THE WILEY INTERNATIONAL HANDBOOK OF

EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Edited by
DUNCAN WAITE
and IRA BOGOTCH

WILEY Blackwell

**The Wiley International Handbook
of Educational Leadership**

The Wiley International Handbook of Educational Leadership

Edited by

Duncan Waite
Texas State University
San Marcos, U.S.

Ira Bogotch
Florida Atlantic University
Boca Raton, U.S.

WILEY Blackwell

Contents

Notes on Contributors

Gary L. Anderson is a professor of Educational Leadership in the Steinhardt School of Culture, Education, and Human Development at New York University. A former high school teacher and principal, he has published on topics such as critical ethnography, action research, school micro-politics, and school reform and leadership. With Kathryn Herr, he has co-authored two books on action research: *The Action Research Dissertation: A Guide for Students and Faculty* (2015, Sage Pub.), and *Studying your Own School: An Educator's Guide to Practitioner Action Research* (2nd edition 2007, Corwin Press). He has also written several books on educational leadership, including, *Advocacy Leadership: Toward a Post-Reform Agenda* (2009, Routledge).

Khalid Arar (PhD) is Associate Professor of Educational Leadership & Higher Education at the College for Academic Studies and Seminar Hakibbutzim College. His studies focuses in issues of diversity, equity and ethnicity in educational leadership and higher education. He has published extensively in the last years in issues of educational leadership and higher education in scholarly journals, his most recent books include, *Arab women in management and leadership* (2013, Palgrave, with Tamar Shapira; Faisal Azaiza and Rachel Hertz Lazarowitz); *Higher Education among the Palestinian Minority in Israel* (2016, Palgrave, with Kussai Haj-Yehia).

Dr. Maysaa Barakat is an Assistant Professor at the department of Educational Leadership and Research Methodology, Florida Atlantic University. She received her PhD in educational leadership from Auburn University, Alabama in 2014. For 15 years she served as a school administrator in Egypt and the United States. Dr. Barakat served as senior graduate student representative for the Educational Administration Research Association (AERA), Leaders for Social Justice Special Interest Group (LSJ-SIG) from 2010 to 2013. She was a 2012 University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) Clark Scholar. Her research interests and publications focus on social justice, cultural competence, educational leadership preparation and international education with a focus on the Egyptian education system.

Mere Berryman, MEd PhD ONZM, is an Associate Professor at the University of Waikato in the Faculty of Education. Her research in the 1990s focused on collaborations with schools, Māori students, their families and communities through relational and responsive literacy and behavioral interventions. This work merged with the inception of Te Kotahitanga, an iterative research program aimed at working with schools to develop more effective learning relationships and culturally responsive pedagogy to

promote Māori students' educational success as Māori. This pedagogical pathway saw understandings from kaupapa Māori begin to merge with critical theories and a sociocultural view of the mind.

Mere is currently directing a national secondary school reform initiative, Kia Eke Panuku: Building on Success. This initiative spans three tertiary institutions and continues to work extensively with school leaders, classroom practitioners, Māori communities, iwi and other education professionals to bring about education reform for Māori students in 94 secondary schools. Ongoing evidence of educational disparities for Māori students in our schools, continues to make education for equity a priority.

Mere has also worked in these areas with indigenous and minoritized groups from other parts of the world. She continues to publish widely in this field.

Gert Biesta is Professor of Education and Director of Research in the Department of Education of Brunel University London, UK. In addition he is part-time NIVOZ Professor for Education at the University for Humanistic Studies, the Netherlands, and Visiting Professor at NLA University College, Bergen, Norway. His work focuses on the theory and philosophy of education and the theory and philosophy of educational and social research, with a particular interest in questions of democracy and democratization. He has published widely on a range of educational topics and issues, including teaching, teacher education, curriculum, citizenship education, adult education, education policy, and vocational education. His 2004 book, *The Beautiful Risk of Education*, won the 2014 Outstanding Book Award from the American Educational Research Association (Division B).

Dr. Jill Blackmore is Alfred Deakin Professor in the Faculty of Arts and Education, Deakin University, former Director of the Centre for Research in Educational Futures and Innovation, and Fellow of the Academy of Social Sciences, Australia. Her research interests include, from a feminist perspective, globalization, education policy and governance in universities, TAFE, schools and community; international and intercultural education; educational restructuring, leadership and organizational change; spatial redesign and innovative pedagogies; teachers' and academics' work and equity policy. Recent higher education research has focused on disengagement with and lack of diversity in leadership, international education and graduate employability. She is on editorial board of eight international journals. Recent publications include *Educational Leadership and Nancy Fraser*, Routledge (2016), and Arber, Blackmore, and Macrow (Eds.) (2014) *Mobile Teachers and Curriculum in International Schooling*, Sense.

Ira Bogotch is a professor of educational leadership and research methodology at Florida Atlantic University, Coordinator of the School Leadership Program, and adjunct professor at Griffith University Institute for Educational Research, Australia. His research interests span the topics of leadership for social justice, sociocultural influences (e.g., race, class and gender) on school leadership, urban education, and critical theories and critical methodologies for studying educational leadership.

In 2011, he served as regional (USA) editor for the *International Handbook of Leadership for Learning* (Townsend & MacBeath); in 2014, he co-edited the *International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Social [In]Justice*; and, now (2017) serves as co-editor for this *International Handbook of Educational Leadership*. He has served on

many editorial boards including *Educational Administration Quarterly*, the *Journal of School Leadership*, and *Urban Education*. He currently serves as Associate Editor for the *International Journal of Leadership in Education.*

   Professor Bogotch is currently a Co-Director of the UCEA Center for the Study of International School Leadership and has negotiated three partnership Memoranda of Understandings for FAU around the world, in South Africa, Malaysia, and Egypt. He has earned recognition for his scholarship, including the Davis Award (2010) for best paper in EAQ, co-authored with Autumn Tooms Cypres and Catherine Lugg, and 2015 Article of the Year "Reframing parent involvement: What should urban school leaders do differently?" co-authored with Terri Watson in *Leadership and Policy in Schools.*

Darren A. Bryant is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Education Policy and Leadership at the Education University of Hong Kong. He holds concurrent positions as Associate Director of The Joseph Lau Luen Hung Charitable Trust Asia Pacific Centre for Leadership and Change, Managing Editor of the *Journal of Educational Administration*, and Program Coordinator of the Executive Master of Arts in International Educational Leadership and Change. Darren's research areas include international school leadership, middle leadership, school leaders' roles in policy enact-ment, and leader development.

Wang Chen is Professor and Associate Director in Institute for History of Education and Culture at Beijing Normal University (P. R. China). He received his PhD in Education from Beijing Normal University. He is a historian of education whose research focuses on history of education with main interests in history of idea of higher education. His publications include *The Conservative Ideas of a University: from J. H. Newman to Allen* Bloom (Beijing Normal University Press, 2008) and *A Brief History of Western Education* (Central Radio & TV University Press, 2016).

María Inés Vázquez Clavera is a psychologist. She is a member of the National Agency for Research and Innovation of Uruguay (ANII) and has participated in numerous inter-national projects related to education. She teaches and does research on issues related to educational management, innovation processes, and organizational change and development. She is a member of the Executive Committee of the Support Network for Educational Management (RedAGE) and directs the biannual publication GestiónArte. She is currently the Academic Projects Coordinator at the University Institute (IUACJ) in Montevideo, Uruguay.

Karyn Cooper is a professor in the Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning, University of Toronto, Canada. At the heart of her work is the belief that looking criti-cally at personal and ethical issues may support and enhance inclusion, equity and democratic practice. Some of her books include *Qualitative Research in the Postmodern Era: Contexts of Qualitative Research. Volume I*, Springer, 2012; *Critical Literacies in Action: Social Perspectives and Teaching Practice.* Volume 34 in S. Steinberg and J. Kincheloe (series editors) *Transgressions: Cultural Studies and Education*, Sense Publishers, 2008; and *Burning Issues: Foundations of Education*, ScarecrowEducation, 2004. Her current research (2013, Critics Choice Award, American Study Association) gathered in a two-volume set of texts features video interviews with many of the giants in the field of qualitative research and/or critical perspectives across the social

sciences and humanities. Zygmunt Bauman, Noam Chomsky, Helene Cixous, Clifford Geertz, and Maxine Greene are but a few who share their perspectives, providing an opportunity to compress the history of qualitative and critical research paradigm development into a rich overview. Through the development of two websites select video clips from these texts may be viewed at cooperwhite.com and thedigitalscholar-network.com.

Steven J. Courtney is a Lecturer in Management and Leadership in the Manchester Institute of Education, University of Manchester, UK. His principal research interests are in the relationship between education policy, especially concerning structural reform, and the identities and practices of those leading schools. He is particularly interested in how social theory can be brought to bear in illuminating these. Dr. Courtney is the recipient of the American Educational Research Association Division A 2016 Outstanding Dissertation Award for his doctoral thesis, supervised by Professor Helen Gunter. In his most recent publications, he has typologized the purposively diversified field of provision in "Mapping school types in England", in the *Oxford Review of Education*; and he has described and theorized the turns to totalitarianism and cor-poratization in leadership in "Get off my bus! School leaders, vision work and the elimi-nation of teachers" in the *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, and "Corporatised leadership in English schools" in the *Journal of Educational Administration and History*.

Peter Demerath is an Associate Professor in the Department of Organizational Leadership, Policy and Development, and an affiliated faculty member in the Department of Anthropology at the University of Minnesota. He has conducted major ethnographic research projects on local conceptions of the utility of schooling, student identity, and academic engagement in Papua New Guinea and in the suburban and urban United States. His major research interests include the role of class culture in the perpetuation of social inequality through education; student acquisition of psychological capital; and the development of improvement-oriented school culture.

In 1999, Peter received the Comparative and International Education Society George Z. F. Bereday Outstanding Scholarship Award for his article, "The cultural production of educational utility in Pere Village, Papua New Guinea," and in 2005 received the Ohio State University College of Education Distinguished Teaching Award. His 2009 book, *Producing Success: The Culture of Personal Advancement in an American High School*, is now in its second printing with the University of Chicago Press.

A former middle school social studies teacher, Peter now teaches courses in anthro-pology and education, globalization and education, cultural dimensions of leadership, research methodology, and, with Michael Goh, social scientific foundations of educa-tion. With his wife, Ellen, he runs a non-profit organization dedicated to supporting the sustainable development efforts of the people of Manus, Papua New Guinea.

Colin W. Evers is Professor of Educational Leadership in the School of Education at the University of New South Wales. Prior to that, he was Professor of Education at the University of Hong Kong. He has a disciplinary background in mathematics and phi-losophy and research and teaching interests in the areas of educational administration and leadership, philosophy of education, and research methodology. He is co-author and co-editor of 12 books and has published over 100 scholarly papers. His most recent

publications include *Teacher Leadership: New Conceptions for Autonomous Student Learning in the Age of the Internet* (Routledge, 2014), co-authored with Kokila Katyal; *Decision-Making in Educational Leadership: Principles, Policies and Practices* (Routledge, 2015), co-edited with Stephanie Chitpin; *Realist Inquiry in Social Science* (Sage, London, 2016), co-authored with Brian Haig; *New Directions in Educational Leadership Theory* (Routledge, 2016), co-edited with Scott Eacott; and *Questioning Leadership: New Directions for Educational Organizations* (Routledge, 2017), co-edited with Gabriele Lakomski and Scott Eacott. He is currently the Educational Administration Section Editor for the forthcoming *Encyclopedia of Educational Philosophy and Theory*, (Springer).

Peter Gronn is Emeritus Professor, University of Cambridge and Monash University. From 2008 to 2015, he was Professor Education and Head of Faculty (2011–14) at Cambridge. He is also a Quondam Fellow of Hughes Hall, Cambridge, and a Fellow of the Academy of Social Sciences. Previously he was Professor at Monash University (2003–7), where he held a personal chair appointment, and the University of Glasgow (2007–8). Peter has taught, researched, and published extensively in leadership, management, and policy. Recently he has been extensively involved in the establishment of the new University of Cambridge Primary School (which opened in 2015). He was deputy chairman of the trustees/governing body, and he headed up Cambridge's team which secured UK government approval and funding. Peter has been a membership of a number of journal editorial boards. A recent publication, co-edited with James Biddulph, is *A University's Challenge: Cambridge's Primary School for the Nation* (Cambridge University Press).

