Defining Principals: The Seen and the Unseen
A Critical Discourse Analysis of Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards Five and Six

By Helen A. Nixon

B.A., English, May 1991, Clemson University
M.F.A., Acting, 1994, Virginia Commonwealth University

A Dissertation Submitted to

The Faculty of
The Graduate School of Education and Human Development
Of The George Washington University
In partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Education

August 31, 2015

Dissertation directed by

Patricia Ehrensal
Professor of Education Administration and Policy Studies

The Graduate School of Education and Human Development of The George Washington University certifies that Helen A. Nixon has passed the Final Examination for the degree of Doctor of Education as of August 7, 2015. This is the final and approved form of the dissertation.

Defining Principals: The Seen and the Unseen A Critical Discourse Analysis of Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards Five and Six

Dissertation Research Committee:

Patricia Ehrensal, Assistant Professor, Educational Administration, Dissertation Director

Jennifer Clayton, Assistant Professor of Education Administration, Committee Member

Daniel Dukes, Principal, Abilene Independent School District (Abilene, TX), Committee Member

Acknowledgments

I began this doctoral program on Friday, September 11, 2009, with the love and support of my family and friends. I am forever grateful for their encouragement and their faith in me. This dissertation is dedicated to Dimitrios and Theodora Panagoulias, my parents, who have made so many amazing things in my life possible with their sacrifice and dedication to me and to my children. I am proud to share this accomplishment with my mother and father.

Dr. Ehrensal, I thank you for your guidance and support through this process. I appreciate our conversations on Foucault, war rhetoric, and all things English and Scottish. Our dissertation discussion in a Scottish pub in Edinburgh last summer remains a true highlight in my life. I am also grateful that we had the opportunity to present our paper in Amsterdam in 2012. I hope we can continue our professional collaboration. It has been an honor to be your student and friend.

Dr. Clayton, thank you for all your timely feedback and words of encouragement as well. Your perspectives and comments made my work better and more thoughtful. I am grateful for your expertise.

Dr. Dukes, thank you for taking time out of your work as a middle school principal to serve on my committee. I know that work all too well, and I am aware that every moment counts. I am grateful for your support.

Dr. Mansfield and Dr. Stefkovich, many thanks for being my readers. I know that the summer months are very busy for you. I am grateful for your time and for your feedback on my work. I know that your perspectives will make my dissertation stronger.

I must also acknowledge my amazing friends, Betty Collins and AnneMarie Smith. You have been a great source of strength for me during some of most challenging times in my life. I am in awe of your intelligence and your perseverance as well. Walking this doctoral road with the two of you has made this a truly special journey.

I also have many friends and colleagues in Montgomery County Public Schools (Montgomery County, Maryland) who have been tremendous support system for me, and I am appreciative of their leadership and commitment to my success. Special thanks to Carole Goodman, Jeff Martinez, Travis Wiebe, Diane Smith, Jeanie Dawson, and Sherwin Collette.

I would also like to thank the late Dr. James Parker, my professor and mentor from Virginia Commonwealth University. He gave my academic life wings and told me that I was destined for a doctorate. I miss him very much, but I know he is proud of me today.

Lastly and most importantly, Adam, Andrew, Donna, and Theodora, thank you for your love, patience, and understanding. It was not easy to give up weekends and holidays so that I could write. You gave me the space and time I needed and never complained. You only encouraged me and reminded me that it would be worth it in the end. I hope I have made you proud. There is at last, a doctor in the house.

Abstract

Defining Principals: The Seen and the Unseen
A Critical Discourse Analysis of Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards Five and Six

The purpose of this research is to analyze the standards that examine how individuals are guided, judged, and dominated by those evaluative tools that are disciplinary in nature. The ISLLC Standards are used to measure how well educators perform their duties and how well they invest in the achievement of student and the cultivation of a unified school community. ISLLC Standards serve as the blueprint for effective leaders and consequently effective schools. Their implementation and their use as a tool for assessing, labeling, sorting individuals make it a powerful text. Through the application of critical discourse analysis, the goal is to uncover how this policy contributes to or detracts from its original purpose, the improvement of educational experiences and outcomes for students in school across the United States. Through a critical discourse analysis, this study seeks to examine the ISLLC Standards, a powerful text, in order to unpack themes and ideologies that control and name the work life experiences of school based administrators. District school officials and building-level principals will have to take a closer look at the integrity of the system and judge the practices for their fairness, alignment, and efficacy.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments iii
Table of Contents vi
Chapter One 1
Introduction 1
Role of the School leaders 2
Role Ambiguity 4
Educator Evaluation 6
The Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards 6
for School Leaders 6
Statement of the Problem 8
Significance 9
Theoretical Framework 10
Methodology 11
Limitations and Delimitations 13
Operational Definitions 14
Chapter Two 17
Literature Review 17
The Role of the Principal 19
Historical Development of the Principal 19
The rise of the principal 19
Principals as managers 21
Summary 22
Principal as Leader 24
Principal as instructional leader 24
Principal as moral leader 26
Principal as community and political leader 27
Summary 29
Role Ambiguity 31
Summary 33
Administrator Evaluation 34
Summary 38
The Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards 38

Summary 42
ISLLC Standards 43
ISLLC standards refresh 48
Summary 49
Theoretical Perspective 50
Discipline 51
Governmentatlity 54
Panoptic Gaze 58
Power and Language 60
Summary 61
Conclusion 62
Chapter Three 64
Methodology 64
Research Design and Theoretical Constructs 65
Text 69
Data Collection 70
Subjectivity Statement 71
Chapter Four 74
Discourse Analysis 74
Gee's Seven Tasks, Frames, and Metaphors 75
Frames 76
Metaphors 77
Summary 78
Intertextuality 78
The ISLLC Document 81
Standards One through Four 87
Standards Five and Six Overview 88
Summary 88
Standard Five: Discourse Analysis 89
Select Key Terms 89
Frames 93
Metaphors 93
Leader as Hero 93
Standard Six: Discourse Analysis 95

Frame 98
Metaphor 99
Leader as Political Visionary 99
Narrative 104
Standard Five and Standard Six Narratives 105
Concluding Summary 108
CHAPTER FIVE 110
Critical Discourse Analysis 110
Summary 113
The Themes of the Discourse of ISLLC Standards 5 and 6 114
Role Ambiguity 115
Identity 118
Summary 120
Critical Discourse Analysis Ambiguity and Identity in the School Leader Role 121
Duality Search 121
Reinterpret the Hierarchy 123
Rebel Voices 124
Other Side of the Story 126
Deny the Plot 127
Find the Exception 129
State what is Between the Lines 130
Resituate 131
Summary 133
Concluding Summary 135
Chapter Six 137
Conclusion 137
Discipline 137
Summary 139
Governmentality 140
Summary 142
Power/Knowledge 143
Summary 146
Implications on Policy Research 147
Summary 148

Final Thoughts 148
References 151

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

President Barrack Obama made education reform history when he approved the initiative efforts to overhaul America's public education. *Race to the Top* (2009) prompted 48 states to adopt the common standards for K-12. The common standards were developed by the National Governor's Association (NGA) and the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) with funds from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation. This $4 billion dollar stimulus package was part of the Obama administration's *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act*. *Race to the Top* required that individual states complete a comprehensive application that outlined their reform efforts in curriculum design, principal evaluation, teacher evaluation, data driven decision making, and commitment to increased math, science, and technology initiatives. Supporters of *Race to the Top* applauded the nation's commitment to pushing an agenda that looked at school improvement in a targeted way and put the scrutiny and accountability squarely on the school-based principal.

McGough (2003) posited that much of the literature on the principal has focused on creating a new vision for the role and setting forth plans to implement those preconceived ideas. Beck and Murphy (1993) argued that trying to navigate the complexities of the role of the principal has been part of the narrative in educational literature for the last century. It is a complicated story and is driven by social, political, and economic forces that impact education reform and educational guidelines set forth by the federal and local agencies. The role of the school leader is further impacted by national policy and standards that seek to accredit, define, assess, and evaluate

individuals in their roles. Over the last ten to fifteen years states have been implementing varied practices for educator effectiveness via evaluation protocols as a result of *No Child Left Behind* (2001), *Race to the Top* (2008) and most recently the *Common Core*. The trend to link evaluations of educators to test scores is also an added layer to many of the new evaluation policies reinforced in The *Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards* (*ISLLC*). There is not a substantial amount of literature that has examined how these new evaluation tools impact the role of the school based administrator or the overall achievement levels of the students. District school officials and building-level principals will have to take a close look at the integrity of the system and judge the practices for their fairness, alignment, and efficacy. Through a critical discourse analysis, this study seeks to examine the ISLLC Standards, a powerful text, in order to unpack themes and ideologies that control and name the work life experiences of school based administrators. This is important because principals have their professional lives scrutinized and assessed on multiple professional standards. In many instances, the assessments are based on performance targets, test scores, and quantifiable results. Under ISLLC Standards Five and Six, the principal leader is measured against subjective data that seeks to define someone's moral compass and level of political skill and savvy.

Role of the School leaders

The role of the principal has encountered many paradigm shifts over the years. Since the *A Nation and Risk for Educational Reform* report there has been even greater scrutiny placed on the role of the principal. Additionally, some of the results from the 90-90-90 schools research also uncovered that the role of the effective principal really did have an impact on the success of the students in a given building. Principals have had to

inhabit many roles to accomplish certain goals. With increasing federal pressure to close the achievement gap, principals and their administrative teams have been working to determine strategies for academic success. Principals are considered to be at the center of school improvement both instructionally and operationally. Their leadership is critical to the development of the plans that lead the students and staff in the direction of high academic standards and excellence (McGough, 2003). The changing vision of what it is to be a principal leader is influenced by the level of professional preparation he/she has, the induction, and professional learning opportunities on the job. McGough (2003) stated that there are a series of complicated issues to grapple with as a principal balances the manager and instructional leader roles while learning on the job and reacting to the contextual situations that arise in given school that is heavily influenced by the social, economic, and political landscape of a given community. Lastly, McGough (2003) pointed to the aspects of the ethical leader. That is, how do you become a leader who cares? Some would argue that an effective principal is one who demonstrates care and compassion to students, staff, and community members alike. Leithwood (2007) identified that there are four key components involved in the refining and overall aligning that occurs within the school organization. He stated that building collaborative cultures, restructuring the organization to support collaboration, building productive relationships with families and communities, and connecting the school to the wider community are essential building blocks to ensuring a positive climate that also supports building the professional capacity of educators. "Much has been written about the importance of the principal as an instructional leader. Often, however, this scholarship fails to reflect the messiness of what principals do on a day-to-day basis" (Leithwood, 2007, para, 4).

Role Ambiguity

Seeman (1953) found that for school executives potential sources of role conflict resulted in significant decision-making difficulty. This notion of conflict and ambiguity is crucial to acknowledge and understand because as Rizzo, House, and Lirtzman (1970) examined these themes and a recurring concern was that individuals were evaluated and assessed on their job performance. If role conflict and ambiguity were present, there was the potential for a moral and ethical dilemma in accurately assessing how someone is performing on the job if entangled in those day-to-responsibilities are the ambiguities for performance. Frank and Ditz (1959) found that conflicting directions made it necessary for managers to use multiple criteria in judging personnel performance. This analysis was particularly powerful because it clearly linked the dilemma between role ambiguity and evaluation.

There has been research on role conflict and ambiguity in the fields of sociology, education, and business organization. Rizzo, House, and Lirtzman (1970) developed the Role Conflict and Ambiguity Scales (RCA) to measure attitudes and behaviors of employees in an organizational setting. One of the challenges school leaders face is attempting to balance the instructional needs and the managerial needs. Principals become the resident experts on instructional matters, human resources, community issues, and fiscal responsibilities. Swirling in this mix of duties is a level of role ambiguity. Human resources literature suggests that conflict and ambiguity no matter the setting have a profound impact on how employees perceive their own value and success within the organization that ultimately leads to their job satisfaction or potential "burnout".

Organizational stress can be viewed as a "perceived dynamic state involving uncertainty about something important" (Shuler, 1984, p.6). Role conflict and role ambiguity are two stressors in the work place that hinder productivity and lead to low morale. Khan (1964) defined role conflict as the simultaneous occurrence of two or more sets of demands such that compliance with one would make compliance with the other more difficult. Khan (1964) and Graen (1976) described role ambiguity as "the degree to which information is lacking concerning the role expectations, methods for fulfilling role expectations, and the consequences of role performance" (p.39). The lack of specificity and clarity on duties and responsibilities that should be captured in the position description produced by the organization may lead to the frustrations that contribute to role ambiguity.

Organizations (even pedagogical institutions) mirror social paradigms. Individuals closely align their identities with what they do and how they serve within the organizational structure. In attempting to reconcile the inconsistent interpretations of the social role of the professions, the theory of professionalization has excluded the one element which was consistent in earlier approaches: the attempt to understand professional occupations in terms of their power relations in society---their sources of power and authority and the ways in which they used them (Johnson, 1972). Organizations have relied on the followership capacity of their employees and the literature of the organization to discipline individuals into their roles making autonomy in the workplace a consistent challenge. There is also the inextricable meshing of identities and values in the workplace setting. One must consider the identity of the organization and the identity of the worker.

Educator Evaluation

Educator evaluation, specifically the evaluation of school leaders, has become a significant topic in the nation's discourse on education reform, accountability, and overall school improvement. The notion is that a critical eye on the school practitioner will improve instruction and thus the academic experience for all students in the form of higher test scores, improved graduation rates, and a more accountable workforce (Goldring, 2009; Cravens, 2009; Murphy, 2009; Porter, 2009; Elliott, 2009; Carson, 2009). Determining the tool for the evaluation and establishing the criteria for effective job performance is yet another layer in the discussion on holding school leaders accountable. The complexity of the principal's role can be assessed against a variety of leadership dimensions. (Glasman & Heck, 1992; Hart, 1992; Huff, 2006; Marcoulides, Larsen, & Heck, 1995; Oyinlde, 2006). The leadership dimensions include; knowledge and skills, processes, responsibilities, and organizational outcomes (Ginsberg & Thompson, 1992). Gitlin and Smyth (1989) posited that the process of evaluation can be perceived as something that is imposed by the outside. Additionally, evaluation is associated judgments that are made, interpreted, and discerned in a quantitative approach.

The Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards for School Leaders

The ISLLC Standards for school leaders policy standards were designed, originally, to define professional standards for educational leaders, specifically principals in an effort to assist in the development of leaders who are adept at guiding school communities as they embraced the curriculum and achievement standards defined to address the educational deficits articulated in the *Nation at Risk* (1983) report. The *Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards* (*ISLLC)* has become the

"gold standard" that forms the basis of education, testing, recruiting, and evaluation of school based personnel.

The ISLLC Standards for School Leaders was developed in 1994 as a result of the collaborative efforts of the National Commission for Excellence in Educational Administration (NCEEA) and the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA) to develop standards to anchor the profession headed to the 21st century (Murphy, 2003). Murphy wrote that the *ISLLC* committee convened in an attempt to also "reground the profession." The committee members looked at eight questions or pathways when discussing the framework for what the professional standards would be. The eight original strands included:

1. What do we know about schools where all youngsters achieve at high levels?
2. What do we know about the actions and values of the women and men who lead effective schools and productive school systems?
3. What trends are visible in the environment in which schooling is embedded that are likely to reshape the educational enterprise?
4. What are the major changes underway in the school enterprise itself?
5. What are the valued ends of schooling?
6. What are the valued goals of educational programs in school administration?
7. What are the needs and wants of the customers of school administration preparation programs?
8. What are the expectations of resource providers?

The questions from the above framework that most closely align with the scope of this project include themes related to the values held of the men and women who lead

effective schools. These questions examine the professionalism of those who work in schools and the commitments to reach the goals that serve the students, the staff, and the overall community. These initial questions helped to frame the standards and their respective competencies. The reflective pieces of critical interest for me revolves around attempting to "name" what an ethical behavior may or may not be and who ultimately has the authority to make that judgment and in what context. It is also of concern to the researcher that there are questions omitted from this initial framework. For example, how will we define "high levels"? What will distinguish a productive school system from a non-productive school system? Are data points for success solely based on test scores? If not, then what? These unanswered questions become part of the critical discourse analysis when Standards Five and Six are more thoroughly examined.

The *ISLLC* committee had several goals that centered on creating a system of evaluation that considered schools as more than organizations of management. The committee looked to create a system of standards that looked at educational institutions as communities that believed in school improvement, social justice, and partnerships with stakeholders outside of the school building. The new push was to show that everyone owned the challenges of the school community. Community leaders, parents, teachers, all staff members, central office staff members, and students all had a significant contribution to make to the success of the school (CCSSO, 2007).

Statement of the Problem

The study is important because it seeks to identify asymmetrical power relationships inherent in the evaluation process, expose the levels of ambiguity found in the discourse, and interrogate that language that reinforces the ambiguities in the daily

work of the principal. Authors of *Race to the Top* have relied on phrasing such as "highly qualified administrators" and "high performing schools". Whatever the phrasing, building administrators, including assistant principals will be left to interpret, implement, and monitor the new standards. Taking evaluations to new levels, it is becoming common practice to add student performance data to the evaluation system. In addition to the evaluator's comments, will be a section on student performance data. A principal, assistant principal, and teacher will be assessed and evaluated not only the merit of their work but on the test scores of the students in their respective buildings.

Additionally, the study seeks to analyze the standards that examine how individuals are guided, judged, and dominated by those evaluative tools that are disciplinary in nature. The ISLLC Standards are used to measure how well educators perform their duties and how well they invest in the achievement of student and the cultivation of a unified school community. ISLLC Standards serve as the blueprint for effective leaders and consequently effective schools. Their implementation and their use as a tool for assessing, labeling, sorting individuals make it a powerful text. Through the application of critical discourse analysis, the goal is to uncover how ISLLC contributes to or detracts from its original purpose, the improvement of educational experiences and outcomes for students in school across the United States.

Significance

Ultimately, the study will offer a critical discourse analysis of the ISLLC Standards interrogating how school leaders are evaluated and how school districts use evaluation materials to gauge progress that falls in line with federal policies. The aim is to have those who author evaluations look closely at language, practices, and protocols

that define professional relationships at the building level. There also needs to be consideration given to the equity and logic of having first, second, and third year assistant principals evaluated by the same standards as veteran school leaders. The challenge presented in the implementation of the ISLLC Standards is that the standards do not clarify the roles of the principal and the assistant principal but add to the ambiguity and complexity of roles.

An understanding of the choices associated with the meanings will enable one to determine how best to operationalize the standards, or even if one should operationalize them at all. The investigation of these two standards will reveal the "effects of their power, the illumination of the (language-based and iconographic) means by which they work-in particular by collective symbolism which contributes to the linking-up of the various discourse strands" (Jager, 2001, p. 33). By determining the inherent contradictions within the text as well as revealing the unexpressed concepts, one can determine how the discourse is problematic rather than clarifying.

Theoretical Framework

According to Wodak (2001a) the discourse-historical approach is about "discovering inconsistencies, (self) contradictions, paradoxes and dilemmas in the text-internal or discourse-internal structures" (p. 65). The socio-diagnositc critique examines the background and contextual knowledge of the text in order to determine the social and political context and interpreting it by means of social theories. Fairclough (2003) explained that for any text, there is another text or voice that has potential relevance and that relevance is potentially incorporated into the first text. The analyst, therefore, is tasked with tracking history to determine "which texts and voices are included, which are

excluded, and what significant absences are there?" (p. 47). The theoretical perspective is drawn from Foucault's work particularly in discipline, governmentality, and the panoptic gaze.

The foundational theorist for this research will be Michel Foucault. Foucault wrote about power regimes and discursive practices in organizational settings that create opportunities for individuals to be classified, objectified, disciplined, and normalized. Foucault's work on hierarchical surveillance is presupposed in the ideas that networks of observations work from top to bottom, bottom to top and also laterally (Foucault, 1977). Figure 1.1 illustrates how the outlying layers envelop the school based administrator.

Methodology

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is the process of uncovering the psychological, social, and political contexts of what is being said to reveal the power relations binaries of domination and subordination embedded within. Foucault (1972) posited that all discourses are bodies of knowledge that reproduce (and create) social institutions. These social institutions create subjective meanings that regulate and control our understanding of what is (or appears to be) normal. It is vital to understand that power is anchored within this text in order to understand "who exercises it, over whom and by what means it is exercised" (Jager, 2001, p.36). It is vital because these standards define the professional work of educators and assesses their effectiveness as school leaders. Standards Five and Six of the ISLLC Standards are the focus of this CDA because it is within these competencies that the preparation for the role and the actual role becomes more complex and dependent upon values, unobservable data points, and

subjective conclusions about ethical behavior, professionalism, and political connectedness.

The research questions for this study will interrogate how ISLLC Standards Five and Six purport a set of values and competencies that socially construct the experience of the school leader. Standard Five states that an educational leader promotes the success of every student by acting with integrity, and in an ethical manner. Standard Six states that an educational leader promotes the success of every student by understanding, responding to, and influencing the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context (CCSSO, 2008). The roles as delineated in the ISLLC Standards and further defined in the competencies (to be explored further in Chapters 4 and 5). The main research question is: What types of disciplinary themes can be uncovered through a critical discourse analysis of ISLLC Standards Five and Six?

Standards Five and Six of the ISLLC Standards identify and define the core competencies of a leader. The Standards speak to the ethical and fair nature of the leader as well as his/her ability to respond to, and influence the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context of his/her school community. In order to investigate the scope of these standards the subset questions help to drill down to some of the central ideas. These subset questions also offer an opportunity to examine the process of evaluation itself and how professional relationships are impacted by this dynamic. For example, for the assistant principal, the relationship has some unique challenges and implications, as the principal in charge is seen as not only mentor but as evaluator thus creating ambiguity and power imbalance. In turn, at some point the principal will be the one evaluated by his/her superior placing the principal in a liminal space.

The sub questions also offer the researcher the opportunity to expand on some central ideas and with question four in particular, the unspoken and unwritten portions of the ISLLC Standards come into examination. Ultimately, these subset questions help to flesh out the ideas of the main question and tie together the concepts of values, power relations, and role ambiguity.

There are several subset questions to consider as well. They are:

1. To what extent does evaluation itself encourage and sustain asymmetrical power relations between the evaluator and the one being evaluated?
2. Which individual words and phrases within ISLLC Standards Five and Six reinforce the ambiguities inherent in the role of the school based administrator?

Limitations and Delimitations

The limitation in this study was that the critical discourse analysis (CDA) methodology can be seen as highly interpretive and not supported by quantifiable measures. The application of CDA to interrogate the standards is not value free. CDA, however, is a rigorous strategy as it considers the link between text and social interaction and invites deep level questioning and allows for problematizing issues that are critical in the overall narrative.

The first four standards of *ISLLC* have a focus on teaching and learning. They examine the role of the administrator in terms of being an instructional leader. The focus of this study was on the two standards that are not directly related to instruction but rather to the role of the administrator as the moral, ethical, and political leader of the school. It is within that delineation of the standards where identity and role ambiguity emerge. The task of evaluating a leader's moral compass, level of caring, and political savvy can lead

to a variety of challenges for the principal that make him/her vulnerable to subjective critique that can either elevate or adversely impact his/her career path.

Operational Definitions

1. Craft Knowledge: Abilities, awareness, information, and other accumulated knowledge based on field and classroom experience (CCSSO, 2008).
2. Critical Discourse Analysis: Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is a type of discourse analytical research that primarily studies the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context. With such dissident research, critical discourse analysts take explicit position, and thus want to understand, expose, and ultimately resist social inequality (Van Dijk, 2003, p. 352).
3. Discipline: As defined through a Foucauldian concept to mean that power can be made manifest in learning institutions that practice sorting and classification of students, the implementation of hierarchical constructs, the need for control in all aspects of the lives of teachers and students, the measurement of units or outcomes, and the process of examination (Pomgratz, 2007).
4. Governmentality: The influence of the State on not only the physical body of the individual but on the dominance and social control of the individual as well (Foucault, 1970).
5. Panoptic Gaze: The notion of hierarchical observation has always been central to the school system. Foucault sees the success of disciplinary power as deriving from three simple instruments: hierarchical observation; normalizing judgment; and the examination" (Gilles, 2007).

6. Policy Standards: High-level, broad national standards that policymakers and states use as a model for developing their own policy standards. Policy standards are typically used for visioning, policy development, and identifying general goals for education leaders (CCSSO, 2008).
7. Practice Standards: Observable behaviors and actions required to meet performance standards. They are measurable and can be used as guides to establish individual performance goals, professional development plans, and evaluation conferences within a system of continuous improvement focused on expert performance (CCSSO, 2008).
8. Program Standards: Guide curriculum planning, program and candidate assessment design, and implementation of the accreditation process for school building and district leadership preparation programs at colleges and universities undergoing NCATE accreditation (CCSSO, 2008).
9. Role Ambiguity: Lack of clarity that comes with a job that has a misalignment between what is expected in the role and what the reality is of the requirements of the job (Khan, 1964).
10. Role Stress: Stress that is experienced in organizational roles as problems are encountered in role performance (Srivastav, 2010).
11. Results: Outputs and outcomes achieved by an organization (CCSSO, 2008).
12. Stakeholders: Individuals or groups that might be affected by a particular action and/or activity (CCSSO, 2008).

13. Standards: The knowledge and skills that should be mastered in order to achieve a level of proficiency in a particular area. Standards are also a means of setting criteria for accomplishing or judging a particular activity or event (CCSSO, 2008).

CHAPTER 2

Literature Review

The evolution of the role of the school leader has its own unique history. The inception of the role of the principal created the middle manager concept in education that led to new hierarchies and new methods for building and sustaining schools. The focus on the supervision of teachers also cultivated a newly conceived notion of power relations between the principal and the teachers and the principals and the district leaders. Rousmaniere (2007) wrote that the principalship became a conduit between the district's goals and the school's performance. The district office and its scientific management approach to ensuring that schools were performing looked to these newly minted managers to navigate the growing educational bureaucracy. Rousmaniere (2007) added that principals developed a duality in their role as they negotiated the management of teachers with the expectations of the district office. Principals were trained as educators not as managers. Reconciling those roles was and remains challenging as principals wear many hats as instructional leaders, managers, moral agents, and political figures in the community. In order to better understand the nature of this evolution, it is important to understand the historical context of education as a democratic notion that looked to not only create a moral society, but a committed workforce that could compete at all levels both at home and abroad all under the watchful eye of the principal leader.

The literature review presents two distinct sections: first, it outlines the historical context of the common school reform era and the rise of the role of the school leader. Included in the evolution of this principalship is the rise of the leader role and its many facets. Principals take on the roles as instructional leaders, managers, moral leaders, community partners, and change agents. Accountability and work performance in a

demanding setting also meant greater scrutiny under circumstances beset with ambiguities in the role. School leaders responded to students, teachers, parents, community partners, and district and state offices. The constant navigation of political and social contexts became a natural and ingrained aspect of the work of the school leader.

