x Teaching and Teacher Education

Time= (1971-1975) x (1976-1980) x (1981-1985) x (1986-1990)

within and among the four selected fields across four time periods: (1971-1975), (1976-1980), (1981-1985), and (1986-1990).

A Two-Way Anova test was computed to compare the means across groups. A P-value of .496 was obtained. (See Table 15) In order for significance to have occurred a value of less than .05 must have been found. No significant difference was found. Therefore, null Hypothesis 2c was not rejected.

Hypothesis 3a. There will be no significant relationships between productive professors and productive Schools of Education (who) which have published the largest number of articles in influential journals within and among the four selected time periods: (1971-1975), (1976-

1980), (1981-1985), and (1986-1990).

A Two-Way Anova test was computed to compare the means across groups. A P-value of .001 was obtained. (See Table 16) In order for significance to have occurred a value of less than .05 must have been found. Therefore, null Hypothesis 3a was rejected.

Hypothesis 3b. There are no significant relationships between productive professors and productive Schools of Education (who)which have published the largest number of articles in influential journals across four selected time periods: (1971-1975), (1976-1980), (1981-1985), and (1986-1990).

A Two-Way Anova test was computed to compare the means across groups. A P-Value of .001 was obtained. In order for significance to have occurred a value of less than .05 must have been found. Therefore, null Hypothesis 3b. was rejected.

It was interesting to note that time appeared to be an important variable when it came to identifying scholars. At different periods of time, different scholars rose to prominence. By looking at all the data, subtle changes in who was productive began to appear. Scholars tended to write prolifically for an extended period of time; moreover, these leaders expanded into other fields.

Table 16

Two-Way Anova Testing Hypotheses Relating to Productive Universities to Time Periods and Field of Study

Two-Way Anova Chart

Source	ss	df	MS	F	P
Field	1557.192	3	519.064	6.963	.001 *
Time	378.362	3	126.121	1.692	.169
Univ	10351.918	29	356.963	4.788	.001 *

Note: * significant at .001 level

Field= Administration and Supervision x Curriculum Studies x Learning and Instruction x Teaching and Teacher Education

Time= (1971-1975) x (1976-1980) x (1981-1985) x (1986-1990)

Univ= University totals

A productive scholar's influence appeared in than just his or her area of expertise. The influence was noticed far beyond a particular field. In fact, the results of this investigation showed that the productive scholars in the field of Learning and Instruction have written many articles that were also tallied in the fields of Curriculum Studies and Teaching and Teacher Education. However, the reverse was not true. There were only a few scholars that were named influential in the Learning and Instruction category that were not educational psychologists. For example, Alex Molnar appeared in the 1981-1985 listing and Madeline Hunter appeared in the 1986-1990 listing. Although the branches of

each of the fields of education were not isolated, little interaction occurred among the fields of Administration and Supervision, Curriculum Studies, and Teaching and Teacher Education into the field of Learning and Instruction. Further investigation should be continued to explore the ramifications of this finding.

Productive scholars differed from productive Schools of Education in that time periods were important to scholar prominence while the particular field was important to the prominence of the Schools of Education. The factor of professor aging or professor mobility presumably figured into the results about professors. Institutions of higher learning were not as noticeably sensitive to these variables.

According to the findings reported here, departments within Schools of Education differ significantly. For example, if a Curriculum Department was considered productive it did not necessarily follow that the Department of Administration and Supervision would also be considered productive. Productivity varied by field or department throughout each of the universities. There were significant differences according to each particular field investigated within the same university. Some universities were strong in certain fields. No one particular university monopolized productivity in all four fields.

CHAPTER IV

PRODUCTIVE SCHOLARS

While collecting data to corroborate Hypothesis 1a, a database was constructed of all who contributed articles to influential journals within the twenty year time period (1971-1990). In what follows are the results of the study separated into the five year interval time periods.

Productive Scholars 1971-1975

According to what is reported here, the field of Administration and Supervision was most influenced by the writings of Mario Fantini from 1971-1975. Fantini was identified as the most productive scholar of this particular time period because he wrote the most articles published in influential journals during this period. The next most productive scholar was Myron Lieberman. Allan Ornstein and W. James Popham were tied for third, and Harold Shane was fifth. Other productive scholars identified in the field of Administration and Supervision during this period were: (6) James Banks, (7) Harold Spears, (8) Donald Willower, (9) Frank Lutz, and (10) Peter Idstein. (See Table 17)

It should be mentioned that the category of Administration and Supervision was heavily represented by authors from

TABLE 17

A Comparative Listing of the Top Ten Productive Scholars in Four Selected Fields, (1971-1975)

Administration and Supervision	Curriculum Studies	Learning and Instruction	Teaching and Teacher Education
1. Mario Fantini	1. Mario Fantini	1. Richard Anderson	1. Mario Fantini
2. Myron Lieberman	2.5 Myron Lieberman 2.5 W. James Popham	2. Herbert Walberg	2.33 Allan Ornstein 2.33 Myron Lieberman 2.33 W. James Popham
3.5 Allan Ornstein 3.5 W. James Popham		3. Arthur Jensen	
	4. Allan Ornstein	4. Joel Levin	
5. Harold Shane	5. Harold Shane	5.5 Jere Brophy 5.5 Richard Mayer	5. Harold Shane
6. James Banks	6.25 James Banks 6.25 James Coleman		6. James Banks
7. Harold Spears	6.25 Harold Spears 6.25 Decker Walker	7. S. Jay Samuels	7. Harold Spears
8. Donald Willower		8. William Rohwer,Jr.	8. James Coleman
9. Frank Lutz		9. Robert Gagne	9.5 Lawrence Kohlberg 9.5 John Stewig
10. Peter Idstein	10. Lawrence Kohlberg	10. Raymond Kulhavy	

Educational Leadership and *Phi Delta Kappan*. If an author was frequently published in either *Educational Leadership* or *Phi Delta Kappan*, then being named a productive scholar was assured. For example, Allan Ornstein was identified as a productive scholar solely based upon his large publishing count (n=6) established from his contributions to *Phi Delta Kappan*. In the case of Mario Fantini, if his contributions to *Educational Leadership* and *Phi Delta Kappan* were excluded, he would not have been named a productive scholar.

In the field of Curriculum Studies during the 1971-1975 time period, Mario Fantini was identified as the most

productive scholar because he wrote the most articles published in influential journals during this period. Myron Lieberman and W. James Popham were tied as the next productive scholars in this category. Allan Ornstein was fourth, while Harold Shane was fifth. Other productive scholars identified in the field of Curriculum Studies during this period were: (6) James Banks, (6) James Coleman, (6) Harold Spears, (6) Decker Walker --all of who were tied, and (10) Lawrence Kohlberg. (See Table 17)

In the field of Learning and Instruction during the 1971-1975 time period, Richard Anderson was identified as the most productive scholar. Herbert Walberg was the second most productive scholar, Arthur Jensen was third, Joel Levin was fourth and Jere Brophy and Richard Mayer were tied for fifth. Other productive scholars in the field of Learning and Instruction during this period were: (7) S. Jay Samuels, (8) William Rohwer, (9) Robert Gagne, and (10) Raymond Kulhavy. (See Table 17)

In the field of Teaching and Teacher Education during the 1971-1975 time period, Mario Fantini was identified as the most productive scholar because he wrote the most articles published in influential journals during this period. Allan Ornstein, Myron Lieberman, and W. James Popham were tied for the second most productive scholar, while Harold Shane was fifth. Other productive scholars in the field of Teaching and Teacher Education during this

period were: (6) James Banks, (7) Harold Spears, (8) James Coleman, Lawrence Kohlberg, and John Stewig were tied for ninth. (See Table 17)

A Comparative Analysis of the Four Selected Fields

The three fields of Administration and Supervision, Curriculum Studies, and Teaching and Teacher Education were similar in the listing of productive scholars. Some subtle changes were noted but overall these categories share many of the same members. However, the field of Learning and Instruction exhibited a more pronounced difference when compared with the other three fields of education studied. This may be due to the extent to which this field was influenced by specialist journals in educational psychology.

A Comparative Analysis of Productive Scholars Across All Four Fields of Inquiry 1971-1975

The data collected to substantiate Hypothesis 1b. yielded the following: Richard Anderson and W. James Popham (tied for first place) wrote the most articles published in influential journals when all fields were combined during this time period. Herbert Walberg was third, followed by (4) Mario Fantini. Myron Lieberman and Allan Ornstein were tied for fifth place. Other scholars who were productive during this time period were: (7) Jere Brophy, (8) James Coleman, (9) Harold Shane, and (10) Joel Levin. (See Table 18)

Table 18

The Top Ten Productive Scholars Across Four Fields: Administration and Supervision, Curriculum Studies, Learning and Instruction, and Teaching and Teacher Education, (1971-1975)*

1.5	Richard Anderson
1.5	W. James Popham
3.	Herbert Walberg
4.	Mario Fantini
5.5	Myron Lieberman
5.5	Allan Ornstein
7.	Jere Brophy
8.	James Coleman
9.	Harold Shane
10.	Joel Levin

* Based on counting the total number of articles published in four selected fields.

Overall Influential Scholars Among the Four Fields of Inquiry 1971-1975

Overall standings among the four selected fields were calculated by averaging the ranking and number of times a productive scholar appeared in the comparative listing of the top ten productive scholars. This procedure measured the extent of that scholar's total influence among the four selected fields. This was an expansion of the analysis performed to validate Hypothesis 1b. An influential

productive scholar category was analyzed using only the top five members because after the top five, influence was not well defined.

Once again, Mario Fantini was identified as the most influential productive scholar during the 1971-1975 time period because he was rated first in three out of the four fields investigated: Administration and Supervision, Curriculum Studies, and Teaching and Teacher Education. Myron Lieberman was identified as the second most influential productive scholar because he was rated second in three out of the four fields investigated: Administration and Supervision, Curriculum Studies, and Teaching and Teacher Education. W. James Popham was identified as third, because he was rated third in the field of Administration and Supervision, second in the fields of Curriculum Studies and Teaching and Teacher Education. Allan Ornstein was fourth, because he was rated second in the field of Teaching and Teacher Education, third in the field of Administration and Supervision, and fourth in the field of Curriculum Studies. Harold Shane was identified as the fifth most influential productive scholar of this time period, because he was rated fifth in the following fields: Administration and Supervision, Curriculum Studies, and Teaching and Teacher Education. (See Table 19)

Productive Scholars 1976-1980

According to what is reported here, the field of

Table 19

The Top Five Averaged Ranking of the Most Influential Scholars in Four Selected Fields: Administration and Supervision, Curriculum Studies, Learning and Instruction, and Teaching and Teacher Education, (1971-1975)*

1.	Mario Fantini
2.	Myron Lieberman
3.	W. James Popham
4.	Allan Ornstein
5.	Harold Shane

* Based on rankings within the four selected fields, then averaging the rankings for a total rank score.

Administration and Supervision was most influenced by the writings of W. James Popham from 1976-1980 because he wrote the most articles published in influential journals during this period. Vincent Rogers was second, Harry Broudy was third, followed by Philip Hosford. Eugene Budig, Mario Fantini, Samuel Halperin, Mary Anne Raywid, and B. Othanel Smith were tied as the fifth most productive scholar. Another scholar who was identified as productive during this time period was (10) Rita Dunn. (See Table 20)

In the field of Curriculum Studies during the 1976-1980 time period, W. James Popham was identified as the most productive scholar. Vincent Rogers was second, Harry Broudy was third, Elliot Eisner was fourth, and Philip Hosford was

TABLE 20

A Comparative Listing of the Top Ten Productive Scholars in Four Selected Fields, (1976-1980)

Administration and Supervision	Curriculum Studies	Learning and Instruction	Teaching and Teacher Education
1. W.James Popham	1. W.James Popham	1. Robert Slavin	1. W.James Popham
2. Vincent Rogers	2. Vincent Rogers	2. Richard Mayer	2. Vincent Rogers
3. Harry Broudy	3. Harry Broudy	3. Michael Pressley	3. John Zahorik
4. Philip Hosford	4. Elliot Eisner	4. Lloyd Humphreys	4. Patrick Groff
5.20 Eugene Budig	5. Philip Hosford	5.5 Philip Hosford	5. Harry Broudy
5.20 Mario Fantini		5.5 Penelope Peterson	
5.20 Samuel Halperin			
5.20 Mary Anne Raywid			
5.20 B. Othanel Smith			
	6.12 Eugene Budig		6.5 B.Othanel Smith
	6.12 Mario Fantini		6.5 Perry Zirkel
	6.12 Henry Giroux		
	6.12 Maxine Greene		
	6.12 Samuel Halperin		
	6.12 Herbert Kliebard		
	6.12 Mary Anne Raywid		
	6.12 B. Othanel Smith		
		7. Harris Cooper	
		8. Joel Levin	8. Philip Hosford
		9. John Houston	9. John Goodlad
10. Rita Dunn		10. Francis DiVesta	10. Robert Anderson

fifth. Other productive scholars in the field of Curriculum Studies during this period were: (6) Eugene Budig, (6) Mario Fantini, (6) Henry Giroux, (6) Maxine Greene, (6) Samuel Halperin, (6) Herbert Kliebard, (6) Mary Anne Raywid, and (6) B. Othanel Smith. All these professors were tied for sixth place. (See Table 20)

In the field of Learning and Instruction during the 1976-1980 time period, Robert Slavin was identified as the most productive scholar. Richard Mayer was second, Michael

Pressley was third, and Lloyd Humphreys was fourth. Philip Hosford and Penelope Peterson were tied for fifth. Other productive scholars identified in the field of Learning and Instruction during this period were: (7) Harris Cooper, (8) Joel Levin, (9) John Houston, and (10) Francis DiVesta. (See Table 20)

In the field of Teaching and Teacher Education during the 1976-1980 time period, W. James Popham was identified as the most productive scholar. Vincent Rogers was second, John Zahorik was third, Patrick Groff was fourth, and Harry Broudy was fifth. Other productive scholars identified in the field of Teaching and Teacher Education during this period were: B. Othanel Smith, and Perry Zirkel tied for sixth, (8) Philip Hosford, (9) John Goodlad, and (10) Robert Anderson. (See Table 20)

A Comparative Analysis of Productive Scholars Across All Four Fields of Inquiry 1976-1980

The data collected to substantiate Hypothesis 1b yielded the following: Robert Slavin wrote the most articles published in influential journals when all fields were combined during this period. W. James Popham was second, Vincent Rogers was third, Richard Mayer was fourth, followed by Harry Broudy, Patrick Groff, and John Zahorik --all who were tied for fifth. Other scholars who were identified as productive during this period were: (8) Thomas Good, (9) Daniel Duke, and (10) Elliot Eisner. (See Table 21)

Table 21

The Top Ten Productive Scholars Across Four Fields: Administration and Supervision, Curriculum Studies, Learning and Instruction, and Teaching and Teacher Education, (1976-1980)*

1.	Robert Slavin
2.	W. James Popham
3.	Vincent Rogers
4.	Richard Mayer
5.33	Harry Broudy
5.33	Patrick Groff
5.33	John Zahorik
8.	Thomas Good
9.	Daniel Duke
10.	Elliot Eisner

* Based on counting the total number of articles published in four selected fields.

Overall Influential Scholars Among the Four Fields of Inquiry 1976-1980

Overall standings among the four selected fields were calculated by averaging the ranking and number of times a productive scholar appeared in the comparative listing of the top ten productive scholars. This procedure measured the extent of that scholar's total influence among the four selected fields. This was an expansion of the analysis performed to validate Hypothesis 1b. The overall

influential scholar category was analyzed using only the top five members because after the top five, influence was not well defined.