Helen M. Gunter is Professor of Educational Policy and Sarah Fielden Professor of Education in The Manchester Institute of Education, University of Manchester, UK, and is a Fellow of the Academy of Social Sciences. She co-edits the *Journal of Educational Administration and History*. Her work focuses on the politics of education policy and knowledge production in the field of school leadership. Her most recent books are: *Leadership and the Reform of Education* published in 2012 by Policy Press; *Educational Leadership and Hannah Arendt* published in 2014 by Routledge; *An Intellectual History of School Leadership Practice and Research* in 2016 by Bloomsbury Press; and *Consultants and Consultancy: the Case of Education*, coauthored with Colin Mills, Springer, 2016.

Qian Haiyan is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Education Policy and Leadership at the Education University of Hong Kong. Prior to joining the Institute in 2012, she worked at the different educational institutions in mainland China. Her research interests include education leadership and school principalship in China and influence of the social and cultural context on schooling across Chinese societies. Her studies in these fields emphasize building indigenous understandings about how Chinese school leaders develop teachers, promote teaching and learning, and improve schools.

David Hall is Professor of Education Policy and Practice at the Manchester Institute of Education, University of Manchester, UK. His research has focused upon large-scale reforms of educational institutions and those who work within them. This has led to a variety of books and international journal articles focusing upon New Public

Management, leadership, professional identities, and the complexities of neoliberal reform. His research has been funded by organizations including the Joseph Rowntree Foundation and the UK Economic and Social Research Council. Prior to joining the university sector David spent twelve years as a teacher of Economics, Politics and Business Studies. David was appointed as Head of the Manchester Institute of Education in July, 2013.

Cliona Hannon is Director of the Trinity Access Programmes in Trinity College Dublin, the University of Dublin, Ireland, a role which involves the development and implementation of strategic priorities relating to higher education access for low-income groups. A graduate of Trinity College, Cliona worked in a variety of educational and not-for-profit contexts before joining Trinity to set up Foundation Course for young adults from low-income backgrounds. Since then, Trinity's work in widening participation has expanded enormously and now comprises a continuum of programs for elementary school pupils right through to graduation. Cliona is now leading the implementation of the 'Trinity Access 21' projects, an action research project aimed at informing national policy development related to low-income students accessing higher education. She is also a Visiting Fellow in Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford University, to establish a Foundation Year for low-income young adults.

John Hardman, PhD, is an instructor in the Department of Educational Leadership & Research Methodology at Florida Atlantic University, where he teaches master's- and doctoral-level courses in school administration. He is the departmental liaison to the Palm Beach County School District, and Chair of the College of Education's Diversity Committee. He is also a member of the College of Education Accreditation Core Working Group, and of the Florida Atlantic University Diversity Council. His research focuses on effective leadership for regeneration and sustainability in business, education, and community.

John is the founder of Regenerative Organizations, a process consulting firm that specializes in helping civic and corporate leaders facilitate the shift of their organizations toward sustainability and regenerative practice. He is the author of *Leading for Regeneration: Going beyond Sustainability in Business, Education, and Community* (Routledge, 2012), which is based on his doctoral studies, ongoing research, and consulting work with organizations in the private and civic sector. He has served as the Strategic Planning Chair and Community Campaign Manager of the United States Green Building Council (USGBC) South Florida Chapter, and member of the Climate Action Coalition of South Florida.

Andy Hargreaves is the Thomas More Brennan Chair in the Lynch School of Education at Boston College, where he received the 2015 Excellence in Teaching with Technology Award. Previously, he was the co-founder and director of the International Centre for Educational Change at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Andy has authored or edited over 30 books, several of which have achieved outstanding writing awards from the American Educational Research Association, the American Libraries Association, and the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. One of these, *Professional Capital: Transforming Teaching in Every School* (with Michael Fullan), has received three prizes, including the prestigious Grawemeyer Award.

Andy serves as adviser in education to the Premier of Ontario, is founding editor of *The Journal of Educational Change* and the *Journal of Professional Capital and Community*, and is President Elect of the International Congress for School Effectiveness and Improvement. He holds an Honorary Doctorate from the University of Uppsala in Sweden and is a Fellow of the Royal Society of Arts in the UK. He is ranked in *Education Week*'s top ten scholars with most influence on US education policy debate.

Andy consults with organizations and governments all over the world. He is founder of the Atlantic Rim Collaboratory – www.atrico.org. His most recent book is *Uplifting Leadership* (with Alan Boyle and Alma Harris) published by Jossey Bass Business in 2014.

Professor Dr. Alma Harris is currently Director of the Institute of Educational Leadership at the University of Malaya in Malaysia. Until recently, she was Professor of Educational Leadership and Pro-Director (Leadership) at the Institute of Education, University College London. In 2010/12 she was a Senior Policy adviser to the Welsh Government reporting to the Minister of Education. Her research work focuses primarily on leading organizational change and development. She is internationally known for her work on school improvement, focusing particularly on improving schools and school systems. Professor Harris has written extensively about leadership in schools, particularly distributed leadership, and her books have been translated into several languages. She is a visiting Professor at the University of Southampton and the Moscow Higher School of Economics. She holds an honorary research fellowship at the Hong Kong Institute of Education. Professor Harris is Past President of the International Congress of School Effectiveness and School Improvement and is leading a major research study on leadership and system improvement in Asia (#7systemleadershipstudy).

Katie Higginbottom is an Ontario Graduate Scholar and PhD Candidate at The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE)/University of Toronto (Canada), studying Women in Leadership in the Department of Educational Administration and Policy. Katie's PhD dissertation focuses on strategies successful women leaders use to overcome obstacles associated with being a woman leader. Katie's other research interests include social justice leadership and micropolitics in schools. Prior to beginning her PhD, Katie taught high school for five years. Katie holds a Bachelors of Arts in Sociology from Queen's University and a Bachelors of Education and Masters in Educational Leadership from the University of Western Ontario. She has co-authored an article for practitioners in the *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy* (CJEAP), as well as a co-authoring a chapter for academics in *Working (with/out) the System: Educational Leadership, Micropolitics and Social Justice.*

Sonia Ilie is Research Fellow (postdoctoral) at the Faculty of Education, University of Cambridge. She uses large-scale administrative and survey databases to look at inequalities in educational achievement and learning, in both England, and developing countries. Sonia's work has recently focused on access to higher education in relation to prior learning and socioeconomic deprivation. Her previous research projects addressed issues concerning school effectiveness, school leadership, and student achievement in mathematics.

Natalia Isaeva is a Junior research fellow, doctoral student in the Center of Leadership Development in Education, at the Institute of Education at National Research University

Higher School of Economics, Moscow. Her expertise is in leadership in education, instructional design, and games and simulations in education and assessment.

Edward P. St. John, Algo D. Henderson Collegiate Professor Emeritus at the University of Michigan's Center for the Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education, is concerned with education for a just society, an interest that stems from three decades of research on educational policy and practice. He is a Fellow of the American Educational Research Association and has received awards for leadership and research from the Association for the Study of Higher Education. Professor St. John is an editor for *Globalization and Social Justice*, a book series addressing comparative issues in higher education (AMS Press); *Readings on Equal Education*, an annual volume focusing on initiatives seeking to reduce inequalities in K-12 and higher education (AMS Press); *Core Issues in Higher Education,* topical texts for professors and graduate students with an interest in the field (Routledge); and *Engaged Research for Social Justice in Education,* a series of scholarship supporting change initiatives (Stylus Press). His most recent co-authored book is *Left Behind: Urban High Schools and the Failed Market* (Johns Hopkins University Press).

Associate Professor Michelle Jones is the Deputy Director of the Institute of Educational Leadership at the University of Malaya in Malaysia. In 2008–2011 she was a School Effectiveness Adviser to the Welsh Government. Her research work focuses primarily on educational leadership and leading organizational change. She is a visiting Senior Research Fellow at the Moscow Higher School of Economics and a Research Fellow at the Hong Kong Institute of Education. Dr. Jones is currently the Co PI of three major research projects: the 7 System Leadership Study, (University of Malaya); School Turnaround in Asia (The Head Foundation) and Instructional Leadership in East Asia (Hong Kong Institute of Education).

Anatoly Kasprzhak is Professor and Head of the Center of Leadership Development in Education, and Program Academic Supervisor in the Institute of Education at National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow. He graduated from the Moscow State University of Education, and received a PhD in pedagogy. Before the 1990s he worked as a teacher, than as a school principal. He was one of the modern secondary education program developers in Russia. In the early 1990 he became one of the organizers of the laboratories for innovative school models at the Moscow Institute of Educational Systems, which he directed for several years. In 2001, he became leader of the Faculty of Management in Education (now the Educational Policy Studies Center) in the Moscow School of Social and Economic Sciences (MSSES). In 2007, he was elected to the post of MSSES Rector. Prof. Kasprzhak is the author of more than 150 publications, including articles and books in Russian and English.

His expertise is in leadership in education, management of educational systems; development and implementation of educational and training programs, retraining and advanced training of educators; monitoring the quality of education; and modern educational technology. He is a member of the jury and the organizing committee of the national competition "School principal. Honored Teacher of the Russian Federation."

Hans W. Klar, PhD, is an associate professor in the College of Education at Clemson University. Prior to completing his doctorate at the University of Wisconsin-Madison in

2010, Dr. Klar held a variety of teaching and educational leadership positions in Japan, Australia, and China. At Clemson, he led the South Carolina Successful School Principals' Project, and is currently co-director of a leadership mentoring initiative developed in collaboration with the Western Piedmont Education Consortium called the Leadership Learning Community (LLC). His teaching and research is focused on developing leadership for improving teaching and learning, especially in high-needs schools. His most recent article, "Fostering the capacity for distributed leadership: A post-heroic approach to leading school improvement," (with Kristin Huggins, Hattie Hammonds, and Frederick Buskey) was published in the *International Journal of Leadership in Education* in 2015.

Susanna Kofie (PhD student, University College London (UCL)) is Deputy Director of Education in the Ghana Education Service, a branch of the Ministry of Education. Her research is in the area of supervision, organizational improvement, and professional development of school leaders. Her interest is particularly in identifying ways to prevent schools from sliding into ineffectiveness, and in finding strategies and processes that allow ineffective schools to manage change and become effective. With her scientific background in the education service for 25 years, she has encouraged a number of girls into the field. She has a strong personal interest in transforming education and girls' attitudes towards science.

Gabriele Lakomski is Professor Emeritus in the Melbourne Centre for the Study of Higher Education at the University of Melbourne. Her research interests are in the areas of leadership, (organizational) learning and culture, and organizational theory.

Her current research focuses on neuroscience and the emotions, the relation between cognition and emotion, and its implications for rational decision-making in organizational contexts. Gabriele was Editor of the *Australian Journal of Education*; Section Editor of the *Second International Encyclopedia of Education*; Senior Editor of *Organization Studies*, and section editor of the *Springer Encyclopedia of Educational Philosophy and Theory (Educational Leadership)*. She is a member of a number of editorial boards, such as the *Journal of Educational Administration* and *Management Learning*. She is author, co-author and co-editor of six books and over 80 scholarly papers. She is Deputy Chair of the Board of St. Michael's Grammar School, Melbourne.

Dawn Lawrence, MEd DipTchg, is an experienced secondary school teacher who has held both middle leadership and national subject association leadership roles, before leading the implementation of Te Kotahitanga as a school-based professional development facilitator. She then went on to be a member of the Research and Professional Development Facilitation team within that program based at the University of Waikato. Dawn is currently an Academic Director and in-service professional development facilitator in Kia Eke Panuku: Building on Success. She is based at the Faculty of Education, University of Auckland. Her research has primarily focused on teachers' discourses, at both the classroom and leadership level, and the impact of such discourses on their implementation of culturally responsive and relational pedagogies. Drawing from personal experiences and her research, Dawn has published an auto-ethnographic article on her experiences as an English born educator seeking to work with teachers of Māori students. She has also co-authored a chapter with a Māori colleague which

presents a dialogue from indigenous and non-indigenous perspectives around Māori metaphor used to conceptualize culturally responsive and relational pedagogies within Aotearoa New Zealand.

Beverly Lindsay is a Visiting Professor at the University College London – Institute of Education and held former Distinguished Fulbright Fellowships in Indonesia, Mozambique, South Korea, and Zimbabwe. She is the Principal Investigator/Project Director for the National Science Foundation (NSF) grant that compares graduate Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) programs in the United States and the United Kingdom. She is also the Principal Investigator and Co-Director for Ford Foundation Funded Institute: University Leadership and Agents of Change in Post Conflict and Transitional Societies, University of California. She is a Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) and member of the Council on Foreign Relations. She was the Inaugural University Fellow and Professor at Dillard University in New Orleans and former Visiting Professor at the University of the West Indies, Kingston. Her scholarship examines international higher education and public policy issues, and her books include: *Universities and Global Diversity* (with Wanda J. Blanchett); *Ralph Johnson Bunche: Public Intellectual and Nobel Peace Laureate*; *Terrorism's Unanswered Questions* (with Alan Lowther); and *The Quest for Equity in Higher Education* (with Manuel Justiz).