Unpacking the historical precedents for workplace performance and standards lends itself to better understanding how school systems have adopted and adapted many of these similar protocols when evaluating the effectiveness of school-based administrators and their performance as leaders. Additionally, this section explores the development and implementation of the *Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium* (ISLLC) Standards as a means for establishing the core professional competencies needed to be mastered by school-based administrators in order to be licensed to practice and to be evaluated for mastery of work performance.

The second section examines the educational policies used to create the ISLLC Standards, which led to the social construction of the school leader. The works of Michel Foucault interrogate the balance of power, the use of documentation to sort and categorize, and the aspect of surveillance to discipline professionals in their roles (Niesche, 2011). The ISLLC Standards serve to record and document accounts of the administrator's behavior. Additionally, the ISLLC Standards provide the framework for appropriate professional expectations for the administrator not only characterized by duties and responsibilities, but also competencies such as integrity, diplomacy, professionalism, and political savvy. The behaviors that are documented and archived

serve to evaluate the administrator and guide his/her career track as he/she is evaluated by district level leaders.

The Role of the Principal

Understanding the historical context that gave rise to the budding role of the school leader is critical. There are myriad social, political, and economic circumstances that merged to create the need for the principal. Schools, particularly in the large urban areas, no longer prospered in a single-room model (Kowalski, 2010). Increased student population rates called for classifying students by age and grade level. The influx of immigrant children who spoke no English demanded a new response from the school districts. The principal role was created to manage, lead, and implement the response of the district to these growing social issues that were manifest in the community schools. From its earliest iteration, the principalship was a complex role characterized by the needs for high quality instruction, moral leadership in the wake of social dilemmas, and political skill to implement district reforms in a systematic way. The following section offers a brief sketch of some historical conditions that influenced the burgeoning field of educational reform and consequently the principal as a leader of those reform efforts (Kowalski, 2010).

Historical Development of the Principal

The rise of the principal. The Common School Reform era in the 1840's was marked by a series of social challenges remedied by government responses in the form of policy and early attempts at reform (Kaestle, 2001). The main purpose of a public school education in the 19th Century was to develop a citizenry of good character by teaching the tenets of the Bible and developing what Horace Mann (1840) would call the "collective

understanding." Early schools were rooted in nonpartisan agendas that promoted patriotism and the training of an ideal workforce that would stimulate the economy. Theodore Search (1898) wrote about educational institutions "which would give us skilled hands and trained minds for the conduct of our industries and our commerce" (p. 172). Over one hundred years later and still the same comparisons are being made between the quality of our trained students and our trained workforce and their profound impact on the economy (present and future).

By the 20th Century, trained experts (male principals) were considered to be viable leaders who could exert local control at the school level. Hart and Bredeson (1996) speculated that this early role responsibility provided at least a partial explanation for the importance of discipline in the evolving role of the principals. A plethora of social issues including immigration, urban growth, and oversized classrooms presented challenges to schools that needed full-time attention. While the principal, most often a male, in the building was considered a master teacher; the reality of the job began to take on the nature of a business manager and stern disciplinarian. Additionally, schools had to find efficient and effective ways to manage the rapidly changing demographics and the unique challenges brought on by those social and economic changes. The nature of the work of the school principal developed into a complex string of duties and responsibilities that were direct responses to the community that schools served.

Consequently, principals were accountable for all aspects of the effective functioning of the school building. School principals found themselves immersed in mircopolitics (Wirt and Kirst, 1997). That is, principals were required to have the personal ability to mobilize influence and affect decision-making. Principals became

"actors" who held power over assistant principals and teachers in the form of esteem, support, opinion, conformity and reputation. Superintendents in turn held the same power over principals (Wirt and Kirst, 1997).

Principals as managers. The American public school system has a long and complex history. There does not appear to be at time in the last hundred years that the educational system as a whole has not been under severe scrutiny. "The public has always demanded that the public schools produce educated students and responsible citizens at a minimum cost to the tax payer" (Callahan, 1962, p. 49). Since 1910, the public education system has been dominated by business-men and business values with a focus on efficiency and economy (Callahan, 1962). Taylor's scientific management stated that there was one best way of doing any job and that this one best way or best practice could be determined through scientific study of job experts (Taylor, 1911). Scientific management challenged the efficiency of schools, the judgments of the superintendents, and the decision-making that went on at the district and school level.

> Critics were everywhere and investigations of school systems were increasing. Since the fundamental doctrine of these innovators was the "elimination of waste," he reminded the administrators of the new developments in industry in which "new processes, new labor-saving devices, new methods of planning, more detailed instructions, more exacting records" were being used and production was being doubled and even tripled. (Callahan, 1962, p. 55)

The drive to standardize processes and work habits became the norm in public education and by 1911 the National Council of Education convened a committee to create the "Tests and Standards of Efficiency of Schools and Systems" (Callahan, 1962). The standards were to measure the efficiency of schools on a variety of school-related issues such as academic and instructional performance. By the 1911-1912 school year, the Committee of Uniform Records and Reports formed at the annual meeting of the

Department of Superintendence (Callahan, 1962). As a result of this committee meeting, states were directed to keep more thorough records, notes, and memoranda to capture and reflect what was going on in the school in order to determine how well the school leaders were implementing the goals of scientific management. This record keeping initiative was to serve as an accountability measure. Reports collected from school districts were made public and communities were acutely aware of which schools were performing and which were not. Superintendents had their careers cut short as a result of poor record keeping or poor record showing (Callahan, 1962). Public pressure and outcry kept school leaders in check.

> With critical public opinion demanding economy and efficiency, and with a new conception of education growing rapidly into a science of education, we had both the motive and the means by which the survey movement could take form. Under these circumstances it was not strange that the public should take readily to the survey idea. People were already familiar with the work of the efficiency engineer and the accounting expert in business and industry. Naturally, then, when boards of education called upon educational experts to help point the way out of difficulties, the idea was promptly understood and sanctioned by the public, and the school survey movement had begun. (Sears, 1925; p. 3-4)

Summary. Principals found themselves in unique positions as middle managers responding to the changing social, economic, and political landscape in the United States. Ambiguities in the role of the principal rooted in early and complex reform efforts often created struggles for new leaders whose background and education prepared them to be educators and not business persons. The scrutiny that came with the role also produced new relationships with leaders at the district level. Accountability and data to support job performance bolstered the need for evaluation and for measures that could speak to specific tasks and skills possessed by these professionals. The need for this kind of reporting cultivated the field evaluation in education, created a hierarchical structure, and

redefined the role of a principal or school leader as more of a manager than an instructional leader. Within the context of education, grappling with concepts of professions and professionalism also involves aspects of role theory that includes conflict and ambiguities inherent in a particular profession and/or position. The role of a school-based administrator and the expectations for the administrator's job performance are equally complex. The ambiguity of his/her role, the conflicts involved with decision making, and the surveillance by the district office on his/her job performance converge to challenge individual levels of professionalism and control.

Education leadership can be characterized by a variety of styles and theories related to school improvement, effectiveness, management, and policy. Gunter (2001) wrote that the "field of educational leadership is a territory where those labeling their work as policy sociology, educational management, school effectiveness and school improvement locate their activity" (p. 125). As one examines the role of the school leader both horizontally and vertically, within the same district there will be discrepancies in the activities and experiences that individuals face (Kowalski, 2010). Individual differences, role differences, and institutional differences create contexts that are varied and influenced by social, political, and economic factors that represent the greater community. Kowalski (2010) wrote that even "when two principals have identical job titles and job descriptions, what is truly expected may not be the same" (p.21). Gaziel (2003) explained that because leaders experience myriad conflicts and situations in the workplace, their world-views are shaped and defined differently.

This raises questions regarding evaluation and the equitable application of evaluation standards on principals when the experiences and circumstances presented can

be so varied, unpredictable, and shaped by environmental factors beyond the control of the school leader. Professional standards for school leaders dictate that building administrators are experts in instruction, skilled in politics and diplomacy, and moral figures who know how to put the needs of children and families first.

Principal as Leader

Principal as instructional leader. The key messages embedded in instructional leadership deal with reform and accountability and ideas of collaborative planning. In their roles as instructional leaders, principals are seen as experts in the areas of teaching and learning. In this role, the principal takes the primary responsibility on all aspects of the instructional program, which includes; master scheduling, professional learning, school improvement, and testing duties.

As a designated expert, the principal evaluates instruction, offers feedback for professional growth, and engages in capacity building (Marks and Printy, 2003). A successful instructional leader will outline his/her vision, collaborate to meet goals, and engage in shared decision-making (Kowalski, 2010). An effective instructional leader can marshal resources, invest in professional leaning opportunities for staff, and focus on creating a collegial climate. “Leadership is about direction and influence. Stability is the goal of management. Improvement is the goal of leadership. But both are very important” (Leithwood and Seashore-Lewis, 2012, para. 1).

Data-driven results are compared to the bottom line and the inputs and outputs of the organization’s ultimate goals (Lezotte, 1994). The challenge to an instructional leader occurs when the focus on data driven decision-making and test scores become the primary drivers for the work to be done. Principals face evaluation and scrutiny for high

stakes testing achievement. Institutional variables even within the same district can significantly impact the outcome. For example, in a given district, a school with high socio-economic status will most likely encounter relatively higher test scores and will earn the designation of an achieving school. Another school in the same district with low socio-economic status may earn the designation of low-performing or failing due to poor test scores. Both principals will experience evaluation differently due to institutional, community, and social variables that they have no control over. Despite the number of years of experience or the discrepancy in the how the role is experienced, all administrators are held to the same standards and evaluated and/or judged accordingly.

Nelson and Sassi (2005) wrote about some of the assumptions made concerning educational leadership. A main assumption is that teachers who receive timely feedback, constructive suggestions, and a timeline for improvement will improve in the overall classroom instruction. "Although these assumptions have an attractive ring to them, they rest on shaky ground at best. The evidence to date suggests that few principals have made the time and demonstrated the ability to provide high-quality feedback to teachers" (Nelson & Sassi, 2005, p. Kindle Location 633).

Leithwood and Seashore-Louis (2012) conducted an extensive study on effective school leadership and the influence on student learning. They concluded that successful education leaders are skilled at creating synergy among their staff, community, and students. Additionally, their research showed that leadership is linked to organizational improvement and putting actions in place that show a clear vision for the direction that the organization is headed. Seashore-Louis and Wahlstrom (2012) concluded that principals and their instructional leadership impact the quality of instruction and

influence the teacher's own leadership capacity. Seashore-Louis and Wahlstrom also stated that the emotional side of principal behavior plays a role on student achievement. "First, the emotional side of principal behavior, which we have assessed by reference to teachers' trust in the principals as ethical, caring, and competent, has on its own been shown to have a strong relationship to student outcomes" (Seashore-Louis & Wahlstrom, 2012, p. Kindle Location 1292).

Principal as moral leader. Schools have always been seen as social institutions. Early schools under the direction of teachers, and later principals, created schooling experiences for children based on Christian standards. Sergiovanni (2002) called the work of educators a moral duty. He stated that the moral dimensions of the work of educators are based on purpose, values, and beliefs.

Today, the narrative in public education created out of policies such as *No Child Left Behind* (2001) and *Race to the Top* (2009) echo sentiments of moral imperative, social justice, and equity. Vaill (1982) suggested that communities of learners come together around a common purpose. Vaill wrote about "purposing". Purposing implies that the leadership has a responsibility for continually clarifying the organization's goals and providing strategies for reaching those goals. In a successful setting the professional learning offers time to reflect on practice, to nurture relationships, and to build communities of learners. Moral leaders are tasked with also creating the environment for working and learning that is inclusive of social emotional values. It is through the purposeful reflective practice that change will manifest in the school via the intentional work of the school leader.

Starratt (1991) wrote that for school leaders there are three core components for moral and ethical leadership and they include the ethic of critique, the ethic of caring, and the ethic of justice. The components center around three questions:

> Whose interests are served by a decision?
>
> Who cares for students or employees and their authentic individuality?
>
> How does one focus on the democratic participation and equal access to programs and resources? (p.47)

The responsibility of a moral leader is all encompassing as it addresses power, privilege, justice, and integrity in all interactions. The challenge this poses for the building administrator is complex because the attributes are unseen, immeasurable, and guided by one's personal definitions of what is right or wrong and acceptable or unacceptable. When evaluating someone on moral principles, integrity and degree of compassion, the one being evaluated is subject to the potential for unfair judgment. When one value system does not reconcile with another's value system, who is right and who is wrong?

Principal as community and political leader. Canole and Young (2013) listed nearly twenty studies that identify advocacy as an important skill and activity for an effective leader in the educational system. A principal must be aware of policies, laws, and regulations in their system. They suggest principals should know how to improve the social opportunities for their students and be prepared to advocate for changes to policy, regulations, and laws to positively influence the educational environment. An effective leader should be aware of emerging political, social, economic, legal, and cultural trends

that can affect the academic achievement and engagement of her/his students and adapt her/his leadership strategies accordingly.

A balance must be maintained when describing the school leader as a political figure. While he/she is expected to be aware of the political climate surrounding the school, community, and district, principals are often discouraged from making public statements on policy that may lead to partisan conflicts (Wilensky, 2009). Principals as politicians must work at the school level to implement mandated policies, oversee budgets, determine spending, navigate difficult relationships with underperforming teachers and angry parents, mentor and coach assistant principals, and lead the core instructional program. While it may not appear to be political in nature on the surface, the presence of power in this paradigm is undeniable.

Gaziel (2003) in his research on principals and their perceptions of political power drew from the work of Morgan (1986) who wrote about metaphors for understanding organizations. In terms of a political lens the principal in a school building advocates and negotiates constantly while networking, building a power base, and compromising. This is not to suggest that all principals engage in this all the time or that they are successful in their efforts.

Fuchs (1995) argued that principals often use skills in negotiation, persuasion, and influence to seek consensus and support. Principals, in their role as a political leader, sometimes reinforced the hierarchical structures often found in the central office paradigm. Principals are political beings because inherent in their role is the opportunity to influence decisions, mediate conflicts, build coalitions, exert power over teachers, staff, and students, and control the physical space of the building (Fuchs, 1995). The

school can also be perceived as a political organization as it is an extension of the central office and the district as a whole. The political metaphor "encourages us to see organizations as loose networks of people with divergent interests who gather together for the sake of expediency" (p. 34).

When a school leader is evaluated based on his/her efficacy as a political leader, there are many interests, conflicts, and contextual aspects to consider. Determining the measurements for what constitutes an effective political leader are unclear. School organizations and communities are comprised of divergent interests. It can take years for a school leader to forge and build relationships of trust and mutual benefit. Experiences and events that surround the school community can have a profound impact on one's ability to successfully negotiate a political agenda that must be handled in many instances under scrutiny of students, teachers, parents, and the district office (Fuchs, 1995).

Summary. While there are many examples of extraordinary leaders who have truly made significant changes in their districts or schools, that appears to be the exception rather than the rule. The public school system is the United States has had great leaders lead reform movements from Horace Mann to Deborah Meier (Copeland, 2003). Copeland (2003) wrote that more often than not the hierarchical structures that are in place in most schools across the country continue to fail in their strategies to implement the reform efforts. There are many factors that contribute to this failure such as; staffing, funding, complex social issues that are characteristic of high poverty schools, economics, etc. Reform efforts in curriculum, testing, and evaluation continue to trickle down to schools, and schools continue to struggle with how to best implement the changes in a complex organization.

This section on principal role and leadership sought to sketch an outline of the variety of styles of leadership theory that have emerged over the years. The styles are as varied as the individuals who seek to assume and implement them. School leaders are ultimately evaluated on how well they have selected, integrated, and implemented the leadership style that is most appropriate for his/her school at a given time under a given set of circumstances. The challenge however is that the circumstances are in a constant state of flux. The context and landscape may change but the scrutiny and the expectations for performance results for principals and the assistant principals remains the same. Langer and Boris-Schacter (2003) wrote that the scrutiny on schools and subsequently the principal trickles down from the national to the local level. Principals must be responsive to multiple stakeholders and demand which can often be in conflict with one another. Glidden (1999) stated that the most pressing order for principals was the focus on academic standards and instructional effectiveness. Garsten and Buckley (1999) posited that in addition to matters of teaching and learning, schools must also be held accountable for greater social issues which impact students such as bullying, anti-drug campaigns, and gun violence.

Principals forge relationships with their superiors, their staff, community members, and students. Principals attempt to balance their daily experiences so that they are prepared to handle the routine an as well as the unexpected (Blasé & Blasé, 1998). On any given day a principal must negotiate if he/she will be the instructional leader, manager, disciplinarian, visionary, facilitator, or all of the above (Catano & Stronge, 2006).

Role Ambiguity

Rizzo, House, and Lirtzman (1970) wrote that variables in an organization such as ambiguity and role conflict can have a tremendous impact on individuals who implement organizational practices and policies and consequently influence organizational outcomes both positively and negatively. The most common definitions that align themselves with role ambiguity include the "predictability of the outcome or responses to one's behavior and the existence or clarity of behavioral requirements" (p. 155-156). When individuals experience a lack of clarity in expectations coupled with hierarchical demands, role ambiguity significantly impacts the stress, anxiety, and performativity of an individual (Khan, 1964). Bredeson (1993) wrote that "individuals in roles are in the dynamic process of role making in which they are constantly creating, redefining, and interpreting the roles they assume" (p. 36). Role theory states that, when the behaviors expected of an individual are inconsistent-one kind of role conflict-he will experience stress, become dissatisfied, and perform less effectively than if the expectations imposed on him did not conflict. Role conflict can therefore be seen as resulting from violation of these two classical principles and causing decreased individual satisfaction and decreased organizational effectiveness. (p. 151)

The experience of being caught in the middle was explored by Blau and Scott (1962) in their work on chain-of-command principle, outlines the norms for how hierarchical relationships exist in a professional organization. That is, there is always a clear flow of command for expectations, performance, and accountability. In theory, the hierarchy appears to be very clear cut with a top down approach. Complex organizations

such as schools however have multiple authorities that they are accountable to for the duties they perform and the results they achieve.

Frank (1958) and Ditz (1959) examined the impact on individuals who violated the chain-of-command principles. In their study, they considered the work of factory middle managers who were subject to scrutiny not only by the factory owners, but also the market. Frank's study found that middle managers most often responded to conflicts by ensuring that safety factors in the factory were in place, simulated the meeting of standards, and used their personal influence to obtain favors and concessions" (p. 152). Ultimately, Frank suggested that individuals would select to do and to lead according to the standards that are in accord with what they believe. Khan (1964) added that individuals who reported conflict and ambiguity in their workplace due to pressures from superiors from the outside had less trust in those who were imposing. "They liked them less, held them in lower esteem, and communicated with them less often" (p. 152).

While many role-conflict situations may be short-term, for the manager in the middle that is not the case. School leaders often fall into this category according to Seeman (1953) thus creating role conflict in the process of decision-making. Seeman examined the "exposure of an individual in a given situation to incompatible behavioral expectations" (p. 373).

In some business management literature role ambiguities have also been explored in the commercial and industrial markets. Specifically, Behrman, Bigoness, and Perrealut (1981) examined how salespersons experience ambiguity in their day-to-day professional lives as they are (like school leaders) in the middle navigating expectations from their mangers, company executives, and customers. Job satisfaction is important as

it affects motivating to sell, turnover, and attendance. Salespeople in this study were found to have varied perceptions about what they were and were not in control of when it came to their jobs. The most common theme, however was that there are always circumstances beyond their control that impact their ability to sell a product yet they are expected to meet monthly, quarterly, and annual sales targets. Salespeople are assessed by their ability to reach profit goals. School leaders are assessed by their ability to improve test scores and meet federal and state benchmarks.

Bredeson (1993) studied how principals and assistant principals experience role strain when they are required to change role-related behaviors due to changing expectations from school board, superintendent, and/or other superiors. When school leaders were confronted with ambiguities, loss of control, and uncertainty of expectations, they experienced "fear of failure, self-doubts about personal competence and the ability to be successful, impatience and frustration, and concerns about the loss of professional identity" (p. 46). Cascadden (1998) explored the sense of conflict that principals faced as they juggled multiple roles. He wrote that principals strove to fulfill their leadership roles and to focus on vision and school improvement while having to attend to managerial issues.

> Bombarded with multiple theories of leadership and management, school principals will likely experience a significant amount of role conflict and role overload as they work to fulfill the perceptions of what they are expected to accomplish, and how. Role conflict has the potential to affect the principal's effectiveness. In addition, external forces for improved student outcomes may cause role strain as principals strive to exert greater control of instructional issues while simultaneously working to empower staffs through increased shared governance. (Catano & Stronge, 2006, p. 224)

Summary. Role ambiguity fosters levels of mistrust within the organization. The lack of clear expectations and alignment of duties and accountability measures makes it

very difficult for individuals to negotiate what they do, how they do it, and how well they do it. For school leaders role ambiguity is exacerbated by reform efforts, district policies, budget implications, and a host of social, political, and economic factors that impact the situations that they are confronted with on a daily basis. The added challenge for school leaders is that they will be evaluated on their ability to adjust quickly and successfully to challenges that manifest in terms of instruction, in terms of morality, and in terms of political skill. The complexity of the principal role makes it difficult to define (Cantano & Stronge, 2006).

Administrator Evaluation

The idea of evaluating the work performance of an educational leader can be traced to the 1920's. Evaluation's first known clients in education were the efficiency-minded local school boards in the 1920's (e.g. Callahan, 1962). Later, President Lyndon Johnson with his legislation to combat the *War on Poverty* in the 1960s put the spotlight on how poverty and the lack of opportunities for children of color in the area of education create a divide. The authorization of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* (ESEA) in 1965, placed schools at the heart of a major social and economic issue. The commitment of the federal government to provide major funding for schools also increased the level of scrutiny on these schools. There was public and congressional interest in how the allocations were determined, how the money was spent, and how documentation of success would be reported. As early as 1911, the formation of the Committee on Uniform Record and Reports required annual records and accountability from superintendents. These annual reports were used to quell public outrage at what they considered to be wasteful spending for education (Callahan, 1962).

A distinction between assessment and evaluation needs to be made. Assessment is a measurement practice based on certain preset criteria. It is different from evaluation, which is a more complex process that involves making judgments and taking the assessment results into account (Kizlik, 2008). Derrington, Sharrat, & Spokane (2008) explained that the role change for principals along with the demand for scrutiny and accountability made it critical to have an updated set of standards and competencies. The Department of Education in 2009 offered federal funds to schools meeting specific standards and assessment criteria. Student achievement was considered one of the main data points with which alignment could be made to determine the efficacy of instructional practices.

ETS is a non-profit organization that develops, administers, and scores a range of standardized tests for a variety of subject and certification areas. WestEd is a national firm that provides research, consulting, and professional development in areas that promote social justice, equity and excellence in education. The need for evaluation instruments was addressed when ETS and WestEd, as well as a number of other organizations, developed and tested evaluation instruments based on the ISLLC Standards. It should be noted, however, that despite the development of these instruments, there is little actual research associated with assessing leaders. Goldring et al (2009) noted a "dearth of research literature about evaluation of principals in the United States and internationally" (p.2) in large part because of the complexity of the role of this type of leader.

> The effects of leadership on student learning are largely indirect. Studies designed to explore direct effects of leadership rarely detect significant effects, whereas many studies of indirect effects do. The reasons for this are obvious:

> people in formal leadership positions rarely have a great deal of interaction with students that is directed at learning. (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2012, para. 4)

In 2009, Goldring, Cravens, Murphy, Porter, Elliott, and Carson conducted a comprehensive study on how states and urban districts assess leadership. They overwhelmingly found that states and districts "focused on a variety of performance areas (e.g., management, external environment, or personal traits) when evaluating their principals, with different formats at various levels of specificity" (2009, p. 19). It was also reported by principals that most often feedback from their own evaluations was not timely or useful and conducted by sources who worked outside of the school building. Some respondents also commented that the assessments were "inconsequential, and that the criteria of the evaluations were unclear" (Reeves, 2005 p. 23).

House (1978) wrote that those who evaluate integrate into those evaluations their ethics, their epistemology, and their political ramifications. Evaluations and their application, according to House, serve as a "watchdog" function because the assessments seek to make a statement about efficiency, productivity, and accountability. The strength of House's critique of evaluation models is that he highlights that the evaluator's epistemological orientation plays a crucial role in how the evaluation will be administered and more importantly how the data will be interpreted based on their orientation to what they have witnessed. In this way the argument is set up that most often the evaluator will make meaning and construct judgments based on his/her belief systems. Scriven (1972) called this the quantitative sense of objectivity. "One person's perception of something is regarded as being subjective-the disposition of one individual" (House, 1978; p.8). Dweck (1986) addressed implicit theory in her work. She examined

the malleability of personal attributes and the ways in which a manager may perceive a person's ability to perform and change.

> Dweck (1986) defined implicit theories as lay beliefs about the malleability of personal attributes (e.g., ability and personality) that affect behavior. A prototypical entity implicit theory assumes that personal attributes are largely a fixed entity, whereas an incremental implicit theory assumes that personal attributes are relatively malleable (Heslin, Walle, & Latham, 2005, p. 842.)

In some instances managers may demonstrate fixed views of people and situations that lead them to make certain judgments of others. They may resist adjusting and changing their minds even if information is produced that contradicts their existing belief (Heslin, Walle, & Latham, 2005). In much of the language related to education reform, evaluation is perhaps one of the most overused words. Since *No Child Left Behind* (2001) and *Race to the Top* (2009) the emphasis on evaluation of principals and teachers has been heightened. Evaluation and thus accountability is seen as the essential component to achieving excellence. Monitoring, measuring and appraising the work of school-based staff supports an outward and transparent activity that can be judged by district, state, and local officials as well as the public-at-large. Labeling and sorting schools as failing, passing, Blue Ribbon, etc. is a tangible way that magnifies and gives a "face" to schools that we call "bad" and "good". In much the same way, school leaders are sorted, labeled, and categorized. In terms of the principal and the assistant principal, the evaluation is critical to the professional development of an emerging school leader.

Stufflebeam (1971) wrote that evaluation is perceived as a process of "delineating, obtaining, and providing useful information for judging decision alternatives (p. 40). Niesche (2011) wrote about Foucauldian concepts in education

administration and the reinforcement of certain types of disciplinary actions that shaped the experiences of administrators.