W. James Popham was identified as the most productive influential scholar during the 1976-1980 time period. He was rated the first in three out of the four fields investigated: Administration and Supervision, Curriculum Studies, and Teaching and Teacher Education. Vincent Rogers was identified as the second most influential productive scholar. Rogers was rated second highest in three out of the four fields investigated: Administration and Supervision, Curriculum Studies, and Teaching and Teacher Education. Harry Broudy and Philip Hosford tied for third most influential productive scholar. Broudy was identified as the third most productive scholar in the fields of Administration and Supervision and Curriculum Studies but in the field of Teaching and Teacher Education, he was fifth. Philip Hosford was identified as fourth in the field of Administration and Supervision, fifth in the fields of Curriculum Studies, and Learning and Instruction, and eighth in the field of Teaching and Teacher Education. Hosford was the first influential productive scholar to be named in all four fields of education discussed in this investigation. B. Othanel Smith was fifth. He was rated as fifth in the fields of Administration and Supervision, and Curriculum Studies, and sixth in the field of Teaching and Teacher

Education. (See Table 22)

Productive Scholars 1981-1985

According to what is reported here, the field of Administration and Supervision was most influenced by the writings of Donald Willower from 1981-1985. John Goodlad was second, Robert Sternberg was third, and Edward Wynne was fourth. The following scholars were tied for fifth place: Thomas McDaniel, Mary Anne Raywid, and Elliot Eisner. Other productive scholars identified in the field of Administration and Supervision during this period were: (8) Herbert Walberg and Jerry Duea and Allan Ornstein, tied for ninth. (See Table 23)

In the field of Curriculum Studies during the 1981-1985 time period, John Goodlad was the most productive scholar. Robert Sternberg was second, followed by Elliot Eisner, Allan Ornstein, and Edward Wynne, who were tied for third. Other identified productive Curriculum Studies scholars during this period were: (6) Michael Kirst, (7) Chester Finn, (8) Thomas McDaniel, (8) Diane Ravitch, and (8) Mary Anne Raywid, who were tied for eighth. (See Table 23)

In the field of Learning and Instruction during the 1981-1985 time period, Herbert Walberg was identified as the most productive scholar. Robert Sternberg was second, Dale Schunk and Noreen Webb were tied for third, and James Kulik was fifth. Other productive scholars identified in the field of Learning and Instruction during this period were:

TABLE 22

The Top Five Averaged Ranking of the Most Influential Scholars in Four Selected Fields: Administration and Supervision, Curriculm Studies, Learning and Instruction, and Teaching and Teacher Education, (1976-1980)*

1.	W. James Popham
2.	Vincent Rogers
3.	Harry Broudy
4.	Philip Hosford
5.	B. Othanel Smith

* Based on rankings within the four selected fields, then averaging the rankings for a total rank score.

TABLE 23

A Comparative Listing of the Top Ten Productive Scholars in Four Selected Fields, (1981-1985)

Administration and Supervision	Curriculum Studies	Learning and Instruction	Teaching and Teacher Education
1. Donald Willower	1. John Goodlad	1. Herbert Walberg	1. John Goodlad
2. John Goodlad	2. Robert Sternberg	2. Robert Sternberg	2. Doyle Watts
3. Robert Sternberg	3.33 Elliot Eisner 3.33 Allan Ornstein 3.33 Edward Wynne	3.5 Dale Schunk 3.5 Noreen Webb	3. Robert Sternberg
4. Edward Wynne			4.5 Donald Cruickshank 4.5 Edward Wynne
5.33 Thomas McDaniel 5.33 Mary Anne Raywid 5.33 Elliot Eisner		5. James Kulik	
	6. Michael Kirst	6. Joel Levin	6. Allan Ornstein
	7. Chester Finn, Jr.	7. Alex Molnar	7. Chester Finn, Jr.
8. Herbert Walberg	8.33 Thomas McDaniel 8.33 Diane Ravitch 8.33 Mary Anne Raywid	8. Richard Mayer	8.17 Elliot Eisner 8.17 Michael Kirst 8.17 Thomas McDaniel 8.17 Alex Molnar 8.17 Diane Ravitch 8.17 Mary Anne Raywid
9.5 Jerry Duea 9.5 Allan Ornstein		9.5 Penelope Peterson 9.5 Robert Slavin	

(6) Joel Levin, (7) Alex Molnar, (8) Richard Mayer and Penelope Peterson and Robert Slavin, who were tied for ninth. (See Table 23)

In the field of Teaching and Teacher Education during the 1981-1985 time period, John Goodlad was identified as as the most productive scholar. Doyle Watts was second, and Robert Sternberg was third. Donald Cruickshank and Edward Wynne were tied for fourth. Other productive scholars identified in the field of Teaching and Teacher Education during this period were: (6) Allan Ornstein, (7) Chester

Finn, (8) Thomas McDaniel, (8) Diane Ravitch, and (8) Mary Anne Raywid, who were tied for eighth. (See Table 23)

In the field of Learning and Instruction during the 1981-1985 time period, Herbert Walberg was identified as the most productive scholar. Robert Sternberg was second, Dale Schunk and Noreen Webb were tied for third, and James Kulik was fifth. Other productive scholars identified in the field of Learning and Instruction during this period were: (6) Joel Levin, (7) Alex Molnar, (8) Richard Mayer and Penelope Peterson and Robert Slavin, who were tied for ninth. (See Table 23)

In the field of Teaching and Teacher Education during the 1981-1985 time period, John Goodlad was identified as as the most productive scholar. Doyle Watts was second, and Robert Sternberg was third. Donald Cruickshank and Edward Wynne were tied for fourth. Other productive scholars identified in the field of Teaching and Teacher Education during this period were: (6) Allan Ornstein, (7) Chester Finn, and Elliot Eisner, Michael Kirst, Thomas McDaniel, Alex Molnar, Diane Ravitch, and Mary Anne Raywid, who were tied for eighth. (See Table 23)

A Comparative Analysis of Productive Scholars Across All Four Fields of Inquiry 1981-1985

The data collected to substantiate Hypothesis 1b yielded the following: Robert Sternberg wrote the most articles published in influential journals when all fields

were combined during this period. Herbert Walberg was second, Donald Willower was third, Robert Slavin was fourth, followed in fifth by Jere Brophy. Other scholars who were productive during this time period were: John Goodlad, Maxine Greene, Allan Ornstein, Doyle Watts, who were tied for sixth, and (10) Noreen Webb. (See Table 24)

Overall Influential Scholars Among the Four Fields of Inquiry 1981-1985

Overall standings among the four selected fields were calculated by averaging the ranking and number of times a productive scholar appeared in the comparative listing of the top ten productive scholars. This procedure measured the extent of that scholar's total influence among the four selected fields. This was an expansion of the analysis performed to validate Hypothesis 1b. An influential productive scholar category was analyzed using only the top five members because after the top five, influence was not well defined.

When compared to the previous time periods investigated (1971-1975 and 1976-1980) a difference in the actual number of productive scholars in this time period was noted. More individual professors were identified as productive scholars instead of a few scholars repeatedly named across the four fields. Robert Sternberg was not identified as the most productive scholar in any field; however he was rated second in two fields, Curriculum Studies and Learning and Instruc

Table 24

Top Ten Productive Scholars Across Four Fields: Administration and Supervision, Curriculum Studies, Learning and Instruction, and Teaching and Teacher Education, (1981-1985)*

1.	Robert Sternberg
2.	Herbert Walberg
3.	Donald Willower
4.	Robert Slavin
5.	Jere Brophy
6.25	John Goodlad
6.25	Maxine Greene
6.25	Allan Ornstein
6.25	Doyle Watts
10.	Noreen Webb

* Based on counting the total number of articles published in four selected fields.

tion, and third in the other two fields, Administration and Supervision and Teaching and Teacher Education compared to previous years when Mario Fantini and W. James Popham were identified as the top productive scholars in three fields. Robert Sternberg was identified as the most influential productive scholar during the 1981-1985 time period. However, he was not rated the highest in any individual field.

Even though John Goodlad was ranked first in two

fields, Curriculum Studies and Teaching and Teacher Education, he was identified as the second most influential productive scholar. Sternberg's overall influence was more pronounced in all four of the selected fields compared to Goodlad's influence in three fields. Goodlad was also identified as second in Administration and Supervision. Although Donald Willower was identified as the most productive scholar in the field of Administration and Supervision, his influence was seen only in that field. Herbert Walberg was identified as the most productive scholar in the field of Learning and Instruction, and he had some influence (rated 8) in the field of Administration and Supervision. Edward Wynne was identified as the third most influential productive scholar. He was rated as third in Curriculum Studies, and fourth in fields of Administration and Supervision, and Teaching and Teacher Education. Elliot Eisner was identified as the fourth most influential productive scholar of this period. Eisner was third in Curriculum Studies, fifth in Administration and Supervision, and eighth in Teaching and Teacher Education. Allan Ornstein was identified as fifth influential productive scholar with a third place rating in Curriculum Studies, sixth in Teaching and Teacher Education, and ninth in Administration and Supervision. (See Table 25)

Productive Scholars 1986-1990

According to what is reported here, the field of

Table 25

The Top Five Averaged Ranking of the Most Influential Scholars in Four Selected Fields: Administration and Supervision, Curriculm Studies, Learning and Instruction, and Teaching and Teacher Education, (1981-1985)*

1.	Robert Sternberg
2.	John Goodlad
3.	Edward Wynne
4.	Elliot Eisner
5.	Allan Ornstein

* Based on rankings within the four selected fields, then averaging the rankings for a total rank score.

Administration and Supervision was most influenced by the writings of Robert Slavin from 1986-1990. Larry Cuban was second, Alex Molnar was third, followed by Madeline Hunter and Carl Glickman who were fourth and fifth respectively. Other productive scholars identified in the field of Administration and Supervision during this period were: (6) Ann Lieberman, (7) Herbert Walberg, (8) John Goodlad, (9) Edward Jenkinson, and (10) Samuel Bacharach. (See Table 26)

In the field of Curriculum Studies during the 1986-1990 time period, Robert Slavin was identified as the most productive scholar. Larry Cuban was second followed by Alex Molnar who was third. Madeline Hunter was fourth and Carl Glickman was fifth. Other productive scholars in the

field of Curriculum Studies during this period were: (6) Ann Lieberman, (7) Linda McNeil, (8) Herbert Walberg and John Goodlad, and Edward Jenkinson were tied for ninth. (See Table 26)

In the field of Learning and Instruction during the 1986-1990 time period, Robert Slavin was identified as the most productive scholar. Richard Mayer was second, Alex Molnar was third, Madeline Hunter was fourth, and Dale Schunk was fifth. Other productive scholars identified in the field of Learning and Instruction during this period were: (6) Gaea Leinhardt, (7) Dona Kagan, (8) Penelope Peterson, (9) Joel Levin and, Jere Brophy, Carl Glickman, and Samuel Totten were tied for tenth. (See Table 26)

In the field of Teaching and Teacher Education during the 1986-1990 time period, Robert Slavin was identified as the most productive scholar. Larry Cuban was second, Madeline Hunter was third, Alex Molnar was fourth, and Carl Glickman was fifth. Other productive scholars identified in the field of Teaching and Teacher Education during this period were: (6) Martin Haberman, (7) Ann Lieberman, (8) Herbert Walberg, and John Goodlad, Kenneth Howey, Edward Jenkinson, and Andrew Porter were tied for ninth. (See Table 26)

Table 26

A Comparative Listing of the Top Ten Productive Scholars in Four Selected Fields, (1986-1990)

Administration and Supervision	Curriculum Studies	Learning and Instruction	Teaching and Teacher Education
1. Robert Slavin	1. Robert Slavin	1. Robert Slavin	1. Robert Slavin
2. Larry Cuban	2. Larry Cuban	2. Richard Mayer	2. Larry Cuban
3. Alex Molnar	3. Alex Molnar	3. Alex Molnar	3. Madeline Hunter
4. Madeline Hunter	4. Madeline Hunter	4. Madeline Hunter	4. Alex Molnar
5. Carl Glickman	5. Carl Glickman	5. Dale Schunk	5. Carl Glickman
6. Ann Lieberman	6. Ann Lieberman	6. Gaea Leinhardt	6. Martin Haberman
7. Herbert Walberg	7. Linda McNeil	7. Dona Kagan	7. Ann Lieberman
8.5 John Goodlad 8.5 Edward Jenkinson	8. Herbert Walberg	8. Penelope Peterson	8. Herbert Walberg
	9.5 John Goodlad 9.5 Edward Jenkinson	9. Joel Levin	9.25 John Goodlad 9.25 Kenneth Howey 9.25 Edward Jenkinson 9.25 Andrew Porter
10. Samuel Bacharach		10.33 Jere Brophy 10.33 Carl Glickman 10.33 Samuel Totten	

A Comparative Analysis of Productive Scholars Across All Four Fields of Inquiry 1986-1990

The data collected to substantiate Hypothesis 1b. yielded the following: Robert Slavin was first when all fields were combined during this period. Larry Cuban was second and Richard Mayer was third. Madeline Hunter was fourth, followed by Alex Molnar who was fifth. Other scholars who were productive during this time period were: (6) Carl Glickman, (7) Ann Lieberman, (8) Martin Haberman, (9) Jere Brophy, and (10) Robert Sternberg. (See Table 27)

Table 27

The Top Ten Productive Scholars Across Four Fields: Administration and Supervision, Curriculum Studies, Learning and Instruction, and Teaching and Teacher Education, (1986-1990)*

1.	Robert Slavin
2.	Larry Cuban
3.	Richard Mayer
4.	Madeline Hunter
5.	Alex Molnar
6.	Carl Glickman
7.	Ann Lieberman
8.	Martin Haberman
9.	Jere Brophy
10.	Robert Sternberg

* Based on counting the total number of articles published in four selected fields

Overall Influential Scholars Among the Four Fields of Inquiry 1986-1990

Overall standings among the four selected fields were calculated by averaging the ranking and number of times a productive scholar appeared in the comparative listing of the top ten productive scholars. This procedure measured the extent of that scholar's influence among the four selected fields. This was an expansion of the analysis performed to validate Hypothesis 1b. An influential produc-

tive scholar category was analyzed using only the top five members because after the top five, influence was not well defined.

Robert Slavin was recognized as the most influential productive scholar during the 1986-1990 time period because he was identified as the highest productive scholar in all four fields examined in the investigation (Administration and Supervision, Curriculum Studies, Learning and Instruction, and Teaching and Teacher Education). Alex Molnar was identified as second. He, too, was identified as a productive scholar in all of the four fields studied. Molnar was third in the fields of Administration and Supervision, Curriculum Studies, and Learning and Instruction, and fourth in Teaching and Teacher Education. Madeline Hunter was third because she was ranked third in Teaching and Teacher Education and fourth in the fields of Administration and Supervision, Curriculum Studies, and Learning and Instruction. Larry Cuban was identified as the fourth most influential productive scholar because he was rated second in the fields of Administration and Supervision, Curriculum Studies, and Teaching and Teacher Education. Carl Glickman was fifth because he was identified as fifth in the following fields: Administration and Supervision, Curriculum Studies, and Teaching and Teacher Education. (See Table 28)

Table 28

The Top Five Averaged Ranking of the Most Influential Scholars in Four Selected Fields: Administration and Supervision, Curriculum Studies, Learning and Instruction, and Teaching and Teacher Education, (1986-1990)*

1. Robert Slavin
2. Alex Molnar
3. Madeline Hunter
4. Larry Cuban
5. Carl Glickman

* Based on rankings within the four selected fields, then averaging the rankings for a total rank score.