Andrea López is a doctoral candidate in Educational Leadership at New York University. Andrea served as Academic Coordinator and Teacher at PENTA UC, the Educational Program for Kids with Academic Talent of Pontificia Universidad Católica in Santiago, Chile, and participated in educational support programs for Chilean public schools. Andrea has a bachelor's degree in Psychology and in Aesthetics, from Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile. She earned a Master's in Human Resources Management from Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, and a Master's in Art Theory and History from Universidad de Chile. Her research interests include citizenship education, civic engagement, social justice art education, and K-12 school reform.

Karen Seashore Louis is a Regents Professor and the Robert H. Beck Chair in the Department of Organizational Policy, Leadership, and Development at the University of Minnesota. She has also served as the Director of the Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement at the University of Minnesota, Department Chair, and Associate Dean of the College of Education and Human Development. Her work focuses on school improvement and reform, school effectiveness, leadership in school settings, and the politics of knowledge use in education. Her most recent books include *Building Strong School Cultures: A Guide to Leading Change* (with Sharon Kruse, 2009), *Linking Leadership to Student Learning* (with Kenneth Leithwood, 2011), *Educational Policy: Political Culture and Its Effects* (2012) and *Reach the Highest Standard in Professional Learning: Leadership* (2016, Corwin Press). A Fellow of the American Educational Research Association, she also served as the Vice President of Division A, and on the Executive Board of the University Council for Educational Administration. She has received numerous awards, including the Lifetime Contributions to Staff Development award from the National Staff Development Association (2007), the Campbell Lifetime Achievement Award from the University Council for Educational Administration (2009), and a Life Member designation from the International Congress for School Effectiveness and School Improvement.

Dr. Rebecca Lowenhaupt is an Assistant Professor of Educational Leadership in the Lynch School of Education at Boston College. Her research focuses on school leadership in the context of immigration. She studies school reform as it relates to shifting student demographics and changing policy. Recent work includes a study of instructional leadership in the context of science reform, as well as research on the implementation of policies for immigrant students. She has also partnered with local school districts focused on increasing family engagement in new immigrant destinations. Her scholarship has appeared in several academic journals, including the *American Education Research Journal*, *Education & Urban Society* and the *Journal of Educational Administration*. She has received funding for her research from the Spencer Foundation and the National Science Foundation.

Joyce G. Mbepera (PhD, University College London (UCL) 2015), is lecturer in leadership and management studies at Mkwawa University College of Education, a Constituent College of University of Dar es Salaam. Her research and consultation has been in the area of women and leadership and girls' education. She recently researched on organizational obstacles which hinder women to involve in leadership in community secondary schools in rural Tanzania. She is interested to work with women and girls in marginalized society.

Alexander J. Means is an assistant professor in the Department of Social and Psychological Foundations of Education at SUNY Buffalo State. He is the author of *Schooling in the Age of Austerity: Urban Education and the struggle for Democratic Life* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), which won a 2014 Society of the Professors of Education Book Award, and *Toward a New Common School Movement* (Paradigm, 2014) with Noah De Lissovoy and Kenneth Saltman. His work examines educational policy in relation to political, economic, cultural, and social change.

Jorunn Møller is a professor at the University of Oslo, Department of Teacher Education and School Research. Her professional interests are in the areas of educational leadership and governance, reform policies, and school accountability. She is currently leading the research group "Curriculum Studies, School Leadership and Educational Governance" at the Faculty of Educational Sciences. She has been a manager of several research projects examining the implementation of school reform, accountability, school leadership, and leadership identities in a Norwegian context and across countries, and she is also involved in international research networks in the field of successful school leadership. Recently she has participated in a project researching the spread of New Public Management (NPM) across European education systems, with a particular focus upon the implications of this development for schools serving a diverse student population. At present, she is leading a project designed to disentangle the complexity of legal standards and school leaders' professional judgment with a focus on students' right to a good psychosocial learning environment and special needs education. The project is cross-disciplinary and funded by the Research Council of Norway.

Dr. Richard Niesche is a senior lecturer in the School of Education at the University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia. He has worked as a teacher in Queensland and New South Wales at both primary and secondary levels. His research interests include educational leadership, the principalship, and social justice. His particular research focus is to use a critical perspectives in educational leadership to examine the work of

school principals in disadvantaged schools and how they can work towards achieving more socially just outcomes. He has published his research in a range of peer-reviewed journals and is the author of a number of books including *Foucault and Educational Leadership: Disciplining the Principal* (Routledge, 2011) and *Deconstructing Educational Leadership: Derrida and Lyotard* (Routledge, 2013 and 2015). Most recent *is Leadership, Ethics and Schooling for Social Justice*, co-authored with Dr. Amanda Keddie from the University of Queensland (Routledge, 2015).

Izhar Oplatka is a professor of Educational Administration and Leadership at the School of Education, Tel Aviv University, Israel and the head of the department of Educational Policy and Administration. Professor Oplatka's research focuses on the lives and career of school teachers and principals, educational marketing, emotions and educational administration, and the foundations of educational administration as a field of study. His most recent books include *Higher Education Consumer Choice* (2015, with Jane Hemsley-Brown, Palgrave); *The Legacy Of Educational Administration: A Historical Analysis of an Academic Field* (2010, Peter Lang Publishing); *The Essentials of Educational Administration* (2015, Pardes Publisher, in Hebrew); and *Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Schools* (2015, Routledge, with Anit Somech). His publications have appeared in various international journals including *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *Journal of Educational Administration*, *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, *Comparative Education Review*, *Teachers' College Record*, *Canadian Journal of Education Administration and Policy*, *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, *Journal of Education Policy*, *School Leadership & Management*, *Urban Education*, *International Journal of Educational Management*, and so forth.

Oksana Parylo received her PhD in Educational Administration and Policy from the University of Georgia, USA, in 2012. Her doctoral research focused on principal succession and professional learning. In 2013–2014, Dr. Parylo was a research associate in the Methodology of Educational Sciences Research Group at the Katholieke Universiteit in Leuven, Belgium. Her research interests include the preparation, professional development, and evaluation of teachers and leaders, qualitative and mixed methodologies, and meta-synthesis. Currently, she is working as a Journal Development Specialist for the Open Access publisher Frontiers (Lausanne, Switzerland).

Rosa María Tafur Puente is a teacher in the Universidad Pontificia Católica del Perú (PUCP). She is specialist in university quality, educational management, institutional evaluation and pedagogical audit. She is former director of the Research Center and Educational Services of the PUCP, currently she is director of the Journal Educación and coordinator of self-evaluation processes and external evaluator by the UDUAL (México) and CONCYTEC (Perú), certified external evaluator by the CONEACES (Perú) and Founder of the group AGE-Perú.

Kirsten Robbins is a Doctoral Student in the Urban Education Studies Program at Indiana University School of Education (IUPUI).

James Ryan is a professor in the Department of Leadership, Higher and Adult Education at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto. His current research and teaching interests include leadership, inclusion, and politics. His latest book is an edited volume with Denise Armstrong entitled *Working With/out the System: Leadership, Micropolitics and Social Justice.*

Joaquín Gairín Sallán is professor of Didactics and School Education in the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. As an international consultant, he is involved in educational reform programs in Spain and Latin America and is currently overseeing projects in social and educational development, organizational development, educational changes processes, leadership, program and institutional assessment, ICT in training and impact evaluation. He directs the EDO research group (http://edo.uab.es), the journal *EDUCAR* (http://educar.uab.cat/) and coordinates the Support Network for Educational Management (RedAGE: http://www.redage.org).

Kenneth J. Saltman is a Professor of Educational Leadership at the University of Massachusetts Dartmouth, where he teaches in the Educational Leadership and Policy PhD program. His most recent books are *Scripted Bodies: Corporate Power, Smart Technologies, and the Undoing of Public Education* (Routledge 2016), *The Politics of Education: A Critical Introduction* (Routledge 2014), and (with Alexander Means and Noah DeLissovoy) *Toward a New Common School Movement* (Routledge 2014).

Dr. Michael Schratz is Professor of Teacher Education and School Research, presently Dean of the School of Education at the University of Innsbruck, Austria, and Scientific Director of the National Leadership Academy. He is the present Speaker of the Jury of the German School Award and President of ICSEI (International Conference for School Effectiveness and Improvement). His main interests are in educational innovation and change, with a particular focus on leadership, school improvement, and mindfulness of learning. He taught in Austria and Great Britain, did research at the University of California, San Diego, and worked at Deakin University (Australia). His main research projects are in educational leadership, learning and teaching as well as policy development. His publications have been translated into several languages.

Roberto Serpieri is Professor of Sociology of Education and Educational Policy in the Department of Social Sciences, University of Naples Federico II, Italy. He is member of the International boards of the *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, the *Italian Journal of Sociology of Education* and *Scuola Democratica*. His interests focus on governmentality studies, with a specific reference to issues of leadership and governance. He is the author of several articles and chapters in international journals and books; among his latest works are: *New Public Management and the Reform of Education in Europe*, coedited with H. Gunter, E. Grimaldi and D. Hall (Routledge, 2016); "Discourses and contexts of educational leadership: from ideology to dispositif", chapter in E. Samier (Ed.), *Ideologies in Educational Administration and Leadership* (Routledge, 2016).

Pat Thomson PhD PSM FAcSS is Professor of Education and Convenor of the Centre for Research in Arts Creativity and Literacies (CRACL., see cracl.net) at the University of Nottingham. She was formerly a K-12 headteacher in South Australian disadvantaged schools. Her research is primarily in arts and school and community change. She is currently working on projects with the Royal Shakespeare Company, Tate, Serpentine and Nottingham Contemporary. She has published 17 books; her most recent are *Detox Your Writing: Strategies for Doctoral Researchers* with Barbara Kamler (Routledge 2016); *Place Based Methods for Researching Schools* with Christine Hall (Bloomsbury, 2016); and *Pierre Bourdieu and Educational* leadership (Routledge, 2016). She blogs at patthomson.net and tweets as @ThomsonPat.

Tony Townsend has worked all over the world. After more than 20 years at Monash University in Australia he became a professor of Educational Leadership at Florida Atlantic University in the United States and then Professor of Public Service, Educational Leadership and Management at the University of Glasgow in the UK. On his return to Australia in 2013, he accepted part-time positions as Professor of Educational Leadership at the University of Tasmania and Griffith University and he still works for both. He has been a visiting professor in Michigan in the USA; Johannesburg and Durban in South Africa; Saskatoon in Canada; Macau; Kuala Lumpur in Malaysia; Brno in the Czech Republic; and Dublin in the Republic of Ireland. His recent consulting has involved establishing an online teacher education program (Commonwealth Trust), reviewing the development of leadership standards (National Education Council, Chile), Teacher Capacity Development Plans (Pakistan) and in the last five years has worked with school leaders in Mongolia, the Maldives, the UK, Germany and Australia. He has published eleven books and numerous articles, chapters, and papers, in the areas of leadership, school effectiveness, school improvement, teacher education, and community education and development, in Australia, Europe and North America. He has been President and is a life member of both the International Congress for School Effectiveness and Improvement (ICSEI), and the International Council on Education for Teaching (ICET). In 2009, he was the Australian Council for Educational Leaders' Travelling Scholar, giving workshops in states and territories around the country.

Selahattin Turan (PhD) received his BA from Ankara University Faculty of Educational Sciences in 1990 and PhD from the Ohio University, School of Applied Behavioral Sciences and Educational Leadership, in 1998. He joined Eskisehir Osmangazi University in 1998, where he is a professor of Educational Leadership. He was past president of the International Society for Educational Planning (ISEP) and a past chair of the Division A (Administration, Organization and Leadership) Ad Hoc International Committee of the (AERA). His primary professional interests are theory in leadership, educational policy, and sociology of technology and alternative perspectives in education. Dr. Turan is co-authored many book chapters and books. He is also on the editorial boards of many national and international journals. He has published widely in a variety of scholarly journals and presented papers at the annual meetings of AERA, ISEP, NCPEA and UCEA. Mr. Turan was past president of ECO Educational Institute and currently serving as the dean of the College of Education at Eskişehir Osmangazi University.