> Hierarchical surveillance is presupposed in the idea that the networks of observation work from top to bottom, bottom to top, and also laterally. It is a mechanism that 'coerces by means of observation; an apparatus in which the techniques that make it possible to see induce effects of power and in which, conversely, the means of coercion make those on whom they are applied clearly visible. (Niesche, 2011, p. 28)

Summary. Rossi and Freeman (1993) wrote that evaluation is responsive to the context or "policy space" and is essential to assessing the appropriateness of a program and/or the effectiveness of performance in order to meet accountability requirements. Evaluations for educators are most effective when the educators involved are fully aware and fully comprehend their roles. It is evident from the challenges presented above that many educators are unclear about the expectations and requirements of their jobs. The standards that guide, assess, and determine accountability are outlined. There is a convergence and divergence in this space between what the educator does and what the standards dictate. There is tremendous room for interpretation and value judgment for actions and/or activities that the evaluator may not fully understand or even have knowledge. Of all the ISLLC Standards, *Standards Five and Six* represent imbedded values and ideologies of those who are doing the evaluating.

The Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards

Accountability in professions can be viewed as a form of social control (Friedson, 1984). Political pressure and policy reforms particularly in education have made the need for standards to exercise more control over members, methods, and perceived best practices. The implementation of standards also requires a mechanism for having the

standards applied and evaluated. Friedson (1984) referred to the administrative elite of professionals who "serve as supervisors, managers, chief executive officers, and owners guide and evaluate performance of rank and file professionals" (p.1). The creating of standards name and outline the parameters for acceptable performance and actions and thus no longer encourage the idea that professionals can follow the influence of their own value judgments (Friedson, 1984). Deviating from acceptable standards and or codes of behavior can lead to the loss of privileges or expulsion from the profession.

Gillies (2013) in his examination on the influence of Foucault on educational leadership and management wrote that modern educational leadership calls for "the development of approved management and leadership skills and behaviors" (Gillies, 2013, para., 2). The Foucauldian themes will be further explored in a later section; however, it is important to note here that the application and stratification of standards for approved management and leadership skills and behaviors have a unique historical development.

> The related focus on cultivating, valuing, and rewarding effective leaders is eminently suited to foucauldian critique, which not only questions the basis for its assumptions and norms, but also examines the way in which the subjects of the field of educational leadership, management, and administration (ELMA), who are today's educational professionals, are both constructed by the discourse and are called upon the shape themselves accordingly (Gillies, 2013, para., 2)

In education there are many accrediting bodies that set the standards and define the behaviors, benchmarks, competencies, and scores that appropriately label the educator as certified, licensed, tenured, highly qualified, nationally board certified, etc. The agencies and systems that sanction the credentials ultimately serve to legitimize the educational profession. The systems in place include processes such as standardized testing, coursework, and internship requirements. These programmatic requirements can

be expensive, time consuming, and exclusive. These combined mechanisms lead to the social control of educational institutions because the stipulations and guidelines for public school standards are set at the federal and state level. "The general problem of social control can be seen as one in which standards of performance are set and enforced so that the objects of control (individuals, groups, communities, large-scale organizations, nations) conform to the norms or standards of some embracing social system" (Wiley and Zald, 1968, p. 37-38).

Schools, in particular, seek accreditation as it lends legitimacy to the profession and to the teachers and administrators who claim their membership in the organization. "Organizations with a strong tie to the social actor that defines professional standards are likely to comply with new standards" (Casile and Davis-Blake, 2002, p. 191). Private schools in particular increase their marketability when they can claim to be a Blue Ribbon School or an International Baccalaureate School.

The certification process is yet another form of what Wiley and Zald (1968) referred to as a type of social control. Certification, accreditation, and/or individual licensing processes are most often required in organizations that are naturally hierarchical. "Certifying associations develop in areas where the pursuit of specific social values is part of a professional mandate" (Wiley and Zald, 1968, p. 38). Wiley and Zald (1968) wrote that licensing (a subset of certification) is backed by state sanctions that can reward or coerce the individual who ultimately is required to conform to the requirements outlined.

Sergiovanni (1991) wrote that in the early 20th century, there was an effort afoot to professionalize educational administration. While there was significant discussion on

the credentialing of teachers, there was little attention on what the requirements were for making certain that school-based administrators were qualified and/or meeting the set standards. In 1987, the Leaders for America's Schools reported "called for sweeping changes in the recruitment, preparation, regulation, and evaluation of school leaders" (Sergiovanni, p. 522). The Commission on Excellence in Education Administration made eight major recommendations.

By 1988 the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) took the lead in establishing the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (Sergiovanni, 1991). UCEA is a consortium of higher education institutions. This organization promotes, sponsors, and disseminates research on essential issues that impact educational leadership and policy related topics. UCEA submitted their own report on the state of school based administrators called *Improving the Preparation of School leaders: An Agenda for Reform*. This report called for stricter requirements with respect to credentials that included more coursework, a doctorate, and more standardized testing with higher passing scores. Sergiovanni (1991) called some of these reform efforts "the dark side of professionalism." Sergiovanni explained the calls for stricter credentialing led to greater hierarchies in the school building and the intended or unintended layers that made access to women and minorities very difficult. He wrote that:

> By mystifying administration and by changing its center from issues of substance to issues of process and its core technology from teaching and learning to something called management, we place administration squarely in a male world. As matters now stand, increased professionalization in the form of lengthier study, higher certification requirements, the use of certifying boards, and the requirement for higher degrees may well create a core technology for the profession of educational administration that is heavily weighted toward management themes and that will further widen the rift that now separates

> teaching and administration…Accumulating such symbolic credentials is a cost more easily borne by white males than by women and minorities (p. 526)

The influence of the national leaderships standards such as the ones outlined in *ISLLC* have had an impact in the development and shaping not only of the curriculum offered to aspiring school leaders, but also to the national assessments future leaders take to earn their appropriate credentials. While there are many critiques of existing education leadership programs throughout the country, the most common theme is that departments are attempting to infuse more leadership content, internships and field experiences. At the level as well, there is a need for evaluation and assessment for effectiveness and compliance with national standards.

Summary. Standards for any profession exist for the purpose of professionalizing and legitimizing the work and/or actions of individuals in a given field. The need for standards and accrediting processes has their roots in need for legitimizing a profession and reinforcing the power of the institution to have control over what is considered acceptable behavior (Casile and Davis-Blake,2002). Tolbert and Zucker (1983) wrote in "order to be institutionalized, acts must be perceived to be objective and repeatable" (180). An act that is institutionalized is one that can be repeated by different actors in similar ways. Taken a step further, the repeatable acts earn the actor the "seal of approval" in that the behaviors and actions closely align with what the organization has deemed to be successful and representative of what the organization believes in and espouses. Scott (1995) "noted that accreditation standards are key aspects of a normative environment" (181).

Additionally, schools of education also play a key role in how professional standards are developed and aligned with the day-to-day experiences of administrators. It

is in these settings where topics of leadership, social justice, and democracy in schools are explored, defined, and integrated into the lived experiences of school-based leaders. There is an interdependence between the educational leadership programs and the way in which the accepted national standards become policy and mandated at the state and local levels.

ISLLC Standards

Education policies are geared towards identifying systemic issues and/or problems and proposing solutions to challenges that ultimately benefit the experiences that students will have in their respective schools. Education policy is purposeful, directed toward a problem, need, or aspiration, specifying principles and actions designed to bring about desired goals (Doherty, 2007). Olsen et al. (2004) and his colleagues "define policy in terms of courses of actions and allocations of resources" (p. 71). Education policy therefore is linked to politics and power and their influence on the behaviors and actions of educators. Doherty (2007) wrote that in the shaping of conduct, power is exercised through the active construction of representations of the economic and social systems and through the issuing of complementary sets of instructions, requirements, and guidance on how subjects should behave and respond.

In 1996 the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) adopted a set of standards for school leaders. The consortium believed a common set of standards for educational leaders could be instrumental in leveraging the ongoing educational reform efforts in the United States. In the original iteration, the ISLLC Standards included a series of knowledge, dispositions, and performances for each standard. These standards quickly became the basis for educational leadership programs and the

Educational Testing Service (ETS) designed the School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA). By 2006, this exam, or any exam based upon the ISLLC Standards, was required in forty-three states for administrator licensure (Derrington, Sharatt, & Spokane, 2008; Babo, 2010). The standards were not originally designed for integration into an evaluation system, however since they are the foundation in leadership curriculum, leadership testing for licensure, and leadership recruitment, it became the next natural step in codifying the measures for leadership performance and evaluation. They are also used as the organizing schema or basis for professional development.

The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) updated the 1996 ISLLC Standards to couch the standards in a policy-oriented document, primarily because the standards were fast becoming a model for state policies relating to leadership in education (CCSSO, 2008). As part of the updates, the CCSSO convened a panel of scholars and experts in educational administration and policy to review the literature for research that had flourished after they first introduced the standards in 1996. The CCSSO stressed that the 2008 standards "are policy standards and are designed to be discussed at the policymaking level to set policy and vision (p.6)

The creation of the ISLLC Standards served to guide, label, and measure the efficacy of education practitioners on virtually every level. The historical, social, and political backdrop for ISLLC Standards was aligned with the reform movements that included greater accountability, high stakes testing, social justice, and global competition. The ISLLC Standards outlined the benchmarks that were to be used as a framework in order to measure the effectiveness of school instructional leadership, the levels of

personal integrity and professionalism in a variety of social and political settings (CCSSO, 2008).

To put evaluation and assessment in context, it is important to understand the evolution and creation of the ISLLC Standards. Leaders in education reform sought to move away from the efficiency model and the checklists for evaluating the work of educators. In an attempt to legitimize education as a professional body in and of itself, reform efforts led to the creation of standards that moved away from ratings and checklists to a more qualitative approach to capturing the essence of what a school-based professional achieved on a daily basis. Murphy (2003) wrote that "the creation of the ISLLC Standards was concerted effort to rebuild the foundations for school administration, both within the practice and academic domains in the profession" (p.1). The idea was to move away from a management-based approach to leading to a leadership that focused on teaching and learning.

The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) heavily influenced the licensure and accreditation policies that impacted ISLLC (Murphy, 2003).

> We decided, therefore, not to focus on the two questions that had guided the development of the field in the past century: (1) What is afoot in the corporate world that we can borrow to rethink the work of school leaders and (2) What is unfolding in the behavioral sciences that can be applied to the power reform efforts? We sought alternative and what we hoped would be more productive pathways to our goal of regrounding the profession. (Murphy, 2003, p. 6)

The ISLLC committee also weighed factors that had not traditionally been considered when evaluating administrators. The Consortium believed that economic, social and political awareness needed to be integrated into this new paradigm. The belief was that an effective school leader would need to be cognizant of how to navigate and move a school forward in light of external pressures. Administrators who worked in low

socio-economic schools in particular would need a special skill set to meet the needs of students, teachers, parents, and the looming reform efforts (Murphy, 2003). "In this way the Consortium fostered the notion of community between the home and school, among the staff members in a school building (ethic of collaboration), [Lieberman & Miller, 1999, p. 64] and a community between the adults in the building and the youngsters" (Barth, 1988, p.129). Another feature of the ISLLC Standards was the idea of social justice and a value on making ethical decisions in the best interest of students. As Riehl (2000) noted "when we turn to schooling, social justice decomposes into two large dimensions and is directed toward the role of the school in creating a more just society."

The ISLLC committee was comprised of a variety of members from governmental agencies, university professionals, and oversight agencies. Ultimately, the Consortium was successful in having 40 of 50 states adapted the standards by 2003 with more that followed in the in subsequent years. A host of colleges and universities in the 40 states noted agreed to realign their training programs to fall in line with the *ISLLC Standards*. ISLCC went on to also impact program approval, program accreditation, and licensure, relicensure, professional development, administrator evaluation, and whole state reform. ISLLC also partnered with Education Testing Services (ETS) as well to create exit examinations for aspiring school leaders (Murphy, 2003). Additionally, with the approval of the ISLLC Standards, the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA) approved the *Educational Leadership Constituent Council's* (ELCC) plan to revise the ELCC's standards for presentation to the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education in 2010 (NPBEA 2011). The *ELCC Standards* defined the measures of success for institutions undergoing NCATE accreditation.

There are six ISLLC Standards. Under each standard are also a set list of criteria that establish knowledge base and key dispositions that one must possess. The ISLLC Standards are (Council of Chief of Chief State School Officers, 2008):

Standard 1: A school leader is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.

Standard 2: A school leader is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth

Standard 3: A school leader is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment

Standard 4: A school leader is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources

Standard 5: A school leader is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner

Standard 6: A school leader is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context. (CCSSO, 2008)

The ISLLC Standards and the dispositions or competencies that have been written create what de Bono (1972) calls the “boxed definitions”. Something is either inside or outside the box. This type of binary logic is produced” (pg. 31). English (2002) viewed

the ISLLC Standards as another form of "Taylorism". "The bureaucratization seen today in thousands of American school districts, the 50 state departments of education, and hundreds of intermediate agencies" (p.105). Clough (1984) stated that the ISLLC Standards are a "product of rational-technical organizational theory, both in their conceptual development and in the actual content of the standards themselves. Furthermore English looked to the work of Eldersveld (1989), Hough (1975), and French and Bell (1973) who all shared similar points of view in terms of how complex and bureaucratic organizations share similar characteristics such as" special subcultures, efficiency, technical expertise, hierarchical authority, interpersonal human relationships, and careerism" (p. 108).

English (2002) offered an assessment of what content was left out of the ISLLC Standards. The language of what was excluded in the ISLLC Standards is as important as what was included. He notes that there was not an emphasis on the concept of inequities facing schools, an understanding of organizational/systems theory, and no recognition of the importance of understanding context.

> In short, ISLLC is a product of the political and economic status quo. The selection by the designers of school improvement models as the mechanism for reform is congruent with current elite political control which is thoroughly conservative. Work is presently underway to link ISLLC Standards to procedures to document the continued professional development of practicing administrators. (English, 2002; p. 117)

ISLLC standards refresh. In June 2014, CCSSO in partnership with the NPBEA announced an effort to refresh the ISLLC Standards. In a press release the CCSSO announced that the refresh was focused on student achievement and high expectations. This is the first update since the 2008 release. The newest feature of the refreshed ISLLC Standards will be that for the first time there will be standards for those

who coach, mentor and support principals. The refresh committee is comprised of over 70 principals, superintendents, professors, researchers, and policy analysts. Drafts of the ISLLC Standards will be available for review in the fall of 2014. (CCSSO, 2014).

Summary. Usher and Edwards (1996) wrote that "efficiency has no end" (p. 166) because there is always the need to find the better way to get it done faster, easier, and more cheaply. The establishment of best practices in education legitimize one right way of doing something. Education reform is notorious for seeking that one best way to attain results. ISLLC ultimately is looking for homogenization as the way to secure "improved schooling for all" (p. 120) and to mold leaders within its framework.

It may appear on the surface that the ISLLC Standards are steeped in the research for effective schools but the research the authors of ISLLC reference is not clearly cited. Pattison (1997) in his review of the ISLLC Standards noted that the standards are replete with "management speak". He also noted that Totally Quality Management (TQM) philosophy is naturally integrated in the standards as well. It is especially of concern to note in Standard 5 and Standard 6 that educators are being evaluated on integrity, fairness, and ethics as well ability to respond to political, social, cultural contexts. These two standards move away from teaching and learning criterion and cross over into subjectivity, interpretation, and unobservable actions. The epistemological orientation of the evaluator shapes, frames, and determines and even creates what "he sees" (English, 2003). ISSLC purports to be a positivist evaluation systems based on scientific rules, observable behaviors, and empirical data. There is divergence here between ISLLC's stated methodology and its practical application. Supervisors and/or superiors are

required to assess and evaluate the integrity and moral compass and political acumen of a subordinate. Pongratz (1989) wrote

> Disciplinary power instills particular forms of acting on individuals, by arranging them spatially (through confinement, subdivision, assignment to functions, and hierarchical classification), by controlling their activities temporally (by breaking down operations and establishing time units), by harnessing them to ultimate time frames (with a definitive sequence of guidelines concerning means and ends, with exercises and examinations) and by frequently linking these "techniques" to each other. (p. 203)

Theoretical Perspective

French philosopher and theorist, Michel Foucault, contributed greatly to the understanding of power and knowledge and how those concepts affected social relationship and individual behaviors. Foucault's focus on concepts such as power, the self, punishment, prisons, and hierarchies of surveillance lent themselves as lenses by which social commentary could be crafted. The works of Foucault dovetail nicely with topics in education. "The importance of Foucault's work is that it can be used to provide different ways of understanding discourses of educational leadership" (Niesche, 2011; p. 18). Barker and Cheney (1994) wrote that "Foucault's exploration of workings of power in modern (i.e. post-Enlightenment) life provides a solid basis for understanding the subtleties of power-in-action in a variety of specific social contexts: the family, the government, health-care institutions" (p. 19).

There are three major themes that Foucault examines that can be directly applied to the experience of school leaders. The themes are discipline, governmentality, and the panoptic gaze. Each one of these themes can be used as a lens through which to examine the nature of the roles of the school leader and the application of evaluation tools used to measure his/her effectiveness as leaders, moral agents, and political figures. Overall, Foucault "sees the success of disciplinary power as deriving from three simple

instruments: hierarchical observation; normalizing judgment; and the examination" (Gillies, 2013).

Discipline

In his seminal work, *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault connected systems of oppressive thoughts and behaviors popular in the 17th Century to modern day systems. Specifically, Foucault's descriptions of the penal system and schools in general in 17th Century largely match the descriptions of some modern day institutions. Parallels are made not only to the day-to-day schooling and sorting of children but also to the physical structures of the buildings themselves. Bowen (1992) wrote that in the "most progressive pedagogic institution's, new procedures were implemented which boiled down to transforming people into learning machines and schools into pedagogic machines (p. 34). Disciplinary power that manifested in these learning institutions included sorting and classification of students, the implementation of hierarchical constructs, the need for control in all aspects of the lives of teachers and students, the measurement of units or outcomes, and the process of examination (Pomgratz, 1989). Foucault further identified that within these learning institutions it was critical to make certain that tasks were routinized and predictable. The role of schooling the child was not only to educate but also to normalize and ultimately create a clear hierarchy of control over what he called the docile bodies (Foucault, 1979).

Foucault (1979) believed that political power was not merely situated in obvious political institutions like central and local governments and economic institutions. Power and domination were not unique to the state apparatus. Domination could be seen in other social organizations that had influence on the lives of citizens. In his analyses,

Foucault (1977) often commented on some of the less obvious power institutions like hospitals, prisons, and universities. In terms of pedagogic institutions and their overt influence on the schooling and educating of students, Foucault commented on the power of universities to disseminate knowledge. He said in 1971 during his debate with Noam Chomsky that universities "are made to maintain a certain social class in power; and to exclude the instruments of power of another social class." Foucault went on to say that "every educational system is a political means of maintaining or modifying the appropriation of discourse, with the knowledge and the powers it carries with it" (1977).

The concepts that Foucault grappled with in *Discipline and Punish* are evident in not only the conceptualization of children but also in the conceptualization of the educators in these pedagogic institutions. Foucault described a docile body as "any person that may be subjected, transformed, used, and improved" (Foucault, 1979). The discipline of an individual was critical so that outcomes were predictable, measured, and aligned with standards and codes. In the field of education the forms of discipline are not merely based on relationships of power. In fact, Foucault (1983) stated that he did not seek out to investigate the idea of power and power struggles but that he was more interested in understanding how certain discourses shape the narrative that produce the realities for individuals and influence the way they discover the truth. The educational field is heavily influenced by policies and political agendas, texts, and ongoing public conversations about effective schools, best practices, social justice, curriculum, and high quality teaching. These topics become tools for disciplining. For example, states are required to implement reform efforts that policy makers have deemed necessary, good, and in the best interest of children. Schools that refuse to follow the rules are punished in

the form of being denied funds in an economic climate that is dire for many states. In this way, education leaders are required to implement changes, tracked to ensure compliance, and rewarded if the outputs show favorable results and reprimanded if the results are not adequate. "Technologies of power determine the conduct of individuals and submit them to certain ends or domination, an objectivizing of the subject (Foucault, 1988, p. 18).

> By referring individual actions to a whole field of comparisons, ranking enables individuals to be known through being differentiated from one another. It measures and hierarchizes according to the value, the abilities, the level, and the nature of the individuals. As Foucault (1977, p. 223) put it: "Disciplines characterize, classify, specialize; they distribute along scale, around a norm, hierarchize individuals in relation to one another and, if necessary, disqualify and invalidate." (Townley, 1993, p. 521)

For school-based administrators the pressure is high to lead for performance goals that meet the expectations of the reform policies. The accountability factors are rigid and in place and render the work they do as highly visible. Scores are made public, in some instances evaluations are made public, and labels are applied to name, sort, and classify students, teachers, administrators, and the school community overall. Foucault believed that "power has to be able to gain access to the bodies of individuals, to their acts, attitudes, and modes of everyday behavior" (1980: 125). The heavy reliance on data to measure test scores, teacher efficacy, and administrative leadership changes the nature of the work at the school level. "The relationship with data is codified and ranked in terms of synthesizing, coordinating, innovating, analyzing, computing, compiling, copying, and comparing. These techniques elaborate the construct "job" through the concept of job skills. Activities are created and serially ordered" (Townly, 1993, p. 522). The ISLLC

Standards and their application for licensing, credentialing, and evaluating school leaders have become the framework for sorting and labeling.

Foucault also wrote about the invisibility of disciplinary power and the impact that it had on those on whom it was being exercised. For educators constantly under the scrutiny of the authority of the supervisor, the invisibility of the disciplinary power is mentally ever present. The idea of evaluation and assessment to determine effectiveness and compliance reinforces a heightened state of anxiety for the individual who is expected to perform within the confines of the standards. Foucault wrote "In the space of domination, disciplinary power manifests its potency, essentially by arranging objects. The examination is, as it were, the ceremony of this objectification" (1978, p. 91).

Governmentatlity

Foucault was acutely interested in understanding the influence of the State on not only the physical body of the individual but on the dominance and social control of the individual as well. Foucault documented in many of his writings the histories of the various techniques that have been used to regulate and dominate the experiences of individuals throughout history. Governmentality sought to produce citizens who followed the rules and acted in the best interest of what the State determined was appropriate and ethical. The appearance of power in governmentality is not merely a power over construct, but a constant push and pull as individuals navigate their space. There is not just a top-down hierarchy of power but rather, a complex system of multiple institutions which also engage in both the physical influence and on the mental influence of individuals. Evaluating and standardizing behaviors of educators is an example of how state and local authorities draw the boundaries for what is deemed appropriate behavior.

Educators live within those boundaries and govern themselves accordingly or not. In which case there is the potential for both reward and punishment. Foucault (1978) wrote:

> Let us take the question of power, political power, replacing it within the more general question of governmentality, which is governmentality understood as a strategic field of relations of power in the broadest sense of the term, not simply the political sense. Thus, if one understands by governmentality, a strategic field of power relations which are mobile, transformable and reversible, I think that the reflection on the notion of governmentality cannot help but pass both theoretically and practically through the element of a subject that is defined by the relation of self to self. (p. 81)

Governmentality and the panoptic gaze ultimately fit under the larger picture of what Foucault called discipline. Doherty (2007) wrote that critical analysis of government policies is essential for the practices of being able to "unmask or decode the ideological dimensions, values, and assumptions of public policy" (p. 194). It is virtually impossible to name an aspect of life that does not have a direct or indirect relationship with the governmental policies. Education policy in the United States has a long history of setting the stage for how public schools and agents in public schools across the nation will "fix" themselves to be in compliance with mandates and regulations deemed necessary at the federal and local level. This type of policy production is heavily influenced by social, political, and economic factors and is now "cast in molds that reflect this 'new complexity' in the policymaking climate, a complexity comprised of the interrelation between the supranational, the nation state, and the regional" (p. 194).

Foucault's examination of governmentality explores not only the collective level but also the role of the individual in that construct. Gillies (2013) wrote that how "one explains and justifies one's own behavior is of the same nature as how the government rationalize their own exercises of power". Additionally, Foucault believed that the concept of power as it related to governmentality was a complex feature. Power was not

merely hierarchical in form. Power was not strictly a top-down approach to dispensing rules and regulations (Gillies, 2013, para., 4). In terms of governmentality power was conceived to be present in not only people, but also in social institutions such as schools, hospitals, the military, and other public institutions. Within institutions, there are inherent rules and laws that are in place per government policy and regulations to ensure that those individuals within those institutions act in a way that is acceptable and within the boundaries of what has been defined as appropriate.

> Governmentality is a perspective that resists systemization or a neat explanatory theoretical ordering of government or politics, but tends to the complexity, silhouetting a multi-dimensional matrix of intersecting problems, ambitions, protagonists, struggles, technical apparatuses, and discursive structures. For Foucault, the central labour around which such a matrix forms, under a liberal mentality of governing, is directed toward the constitution of the self, the configuration of the subject under the action of government. (Doherty, 2007, p. 196)

Current government policies on education reform, curriculum, and evaluation seek to create a social order in public schools, whereby individuals are required to implement the policies and practices that the federal government has deemed as effective and most appropriate. Governmentality presumes to know what is best for citizens; in this case, educators, as the reform efforts such as *No Child Left Behind*, *Race to the Top*, new educator evaluation systems, the new Common Core Curriculum all dictate the work that is done in public schools across the United States. The policies are all bound to political power and influence as many of these reform efforts come with the promise of financial and pedagogical support. There are incentives built in these policies to control the work and monitor the progress. Doherty (2007) stated "governmentality is as much about what subjects do to themselves as what is done to them" (p. 197).

Governmentality is characterized as that leading body that determines what Gillies (2013) called the 'conduct of conduct'. On the surface, it appears as if it is concerned with systems, resources, and curriculum, but it is more concerned with managing and controlling conduct in the field of education. Gewirtz (2002) wrote that "schools are discursively shaped as business enterprises, and their management positioned in the same way as the corporate world" (Gillies, 2013, para. 3).

Governmentality is ever present in the context of education and public schools. The narrative for education reform centers on themes such as education as freedom, social justice, and a civil right. Thus, the government has the responsibility of designing the processes, regulating the implementation of the work, assessing the work, and distributing the money and resources to the state and/or local agents who comply and work within the parameters of what is acceptable. At the micro level of implementation, of arrangements, of techniques, all kinds of practices (administrative, bureaucratic, monitoring, auditing, training, performance managing) are enacted. Discourses, rationales, and forms of knowledge support these socially mediated arrangements. (Doherty, 2007, p. 201). Understanding the role of governmentality is critical for making the connections to the role of the school leader and to the ISLLC Standards. ISLLC Standards are in place in order to offer licensure for school leaders and to ensure compliance in the day-to-day work. The ISLLC Standards exercise a form of power as they are used to measure people. Foucault called this form of governmentality the practice of others becoming "useful, docile, practical citizens" (Foucault, 1988). The oversight of individuals within an evaluation system can be examined through Foucault's concepts of surveillance which means that individuals are monitored in order to either

regulate or dictate their behavior in the workplace. The system of surveillance, as a monitoring tool and as a means of producing knowledge is a byproduct of some of the requirements that governmental policies and procedures demand to ensure compliance and correct behavior.