Productive Scholars by Selected Fields of Inquiry: 1971-1990

The data collected to corroborate Hypothesis 3a. yielded the following the most productive scholar in the field of Administration and Supervision during the 1971-1990 time period was W. James Popham. John Goodlad was second, Vincent Rogers was third, Allan Ornstein was fourth, and Donald Willower was identified as the fifth most productive scholar. Other productive scholars identified in the field of Administration and Supervision during this twenty year period were: Larry Cuban, and Harold Shane, who were tied for sixth. Mario Fantini and Alex Molnar were tied for eighth, and Michael Kirst was tenth. (See Table 29)

In the field of Curriculum Studies during the 1971-1990 time period, W. James Popham was identified as the most

Table 29

A Comparative Listing of Top Ten Productive Scholars in Four Selected Fields, (1971-1990)

Administration and Supervision	Curriculum Studies	Learning and Instruction	Teaching and Teacher Education
1. W. James Popham	1. W. James Popham	1. Robert Slavin	1. W. James Popham
2. John Goodlad	2. Elliot Eisner	2. Richard Mayer	2. John Goodlad
3. Vincent Rogers	3. John Goodlad	3. Herbert Walberg	3. Robert Slavin
4. Allan Ornstein	4. Allan Ornstein	4. Joel Levin	4. Allan Ornstein
5. Donald Willower	5. Vincent Rogers	5. Richard Anderson	5. John Zahorik
6.5 Larry Cuban 6.5 Harold Shane	6. Harold Shane	6. Jere Brophy	6. Vincent Rogers
8.5 Mario Fantini 8.5 Alex Molnar	7.33 Larry Cuban 7.33 Mario Fantini 7.33 Alex Molnar	7. Alex Molnar	7.5 Alex Molnar 7.5 Harold Shane
		8. Penelope Peterson	
10. Michael Kirst	10. Robert Slavin	9. Robert Sternberg	9.5 Larry Cuban 9.5 Mario Fantini
		10. Thomas Good	

productive scholar. Elliot Eisner was second, John Goodlad was third, Allan Ornstein was fourth, and Vincent Rogers was identified as the fifth major productive scholar. Other productive scholars identified in the field of Curriculum Studies during this twenty year period were: Harold Shane in sixth place, and Larry Cuban, Mario Fantini, and Alex Molnar who were tied for seventh. Robert Slavin was tenth. (See Table 29)

In the field of Learning and Instruction during the 1971-1990 time period, Robert Slavin was identified as the most productive scholar. Richard Mayer was second, Herbert

Walberg was third, Joel Levin and Richard Anderson were fourth and fifth respectively. Other productive scholars identified in the field of Learning and Instruction during this twenty year period were: (6) Jere Brophy, (7) Alex Molnar, (8) Penelope Peterson, (9) Robert Sternberg, and (10) Thomas Good. (See Table 29)

In the field of Teaching and Teacher Education during the 1971-1990 time period, W. James Popham was identified as the most productive scholar. John Goodlad was second, Robert Slavin was third, Allan Ornstein was fourth, and John Zahorik was fifth. Other productive scholars identified in the field of Teaching and Teacher Education for this twenty year period were: Vincent Rogers in sixth, Alex Molnar and Harold Shane tied for seventh, Larry Cuban in ninth, and Mario Fantini in tenth. (See Table 29)

Productive Scholars Across All Four Fields of Inquiry 1971-1990

The data collected to substantiate Hypothesis 3b yielded the following: the most productive scholar for all four fields and time periods investigated from 1971-1990 was Robert Slavin. Richard Mayer was second, Herbert Walberg was third, Jere Brophy was fourth, and W. James Popham was fifth. Other productive scholars identified for the 1971-1990 period were: (6) Allan Ornstein, (7) Joel Levin, (8) Elliot Eisner, (9) Thomas Good, and (10) John Goodlad. (See Table 30)

Overall Influential Scholars Among the Four Fields of Inquiry 1971-1990

Overall standings among the four selected fields were calculated by averaging the ranking and number of times a productive scholar appeared in the comparative listing of the top ten productive scholars. This procedure measured the extent of that scholar's total influence among the four selected fields. This was an expansion of the analysis performed to validate Hypothesis 3b. An influential productive scholar category was analyzed using only the top five members because after the top five, influence was not well defined.

W. James Popham was identified as the most influential productive scholar during the 1971-1990 time period. He was identified as the highest productive scholar in three of the four fields examined in this investigation (Administration and Supervision, Curriculum Studies, and Teaching and Teacher Education). John Goodlad was identified as the second most influential productive scholar. He was identified as a productive scholar in three of the four fields investigated. Goodlad was second in the fields of Administration and Supervision, Teaching and Teacher Education, and third in the field of Curriculum Studies. Allan Ornstein was identified as the third most influential productive scholar. Ornstein was identified as the third

Table 30

Productive Scholars Across Four Fields: Administration and Supervision, Curriculum Studies, Learning and Instruction, and Teaching and Teacher Education, (1971-1990)*

1. Robert Slavin
2. Richard Mayer
3. Herbert Walberg
4. Jere Brophy
5. W. James Popham
6. Allan Ornstein
7. Joel Levin
8. Elliot Eisner
9. Thomas Good
10. John Goodlad

* Based on counting the total number of articles published in four selected fields.

most influential productive scholar. Ornstein was ranked fourth in the fields of Administration and Supervision, Curriculum Studies and Teaching and Teacher Education. Vincent Rogers and Robert Slavin were identified as the fourth (tied) most influential productive scholar. Rogers was rated third in Administration and Supervision, fifth in Curriculum Studies, and sixth in Teaching and Teacher Education. Slavin was rated first in Learning and Instruction, third in Teaching and Teacher Education, and

tenth in Curriculum Studies. (See Table 31)

Implications

According to what is reported here, scholars from the field of Learning and Instruction dominated the productive scholar list. In fact, educational psychologists tended to appear regularly as scholars in non-psychology fields such as Administration and Supervision, Curriculum Studies, and Teaching and Teacher Education. However, scholars who were not noneducational psychologists were rarely mentioned in the Learning and Instruction category. The outcome was, the five top ranked scholars for the four fields combined (Administration and Supervision, Curriculum Studies, Learning and Instruction, and Teaching and Teacher Education) for this twenty year period were all educational psychologists; within the top ten list, seven out of the ten were educational psychologists, except Ornstein who ranked sixth, Eisner who ranked eighth, and Goodlad who ranked tenth.

When the four fields of inquiry were examined over the entire twenty year period, a larger picture of each particular field could be seen. After listing the outcomes of the twenty years examined for each of the four fields of inquiry, a larger picture of each individual field was seen.

Table 31

The Top Five Averaged Ranking of the Most Influential Scholars in Four Selected Fields: Administration and Supervision, Curriculum Studies, Learning and Instruction, and Teaching and Teacher Education, (1971-1990)*

1.	W. James Popham
2.	John Goodlad
3.	Allan Ornstein
4.5	Vincent Rogers
4.5	Robert Slavin

* Based on rankings within the four selected fields, then averaging the rankings for a total rank score.

Administration and Supervision:

An Overview of Twenty Years

In the field of Administration and Supervision, there were thirty three scholars listed in the top ten category. These scholars may be categorized into three smaller areas. The first category consisted of scholars who were listed as productive once during the twenty year period. The following seventeen scholars were listed once: Myron Lieberman, Harold Shane, James Banks, Harold Spears, Frank Lutz, Peter Idstein, Vincent Rogers, Harry Broudy, Philip Hosford, Samuel Halperin, B. Othanel Smith, Rita Dunn, Robert Sternberg, Edward Wynne, Thomas McDaniel, Elliot Eisner, and Jerry Duea. The next category of scholars was also listed once during the twenty year period. However,

they were listed in the 1986-1990 time period. These eight scholars may be considered up and coming. They were as follows: Robert Slavin, Larry Cuban, Alex Molnar, Madeline Hunter, Carl Glickman, Ann Lieberman, Edward Jenkinson, and Samuel Bacharach. The third category consisted of eight scholars who were listed more than once during the twenty year period. Mario Fantini, Allan Ornstein, W. James Popham, Eugene Budig, Mary Anne Raywid, John Goodlad, and Herbert Walberg were all listed twice during this time period. (See Table 32)

Due to the limited data collected, the scholar category could not be examined in any greater detail or variety because the results become diffuse. However, the School of Education section was examined in a later section.

Curriculum Studies: An Overview of Twenty Years

In the field of Curriculum Studies, there were thirty seven scholars listed in the top ten category. These scholars may be categorized into three smaller areas. The first category consisted of scholars who were listed as productive once during the twenty year period. The following twenty two scholars were listed once: Myron Lieberman, Harold Shane, James Banks, James Coleman, Harold Spears, Decker Walker, Lawrence Kolhberg, Vincent Rogers, Harry Broudy, Philip Hosford, Eugene Budig, Henry Giroux, Maxine Greene, Samuel Halperin, Herbert Kliebard, B. Othanel Smith, Robert Sternberg, Edward Wynne, Michael Kirst,

Table 32

Productive Scholars in Administration and Supervision: An Overview of the Twenty Years, (1971-1990)

Scholars	1971-1975	1976-1980	1981-1985	1986-1990
Mario Fantini	1	5.25	x	x
Myron Lieberman	2	x	x	x
Allan Ornstein	3.5	x	9.5	x
W. James Popham	3.5	1	x	x
Harold Shane	5	x	x	x
James Banks	6	x	x	x
Harold Spears	7	x	x	x
Donald Willower	8	x	1	x
Frank Lutz	9	x	x	x
Peter Idstein	10	x	x	x
Vincent Rogers	x	2	x	x
Harry Broudy	x	3	x	x
Philip Hosford	x	4	x	x
Eugene Budig	x	5.25	x	x
Samuel Halperin	x	5.25	x	x
Mary Anne Raywid	x	5.25	5.33	x
B. Othanel Smith	x	5.25	x	x
Rita Dunn	x	10	x	x
John Goodlad	x	x	2	8.5
Robert Sternberg	x	x	3	x
Edward Wynne	x	x	4	x
Thomas McDaniel	x	x	5.33	x
Elliot Eisner	x	x	5.33	x
Herbert Walberg	x	x	8	7
Jerry Duea	x	x	9.5	x
Robert Slavin	x	x	x	1
Larry Cuban	x	x	x	2
Alex Molnar	x	x	x	3
Madeline Hunter	x	x	x	4
Carl Glickman	x	x	x	5
Ann Lieberman	x	x	x	6
Edward Jenkinson	x	x	x	8.5
Samuel Bacharach	x	x	x	10

x= did not rank in the top ten listing at this time

Chester Finn, Thomas McDaniel, and Diane Ravitch. The next category of scholars was also listed once during the twenty year period. However, they were listed in the 1986-1990 time period. These nine scholars may be considered up and coming. They were as follows: Robert Slavin, Larry Cuban, Alex Molnar, Madeline Hunter, Carl Glickman, Ann Lieberman, Linda McNeil, Herbert Walberg, and Edward Jenkinson. The third category consisted of six scholars who were listed more than once during the twenty year period. Mario

Fantini, W. James Popham, Allan Ornstein, Elliot Eisner, Mary Anne Raywid, and John Goodlad were all listed twice during this time period. (See Table 33)

Learning and Instruction: An Overview of Twenty Years

In the field of Learning and Instruction, there were twenty eight scholars listed in the top ten category. These scholars may be categorized into three smaller areas. The first category consisted of scholars who were listed as productive once during the twenty year period. The following fifteen scholars were listed once: Richard Anderson, Arthur Jensen, S. Jay Samuels, William Rohwer, Robert Gagne, Raymond Kulhavy, Michael Pressley, Lloyd Humphreys, Philip Hosford, Harris Cooper, John Houston, Francis DiVesta, Robert Sternberg, Noreen Webb, and James Kulik. The next category of scholars was also listed once during the twenty year period. However, they were listed in the 1986-1990 time period. These five scholars may be considered up and coming. They were as follows: Madeline Hunter, Gaea Leinhardt, Dona Kagan, Carl Glickman, and Samuel Totten. The third category consisted of eight scholars who were listed more than once during the twenty year period. Herbert Walberg, Jere Brophy, and Alex Molnar were listed twice. Penelope Peterson and Robert Slavin were listed three times. Joel Levin and Richard Mayer were listed in all four time periods. (See Table 34)

Table 33

Productive Scholars in Curriculum Studies: An Overview of the Twenty Years, (1971-1990)

Scholars	1971-1975	1976-1980	1981-1985	1986-1990
Mario Fantini	1	6.13	x	x
Myron Lieberman	2.5	x	x	x
W. James Popham	2.5	1	x	x
Allan Ornstein	4	x	3.33	x
Harold Shane	5	x	x	x
James Banks	6.25	x	x	x
James Coleman	6.25	x	x	x
Harold Spears	6.25	x	x	x
Decker Walker	6.25	x	x	x
Lawrence Kolhberg	10	x	x	x
Vincent Rogers	x	2	x	x
Harry Broudy	x	3	x	x
Elliot Eisner	x	4	3.33	x
Philip Hosford	x	5	x	x
Eugene Budig	x	6.13	x	x
Henry Giroux	x	6.13	x	x
Maxine Greene	x	6.13	x	x
Samuel Halperin	x	6.13	x	x
Herbert Kliebard	x	6.13	x	x
Mary Anne Raywid	x	6.13	8.33	x
B. Othanel Smith	x	6.13	x	x
John Goodlad	x	x	1	9.5
Robert Sternberg	x	x	2	x
Edward Wynne	x	x	3.33	x
Michael Kirst	x	x	6	x
Chester Finn	x	x	7	x
Thomas McDaniel	x	x	8.33	x
Diane Ravitch	x	x	8.33	x
Robert Slavin	x	x	x	1
Larry Cuban	x	x	x	2
Alex Molnar	x	x	x	3
Madeline Hunter	x	x	x	4
Carl Glickman	x	x	x	5
Ann Lieberman	x	x	x	6
Linda McNeil	x	x	x	7
Herbert Walberg	x	x	x	8
Edward Jenkinson	x	x	x	9.5

x= did not rank in the top ten listing at this time

Table 34

Productive Scholars in Learning and Instruction: An Overview of the Twenty Years, (1971-1990)

Scholars	1971-1975	1976-1980	1981-1985	1986-1990
Richard Anderson	1	x	x	x
Herbert Walberg	2	x	1	x
Arthur Jensen	3	x	x	x
Joel Levin	4	8	6	9
Jere Brophy	5.5	x	x	10.33
Richard Mayer	5.5	2	8	2
S. Jay Samuels	7	x	x	x
William Rohwer	8	x	x	x
Robert Gagne	9	x	x	x
Raymond Kulhavy	10	x	x	x
Robert Slavin	x	1	9.5	1
Michael Pressley	x	3	x	x
Lloyd Hymphreys	x	4	x	x
Philip Hosford	x	5.5	x	x
Penelope Peterson	x	5.5	9.5	8
Harris Cooper	x	7	x	x
John Houston	x	9	x	x
Francis DiVesta	x	10	x	x
Robert Sternberg	x	x	2	x
Dale Schunk	x	x	3.5	5
Noreen Webb	x	x	3.5	x
James Kulik	x	x	5	x
Alex Molnar	x	x	7	3
Madeline Hunter	x	x	x	4
Gaea Leinhardt	x	x	x	6
Dona Kagan	x	x	x	7
Carl Glickman	x	x	x	10.33
Samuel Totten	x	x	x	10.33

x= did not rank in the top ten listing at this time

Teaching and Teacher Education:

An Overview of Twenty Years

In the field of Teaching and Teacher Education, there were forty scholars listed in the top ten category. These scholars may be categorized into three smaller areas. The first category consisted of scholars who were listed as productive once during the twenty year period. The following twenty six scholars were listed once: Mario Fantini, Myron Lieberman, Harold Shane, James Banks, Harold

Spears, James Coleman, Lawrence Kolhberg, John Stewig, Vincent Rogers, John Zahorik, Patrick Groff, Harry Broudy, B. Othanel Smith, Perry Zirkel, Philip Hosford, Robert Anderson, Doyle Watts, Robert Sternberg, Donald Cruickshank, Edward Wynne, Chester Finn, Elliot Eisner, Michael Kirst, Thomas McDaniel, Diane Ravitch, and Mary Anne Raywid. The next category of scholars was also listed once during the twenty year period. However, they were listed in the 1986-1990 time period. These ten scholars may be considered up and coming. They were as follows: Robert Slavin, Larry Cuban, Madeline Hunter, Carl Glickman, Martin Haberman, Ann Lieberman, Herbert Walberg, Kenneth Howey, Edward Jenkinson and Andrew Porter. The third category consisted of four scholars who were listed more than once during the twenty year period. Allan Ornstein, W. James Popham, and Alex Molnar were all listed twice. John Goodlad was listed three times during this time period. (See Table 35)

According to data, many more scholars were listed once during a twenty year period than any other category. One variable such as scholar age may have caused a large difference when considered over the twenty year period examined.