Anna Vignoles is Professor of Education and Director of Research at the Faculty of Education, University of Cambridge and a trustee of the Nuffield Foundation. Anna has extensive experience of using large-scale administrative data to study factors relating to pupil achievement and students' outcomes from education. She has published widely on widening participation into higher education and on the socioeconomic gap in pupil achievement. Her research interests include issues pertaining to equity in education, school choice, school efficiency and finance, higher education and the economic value of schooling. Anna has advised numerous government departments, including the Department for Education, the Department of Business, Innovation and Skills and HM Treasury.

I am **Duncan Waite**, professor in the Education and Community Leadership Program and the School Improvement Doctoral Program at Texas State University. I am

co-editor, along with Ira Bogotch, of this, the *International Handbook of Educational Leadership*. I am the editor of the *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, having founded it twenty years ago. I authored a book on instructional supervision (*Rethinking Instruction Supervision: Notes on Its Language and Culture*) and contributed chapters to such research handbooks as *The Handbook of Research in School Supervision*; *Language Policy and Political Issues in Education*, *Encyclopedia of Language and Education (Vol. 1)*; and *The International Handbook on Globalization, Education, and Policy Research*, among others. I have published widely, including in the *American Educational Research Journal* (AERJ), *Qualitative Inquiry*, *La Revista Española de Pedagogía*, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *The Urban Review*, *The Journal of School Leadership*, *World Studies in Education* and many more.

I am bilingual English-Spanish, having lived in Guadalajara, Mèxico for three-and-a-half years and taught 2nd, 3rd, 4th and 5th grades at The American School of Guadalajara. I took my BA degree in philosophy from the University of Michigan and my PhD from the University of Oregon. I teach philosophy, theory, and qualitative research. I have given keynote addresses at conferences in Scotland, Russia, Spain (both in Granada and Barcelona), Chile, Portugal, Norway, and elsewhere. I am a teacher and a philosopher, but then aren't we all?

Susan Field Waite teaches in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at Texas State University, where she serves as the graduate coordinator for the talent development program. Her research interests include the thinking of "talent development" from the taking-place of coexistence, creative action, and the education of the provocations and bearings of irreducibly plural existence—for responsible publics, instead of for the schooled reign of acquisitive consumers, constructivists, and producers of order.

Allan Walker is Joseph Lau Chair Professor of International Educational Leadership, Dean of the Faculty of Education and Human Development and Director of The Joseph Lau Luen Hung Charitable Trust Asia Pacific Centre for Leadership and Change at The Education University of Hong Kong. Allan's research interests include the impact of culture on educational leadership and school organization, school leadership In South East Asia, particularly China, leadership development, leading international schools and values and educational leadership. He has published widely and is currently Editor of the *Journal of Educational Administration*.

Robert E. White is Associate Professor in the Department of Curriculum and Leadership (MEd) in the Faculty of Education, St. Francis Xavier University, Canada. He also teaches in the BEd and Doctoral programs. Robert began teaching in 1972 and has taught extensively in public school systems across Canada. Research interests include critical aspects of literacy, learning and leadership, as well as globalization and corporate involvement in educational settings. He has numerous journal publications in national and international journals, as well as books on topics relating to critical literacy, pedagogy, leadership, globalization in education, social justice issues, and qualitative research. Robert has received four tri-council research grants from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. His published volumes, co-authored with Dr. Karyn Cooper, include *Burning Issues: Foundations of Education* (2004), *The Practical Critical Educator: Critical Inquiry and Educational Practice* (2006), *Critical*

Literacies In Action: Social Perspectives and Teaching Practice (2008), *Principals In Succession: Transfer and Rotation in Educational Administration* (2011), *Qualitative Research in the Postmodern Era: Contexts of Qualitative Research* (2012), and *Democracy And Its Discontents: Critical Literacy Across Global Contexts* (2015). He has also authored *How Corporate Business Practices are Transforming Education: Case Studies of Five Canadian Secondary Schools.* (2009). He is assistant editor for the *International Journal of Leadership in Education.* In 2013, Robert was awarded the President's Research Award for St. Francis Xavier University. He was also awarded the Critics' Choice Book Award for qualitative research in the postmodern era by the American Educational Studies Association.

Jane Wilkinson is an Associate Professor of Educational Leadership at Monash University, Melbourne, Australia. Jane's main research and teaching interests are in the areas of educational leadership for social justice and practice theory (feminist, Bourdieuian and practical philosophy). She has conducted extensive research with women leaders of diverse ethnic backgrounds in the university sector, and with young refugee students and schools in regional Australia. She has also researched extensively with primary and secondary schools on how 'exemplary' schools connect up their leadership and professional development practices in ways that enhance teaching and students' academic and social practices. This study is the basis for her coauthored book, *Changing Practices, Changing Education* (2014) (with Kemmis, Wilkinson, Edwards-Groves, Hardy, Grootenboer and Bristol; Springer). Other publications include *Professional Development: Education For All As Praxis* (Routledge, 2016) and *Travelling Towards a Mirage? Gender, Leadership and Higher Education* (with Tanya Fitzgerald) (Post Pressed, 2010). Jane has been a visiting scholar at the Universities of Gothenburg, Sweden; Tromso, Norway; Jyväskylä, Finland; and the Universities of Manchester and Nottingham in England. She is a member of the editorial boards of the *Journal of Educational Leadership, Policy and Practice*; *Journal of Gender Studies* and an Assistant Editor of the *International Journal of Leadership in Education.*

Jane is the Convenor of the Australian Association of Educational Research's Educational Leadership Special Interest Group, and a member of the Australian Council of Educational Leaders (ACEL) Victorian Committee.

Cathy Wylie is a Chief Researcher with the New Zealand Council for Educational Research. She has tracked the long-term effects of a system of autonomous schools since 1989 through regular national surveys of New Zealand schools, and qualitative studies of school leadership, school improvement, and school financial management. She has also written on vouchers and accountability. Her 2012 book, *Vital Connections, Why We Need More Than Self-Managing Schools*, uses this research and others' to show the shortcomings of a narrow focus on autonomy and school choice, in terms of equity and student achievement overall.

Sally J. Zepeda, PhD is a professor in the Department of Lifelong Education, Administration, and Policy in the College of Education at the University of Georgia where she is also a Fellow in the Institute for Interdisciplinary Research in Education and Human Development. Her research and teaching span teacher and leader supervision and evaluation, professional learning, and principal and superintendent

development. Her latest book is *Job-Embedded Professional Development: Support, Collaboration and Learning in Schools* (Routledge, 2015), and she has authored over 20 books. Dr. Zepeda co-edited (with Jeffrey Glanz) the book, *Supervision: New Perspectives for Theory and Practice* (Rowman and Littlefield, 2016). She was the inaugural Master Professor named by the University Council of Educational Administration, and she has worked with school systems nationally and internationally supporting leadership and teacher development.

Working Within Radical Pluralism: Reconstructing Educational Leadership

Ira Bogotch and Duncan Waite

This handbook is an expression of ourselves and our lives' work. We are devoted—beyond the doing of our work as professors and editors—to the search for leadership. As educators, more specifically as educational leadership researchers, we understand the need to proceed systematically in our investigations, while also being imaginative, positive, and critical of the many different ideas we encounter. For we believe that educational ideas and experiences are filtered by personal, cultural, and professional identities. Hence, our judgments are based on both reason and imagination. The search for leadership, differs for each of us, according to our unique experiences, contexts, critiques, and consequences. The search for leadership—our lives' work—is more complicated than simple reflections upon the narratives and discourses we and others use to define leadership. However reassuring definitions may be, that is not the pathway to knowing education or educational leadership.

To be clear, we're not just talking about identifying leaders, those individuals whose ideas and actions are affixed to various schools of thought or school reform programs. We cannot ignore the role individuals play; however, the search for leadership always and everywhere extends beyond the thoughts and actions of individuals, for thoughts and actions intersect with the many relationships in and out of organizations and institutions. Moreover, by adding the term education to leadership, the search specifically asks us to explain why education matters. For example, understanding that education is not a preparation for life, but rather life's experiences in terms of growth and development was central to John Dewey's philosophy. Likewise, Neil Postman (1995) made the important distinction that "public education does not serve a public. It *creates* a public" (p. 18, emphasis in original). The marriage of education and democracy introduces a distinction between spectators and participants in terms of the means and ends of education. Gert Biesta and Carl Safstrom (2010/2011) call for educators to find ways to speak as educators and not through other disciplinary ways of knowing, so that we do not just speak *about* or *for* education, but *as* educators. In other words, appropriating (or being appropriated by) disciplinary ideas or accepting *a priori* definitions to be applied to education should only be considered after we, as educators, have analyzed and critiqued educational problems and their environments first. This continues to be the motivation and theory behind the many writings on social justice which assert that social justice is an educational construct, not the handmaiden of social theory, politics, ethics or philosophy (Bogotch, 2008, 2014).

Consequently, delimiting leadership to influences or service or transformation misses the fundamental notion that leadership, particularly educational leadership, is fully educational; thus, the objectives, both means and ends, of education are not for *any* externally driven policy or for creating *any* public, but rather, as Postman (1995) stated, for creating a particular public, one that fulfills the dreams and aspirations of all humans in terms of freedom, equality, and fulfillment. Yet even these high-minded abstractions have contextual meanings—culturally, racially, ethnically, and nationally. In this sense, education becomes more than formal schooling, just as leadership is more than school leadership. In his Rock & Roll Hall of Fame induction speech, Prince (2004) commented how, "When I first started out in the music industry, I was most concerned with freedom. Freedom to produce, freedom to play all the instruments on my records, freedom to say anything I want to… I embarked on a journey more fascinating than I could ever have imagined." As with other human endeavors, shouldn't educational leadership, too, be musical, poetic and beautiful (English & Ehrich, 2016)? Yet we see that too many of our brightest and most promising practitioners and researchers delimit and are limited in their thinking to the educational leadership theories concerning what is currently happening in schools without connecting their (re)search to outsights (Kouzes & Posner, 2002) and ideas on how to better the societies of which schools and schooling are a vital component. As educational leaders, we cannot be oblivious to world events, from the mundane to the horrific, even when our work is grounded in local, regional, and national educational reforms. It is, therefore, the purpose of educational leadership research to engage in promoting educational ideas as part of the social, political and economic discourses circulating throughout societies the world over.

Our aim for this Handbook is for us all to recognize the many ways of knowing educational leadership within and beyond schools (Foster, 1986). The Handbook as *discourse* and as *action* is a liberatory project; searching for a leadership that seeks to understand, critique, and invite others in creating new educated publics and spaces that will be life-sustaining. That said, an international handbook such as this recognizes that there are many nations today in which such work is more difficult and more dangerous than in other developed, more stable, often Western nations. We in no way intend this to be dismissive of our colleagues' serious struggles for leadership, because we recognize that we must all name, confront, and resist those dominant discourses, policies, and projects that only serve to promote exclusion, elitism, favoritism, corruption, or corporatization (see Waite, 2010, 2014; and Waite & Waite, 2010) and other malignant societal forces that must be resisted everywhere, all the time. Rather, we name the dangers so that even those of us working in safer settings understand the stakes involved in promoting educational leadership. In other words, to paraphrase the Reverend Martin Luther King, an educational victory anywhere in the world is a victory everywhere. An international handbook that brings hope to the world cannot but aid in a successful educational leadership journey.

In connecting the world, Freire (1970), Noddings (1988), and Waite (2000) remind us that educators need our love, respect and consideration so that they, too, may relate to children and other adults from the heart. The diverse and complex field of educational leadership distinguishes itself from education writ large in that a primary focus for education and love involves the adults working inside and out of educational institutions. For adults, doing education even under normal circumstances is hard work, and becoming more difficult, more stressful, and sometimes dangerous for one's health and well-being

(Riley, 2014). Many administrators spend 60, 70, sometimes 80 hours a week *at work.* The tasks administrators perform are many and varied, and most administrators are experiencing work intensification, that is, having to do more with less (e.g., fewer resources, fewer staff, out-of-subject area teachers teaching in difficult, hard-to-fill subjects and schools, schools which are filled to overcapacity and which are themselves in dangerous circumstances) (Waite, 2015). The work is hard and the remuneration and public recognition rarely compensate for the professional efforts needed to do the job and do it well. Nevertheless, damage is done to education, public schools, and school people by the naming and shaming in reactionary public policy discourses. This affects the way that many in the public view public schools, teachers and administrators, and students.[1] Repeated attacks on public education—affixing negative labels collectively— are too numerous and strident for even the most diligent of critical researchers to challenge effectively. Our defenses are feeble in the face of these dominant narratives. And yet, it is left to us as educational leadership researchers to fight back with as much courage as our ideas can muster, for thinking and writing anew about educational organizations are courageous acts in these social and political times. Putting forth new and alternative leadership ideas into practice, for example, Professor Carolyn Shields and transformative leadership (2013), can be even more courageous/dangerous. Nevertheless, it is towards the task of thinking otherwise, in understanding that schools and public education can be the hope for a better future that is our responsibility. We strive to bring new meanings to our field by way of this international handbook.