Panoptic Gaze

The panoptic gaze that Foucault wrote about is a reference to Jeremy Bentham's 18th Century prison design. The construction of this prison was such that prisoners were conditioned to monitor their own behaviors at all times as they were unaware if they were being watched or not. The physical shape of the prison made it impossible to know who was being watched and when. Inmates lived under the assumption that they were being watched at all times. This panoptic design made surveillance the primary focus and was thus used in the design of other public institutions such as hospitals and schools where monitoring the behavior of patients and children was critical for the order of the institution.

> The notion of hierarchical observation has always been central to the school system. Foucault sees the success of disciplinary power as deriving from three simple instruments: hierarchical observation; normalizing judgment; and the examination" (Gilles, 2013). In terms of students, school systems use rankings, grade point averages, standardized test scores, and other data points to measure achievement, sort, and categorize students. Foucault stated that "a relation of surveillance, defined and regulated, is inscribed at the heart of the practice of teaching, not as an additional or adjacent part, but as a mechanism that is inherent to it and which increases its efficiency. (1977, p. 176)

Staff members and school leaders in a given school building are also ranked and measured by similar data points. Educators who are measured by the ISLLC Standards can be categorized as meeting or not meeting standard based on a series of evaluations. Recently, reforms in evaluation systems overall have included measures for teacher and

principal effectiveness based on student scores. Gilles (2007) refers to the vertical model of responsibility and accountability. Townley (1993) concluded that relationship with data construct the "job", make workers visible, and create activities that are serially ordered and easy to see and judge. The concept of gaze implies that documentation and information is being gathered in an effort to critique, to judge, and to assess.

> The educational leader is both required to have a strong surveillance role so that every aspect of their responsibilities is known and understood by them, and to be subject to surveillance themselves from a range of interested parties, including school boards, local authority employers, the inspectorate, and parents/caregivers. It aims at conformity: 'the perpetual penalty that traverses all points and supervises every instant in the disciplinary institutions compares, differentiates, hierarchizes, homogenizes, excludes. In short, it normalizes. (Foucault, 1977, p. 183)

Evaluation serves as a form of control and normalization as it seeks to ensure that individuals within a given system are adhering to the rules and regulations that have been established as the normal guidelines. In human resources management literature evaluation is defined as making individuals calculable and knowable (Townley, 1993). Assessing an individual's performance means that a supervisor or upper level manager observes tasks, behaviors, and interactions that can be categorized and measured (Townley, 1993). According to Foucault the evaluative procedures allow for the 'ordering of individuals.' He wrote that "disciplines characterize, classify, specialize; they distribute along a scale, around a norm, hierarchize individuals in relation to one another and, if necessary, disqualify and invalidate (1977, p. 233).

Foucault wrote that individuals can become involved in power relationships "in the fabric of our social systems and organizations" (1982; p. 793). These power relations that grow within and around school organizations are fostered by larger (federal and state) and smaller (local) entities that converge to make certain that the school

organization and its members are operating in a manner that is aligned with public expectations. School leaders are constantly monitoring their behaviors and submitting artifact of proof for compliance to local and state offices. For example, school leaders collect data for review, monitor and submit school improvement plans, and submit teacher and assistant principal evaluations to the district offices for review. District offices in turn submit their required paperwork to the state and the state to the federal level.

At the school level, the school leader is a target within the gaze. Educational leaders serve as the implementers of the school reform mandates. It is a daunting task to be "beholden to multiple political interests" and to "beholden to parents, teachers, community leaders, activists, and residents of local neighborhoods" (Wayne, 2001, p. 11). This dilemma speaks to the role ambiguities that school leaders face as they navigate the liminal space of being in charge and not being in charge-of having power and not having power. "The principal is held accountable through these webs of documents and is ultimately 'knowable' through these forms of management.

> Hierarchical surveillance is presupposed in the ideas that networks of observation work from top to bottom and also laterally (Foucault, 1977, p. 176). It is a mechanism that 'coerces' by means of observation; an apparatus in which the techniques that make it possible to see induce effects of power in which, conversely, the means of coercion makes those on whom they are applied clearly visible. (Niesche, 2011, p.29)

Power and Language

The ability and skill to use language as a tool of power has been examined on many levels. Language, while not physically constraining or controlling, can powerfully produce conditions that have similar impact on the reader (text) or recipient (talk) psychologically and emotionally. Cole (2012) wrote that strategies and tactics of

domination are often discursive-hidden beneath the layers of everyday language. Coles (2012) went on to assert that when individuals speak about themselves or assess a situation based on their perceptions, values, and beliefs they are not merely making a comment on themselves but are also in those instances defining and subjectivating others. In terms of evaluation and assessment of professionals in the workplace, specifically school-based administrators, the nature of language as a tool of power is a powerful instrument. The ISLLC Standards serve as the guiding tenets of acceptable professional behavior within the educational setting.

In the relationship of superior and subordinate, the emergence of a particular social structure surfaces. The superior and the subordinate actively engage in communication practices that define the social relationship. Foucault (1971) asserted that the way we define ourselves individually and collectively position us and others as social subjects thereby structuring social relations and power of domination (Mulderrig, 2009).

Summary. Anderson and Grinberg (1998) have introduced the importance of Foucault's work (view of power, discourse, and method) to educational administration. Best and Kellner (1991) wrote that the overriding emphasis of Foucault's work is on the way in which individuals are classified, excluded, objectified, individualized, disciplined, and normalized. Foucault's work on disciplinary power is particularly important for an examination of the subjectification of leaders through the multifarious disciplinary regimes of school-based management (p.20-21).

> Commonly, the discourses embedded in policy texts operate to constitute, position, make productive, regulate, moralize and govern the citizen. Such texts are also indelibly marked by hidden conceptions of government, the task of governing, and its associated technologies. Foucault understood the activity of governing as only becoming possible through the development, harnessing, incorporation, and active employment of discourse. (Doherty, 2007, p. 195)

Collecting and sorting data on individuals is at the core of the administrator evaluation system. Both qualitative and quantitative data points are examined and assessed in order to make assumptions and create truths about the individual and his/her work. Fox (1998) wrote that a principal technology of power Foucault argued (1976, 1979, 1980a) is the gaze, which is concerned with the gathering of information, to inform and create a discourse on its subject-matter (p. 416).

The gaze that Foucault wrote about is embedded in surveillance techniques. Fox (1998) goes on to suggest that Foucault believed that techniques of surveillance supplied the raw material for the discourse, which turns people into subjects of professions (or disciplines) (p.416). Niesche (2011) examined agency and normalization in educational management. School leaders are expected to formulate visions that encourage change, but they are at the same time constrained and normalized by bureaucratic processes and mechanisms. As scrutiny and accountability are heavily applied concepts on the school leader, the documents and evaluations used to determine their effectiveness become the truth. Niesche (2011) writes that that a principal is held accountable through these webs of documents and ultimately "knowable" through these forms of management (pg. 20).

Conclusion

The literature review began with an examination of the role of the principal through a historical context as well as a modern day sketch of the role. Embedded in the analysis was also a discussion on the role ambiguities and role conflicts that emerge due to the unique nature of the principal's role. Principals and assistant principals consistently find themselves in ambiguous space as they are constantly responding to situations that require them to make assessments and judgments that impact the school

community. Their superiors at the district level place great emphasis on their ability to be all things to all people in their school building. The responsibility and/or burden of those expectations weigh heavily on school leaders and can lead to many to many professional and personal conflicts. The literature review also explored the influence of the ISLLC Standards as policy and as a powerful text that serves to accredit, name and guide the work and job performance of a school based administrators. Additionally, the literature review examined Foucauldian concepts as the basis for the theoretical framework specifically, the themes of discipline, governmentality and the panoptic gaze.

The role of the school leader is further impacted by national policy and standards that seek to accredit, define, assess, and evaluate that individual in that role. States are currently implementing new practices for educator effectiveness via evaluation protocols. The trend to link evaluations of educators to test scores is also an added layer to many of the new evaluation policies reinforced in The *Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards* (ISLLC). There is not a substantial amount of literature that has examined how these new evaluation tools impact the role of the school based administrator.

District school officials and building-level principals will have to take a close look at the integrity of the system and judge the practices for their fairness, alignment, and efficacy. Through a critical discourse analysis, this study seeks to examine the ISLLC Standards (specifically Standards Five and Six), a powerful text, in order to unpack themes and ideologies that control and name the work life experiences of school based administrators.

CHAPTER 3

Methodology

Maxwell (2005) writes that there are three kinds of goals that drive the researcher. These goals are personal goals, practical goals, and intellectual goals. These goals are ultimately driven by the motivation and the desire the researcher has to uncover a particular truth or explore a side of an issue that has never been considered. The personal goals that a researcher cultivates are the most important because it inspires the passion for the topic and can sustain the interest for the topic. The personal and intimate connection that the researcher forms with the subject matter and with the participants in the research process is a lifelong relationship. The series of professional and personal events that lead to doctoral level research are rooted in a researcher's need to add knowledge to the field that defines his/her professional self (Maxwell, 2007).

The purpose of this study is to examine how ISLLC Standards Five and Six, reinforce role ambiguities for school based administrators. The ambiguities are impacted by the sorting and labeling of individuals through evaluation of job performance. The use of CDA as the methodology will be applied to deconstruct themes, values, and ideologies that are embedded in ISLLC Standards Five and Six and the competencies that are ascribed to each standard. The specific language within ISLLC Standards Five and Six will first be analyzed through a text analysis approach. The researcher will select the words and phrases that closely align with the themes of Standards Five and Six which are ethical practice and advocacy respectively. Teasing out the themes embedded within the text will allow the researcher to understand how the language in the text influences the socially constructed world of the school-based administrator.

There are two main research questions to be examined:

1. Which individual words and phrases within ISLLC Standards Five and Six reinforce the ambiguities inherent in the role of the school based administrator?
2. To what extent does the discourse of evaluation encourage and sustain asymmetrical power relations between the evaluator and the one being evaluated?

Research Design and Theoretical Constructs

The research design for this study is critical discourse analysis. Discourse studies and educational research are both socially committed paradigms that address problems through ranges of theoretical perspectives (Fairclough, 1995). The examination of language and the inquiries into meaning making are also ways in which power is explored. Blommaert (2000) stated that power is a central concept in critical discourse studies-rooted in constitutive relationship between discourse and the social world. Bloomaert suggested "critical discourse studies should offer an analysis of the effects of power, the outcomes of power, of what power does to people, groups, and societies" (p. 447-466).

An understanding of the choices associated with the meanings will enable one to determine how best to operationalize the standards, or even if one should operationalize them at all. The investigation of these two standards will reveal the "effects of their power, the illumination of the (language-based and iconographic) means by which they work-in particular by collective symbolism which contributes to the linking-up of the various discourse strands" (Jager, 2001, p. 33). By determining the inherent contradictions within the text as well as revealing the unexpressed concepts, one can determine how the discourse is problematic rather than clarifying.

Jager (2001) explained that the discourse plane is "the societal locations from which 'speaking' happens" (p. 49). The ISLLC Standards were developed within a paradigm defined by improving educational outcomes for American schoolchildren by focusing on working toward achievements standards that are measured with standardized tests. The focus is upon empirically demonstrating that "learning" is occurring in American schools and this paradigm for evaluating based upon standardized criteria is being replicated at all levels. Not only are teachers and principals being evaluated based upon the test scores of the students in their districts, but their formal evaluations also included scoring of professional standards (such as those found in ISLLC) using instruments that seek to quantify their mastery and/or compliance.

By using critical discourse analysis as the methodology for examining Standard Five and Standard Six of the ISLLC Standards, one will be able to see the underlying issues of power and control over school leaders with regards to how they are evaluated in their positions and how the evaluation impacts their status as professionals, their career path, and their position within the school community. Fairclough (2003) wrote that increasing consciousness of how language contributes to the domination of some people by others is a first step towards emancipation. Fairclough (1992) asserted that critical discourse analysis is also "three-dimensional" because it connects to discourses, locating them in a historical and social context, by which we refer to the particular actors, relationships, and practices. Fairclough was saying that there were multiple perspectives that must be considered when applying critical discourse analysis to a particular text.

The understanding of context and the historical timeline can significantly affect the lens with which assumptions are made and truth(s) constructed by evaluators. The

history of education itself, the reform efforts of the last 30 years, and the myriad social, political, and economic policies have all in some way influenced the authorship and the agenda of the ISLLC Standards. When there is opportunity for evaluation and judgment, there is also opportunity for a power imbalance to occur. Critical discourse analysis focuses on the role of discursive activity in constituting and sustaining unequal power relations (Fairclough and Wodak, 1997). Critical discourse analysis "should describe and explain how power abuse is enacted, reproduced or legitimated by the talk and text of dominant groups and institution" (van Dijk, 1996, p. 84).

In terms of a theoretical perspective post modernism and in particular the work of Michel Foucault, undergird the critical discourse analysis that will be applied to Standard Five of the ISLLC Standards. The Standards used to subjectively evaluate and judge school leaders will be under scrutiny. Foucault (1980) posited that the term subjective is "another label applied the same way to discredit or demean the alternative concepts because objective is the desired state that enshrines those who enjoy institutional power-knowledge hierarchical rank and status" (p. 17).

In terms of deconstructing the ISLLC Standards the researcher will be using Boje and Dennehy (1999) who put forth a strategy for deconstruction, which can be applied to CDA. Their strategies for deconstruction consists of eight parts:

1. *Duality Search*- Make a list of any bipolar terms, any dichotomies that are used in the story. Include the term even if only one side is mentioned. For example, in male-centered and or male-dominated organization stories, men are central and women are marginal others. One term mentioned implies its partner.

2. *Reinterpret the Hierarchy*- A story is one interpretation or hierarchy of an event from one point of view. It usually has some form of hierarchical thinking in place. Explore and reinterpret the hierarchy (e.g. in the duality terms how one dominates the other) so you can understand its grip.
3. *Rebel Voices*- Deny the authority of the one voice. Narrative centers marginalize or exclude. To maintain a center takes energy. What voices are not being expressed in this story? Which voices are subordinate or hierarchical to other voices (e.g. Who speaks for the trees?)
4. *Other side of the story*- Stories always have two or more sides. What is the other side of the story (usually a marginalized, under-represented, or even silent)? Reverse the story, but putting the bottom on top, the marginal in control, or the back stage up front. For example, reverse the male-center, by holding a spotlight on its excesses until it becomes a female center In telling the other side, the point is not to replace one center with another, but to show how each center is in a constant state of change and disintegration.
5. *Deny the Plot*- Stories have plots, scripts, scenarios, recipes, and morals (move from romantic to tragic or comedic to ironic).
6. *Find the Exception.* What is the exception that breaks the rule that does not fit the recipe that escapes the strictures of the principle. State the rule in a way that makes it seem extreme or absurd.
7. *Trace what is between the lines*- Trace what is not said? Trace what is the writing on the wall? Fill in the blanks. Storytellers frequently use "you know that part of the story." This is when there are assumptions made about how a listener can fill in the

details based on some prior knowledge. Trace what you are filling in. With what alternate way could you fill it in? (E.g. trace to the context, the back stage, the between, the intertext).

8. *Resituate*- The point of doing 1 to 7 is to find a new perspective, one that resituates the story beyond its dualisms, excluded voices, or singular viewpoint. The idea is to reauthor the story so that the hierarchy is resituated and a new balance of views is attained. Restory to remove the dualities and margins. In a resituated story there are no more centers. Restory to script new actions.

Text

This study will focus on Standards Five and Six of the ISLLC Standards. Standard Five states that an educational leader promotes the success of every student by acting with integrity, and in an ethical manner. Standard Six states that an educational leader promotes the success of every student by understanding, responding to, and influencing the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context (CCSSO, 2008). The research questions for this study will interrogate how the ISLLC Standards Five and Six purport a set of values and competencies that socially construct the experience of the school leader. Standard Five: An educational leader promotes the success of every student by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.

Functions:

1. Ensure a system of accountability for every student's academic and social success
2. Model principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior
3. Safeguard the values of democracy, equity, and diversity

4. Consider and evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of decision-making
5. Promote social justice and ensure that individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling

Standard Six: An education leader promotes the success of every student by understanding, responding to, and influencing the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

Functions:

1. Advocate for children, families, and caregivers
2. Act to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning
3. Assess, analyze, and anticipate emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt leadership strategies

Data Collection

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is usually informed by a research question, and to that end, the text will be examined to determine how each theme in the standards contributes to (or detracts from) improved student achievement. This analysis will seek to uncover the context and power relations (the evident and the hidden binaries in each discourse fragment) in Standards Five and Six of the *ISLLC Standards*, primarily to reveal the interpretive choices that determine the effectiveness of each discourse strand in building educational leaders who are able to guide practice that improves the educational outcomes for students in their schools. A hermeneutic approach to the examination of language is most appropriate for this study. Unpacking the rich meaning and the social

relationships between text and talk is the aim of Critical Discourse Analysis (Phillips & Hardy, 2002).

Subjectivity Statement

Pursuing the work required for a dissertation is an intensely personal mission. Maxwell (2005) wrote that there are three kinds of goals in particular that drive the researcher. These goals are personal goals, practical goals, and intellectual goals. These goals are ultimately driven by the motivation and the desire the researcher has to uncover a particular truth or explore a side of an issue that has never been considered. The personal goals that a researcher cultivates are the most important because it inspires the passion for the topic and can sustain the interest for the topic even when the researcher may be feeling overwhelmed by the process and by the amount of concentrated research, reading, writing, editing, and rewriting that doctoral work requires on a daily basis. The personal and intimate connection that the researcher forms with the subject matter and with the participants in the research process is a lifelong relationship. The series of professional and personal events that lead to doctoral level research are rooted in a researcher's need to add knowledge to the field that defines his/her professional self (Maxwell, 2007). It is impossible to separate the individual from the research especially in a qualitative study.

Understanding the epistemological perspective of an author allows the reader a unique insight into what Creswell (2007) calls the "closeness" that follows between the researcher and that being researched. This closeness, for example, is manifest through time in the field, collaboration, and the impact that that being researched has on the

researcher (Creswell, 2007). The epistemological orientation that a researcher possesses plays a significant role in how he/she selects a course of study, determines the methodology for that exploration, and engages with the subject and the participants. The epistemology is rooted in the researcher's life experiences, in the personal beliefs and values that he/she holds, and in the intellectual curiosity that propels the work that he/she finds to be compelling and worthy of research.

The epistemological orientation that I lean most heavily towards is constructivist and critical theory. Both orientations are value laden and require the researcher to take into consideration assumptions about knowledge. Critical discourse analysis unpacks how language and text can be used as forms of social and political domination.

Jones (1970) wrote about the vantage points from which research can be conducted (p. 251). I am considered an "insider" because the work that I have selected to research is so closely related to my day-to-day duties and responsibilities. My close affiliation to evaluation work and the ISLLC Standards gives me an access to certain types of information and experiences that can uniquely inform the way I approach the text analysis of Standards Five and Six. Jones (1970) mentioned the potential for emotional involvement in being an insider. I identify with the emotional involvement for two reasons. First, the responsibility of the evaluator is to be as honest and forthright as possible and to make assertions that are truthful and accurate. Second, the evaluator holds significant power over the person being evaluated as the document serves as a testament to job performance. If the evaluator determines that the employee is not working up to standard, the impact on the other person is significant.

> One vantage point cannot be said to be better than the other. There are logical dangers inherent in both approaches. The outside may enter the social situation

> armed with a battery of assumptions which he does not question and which guide him to certain types of conclusions; and the insider may depend too much on his own background, his own sentiments, his desires for what is good for his people. The insider, therefore, may distort the "truth" as much as an outsider." (p. 256)

As I approach my research and work with critical discourse analysis, I need to fully disclose the work experiences that have shaped my attitudes and possible biases. I have been a classroom teacher, a staff development teacher, a department chair, a middle school leader, and a central office administrator in a very large mid-Atlantic school district. As an administrator, I was required to take and complete several continuing professional development courses to ensure that I am literate in the ISLLC Standards. Additionally, I have taken coursework in observing and analyzing teaching through my district's "grow your own" principal program. I have been evaluated under the ISLLC Standards and I evaluate the educators who were designated to report to me. As a school-based administrator, I was responsible for the evaluations of eighteen teachers. There are aspects of the evaluation process that I would consider to be effective and critical to the professional development and improvement of teachers and staff member. There are aspects of the evaluation tool and the implementation protocols that I believe can be misused and applied unfairly. I have been asked why focus on Standards Five and Six and not Standards One through Four. To me, Standards Five and Six are the most difficult to support with quantitative data. These standards require the evaluator to make subjective decisions about performance. These standards also most closely aligned with the theoretical framework that I am using for my research. These standards can be analyzed through a Foucauldian lens because of their nature for subjectivity and interpretive nature.

CHAPTER 4

DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

This chapter will offer a discourse analysis of Standards Five and Six of the *ISLLC* Standards using the work of mainly Gee (2011), Tannen (1993) and others such Bateson (1955), Goffman (1974), and Frake ((1977) to examine the use of language and in particular, the ways the data reveal the emerging narrative, frames, and metaphors. Gee (2011) writes that discourse analysis is "a study of language in use" (p. ix). That is, language is useful in conveying messages and also powerful as it moves individuals to action. According to Gee, language is significant because it also allows individuals to socially identify themselves, as they take on multiple identities in their daily lives. For example, the literature review illustrated some of the many identities principals assume. Principals identify themselves as managers, instructional leaders, servant leaders, and community leaders to name a few. These varied experiences can lead to conflict and ambiguity for some, while others may internalize the experience as a rewarding challenge. Understanding context allows individuals to consider that multiple factors can influence one's experiences and responses in a given situation. "As such, we can consider organizations as material practices of text and talk set in currents of political economy and sociohistory-in time and space" (Boje, Oswick, & Ford, 2004, pg. 571).

> Context includes the physical setting in which the communication takes place and everything in it; the bodies, eye gaze, gestures, and movements of those present; all that has previously been said and done by those involved in the communication; any shared knowledge of those involved have, including cultural knowledge, that is, knowledge of their own shared culture and any other cultures that may be relevant in the context. (Gee, 2011, p. 84)

Gee (2011) also stresses the importance of understanding the context of a given situation to better interpret the potential meanings and themes that emerge. Boje,

Oswick, and Ford (2004) write that language is content that goes beyond reporting and describing. Language is used to "know" reality and influences our actions. Schools districts and individual school buildings are complex organizations influenced by language. For example, the language of policy, mandates, and educator evaluation contribute to the discursive nature of the school organization. The ISLLC Standards serve to structure the experience of the educator, to name the work the educator will engage, and to document the performance effectiveness of the individual educator. In this way, language moves people to action, implicates their identity, and creates meaning making.

Gee employs a host of "building tasks" for discourse analysis that further explore meaning. These seven tasks include "significance, practices, identities, relationships and politics, connections, and sign systems and knowledge." Additionally, Gee writes about the tool of "intertextuality" that is significant to unpack in the discourse analysis process as well. Intertextuality here implies that a piece of text is subject to the influence of other texts, narratives, discourses, and events (social, political and/or economic) that can and inform and shape the "life" of that text.

Gee's Seven Tasks, Frames, and Metaphors

Gee explains that words and language are used to "build" things in the world (Gee, 2011). As such, words and language give meaning to things, shape, and engage experience. The following seven tasks can be applied to the ISLLC text for analysis. For the purposes of this analysis *significance, practices*, *identities*, and *relationships* will primarily be considered because of their close alignment to themes embedded in the ISLLC Standards.

Significance---Using language to make things significant or important in various ways or to lower their significance or importance

Practices---Culturally supported endeavor that usually involves sequencing or combining actions in certain and specified ways

Identities---We use language to get recognized as taking on a certain identity role, that is, to build and identity here and now

Relationships---We use language to signal what sort of relationship we have, want to have or are trying to have

Politics---We use language to convey a perspective on the nature of the distribution of social goods

Connections---We use language to render certain things connected or relevant (or not) to other things, that is to build connections and relevance

Sign Systems and Knowledge---Using language to create, sustain, revise, change, privilege, or disprivilege any language or sign system or characteristic way of knowing the world (Gee, 2011, p. 17-19).

Frames. Bateson (1955) introduced the idea of frames to "explain how exchange signals allow individuals to agree upon the level of abstraction at which any message is intended" (Tannen, 1993, p. 18). Tannen (1993) went on to write that frames "thus in the anthropological/sociological view stresses frame as a relational concept rather than a sequence of events; it refers to the dynamic relationship between two people" (p. 19). Frames also emerge "in and are constituted by verbal and non-verbal interaction" (p. 60). Tannen (1993) wrote that people have many stored experiences that she called "an

organized mass," and people "see events and objects in the world in relation to each other and in relation to their prior experience" (p. 21).

Metaphors. Yannow (1996) writes that figurative language such as metaphors allows people to experience a kind of mental mapping. This mapping influences the way people think and reason. Stone (1997) writes that figurative language devices such as metaphors are "important for strategic representation in policy analysis" (p.148). The exploration of narrative, frames, and metaphors help to unpack the robust "story" that emerges from the data. The use of metaphors to extend the meaning of institutions and organizations is an effective way to produce new understandings of those organizations. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) write that with metaphors "we are concerned primarily with how people understand their experiences. We view language as providing data that can lead to general principles of understanding" (p. 116). Lakoff and Johnson (1980) state that abstract ideas like happiness, arguing, times, ideas, status, and morality require a metaphorical connection because they are concepts difficult to grasp and not "clearly enough delineated in their own terms to satisfy the purposes of our day-to-day functioning" (p. 118). "Metaphors may create realities for us, especially social realities. A metaphor may thus be a guide for future action. Such actions will, of course, fit the metaphor. This will, in turn, reinforce the power of the metaphor to make the experience coherent" (p. 156). This is especially pertinent to Standard Five as individuals are evaluated on abstract ideas such as "integrity", "fairness", and "ethics."

Metaphor is shown to exert important influence on the development of language (Miller, 1997) as meaning is transferred from one situation to another. For example, in Standard Six, the principal as a political leader is a prominent idea. While the principal

does serve a critical leadership role in the school and community, he/she may not ultimately influence or change policy. In some instances, the principal may personally not be aligned with a particular political agenda. There may be decisions in direct conflict with his/her moral stance on an issue. The principal, as a school board appointed entity and/or representative, must accept the political decisions that are ultimately made at the federal, state, and/or district levels.