The Influence of Editorial Boards

After compiling the data set, it appears that some people that were on the board of directors or acted as editorial consultants were published more frequently in those journals. This seemed especially true for influential

Table 35

Productive Scholars in Teaching and Teacher Education: An Overview of the Twenty Years, (1971-1990)

Scholars	1971-1975	1976-1980	1981-1985	1986-1990
Mario Fantini	1	x	x	x
Allan Ornstein	2.33	x	6	x
Myron Lieberman	2.33	x	x	x
W.James Popham	2.33	1	x	x
Harold Shane	5	x	x	x
James Banks	6	x	x	x
Harold Spears	7	x	x	x
James Coleman	8	x	x	x
Lawrence Kohlberg	9.5	x	x	x
John Stewig	9.5	x	x	x
Vincent Rogers	x	2	x	x
John Zahorik	x	3	x	x
Patrick Groff	x	4	x	x
Harry Broudy	x	5	x	x
B. Othanel Smith	x	6.5	x	x
Perry Zirkel	x	6.5	x	x
Philip Hosford	x	8	x	x
John Goodlad	x	9	1	9.25
Robert Anderson	x	10	x	x
Doyle Watts	x	x	2	x
Robert Sternberg	x	x	3	x
Donald Cruickshank	x	x	4.5	x
Edward Wynne	x	x	4.5	x
Chester Finn	x	x	7	x
Elliot Eisner	x	x	8.17	x
Michael Kirst	x	x	8.17	x
Thomas McDaniel	x	x	8.17	x
Alex Molnar	x	x	8.17	4
Diane Ravitch	x	x	8.17	x
Mary Anne Raywid	x	x	8.17	x
Robert Slavin	x	x	x	1
Larry Cuban	x	x	x	2
Madeline Hunter	x	x	x	3
Carl Glickman	x	x	x	5
Martin Haberman	x	x	x	6
Ann Lieberman	x	x	x	7
Herbert Walberg	x	x	x	8
Kennth Howey	x	x	x	9.25
Edward Jenkinson	x	x	x	9.25
Andrew Porter	x	x	x	9.25

x= did not rank in the top ten listing at this time

journals such as *Educational Leadership* and *Phi Delta Kappan*. For example, *Educational Leadership*'s and *Phi Delta Kappan*'s Vincent Rogers was named a productive scholar based solely upon his work in those two influential journals.

Rogers was on *Phi Delta Kappan*'s editorial board from

January 1971 to June 1976. In the 1971-1975 period he wrote one article but in the time period from 1976-1980 he had five articles published in *Phi Delta Kappan*. His greatest number of articles was published just after his affiliation with *Phi Delta Kappan* ended. Rogers was on the editorial board of *Educational Leadership* in October of 1978, and again in October 1980 to May 1983. During the 1976-1980 period, he published three articles in this journal, and in 1981-1985 he had another 2.6 articles published. Martin Haberman joined the board of directors of *Phi Delta Kappan* in January of 1987. He had four articles published in *Phi Delta Kappan* during the 1986-1990 time period. Haberman was not published in *Phi Delta Kappan* before this time.

These observations could mean that the journal editors knew or liked the scholarship of these professors and these professors were then asked to serve on editorial boards. Particular scholars, such as the examples cited above, might have become interested enough to become actively involved in these journals. This active participation supported further research, which in turn could have been the impetus for the production of more articles.

Of the seventy five productive scholars identified in this investigation forty nine or 65% had some type of affiliation with the influential journals. However, scholars were not published during the time of affiliation to any greater extent than scholars with no affiliation.

For example, W. James Popham was affiliated with the following journals: *American Educational Research Journal*, *Educational Psychologist*, and *Review of Educational Research*. Popham did not have any articles published during the time of his affiliation with these journals. John Goodlad was affiliated with the *Journal of Curriculum Studies* and *Review of Eductional Research*. During his time of affiliation, Goodlad did not publish any articles for these particular journals. Elliot Eisner was affiliated with the following journals: *Curriculm Inquiry*, *Educational Leadership*, and *Review of Educational Research*. However, Eisner had three articles published in *Curriculum Inquiry* during his association. Eisner had one article published in *Educational Leadership* during his association with that journal. He wrote more articles (n=5) when he was not associated with that journal. During his affiliation with *Review of Educational Research*, Eisner did not have any articles published in that journal. It appears that for the most part editors or board members of journals did not publish more in journals with which they are associated. Productive scholars that have held places either on editorial boards or as editors of influential journals named in this investigation are located in Appendix G.

The Influence of Gender

Female Scholars 1971-1975

During the first five year time period investigated, 1971-1975, there were no females listed in the four selected fields. Females were not being published much in influential journals at this particular time. Comfort, Bowen and Gansneder (1974) discussed their analysis of the following journals: *Phi Delta Kappan*, *Today's Education*, *Educational Leadership*, *National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin* (*NASSP Bulletin*), and *Harvard Educational Review* published between 1972-1973. They concluded that eighty-one percent of the articles published in these journals during this time period were written by males. However during this same period, in 1974, *Phi Delta Kappa* finally allowed women to become members.

Female Scholars 1976-1980

In the next time period investigated, 1976-1980, four females were identified as being in the top ten productive scholar category five times. Mary Anne Raywid was identified as the fifth most productive scholar in the field of Administration and Supervision, and sixth most productive scholar in the field of Curriculum Studies. Rita Dunn was rated as the tenth most productive scholar in Administration and Supervision during this period. In the field of Curriculum Studies, Maxine Greene was identified as the sixth (tied with Mary Anne Raywid, Elliot Eisner, Michael Kirst,

Thomas McDaniel, and Alex Molnar) most productive scholar during this period. Penelope Peterson was rated as the fifth most productive scholar in the field of Learning and Instruction during this period.

Female Scholars 1981-1985

During the 1981-1985 time period, four women were also identified as productive scholars seven times throughout the four selected fields. Mary Anne Raywid was identified as the fifth most productive scholar in the field of Administration and Supervision, and the eighth most productive scholar in the fields of Curriculum Studies and Teaching and Teacher Education. Diane Ravitch was rated as the eighth (tied with Mary Anne Raywid and Thomas McDaniel) most productive scholar in the field of Curriculum Studies, and eighth productive scholar (tied with Raywid and others) in the field of Teaching and Teacher Education. Noreen Webb was the third most productive scholar in the field of Learning and Instruction, while Penelope Peterson was the ninth most productive scholar in the same field.

Female Scholars 1986-1990

During the 1986-1990 time period, six women were identified as productive scholars. These six women ranked high in eleven out of forty places throughout the four selected fields. Madeline Hunter was the third most productive scholar in the field of Teaching and Teacher Education, and fourth in the fields of Administration and

Supervision, Curriculum Studies, and Learning and Instruction. Ann Lieberman was identified as the sixth most productive scholar in the fields of Administration and Supervision and Curriculum Studies and seventh in the field of Teaching and Teacher Education. Linda McNeil was rated as the seventh most productive scholar in the field of Curriculum Studies. In the field of Learning and Instruction, Gaea Leinhardt was sixth, followed by Dona Kagan and Penelope Peterson in seventh and eighth respectively.

Female Scholars 1971-1990

Penelope Peterson was the only female identified as a productive scholar during the cumulation of the 1971-1990 period. She was rated as the eighth most productive scholar during this time period in the field of Learning and Instruction. No females were identified as productive scholars in the fields of Administration and Supervision, Curriculum Studies, and Teaching and Teacher Education in the longer time period. Females do not figure prominently in this analysis. No female was included in the top ten productive scholar listing of the overall combination of four time periods and the four selected fields. When a total article count was completed, no females were listed among the top ten productive scholars.

There has been a slow steady increase in the influence of females within the twenty year period investigated. Females have started to become influential from their

virtual non-existence in the publication of articles in the early 1970s, to the slow acceptance of articles in the mid 1970s, to a larger amount of articles published in the 1980s, and to taking over several editorial positions in the 1980s and 1990. (See Table 36)

The field of Learning and Instruction once again deviated from the pattern set by the other three fields. The *Journal of Educational Psychology* had a female editor, Joanna Williams, in February of 1973; the *American Educational Research Journal* had a female editor, Maryellen McSweeney in 1976, and in 1978 *Educational Psychologist* had Margaret Clifford as its editor.

Other female editors during the twenty year period were: Claire Weinstein (1989) for *Educational Psychologist*; Patricia Ashton (1990) for *Journal of Teacher Education*; Ann Hart (1990) for *Educational Administration Quarterly*; Mary Lee Smith (co-editor, 1984), Lorrie Shepard (co-editor, 1985), Virginia Koehler (1987), and Hilda Borko (1990) for the *American Educational Research Journal*; Penelope Peterson for *Review of Education Research*; and Pauline Gough for *Phi Delta Kappan*. (See Table 36)

The first time a female attained a high placement in this investigation was during the 1981-1985 time period. Noreen Webb was identified as the third most productive scholar in the field of Learning and Instruction. Later,

Table 36

Female Editors of Influential Journals (1971-1990)

American Educational Research Journal	
Name of Editor	Years as Editor
Maryellen McSweeney	Winter 1976-Spring 1977
Mary Lee Smith (co-editor)	Spring 1984-Winter 1986
Lorrie Shepard (co-editor)	Spring 1985-Winter 1986
Virginia Koehler	Winter 1987-Winter 1989
Hilda Borko	Spring 1990-Winter 1990*
Educational Administration Quarterly	
Ann Hart	November 1990**
Educational Psychologist	
Margaret Clifford	Spring 1978
Claire Weinstein	Spring 1989-Fall 1990
Phi Delta Kappan	
Pauline Gough	February 1988-Dec 1990
Journal of Educational Psychology	
Joanna Williams	February 1973-Feb 1978
Journal of Teacher Education	
Patricia Ashton	January 1990-Dec 1990
Review of Education Review	
Penelope Peterson	Spring 1985-Dec 1990

* Note: starting in Spring 1990 *American Educational Research Journal* was divided into two fields, Social and Institutional Analysis and Teaching, Learning and Human Development. Professor Borko became the editor of Teaching, Learning, and Human Development

** Note: A Quarterly publication

during the 1986-1990 time period, Madeline Hunter equalled Webb's accomplishment. Hunter was the third most productive scholar in the field of Teaching and Teacher Education. Mary Anne Raywid was the first female identified as being productive in two fields, Administration and Supervision and Curriculum Studies in the 1976-1980 time period. Diane Ravitch and Mary Anne Raywid were productive scholars that were rated as the eighth (a tie) most productive scholars in Curriculum Studies and Teaching and Teacher Education during the 1981-1985 time period. In the 1986-1990 time period, Madeline Hunter was the fourth most productive scholar in the following fields: Administration and Supervision, Curriculum Studies, and Learning and Instruction. Hunter was the first female to be named a productive scholar in all four fields. In the same time period, females were rated (fourth) Madeline Hunter, (sixth) Gaea Leinhardt, (seventh) Dona Kagan, and (eighth) Penelope Peterson in the field of Learning and Instruction. (See Table 26)

When all four selected fields were combined females did not appear as productive scholars until the 1980s. In the 1981-1985 time period, Maxine Greene was identified as the sixth productive scholar during that period. Noreen Webb was identified as the tenth productive scholar during that same period. In the 1986-1990 time period when all four selected fields were combined Madeline Hunter was identified as fourth and Ann Lieberman was eighth most productive

scholar.

It should be pointed out that presently females tend to dominate (in volume) in the field of Learning and Instruction. Female scholars have shown great promise of productivity in this area, with many new names emerging from this field. Several female scholars were editors of influential Learning and Instruction journals.

CHAPTER V

PRODUCTIVE SCHOOLS OF EDUCATION

While collecting data to corroborate Hypothesis 2a, a database was constructed of all who contributed articles to influential journals within the twenty year time period (1971-1990). University affiliation was determined at the time the article was published. In what follows, the results are separated into the designated time periods.

Productive Schools of Education 1971-1975

According to what is reported here, the field of Administration and Supervision was most influenced by the scholars from Indiana University from 1971-1975. Indiana University was identified as the most productive School of Education during this period, because Indiana University professors published the most articles in influential journals from 1971-1975. The University of Florida was the second most productive School of Education. The University of Massachusetts--Amherst was ranked third, followed by Pennsylvania State University, and the University of Illinois--Champaign. Other Schools of Education identified as productive from the field of Administration and Supervision during this period were: (6) the University of California--

Los Angeles, (7) the University of Washington, (8) State University of New York--Buffalo, (9) Columbia University, and (10) Syracuse University. (See Table 37)

In the field of Curriculum Studies during the 1971-1975 time period, Indiana University was identified as the most productive School of Education. Harvard University was second, the University of Massachusetts--Amherst was third, the University of Florida was fourth, and the University of California--Los Angeles was fifth. Other productive Schools of Education identified in the field of Curriculum Studies during this period were: (6) Stanford University, (7) the University of Chicago, (8) the University of Illinois--Champaign, (9) Syracuse University, and (10) the University of Washington. (See Table 37)

In the field of Learning and Instruction during the 1971-1975 time period, the University of Illinois--Champaign was identified as the most productive School of Education during this time period. The University of Wisconsin--Madison was second, Stanford University was third, and the University of Minnesota, and the University of Texas--Austin were ranked fourth and fifth respectively. Other productive Schools of Education in the field of Learning and Instruction during this period were: (6) Pennsylvania State University, (7) Florida State University, (8) University of California--Los Angeles, and Indiana University and the University of Florida which were tied for ninth.

Table 37

A Comparative Listing of the Top Ten Productive Schools of Education in Four Selected Fields, (1971-1975)

Administration and Supervision	Curriculum Studies	Learning and Instruction	Teaching and Teacher Education
1. Indiana	1. Indiana	1. U of Illinois-Champaign	1. Indiana
2. U of Florida	2. Harvard	2. U of Wisconsin-Madison	2. Harvard
3. U of Massachusetts-Amherst	3. U of Massachusetts-Amherst	3. Stanford	3. U of Massachusetts-Amherst
4. Pennsylvania State	4. U of Florida	4. U of Minnesota	4. U of Florida
5. U of Illinois-Champaign	5. U of California-Los Angeles	5. U of Texas-Austin	5. U of Chicago
6. U of California-Los Angeles	6. Stanford	6. Pennsylvania State	6. U of Wisconsin-Madison
7. U of Washington	7. U of Chicago	7. Florida State	7. U of California-Los Angeles
8. State U of New York-Buffalo	8. U of Illinois-Champaign	8. U of California-Los Angeles	8. Pennsylvania State
9. Columbia	9. Syracuse	9.5 Indiana 9.5 U of Florida	9. Ohio State
10. Syracuse	10. U of Washington		10. U of Illinois-Champaign

In the field of Teaching and Teacher Education during the 1971-1975 time period, Indiana University was identified as the most productive School of Education. Harvard University was second, the University of Massachusetts--Amherst was third, the University of Florida was fourth, and the University of Chicago was fifth. Other Schools of Education identified as productive during this period were: (6) the University of Wisconsin--Madison, (7) the University of California--Los Angeles, (8) Pennsylvania State University, (9) Ohio State University, and (10) the University of Illinois--Champaign. (See Table 37)

A Comparative Analysis of Productive Schools of Education Across All Fields of Inquiry 1971-1975

The data collected to substantiate Hypothesis 2b. yielded the following: when the total number of articles published from all four fields were combined, professors from the University of Illinois--Champaign wrote the most articles published in influential journals during this period. Indiana University was second, the University of Wisconsin--Madison was third, Pennsylvania State University was fourth, and Stanford University was fifth. Other productive Schools of Education during this period were: (6) the University of California--Los Angeles, (7) Harvard University, (8) the University of Chicago, (9) Florida State University, and (10) the University of Minnesota. (See Table 38)

Overall Influential Schools of Education Among the Four Fields of Inquiry 1971-1975

Overall standings among the four selected fields were calculated by averaging the ranking and number of times a university appeared in the comparative listing of the top ten productive Schools of Education. This procedure measured the total extent of a School of Education's influence. This was an expansion of the analysis performed to validate Hypothesis 2b. The influential productive School of Education category was analyzed using only the top five institutions of higher learning because after the top

Table 38

The Top Ten Most Productive Schools of Education Across Four Fields: Administration and Supervision, Curriculum Studies, Learning and Instruction, and Teaching and Teacher Education, (1971-1975)*

1. University of Illinois--Champaign
2. Indiana University
3. University of Wisconsin--Madison
4. Pennsylvania State
5. Stanford University
6. University of California--Los Angels
7. Harvard University
8. University of Chicago
9. Florida State University
10. University of Minnesota

* Based on counting the total number of articles published in four selected fields.

five, influence was not well defined.