The Reinvention of an International Handbook of Educational Leadership

In our initial invitation letter to scholars from around the world, we asked them to unleash their imaginations and inner dreams, sharing with readers what they envisioned for the future. Our invitation to them asked that:

> In so doing, you should highlight the trends, the research questions, the social impetuses or movements swirling about today and where you think these social, political and aesthetic forces might take us? What utopian and/or dystopian futures seem most likely? Please don't hold back or self-censor; as editors, we'll help you rein it in, if and only if, that seems advisable. We are asking for your best and boldest statements to date.

What you will find here is a threefold departure from previous handbooks in educational leadership: at the analytical level, this handbook champions radical pluralism—of people and of ideas—over consensus and pseudoscientific or political solutions to problems; on methodologies, this handbook embraces social, economic, and political relevance alongside the traditions of careful and systematic rigor; as for conceptions of leadership themselves, this handbook aligns with John Dewey in never assuming *a priori* what leadership means, but rather searching for leadership contextually (aka internationally), deliberately and purposefully. Consequently, this handbook challenges the epistemological, cultural, and methodological biases favoring grand narratives built on consensus, heroism, quantification, and dominant discourses drawn

primarily from Western ideas on leadership. Intentionally or not, these biases have pushed the field of educational leadership towards becoming insular in its thinking and routines and, consequently, of limited interest and relevance to the public or to other fields of educational inquiry, most notably curricular theorists. To counter these traditions and abiding frameworks, this handbook is explicitly transgressive in how our authors approach leadership while, at the same time, being authentically international.

The chapter authors have each imagined how leadership might transcend the insular disciplinary and bureaucratic confines imposed by today's research designs and methods, and the unromantic, literal chronicling of schooling which dominates most of today's scholarly journals. In contrast, our vision, in a nutshell, is to present the most representative, provocative, stimulating, and authoritative compendium on leadership in education across the globe, one grounded in our field's historical antecedents, and reaching into the future. Herein, you will find radically new possibilities for remaking educational leadership research and educational institutions which are not yet in wide-scale operation at primary, secondary, and post-secondary levels. At the same time, you will see how our history had sought to advance the field; how language and politics were always at play; how new ideas were introduced into the field; and how the way forward, internationally, looks very different from the ever-present nineteenth-century, mechanistic, behavioristic, and psychometric models which are still dominant in nations around the world today. This handbook literally talks back to intransigent bureaucrats, profit-seeking business people, short-sighted politicians, and well-meaning, but misguided philanthropists. The chapter authors were given license to (re)create publics. Of course, in some geopolitical environments, educational leadership is more a matter of colonial reproduction wherein local educators have not been able to create spaces for critique of the dominant models of leadership preparation and practice. To these audiences, we seek to build bridges to leapfrog over template reproduction and move to more culturally relevant and indigenous ways of knowing. It is not enough for nations in Asia, for example, to raise the bar on standardized test scores; it is for them and others to discover leadership capacities that are grounded in their own values and contexts. The struggle in the United States begins with questioning the Institute of Education Sciences (IES), established in 2002, and how it has policed educational research such that methodological rigor and narrow definitions of evidence trump relevance and within-school quality-of-life experiences. Internationally, econometricians are working feverishly to establish a causal link by way of some sort of linear path analysis from leadership preparation programs to school administrator performance to teacher performance to student achievement, in order to hold all parties "accountable" in a name-blame-and-shame game. Talk about a lack of imagination! These absurd attempts at making causal connections highlight the worst of the uses to which statistics can and are being put. Such specious causalities are the logical ends of the "values added" movement championed by some in our own field. But we must not forget that such policies, policies which begin with documenting how much third graders, even kindergarteners know, have resulted in the erasure of music, art, gardening, school field trips, recess, and play from the school lives of children. There are always consequences to educational reform policies that can burden young and old throughout their lives. Our job is to "opt out," talk back, resist, and (re)create publics of freedom-loving peoples.

While the establishment of a profession implies agreed-upon goals and objectives, the processes by which these goals and objectives come to be also introduce the very

freedoms to enact different policies and practices, independent of and in opposition to external, non-educative forces. Whether or not educational leadership is a *true* profession, however, is still debatable. Our routines and work are circumscribed and delineated by roles, norms and proscribed practices for teachers, administrators, researchers, clinical professors, and other educators. Psychologically, agreed-upon goals create a space and feeling of belonging, namely a community, a normal science in Kuhn's (1962) paradigmatic terms. Consider the converse—one view of radical pluralism—as described by Yeats, writing after World War I. His poem the *Second Coming* includes this verse:

> Turning and turning in the widening gyre
> The falcon cannot hear the falconer;
> Things fall apart; the centre cannot hold;
> Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world,
> The blood-dimmed tide is loosed, and everywhere
> The ceremony of innocence is drowned;
> The best lack all conviction, while the worst
> Are full of passionate intensity.

Holding to, wishing for or establishing a center is reassuring and a likely tacit motivation behind many previous educational leadership handbooks. Terms such as coherence, alignment, fidelity, correspondence, consensus, measurement, classification, efficiency, and effectiveness have dominated too many past and present discussions of educational leadership. Such terms and their concepts allow for editorial alignment of both topics and authors into seemingly coherent texts. But this coherence has been, to a large extent, empty of substance and of questionable worth, an illusion often based on a succession of correlations of probabilities moving in a similar direction.

A second set of terms, too, is often found in these handbooks: words such as community, context, diversity, difference, and culture. Their use, however, is not meant to compete with one another for intellectual space and significance. Rather they are used as background or mediating or moderating factors. This is where language and methods conjoin: dominant discourses in major keys; receding discourses in minor keys, all beginning at the top by substituting science, measurement, and social efficiency for the moral and intellectual responsibilities of educators. Of course, such language games appear in our field as disciplinary surveillance (Foucault, 1975), whereby leadership was conceived of as supervision, inspection, administration, and management. We might ask, did any of these changes in terminology result in increased professional judgments, job enrichment, school improvement and student growth? To Thomas Sergiovanni (1992), all this amounts to is a displacement of goals, not professional freedoms.

By our efforts at destabilizing the insularity of educational leadership, we strive to place the moral and intellectual responsibilities of teachers and administrators at the forefront of what we all do. For us as editors, the field of educational leadership is diverse and radically pluralistic. At best, our philosophies and politics, as manifested through our collective and collaborative work in this handbook, while critical, yet reflect a positive stance, one of hope, as we champion liberatory ways of knowing. The chapters themselves are diverse, bringing to light the voices of those who are practicing leadership around the globe. The authors we have assembled here—the scholars,

practitioners and critics—possess the humility we value. In addition to being critics and doing cutting-edge work, none is dismissive of or presumes to know more than others—other scholars, readers, other practitioners in other geo-epistemological spaces. "For those who by chance or fortune occupy higher-level positions in our social structures to assume some type of superiority, for them to treat others disdainfully or with no consideration at all, should not be tolerated by anyone." (Waite, 2014, p. 1226). Therefore, we do not presume to provide step-by-step directions for others to follow in their workaday lives. We respect others' ability to take what is offered here and apply it themselves in their unique situations. The realities of life as diverse cannot be ignored, whether the context is a matter of life and death or of *repairing the world*, locally first, then globally.

Breaking with the Past, While Respecting Others

To better understand how and why this Handbook is coming at a significant time in the history of educational leadership, it is important for readers to walk briefly through some significant milestone events, both advances and setbacks. Knowledge of history, or, better said, the historical antecedents to the current situation(s), is an essential part of the social critics' analysis. Such knowledge, naming and making explicit the antecedents and precursors to our historical moment(s), brings into clearer relief the notion that these moments are contemporary social constructions. Therefore, analysis of the social constructions gives the social critic, the educational leader, insights on how to change current social conditions. Unfortunately, our field's current knowledge and experiences of using historical antecedents have too often been ignored.

It is not a sign of good health for any academic field or discipline to have an uncontested and unexamined history, especially when that field is education. Discussion and debate, as well as actions, invigorate the policies and practices of school leadership. Practically every contemporary problem has had a long and rich history of discussion and debate. Yet, many of us today will not even consider consulting the hard-earned experience of our predecessors when faced with a problem, whether it be adopting a new reading curriculum or deciding on the role of classroom testing or the scheduling of classes. Our own history seems to have no place at the school leadership and policy tables (Bogotch, 2005, p. 8).

Any history, however, is presented as an interpretation, more accurately, as one of many possible interpretations, reflective of multiple contexts and diverse cultural truths. Educational leadership itself was born out of the diagnoses of structural-functional problems as experienced by practitioners (Buckingham, 1919–1920; Mershon & Schlossman, 2008; Urban, 1998). For decades, the focus was on the study of practical educational problems by describing quantitatively the complexities of schooling, focusing on managing people, resources and facilities, and establishing professional criteria for differential roles and responsibilities in schools, school districts, and universities. As such, educational leadership research was torn between efforts to pragmatically and efficiently solve administrative problems, including the supervision of teachers and the direction of curriculum to meet the needs of practitioners and students, in contrast to efforts to study and better understand the philosophical underpinnings of education in relationship to society. The countervailing forces (Lewin, 1946)

do not, however, explain why the field of educational leadership has not, over the course of a century, established itself as a moral and intellectual endeavor, as envisioned by Dewey, Foster (1986, 1989, 1994), Bates (2006) and others. This dichotomous state of affairs is not for any lack of intellectual effort on the part of educators, whether practitioners or the professoriate, to bring us together as a profession. Yet, almost from the beginning of the twentieth century, the distance between schools and universities has widened, and the venues for writing about educational leadership in schools and universities have become divided between scholarly journals, read almost exclusively by university graduate students and their professor-authors, and practitioner-focused articles on "what works" and "best practices." Moreover, the income disparities between administrators and teachers reflects and reinforces the hierarchies and hierarchical thinking that continue to plague public education. In describing the history of this professional situation, Foster reminded us that our work must always *go beyond* schools and as a human endeavor be grounded in values and contestations over power and language.

Foster's (1989) admonition to think and incorporate societal issues, dispositions, and practices was rejected (e.g., NCATE accreditation standards) and co-opted by the corporate business thinking that contributed to the enactment of neoliberal policies, and the deregulation and dismantling of centralized, public authorities, to be replaced by private enterprises. Thus, the co-optation of "beyond school" was translated into competitive—not at all free—markets controlled by entrepreneurs in publishing, hardware, and software companies. The public was replaced by the private; the social by the individual; cooperation by competition; and the collegial was replaced by unfunded and mandated "to-dos." All the while, in just a few short decades, educational institutions became ever more stressful, toxic, and de-professionalized. And what exactly has our response been to this degradation?

To answer that question adequately would require an in-depth historical analysis, which we cannot provide here. What we can do is outline a few of the more significant ideas and directions taken by numerous scholars since the 1980s. For those who immediately want a deeper critical discussion of the ebbs and flows throughout our history, we recommend Ellen Condliffe Lagemann's (2000) *An Elusive Science: The Troubling History of Education Research*; Fenwick English's (2003) *The Postmodern Challenge to the Theory and Practice of Educational Administration*; and Helen Gunter's (2016) *An Intellectual History of School Leadership Practice and Research*.

In the last few decades, two dynamic forces clashed: (1) the postmodern critique of the field of educational leadership which encouraged multiple pathways for understanding the field, including the struggles for wider representation successively of women, people of color, students with special needs, and indigenous voices; and (2) what the majority of chapter authors refer to as dominant discourses, specifically neoliberalism. Yet in spite of this clash, our field has become decidedly more inclusive. Pluralism acknowledges and values more than one way of knowing. Pluralism manifests itself through co-constructing meanings, through critical dialogues, and through the creative processes of sense-making with others (Christa Boske, personal communication, May 13, 2016). But the question now is whether this inclusiveness, through co-constructing, dialogue, and creativity, has had a material effect on the practice of educational leadership or whether the dominant discourses and professional associations representing distinct constituencies have held the field captive to powerful external authorities.