Summary. Gee's tasks, frames, and metaphors help us to further conceptualize and categorize ideas and allow for meaning-making when ideas and concepts are not tangible and hard to quantify. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) write that "for human beings, categorization is primarily a means for comprehending the world, and such it must serve that purpose in a sufficiently and flexible way" (p. 122). The standards themselves are ultimately categories of educational leadership. They name the work, determine the criteria for success, and break down the tasks into smaller units setting the expectations for individuals to follow and enact. The ISLLC Standards are more than a powerful text. The standards also serve to license, accredit, and evaluate the school leaders. An understanding of the interconnectedness of the document and reform efforts is essential to unpacking the analysis.

Intertextuality. Porter (1986) writes "examining texts intertextuality means looking for "traces," the bits and pieces of text which writers or speakers borrow and sew together to create new discourse" (p. 34). The idea is that a piece of text often has a connection to another body of work or to a collection of ideas. "There are always other words in a word, other texts in a text. The concept of intertextuality requires, therefore, that we understand texts not as self-contained systems but as differential and historical, as

traces and tracings of otherness, since they are shaped by the repetition and transformation of other textual structures" (Martinez-Alfaro, 1996, p. 268). Intertextuality is an important consideration in the discourse analysis of the ISLLC Standards. The influence of other narratives, points of view, social and political factors are readily present. There is historical precedence for the development of the standards. Years of efforts to identify solutions for better schools, improved leadership, effective teaching, civil rights in education, and accountability converged to set the stage for the accountability and standards in public education.

In passing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) in 1965 the federal government sought to provide federal funds to help low income students. This reform influenced the 1968 Bilingual Education Act (Title VIII), which eventually became *No Child Left Behind* (2000). As the various reform movements evolved, the focus for accountability was placed squarely on school leadership impacting how the school leader's work would be defined and measured for success.

There have been numerous studies and assessments made by the Council of Chief State School Officers, the National Policy Board for Education Administration, and the Wallace Foundation that have also impacted the shaping of the *ISLLC* Standards. The 2008 refresh was inspired by the passage of *No Child Left Behind*. One of the most significant recommendations in NCLB was to align teacher evaluation to student performance measures. Eventually, the recommendations would evolve to tie principal evaluation to student performance measures. The influence of reform efforts, policy, and mandates have reshaped some of the conversations principals have with teachers about teaching, learning, compliance, and performance data. Some school district leaders are

having similar conversations with some principals about leading for change and tying principal effectiveness to student scores which was part of Race to the Top (RTT) and now aligned with Common Core efforts as well.

Race to the Top prompted 48 states to adopt the common standards for K-12. The National Governor's Association and the Council of Chief State School Officers developed the standards with funds from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation. This $4 billion dollar stimulus package is part of the Obama administration's American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA). Overall, Race to the Top sets up a system of competition for federal money in an effort to make every child in America "college ready" by the year 2020.

The Common Core Standards (authored by the National Governors Association Center for Best Practices and the Council of Chief State School Officers), were developed to "establish consensus on expectations for student knowledge and skills that should be developed in Grades K-12" (Porter, McMaken, Hwang, and Yang, 2011, p. 103). The push for a national curriculum is tied to the idea of "standards that aim to align instruction with this framework so that many more students than at present can meet requirements of college and career readiness" (p. 103). The push for Common Core was a response to the need for a more uniform approach to designing curriculum. The emphasis had been on how students are taught as opposed to what they are taught (LaVenia, Cohen-Vogel, Lang, 2015). Additionally, hundreds of millions of dollars in incentives to adopt the Common Core Standards are available for participating districts. This is important because the financial incentives push the agenda and help to guide many of the decisions that are then made at the school level. The connection this all has

to the ISLLC Standards is that many states are integrating student scores into the evaluation process. As a result of new Common Core standardized testing scores in many districts success will be tied to school leader evaluations.

The ISLLC Document

Both the 1996 and the 2008 *ISLLC* committee of authors were comprised of a variety of members from governmental agencies, university professionals, and oversight agencies. Ultimately, the Consortium was successful in having 40 of 50 states adapt the standards by 2003, with more that followed in the subsequent years. A host of colleges and universities in the 40 states agreed to realign their training programs to the *ISLLC Standards*. *ISLCC* went on to impact program approval, program accreditation, licensure, relicensure, professional development, administrator evaluation, and whole state reform that focused on accountability at the school building level for the academic of achievement of every child. The ISLLC Standards have been described as a "set of high level policy standards for educational leadership" (CCSSO, 2008). The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) is comprised of state leaders who worked on behalf of elementary and secondary educational programs. CCSSO, together with the National Policy Board of Educational Administration (NPBEA) and the Wallace Foundation took the lead on updating the 1996 ISLLC Standards in an effort to be more responsive to the changing trends in public school education and to the increased scrutiny placed on the role of effective school leadership.

The development of the *Educational Leadership Policy Standards*: *ISLLC* 2008, have been used by over 40 states to provide structure and guidance in education leadership, licensure, evaluation and professional development (CCSSO, 2008). This

study focuses on only two of the six standards as part of this critical discourse analysis (CDA). I sought to examine the ISLLC Standards, a powerful text, in order to unpack themes and ideologies that control and name the work life experiences of school based administrators, specifically the public school principal. Additionally, the study sought to analyze the standards that examine how individuals are guided, judged, and dominated by those evaluative tools that are disciplinary in nature. The ISLLC Standards are used to measure how well educators perform their duties and how well they invest in the achievement of students and the cultivation of a unified school community. ISLLC Standards serve as the blueprint for effective leaders and consequently effective schools (CCSSO, 2008).

The 2008 iteration of the ISLLC Standards addressed the ideas that school building administrators inhabit multiple roles. Their jobs move beyond the managing of bus schedules, hall duty, and managing school finances. The complexity of the role demands that principals are data analysts, community agents, instructional leaders, and change agents (CCSSO, 2008). The 2008 policy report also noted that the narrative on school leadership moved from debating if school leadership mattered to a focus on the training, supporting and placing effective school leaders in every public school (CCSSO, 2008).

> The most fundamental change, however, responds to the recognition that when implementing the 1996 standards, some institutions used them differently, confusing policy standards with practice standards and/or program standards. Consequently, this document states unequivocally, in its title and elsewhere that the standards here are policy standards and are designed to be discussed at the policymaking level to set policy and vision. (CCSSO, 2008, p. 6)

The 2008 document was a twenty-four-page document that outlined some of the newest research applied to the 1996 ISLLC Standards, a rationale for why the update was

needed, and an update on how the standards were improving the work in the field around licensure, evaluation, and professional development. "ISLLC 2008 keeps the footprint of the original ISLLC Standards, but it is written for new purposes and audiences" (CCSSO, 2008, p. 5). The impact of *No Child Left Behind* (2001) was also evident in the new iteration of the standards. It was noted in the introduction that pressure due to high stakes testing, mounting scrutiny on the building principal, and the overall complexity of the principalship itself were all at the heart of the 2008 reexamination of the standards. Devita (2008) noted in the Wallace Foundation report, *A Bridge to School Reform* that the narrative on the critical need for effective leaders in all schools should be at the forefront of the conversation for education reform.

The updated standards were also born out of a need to coordinate efforts among policy makers, educators, and researchers by examining five key questions as outlined in the CCSSO report (p. 5):

1. How do schools of education know what education leaders need to know as it relates to every child meeting academic achievement standards?
2. How can schools of education effectively convey that knowledge in a coherent fashion?
3. How does district office evaluate the skills and dispositions of a candidate to improve student performance?
4. How does one evaluate appropriate continuing education programs or mentoring of new principals?
5. How does one evaluate existing school leaders in meeting accountability goals? (CCSSO, 2008 p. 5)

Improving leadership standards was the core work of the committee that came together to upgrade the 1996 standards. The key messages for the 2008 refresh centered on six key statements:

1. Setting a widely shared vision for learning;
2. Developing a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth;
3. Ensuring effective management of the organization, operation, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment;
4. Collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources;
5. Acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner; and
6. Understanding, responding to, and influencing the political, social, legal, and cultural contexts. (CCSSO, 6)

There are six ISLLC Standards. Under each standard are also sets of functions that further define the standards. The ISLLC Standards are:

Standard 1: A school leader is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community. Functions:

A. Collaboratively develop and implement a shared vision and mission

B. Collect and use data to identify goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and promote organizational learning

C. Create and implement plans to achieve goals

D. Promote continuous and sustainable improvement

E. Monitor and evaluate progress and revise plans

Standard 2: A school leader is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth. Functions:

A. Nurture and sustain a culture of collaboration, trust, learning, and high expectations

B. Create a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular program

C. Create a personalized and motivating learning environment for students

D. Supervise instruction

E. Develop assessments and accountability systems to monitor student progress

F. Develop the instructional and leadership capacity of staff

G. Maximize time spent on quality instruction

H. Promote the use of the most effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning

I. Monitor and evaluate the impact of the instructional program

Standard 3: A school leader is an educational leader, who promotes the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment, Functions:

A. Monitor and evaluate the management and operational systems

B. Obtain, allocate, align, and efficiently utilize human, fiscal, and technological resources

C. Promote and protect the welfare and safety of students and staff

D. Develop the capacity of distributed leadership

E. Ensure teacher and organizational time is focused to support quality instruction and student learning

Standard 4: A school leader is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources. Functions:

A. Collect and analyze data and information pertinent to the educational environment

B. Promote understanding, appreciation, and use of the community's diverse cultural, social, and intellectual resources

C. Build and sustain positive relationships with families and caregivers

D. Build and sustain productive relationships with community partners

Standard 5: A school leader is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner. Functions:

A. Ensure a system of accountability for every student's academic and social success

B. Model principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior

C. Safeguard the values of democracy, equity, and diversity

D. Consider and evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of decision-making Promote social justice and ensure that individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling

Standard 6: A school leader is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context. Functions:

A. Advocate for children, families, and caregivers
B. Act to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning
C. Assess, analyze, and anticipate emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt leadership strategies (CCSSO, 2008, p. 19)

Standards One through Four

All six standards have at their core the commitment to academic success for all students. As noted earlier, the idea of these policy standards is to ensure that each child meets with academic success. The ISLLC Standards can be chunked into two overarching categories. The first four standards can be designated as having a focus on instructional leadership, test scores, and other data points that reflect proficient or advanced designations in academic achievement. Quantifiable data points leave little room for interpretation. As data are disaggregated by race and by content specific areas, the measures declare, "met" or "not met." The final two standards focus on the leader as an individual and on his/her leadership practices as dictated by ethical, moral, and political standards and/or values. The connection however is that every action taken by the educational leader is tied to that designated level of success. Each decision and each action comes back to whether or not the school leader had as his/her focus the success of each child. While there are differences among the standards, it is important to remember that the standards as a whole influence and bolster one another. The running through line

is success for each student at all levels. The first four standards are centered on leading the instructional program and guiding the teaching. The measures for success are marked by the test scores and/or the performance indicators. For teachers, in many states, the added measure of teaching success will be aligned to student test scores. Standards Five and Six examine and assess leadership against ideas and concepts that are interpretive and often non-objective. The highly subjective nature of these standards and the need to understand contextual nuances is important as their superiors in the workplace are making assessments about individuals. School organizations are complex and heavily influenced by factors beyond the control of the principal. Reconciling those complexities with the requirements of the standards should be considered.

Standards Five and Six Overview

The evidence of success for Standards Five and Six are not as clearly discernable as the evidence of success for the first four standards. Standards Five and Six are contingent upon an educational leader acting and behaving in such a manner that is reflective of high moral character and political savvy. The requirements outlined in these two standards are more subjective and highly interpretative. The educational leader in this context is no longer simply the instructional leader focused on student achievement and test scores and instructional leadership, but rather he/she is designated as a moral leader, a liaison to the district and/state offices, and a political agent.

Summary. The principles of education reform, the policies, the mandates, the standards themselves collectively have influenced and shaped one another. The idea that school principals are needed to engage in educational reform work that is, to move schools, students, and teachers to greatness is a significant effort. Great principals are

needed to implement visionary plans, to coach teachers, to mentor students, to engage families, and to do it all seamlessly and with conviction. Sanders (2014) wrote that "Increasingly, theory and research highlight the importance of leadership at the school, district, and state levels to achieve meaningful and lasting changes in how schools function" (p. 89).

Standard Five: Discourse Analysis

Select Key Terms. The excerpt below represents the portion of Standard Five, which I have selected to examine in the discourse analysis. These key terms have been selected because they demonstrate the complexity of the expectations and dispositions that the standard evaluates. Each of these statements will be examined using several of Gee's building tasks to help guide the analysis.

An educational leader promotes the success of every student by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.

1. Safeguards the values of democracy, equity, and diversity
2. Promote social justice and ensure that individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling

An educational leader promotes the success of every student by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner. The difference between the 1996 and 2008 Standard Five wording is minimal, but the edits widened the scope of accountability as the change meant that a more collaborative and concerted effort would be needed to ensure leadership quality and student academic and social success. "Educational leader" here includes the building principal/assistant principal, and central office leaders as well. This term replaced the term "administrator found in the 1996 version of the ISLLC

Standards. The idea to "grow" the term to educational leader cast a wider net for who would fall into that category. The accountability and evaluation practices put in place sought to ensure student success by creating rigorous standards for educator performance particularly the public school principal. No longer were the standards applicable to just the building leader, but accountability also extended to the district level leaders. Gee's *significance* building task here demonstrates the elevation of the term to encompass a greater pool of leaders who would be accountable for these dispositions and for the academic and social success of each student. Gee's *practices* and *identities* in this key term move beyond effective pedagogy, instructional practice, and the traditional role of the principal leader. In this standard, the principal leader is described to be someone who embodies abstract and personalized qualities. This standard expects that principal leaders are reflecting on matters of honesty, building personal relationships, the consideration of larger social issues that challenge students and their families, and how their actions can be identified as being "fair," "ethical," and "moral." The high profile of the principal leader lends itself to scrutiny. The *relationships* cultivated move beyond classrooms visits and discussions on test scores and curriculum. In this context, the principal leader is subject to continuous personal scrutiny. "Issues of race, ethnicity, language background, and class can magnify the impact of interpersonal problems. Leaders working with diverse groups of educators, parents, and students must interact with a strong sense of integrity, a commitment to fairness, and an unyielding focus on the best interest of all students (Johnson and Uline, 2005, p. 50).

Canole and Young (2013) explain that ethical practice demands leaders and their actions must not only adhere to the laws and regulations of the state, but also to the spirit

of those laws and regulations. They also suggest, however, that principals must "rest on moral principles of justice and fairness…[and] on the moral principles of building goodness and community grounded in a collective commitment to the pursuit of truth and truthfulness" (p. 34). This section implies that an ethical principal has a moral obligation to protect students from unfair or unjust laws and regulations.

Safeguards the values of democracy, equity, and diversity and promotes social justice and ensures that individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling. In the context of social justice, "school leaders are being called on to take up the role of transformative intellectuals, public intellectuals, or critical intellectuals" (Cambron-McCabe and McCarthy, 2011, p. 195). Social justice language in education equates to "high academic standards", "closing the achievement gap", and "stringent assessment strategies" (Cambron-McCabe, 2009; Marshall & McCarthy, 2002, p. 195). In applying Gee's building tasks to this key term, the *significance* is that while social justice has an educational definition and application to it, there are other interpretations implied when social justice is aligned with democracy, equity, and diversity. The implication is that there are greater social issues to consider. Cambron-McCabe and McCarthy (2011) state "the by-product of this policy discourse of accountability, standards, and quality is safe language that eschews more controversial confrontations about race, class, gender, sexual orientation, and systemic inequalities" (p. 195). School leaders who may have a desire to challenge existing injustices may seek to create more inclusive programs, offer more rigorous course selections, and establish after school programs may find that their practices are challenged by district and/or state "rules, regulations, and state controls" (Foster, 2004). This standard asks that the school leader engage in social activism and

that he/she consider decision-making that is in the best interest of children and their social-emotional development not just their academic achievement (Foster, 2004). Educational equity and social justice are closely linked (Cambron-McCabe and McCarthy, 2011), as principal leaders must not only consider academic disparities that exist but socio-economic ones as well. Under Standard Five, the school leader confronts the socio-economic challenges and the racial inequities that may exist in a school community.

Canole and Young (2013) examined no less than a dozen studies and commentaries that expressed "critical need" for principals to have an understanding and knowledge of "the moral and legal consequences of decision-making" (p. 35). This suggests that accountability can be subjective. Navigating the balance of what student needs are in diverse school communities requires principal leaders to have what McKenzie and Scheurich (2004) have called "practiced reflexivity, where individuals consciously take responsibility for their actions-recognizing that all actions have an impact on the community." In this standard, principal leaders are expected to be transparent and collegial in their problem solving and decision-making. School leader *practices*, *identities*, and *relationships* are embedded in this standard. Under this standard principals are called on to be charismatic, transformational, moral and servant leaders. The substantive changes and improvements that many school communities need challenge principal leaders to be moral agents and to embody "super human" qualities. The principal leader is expected to make decisions with integrity and always in the best interest of students, staff, and community.

Frames. Tannen (2009) writes about frame analysis and how individuals navigate the question "What is it that's going on here?" (8). For principal leaders, there are several issues "at play" in Standard Five, which must be navigated. There is the standard itself as a performance evaluation tool that serves to assess the quality of the work that is done. The principal leader is accountable for meeting the requirements of the dispositions outlined in the standard as part of the practice of leadership evaluation. There is also the presence of a specific identity that the principal leader must embody to meet the requirements of the standard. The principal leader is expected to be a social justice leader, an advocate for equity and diversity, and a moral agent. "What is known currently about the topics of values, ethics, and moral leadership in the field of educational leadership pertains to how practicing educational leaders approach, or should approach, decision making and their consequent actions along various ethical frameworks, that is justice, care, critique, community administrative virtue, and other moral vantage points (Schussler and Collins, 2006; Starratt, 1991). School leaders are challenged to make connections among experiences and expectations (Tannen, 1993). Principal leaders, in this framing context, are responding to social, political, and economic schemas as they make moral and ethical decisions.

Metaphors

Leader as Hero. The metaphor of hero surfaces in Standard Five as the leader is portrayed as one who acts in a moral and ethical manner by advocating and championing the cause for children. Heroes advocate for those who may have no voice. "School leaders may perceive advocacy in the sense of supporting, maintaining, and defending moral, legal, and thoughtful educational principles and practices for children and youth

(Matthews & Crown, 2003, p. 228). Education is a moral enterprise as parents entrust the lives of their children to the school leader. Sirotnkik (1990) listed five areas of moral responsibilities that fall to the school leader. They include; inquiry, knowledge, competence, caring, and freedom. The school leader thus acts in ways and implements practices that put the best interests of children first. The school leaders influence to champion change and turnaround schools begins with the conviction that it is the right thing to do. The leader understands that it will take a heroic effort to push forward with changes needed to avoid complacency, the lack of accountability, and the apathy that may exist in schools where low expectations thrive due to cultural norms, institutionalized racism, and low socio-economic factors.

Frick (2011) building on the work Stefkovich and Starratt (2010), writes that "moral leadership and ethical administrative decision making require more than the mechanical application of existing rules, regulations, and various levels of school and school related policy" (p. 527). An educational leader is tasked with striking a balance between making decisions deemed to be in the best interest of the school and the students and keeping in line with moral and ethical boundaries. Frick (2011) distinguishes between ethics and morality. Frick writes that "ethics is the thinking and reasoning; morality is the doing of the thing" (p. 528). Educational leaders as moral agents are influenced by their personal values (Frick, 2011). The idea of leading to "serve the best interests of the students" is noted in each of the ISLLC Standards (ISLCC 1996, 2008). The educational leader who serves as a defender of these democratic ideals must constantly weigh his or her beliefs versus social, political, and economic influences that may impact the decision making process. The educational leader as a hero who serves

the school, the children, the staff, and the community must also meet the social, emotional, and intellectual needs of that community. Accountability for successful implementation of plans and ideas is highly visible endeavor.

Standard Six: Discourse Analysis

Standard Six states, "*an education leader promotes the success of every student by understanding, responding to, and influencing the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context*" (CCSSO, 2008, p. 18). This standard is about influencing the world outside of the school in order to improve the school environment and the community so that students are better able to achieve the academic standards set for them. The key terms and phrases selected for this analysis include "*an educational leader promotes the success of every student by understanding, responding to, and influencing the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.*" This statement is an all-encompassing assessment of what an educational leader will do in order to meet the political requirements of his/her job.

An educational leader promotes the success of every student by understanding, responding to, and influencing the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context. This standard states that principals must be aware of policies, laws, and regulations within their system. Standard Six suggest that principals should know how to improve the social opportunities for their students and be prepared to advocate for changes to policy, laws and to positively influence the educational environment. Effective leaders will engage in *practices* that keep them abreast of emerging political, social, economic, legal, and cultural trends that can affect the academic achievement and engagement of his/her students and adapt his/her leadership practices accordingly. The *identity* of the

principal emerges here as a skilled politician and visionary. Canole and Young (2013) list nearly twenty studies that identify advocacy as an important skill and activity for an effective leader in the educational system. A principal must be aware of policies, laws, and regulations within their system. They suggest that principals should know how to improve the social opportunities for their students and be prepared to advocate for changes to policy, regulations, and laws to positively influence the educational environment.

Canole and Young (2013) suggest that the ISLLC Standards are a direct result of leaders engaging in effective advocacy for improved educational opportunities for their students. Principals must cultivate many types of r*elationships* in this standard. The principal must maintain *relationships* with within the school and in the community. Henderson and Mapp (2002) write about the considerable influence that families have on their children's education. Parents, who are able to support their children with homework, articulate high expectations for achievement, attend school functions, and engage their children in conversations about learning and goal setting saw higher grades and low absenteeism. Sheldon (2007) examines the National Network of Partnership Schools (NNPS) and their efforts around promoting parenting advice, strategies for communicating with the school, opportunities and encouragement for volunteering on a regular basis, supporting homework and reading goals at home, decision making, and community and civic duties (p. 268). The principal leader is critical in nurturing role of liaison to school and community.

Auerbach (2009) writes that community engagement and outreach to families can be seen as a tool for creating more equitable schools with culturally responsive and

collaborative leaders. Understanding the community context is critical to the work of the principal. The work of the principal is to promote partnerships that are inclusive of families and community members in the spirit of social justice (Auerbach, 2009). Auerbach goes on to write:

> Education for social justice implies collaboration between schools and families and the active pursuit of school-community partnerships, especially in urban schools where parents have traditionally been marginalized (Auerbach, 2007a; Furman & Shields, 2003; Hoff, Yoder, & Hoff, 2006). Theoharis (2007) uses a qualitative study of seven urban principals' enactment of social justice to elaborate theory on social justice leadership. In his study, outreach to marginalized families, increasing parent participation, and improving home-school relations were key elements of leaders' efforts to "strengthen school culture and community." These and other steps were taken by administrators not only to raise achievement but because they were seen as "the moral or right course of action" (p. 232).

Standard Six defines the role and accountability of the educational leader in a society that seeks to organize, surveil, discipline, and control by means of an omniscient power. This standard also suggests that the principal has *knowledge* and can influence change when principals are tied to policies they have no influence over and limited by the lack of resources or funding that accompany many of the rules and regulations they are expected to implement and enact. Rorrer and Skrla (2005) write that school leaders are mediators and play a role in the success or failure or policies. School leaders are “the essential actors who determine the relationships between policy intent and policy outcome at the local level” (p. 54).

Fuchs (1995) argued that principals often use skills in negotiation, persuasion, and influence to seek consensus and support. Principals, in their role as a political leader, sometimes reinforced the hierarchical structures often found in the central office paradigm. Principals are political beings because inherent in their role is the opportunity

to influence decisions, mediate conflicts, build coalitions, exert power over teachers, staff, and students, and control the physical space of the building (Fuchs, 1995).

When a school leader is evaluated based on his/her efficacy as a political leader, there are many interests, conflicts, and contextual aspects to consider. School organizations and communities are comprised of divergent interests. It can take years for a school leader to forge and build relationships of trust and mutual benefit. Experiences and events that surround the school community can have a profound impact on one's ability to successfully negotiate a political agenda that must be handled in many instances under scrutiny of students, teachers, parents, and the district office (Fuchs, 1995).

While the principal leader is expected to be aware of the political climate surrounding the school, community, and district, principals are often discouraged from making public statements on policy that may lead to partisan conflicts (Wilensky, 2009). Principals as politicians must work at the school level to implement mandated policies, oversee budgets, determine spending, navigate difficult relationships with underperforming teachers and angry parents, mentor and coach assistant principals, and lead the core instructional program. While it may not appear to be political in nature on the surface, the presence of power in this paradigm is undeniable.

Frame. Politics as a frame in this examination of the standards is an appropriate fit. One cannot have a conversation about public education without a consideration of the local, state, and federal political influence that permeates. Political influence is aligned with money and power. Money and power in turn drive many of the reform efforts aimed at managing, improving, and leading change in the educational landscape. Within this frame, there are multiple levels of communication. It is useful to understand that

communication within frames matter and impact meaning. In terms of political framing and education, the directives from federal and state levels send strong messages about actions, compliance, and consequences typically tied to funding/money (Rorrer and Skrla, 2005).

Standard Six looks to ensure that the school leader has a clear understanding of the policies and procedures that guide the work of the day-to-day experiences of a school. This standard promotes more than just the school's instructional program. Standard Six defines the role of the principal as an advocate, a social worker, a community leader, and expert. There are a variety of "hats" that the principal must wear. Navigating the variety of political frames in any context or organization can be difficult but especially in a school when a principal is having to consider the welfare of children, the professionalism of teachers, needs of the community, teacher's union perspectives (in some cases), local, state, and federal mandates. The challenge is trying to balance the various stakeholder needs without losing sight of making sound decisions in the best interest of students.

Metaphor

Leader as Political Visionary. Canole and Young (2013) listed nearly twenty studies that identify advocacy as an important skill and activity for an effective leader in the educational system. A principal must be aware of policies, laws, and regulations in their system. They suggest principals should know how to improve the social opportunities for their students and be prepared to advocate for changes to policy, regulations, and laws to positively influence the educational environment. An effective leader should be aware of emerging political, social, economic, legal, and cultural trends that can affect the

academic achievement and engagement of her/his students and adapt her/his leadership strategies accordingly.

A balance must be maintained when describing the school leader as a political figure. While he/she is expected to be aware of the political climate surrounding the school, community, and district, principals are often discouraged from making public statements on policy that may lead to partisan conflicts (Wilensky, 2009). Principals as politicians must work at the school level to implement mandated policies, oversee budgets, determine spending, navigate difficult relationships with underperforming teachers and angry parents, mentor and coach assistant principals, and lead the core instructional program. While it may not appear to be political in nature on the surface, the presence of power in this paradigm is undeniable.