Indiana University was identified as the most influential School of Education during the 1971-1975 time period. Indiana was rated the highest in three out of the four fields investigated Administration and Supervision, Curriculum Studies, and Teaching and Teacher Education. The University of Florida was second, placing second in Administration and Supervision, fourth in the fields of Curriculum

Studies and Teaching and Teacher Education, and ninth in Learning and Instruction. The University of Massachusetts--Amherst was ranked as third because of its third place in the fields of Administration and Supervision, Curriculum Studies, and Teaching and Teacher Education. The University of Illinois--Champaign was fourth with a first place ranking in Learning and Instruction, fifth in Administration and Supervision, eighth in Curriculum Studies, and tenth in Teaching and Teacher Education. Harvard University and the University of California--Los Angeles were tied for fifth. Harvard University was second in the fields of Curriculum Studies and Teaching and Teacher Education. The University of California--Los Angeles was fifth in Curriculum Studies, sixth in Administration and Supervision, seventh in Teaching and Teacher Education, and eighth in Learning and Instruction. (See Table 39)

Productive Schools of Education 1976-1980

The data collected to substantiate Hypothesis 2b. yielded the following: the field of Administration and Supervision was most influenced by the professors from Stanford University from 1976-1980. Stanford University was identified as the most productive School of Education during this period because Stanford University professors published the most articles in influential journals during this period. Indiana University was second, Ohio State University was third, followed by the University of Illinois--

Table 39

The Top Five Averaged Ranking of the Most Influential Schools of Education in Four Selected Fields: Administration and Supervision, Curriculum Studies, Learning and Instruction, and Teaching and Teacher Education, (1971-1975)*

1.	Indiana University
2.	University of Florida
3.	University of Massachusetts
4.	University of Illinois--Champaign
5.5	Harvard University
5.5	University of California--Los Angeles

* Based on rankings within the four selected fields, then averaging the rankings for a total rank score.

Champaign, and then the University of California--Los Angeles. Other productive Schools of Education identified in the field of Administration and Supervision during this period were: (6) the University of Connecticut, (7) Michigan State University, (8) the University of Texas--Austin, (9) Columbia University, and (10) Harvard University. (See Table 40)

In the field of Curriculum Studies during the 1976-1980 time period, Stanford University was identified as the most productive School of Education. The University of Illinois--Champaign was second, Harvard University was third. Indiana University was fourth, and the University of California--Los

Table 40

A Comparative Listing of the Top Ten Productive Schools of Education in Four Selected Fields, (1976-1980)

Administration and Supervision	Curriculum Studies	Learning and Instruction	Teaching and Teacher Education
1. Stanford	1. Stanford	1. U of Wisconsin-Madison	1. Stanford
2. Indiana	2. U of Illinois-Champaign	2. U of Illinois-Champaign	2. Harvard
3. Ohio State	3. Harvard	3. U of California-Los Angeles	3. Ohio State
4. U of Illinois-Champaign	4. Indiana	4. U of Texas-Austin	4. Indiana
5. U of California-Los Angeles	5.5 U of California-Los Angeles 5.5 U of Wisconsin-Madison	5. U of Minnesota	5. U of Wisconsin-Madison
6. U of Connecticut	7. Ohio State	6. Stanford	6. U of California-Los Angeles
7. Michigan State	8. Columbia	7. U of Pittsburgh	7. U of Texas-Austin
8. U of Texas-Austin	9. Michigan State	8. Columbia	8. U of Illinois-Champaign
9. Columbia	10. U of California-Berkeley	9. U of California-Santa Barbara	9. Michigan State
10. Harvard		10. Purdue	10. U of California-Berkeley

Angeles and the University of Wisconsin--Madison were tied for fifth place. Other productive Schools of Education in the field of Curriculum Studies during this period were: (7) Ohio State University, (8) Columbia University, (9) Michigan State University, and (10) the University of California--Berkeley. (See Table 40)

In the field of Learning and Instruction during the 1976-1980 time period, the University of Wisconsin--Madison was identified as the most productive School of Education. The University of Illinois--Champaign was second, the University of California--Los Angeles was third, the University of Texas--Austin was fourth, and the University of Minnesota was fifth. Other productive Schools of Education identified in the field of Learning and Instruction during this period were: (6) Stanford University, (7) the University of Pittsburgh, (8) Columbia University, (9) the University of University of California--Santa Barbara, and (10) Purdue University. (See Table 40)

In the field of Teaching and Teacher Education during the 1976-1980 time period, Stanford University was identified as the most productive School of Education. Harvard University was second, Ohio State University was third, Indiana University was fourth, and the University of Wisconsin--Madison was fifth. Other productive Schools of Education identified in the field of Teaching and Teacher Education during this period were: (6) the University of California--Los Angeles, (7) the University of Texas--Austin, (8) the University of Illinois--Champaign, (9) Michigan State University, and (10) the University of California--Berkeley. (See Table 40)

A Comparative Analysis of Productive Schools of Education Across All Four Fields of Inquiry 1976-1980

The data collected to substantiate Hypothesis 2b yielded the following: when the total number of articles published from all four fields were combined, professors from Stanford University wrote the most articles that were published in influential journals during this period. Indiana University was second, Ohio State was third, the University of Illinois--Champaign was fourth, and the University of California--Los Angeles was fifth. Other productive Schools of Education during this period were: (6) the University of Connecticut, (7) Michigan State, (8) the University of Texas--Austin, (9) Columbia University, and (10) Harvard University. (See Table 41)

Overall Influential Schools of Education Among the Four Fields of Inquiry 1976-1980

Overall standings among the four selected fields were calculated by averaging the ranking and number of times a university appeared in the comparative listing of the top ten productive Schools of Education. This procedure measured the total extent of a School of Education's influence among the four selected fields. This was an expansion of the analysis performed to validate Hypothesis 2b. An influential productive School of Education category was analyzed using only the top five institution members because after the top five, influence was not well defined.

Table 41

The Top Ten Productive Schools of Education Across Four Fields: Administration and Supervision, Curriculum Studies, Learning and Instruction, and Teaching and Teacher Education, (1976-1980)*

1.	Stanford University
2.	Indiana University
3.	Ohio State University
4.	University of Illinois--Champaign
5.	University of California--Los Angeles
6.	University of Connecticut
7.	Michigan State University
8.	University of Texas--Austin
9.	Columbia University
10.	Harvard University

*Based on counting the total number of articles published in four selected fields

Stanford University was the most influential School of Education during the 1976-1980 time period. Stanford was rated the highest in three out of the four fields studied: Administration and Supervision, Curriculum Studies, and Teaching and Teacher Education, and sixth in Learning and Instruction. The University of Illinois--Champaign was second, with placement as second in the fields of Curriculum Studies and Learning and Instruction, fourth in

Administration and Supervision, and eighth in Teaching and Teacher Education. Indiana University was third, with placement as second in Administration and Supervision, and fourth in the fields of Curriculum Studies and Teaching and Teacher Education. The University of Wisconsin--Madison was fifth with placement as first in Learning and Instruction, and fifth in the fields of Curriculum Studies and Teaching and Teacher Education. (See Table 42)

Productive Schools of Education 1981-1985

According to what is reported here, the field of Administration and Supervision was most influenced by the scholars from Stanford University from 1981-1985. Stanford University was identified as the most productive School of Education during this period because Stanford University professors published the most articles in influential journals during this period. Indiana University was second, the University of California--Los Angeles was third, the University of Illinois--Champaign was fourth, and the University of Illinois--Chicago was fifth. Other productive Schools of Education identified in the field of Administration and Supervision during the 1981-1985 period were: (6) Pennsylvania State University, (7) Columbia University, (8) Ohio State University, (9) Harvard University, and (10) the University of Wisconsin--Madison. (See Table 43)

In the field of Curriculum Studies during the 1981-1985 time period, Harvard University was identified as the most

Table 42

The Top Five Averaged Ranking of the Most Influential Schools of Education in Four Selected Fields: Administration and Supervision, Curriculum Studies, Learning and Instruction, and Teaching and Teacher Education, (1976-1980)*

1.	Stanford University
2.	University of Illinois--Champaign
3.	University of California--Los Angeles
4.	Indiana University
5.	University of Wisconsin--Madison

* Based on rankings within the four selected fields, then averaging the rankings for a total rank score.

Table 43

A Comparative Listing of the Top Ten Productive Schools of Education Across Four Fields: Administration and Supervision, Curriculum Studies, Learning and Instruction, and Teaching and Teacher Education, (1981-1985)

Administration and Supervision	Curriculum Studies	Learning and Instruction	Teaching and Teacher Education
1. Stanford	1. Harvard	1. U of California-Los Angeles	1. Harvard
2. Indiana	2. Stanford	2. U of Illinois-Champaign	2. U of Illinois-Champaign
3. U of California-Los Angeles	3. U of Illinois-Champaign	3. U of Wisconsin-Madison	3. Stanford
4. U of Illinois-Champaign	4. Columbia	4. U of Illinois-Chicago	4. Indiana
5. U of Illinois-Chicago	5. U of California-Los Angeles	5. Stanford	5. Michigan State
6. Pennsylvania State	6. Indiana	6. U of Minnesota	6. U of California-Los Angeles
7. Columbia	7. U of Wisconsin-Madison	7. U of Michigan	7. U of Wisconsin-Madison
8. Ohio State	8. U of Illinois-Chicago	8. U of California-Berkeley	8. U of Texas-Austin
9. Harvard	9. Michigan State	9. U of Pittsburgh	9. Columbia
10. U of Wisconsin-Madison	10. Ohio State	10. Michigan State	10. U of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

productive School of Education. Stanford University was second, the University of Illinois--Champaign was third, Columbia University was fourth, and the University of California--Los Angeles was fifth. Other productive Schools of Education identified in the field of Curriculum Studies during this period were: (6) Indiana University, (7) the University of Wisconsin--Madison, (8) the University of Illinois--Chicago, (9) Michigan State University, and (10) Ohio State University. (See Table 43)

In the field of Learning and Instruction during the 1981-1985 time period, the University of California--Los Angeles was identified as the most productive School of Education. The University of Illinois--Champaign was second, the University of Wisconsin--Madison was third, the University of Illinois--Chicago was fourth, and Stanford University was fifth. Other productive Schools of Education identified in the field of Learning and Instruction during this period were: (6) the University of Minnesota, (7) the University of Michigan, (8) the University of California--Berkeley, (9) the University of Pittsburgh, and (10) Michigan State University. (See Table 43)

In the field of Teaching and Teacher Education during the 1981-1985 time period, Harvard University was identified as the most productive School of Education. The University of Illinois--Champaign was second, Stanford University was third, Indiana University was fourth, and Michigan State University was fifth. Other productive Schools of Education identified in the field of Teaching and Teacher Education during this period were: (6) the University of California--Los Angeles, (7) the University of Wisconsin--Madison, (8) the University of Texas--Austin, (9) Columbia University, and (10) the University of Wisconsin--Milwaukee. (See Table 43)

A Comparative Analysis of Productive Schools of Education Across All Four Fields of Inquiry 1981-1985

The data collected to substantiate Hypothesis 2b. yielded the following: when the total number of articles published from all four fields were combined, professors from the University of Illinois--Champaign wrote the most articles that were published in influential journals during this period. Stanford University was second, the University of Wisconsin--Madison was third, the University of California--Los Angeles was fourth, and Michigan State University was fifth. Other productive Schools of Education during this period were: (6) the University of Illinois--Chicago, (7) Harvard University (8) the University of Minnesota, (9) the University of California--Berkeley, and (10) Columbia University. (See Table 44)

Overall Influential Schools of Education Among the Four Fields of Inquiry 1981-1985

Overall standings among the four selected fields were calculated by averaging the ranking and number of times a university appeared in the comparative listing of the top ten productive Schools of Education. This procedure measured the total extent of a School of Education's influence. This was an expansion of the analysis performed to validate Hypothesis 2b. The influential productive School of Education category was analyzed using only the top five institutions of higher learning because after the top

Table 44

The Top Ten Productive Schools of Education Across Four Fields: Administration and Supervision, Curriculum Studies, Learning and Instruction, and Teaching and Teacher Education, (1981-1985)*

1.	University of Illinois--Champaign
2.	Stanford University
3.	University of Wisconsin--Madison
4.	University of California--Los Angeles
5.	Michigan State University
6.	University of Illinois--Chicago
7.	Harvard University
8.	University of Minnesota
9.	University of California-Berkeley
10.	Columbia University

*Based on counting the total number of articles published in four selected fields.

five, influence was not well defined.

Stanford University and the University of Illinois--Champaign were (tied) identified as the most influential Schools of Education during the 1981-1985 time period. Stanford University placed first in Administration and Supervision, second in Curriculum Studies, third in Teaching and Teacher Education, and fifth in Learning and Instruction. The University of Illinois--Champaign was second in

the fields of Learning and Instruction and Teaching and Teacher Education, third in Curriculum Studies, and fourth in Administration and Supervision. The University of California--Los Angeles was third with placement as first in Administration and Supervision, second in Curriculum Studies, third in Teaching and Teacher Education, and fifth in Learning and Instruction. The University of Illinois--Champaign was second in the fields of Learning and Instruction and Teaching and Teacher Education, third in Curriculum Studies, and fourth in Administration and Supervision. The University of California--Los Angeles was third with placement as first in Learning and Instruction, third in Administration and Supervision, fifth in Curriculum Studies, and sixth in Teaching and Teacher Education. Harvard University was fourth having been rated the highest in only two out of the four fields investigated: Curriculum Studies, and Teaching and Teacher Education and ninth in Administration and Supervision. (See Table 45)

Productive Schools of Education 1986-1990

According to what is reported here, the field of Administration and Supervision was most influenced by the scholars from Stanford University from 1986-1990. Stanford was identified as the most productive School of Education because Stanford University professors published the most articles in influential journals during this period. Harvard University was second, Columbia University was

Table 45

The Top Five Averaged Ranking of the Most Influential Schools of Education in Four Selected Fields: Administration and Supervision, Curriculum Studies, Learning and Instruction, and Teaching and Teacher Education, (1981-1985)*

1.5	Stanford
1.5	University of Illinois--Champaign
3.	University of California--Los Angeles
4.	Harvard University
5.	Indiana University

* Based on rankings within the four selected fields, then averaging the rankings for a total rank score.

third, the University of Washington was fourth, and Johns Hopkins University was fifth. Other productive Schools of Education identified in the field of Administration and Supervision during this period were: (6) Indiana University, (7) the University of Wisconsin--Milwaukee, (8) Michigan State University, (9) the University of California--Los Angeles, and (10) the University of Minnesota. (See Table 46)

In the field of Curriculum Studies during the 1986-1990 time period, Harvard University was identified as the most productive School of Education. Stanford University was second, Michigan State University was third, Columbia

Table 46

A Comparative Listing of the Top Ten Productive Schools of Education in Four Selected Fields, (1986-1990)