The answers to this question turns on the Freirean relationship between the "word" and the "world." Many in our field have sought to leverage state and national policies around the development of leadership standards and the subsequent accountability measures. Others, through professional associations, have looked to reform the field by introducing new research agendas, for example the study of pedagogies and leadership preparation, designing alternative pathways for practicing educational leadership, for example, as scholar-practitioners and as bridge leaders. Still others, following the leadership of Catherine Marshall, sought to re-center the field around the meanings of social justice. International researchers have progressively added depth and richness of critique and perspectives to the US-centricity that had dominated the field's modern era. In coming to this handbook in 2017, the field has become decidedly more international, due, in no small part, to our concerted efforts over the last twenty years editing the *International Journal of Leadership in Education*.

But if these concerted efforts—and reflective living—have taught us one thing, it is that the words as well as the world change, such that meanings and truths change. This is unsettling to administrative, problem-solving minds. It is also unsettling to single-issue theorists and compliant practitioners. It is, however, most unsettling to our policy-makers at every governmental and quasi-governmental level who are seeking to reduce educational leadership to the templated frameworks of standards and accountability as a way to reduce and resolve complexity, conflict and tensions. Pluralism, in contrast, imagines working inside dilemmas, contradictions, and ironies, the whole of human experiences for adults and children that distinguishes educational leadership as a lived experience filled with democratic and moral possibilities. Not surprisingly, the concerted efforts from the dominant discourses seek to constrain these possibilities by way of a definitive list of standards, classroom observation checklists, and dependent variables weighted in favor of standardized test scores. The world's children and educators deserve more.

International Structure and Handbook Format

On many levels, this Handbook and its constituent chapters represent or reflect the field of educational leadership. Like the field, the chapters are diverse, bringing to bear the voices of those who are practicing leadership around the globe. Due to space limitations, we were forced to make strategic decisions about the geo-political areas or regions represented. It would have been impossible to represent or to showcase the work from every region of the globe. How then do you choose? How finely do you divide geographical areas? Take Asia, for instance: Do we have one chapter that covers "Asia"? Or do we cover China only? Do we include a chapter from India? Why not Pakistan or Bangladesh? Is Turkey part of Europe or Asia or the Middle East? What about Hong Kong and Taiwan? Do we need a separate chapter from Japan and one from Korea? In the end, we opted for a chapter co-authored by scholars we thought could capture a sense of Asia as a whole.

It was a similar case with Central and South America, which presented its own unique challenges. The Russian, Middle Eastern and the African cases were similar. In the case of Central and South America, Russia, the Middle East and Africa, we approached scholars who had extensive experience and expertise in/with these geo-political areas

and as with all the chapters here, asked the principal author to collaborate with colleagues who were based in those areas. All of these chapters are informed by local conditions and contexts and yet speak to wider, global trends and educational phenomena.

This, then, was how we decided to proceed: going with the very best scholars with whom we were familiar, fully cognizant of the limitations of this, of any approach. No doubt there were other options and different decisions that could have been made, but we opted to trust our authors to present a well-researched, imaginative and creative chapter. We are pleased with the result. By the numbers, we were pleased with the resultant geo-political representation in the handbook. Our authors come from Australia, Canada, Egypt, Hong Kong, Israel, Italy, Kenya, Mexico, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Russia, Spain, Switzerland, Tanzania, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom, the United States, and Uruguay, representing some 21 countries from around the globe. To be sure, this is a small proportion of the approximately 190 countries represented in the United Nations, but in comparison to previous handbooks, it is a substantial improvement.

In parallel with geo-political representation, we wrestled with topical diversity and coverage. Again, we considered topical coverage carefully, as we were limited by space. We knew that we wanted a coverage of topics that would awaken the imagination as points of departure from previous educational leadership handbooks. We have included chapters on leadership and aesthetics, creativity, eco-justice, advocacy, Big Data and technology, neoliberalism, emerging philosophies and theories, critical democracy, gender and radical feminism, political economies, emotions, postcolonialism, and new directions in higher education around the world. In many cases, readers will see local practices *talking back* to theory, particularly "Western" theory.

Our Assessment

At this point in time, the parts of educational leadership remain larger and more significant, to us, than does the whole. That is, dissensus, difference, debate, diversity trump consensus, continuity, and coherence. Why? Aside from the language games where words become instruments of the powerful, we all still have to translate the words and their highfalutin' theories into practice. This is how planned change and design research move to stages of implementation. If we look at the seemingly inconsistent terms of dissensus, difference, debate and diversity, and then ask how these open-ended mind-sets translate into practice, one answer, for us, is through collaborative communication networks. Conversely, if we look at the dominant terms of consensus, continuity and coherence, then the most logical and efficient methods of management become command and control. Educational leadership does not have to be consistent in its messaging, for such ambiguity is precisely what allows for multiplicities and radical pluralism of people and ideas. Decision-making done far from the locus of action produces only prescriptive and scripted curricula and pedagogies, driven by an unreflexive managerialism. We hope that we have made this position clear both in this introduction and throughout the handbook.

Educational leadership today is divided into narrow research families, each largely unfamiliar with other research families. We recently compared the reference lists of two

histories of critical race theory presented in two highly respected scholarly journals. Fewer than 10 percent of the citations overlapped. Bogotch and Shields (2014) made a similar observation with respect to the citations on social justice from within the field of educational leadership compared to those in curriculum studies. In other words, despite the wish on the part of some in the field to create a canon with consensus, many resist—without consequences. Hence, we are a version of the blended family: peacefully co-existing in parallel play, only rarely feuding in print. To date, education as theory is a center that has not held.

Why is this state of affairs a plus for us? We are the world, learning from one another and not espousing one way of knowing. We do not see difference as "othering" or as deficit. Our authors do not code-switch in the sense that their particular arguments assume normativity as subjects here, but not there. It is, as Gert Biesta reminds us, a subject-to-subject relationship in education. Conversely, the larger field of educational leadership (cum administration) is marching to the tune of governmental authorities, which would erase, ignore, or even quash alternative voices, ways of knowing and being in the world. Unlike the National Policy Board of Educational Administration, the Institute of Education Studies (IES) referred to above, unlike the What Works Clearinghouse, we do not privilege one set of truths above others based on criteria, which we know *a priori* will privilege one set of rules, methods, procedures, practices, and peoples over others.

The question is whether we continue to nurture a healthy and vibrant radical pluralism or whether the societies of the world and their schools will fall under the sway of yet another PISA moment, another scale of League Tables and international rankings or impact factor scores, resulting in another round of colonization by the already strong over the weak and emerging. Will dominant Western templates be taken up by those who mistakenly see things from wealthier Western nations as automatically better? Will globalization (i.e., market-based policies, standardization of products and performance, and accounting for profits) erase cultural and contextual policies and practices nationally and internationally? To what extent have the various meanings of education and educational leadership given way to a standardization of schooling around the world? Will educational researchers develop investigative methods from situationally sensitive perspectives that capture both the local and macro-international trends? Will leadership practices for advancing our field, and observational tools for diagnosing classroom teaching lead to enhanced performance and outcomes? Our position, as stated above, is that anyone writing in the field of educational leadership who is not intimately knowledgeable of our own diverse histories and debates, anyone publishing work in our field who does not acknowledge explicitly our own history, becomes complicit in the corporatization and diminution of our mutual profession. As editors of this handbook, our expectations were met and exceeded by all of our authors, regardless of their individual visions of leadership.

Growth and development (i.e., education) is never guaranteed. Globalism is the magnetic field that continues to lock processes and products in their already clearly-defined places. Its effects are realized through the domination of monopoly capitalism, the antithesis of free markets and free agency. Like John Goodlad (2004), we have had a lifetime love affair with education, even as we have struggled to make cutting-edge educational ideas relevant. We have fought for a more inclusive and imaginative vision of education and educational leadership in the pages of the *International*

Journal of Leadership in Education for the last two decades and continue that work in this international handbook.

So long as there is music, art, literature, sports and free expression in the world; so long as great literature breathes life into the human spirit; so long as the best and the brightest still find their calling in education, we believe that we can transform the dominant global politics. But to do so, we must win hearts and minds inside educational institutions, and that will not be easy. Fear, not love, too often fills the hearts of principals, teachers, and children: Fear of failing, fear of losing one's position, fear of the next evaluation cycle, fear of school closings and re-purposing, fear that the numbers will be taken to mean inadequate performance, fear of the rules of the game, fear of not being liked or respected, fear of not meeting standards—ours and others'. Overcoming these fears is one of the most difficult tasks for any leader, but in particular educational leaders. One cannot teach children or develop healthy relationships in fear. Overcoming fear takes courage, but it also requires that we address the causes of fear and danger. Where being a student, a female student in particular, can be a matter of life or death; where being a teacher or school administrator can also be a matter of life and death, we understand how hard it can be to teach the courage to overcome fear. But where our fears arise from banal and seemingly intractable situations which take over one's thoughts (Sloterdijk, 2013), then the role of educational leadership research is not about finding and validating truths, but rather about changing mindsets by changing the material conditions of where people learn and work (Bogotch, 2014), and of changing practices.

Walzer (2002) believes that critics, to be successful and agential, need to work from the inside. This is why administrators and other school leaders are elemental to any radical change efforts. "One of the most important objectives of an educational leader's education, preparation… is the leader's ability to undertake a critical social contextual analysis, … [for] without a critical social analysis, students, teachers, administrators, other educational leaders, concerned citizens, and policy makers are likely to simply accept and work to maintain the status quo." (Waite, 2010, p. 367). Walzer enumerates three critical virtues of the social critic: courage, compassion and "a good eye."

> Critics must be: brave enough to tell their fellow citizens that they are acting wrongly, when they are acting wrongly, but refuse the temptation of a provocative recklessness. They must sympathize with the victims, whoever the victims are, without becoming their uncritical supporters. They must look at the world in a straightforward way and report what they see. … Critics aren't saints, even if one or another is virtuous beyond the normal run. … I [Walzer] want social criticism that is accurate and timely, and this will often be … radical criticism. But I distrust critics who are not men and women of common virtue and ordinary humanity. …The "connected critic" … stands in a certain moral relationship to his or her society.
>
> *(Walzer, 2002, p. xviii)*

Rittel and Webber (1973) argued that there are no universal win–win solutions given a pluralistic society (p. 168). And herein begins the search for leadership inside issues of power and relationships. Nietzsche (1968), and more recently Bogotch (2012) and Waite (2012), among others, have noted the relation between knowledge

and power: "knowledge works as a tool of power. Hence it is plain that it increases with every increase of power" (Nietzsche, p. 266). As scholars, as citizens, as critics and as practitioners of educational leadership, we prefer to think of this knowledge–power relationship as weighted in favor of the "student"—he/she who chooses to be taught by another. But even as we theorize throughout these pages, even as we conceive, perceive, verbalize, and debate, we would do well to consider, as Walzer (2002) suggests, that "when [our] theory crashes"—as it inevitably will at some point,—"we can still rely ... on our moral sense as a 'guide to knowledge'" (Silone, as cited in Walzer, p. 229) The authors assembled in this handbook, educational critics all, possess this moral sense or compass which guides us and our work. In sum, the search for leadership shifts from a romantic and nostalgic longing to the realization that leadership is a wicked problem (Rittel & Webber, 1973) that must surrender to events and circumstances as they exist in people's lives around the world. As such, to impose leadership is to separate it from beauty, art, creativity and freedom, that is, from our work as educational leadership researchers.

We end by asking a pragmatic question: How will we know that we have made a difference? Were we poets, or were we to translate our love of schooling into poetry, we would follow the leadership of Walt Whitman (1855) in his preface to the first edition of *Leaves of Grass*:

> This is what you shall do: Love the earth and sun and the animals, despise riches, give alms to every one that asks, stand up for the stupid and crazy, devote your income and labor to others, hate tyrants, argue not concerning God, have patience and indulgence toward the people, take off your hat to nothing known or unknown or to any man or number of men, go freely with powerful uneducated persons and with the young and with the mothers of families, read these leaves [pages] in the open air every season of every year of your life, re-examine all you have been told at school or church or in any book, dismiss whatever insults your own soul; and your very flesh shall be a great poem and have the richest fluency not only in its words but in the silent lines of its lips and face and between the lashes of your eyes and in every motion and joint of your body.

Acknowledgement

Note

1 According to John Hattie (2015), not affixing deficit labels to students has had a consistent 0.61 effect size on student achievement, in line with teaching strategies at 0.60 and direct instruction 0.59.

References

Bates, R. (2006). Educational administration and social justice, *Education, Citizenship, and Social Justice*, 1(2), 141–156.

Biesta, G., & Safstrom, C. (2010/2011). *A Manifesto for Education* www.mdh.se/polopoly_fs/…/Manifesto_final.pdf Accessed October 10, 2016. Republished in *Policy Futures in Education,* 9(5).