When a school leader is evaluated based on his/her efficacy as a political leader, there are many interests, conflicts, and contextual aspects to consider. School organizations and communities are comprised of divergent interests. It can take years for a school leader to forge and build relationships of trust and mutual benefit. Experiences and events that surround the school community can have a profound impact on one's ability to successfully negotiate a political agenda that must be handled in many instances under scrutiny of students, teachers, parents, and the district office (Fuchs, 1995). The principal on many levels can have the necessary political skills to navigate many situations, but he/she must also understand that their political clout is largely shaped by what the district office dictates and/or mandates. Their political influence can only stretch so far especially if their personal attitudes and beliefs are in conflict with what is communicated by their superiors.

Leaders exercise initiative. This immediately raises a problem: Do we really want public managers to take any initiatives? Is not the job of the public manager to implement public policies that our elected officials in the legislative and executive branches have already created? If public managers exercise initiative, are they not usurping the powers that we have- constitution- ally-assigned to only those officials whom we elect. The principal leader concept in Standard Six captures the spirit of the principal as political leader who is up-to-date on educational literature, well versed on community topics, clear on his/her role as an advocate, and someone who has considerable influence on "political, social, economic, legal, and cultural" matters that impact the school community but also the community of the neighborhood.

The principal as an "advocate for children, families, and caregivers" (CCSSO, 2008, p. 15) showcases the leadership role in terms of someone who understands social services and concepts of servant leadership (Greenleaf, 1977). A servant leader seeks to meet the needs of everyone in the organization from the perspective of a social-emotional grounding. The servant leader wants to make sure everyone has what he or she need. If students are going to be present and attend to learning, there are many needs that must be met first such as the physical well-being. The principal as an advocate garners support from business, faith-based organizations, and volunteers to martial their resources so that students have what they need at the most basic levels.

Additionally, it is the goal of schools to extend services to parents and caregivers who need access to materials in other languages, job skills training, and/or counseling services through local health and human services offices. The idea of wrap around services for Title I schools, low socio-economic schools, and/or rural schools brings

together a team to examine the needs of students (Cambron-McCabe and McCarthy, 2005). The standard, however, is not written in such a way that highlights the team approach. Again, it places the responsibility of navigating complex social, emotional, and physical arenas on the designated leader. The principal must balance stakeholder interests in his/her role as manager. The expectations however may exceed the capacity of the individuals when the needs go beyond teaching and learning. When the expectations become aligned with social work, political activism, and advocacy the levels of ambiguity for the leader may manifest causing tension in the role.

The metaphor of leader as a visionary demonstrates the need for the school leader to have the skills necessary to articulate what the future will look like for the school and/or district. The leader is thought to me omniscient as he/she is able to "Assess, analyze, and anticipate emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt leadership strategies. (CCSSO, 2008, p. 19). The leader's vision is critical as it maps out the future for the school and/or district. The visionary also demonstrates the courage needed to move forward with change (Matthews & Crow, 2003, p. 151). As Starratt (1993) claimed:

> The leader's vision is what motivates him or her to be a genuine player in the drama and is a call to greatness as well. The leader's vision is also what enables him or her to articulate the major themes of the drama in the role of director. The vision enables the leader/director to see the unity within the various scenes and subplots of the drama, and to call the various actors to express, in their part, those overarching themes (p. 145)

Nanus (1992) identified the four types of roles that a visionary leader plays. They include; direction-setter, change agent, spokesperson, and coach. The school leader under the greater theme of visionary can be seen navigating those roles as well. The

school leader must be able to communicate and embody the new vision internally and externally because the community is also watching and assessing the work of the leader.

The metaphor of school leader as a politician who can exert influence is noted in Standard Six. "An education leader promotes the success of every student by understanding, responding to, and influencing the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context" (CCSSO, 2008, p. 18). In this standard, the school leader must be in tune with and up-to-date on every aspect of the current state. The political, social, economic, legal, and cultural topics influence the school and/or district in profound ways. The school leader must understand the connections, alignments, money sources, other resources, pitfalls, etc. that have the potential to influence how the school and/or district will operate. Slater and Boyd (1999) "identified three ways that schools can be considered political institutions: political systems, civil societies, and the rule of many in the interest of the whole, or democratic institutions" (Matthews & Crow, 2003, p. 202). Above and beyond teaching and learning, in his/her role as politician and defender of democratic ideas in education, the school leader plays a critical role "in helping to make schools into civil societies that prepare students to contribute to their communities" (Matthew & Crow, 2003, p. 204).

The depiction of the principal as a savvy politician and champion for children in Standard Six provides many terms that are bipolar and inspire some pause. In this standard, the principal is expected to understand, navigate, and influence "political, social, economic, legal, and cultural contexts" (CCSSO, 2008). In every standard, the goal is to ensure success for all students. The absolute term "all" and the word "success" (as mentioned earlier) can be a challenge in that 100% success for all students may not be

possible and the definition of success may vary from school to school and community to community.

The notion of the principal as a political leader who leads for social justice is embedded in this standard. The difficulty however is defining what social justice looks like within a given district and from school-to-school. Marshall and Parker (2009) write that social justice is narrowly defined by the need to meet academic standards and close the achievement gap. Cambron-McCabe and McCarthy (2002) caution that a limited view of social justice neglects some greater issues that need attention such as race and equity and issues around gender inequality, sexual orientation biases, and system-wide practices that may serve as intentional or unintentional barriers. "In this climate, school leaders desiring to create inclusive, just schools find themselves constrained by rules, regulations, and state controls. It can not only look at the conditions in which we live, but it also must decide how to change them" (Foster, 1986, p. 185). Cambron-McCabe and McCarthy (2002) write, "in the face of the growing social inequality in the nation, how do we link educational equity and social equity? What skills do leaders need to engage the school and the community in confronting social justice issues? How do we avoid the trap of confusing gains in test scores with substantive educational improvement?" (p.206).

Narrative

"Narratives are useful data because individuals often make sense of the world and their place it in through the telling and retelling of their own stories" (Feldman, Skoldberg, Brown, and Horner, 2004, p. 148). Narrative represents the account of events that tell the "story" of a particular situation. The "story" of public education has a rich

social and political history. Much of the narrative on public education is constructed through policymaking, policy implementation, and adherence to those policies by the implementers at the grass roots levels. There are social and political forces at play as narrative is constructed and shaped by organizational and institutional priorities (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980). Where the ISLLC Standards are concerned, the wave of political influence on education policy requiring a hierarchical structure for implementation is heavily influenced by factors beyond the control of the individuals most impacted by the rules and regulations placed upon them.

> Narrative form can be loosely defined as a sequence of events, experiences, or actions with a plot that ties together different parts into meaningful whole (Czarniawska, 1998; Franzosi, 1998). The information presented in the narrative is valuable. Through the events the narrative includes, excludes, and emphasizes, the storyteller not only illustrates his or her version of the action but also provides an interpretation or evaluative commentary on the subject. In addition, the sequencing of narrative form is important because its structure reveals what is significant to people about various practices, ideas, places, and symbols (Young, 1996).

Narrative and points of view will vary depending upon who is telling the story and what that person's role is in the exchange or interaction. This is significant with regards to the ISLLC Standards: there is an inherent power structure in place when the standards are applied between the one evaluating and the one being evaluated.

Standard Five and Standard Six Narratives. The "story" of the school principal under these standards illustrates a work life marked by expectations for flawless leadership. The portrayal of the principal leader as an advocate for equity, democracy, diversity, and social justice adds many layers of complexity to an already challenging job. In this role the principal moves beyond the instructional leader and manager and

assumes political activism as a priority of the work. Accountability in this narrative transcends test scores, teaching, and learning efforts.

The principal as an advocate for children, families, and caregivers suggests that the principal has influence over not only what occurs inside but outside of the school house as well. The principal can advocate on behalf of children and parents by ensuring that while in schools students are safe and receiving the highest quality education possible. Principals may feel the pull to become involved in the personal lives of students and families, but there are public organizations that are better equipped to handle matters that are related to social services. The principal as an instructional leader and building manager aligns more closely with the training and experiences that he/she has most likely had.

The standards imply that principals hold political sway and that principals have the ability to leverage their position in the community to impact and/or influence local, state, and district policies on education. It is more realistic to say that principals as middle managers must comply and implement national, state, and/or local mandates in order to receive monies that come with compliance. The hierarchical structure of public schools does not readily allow principals to pick and choose which reforms or initiatives they will implement in their respective buildings. Compliance and adherence to local policies and regulations typically help to shape the school's culture, context, and goal setting in terms of school improvement planning. There is a need for principals to adjust their leadership practices and styles in order to more easily adapt to the "emerging trends" mentioned in this standard. The notion of assessing, analyzing, and anticipating emerging trends means that principals are keenly aware of the social, political, and

economic landscape that can ultimately shape the direction his/her school will be required to move. The principal's work life is heavily influenced by factors that intersect one another outside of the school. Political decisions made in the best interest of schools are influenced by social and economic policies that ultimately shape the experiences that the principal will face. The intertextuality, in this context, can be seen in the way that political, social, and economic discourses converge to influence school reform. The resulting decisions make their way to the state and district levels. Public school principals, in many instances, are left to put into practice the results of these competing discourses.

Critical theory is a theoretical lens that seeks to critique and change society. Critical theory examines a topic or issue in such a way that looks at the process of emancipatory value. Creswell (2007) states that in critical theory the researcher examines the study of social institutions and their transformation through interpreting the meanings of social life; the historical problem of domination, alienation, and the social struggles that individuals face.

The narrative or the metanarrative examined here seeks to apply a critical analysis on the narrative presented. In this context, the deeper analysis reveals that role ambiguity and issues of identity emerge for the principal leader. The idea of an all-encompassing and consuming work life has inherent conflicts as the expectation is that principal leader at the school building is ultimately accountable for every aspect of educating, protecting, nurturing, and developing the academic and social lives of students. Role ambiguity and challenges with identity emerged in the discourse analysis. The reform policies that insist on stricter accountability measures for school/site based management, an emphasis on

parent and community stakeholder input, an examination of teaching and learning practices aligned with Common Core, and student data inspired evaluations for staff and principals have led to intense systemic initiatives that are primarily driven by the work of the principal. The fast paced and ever changing school environment demands agility, perseverance, and adaptability in the face of unpredictability. Caruso (2013) reminds us public school funding shortages, lack of public confidence in schools, staffing cuts, increased class sizes, new curricular goals, controversy with new educator evaluations and a host of social and economic factors mold the landscape and shape the experiences that school leaders face. These factors further impact role ambiguity and identity. Chapter five will interrogate these themes via a critical discourse analysis by applying the Boje and Dennehy deconstruction strategies to examine role ambiguity and identity.

Concluding Summary

This chapter sought to identify and offer analysis on key terms in both ISLLC Standards Five and Six that name the work life of the principal leader. The emphasis on these two standards was to demonstrate that the expectations and dispositions outlined are abstract, challenging to quantify, and highly subjective in nature. The ISLLC Standards serve as not only a documentation of professional expectations but as an evaluative tool to determine job performance effectiveness. The principal leader in this context must navigate workplace issues that move beyond curriculum, teaching, learning, and day-to-day management of school business. The requirement that principal leaders assume roles as social justice warriors, supporters of equity, and political figures adds a layer of complexity that in some instances produce stress, role conflict, and ambiguity. "When environmental demands exceed one's ability to meet those challenges, an individual

confronts a stressor. Structurally, the stressor represents a "gap" between what a person wishes to do and is able to do" (Lazarus and Folkman, 1984). Rizzo (1970) summarizes that a lack of clarity, lack of support, and a misalignment of work demands that clash with values, beliefs and motives contribute to the conflict that workers often feel. The demands on school leaders to shoulder responsibilities, make decisions in the best interest of children, and lead for social justice further illustrates that in many of our public schools the expectation is that the school setting and the school leader are responsible for not just every child but the whole child.

CHAPTER FIVE

CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

This chapter will interrogate the themes of *role ambiguity* and *identity* through a critical discourse analysis (CDA) as they emerged from the discourse analysis in the previous chapter. Fairclough (2003) writes that CDA examines the relationship between the text and the social world. He goes on to explain that CDA allows us to describe, interpret, and explain relationships between texts and social practices. The standards, as a powerful policy text, impact the way the educational leader is named and positioned in his/her role. The text is multi-discursive because of the levels of intertextuality that exist among the various education reform policies that evolved over the last fifty years. That is, many social and political narratives and social and political texts have shaped and influenced how these ISLLC Standards have come to be. The standards influences how educational leaders present themselves and enact their day-to-day work as leaders in an educational settings (Luke, 2013). A critical discourse analysis (CDA) of each theme will uncover struggles of role conflict and identity due to inherent ambiguities. Apple (1996) explains that CDA assumes language creates meaning and can thus be studied through a social context as individuals negotiate knowledge, relationships, and identity.

Studies in Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) have their roots in at least three "broad theoretical moves" (Luke, 2013, p. 8); the advent of psycholinguistics, work in socio-linguistics and the ethnography of communication, and poststructuralist analysis of social history and contemporary culture by Foucault (Luke 2013). The work of CDA attempts to examine texts and language to better understand truths, barriers, challenges, and questions within social and political institutions (Luke, 2013). Social institutions, like schools, are "constituted by discourse and discursive relations. Foucault's work

offers educators a fundamental shift in the way that they view educational texts and discourses" (p. 9). Hunter (2008) writes that the work of Foucault demonstrates how discourses on pedagogy are characterized by governmentality, surveillance, and moral regulation.

Fairclough and Wodak (1997) write that critical discourse analysis as a method of analyzing language examines the way in which discursive activities promote unequal power relations. "Critical discourse analysis should describe and explain how power abuse is enacted, reproduced or legitimated by the talk and text of dominant groups and institutions (van Dijk, 1996, p. 84). In the field of education the practices that engage students, teachers, staff, and administrators can be considered communicative events. These events are shaped over time and within multiple contexts. Education is influenced and impacted by social, political, economic and cultural events. Fairclough and Wodak (1997) write that educational practices are closely tied to practices that are socially defined and because there is that influence, the practices cannot be considered neutral but active and fluid. Drawing from the work of Apple (1993), in the field of education, there are myriad interests that impact and influence theory, research, curriculum, and general practices.

The ISLLC Standards as a key educational text that assists in defining the practices within a social institution, the school, allows for educational leaders to make sense of their roles, define their practice, and build their capacity as instructional leaders, manager, and supervisors. The endless multi-tasking and role shifting for educational leaders is the nature of the dynamic work that is influenced by the intertextuality of the texts. By using critical discourse analysis as the methodology for examining Standard

Five and Standard Six of the ISLLC Standards, I will seek to uncover the underlying issues of power and control over school leaders with regards to how they are evaluated in their positions and how the evaluation impacts their status as professionals, their career path, and their position within the school community. Fairclough (2003) writes that increasing consciousness of how language contributes to the domination of some people by others is a first step towards emancipation. Fairclough (1992) asserts that critical discourse analysis is also "three-dimensional" because it connects to discourses, locating them in a historical and social context, by which we refer to the particular actors, relationships, and practices.

The discourse of the ISLLC Standards are embedded in the discourse of school reform. Many discourses about education in general and education reform have been evolving for the last century. In 1965, the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* (ESEA) was passed and provided federal funds to help lower income students. This act influenced the formation of programs such as Title I and bilingual education. By 1983 the *Nation at Risk* report called for sweeping changes and urgent reform in public education and by 2000 the *Educate America Act/Goals 2000* required individual states to submit applications describing how they will create school improvement programs. By 2001, NCLB was approved as the reauthorization of ESEA, which put high stakes testing, and accountability measures at the center of school improvement. The urgent need for continued reform and improvement in public education was critical to the success or our social and economic well-being. *The Nation at Risk* played a pivotal role in highlighting the needs for continuous improvement and school leadership. The passing of NCLB, led to the 2008 refresh of the ISLLC Standards. This historical summary is important to

note, as these collective events, acts, and responses all contributed in some way to the need for ISLLC to be changed and/modified. The narrative on public education is a fluid and dynamic process. The influence of these actors and events has played a critical role at the federal, state, and local levels.

The CDA will be conducted using Boje and Dennehy's (1999) strategies for deconstructing discourses. Boje and Dennehy (1999) offer a strategy for unpacking discourses. "Deconstruction is a method to avoid exploitation. It is also a way to escape the unintentional exploitation of others" (p. 340). Drawing from the work or Wodak (1997), the purpose of CDA is to allow for analysis of themes such as relationships characterized by dominance, discrimination, and power imbalances. In terms of the ISLLC Standards and their application in the area of performance evaluation, there is ample opportunity for unintentional exploitation. The evaluator and the principal leader may disagree on the interpretations of events, facts, and contextual details. Blommaert and Bulcan (2000) referencing the work of Wodak write that "the way in which discourse is being represented, respoken, or rewritten sheds light on the emergence of new orders of discourse, struggles over normativity, attempts at control, and resistance against regimes of power" (p. 449). These ideas are closely aligned with the work of Foucault (1971) and his theories on discourse and power knowledge.

Summary

On the surface, the ISLLC Standards appear to delineate clearly the expectations for how these themes of role ambiguity and identity play out in the work life of the educational leader. However, there are many questions that persist about the alignment of what the standards dictate and what the job actually is on a day-to-day basis. Themes of

identity and role ambiguity emerge when a principal leader attempts to enact the role of the idealized educational leader. For example, when a principal leader is interested in making a personal and/or moral decision about an issue that conflicts with district or Board of Education policy, he/she can be regarded as practicing insubordination. Evaluating and standardizing behaviors of educators is an example of how state and local authorities draw the boundaries for what is deemed appropriate behavior. Educators live within those boundaries and govern themselves accordingly or not. In which case there is the potential for both reward and punishment. Compliance can lead to promotion while disregard for standards and policies that conflict with personal beliefs can lead to demotion or removal for a leadership role

This CDA will be used to interrogate the themes of identity and role ambiguity imposed by the discourse of ISLLC Standards Five and Six. The analysis will continue to also further examine the items that are most common to Standards Five and Six that reinforce role ambiguity and identity as they relate to performance evaluation. It is important to note that while CDA provides insight into a variety of themes that manifest in the national standards, this study does not consider the added functions or iterations of the standards that have been adapted at the state level.

The Themes of the Discourse of ISLLC Standards 5 and 6

The discourse analysis in chapter four revealed that two themes consistently emerged through the study of the select key terms in Standards Five and Six. The discourse analysis revealed that principal leaders (in the context of Standards Five and Six) must demonstrate competency in several dispositions that reflect leaders who are moral agents and political actors. Navigating these identities in various contexts on a

daily basis can lead the principal leader to experience role ambiguity. Identity and role ambiguity are the two themes that surfaced as a result of the discourse analysis.

Role Ambiguity. School leaders are expected to multitask. Kajs and McCollum (2010) write that the school leaders must "be able to respond to unexpected situations with timely decision making that addresses campus and community safety, school district policies and practices, as well as professional etiquette" (p.77). Human resources literature suggests that conflict and ambiguity, no matter the setting, have a profound impact on how employees perceive their own value and success within the organization that ultimately leads to their job satisfaction or potential "burnout". Role ambiguity is defined in terms of "(1) the predictability of the outcome or responses to one's behavior and (2) the existence or clarity of behavioral requirements, often in terms of inputs from the environment, which would serve to guide behavior and provide knowledge that the behavior is appropriate" (Rizzo, House, and Lirtzman, 1970, p. 155-156). Norton (1975) explains ambiguity exists when specific situations and/or circumstances can invite multiple interpretations, hold vague expectations, and offer incomplete information. Lindbergh (2014) writes the performance of the principal in his/her role, as the leader of the school is the critical factor for the success of the schools. Devos and Bouchchenooghe (2009) explain that decentralizing the role of the principal gave the school leader authority to expand his/her sphere of influence. In some of their studies they purport, "principals felt sandwiched between competing pressures when they try to simultaneously apply goal-setting theories and fulfill all the demands placed on them" (p. 521). Lindbergh comments on the complexities of the job that the principal faces:

> Given this reality, the question that arises is how principals respond to stakeholder demands in a shorter and longer perspective. There are several studies that show

> that the day-to-day activities of the principals are dominated by situations reminiscent of a fire brigade. However, even if principals must deal with many immediate matters, filling their schedules with more or less acute situations to be resolved, they must nonetheless have long-term strategies for maintaining high-quality education and competitive student performance. (p. 521)

Organizational stress can be viewed as a "perceived dynamic state involving uncertainty about something important" (Shuler, 1984, p.6). Role conflict and role ambiguity are two stressors in the work place that hinder productivity and lead to low morale. Khan (1964) defined role conflict as the simultaneous occurrence of two or more sets of demands such that compliance with one would make compliance with the other more difficult. Khan (1964) and Graen (1976) described role ambiguity as the degree to which information is lacking concerning the role expectations, methods for fulfilling role expectations, and the consequences of role performance.

Leithewood and Menzies (1998) found in their research on principal workload and priorities that school leaders spent more time on management and less time on instructional leadership. They also found that this disparity was a source of frustration as school leaders viewed themselves more as instructional leaders than managers. England's National Standards for Headteachers reflect many of the same professional practices as the ISLLC Standards. They too, Orchard (2002) argues, grapple with the same kinds of questions that look at how the standards align to the actual day-to-day experiences and the level of expertise of the educational leaders. Orchard (2002) writes that in England, the struggle with role ambiguity headteachers face parallels the experience of American public school leaders. The pressure to be all things to all people at any given time presents unique challenges. Orchard (2002) states that "the sheer range of demands seems daunting" [and that] "they must possess the ability to teach, to

organize, and implement the delivery of curriculum across the school; lead and manage a small-to-medium business organization; combine skills of a competent administrator with the pastoral sensitivity of a counselor or priest; to be publicly accountable for the school they lead" (p. 159). Thus, an educational leader is expected consistently perform duties in a manner that engenders trust, acceptance, and good will from staff, students, and community members.

Rizzo, House, and Lirtzman (1970) write about the "chain of command" and the "unity of command" principles inherent in large hierarchical organizations. The chain of command implies that there is a top to bottom flow of directives so that the employees are clear on expectations. The unity of command means that the employee understands to whom he/she is accountable and for what because the chain of command is clearly delineated. Role theory suggests that conflict arises when there is a violation in this paradigm. When the employee receives multiple directives coming from multiple sources with varied measures for accountability the dissonance causes role conflict, dissatisfaction, frustration, and can potentially lead to decreased organizational effectiveness (Rizzo, House, and Lirtzman, 1970). This role conflict born out of ambiguities can also lead to anxiety and burnout for the individual and cause him/her to perform poorly or leave the profession. Blau and Scott (1962) write that work stress in professional settings often emerge because employees feel caught in the middle of expectations coming from the top and the reality of what the employee is experiencing in the day-to-day work. School leaders, in their roles as managers, instructional leaders, politicians, and advocates for students, staff, and community find themselves navigating the complexities and expectations of these roles. The role can vary from day-to-day and

depending upon the level of experience that each school leader possesses the responses and decisions made can be varied as well making the overall work challenging and demanding. Grodzki (2011) writes about the importance of the socialization process that school leaders encounter as they inhabit their new roles. The new leader must quickly assess the norms, values, and culture of a given school community to effectively navigate and goal set for school improvement. A lack of proper orientation, coaching and mentoring by district offices can lead to what Grodzki calls "ineffective socialization". Drawing from the work of Ashforth and Sacks (1996) a lack of proper onboarding for new school leaders will lead to poor adjustment periods that will contribute to increased role ambiguity. Grodzki (2011) also notes new school leaders are heavily influenced by their organizational identities and the role expectations outlined for them by their superiors. Grodzki, in his research, went on to note that for some school leaders there can be a level of frustration when newer leaders struggle to fulfill district demands because emergent issues at the school building level created "competing expectations" (p. 16).

Identity. In identity theory (Tajfel and Turner, 1979) posit the "self is reflexive in that it can take itself as an object and can categorize, classify, or name itself in particular ways in relation to other social categories or classifications" (Stets and Burke, 2000, p. 224). Hogg and Abrams (1988) explain that because of the highly personalized nature of the way in which people perceive themselves and construct their realities, the categories people place themselves in exist "only in relation to other contrasting categories (for example black vs. white); each has more or less power, prestige, status,

and so on" (p. 225). Over the course of one's personal and professional life, each person will have belonged to a number of socially constructed categories and/or groups.

Schnurr and Zayts (2011) write about workplace identity and identity construction. Their research indicates that identity construction is characterized by "multiple and complex interactional processes" (p. 40). The workplace is a setting where employees enact various functions and roles that formulate specific identities. Tannen and Kendall (1997) study workplace identity as being a complex process influenced by context and having the ability to change over time. Identity construction is also described as being fluid and interactional as others can impose identities on others (Lytta, 2009). Identity construction is also influenced by positional power. Bucholtz and Hall (2005) write about the co-constructed identities that are influenced between leaders and the people they manage and lead. "In other words, identities are created in interactions through the interlocutors' practices and engagements-they are not simply a reflection of institutional roles and responsibilities but are the results of ongoing interactional negotiations (p. 43). Schurr and Zayts (2011) write that reference terms can be used to qualify identities such as "boss," "leader," and "manager." These reference terms connote roles that imply having positional power. Turner et al. (1987) explain:

> In social identity theory, identities also are considered in a relative way because different identities are organized in a hierarchy of inclusiveness. Three levels are generically involved: a superordinate level as "human," an intermediate level such as "American," and a subordinate level such as "southerner." The levels are floating and contextual, and depend on the salience of the difference classifications (p. 231)

The discourse analysis in the previous chapter offered metaphor as means of unpacking meaning for the role of the school leader. The metaphors of school leader as hero, visionary, and politician are present in ISLLC Standards Five and Six. The standards

identify dispositions and characteristics that embody the spirit of one who is a protector, an arbiter of morality, champion for children, omniscient, and politically savvy. While there is an implication that the school leader holds a tremendous amount of power and influence, however the school leader is limited by many factors beyond his/her control. The day-to-day administration, the influence of socio-economic factors, and the steady navigation of school reform policies all merge to add a layer of complexity and challenge to the leader's ability to make "correct" decisions that are transparent, in the best interest of everyone. Drawing from the work of Pfeffer (1977), school leaders also serve symbolic roles. "The symbolic role of leadership is more important than implied in such a description. The leader as a symbol provides a target for action when difficulties occur, serving as a scapegoat when thing go wrong" (p. 110).