Administration and Supervision Education	Curriculum Studies	Learning and Instruction	Teaching and Teacher
1. Stanford	1. Harvard	1. U of Michigan	1. Harvard
2. Harvard	2. Stanford	2. U of California-Los Angeles	2. Stanford
3. Columbia	3. Michigan State	3. U of Wisconsin-Madison	3. Michigan State
4. U of Washington	4. Columbia	4. Johns Hopkins	4. Columbia
5. Johns Hopkins	5. U of Washington	5. Michigan State	5. U of Washington
6. Indiana	6. Johns Hopkins	6. U of California-Santa Barbara	6. U of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
7. U of Wisconsin-Milwaukee	7. Indiana	7. Harvard	7. Johns Hopkins
8. Michigan State	8. U of Wisconsin-Madison	8. Purdue	8. Indiana
9. U of California-Los Angeles	9. U of Wisconsin-Milwaukee	9. U of Maryland-College Park	9. U of Georgia-Athens
10. U of Minnesota	10. U of Minnesota	10. U of Georgia-Athens	10. Ohio State

University was fourth, and the University of Washington was fifth. Other productive Schools of Education identified in the field of Curriculum Studies during this period were: (6) Johns Hopkins University, (7) Indiana University, (8) the

University of Wisconsin--Madison, (9) the University of Wisconsin--Milwaukee, and (10) the University of Minnesota. (See Table 46)

In the field of Learning and Instruction during the 1986-1990 time period, the University of Michigan was identified as the most productive School of Education. The University of California--Los Angeles was second, the University of Wisconsin--Madison was third, Johns Hopkins University was fourth, and Michigan State University was fifth. Other productive Schools of Education identified in the field of Learning and Instruction during this period were: (6) the University of California--Santa Barbara, (7) Harvard University, (8) Purdue University, (9) the University of Maryland--College Park, and (10) the University of Georgia--Athens. (See Table 46)

In the field of Teaching and Teacher Education during the 1986-1990 time period, Harvard University was identified as the most productive School of Education. Stanford University was second, Michigan State University was third, Columbia University was fourth, and the University of Washington was fifth. Other productive Schools of Education identified in the field of Teaching and Teacher Education during this period were: (6) the University of Wisconsin--Milwaukee, (7) Johns Hopkins University, (8) Indiana University, (9) the University of Georgia--Athens, and (10) Ohio State University. (See Table 46)

A Comparative Analysis of Productive Schools of Education Across All Four Fields of Inquiry 1986-1990

The data collected to substantiate Hypothesis 2b. yielded the following: when the total number of articles published from all four fields were combined, professors from Harvard University wrote the most articles that were published in influential journals during this period. Michigan State University was second, Stanford University was third, the University of Wisconsin--Madison was fourth, and Johns Hopkins University was fifth Other productive Schools of Education during this period were: (6) the University of Georgia--Athens, (7) the University of Washington, (8) the University of Michigan, (9) Columbia University, and (10) the University of California--Los Angeles. (See Table 47)

Overall Influential Schools of Education Among the Four Fields of Inquiry 1986-1990

Overall standings among the four selected fields were calculated by averaging the ranking and number of times a university appeared in the comparative listing of the top ten productive Schools of Education. This procedure measured the total extent of a School of Education's influence. This was an expansion of the analysis performed to validate Hypothesis 2b. The influential productive School of Education category was analyzed using only the top five institutions of higher learning because after the top

Table 47

The Top Ten Productive Schools of Education Across Four Fields: Administration and Supervision, Curriculum Studies, Learning and Instruction, and Teaching and Teacher Education, (1986-1990)*

1.	Harvard University
2.	Michigan State University
3.	Stanford University
4.	University of Wisconsin--Madison
5.	Johns Hopkins University
6.	University of Georgia--Athens
7.	University of Washington
8.	University of Michigan
9.	Columbia University
10.	University of California--Los Angeles

* Based on counting the total number of articles published in four selected fields.

five, influence was not well defined.

Harvard University was identified as the most influential School of Education during the 1986-1990 time period. Harvard University was rated the highest in two out of the four fields investigated: Curriculum Studies, and Teaching and Teacher Education. Harvard University was also rated second in Administration and Supervision, and seventh in Learning and Instruction. Stanford University was second, with a first place rating in Administration and

Supervision, second in the fields of Curriculum Studies, and Teaching and Teacher Education, and fifth in Learning and Instruction. Michigan State University was third with a third place ranking in the fields of Curriculum Studies and Teaching and Teacher Education, and eighth in Administration and Supervision. Columbia University was fourth with a third place rating in Administration and Supervision, and fourth in the fields of Curriculum Studies, and Teaching and Teacher Education. Johns Hopkins University was fifth with a fourth place ranking in Curriculum Studies, fifth in Administration and Supervision, sixth in Curriculum Studies, and seventh in Teaching and Teacher Education. (See Table 48)

A Comparative Analysis of Productive Schools of Education Across All Four Fields of Inquiry 1971-1990

The data collected to substantiate Hypothesis 3b. yielded the following: the field of Administration and Supervision was most influenced by scholars at Indiana University from 1971-1990 because Indiana University professors wrote the most articles published in influential journals during this period. Stanford University was second, the University of California--Los Angeles was third, Harvard University was fourth, and Columbia University was fifth. Other productive Schools of Education identified in the field of Administration and Supervision during this twenty year period were: (6) the University of Illinois-

Table 48

The Top Five Averaged Ranking of the Most Influential Schools of Education in Four Selected Fields: Administration and Supervision, Curriculm Studies, Learning and Instruction, and Teaching and Teacher Education, (1986-1990)*

1. Harvard University
2. Stanford University
3. Michigan State University
4. Columbia University
5. Johns Hopkins University

* Based on rankings within the four selected fields, then averaging the rankings for a total rank score.

-Champaign, (7) Michigan State University, (8) Ohio State University, (9) Pennsylvania State University, and (10) the University of Wisconsin--Madison. (See Table 49)

In the field of Curriculum Studies during the 1971-1990 time period, Harvard University was identified as the most productive School of Education. Stanford University was second, the University of Illinois--Champaign was third, Columbia University and the University of California--Los Angeles were fourth and fifth respectively. Other productive Schools of Education identified in the field of Curriculum Studies during this twenty year period were: (6) Michigan State University, (7) the University of Wisconsin--Madison, (8) the University of Massachusetts--Amherst,

Table 49

A Comparative Listing of the Top Ten Productive Schools of Education in Four Selected Fields, (1971-1990)

Administration and Supervision	Curriculum Studies	Learning and Instruction	Teaching and Teacher Education
1. Indiana	1. Harvard	1. U of Wisconsin-Madison	1. Harvard
2. Stanford	2. Stanford	2. U of Illinois-Champaign	2. Indiana
3. U of California-Los Angeles	3. U of Illinois-Champaign	3. U of California-Los Angeles	3. Stanford
4. Harvard	4. Columbia	4. Stanford	4. Michigan State
5. Columbia	5. U of California Los Angeles	5. U of Minnesota	5. U of California Los Angeles
6. U of Illinois-Champaign	6. Michigan State	6. U of Michigan	6. U of Wisconsin-Madison
7. Michigan State	7. U of Wisconsin-Madison	7. U of Pittsburgh	7. U of Illinois-Champaign
8. Ohio State	8. U of Massachusetts-Amherst	8. U of Texas-Austin	8. Ohio State
9. Pennsylvania State	9. U of Chicago	9. U of California-Berkeley	9. Columbia
10. U of Wisconsin-Madison	10. U of California-Berkeley	10. Johns Hopkins	10. U of Texas-Austin

(9) the University of Chicago, and (10) the University of California--Berkeley. (See Table 49)

In the field of Learning and Instruction during the 1971-1990 time period, the University of Wisconsin--Madison was identified as the most productive School of Education. The University of Illinois--Champaign was second, the University of California--Los Angeles was third, Stanford University was fourth and the University of Minnesota was fifth. Other productive Schools of Education in the field of Learning and Instruction during this twenty year period were: (6) the University of Michigan, (7) the University of

Pittsburgh, (8) the University of Texas--Austin, (9) the University of California--Berkeley, and (10) Johns Hopkins University. (See Table 49)

In the field of Teaching and Teacher Education during the 1971-1990 time period, Harvard University was identified as the most productive School of Education. Indiana University was second, Stanford University was third, Michigan State University was fourth, and the University of California--Los Angeles was fifth. Other Schools of Education identified as productive during this twenty year period were: (6) University of Wisconsin--Madison, (7) the University of Illinois--Champaign, (8) Ohio State University, (9) Columbia University, and (10) the University of Texas--Austin. (See Table 49)

Overall Influential Schools of Education Among the Four Fields of Inquiry 1971-1990

Overall standings among the four selected fields were calculated by averaging the ranking and number of times a university appeared in the top ten listing to measure the extent of a School of Education's influence over the twenty year period, 1971-1990, investigated. This was an expansion of the analysis performed to validate Hypothesis 3b. The influential School of Education category was analyzed using only the top five institutions because after the top five, influence was not well defined.

Stanford University was identified as the most influen-

tial School of Education during the 1971-1990 time period. Stanford University was rated as second in the fields of Administration and Supervision and Curriculum Studies, third in Teaching and Teacher Education, and fourth in Learning and Instruction. The University of California--Los Angeles was second with a third place rating in the fields of Administration and Supervision and Learning and Instruction, and fifth in the fields of Curriculum Studies and Teaching and Teacher Education. Harvard University was third with placement as first in the fields of Curriculum Studies and Teaching and Teacher Education, and fourth in Administration and Supervision. The University of Illinois--Champaign was fourth with placement as second in Learning and Instruction, third in Curriculum Studies, sixth in Administration and Supervision, and seventh in Teaching and Teacher Education. The University of Wisconsin--Madison was fifth with placement as first in Learning and Instruction, sixth in Teaching and Teacher Education, seventh in Curriculum Studies, and tenth in Administration and Supervision. (See Table 50)

Productive Schools of Education Across All Four Fields of Inquiry and All Time Periods

To corroborate Hypothesis 3b., all the data collected from each period of time and each selected field was combined. When this combining of all four fields and time periods was completed, the University of Wisconsin--Madison was identified as the most productive School of Education.

Table 50

The Top Five Averaged Ranking of the Most Influential Schools of Education in Four Selected Fields: Administration and Supervision, Curriculum Studies, Learning and Instruction, and Teaching and Teacher Education, (1971-1990)*

1.	Stanford University
2.	University of California--Los Angeles
3.	Harvard University
4.	University of Illinois--Champaign
5.	University of Wisconsin--Madison

* Based on rankings within the four selected fields, then averaging the rankings for a total rank score.

The University of Wisconsin--Madison was identified as the most productive School of Education because professors at this institution wrote the most articles published in influential journals during the twenty year time period, 1971-1990. Stanford University was second, the University of Illinois--Champaign was third, the University of California--Los Angeles was fourth, and Harvard University was fifth. Other productive Schools of Education when the four selected fields and four time periods were consolidated were: (6) Indiana University, (7) Michigan State University, (8) the University of Minnesota, (9) Columbia University, and (10) the University of Texas--Austin. (See Table 51)

Table 51

The Top Ten Productive Schools of Education Across Four Fields: Administration and Supervision, Curriculum Studies, Learning and Instruction, and Teaching and Teacher Education, (1971-1990)*

1.	University of Wisconsin--Madison
2.	Stanford University
3.	University of Illinois--Champaign
4.	University of California--Los Angeles
5.	Harvard University
6.	Indiana University
7.	Michigan State University
8.	University of Minnesota
9.	Columbia University
10.	University of Texas--Austin

* Based on counting the total number of articles published in four selected fields.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Overall the data collected for this investigation provided support for Hypotheses 1b. and 2b. Different scholars and Schools of Education made important contributions to the four selected fields during particular time periods.

An Examination of the Relationships between Productive Scholars and Schools

It should be noted that the productive scholar category did not contain the same members throughout this investigation. While Schools of Education differed in areas of concentration of productivity, a productive School of Education did not necessarily contain a productive professor nor did a productive professor necessarily work at a productive School of Education. For example, Robert Slavin was identified as the top productive scholar during a twenty year period (1971-1990). However, Johns Hopkins University, where Slavin worked during the entire time period, was not identified as one of the top ten productive universities. Other productive scholars affiliated with Schools of Education which were not named productive by this

investigation were as follows: Richard Mayer affiliated with the University of California--Santa Barbara, Herbert Walberg affiliated with the University of Illinois--Chicago, Allan Ornstein affiliated with Loyola University Chicago, and Thomas Good affiliated with the University of Missouri--Columbia.

In order to be identified as productive, a School of Education must have had more than one productive scholar during the time period being examined. That is to say that there must be a group or a critical mass of productive scholars to create a productive institution. (See Table 52)

For example, one University was considered a productive institution of higher learning in the categories of Administration and Supervision, Curriculum Studies, and Teaching and Teacher Education. However, no individual productive scholar from this University was identified in these particular categories.

When the four fields of inquiry were examined over the entire twenty year period, a larger picture of each particular field could be seen. After listing the outcomes of the twenty years examined for each of the four fields of inquiry, a larger picture of each individual field was seen.

Administration and Supervision: An Overview of Twenty Years

In the field of Administration and Supervision, twenty one Schools of Education were listed in the top ten category. These Schools of Education were divided into

Table 52

Productive Scholars and Productive Schools of Education Across Four Fields and Four Time Periods, (1971-1990)

1.	Robert Slavin Johns Hopkins	1.	University of Wisconsin-- Madison
2.	Richard Mayer University of California--Santa Barbara	2.	Stanford University
3.	Herbert Walberg University of Illinois--Chicago	3.	University of Illinois-- Champaign
4.	Jere Brophy Michigan State University	4.	University of California-- Los Angeles
5.	W. James Popham University of California-- Los Angeles	5.	Harvard University
6.	Allan Ornstein Loyola University Chicago	6.	Indiana University
7.	Joel Levin University of Wisconsin-- Madison	7.	Michigan State University
8.	Elliot Eisner Stanford University	8.	University of Minnesota
9.	Thomas Good University of Missouri--Columbia	9.	Columbia University
10.	John Goodlad University of Washington	10.	University of Texas-- Austin

three smaller categories. The first category consisted of Schools of Education which were listed as productive once during the twenty year period. The following eight Schools of Education were listed once: University of Florida, University of Massachusetts--Amherst, State University of New York--Buffalo, Syracuse University, University of Connecticut, University of Texas--Austin, University of Illinois--Chicago, and the University of Wisconsin--Madison. The next category of Schools of Education were also listed once during the twenty year period. However, they were listed in the 1986-1990 time period. These three Schools of Education may be considered up and coming. They were as follows: Johns Hopkins University, University of Wisconsin--Milwaukee, and the University of Minnesota. The third category consisted of ten Schools of Education which were listed more than once during the twenty year period. Pennsylvania State University, the University of Washington, Ohio State University, and Michigan State were listed twice. The University of Illinois--Champaign, Stanford University, and Harvard University were listed three times. Indiana University, University of California--Los Angeles, and Columbia University were listed in all four time periods. (See Table 53)

The following conclusions may be drawn from the data set examined. After several years of being influential in the field of Administration and Supervision, Indiana

Table 53

Productive Schools of Education in Administration and Supervision: An Overview of the Twenty Years, (1971-1990)

Universities	1971-1975	1976-1980	1981-1985	1986-1990
Indiana	1	2	2	6
U of Florida	2	x	x	x
U of Massachusetts--Amherst	3	x	x	x
Pennsylvania State	4	x	6	x
U of Illinois--Champaign	5	4	4	x
U of California--Los Angeles	6	5	3	9
U of Washington	7	x	x	4
State U of New York--Buffalo	8	x	x	x
Columbia	9	9	7	3
Syracuse	10	x	x	x
Stanford	x	1	1	1
Ohio State	x	3	8	x
U of Connecticut	x	6	x	x
Michigan State	x	7	x	8
U of Texas--Austin	x	8	x	x
Harvard	x	10	9	2
U of Illinois--Chicago	x	x	5	x
U of Wisconsin--Madison	x	x	10	x
Johns Hopkins	x	x	x	5
U of Wisconsin--Milwaukee	x	x	x	7
U of Minnesota	x	x	x	10

x= did not rank in the top ten listing at this time

University's influence began to wane. It may be assumed that this long period of dominance prevailed due to the impact of *Phi Delta Kappan* or a mass of productive scholars was gathered there during this period. These assumptions should be explored in further investigations. At approximately the same time, Stanford University's influence

began to grow. Stanford University supplanted Indiana University as the influential leader in the field of Administration and Supervision. Reasons that might explain this occurrence could be further investigated. However, it may be that a clustering or critical mass of scholars had been assembled at Stanford University starting in the mid 1970s. According to the trends or patterns, Harvard University's influence was building in this field. As was noted previously, Harvard scholars began to publish articles in influential journals other than the *Harvard Educational Review,* notably the *Phi Delta Kappan*. Some relationship may also exist between the opening and operation of the principal's academy at Harvard University and the increased number of articles published about Administration and Supervision. Columbia University and the University of Washington seemed to be in the process of rebuilding their departments. It would be interesting to observe some up and coming Schools of Education like Johns Hopkins, University of Wisconsin--Milwaukee and University of Minnesota over the next few years.