Bogotch, I. (2005/revised & updated 2011). A history of public school leadership: The first century, 1835–1942. In F. English (Ed.), *The Sage Handbook of Educational Leadership* (pp. 7–33). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Bogotch, I. (2008). Social Justice as an educational construct. In I. Bogotch, F. Beachum, J. Blount, J. Brooks, & F. English (Eds.), *Radicalizing Educational Leadership: Dimensions of Social Justice* (pp. 79–112). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Bogotch, I. (2012). Introduction: Who controls our knowledge? *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, Special Issue 15(4), 403–406.

Bogotch, I. (2014). Educational Theory: The specific case of social justice as an educational leadership construct. In I. Bogotch & C. Shields, C. (Eds.), *International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Social (In)Justice*, Chapter 4. Dordrecht: Springer.

Bogotch, I. & Shields, C. (2014). Introduction: Promises of social justice trump paradigms of educational leadership. In I. Bogotch & C. Shields, C. (Eds.), *International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Social (In)Justice*. Chapter 1. Dordrecht: Springer.

Buckingham, B. (1919–1920). Bureau of Education Research Announcement. https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=ien.35556003952454;view=1up;seq=37

English, F. (2003). *The Postmodern Challenge to the Theory and Practice of Educational Administration*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

English, F. & Ehrich, L. (2016). *Leading Beautifully: Educational Leadership as Connoisseurship*. London: Routledge.

Foster, W. (1986). *Paradigms and Promises: New Approaches to Educational Administration*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books.

Foster, W. (1989). The administrator as a transformative intellectual. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 66(3), 5–18.

Foster, W. (1994). School leaders as transformative intellectuals: Toward a critical pragmatism. In N. A. Prestine & P. W. Thurston (Eds.), *Advances in Educational Administration*: Vol. 3. *New Directions in Educational Administration: Policy, Preparation, and Practice* (pp. 29–51). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Foucault, M. (1975). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Random House.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed.* New York: Herder and Herder, 1970.

Goodlad, J. (2004). *Romances with Schools: A Life of Education*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Gunter, H. (2016). *An Intellectual History of School Leadership Practice and Research*. London: Bloomsbury.

Hattie, J (2015). http://visible-learning.org/nvd3/visualize/hattie-ranking-interactive-2009-2011-2015.html Accessed October 10, 2016.

Kouzes, J.M. & Posner, B.Z. (2002). *The Leadership Challenge* (3rd edition). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kuhn, T. (1962). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Lagemann, E. C. (2000). *An Elusive Science: The Troubling History of Education Research*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Lewin, K. (1946). *Resolving Social Conflicts and Field Theory in Social Science.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Mershon, S. & Schlossman, S. (2008). Education, science, and the politics of knowledge: The American Educational Research Association, 1915–1940. *American Journal of Education* 114, 307–340.

Nietzsche, F. (1968). *The Will to Power*. W. Kaufman, ed., W. Kaufman & R. J. Hollingdale, trans. New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Noddings, N. (1988). An ethic of caring and its implications for instructional arrangements. *American Journal of Education*, 96, 215–230.

Postman, N. (1995). *The End of Education: Redefining the Value of School*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.

Prince (2004). Acceptance speech. https://www.yahoo.com/music/exclusive-watch-princes-2004-rock-and-roll-hall-225654247.html Accessed October 10, 2016.

Riley, P. (2014). Principal health and well-being survey. https://www.headsup.org.au/docs/default-source/default-document-library/20141204-principal-health-amp-wellbeing-report_executive-summary.pdf?sfvrsn=2 Accessed October 10, 2016.

Rittel, H. & Webber, M. (1973). Dilemmas in a general theory of planning. *Policy Sciences*, 4(2), pp 155–169.

Sergiovanni, T. (1992). *Moral Leadership: Getting to the Heart of School Improvement*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Shields, C. (2013). *Transformative Leadership in Education: Equitable Change in an Uncertain and Complex World*. New York: Taylor and Francis

Sloterdijk, P. (2013). *You Must Change Your Life: On Anthropotechnics*. (trans. W. Hoban). Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Urban, W. (1998). Educational research in a non-academic setting in the USA: The Research Division of the National Education Association, 1922–1930, *Paedagogica Historica*, 34:sup1, 603–620.

Waite, D. (2000). Identity, authority, and the heart of supervision. *International Journal of Educational Reform*, 9, 282–291.

Waite, D. (2010). Preparing educational leaders to serve a democratic society. *Scholar-Practitioner Quarterly*, 4, 367–370.

Waite, D. (2012). Who controls our knowledge? *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 15(4), 505–508.

Waite, D. (2014). Imperial hubris: The dark heart of leadership. *Journal of School Leadership*, 24(6), 1202–1232.

Waite, D. (2015). Of charlatans, sorcerers, alchemists, demagogues, profit-mongers, tyrants and kings: Educational reform and the death by a thousand cuts. *Urban Review*, 48(1), 123–148.

Waite, D. & Waite, S. F. (2010). Corporatism and its corruption of democracy and education. *Journal of Education and Humanities*, 1(2), 86–106.

Walzer, M. (2002). *The Company of Critics: Social Criticism and Political Commitment in The Twentieth Century* (2nd edition). New York, NY: Basic Books.

Whitman, W. (1855). Preface to first edition, *Leaves of Grass.* http://www.bartleby.com/39/45.html

Yeats, W.B. (1919). "The Second Coming." http://www.potw.org/archive/potw351.html

1

Educational Leadership for What? An Educational Examination

Gert Biesta

Introduction: Educational Leadership for What?

If it is granted that educational leaders should lead, then the obvious question is what they should lead *for*—which can also be phrased as the question what they should lead *towards*. Although the question seems obvious, it is easily forgotten in the maelstrom educational leaders find themselves in, being caught up with administration and management rather than leadership, and often just trying to keep up with bureaucratic demands and desires. This means that the question of direction, the question what educational leadership ought to be *for*, is often only answered in the concrete and short-term language of targets, outcomes, and Key Performance Indicators, with little attention and often simply just not enough time for considering the longer-term aims of education and the underlying purposes that direct, give meaning, and justify such aims. Also, in the world of targets and Key Performance Indicators it is quite likely that the answer to what educational leaders should lead for is already decided for them, with little scope for interpretation and negotiation, let alone for critique.

Yet the relative absence of sustained attention to questions of purpose is not just a practical matter; it is not just a matter of lack of time, but also has to do with the presence within educational policy, practice, and its wider discourse, of powerful but nonetheless rather unhelpful ideas, theories, framings, and assumptions of what education is about, what the task of education supposedly is, of how education works, and what this means for the administration, leadership, and improvement of education. The purpose of this chapter is not to provide a detailed overview of all these discussions, but—one step removed from this—raise a number of more fundamental questions about education, including questions of its discourse, its purposes, its theories, and its improvement. The intent partly is to have a perspective from which problems can be identified and can appear as problems, and partly to provide building blocks for a more informed, nuanced, and politically astute discussion about education and its leadership.

The chapter is structured in the following way. I begin where many would argue education should begin, that is with the question of learning, but I will argue that learning—and specifically the language of learning—has become a problem for education rather than just its obvious starting point and frame of reference. From here, I address the question of purpose in education, suggesting that, unlike what is the case in

many other domains of human practice, the question of educational purpose is a multidimensional question, which raises some particular issues for the conduct of, and research about, education. These issues, as I will discuss, call for pragmatism at all levels of education, where pragmatism means that the question about what ought to be done can only ever be answered in relation to what it is we seek to bring about or let emerge. This also has to do with our understanding of the dynamics of education—the question of how education "works." Although there can be no doubt that education does work and should work, much of what is being discussed in relation to this starts from quasi-causal assumptions about the dynamics of educational processes and practices—assumptions that also play a key role in discussions about educational effectiveness. As an alternative to quasi-causal thinking about education, which actually is a cause of many practical and political problems in education, including in the domain of educational leadership, I suggest a complexity-oriented approach, which not only provides a more accurate account of the dynamics of education but also provides a significantly different way into questions about educational change and improvement. In the final section of the chapter I bring these threads together in a discussion about the position of the school in contemporary society, arguing that in an "impulse society" (Roberts, 2014) there is an important duty for schools to resist (Meirieu, 2007) rather than just satisfy the desires that societies project onto their schools.

The Learnification of Education

It seems obvious to start any discussion about education with the question of learning, and many would indeed argue that education is "all about learning," even to the point that education without learning—or in my own phrase: education *beyond* learning (Biesta, 2006)—remains an option that not many would immediately want to consider. As one of the editors of this handbook formulated it recently: "(W)hat underlies and distinguishes educational ideas is that in each and every case, *learning must happen*" (Bogotch, 2016, p.1; emphasis added). While I still consider it important to consider the possibilities of education beyond learning, also in order to free teaching from learning and to free teaching from the politics of learning (Biesta, 2013; 2015a; on learning see also Stables, 2005), the point I wish to discuss in this section does not so much concern learning itself as its *discourse* and the ways in which this discourse has influenced (and in my view: distorted) thinking and acting in education.

The starting point here is the (remarkable) rise of the language of learning in education over the past two decades or so (which is not to suggest that learning was not part of the educational conversation before, but had a different position and status in the discourse). The rise of this "new language of learning" (Biesta, 2006; Haugsbakk & Nordkvelle, 2007) is visible in a number of discursive shifts, such as the tendency to refer to pupils, students, children, and even adults as learners; to redefine teaching as facilitating learning, creating learning opportunities, or delivering learning experiences; or to talk about the school as a learning environment or place for learning. The new language of learning is also visible in the ways in which adult education has been transformed into lifelong learning in many countries (Field, 2000; Yang & Valdés-Cotera, 2011).

The rise of this new language of learning has to be seen as the outcome of a number of only loosely connected developments in the theory, policy, and practice of education.

These include the critique of authoritarian forms of education that focus solely on the activities of the teacher and see education ultimately as a form of control (see, e.g. Freire's critique of "banking education"; Freire, 1972); the rise of new theories of learning, particularly constructivist theories (Richardson, 2003; Roth, 2011); and also, particularly in the shift towards lifelong learning, the influence of neoliberal policies that seek to burden individuals with tasks that used to be the responsibility of governments and the state (see Olssen & Peters, 2005). The language of learning has not only dramatically affected research and policy, but has also become part of the everyday vocabulary of teachers in many countries and settings (Biesta, Priestley, & Robinson, 2017).

What is the problem with the rise of the new language of learning in education? Perhaps the quickest way to express this is to say that the point of education is not that students learn—and it is remarkable how often this is what is being claimed in policy texts or research about what education is for, what teachers should do, and what research should investigate—but always that students learn *something*, that they learn it for particular *reasons*, and that they learn it *from someone*. Education, to put it differently, always raises questions about *content, purpose*, and *relationships*. The language of learning, viewed in this way and used in this way, is therefore at least *insufficient* for expressing what education is about and ought to be about. Just saying that students should learn, that teachers should make students learn or should support their learning, or that research should investigate how all kinds of factors affect student learning, simply doesn't say enough.

Learning, to put it differently, is a process concept, so that it is only when we specify the "of what" and the "for what" of learning—its content and purpose—that we begin to get into a meaningful discussion, both about learning and, more importantly, about education, where the ambition can never be that students will just "learn." A slightly different way to make the point is when we look at examples in which the word "learning" is used correctly, such as learning to ride a bike, learning that two and two equals four, learning the second law of thermodynamics, learning to be patient, learning that there are things that you are not good at, and so on—all examples of learning, and even of things that, in principle, can be learned in school, we can see that just to refer to "learning" is not enough. With this comes the fact that, at least in English language usage, learning is an individual and individualizing concept—you can only learn (for) yourself but cannot learn for someone else—which also makes the language of learning inappropriate if we wish to highlight that education is always in some way about relationships, such as the one between the student and the teacher.

There is not only a problem with the language of learning—that the language is insufficient to articulate what education is about—but also with the discourse of learning, that is, when this language becomes the main way in which educational practitioners, policy makers, and researchers speak, think, and act, as it is a language that, in itself, runs the risk of neglecting to ask the questions that ought to be asked in education about the content and purpose of learning, and about the particular relationships that are at stake in education. This is one of the main reasons why the rise of the language of learning in education is actually quite a problematic development—which was the main reason I coined a "problematic" concept for this development, namely that of "learnification" (Biesta 2010).