Summary

School based leaders must manage a variety of tasks on a daily basis. Catano and Stronge (2006) refer to this type of experience as the juggling act. School leaders are expected to appease internal and external stakeholders. They must be responsive to demands from various constituents and problem solve in manner that is transparent and ethical. That process is also subject to scrutiny and commentary by many voices. Glidden (1999) writes that the contemporary principal is conflicted because the public demand for high student achievement is also weighed against the need to navigate social issues. School leaders contend with social issues such as drugs, violence, bullying, and other social-emotional issues inherent to diverse communities. The congruence can lead to unexpected ambiguities and challenges that contribute to the identity conflicts in the role of the principal.

Critical Discourse Analysis of Role Ambiguity and Identity in the School Leader Role

Boje and Dennehy (1999) pose the ideas of *duality search, reinterpret, rebel voices, other side of the story, deny the plot, find the exception,* and *state what is between the lines* as a CDA strategy for interrogating themes. The Boje and Dennehy strategies will be applied to the themes of *role ambiguity* and *identity* as they pertain to the school leader.

Duality Search. The school leader is socially constructed in his/her role. It has been established that the school leader wears many "hats" in that role and can experience a variety of situations that challenge his/her beliefs, values, and experience level. The school leader as an ethical leader is asked to create a vision for success based on what is in the best interest of all children. Morality and ethical behavior are not clearly defined in the standards and can be open to interpretation thus creating ambiguity in how those ideals are made manifest. Measuring success within this standard is also ambiguous as this can be a highly subjective endeavor. The standards are very specific and precise in the language and expectations of what the school leader should be doing in essence to rule out ambiguity in what the priorities should be for him/her. Given the various "roles" that a school leader must take on, these roles contradict one another. For example, leaders are to act ethically and fair, yet at the same time, they have to demonstrate academic achievement via standardized tests, thus have to ensure that all students make the mark regardless of the individual needs of the students or the "fairness" of the assessment. Principals must be instructional leaders, yet, many lament the fact that they are burdened by managerial tasks that preclude them for spending significant amounts of

time leading for instruction. The reality of the role is that ambiguities exist and persist in the school leader role.

As noted earlier principal preparation programs do not thoroughly prepare administrators for the complexities involved in navigating the political nature of the public school. The college and university departments of education have an obligation to more thoroughly prepare aspiring administrators for the political aspects of the job they are about to enter.

"Since public schools as organizations are open systems with constant interactions between the school community members, the micropolitics of education show how interpersonal relationships are structured in terms of rules, norms, lines of communication, and decision-making structures" (Caruso, 2013, p. 222). The principal as the head teacher and instructional leader is a foil for the political leader. For example, the instructional leader understands that smaller class sizes serve children better and promote more one-on-one opportunities for teachers to reach students. The political agent in this scenario however, must sell the idea that it is possible to keep quality instruction and quality interactions with larger class sizes. Parents and teachers may be vehemently opposed to directives that trickle down from the district office. The work of the school principal is to act as liaison between those constituencies. Caruso goes on to say "principals play a key role in facilitating new governance processes and structures with parents, superiors, colleagues, and teachers in their school settings" (p. 223). In the case of novice principals, Marshall (1985) writes there is a conflict and sense of being "torn" between what is aligned with their personal belief about what is appropriate for their schools and being loyal to goals and directives outlined by their superiors.

Reinterpret the Hierarchy. To combat the role conflict that arises out of ambiguous circumstances inherent in the role, having the standards acknowledge the complexities of the school leader role would be a step in the right direction. Additionally, Standard Five places the educational leader (for our purposes the school leader and/or principal) as having sole responsibility for safeguarding and promoting ideals such as equity and social justice. Integrating a more collaborative approach and documenting that the work of promoting social justice belongs to everyone in the schoolhouse would demonstrate a collective effort needed to ensure that student needs were being met. To r*einterpret the hierarchy*, it would also be important to acknowledge that school leaders are in different stages of their careers. Differentiating expectations and levels of expertise would acknowledge that skills in school leadership are honed over time and are shaped by specific experiences and in a variety of contexts. This acknowledgement could allay anxiety and fears for younger school leaders who may feel the pressure of decision making in new and unfamiliar circumstances. "Principals are performing balancing acts in order to respond effectively to the numerous demands of multiple constituencies" (Catano and Stronge, 2006, p. 223-224).

In this strategy, reinterpreting the hierarchy could establish several points of view. First, if principal preparation programs offered greater training in political skill building for aspiring leaders, the landscape may not be so daunting for principals. There needs to be greater discussion about the reality of the political nature embedded in the work life of the principal. Additionally, if Standard Six addressed ideas of shared governance and decision making this could alleviate some of the challenges with identity and role ambiguity. Blasé and Blasé (1999) write, "researchers have recognized the critical role

of shared-governance leadership by school principals in initiating, implementing, and sustaining viable forms of shared decision making at the school level" (p. 476). The idea of shared decision-making is a tool for gathering input, but in the end the voice of the principal (under the influence of the district office) will still hold the majority of the decision-making power. If principals were to really politically engage with parents and community in the way the standards suggest, the feedback and requests for improvement and action steps could be completely out of line with district requirements. One of the most obvious points of contention could possibly be standardized testing. If community dissent for standardized testing was acknowledged and accepted, there would be gaps in accountability measures, no teaching to the test activities, and less pressure on teachers and administrative teams to "perform" as certain data measures would no longer be applicable. A controversy such as bell times could impact the start and end times of schools in a given district. Communities could have different start and end times based on majority vote for their particular school. In this reinterpretation parents could have a greater voice and presence for making decisions impacting their children's education.

Rebel Voices. Standard Five does not clearly define what "integrity," "fairness," and "ethical manner" mean. A school leader is evaluated against meeting proficiency in these standards. His/her superior is evaluating the school leader. The *rebel voice* that needs to be analyzed further is that school leader who may believe that his/her experiences in a particular school are highly impacted by circumstances beyond his/her control. Disparities in socio-economic communities do contribute to the challenges faced by many school leaders. ISLLC, as a policy text, does not acknowledge the professional development and capacity building needed to develop skills to navigate intense social and

economic issues that may present themselves to school leaders. Educational leaders are asked to lead for equity and social justice. There are however no clear guidelines for what that looks like and how that will be measured. Yet, the educational leader is expected to define those terms for his/her school.

Understanding the rebel voices and finding the exception would mean that within the context of this standard there would be an opportunity for students, teachers, and parents to be considered in terms of how the policy impacts their experiences. The principal is evaluated on how effectively he/she implements, guides, sustains, and nurtures change. Lindle (1999) borrowing from the work of Litwak and Mayer (1974) and Lightfoot (1978), writes that school organization most impacts the lives of families and communities. Lindle goes on to suggest that for many families and/or community members the school house it the closest form of government that they interact with on a frequent basis. Parents act as advocates for their children, teachers advocate for their professional goals, and students for their access to instruction and resources within the school. Education reform and its implementation at the school level is a natural part of the principal's work. Lindle notes however the change that education reform engenders causes ambiguity in the school itself. Drawing from the work of Malen (1995), Lindle asserts, "change breeds ambiguity and the ambiguity provides opportunity for shifts in power structures of most schools" (p. 175). The complexity of how the shifts can impact the day-to-day experiences of all stakeholders must be taken into account. In this current structure, the principal is solely held responsible for how the political shifts (influenced by social, cultural, and economic factors) impact the experiences of teachers, students, staff, and community members. Is there a way that an assessment can be made about the

successful or unsuccessful implementation of a policy without placing the accountability squarely on the shoulders of the principal?

Other Side of the Story. To tell the *other side of the story,* one must examine how Standard Five, in particular, can more closely reflect the experiences of a school leader who is being asked to be "moral," and "ethical," and "fair." There may be instances when a school leader makes a decision that he/she feels is in the best interest of children and the school in general. The decision may be in direct conflict with what the district office would support. The decision may be in conflict with a policy or practice that is standard procedure. The school leader may take a stand for what he/she believes is best for the school and that particular community. Conflict may arise between the school leader and the central office. How will that school leader be supported or not supported for taking stand to promote his/her vision of what is "just," "fair," and "ethical?" Conflict over defining who is right or wrong in this scenario can manifest in a negative evaluation for the school leader. Catano and Stronge (2006) write that evaluation instruments outline the critical day-to-day job components of the school leader. Evaluations serve as tools of communication and documentation. "Written documentation sends a powerful message to principals that their job security and advancement potential are dependent on a judgment of their effectiveness in carrying out institutional goals" (p. 231). School leaders are aware that evaluations are used to measure their effectiveness in their roles. Additionally, the results of the evaluation determine the trajectory of the leader's career path. Compliance to policy and to district protocols may trump a school leader making a personal judgment call due to fear of reprisal for not following procedures. In other side of the story, the principal who is at the center of political practice. Lindle and

Mawwhinney (1999) borrowing from the work of Ball (1987) and Blase (1991), write "school leaders consistently frame their practice as political" (p. 3). Principals work to find and maintain balance as they control and manage their respective environments. As noted above, parents and community members who engage in a political process very likely do so at the school level. Principals are the agents that they have greatest access to for sounding off their discontent on issues and matters affecting their child-(ren). In this space, the principal because not only a representative for the school itself but a representative for whatever policy or reform effort at the heart of the issue. Active and vocal parent communities can sometimes pose a significant challenge to the principal. No matter what his/her personal thoughts are on the matter at hand, he/she must hold the party line and represent the stance of the school board. The other side of the story suggests that a principal speak his/her truth about a given situation. How can the principal leader move out of the middleman position and hold his/her own opinion about a given issue? What would happen if the parent(s) bypass(es) the principal and the idea of site based management completely and go directly to the district office with their complaints? Role clarity would suggest that principals could serve as an authority on matters of teaching and learning, problem-solve for the district office, and agenda set based on the needs of his/her own school. In this way the district office would be a more service oriented entity that provided support based on needs as identified from the school site up to the office as opposed to the other way around.

Deny the Plot. To *deny the plot* in reference to the ambiguity present in Standard Five means to reverse the rules. Rather than a focus on school leaders using their judgment to lead for equity and or promote social justice, the language can state that

school leaders will implement central office policies to every situation and use guidelines to make decisions approved solely by central office administrators. The accountability for morality and ethical leadership can shift to the central office removing the responsibility from the schoolhouse completely. This would reinforce that school leaders are agents for the district and have less control not more. Catano and Stronge (2006) posit "the complexity and lack of clarity surrounding the role of a principal make the formulation of appropriate performance assessment a daunting task" (p. 224). The complexities and ambiguities could dissolve is many of the decisions around ethics, integrity, and social justice were removed from schoolhouse level. In this newer structure, school leaders could put their energy in instructional leadership.

It may be worthwhile to remove this standard completely from the principal evaluation consideration. There are conditions and circumstances (political, social, and economic) present that go beyond the purview and control of the principal leader. Instead, the focus should be on plans that help to support, coach, and mentor principals in navigating complex political agenda items. So much of their success is dependent upon on how other stakeholders accept and integrate change into their practice and experiences. Evaluating a principal on this standard is difficult because the need for change and adapting to new policy needs time and adjustment is not accounted for in the language of ISLLC. Lindle (1999) referencing the work of Adler (1994) and Koppich (1994) writes that the lack of constituent voices in certain education policies intensify debates in schools that challenge principal leadership. This is especially true in school communities that rely heavily on social agencies to assist with food, clothing, and shelter. "When linked to schools, the competing interests of health and educational professionals

intensify the dimensions of debate" (Lindle, 1999, p. 176). Educators do not train as politicians even though there are political aspects to their work. The focus on teaching and learning is clouded by the political nature of this work. Supporting teachers and students to focus on academic achievement should be the focus of their work.

Find the Exception. To *find the exception* in this analysis means to consider the ambiguous nature of the standards as an evaluative tool. To interrogate the ambiguous nature of the role itself, could there be a proposal to have the school leader work with his/her evaluator to goal set based on what the actual work experience is and what the specific needs are for the school he/she serves. Together, they can identify strengths, limitations, and/or challenges that are specific to that school and/or community. This is not suggesting that accountability is lessened however; it is tailored and aligned with the reality of the job. Drawing from the work of Rosenblatt and Somech, Catano and Stronge (2006) question whether or not principals are evaluated against objective measures. There are inconsistencies on what comprises the role of the school principal thus making the evaluation process for their work a "challenging enterprise" (Catano and Stronge, 2006, p. 226). The learning that occurs for the leader is job embedded, informs practice, and is measured in way that can demonstrate impact that is specific to that school's context. Who can best determine the performance of a principal? Who has the better vantage point for the principal being an effective leader and/or manager? Is it the students, parents, teachers, district leaders, or the superintendent? The lack of quantitative measures and the existing ambiguities inherent in the role and already outlined in this paper may suggest that performance evaluation has becomes both unwieldly and meaningless.

State what is Between the Lines. To *state what is between the lines* in this analysis means to delve into the "story" of the school that the principal leader works in on a daily basis. The standards capture holistic qualities, dispositions, and expectations. What is missing is the identity of the school itself. An examination of who the students, teachers, and staff are and how they name their work in the context of the school improvement would be a vital part of the story. Greenfield (2004) writes that "schools are nested within containing community and societal cultures, and the norms and values of those larger social sphere's mediate and shape what transpires among people within the school; just as do sub-cultures within the school itself; just as our respective social class, religion, educational level, race family customs, and ethnicity" (p. 182). The highly personalized nature of this work lends itself to being reflective on the aspects that make each school community unique. Greenfield (2004) considers leadership to be characterized by social, historical, and cultural aspects. These aspects cannot be extracted from the "essential considerations" of moral leadership in schools (p. 190). Applying standardized expectations on a school can appear out of alignment if it conflicts with getting to the heart of the lived experience that the school leader cultivates with students, teachers, staff, and community members.

Johnson (2003) addresses the implications for the "world of practice" (p. 57). That is, what level of preparation do educators receive for navigating the complex and often ambiguous field of politics in education? In stating what is between the lines, the story not being told at present is the fundamental lack of clarity on how to judge and evaluate the political skill set of a principal. The assumption that he/she just knows that the work is political in nature is not enough. Johnson writes:

> Given the critical role played by education in society, have preparation programs been responsive to the requisite knowledge, skills, needs, and demands inherent in the leadership role? Have we identified all of the proverbial bases? What bases are we covering? What bases are we not covering? Are the bases that we are attempting to cover the most important ones? Although not entirely unknown, complete and satisfactory answers to these questions are elusive. The set of tensions examined above provide some insight as to why this is and will continue to be the case. What can be concluded with confidence is that the apolitical myth of education has long since disappeared. (Johnson, 2003, p. 58)

There also needs to be an acknowledgement that principals are not often included in the conversations about the policies that districts adapt and disseminate to their respective schools. District decisions that align to federal and state mandates make their way to the schoolhouse. Often, decisions have been made and negotiations have been completed. The principal then is expected to make the changes work at the school level. The standard states that principals will know and anticipate these trends. While this is the expectation, the story neglects at times to mention that the "decide and announce" district approach becomes the requirement for the school principal even if the decision conflicts with personal and professional values. The principals must rely on the networks they have built, their skill to sell and idea, and their ability to map and guide the change (Ryan, 2010).

Resituate. To *resituate* in this analysis, consideration and acknowledgement would have to be given to the how the complex nature of the princpalship cannot easily be captured in standardized statements. According to English (2003) that while the ISLLC may appear comprehensive there is missing content that should be considered. For example there is no suggestion and/or strategy to address "dealing with changing or reforming the current socio-political-economic structure which produces the inequities facing the schools" (p. 117).

There is also no practice of sustained critical reflection that would "engage and analyze the conceptual boundaries of system/organizational theories in which the standards are grounded and with it the organizational hierarchy in which it is embedded and dependent" (p. 117). The idea here is to ease the ambiguities that exist and fuel role conflict and challenge the identity of the principal. Finding the balance among their identities as moral leaders, instructional leaders, and managers can lead to stress, anxiety, and burnout for school leaders. In an effort to avoid conflict, to support school leaders, and to sustain careers there should be greater consideration given to how the standards are applied, how often they are applied, and to what extent they are used to penalize a leader.

To resituate this story would mean to acknowledge that ambiguity and challenges to the identity of the principal should be acknowledged in the context of ISLLC. Additionally, that quantifying and evaluating success can be challenging. Hoyle (1986) writes that many aspects of the work life within an organization are characterized by ambiguity. Wallace (2003) drawing from the work of Weick (2001) and March and Olsen (1976), asserts that educational organizations are also characterized by ambiguity and "opaqueness connected with internal decision-making" (p. 12). Public schools and public school principals cannot avoid the influence of education reform and required mandates and reporting structures. Wallace (2003) states that the certainty in this context is that ambiguity will be increased as school leaders are left to manage the complex changes. He goes on to write that ambiguous circumstances also "raise the potential for unintended consequences of managers' actions among stakeholders in different organizations across system levels" (p. 12). Limited control, limited awareness, and the

prevalence of contradictory beliefs and values held by stakeholders all contribute the ambiguity that is inherent in political change and policy regulations (Wallace, 2003). The acknowledgement of ambiguity as a natural part of the work of the principal needs to be included in the standards. Evaluating the success of these dispositions is highly subjective. It puts the principal in a position for intense scrutiny by his/her superiors.

Summary.

The objective reality, for each principal, is that student achievement is desired and legislated to be a priority. Achievement is primarily measured with standardized tests. Standardized tests do not measure students' levels of perceived self-worth or potential contribution to society, but then again high measures of principal's levels of professionalism may not correlate to high test scores for their students, particularly when the hands of principals are tied by policies and limited (and inequitable) resources that make true social justice and equity for students a lofty, but unreachable goal.

Every public school can be characterized by its own social climate, unique structure, culture, and subsystems (Iannaccone, 1991). These aspects converge to create the micropolitics of the school as well. In this context, the micropolitics of the school includes the various interactions among teachers, staff, students, and community members. The presences of competing value systems, needs, and goals create the environment that becomes the life of the school. Drawing from the work of Mawhinney (1999), Caruso (2013) writes that the decisions made by school leaders are highly political because those decisions empower some and possibly marginalize others. "Public school principals find themselves balancing penetrating macropolitical elements such as declining state public school funding, waning public confidence in schools, and

federal mandates to improve achievement" (Caruso, 2013, p. 219). There are multiple challenges then that principals face in terms of smaller staff, limited resources, larger class sizes, and scrutiny to be successful with fewer dollars (Boyd, 1983).

Winton and Pollock (2012), drawing from the work of Blase and Blase (2002), write about the political nature of the role of the principal. Principals tap into their political skills and knowledge to navigate many of the reform efforts that trickle down from the central office. These ideals that ground Standard Five intersect with Standard Six as well demonstrating how the intertextuality between the standards exist. Other politically sound skills that principals must employ include the ability to persuade, to formulate an argument, to provoke, to ask critical questions, and to sell ideas that he/she may not necessarily agree with but must support. One of the challenges identified in principal preparation programs according to Blasé and Blasé (2002) is that there is not adequate preparation for how to hone political skills. On the job training and trial and error seem to be the ways in which most principals learn how to garner political power (Crow & Weindling, 2010) leading to ambiguities and work pressure to know and understand how to be a political agent in the context of Standard Six. Caruso (2013) states that principals are expected to align themselves and work within the established processes and boundaries. The ISLLC standards help to draw the boundaries for the expected behaviors.

The themes of *ambiguity* and *identity* teased out in Standard Five are central to the conversation on how the complex role of the principal can be. There is a direct connection between how the presence of ambiguity can impact the way the principal sees himself/herself in the role. Drawing from the work of Blase and Blase (1998), Catano

and Stronge (2006) note principals interact with multiple stakeholders including; supervisors, teachers, parents, and students. Principals also aim to balance "competing needs of each of these constituencies by responding to problems and needs that are unpredictable" (p. 224). A paradigm that allows the school leader to have a voice in the evaluation process so that he/she can tell his/her school story could soften the lines of ambiguity and ease the work stress and potential burnout that comes with school crisis, human error, and an inability to control environmental factors that can impact the experience of the entire school community. The principal as a political leader is an unavoidable role that he/she must fulfill as he/she leads the school. The accountability for student success, implementation of policy, navigation of social issues, and coordination of efforts inside and outside the school make the role complex. Normore (2004) drawing from the work of Abramis (1994), Biddle (1979), and Campbell (1999) writes educational accountability must be aligned with clear purposes, intentions, roles, and expectations. The presence of role conflict, role expectations, role evolution, and role change all contribute to the ambiguity that leaders may face in their ever changing roles as school leaders. This is not to suggest less accountability or lower expectations for job performance. The recommendation is to have greater alignment between what the work actually is and what the evaluation can measure.

Concluding Summary

This chapter sought to further define the themes of ambiguity and identity as they pertain to the principal leader within the context of the ISLLC standards. Standards five and six have a connectedness to them as well. Both standards identify the principal leader as something other than an instructional leader. These standards identify the

principal as a moral and political agent responsible for the social and emotional well-being of students and staff. In this context the principal is not only a school leader but also, a community leader who represents the ideals and policies of the district office and therefore the state and national perspective as well. Successful implementation of policies, accountability for test scores, and responsibility for all day-to-day aspects of the ISLLC Standards outline the dispositions and characteristics needed to meet standard for successful evaluation.

Additionally, the standards that examine how individuals are guided, judged, and dominated by those evaluative tools that are disciplinary in nature. The ISLLC Standards are used to measure how well educators perform their duties and how well they invest in the achievement of student and the cultivation of a unified school community. ISLLC Standards serve as the blueprint for effective leaders and consequently effective schools. Their implementation and their use as a tool for assessing, labeling, sorting individuals make it a powerful text that can also create power imbalances between those who evaluate and those who are evaluated. The principal is formally subject to the panopticon of public opinion as well, which firmly establishes a hierarchical power structure that allows those with the greatest political power to ensure conformity to the continuance of a society of inequity of power and resources.

Chapter Six

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to present a critical discourse analysis (CDA) of the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards Five and Six. Through a critical discourse analysis, this study sought to examine the ISLLC Standards, a powerful text, in order to unpack themes that control and name the work like experiences of school based principal leaders. The foundational theorist for this research has been Michel Foucault. Foucault's work on hierarchical surveillance is presupposed in the ideas that networks of observations work from top to bottom, bottom to top, and also laterally (Foucault, 1977). The language embedded in the standards moves away from merely listing the competencies required for licensure (more than just a policy document) and into an evaluative mechanism that reinforces disciplinary practices, asymmetrical power relations, and role ambiguities educational leaders face by creating and sustaining disciplinary practices to develop docile bodies ensuring governmentality, thus legitimating a knowledge that reinforces power. School principals face challenges with ambiguities in their roles that challenge their multiple identities as instructional leaders, managers, moral champions, and political agents. Discipline, surveillance, and compliance with their superiors are at the heart of the ISLLC Standards and their application as evaluative tools.

Discipline

Embedded practices in education considered disciplinary in nature include norms and routines specific to site based management and supervision (Anderson and Grinberg, 1998). The development of "best practices" and the implementation of those practices as

standards for conducting day-to-day school leadership normalize the behaviors of school leaders at the school level. Drawing from the work of Callahan (1962), Anderson and Grinberg (1998) write that varied discourses in educational administration have roots in historical, political, cultural, and economic contexts. Callahan (1962) asserts that schools, like many organizations that fall under the influence of political and economic contexts are characterized by practices that seek efficiency and rationality. Foucault's work on the archeology (1972) of academic disciplines also focused on how social institutions like the school system seek to normalize behaviors in order to control "the collective behavior." The ISLLC Standards as a policy text that is implemented for the purpose of naming, normalizing, and assessing behaviors of school principals demonstrates a form of disciplinary practice. School principals fall under the "gaze" of the district office. "Throughout the 20th century, the growth and dispersion of administrative discourses in education solidified the categories of administrators and the administered, that is those who are ultimately defined by the administrative gaze" (Anderson and Grinberg, 1998, p. 332-333).

School leaders can be considered docile bodies as supervision and professional development seek to transform and improve their work and contributions to school leadership. School leaders adopt and enact the standards in their daily practice to ensure accountability and compliance to policy standards. Foucault (1972) writes that discipline is created out of the body that it controls. The ways in which education reforms outline steps, determine policies, create procedures, identify benchmarks, and demand accountability become the blueprint for how school leaders will define their work and align themselves to all the expectations in the same manner that soldiers would align

themselves to the military mission. Foucault (1972) considers many aspects of the field of education as "technical rationality." "As educational scholars focus on discrete fields of study such as educational administration, they engage in what Foucault calls dividing practices that fragment knowledge and promote a form of rationality that facilitates control" (Anderson and Grinberg, 1998, p. 335).

Foucault also wrote about the invisibility of disciplinary power and the impact that it had on those on whom it was being exercised. For educators constantly under the scrutiny of the authority of the supervisor, the invisibility of the disciplinary power is mentally ever present. The idea of evaluation and assessment to determine effectiveness and compliance reinforces a heightened state of anxiety for the individual who is expected to perform within the confines of the standards. Foucault wrote "In the space of domination, disciplinary power manifests its potency, essentially by arranging objects. The examination is, as it were, the ceremony of this objectification" (1978, p. 91).

Summary

For school based administrators, the pressure is high to lead for performance goals that meet the expectations of the reform policies. The accountability factors are rigid and in place and render the work they do as highly visible. Scores are made public, in some instances evaluations are made public, and labels are applied to name, sort, and classify students, teachers, administrators, and the school community overall. Foucault believed that "power has to be able to gain access to the bodies of individuals, to their acts, attitudes, and modes of everyday behavior" (1980: 125). The heavy reliance on data to measure test scores, teacher efficacy, and administrative leadership changes the nature of the work at the school level. "The relationship with data is codified and ranked in

terms of synthesizing, coordinating, innovating, analyzing, computing, compiling, copying, and comparing.

The performance functions assigned to the principal under the ISLLC Standards seek uniformity and efficiency (English, 2003). When considering the ISLLC Standards, one cannot just consider the language that makes up the standard, but that holistically these standards come alive in the form of an evaluative tool. "The strategy to locate individuals in discursive spaces is a way to understand and make problematic the classificatory criteria through which individuals are to be disciplined and self-regulated" (Popkewitz and Brennan, 1998, p. 13). These techniques elaborate the construct "job" through the concept of job skills. Activities are created and serially ordered" (Townly, 1993, p. 522). The ISLLC Standards and their application for licensing, credentialing, and evaluating school leaders has become the framework for sorting and labeling and reinforcing disciplinary practices.