Curriculum Studies: An Overview of Twenty Years

In the field of Curriculum Studies, there were nineteen Schools of Education listed in the top ten category. These Schools of Education were divided into three smaller categories. The first category consisted of Schools of Education which were listed as productive once during the

twenty year period. The following six Schools of Education were listed once: University of Massachusetts--Amherst, University of Florida, University of Chicago, Syracuse University, University of California--Berkeley, and the University of Illinois--Chicago. The next category of Schools of Education were also listed once during the twenty year period. However, they were listed in the 1986-1990 time period. These three Schools of Education may be considered up and coming. They were as follows: Johns Hopkins University, University of Wisconsin--Milwaukee, and the University of Minnesota. The third category consisted of nine Schools of Education which were listed more than once during the twenty year period. Ohio State University and the University of Washington were listed twice. The University of California--Los Angeles, University of Illinois--Champaign, University of Wisconsin--Madison, Columbia University, and Michigan State University were listed three times. Indiana University, Harvard University, and Stanford University were listed in all four time periods. (See Table 54)

Once again Indiana University was a leader in the early 1970s. However, its dominance was felt for a shorter period of time in this field as compared with Administration and Supervision. Indiana University seemed to have a few more rivals for this position in the field of Curriculum Studies. Harvard University, Stanford University, and the University

Table 54

Productive Schools of Education in Curriculum Studies: An Overview of the Twenty Years, (1971-1990)

Universities	1971-1975	1976-1980	1981-1985	1986-1990
Indiana	1	4	6	7
Harvard	2	3	1	1
U of Massachusetts--Amherst	3	x	x	x
U of Florida	4	x	x	x
U of California--Los Angeles	5	5.5	5	x
Stanford	6	1	2	2
U of Chicago	7	x	x	x
U of Illinois--Champaign	8	2	3	x
Syracuse	9	x	x	x
U of Washington	10	x	x	5
U of Wisconsin--Madison	x	5.5	7	8
Ohio State	x	7	10	x
Columbia	x	8	4	4
Michigan State	x	9	9	3
U of California--Berkeley	x	10	x	x
U of Illinois--Chicago	x	x	8	x
Johns Hopkins	x	x	x	6
U of Wisconsin--Milwaukee	x	x	x	9
U of Minnesota	x	x	x	10

x = did not rank in the top ten listing at this time

of Illinois--Champaign were strong contenders for the number one position. Indiana University was first in 1971-1975, but it appeared to start a slow descent from that time period. Indiana University was fourth in 1976-1980, sixth in 1981-1985, and seventh in 1986-1990.

In contrast, Harvard University was second in 1971-1975, third in 1976-1980, and first in both 1981-1985 and

1986-1990 time periods. Stanford University was sixth in 1971-1975, first in 1976-1980, and second in both 1981-1985 and 1986-1990 time periods. The University of Illinois--Champaign also started to climb in productive activity. In 1971-1975, the University of Illinois--Champaign was eighth, second in 1976-1980, and third in 1981-1985. After those three periods the University of Illinois--Champaign was not listed in the top ten. Something happened to cause this university to soar and then to stall. Perhaps scholar mobility and/or faculty aging were factors that influenced this situation.

Some up and coming Schools of Education like Johns Hopkins University, University of Wisconsin--Milwaukee and University of Minnesota could be interesting to observe in the next few years.

The current leaders in the field of Curriculum Studies, Harvard University and Stanford University, may continue to exert influence in the years to come. It would be interesting to measure how long this situation continues.

Learning and Instruction: An Overview of Twenty Years

In the field of Learning and Instruction, twenty two Schools of Education were listed in the top ten category. These Schools of Education were divided into three smaller categories. The first category consisted of Schools of Education which were listed as productive once during the twenty year period. The following seven Schools of

Education were listed once: Pennsylvania State University, Florida State University, Indiana University, University of Florida, Columbia University, University of Illinois--Chicago, and the University of California--Berkeley. The next category of Schools of Education were also listed once during the twenty year period. However, they were listed in the 1986-1990 time period. These four Schools of Education may be considered up and coming. They were as follows: Johns Hopkins University, University of Maryland--College Park, and the University of Georgia--Athens. The third category consisted of eleven Schools of Education which were listed more than once during the twenty year period. The University of Texas--Austin, University of Pittsburgh, University of California--Santa Barbara, Purdue University, University of Michigan, and Michigan State University were listed twice. The University of Illinois--Champaign, and the University of Minnesota were listed three times. The University of Wisconsin--Madison and the University of California--Los Angeles were listed in all four time periods. (See Table 55)

Some conclusions drawn from the data were: The University of Illinois--Champaign was the leader in the 1971-1975 time period. This lead was overtaken by the University of Wisconsin--Madison in the 1976-1980 time period. However, the University of Wisconsin--Madison was not able to sustain the lead. In the 1981-1985 time period,

Table 55

Productive Schools of Education in Learning and Instruction: An Overview of the Twenty Years, (1971-1990)

Universities	1971-1975	1976-1980	1981-1985	1986-1990
U of Illinois--Champaign	1	2	2	x
U of Wisconsin--Madison	2	1	3	3
Stanford	3	6	5	x
U of Minnesota	4	5	6	x
U of Texas--Austin	5.5	4	x	x
Pennsylvania State	5.5	x	x	x
Florida State	7	x	x	x
U of California--Los Angeles	8	3	1	2
Indiana	9.5	x	x	x
U of Florida	9.5	x	x	x
U of Pittsburgh	x	7	9	x
Columbia	x	8	x	x
U of California--Santa Barbara	x	9	x	6
Purdue	x	10	x	8
U of Illinois--Chicago	x	x	4	x
U of Michigan	x	x	7	1
U of California--Berkeley	x	x	8	x
Michigan State	x	x	10	5
Johns Hopkins	x	x	x	4
Harvard	x	x	x	7
U of Maryland--College Park	x	x	x	9
U of Georgia--Athens	x	x	x	10

x = did not rank in the top ten listing at this time

the University of California--Los Angeles was first. This university was also unable to hold the lead. In the 1986-1990 time period, the University of Michigan became number one in the field of Learning and Instruction. It should be

noted that the field of Learning and Instruction was the first field that had four different leaders across four different time periods.

One could assume that this may be a highly competitive area making it hard to sustain a position as leader in the field. Subsequent leaders were not easily identified due to the erratic trends examined over the twenty year period. For example, the University of Michigan appeared in the top ten listing in 1981-1985 in seventh place and then jumped to first place in 1986-1990. Strong contenders for future top ten listings might include, Johns Hopkins University, Michigan State University, the University of California--Santa Barbara, Purdue University, and the University of Pittsburgh. Johns Hopkins University was fourth while Michigan State University was fifth in the 1986-1990 time period. The University of California--Santa Barbara was ninth in 1976-1980; and sixth in 1986-1990. Purdue University was tenth in 1976-1980, and eighth in 1986-1990. Purdue University and the University of California--Santa Barbara mirrored each other. Both universities ranked in the top ten category in the 1976-1980 time period, dropped out of the listing in 1981-1985 and reappeared in the 1986-1990 listing. The University of Pittsburgh was seventh in 1976-1980 and ninth in 1981-1985. Although the university was not listed in the top ten category, it was listed within the top twenty universities.

It was interesting to note the emergence of the University of Maryland--College Park and the University of Georgia--Athens. These southern universities appeared as productive in the 1971-1975 time period and reemerged in 1986-1990 time period.

Teaching and Teacher Education: An Overview of Twenty Years

In the field of Teaching and Teacher Education, nineteen Schools of Education listed in the top ten category. These Schools of Education were divided into three smaller categories. The first category consisted of Schools of Education which were listed as productive once during the twenty year period. The following five Schools of Education were listed once: University of Massachusetts--Amherst, University of Florida, University of Florida, University of Chicago, Pennsylvania State University, and University of California--Berkeley. The next category of Schools of Education was also listed once during the twenty year period. However, they were listed in the 1986-1990 time period. These three Schools of Education may be considered up and coming. They were as follows: University of Washington, Johns Hopkins, and the University of Georgia--Athens. The third category consisted of eleven Schools of Education which were listed more than once during the twenty year period. The University of Texas--Austin, Columbia University, and the University of Wisconsin--Milwaukee were listed twice. The University of Wisconsin--Madison,

University of California--Los Angeles, Ohio State University, University of Illinois--Champaign, Stanford University, and Michigan State University were listed three times. Indiana University and Harvard University were listed in all four time periods. (See Table 56)

These conclusions were drawn from the data set. Indiana University was the leader in the field of Teaching and Teacher Education in 1971-1975. However, Stanford University became number one in the 1976-1980 time period. Stanford University did not retain this lead. In the 1981-1985 time period, Harvard University became the leader in the field. Harvard University retained this lead into the 1986-1990 time period. Harvard was still the leader in the field of Teaching and Teacher Education.

Indiana University was fourth in both 1976-1980 and 1981-1985 time periods. However, Indiana University dropped to eighth place in the 1986-1990 time period. In contrast, Harvard University was second in both 1971-1975 and 1976-1980 time periods; and first thereafter. On the other hand, Stanford did not appear in the top ten listing until 1976-1980 where it was first. Stanford University was third in 1981-1985, and second in 1986-1990. It appeared from this data set that Harvard University and Stanford University may continue to vie for first place standings or at least vie with each other for placement in the top ten category.

Table 56

Productive Schools of Education in Teaching and Teacher Education: An Overview of the Twenty Years, (1971-1990)

Universities	1971-1975	1976-1980	1981-1985	1986-1990
Indiana	1	4	4	8
Harvard	2	2	1	1
U of Massachusetts--Amherst	3	x	x	x
U of Florida	4	x	x	x
U of Chicago	5	x	x	x
U of Wisconsin--Madison	6	5	7	x
U of California--Los Angeles	7	6	6	x
Pennsylvania State	8	x	x	x
Ohio State	9	3	x	10
U of Illinois--Champaign	10	8	2	x
Stanford	x	1	3	2
U of Texas--Austin	x	7	8	x
Michigan State	x	9	5	3
U of California--Berkeley	x	10	x	x
Columbia	x	x	9	4
U of Wisconsin--Milwaukee	x	x	10	6
U of Washington	x	x	x	5
Johns Hopkins	x	x	x	7
U of Georgia--Athens	x	x	x	9

x = did not rank in the top ten listing at this time

Predictions as to the future of this field can not be certain, due to the past erratic results. For example, Stanford University seemed to appear out of nowhere to become number one in 1976-1980. If patterns prevail, Michigan State University will be a contender for the top position. Columbia University also seems to be destined to be in one of the top five positions as do the University of

Wisconsin--Milwaukee, and Johns Hopkins University.

This was a difficult field to predict and productive universities may emerge as leaders in a field within a short period of time, with little or no previous evidence of leadership status.

The Findings of this Investigation

1. It should be noted that *Educational Leadership* and *Phi Delta Kappan* exerted much influence throughout this investigation. Authors that were published frequently in either of these two journals usually were designated as productive professors. This indicated that a generalist tended to be rated as a productive scholar more frequently than a specialist who was limited to fewer journals in which he or she might be published.

2. The fields of Curriculum Studies and Teaching and Teacher Education were greatly influenced by the *Harvard Educational Review* (*HER*). Because *HER* publishes primarily authors from Harvard University, this publication tended to skew the findings in these two fields. This also could have caused these two fields to be more similiar than different from each other. In other words, many of the same productive scholars appeared in the fields of Curriculum Studies and Teaching and Teacher Education.

3. Scholars in the field of Learning and Instruction had many articles that were also listed in the fields of Curriculum Studies and Teaching and Teacher Education.

However, the reverse was not true. A few scholars outside the field of educational psychology, like Alex Molnar and Madeline Hunter, were rated highly in the field of Learning and Instruction. However, these scholars were the exceptions, not the rule.

4. Productive scholars rose to prominence at different time periods. It was more difficult for scholars to maintain their standings than for productive universities to hold their positions. The standing of universities were not as sensitive to this particular factor due to the critical mass of scholars required for a university to be labeled productive in the first place.

5. Departments within Schools of Education differ significantly. Even though one department was productive did not necessarily mean that other departments were also productive.

6. In the early years examined by this investigation, there were few articles published by females. Upon examination of the dataset of later years, females began to contribute more frequently. In comparing the various time periods, it was noted that the percentage of female scholars increased. In 1971-1975, there were no female scholars, while in the 1976-1980 time period 12.5% were female scholars. In the 1981-1985 time period 16% were female scholars and in the 1986-1990 time period 25% were female scholars. Females also became editors of influential

journals.

7. Many scholars/professors who were named productive by this investigation contributed their time to editorial boards. Even though 65% of the productive scholars/professors were on editorial boards, these scholars: 1. published small numbers of articles (on the average 1 or 2 articles) or 2. did not publish in those journals.

Further Areas of Investigation

It is recommended that future investigations be conducted to provide more information with respect to productivity by Schools of Education and individual professors. These studies could include the various aspects of productivity.

Investigations about individual professors could include where professors received their training, professor age, professor interests, and professor motivation for the publication of articles.

Further investigations focused upon Schools of Education could include the effects of research grants and money allotted to research, library size, faculty size, student populations, and success of alumni. Qualitative investigations could present one less space an entirely different perspective to this problem.

REFERENCES

Baird, L.L. What Characterizes a Productive Research Department. *Research in Higher Education*, 1986, 25 (1), 211-225.

Barron, P., & Narin, F. *Analysis of Research Journals Related Research Structure in Education*. Chicago, Il: Computer Horizons Inc., 1975.

Beyer, J.M., & Stevens, J.M. Factors Associates with Changes in Prestige of University Departments. *Research in Higher Education*, 1977, 7 (3), 229-255.

Blackburn, R.T., Behymer, C.E. & Hall, D.E. Research Note: Correlates of Faculty Publications. *Sociology of Education*, 1978, 51 (2), 132-141.

Blau, P.M. & Margulies, R.Z. The Reputations of American Professional Schools. *Change*, 1974, 6 (10), 42-47.

Braxton, J.M. & Bayer, A.E. Assessing Faculty Scholarly Performance. In *Measuring Faculty Research Performance*, ed. J.W. Creswell, 25-42. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 4. Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education, 1985.

Budd, J.M. Higher Education Literature Characteristics of Citation Patterns. *Journal of Higher Education*, 1990, 61(1), 84-97.

Cartter, A.M. *An Assessment of Quality in Graduate Education*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1966.

_____, A.M. The Cartter Report on the Leading Schools of Education, Law, and Business. *Change*, 1977, 9 (2), 44-48.

Comfort, R.E., Bowen, L.S., & Gansneder, B.M. Who's Writing About What in Education's Major Journals. *Educational Leadership*, 1974, 31 (8), 663-667.

Creswell, J.W. *Faculty Research Performance:Lessons from the Sciences and the Social Sciences*. ed J.W. Creswell, 1-5 ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 4. Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education, 1985.

Davis, D. & Astin, H.S. Reputational Standing in Academe. *Journal of Higher Education*, 1987, 58 (3), 261-275.

Denton, J.J., Tsai, C.Y., & Cloud, C. Productivity of Faculty in Higher Education Institutions. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 1986, 37 (5), 12-16.