All this is of course not to suggest that when the only or main discourse available in education is the discourse of learning, that there is no content and no direction. On the contrary, the rise of the language of learning may have actually made it easier for particular forces to take control of what education should focus on or bring about. In this regard, it is interesting that the rise of the language of learning has coincided with the rise in education policy of a focus on a narrow set of "learning outcomes" (note the term) which, in recent years, have become the main "currency" of the global education measurement industry (Biesta 2015b). And it is not only policy who is to blame here, as the language of learning has also been promoted in research and scholarship, with a similar lack of attention to content and purpose, the "of what" and "for what" of learning. This is both the case in general scholarship on education[1] and in scholarship in the field of educational leadership, where leadership and learning are often seen as closely connected—see, for example, the occurrence of this connection in Boyle & Charles (2010), Collinson (2012), and Dempster (2012)—or the rise in leadership of the phrase "lead learner" in discussions about educational leadership.

The Question of Purpose in Education: A Threefold Issue

Having established that learning is not "enough"—that the *language* of learning is insufficient as an educational language and that the *discourse* of learning may actually distract educators from asking the questions they should be asking about their practice—the question that needs addressing, then, is what is needed to transform the language of learning into a language and discourse of education. I have suggested above that in education we always need to engage with questions of content, purpose, and relationships. Of these three, the question of purpose is the first and, in a sense, the most important question, because it is only when we have established a view about what we seek to bring about with our educational endeavors—in the broad sense of the word—that we have a criterion to make judgments about the content that is most appropriate for this and about the ways in which relationships can support our ambitions. Some authors have even gone so far as to say that the purpose is *constitutive* of education, which means that education *necessarily* needs a (sense of) purpose. In more technical terms, this means that education is a teleological practice, that is a practice constituted by a "telos"—the Greek word for the "point" and purpose of a practice (see Carr, 2003, p. 10).

There is, however, something distinctive about the question of purpose in education because, unlike what is the case in many other domains of human action, the purpose of education is not one-dimensional—there is not *one* purpose education is orientated towards—but is actually three-dimensional (and thus requires three-dimensional thinking; an issue I will discuss in more detail in the next section). The suggestion that the purpose of education is three-dimensional stems from the simple but nonetheless important observation that when we look at concrete instances of educational practice, we can find that they have a potential impact in three different domains or dimensions. What many would recognize is that education is about qualification; that it is about the transmission and acquisition of knowledge and skills. Acquiring knowledge and skills is important because it allows children, young people, and adults to "do" something—it qualifies them. This "doing" can be very specific, such as in the field of vocational and professional education, or it can be conceived of more widely, such as in general

education that seeks to prepare children and young people for their lives in complex modern societies. Some see qualification as the only task and function of the school, and assert that schools should stick to this remit. The idea that qualification is the only thing that matters and should matter in school education is also visible in much that is being measured about education, as it tends to focus on "academic" outcomes, and often only outcomes in a rather narrow domain (science, mathematics, and first language).

But even if the official discourse argues that schools ought to be only involved in qualification—in the transmission and acquisition of knowledge and skills—research on education has shown for a long time that schools are also powerful institutions of socialization, as they communicate traditions and practices and play an important role in providing opportunities for children and young people to engage with such traditions and practices. This partly happens "behind the backs" of teachers and students—as research on the hidden curriculum has shown—but is increasingly seen as a legitimate ambition of education, both in its more conservative modes, where the ambition is, for example, to communicate and preserve particular social, cultural, political or religious traditions and ways of being and doing, and in more progressive modes, where the emphasis may be on traditions of critical democratic citizenship. Socialization is therefore a second domain in which education functions.

In addition to qualification and socialization, I wish to argue that education always also affects what, in general terms, we might call the personhood of the student. And again we make a distinction between the fact that education always has such an impact and the fact that educators can actively seek to achieve such an impact, for example when they consider particular qualities that they seek to promote—such as critical thinking, a collaborative attitude, and so on. In my own work—see particularly Biesta (2010)—I have referred to this as the domain of subjectification, highlighting the fact that all education worthy of the name, that is, education that is not enacted as indoctrination, should ultimately promote the possibility for children and young people to exist as subjects of action and responsibility, rather than as objects of the intervention and control of others.

The argument I wish to put forward here is that qualification, socialization, and subjectification are more than simply three possible "effects" of education—that is, three domains in which education *functions*. I wish to suggest that because education always has a potential impact in these three domains, educators and educational leaders should also take explicit responsibility for what they seek to achieve in each of these domains (and engage with the question how their ambitions can be justified). This means that in addition to seeing them as three functions of education, we should also see qualification, socialization, and subjectification as *three domains of educational purpose*.

Two further observations are relevant for the focus of this chapter. The first is that if we see qualification, socialization, and subjectification as three legitimate domains of educational purpose, then we have a starting point for criticizing and countering trends that seek to reduce education to only one of these domains. The issue here is not only that such approaches tend to create educational systems and practices that are out of balance, but also that a one-sided emphasis can often annihilate one or more of the other domains (for an early "warning" on this problem see Kohn, 1999). Although the strongest "pushes" many educators and educational leaders are experiencing are

attempts at reducing education to qualification and, more specifically, to measurable outcomes in a small number of school subjects, we should not forget that attempts to "drive" education solely with regard to socialization or with regard to subjectification are also one-sided. Good education, therefore, should always be concerned with content, tradition(s) and the (formation of the) person. The second observation I wish to make here is that although qualification, socialization, and subjectification can be distinguished, they can never be separated. This raises some important considerations with regard to the design and conduct of education, to which I now turn.

The Need for Judgment and Pragmatism

If we look at education from the angle of purpose and acknowledge that the question of purpose poses itself as a three-dimensional or threefold question, and if we also acknowledge that the three domains are always "there" *together*, then we have a starting point for identifying the kinds of judgment required in an education that is oriented towards such a broad and encompassing conception.

First there is judgment needed about what we seek to achieve in each of the three domains and about how we can keep these domains in an educationally meaningful balance. Rather than to say that education should promote learning, the question becomes what it is we seek to achieve with regard to the qualification, socialization, and subjectification of our students. This is not just an abstract question that can be resolved at the highest level of policy and curriculum development—although it has to be taken into consideration there as well—but is also a question that poses itself again and again in the everyday practice of education and also in relation to each individual student. The need for achieving an educationally meaningful balance between the three domains introduces another moment of judgment in education, as qualification, socialization, and subjectification are not necessarily always in synergy with each other.

This means that a second judgment that needs to be made—again not only at a general level, but also in relation to each student at each point in time—is how we deal with the trade-offs between the three domains. What, in other words, are willing to give up *temporarily* in one or two of the domains in order to make something possible with regard to another domain. As educators, we know that it makes good sense to focus our educational endeavors and the efforts of our students on particular aspects of the educational spectrum—sometimes they have to focus on particular skills or knowledge; sometimes they need to focus on their relationships with fellow students. But such one-sidedness always comes at a price, so the key question is to what degree it is reasonable to limit our efforts in one or two domains in order to make something in another domain possible. it is here that we encounter a tipping point that shifts education out of balance—(and the current systematic drive on academic achievement reveals a system that runs a serious risk of being out of balance).

In addition to judgments about purpose—about the "what for"—education also requires judgments about the "how." These are judgments about pedagogy, curriculum, assessment, classroom organization, school architecture, and so on. The reason why this requires attention as well has to do with another peculiarity of the practice of education, namely the fact that the means of education—the ways we "do" education—are not neutral "interventions" that only require a check on their effectiveness. On the contrary, the means of education themselves send important messages to our students, so

that it is never only a question of whether how we "do" education is effective with regard to what we seek to achieve or bring about, but also whether it is educationally meaningful (see Carr 1992). Students, after all, not only learn from what we say, but also—and in most cases even more—from how we do things, and many students are very good at spotting the contradictions between the two.

These consideration show the central role of judgment in teaching, and such judgments are first of all "of the teacher" (see Heilbronn, 2008) because they must be made in the always in some respect new, concrete, and unique situations teachers encounter. For educational leadership, this first of all raises the question of what needs to be done to provide teachers with the space for making such judgments—a complex question that has to do with the interaction of individual capacity, the cultures within which teachers work, and the structures that frame their work. They are questions, in other words, about what is required from those with leadership responsibility to make it possible for teachers to exercise *agency* (Priestley, Biesta, & Robinson, 2015). This is not to suggest that educational leadership is only there to facilitate the agency of teachers. Questions of educational purpose also play beyond the classroom—at the level of school policy and practice—and it is here that questions of judgment and engagement with educational purpose in its threefold manifestation are also within the remit of those involved in educational leadership.

A final observation I wish to make here concerns the fact that judgments about the purposes, the forms, and the trade-offs in education have to be understood as fundamentally *pragmatic* in nature. Pragmatic here means that the question as to what to do in education and how to do it can only be answered in relation to what it is that we seek to achieve. It can only be answered, in other words, with reference to our views on the purposes of education. This is an important warning against a trend in education to make *principled* claims about what should be done—a trend that is particularly fueled by research and particularly enacted by education policy. Principled statements about education suggest that in education things should *always* be done in a particular way. We encounter such claims often in the form of educational fashions, such as current claims that all education should be flexible, personalized, focused on the student, and so on. To highlight that most if not all judgments in education are pragmatic, means to see that whether education should be flexible, personal, and student-centered always depends on what it is we seek to achieve. In some cases we may indeed conclude that flexibility or personalization are meaningful ways to design and enact education, but in other cases we may judge that this is precisely *not* what needs to happen.

The current push towards evidence-based forms of education tends to overlook this important insight in suggesting that the only consideration that should matter is "what works"—forgetting that the question "what works" is meaningless if we forget to ask what something is supposed to work *for* (Bogotch, Mirón, & Biesta, 2007), and also if we forget to ask about the way in which the "how" of education itself crucially contributes to what it is we seek to achieve.[2]

How Does Education Work, and How Can It Work Better?

In the previous sections I have outlined that if we wish to move "beyond learning" in our thinking and speaking about, and doing of, education, we need to engage explicitly with the question of the purpose of our educational activities and endeavors. While I do not

wish to determine what the purpose or purposes of such endeavors should be, I have indicated three domains that are always "at stake" in education and that all education in some way needs to attend to. Looking at education in this way also begins to highlight the particular judgments that are required in the design and enactment of education—judgments that are at the heart of the daily work of teachers and that also occupy an important position in the work of those with a leadership responsibility. All this also provides a framing for the critical analysis of the all-too-easy solutions that some researchers and some policy makers (and some practitioners too) seek to generate, implement and adopt: solutions that are based on the assumption that if we have robust scientific knowledge about the relationship between educational inputs, mediating factors, and educational outcomes, we can reduce the need for difficult judgments about the complexities of education, including value-laden judgments about what education is supposed to be *for*. One thing I have tried to argue is that the complex, open character of education and the need for judgment are not the result of a lack of knowledge—such that with more investment in research we could eventually "close" education and take judgment out—but rather belong to the very qualities that make education *educational*.

There are two further aspects I would like to add to the discussion so far before I draw my conclusion about the meaning of the approach presented in this chapter for the field of educational leadership. The issue I wish to explore briefly in this section has to do with the question of how education "works" and with common assumptions about the workings of education—assumptions that, in my view, tend to generate quite unhelpful questions, expectations, research agendas, policy initiatives, and interventions. What I have in mind here is what I refer to as quasi-causal assumptions about the workings of education, that is, assumptions that tend to depict education in terms of inputs, mediating factors, and outputs or outcomes. Whereas I don't think that many would argue for perfect causality in education—where teaching is seen as the cause of learning and where good, effective or perfect teaching would produce predictable learning outcomes—there seems to be, nonetheless, a not-uncommon expectation in research, policy, and practice that education roughly works in this way (hence, for example, the ongoing appeal of the phrase "what works" in many corners of education).

I have found it useful to approach the question of how education works in terms of insights from complexity theory and systems theory (see, for example, Osberg & Biesta, 2010). One thing that such a perspective allows us to do, is to ask the question about the conditions under which perfect causality actually occurs. The answer to this question is that perfect causality actually only happens in closed systems within which interactions between elements work in deterministic and non-recursive ways. This already begins to show why causal expectations about education are problematic, as education is best understood as an open system, a system that is in interaction with its environment, and as a system where the interactions are not deterministic but semiotic (much in education happens through communication and interpretation), and where these interactions are recursive (which basically means that the "elements" in the system—teachers and students—can think and make up their own mind and can adjust their actions based on the conclusions they draw).

To argue that education should be understood as an open, semiotic, and recursive system, begins to raise the question of how anything in education can "work" at all. After all, if education systems are open to outside influences, based on ongoing processes of mutual interpretation, and populated with people who can think and make up