Dill, D. *Research as a Scholarly Activity: Context and Culture*. ed. J.W. Creswell, 1-5 ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 4 Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education, 1985.

Eash, M. Educational Research Productivity of Institutions of Higher Education. *American Educational Research Journal*, 1983, 20 (1), 5-12.

The Editor's of U.S. News & World Report, America's Best Colleges, Washington, D.C.: U.S. News & World Report, 1990.

Freed, M.N., Hess, R.K. & Ryan, J. The Educator's Desk Reference. New York: Macmillian, 1989.

Gordon, N.J., Nucci, L.P., West, C.K., Hoerr, W.A., Uguroglu, M.E., Vukosavich, P., & Tsai, S. Productivity and Citations of Educational Research: Using Educational Psychology as a Data Base. *Educational Researcher*, 1984, 13, 14-20.

Hattendorf, L. College and University Rankings: An Annotated Bibliography of Analysis, Criticism, and Evaluation. *RQ*, 1986, 25, 3:332-347.

Henson, K. Writing for Professional Publications: Ways to Increase Your Success. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 1984, 65, (9): 635-637.

_____. Writing for Publication: Playing to Win. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 1986, 67, (8):602-604.

_____. Writing for Educational Journals. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 1988, 69, (10):752-754.

_____. Writing for Educational Journals. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 1990, 71, (10):800-802.

Hunter, D.E. and Kuh, G.D. The "Write Wing: Characteristics of Prolific Contributors in the Higher Education Literature. *Journal of Higher Education*, 1987, 58, (4):443-462.

Jalongo, M.R. Faculty Productivity in Higher Education. *Educational Forum*, 1985,49, (2):171-182.

Katz, B. & Katz, L.S. Magazines for Libraries. New York: R.R. Bowker Company, 1989.

King, S. and Wolfe, L.M. A Latent-Variable Causal Model of Faculty Reputation Ratings. *Research in Higher Education*, 1987, 27, (2):99-106.

Kroc, R. Using Citation Analysis to Assess Scholarly Productivity. *Educational Researcher*, 1984, 13, (6): 17-22.

Kyvik, S. Age and Scientific Productivity: Differences between Fields of Learning. *Higher Education*, 1990, 19, (1):37-55.

Lawrence, J.H. and Blackburn, R.T. Age as a Predictor of Faculty Productivity: These Conceptual Approaches. *Journal of Higher Education*, 1988, 59, (1):22-38.

Lawrence, J.K. and Green, K.C. A Question of Quality; *The Higher Education Ratings Game*. Washington, D.C.: AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 5, 1980.

Luce, T.S. and Johnson, D.M. Rating of Educational and Psychological Journals, *Educational Researcher*, 1978, 7, (10):8-10.

McGuire, J.W., Richman, M.L., Daly, R.F., and Jorjani, S. The Efficient Production of "Reputation" by Prestige Research Universities in the United States, *Journal of Higher Education*, 1988, 59, (4):365-389.

Margulies, R.Z. and Blau, P.M. America's Leading Professional Schools, *Change*, 1973, 5, (9):21-27.

Morton, H.C. and Price, A.J. *The ACLS Survey of Scholars: The Final Report of Views on Publications, Computers, and Libraries*. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1989.

Muffo, J.A., Mead, S.V., and Bayer, A.E. Using Faculty Publication Rates for Comparing "Peer" Institutions, *Research in Higher Education*, 1987, 27, (2):163-175.

Over, R. Does Research Productivity Decline with Age?, *Higher Education*, 1982, 11, (5):511-20.

Roose, K.D., and Anderson, C.J. *A Rating of Graduate Programs*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1970.

Salk, J. (ed). Ulrich's International Periodicals. Directory 1991-1992. New Providence, New Jersey: R.R. Bowker Company, 1991.

Saunier, M.E. Objective Measures as Predictors of Reputational Ratings, *Research in Higher Education*, 1985, 23, (3):227-244.

Schubert, W.H. Contributions to AERA Annual Programs an Indicator of Institutional Productivity, *Educational Researcher*, 1979, 8, (7):13-17.

Scully, M. The Well-Known Universities Lead in Rating of Faculties' Reputations, *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 1979, 19, (17)(January 15):6-7.

Schwebel, M. Research Productivity of Education Faculty: A Comparative Study, *Educational Studies*, 1982, 13, (2):224-239.

Silverman, R.J. Publishing Patterns Evidenced in the Core Higher Education Journals, *Research in Higher Education*, 1984, 21, (2):159-177.

_____. Higher Education as a Maturing Field? Evidence from Referencing Practices, *Research in Higher Education*, 1985, 23, (2):150-183.

Smart, J.C. Perceived Quality and Citation Rates of Education Journals, *Research in Higher Education*, 1983, 19, (2):175-228.

Smart, J.C., and Elton, C.F. Structural Characteristics and Citation Rates of Education Journals, *American Educational Research Journal*, 1981, 18, (4):399-413.

Smart, J.C., and McLaughlin, G.W. Educational Specialty Areas, *Educational Research*, 11, (7):10-13.

Smith, N.L., and Caulley, D.N. The Evaluation of Educational Journals through the Study of Citations, *Educational Researcher*, 1981, 10, (5):11-34.

Stark, J.S. Administrator and Faculty Views of Scholarly Performance, In *Measuring Faculty Research Performance*, ed. J.W. Creswell, 59-74, ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No.4. Washington, D.C.:Association for the Study of Higher Education, 1985.

Walberg, H.J. Educational Psychology: Core Journals, Research Fronts, and Highly Cited Papers, *Current Contents*, 1990, 22, (13):5-14.

Walberg, H.J. University Distinction in Educational Research: An Exploratory Survey, *Educational Researcher*, 1972, 1, (1):15.

Walberg, H.J., Rasher, S.P., and Mantel, H. Eminence and Citations in Educational Psychology, *Educational Researcher*, 1977, 6, (3):12-14.

Walberg, H.J., Vukosavich, P., and Tsai, S. Scope and Structure of Journal Literature in Educational Research, *Educational Researcher*, 10, (8):11-13.

Walberg, H.J., Strykowski, B.F., Rovai, E., and Hung, S.S. Exceptional Performance, *Review of Educational Research*, 1984, 54, (1):87-112.

Webster, D.S. America's Highest Ranked Graduate Schools, 1925-1982, *Change*, 1983, 15, (4):14-24.

———. Who is Jack Gourman and Why is He Saying All Those Things About My College, *Change*, 1984a, 16, (8): 31-39.

———. The Bureau of Education's Suppressed Rating of Colleges, *History of Education Quarterly*, 1984b, 24, (4):499-511.

———. *Academic Quality Rankings of American Colleges and Universities*. Springfield, Il: Charles C. Thomas, 1986a.

———. Jack Gourman's Rankings of Colleges and Universities: A Guide for the Perplexed, *RQ*, 1986b, 25, (3): 323-331.

_____. Ranking Academic Quality, *Change*, 1986c, 18, (6):323-331.

West, C.K. Productivity Ratings of Institutions Based on Publication in the Journals of the American Educational Research Association: 1970-1976, *Educational Researcher*, 1978, 7, (2):13-14.

APPENDIX A

JUDGES IN THE FOLLOWING AREAS

Administration and Supervision Area:

Patrick Forsyth, Arizona State University
* Allan Glatthorn, Univ. of East Carolina-N. Carolina
* James W. Guthrie, University of California--Berkeley
* Ben Harris, University of Texas--Austin
* Wayne Hoy, Rutgers University
* Michael Kirst, Stanford University
* Ann Lieberman, Columbia University
* Cecil Miskel, University of Michigan
Raphael Nystrand, University of Louisville
* Peter Oliva, Georgia Southern College
* Thomas Sergiovanni, Trinity University

Curriculum Studies:

* Michael Apple, University of Wisconsin--Madison
* James Beane, National-Louis University
* Elliot Eisner, Stanford University
Arthur Foshay, Columbia University
Glen Hass, University of Florida
* Francis Hunkins, University of Washington
* Herbert Kliebard, University of Wisconsin--Madison
* John McNeil, University of California--Los Angeles
* Allan Ornstein, Loyola University of Chicago
* A. Harry Passow, Columbia University
* Decker Walker, Stanford University
* Robert Zais, Kent State University

Learning and Instruction:

* David Berliner, Arizona State University
* Benjamin Bloom, Northwestern University
* Rita Dunn, St. John's University
* Howard Gardner, Harvard University
Thomas Good, University of Missouri--Columbia
* Nancy Karweit, Johns Hopkins University
* Joel Levin, University of Wisconsin--Madison
* Barak Rosenshine, University of Illinois--Champaign
* Robert Slavin, Johns Hopkins University
* Richard Snow, Stanford University
* Robert Sternberg, Yale University
* Bruce Tuckman, Florida State University
* Herbert Walberg, University of Illinois--Chicago

Teaching and Teacher Education:

* Jere Brophy, Michigan State University
* James Cooper, University of Virginia
* Daniel Duke, University of Virginia
* Carolyn Evertson, Vanderbilt University
* Martin Haberman, University of Wisconsin--Milwaukee
* Judith Lanier, Michigan State University
* Kevin Ryan, Boston University
* Lee Shulman, Stanford University

* denotes responded to survey

APPENDIX B

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

April 10, 1991

Dear Professor_____,

I am currently working on a dissertation at Loyola University of Chicago under the direction of Dr. Allan Ornstein.

A key aspect of this investigation is to identify experts in four fields of education(Administration and Supervision, Curriculum Studies, Learning and Instruction, and Teaching and Teacher Education) and ask these experts to indicate their opinion as to what journals are most influential in their respective fields. Therefore, I have identified you as an expert in_____ and ask your opinion as to what journals you designate as the most influential in this field.

Please complete the enclosed survey and return it within 10 days. A Self-addressed stamped envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

Thank you for your time. If you would like to know the results of this survey, please indicate below and a copy will be sent to you.

Thank you for your time and cooperation.

Joanne M. Frey
1909 W. Cortland
Chicago, IL 60622

THE MOST INFLUENTIAL JOURNALS IN_____:

1._____

2._____

3._____

4._____

5._____

If you are interested in a copy of this survey place a check here_____

APPENDIX C

INFLUENTIAL JOURNAL RANKING BY EXPERTS IN THE FOUR SELECTED FIELDS

Selected Journals for

Administration and Supervision

	Year first Published	Sub-scription	Times a year Published
Educational Leadership	1943	135,000	8
Phi Delta Kappan	1915	150,000	10
Educational Administration Quarterly	1964	1,695	4
Journal of Educational Administration	1963	1,500	4

Selected Journals for

Curriculum Studies

Curriculum Inquiry	1971	1,100	4
Journal of Curriculum Studies	1968	no data	6
Educational Leadership	1943	135,000	8
Harvard Educational Review	1931	10,000	4
Phi Delta Kappan	1915	150,000	10

Selected Journals for

Learning and Instruction

	Year first Published	Subscription	Times a year Published
Journal of Educational Psychology	1910	4,400	4
American Educational Research Journal	1964	14,500	4
Review of Educational Research	1931	16,000	4
Educational Psychologist	1963	3,700	4
Educational Leadership	1943	135,000	8

Selected Journals for

Teaching and Teacher Education

Journal of Teacher Education	1950	6,000	6
Elementary School Journal	1900	6,000	5
Harvard Educational Review	1931	10,000	4
Phi Delta Kappan	1915	150,000	8
Educational Leadership	1943	135,000	10

APPENDIX D

PRODUCTIVE SCHOLARS WITH JOURNAL AFFILIATIONS PAST AND PRESENT

Richard Anderson	*American Educational Research Journal* *Review of Educational Research*
Robert Anderson	*Journal of Teacher Education*
James Banks	*Journal of Teacher Education*
Jere Brophy	*American Educational Research Journal* *Educational Psychologist* *Journal of Educational Psychology* *Review of Educational Research*
Harry Broudy	*Review of Educational Research*
Eugene Budig	*Phi Delta Kappan*
James Coleman	*American Educational Research Journal* *Review of Educational Research*
Harris Cooper	*American Educational Research Journal* *Journal of Educational Psychology*
Donald Cruickshank	*Journal of Teacher Education*
Larry Cuban	*Phi Delta Kappan* *Review of Educational Research*
Francis DiVesta	*Educational Psychologist* *Journal of Educational Psychology*
Elliot Eisner	*Curriculum Inquiry* *Educational Leadership* *Review of Educational Research*
Chester Finn	*Phi Delta Kappan*
Robert Gagne	*American Educational Reseach Journal* *Educational Psychologist* *Journal of Educational Psychology* *Review of Educational Research*
Henry Giroux	*Curriculum Inquiry*

Carl Glickman	*Educational Leadership*
Thomas Good	*American Educational Research Journal* *Elementary School Journal* (editor) *Journal of Educational Psychology*
John Goodlad	*Journal of Curriculum Studies* *Review of Educational Research*
Maxine Greene	*American Educational Research Journal* *Review of Educational Research*
Martin Haberman	*Phi Delta Kappan* *Journal of Teacher Education* (editor) *Review of Educational Research*
Kenneth Howey	*Journal of Teacher Education* *Review of Educational Research*
Lloyd Humphreys	*American Educational Research Journal*
Arthur Jensen	*Educational Psychologist* *Journal of Educational Psychology*
Michael Kirst	*Phi Delta Kappan* *Review of Educational Research*
Lawrence Kohlberg	*Review of Educational Research*
Raymond Kulhavy	*American Educational Research Journal* *Journal of Educational Psychology*
Gaea Leinhardt	*American Educational Research Journal* *Journal of Educational Psychology* *Review of Educational Research*
Ann Lieberman	*Phi Delta Kappan*
Myron Lieberman	*Phi Delta Kappan*
Joel Levin	*Educational Psychologist* *Journal of Educational Psychology* (consulting editor, associate editor, present editor)

Richard Mayer	*Educational Psychologist* (editor, editorial board) *Journal of Educational Psychology* *Review of Educational Research*
Alex Molnar	*Educational Leadership* (columnist)
Penelope Peterson	*American Educational Research Journal* *Educational Psychologist* *Elementary School Journal* *Journal of Educational Psychology* *Review of Educational Research* (editor)
W. James Popham	*American Educational Research Journal* *Educational Psychologist* *Review of Educational Research*
Andrew Porter	*American Educational Research Journal* *Journal of Teacher Education*
G. Michael Pressley	*Educational Psychologist* *Elementary School Journal* *Journal of Educational Psychology* *Review of Educational Research*
Mary Anne Raywid	*Journal of Teacher Education* *Phi Delta Kappan*
William Rohwer	*American Educational Research Journal* *Journal of Educational Psychology* *Review of Educational Research*
Vincent Rogers	*Educational Leadership* *Phi Delta Kappan*
S. Jay Samuels	*American Educational Research Journal* *Educational Psychologist* *Journal of Educational Psychology* *Review of Educational Research*
Dale Schunk	*Educational Psychologist* *Journal of Educational Psychology*

Harold Shane	*Phi Delta Kappan*
Robert Slavin	*American Educational Research Journal* *Elementary School Journal* *Journal of Educational Psychology* *Review of Educational Research*
Robert Sternberg	*Educational Psychologist* *Journal of Educational Psychology*
Herbert Walberg	*American Educational Research Journal* *Educational Psychologist* *Journal of Educational Psychology* *Review of Educational Research*
Decker Walker	*Curriculum Inquiry* *Educational Leadership*
Donald Willower	*American Educational Research Journal* *Educational Administration Quarter* *Journal of Educational Administration*
Noreen Webb	*American Educational Research Journal* *Journal of Educational Psychology* *Review of Educational Research*
Perry Zirkel	*American Educational Research Journal* *Phi Delta Kappan*

The dissertation submitted by Joanne M. Frey has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Allan C. Ornstein, Director
Professor, Curriculum and Instruction
Loyola University of Chicago

Dr. Barney M. Berlin
Associate Professor, Curriculum and Instruction
Loyola University of Chicago

Dr. Ronald R. Morgan
Associate Professor, Counseling and Educational Psychology
Loyola University of Chicago

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is, therefore, accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

11/3/92
Date

Director's Signature