Governmentality

Doherty (2007) writes that critical analysis of government policies is essential for the practices of being able to "unmask or decode the ideological dimensions, values, and assumptions of public policy" (p. 194). It is virtually impossible to name an aspect of life that does not have a direct or indirect relationship with the governmental policies. Education policy in the United States has a long history of setting the stage for how public schools and agents in public schools across the nation will "fix" themselves to be in compliance with mandates and regulations deemed necessary at the federal and local level. This type of policy production is heavily influenced by social, political, and economic factors and is now "cast in molds that reflect this 'new complexity' in the

policymaking climate, a complexity comprised of the interrelation between the supranational, the nation state, and the regional" (p. 194). Li (2007) writes that Foucault's idea of governmentality is also about "corrective interventions" (p. 276). Understanding the role of governmentality is critical for making the connections to the role of the school leader and to the *ISLLC Standards*. ISLLC Standards are in place in order to offer licensure for school leaders and to ensure compliance in the day-to-day work. The ISLLC Standards exercise a form of power as they are used to measure people.

Lemke (2002) writes for Foucault the idea of governmentality is not just about state sanctioned codes of conduct, but how those codes of conduct influence the way people govern themselves and others. The ISLLC Standards set the course for how principals will govern themselves in their roles as school leaders, school heroes, and school politicians. Despite the varied roles, ambiguities, and site based challenges, the standards guide their behaviors and name their work. Kim (2010) borrowing from the work of Perryman (2006) writes that ideas of accountability in the educational setting seek to normalize schools and the professional at the school. She goes on to all these notions "panoptic performativity" and "regulated autonomy" (p, 68).

While school principals are evaluated and assessed by district leaders, the principals are still aware that the standards serve to literally document and control their daily practice. Additionally, the documentation manifested in the professional evaluation may impact their ability to continue in their roles and may impact their opportunities for future promotion. The intense emphasis on normalizing school leaders in their behaviors can manifest in school leaders transferring that same approach to their interactions with

teachers. The spillover effect of this according to Popham (2005), is an intense focus on test-based policy is more concerned with compliance that what is best for teachers and students (teaching and learning). The pressure of being in compliance with all policies that are in place can lead to leadership that focuses on repetitive practice, "drill and kill", and a lack of creativity in leadership, in teaching, and in learning opportunities for students.

The text itself is a powerful tool representing the philosophies and ideologies. English (2003) wrote ISLLC agenda "has been carved out of consensual political agendas" (p.113). English compares the numerous political agencies involved in the construction of ISLLC as units that seek to control and implement processes to ensure compliance and efficiency. There are also components of the ISLLC Standards as a policy text that are challenging to assess and quantify. The aspects of the standards five and six that speak to evaluating and critiquing the efficacy of the work of the principal are challenging. Louden and Wildey (1996) write that the standards do not adequately state, for example, "the extent to which principals would need to demonstrate the disposition toward believing in the educability of all." There is a lack of discussion on what would be good, average, or poor. The standards may be place to clarify and identify, but there are ambiguities inherent in the standards due to interpretation and their application. Who is being observed and by whom and in what context matters in the discussion.

Summary

Thus, the government has the responsibility of designing the processes, regulating the implementation of the work, assessing the work, and distributing the money and resources to the state and/or local agents who comply and work within the parameters of

what is acceptable. At the micro level of implementation, of arrangements, of techniques, all kinds of practices (administrative, bureaucratic, monitoring, auditing, training, performance managing) are enacted. Discourses, rationales, and forms of knowledge support these socially mediated arrangements. (Doherty, 2007, p. 201).

Foucault called this form of governmentality the practice of others becoming "useful, docile, practical citizens (Foucault, 1988). The oversight of individuals within an evaluation system can be examined through Foucault's concepts of surveillance, which means that individuals are monitored in order to either regulate or dictate their behavior in the workplace. The system of surveillance as a monitoring tool and as a means of producing knowledge is a byproduct of some of the requirements that governmental policies and procedures demand to ensure compliance and correct behavior.

Power/Knowledge

Policy documents, such as this, are presented as aids for standardization of expectations in order to facilitate growth and progress, but the standards included suggest the end result should facilitate more effective application of power over the bodies by regulating "even the smallest details of everyday life." The policy implies the value of social justice and equity, but restricts this value by incorporating a gaze that is meant to find and judge the "abnormal." "We must cease once and for all to describe the effects of power in negative terms: it 'excludes', it 'represses', it 'censors', it 'abstracts', it 'masks', it 'conceals'. In fact power produces; it produces reality; it produces domains of objects and rituals of truth. The individual and the knowledge that may be gained of him belong to this production" (Foucault 1991, p. 194).

The ISLLC Standards represent specific areas of power knowledge and competencies. A select group of members representing multiple government agencies and education reform agendas prescribed the ideals that constitute and effective school leader. Colleges and universities and testing agencies adopted these standards and thus offer credentials and accreditation to individuals who successfully understand and enact these qualities. Educators who pass licensure examinations demonstrate they have successfully completed and understood what the standards are and how to enact them successfully in the day-to-day running of a school. The knowledge education leaders (district level and/or school level) have gained legitimizes their authority.

Kogan (2005) writes that power and authority are inextricably linked. He asserts, "the power of knowledge may indeed become authority, which we can take to be an institutional sub-set of power" (p. 11). In terms of the ISLLC Standards, there is inherent power embedded in the academic disciplines that it seeks to enforce. There is specialized knowledge that school leaders gain through their principal preparatory graduate programs and licensure examinations. These credentials empower school leaders and further set them apart from those who do not hold the credential or who do not have the advanced degree. "Those not empowered by specialized knowledge are excluded. Those within the peer group who gain authority by their participation in the knowledge. In that sense, power is both a meaning shared within the group and an exclusive and esoteric meaning as far as those outside the group are concerned" (p. 12).

Principals who are measured by the ISLLC Standards can be categorized as meeting or not meeting standard based on a series of evaluations. Recently, reforms in evaluation systems overall have included measures for teacher and principal effectiveness

based on student scores. Gilles (2007) refers to the vertical model of responsibility and accountability. Townley (1993) concluded that relationship with data construct the "job", make workers visible, and create activities that are serially ordered and easy to see and judge. The concept of gaze implies that documentation and information is being gathered in an effort to critique, to judge, and to assess.

Foucault wrote that individuals could become involved in power relationships "in the fabric of our social systems and organizations" (1982, p. 793). These power relations that grow within and around school organizations are fostered by larger (federal and state) and smaller (local) entities that converge to make certain that the school organization and its members are operating in a manner that is aligned with public expectations. School leaders are constantly monitoring their behaviors and submitting artifact of proof for compliance to local and state offices. For example, school leaders collect data for review, monitor and submit school improvement plans, and submit teacher and assistant principal evaluations to the district offices for review. District offices in turn submit their required paperwork to the state and the state to the federal level. One of the dangers of the misuse of ISLLC and the application to evaluation is that in occurrences where district leaders want to limit or stifle one's progress, there is enough ambiguity in Standards 5 and 6 to penalize someone for a lack skill. The removal of a principal can be easily supported by the failure to meet proficiency in Standards 5 and 6. Conversely, those same ambiguities can reinforce the difficulties in identifying proficiency, and thus elevate someone's career because a proper measurement is lacking. The one who is evaluating the principal ultimately makes the decision through a series of school visits and observations all based on personal interaction and anecdotal feedback.

Summary

At the school level, the school leader is a target within the gaze. Educational leaders serve as the implementers of the school reform mandates. It is a daunting task to be "beholden to multiple political interests" and to "beholden to parents, teachers, community leaders, activists, and residents of local neighborhoods" (Hoy, 2001, p. 11). This dilemma speaks to the role ambiguities that school leaders face as they navigate the liminal space of being in charge and not being in charge-of having power and not having power.

The ISLLC standards contribute and reinforce ideas of power, identity and role ambiguity. The practice of evaluating principals reinforces hierarchies in the school organization and creates dynamics that may be perceived as being unfair, lacking in objectivity, and a fundamental lacking of understanding of the school's context. English (2003) notes that one of the consultants who contributed to the authorship of the ISLLC standards stated "we consciously decided, therefore, not to have the standards attend to every function and aspect of the leader's job. We privileged those dimensions that focused on shaping and directing the core technology" (Murphy, Yff, and Shipman, 2000, p. 13). Maxcey (1994) writes that the documentation that is kept (the bureaucratic record keeping) serves as a control mechanism because it is powered by surveillance of normalized and sanctioned school activities. The compilation of documentation is a power move for those district supervisors who collect and sort data on the principals they manage and/or supervise.

Implications on Policy Research

Future research to build upon the work of this study could include a comprehensive study of how ISLLC has been integrated into the evaluation systems of school districts around the country. There should be interviews and/or focus groups that highlight the experiences of principal leaders as they are evaluated against the standards (with particular emphasis on standards five and six). A critical discourse analysis of actual principal evaluations could be beneficial to further understanding the impact of this tool on the lived experience of the principal. It would also be beneficial to learn how evaluators perceive their roles as offering critique of job performance. An analysis of how leaders interpret and assess leadership qualities should have a focus on job embedded professional learning and development.

There also needs to be research and consideration given to differentiating ISLLC as an evaluative tool. A new principal leader and a veteran principal leader are evaluated and assessed on the same standards. Differentiated and/or modified expectations for the first few years of his/her tenure could be implemented. This is not to suggest that accountability factors are compromised. Kim (2010) writes

> In general, the control mechanisms of professionals are dependent on professional ethics and peer review in that professionals hold the professional expertise and practical experiences of subject knowledge, instructional know-how, and curriculum practice through long-term careers and in-service training. In this vein, the objectives and performance styles of school organizations should be decided by the educators. (p. 82)

Providing principal leaders with authentic feedback that informs their practice and builds their capacity to lead and to possess "instructional autonomy" is critical. Personal reflection on performance is an idea that Kim (2010) supports. The idea that principal leaders can engage in a level of "self-gaze" that moves away from norming practices

supported by surveillance can lead to improvements in the overall evaluation process. Drawing from the work of Guba and Lincoln (1989), Kim asserts that mutual mentoring and coaching are much more effective that rote evaluation. Schools organizations are characterized by complexities inherent in the school. Ranson (2003) states that a collective learning process is valuable in the evaluation of school leaders because it takes in to account the varied "meanings, purposes, perspectives, and practices of the school organization" (p. 83).

Summary

Part of the professional learning around evaluation in a school district should focus on:

- Providing differentiated feedback for novice and veteran principals
- Providing opportunities for evaluators to discuss how they communicate expectations to principals, how they gather data points, how they construct their responses, how they present their data, and how they goal set with the principals leader
- Providing opportunities for all school leaders to have professional conversations about the standards in their respective districts
- Demystifying the process of evaluation and accountability expectations by clearly communicating district goals what have clear measurable outcomes

Final Thoughts

Education policies are geared towards identifying systemic issues and/or problems and proposing solutions to challenges that ultimately seek to improve the experiences those students will have in their respective schools. Education policy is purposeful, directed towards a problem, need, or aspiration, specifying principles and actions designed to

bring about desired goals (Doherty, 2007). Educators who are measured by the ISLLC Standards can be categorized as meeting or not meeting standard based on a series of evaluations. Gillies (2007) refers to the vertical model of responsibility and accountability. Townley (1993) concludes that relationship with data construct the "job", make workers visible, and create activities that are serially ordered and easy to see and judge. The concept of gaze implies that documentation and information is being gathered in an effort to critique, to judge, and to assess.

There is value in workplace colleagues having professional conversations about leadership practice, expectations for job performance, and accountability for professionalism. There are certain acknowledgements that this study sought to bring to light in terms of evaluation and the ISLLC Standards. First, the ISLLC Standards should not be applied as a form of punishment but as an opportunity for discussion about the complex nature of the role of the principal. Second, if standards fail to account for specific school context and history, it is the responsibility of both the evaluator and the one being evaluated to acknowledge that the context matters and that context could potentially influence the outcomes of the evaluation. Third, the collaborative approach to implementing the evaluation so that both parties are creating the "story" together. The standards provide a solid framework for what an effective school leader should know and be able do. The standards can map an administrator's journey of professional success, but there must be acknowledgment and understanding between those who evaluate and those who are evaluated. The school leader grapples with the role of middle manager, instructional leader, moral leader, ethical leader and political leader. The scrutiny applied to these educators via this system of evaluation can be intense. The principal leader

being evaluated should have every opportunity to demonstrate his/her sills and should have the opportunity and confidence that he/she can share the need for support and/or coaching without fear of reprisal.

References

Adler, L. (1994). *The politics of linking schools and social services,* Philadelphia, PA: Falmer Press.

Anderson, G. L. (2001). Disciplining leaders: A critical discourse analysis of the ISLLC national examination and performance standards in educational administration. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 4*(3), 199-216.

Apple, M.W. (1996). Power meaning and identity: Critical sociology of education in the United States. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 17*(2), 125-144.

Armstrong, D. (2009). *Administrative passages: Navigating the transition from teacher to assistant principal*. Ontario: Springer

Aspiazu, G., Bauer, S.C., & Spillett, M.D. (1998). Improving the academic performance of Hispanic youth: A community education model. *Bilingual Research Journal, 22*(2), 103-123.

Auerbach, S. (2009). Walking the walk: Portraits in leadership for family engagement in urban schools. *School Community Journal, 19*(1), 9-31.

Babo, G. (2010). The ISLLC Standards: Footprints and principal evaluation: A national study of school superintendents. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation, 5*(1).

Bachrach, S.B., Bamberger, P, & Conley, S. (1991). Work-home conflict among nurses and engineers: Mediating the impact of role stress on burnout and satisfaction at work. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 12*(1), 39-53.

Bacchi, C. (2000). Policy as discourse: What does it mean? Where does it get us? *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*. 21(1) 45-57.

Barker, J.R. & Cheney, G.(1994). The concepts and the practices of discipline in contemporary organizational life. *Communication Monograph, 61*, 19-43.

Bateson, G. (1954). *A theory of play and fantasy: Steps to an ecology of the mind*, New York: Ballantine.

Beck, L.G. (1994). *Reclaiming educational administration as a caring profession*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Beck, L.G. & Murphy, J. (1993). *Understanding the principalship: Metaphorical themes, 1920s-1990s*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Behrman, D., Bigoness, W. & Perreault, W., (1981). Sources of job related ambiguity and their consequences upon salespersons' job satisfaction and performance. *Management Science 27*(11), 1246-1260.

Blase, J.J. (1986). Socialization as humanization: One side of becoming a teacher. *Sociology of Education. 59*(2), 235-256.

Blase, J.J. & Anderson, G. (1995). *The micropolitics of educational leadership: From control to empowerment*. London, England: Casell.

Blase, J. & Blase, J. (2002a). The dark side of leadership: teacher perspectives of principal maltreatment. *Educational Administration Quarterly*. 38(5), 671-727.

Blau, P. & Scott, W. (1962). *Formal organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Chandler.

Blommaert, J. (2000). Critical discourse analysis. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 29*, 447-466.

Boje, D. M., Oswick, C., & Ford, J. D. (2004). Language and organization: The doing of

discourse. *Academy of Management Review*, *29*(4), 571-577.

Boje, D.M. & Dennehy, R.F. (1999). *Managing in the postmodern world: America's revolution against exploitation*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt Publishing. Retrieved from http://business.nmsu.edu/~dboje/mpwchap2.html#deconstruction

Boleman, L. G. & Deal, T. E. (2008). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice and leadership (Fourth Edition)*. San Francisco: Josey-Bass Inc.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Harvard University Press.

Bowen, D.E. & Lawler, E.E. (1992). Total quality-oriented human resources management. *Organizational Dynamics*, *20*(4), 29-41.

Boyan, N.J. (1963). Common and specialized learning for administrators and supervisors: Some problems and issues. In D.J Leu and H.C. Rudman (eds.) *Preparation Programs for Administrators: Common and specialized learning*, (pp. 1-23), East Lansing: Michigan State University.

Bredeson, P. (1993). Letting go of outlived professional identities: A study of role transition and role strain for principals in restructured schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *29*(1), 34-68.

Bredeson, P.V. (1985). An analysis of metaphorical perspectives on school principals. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *21*(1), 29-50.

Bredeson, P.V. (1989). Redefining leadership and the roles of school principals: Responses to changes in the professional work life of teachers. *High School Journal*. *73*(1), 9-20.

Brennan, A., & Brennan, D. (1988). The principal, ethics and special education decisions. *NASSP Bulletin*, *72*(16), 16-19.

Bucholtz, M. and Hall, K. 2005. Identity and interaction: A sociocultural linguistic approach. *Discourse Studies, 7*(4-5), 585-614.

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

Bustamante, R.M., Nelson, J.A. & Onwuegbuzie, A.J. (2009). Assessing schoolwide cultural competence: Implications for school leadership preparation. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 45*(5), 793-827.

Calabrese, R. (1988). Effective assistant principals: What do they do? *NAASP Bulletin*. *75*(533), 51-57.

Calabrese, R., & Tucker-Ladd, P. (1991). The principal and the assistant principal: A mentoring relationship. *NAASP Bulletin, 75*(533), 67-85.

Callahan, R. (1962). *Education and the cult of efficiency*. Chicogo, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Cambron-McCabe, N., & McCarthy, M.M.. (2005). Educating school leaders for social justice. *Educational Policy,* 19(1), 201-222.

Canole, M,. & Young, M. (2013). Standards for educational leaders: an analysis. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.

Catano, Nancy, and James H. Stronge. 2006. What are principals expected to do? congruence between principal evaluation and performance standards. *NASSP Bulletin 90*(3), 221-237.

Caruso, L. F. (2013). The micropolitics of educational change experienced by novice public middle school principals. *NASSP Bulletin. 97*(3), 218-252.

Casile, M. & Davis-Blake, A. (2002). When accreditation standards change: Factors

affecting differential responsiveness of public and private organizations. *Research in Higher Education, 45*(1), 180-195.

Cherryholmes, C. (1988). *Power and criticism: Poststructural investigations in education.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Chouliaraki, L., & Fairclough, N. (1999). *Discourse in late modernity: Rethinking critical discourse analysis*. Edinburgh University Press.

Condon, C., and Clifford, M. (2010). Measuring principal performance: How rigorous are commonly used principal performance assessment instruments? Naperville, IL: Learning Point Associates. http://www.betterhighschools.org/MidwestSIG/documents/Handout_QSL Brief.pdf

Copland, M.A. (2003). Leadership of inquiry: Building and sustaining capacity for school improvement. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 375-395.

Cosner, S. (2009). Building an organizational capacity through trust. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 45*, 248-291.

Council of Chief State School Officers. (2007). Educational leadership policy standards: ISLLC. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.

Derrington, M. L., Starratt, G., & Spokane, W. A. (2008). Evaluation of school principals using interstate school leaders licensure consortium (ISLLC) standards. *Journal of Scholarship & Practice*, *5*(3), 20-29.

Devos, G. & Bouchchengooghe, D. (2009). An explanatory study on principals' conceptions about their roles as school leaders. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 8*(2), 173-196.

Ditz, G. & Frank, A. (1959). Goal ambiguity and conflicting standards: Approach to the study of organizations. *Human Organization 17,* 8-13.

Doherty, R. (2007). Critically framing education policy: Foucault, discourse and governmentality. In: Peters, M.A. and Besley, T. (eds.) *Why Foucault? New Directions in Educational Research.* Peter Lang, New York, 193-203.

Eldersveld, S.J. (1989). *Political elites in modern societies.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

English, F. W. (2002). Pssssst! What does one call a set of non-empirical beliefs required to be accepted on faith and enforced by authority?[Answer: a religion, aka the ISLLC Standards]. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, *3*(2), 159-167.

English, F.W. (2003). *The postmodern challenge to the theory and practice of educational administration.* Springfield: Charles C. Thomas

English, F. W. (2012). Bourdieu's misrecognition: why educational leadership standards will not reform schools or leadership. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, *44*(2), 155-170.

Fairclough, N. (2001). *Critical discourse analysis. How to analyze talk in institutional settings: A casebook of methods.* London: Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (2012). Critical discourse analysis. International Advances in Engineering and Technology, *7*, 452-487

Fairclough, N. (1993). Critical discourse analysis and the marketization of public

discourse: The universities. *Discourse & Society, 4*(2), 133-168.

Fairclough, N. (1992). Discourse and text: Linguistic and intertextual analysis within discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society, 3*(2), 193-217.

Fairclough, N., Mulderrig, J., & Wodak, R. (2011). Critical discourse analysis in T. Van Dijk (Ed.) *Discourse studies, A multidisciplinary introduction.* (2nd ed., pp. 357-379). London: Sage.

Fiore, D. J. (2009). Introduction to educational administration: Standards, theories, and practice. Larchmont, NY: Eye On Education.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. (Translated from the French by Alan Sheridan, 1977). New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge and the discourse on language*. (Translated from the French by A.M. Sheridan Smith). New York, NY: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1970). *The order of things: An archaeology of the human sciences*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Freidson, E. (1984). The changing nature of professional control. *Annual Review of Sociology, 10*(1) 19-39.

French, W.L. & Bell, C.H. (1973). *Organization Development: Behavioral Science Interventions for Organization Improvement,6th Edition,* Homewood, Ill: BPI/Irwin.

Frick, W. C. (2011). Practicing a professional ethic: Leading for students' best interests. *American Journal of Education, 117*(4), 527.

Fuchs, H. (1995). *Professional development of elementary school principals*. Iyounim Beminhal Veirgun Hahinuch *20*: 109-139.

Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change*. San Francisco: Josesey: Bass.

Fullan, M. (2003). *The moral imperative of school leadership*. Thousand Oakes, CA: Corwin Press and Ontario Principals Council.

Gaziel, H. (2003). Images of leadership and their effect upon school principal's performance. *International Review of Education*, *49*(5), 475-486.

Gee, J. P. (1999). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Gee, J. P., & Green, J. L. (1998). Discourse analysis, learning, and social practice: A methodological study. *Review of Research in Education*, *23*, 119-169.

Gewirtz, S. (2002). The managerial school: Post-welfarism and social justice in education. London: Routledge

Gilburt, S. (1957). On being an assistant principal. *The Clearing House, 31*(7), 423.

Gilles, D. (2013). *Educational leadership and Michel Foucault.* London: Routledge.

Glanz, J. (1994). Where did the assistant principalship begin? An overview of the frustrations, rewards. *NAASP Bulletin,* 8087-98.

Glanz, J. (1994). Where is the assistant principalship headed? *NAASP Bulletin, 78*(564), 35. Retrieved from Academic Search Premier database.

Glassman, N.S. & Heck, R.H. (1992). The changing leadership role of the principal: Implications for principal assessment. *Peabody Journal of Education*, *68*(1), 5-24.

Glidden, H. (1999). *Making standards matter: Executive summary.* Policy brief.

Washington, DC: American Federation of Teachers, Educational Issues Department. https://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=Making+standards+matter+policy+brief&hl=en&as_sdt=0&as_vis=1&oi=scholart&sa=X&ved=0CBsQgQMwAGoVChMI9_mXscWwxwIVBXA-Ch35YAeR

Goffman, E. (1981). Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience. *Contemporary Sociology, 10*(1), 60-68.

Goldring, E., Huff, J., May, H., & Camburn, E. (2008). School context and individual characteristics: what influences principal practice? *Journal of Educational Administration, 46*(3), 332-352.

Goldring, E., Porter, A., Murphy, J., Elliott, S. N., & Cravens, X. (2009). Assessing learning-centered leadership: Connections to research, professional standards, and current practices. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 8*(1), 1-36.

Gorton, R.A. & Kettman, B. (1985). The assistant principal: An underused asset. *Principal*, (65)2, 36-39.

Graen, G., Dansereau, F. Minami, T. & Cashman, J. (1973). Leadership behaviors as cues to performance evaluation. *The Academy of Management Journal 16*(4), 611-623.

Graham, L. J. (2011). The product of text and "other" statements: Discourse analysis and the critical use of Foucault. *Educational Philosophy & Theory*, *43*(6), 663-674.

Greenburg, J., & Baron, R. (1997). Behavior in organizations. New York: Prentice Hall.

Greenfield, W. (1985). Studies of the assistant principalship: Toward new avenues of inquiry. *Education and Urban Society, 18*(1), 7-27.

Greenleaf, R. (1970). *The servant as leader*. Indianapolis: The Robert K. Greenleaf Center.

Gunter, H. M. (2008). Modernisation and the field of educational administration. *Journal of Educational Administration and History, 40*(2), 161-172.

Gunter, H., & Ribbins, P. (2003). The field of educational leadership: Studying maps and mapping studies. *British Journal of Educational Studies. 51*(3): 254-281.

Hanson, K. L. & Interstate School Leadership Licensure Consortium. (2009). *A casebook for school leaders: Linking the ISLLC Standards to effective practice* (3rd ed.) Upper Saddle River, NJ*:* Pearson/Merrill/Prentice Hall.

Hart, A.W. (1992). The social and organizational influence of principals: Evaluating principals in context. *Peabody Journal of Education, 63*(1) 37-57.

Hart, A.W., & Bredeson, P.V. (1996). *The principalship: A theory of professional learning and practice*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hitt, D. H., Tucker, P. D., & Young, M. D. (2012). The professional pipeline for educational leadership: a white paper developed to inform the work of the national policy board for educational administration. *University Council for Educational Administration.* http://npbea.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/06/ProfessionalPipelineWhitePaper.pdf

Huff, J. (2006). Measuring a leaders practice: Past efforts and present opportunities to capture what educational leaders do. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the *American Education Research Association*, San Francisco, CA.

Holland, D., William, J., Skinner, D., & Cain, C. (2001). *Identity and agency in cultural worlds*. http://www.unc.edu/~healdric/soci380/2001/Readings/Holland.pdf

Hooyman, N. and Kaplan, J. (1976). New roles for professional women: Skills in change. *Public Administration Review 36* (4), 374-378.

House, R. & Rizzo, J. (1978). Role conflict and ambiguity as critical variables in a model of organizational behaviour. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 7*, 467-505.

Hoy, Wayne K., and Scott R. Sweetland. 2001. Designing better schools: The meaning and measure of enabling school structures. *Educational Administration Quarterly 37*(3), 296-321.

Hoyle, Eric, and Mike Wallace. 2014. Organisational studies in an era of educational reform. *Journal of Educational Administration and History 46*(3), 244-269.

Iannacone, L. (1991). Micropolitics of education: What and why. *Education and Urban Society, 23*(4), 465-471.

Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (2008)

Jager, S. (2001). Discourse and knowledge: Theoretical and methodological aspects of critical discourse and dispositive analysis in R. Wodak and M. Meyer (eds.) , *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis,* London: SAGE.

Johnson, T. (1972). *Professions of power*. MacMillan Education LTD: London.

Johnson,J., and Cynthia L. Uline. 2005. Preparing educational leaders to close achievement gaps. *Theory into Practice, 44*(1), 45-52.

Kajs, L.T. & McCollum, D.L. (2010). Dealing with ambiguity: Assessment of tolerance for ambiguity in the context of school leadership. *Academy of Educational*

Leadership Journal, 14, 77-91.

Kaestle, C.F. (2001). School: *The story of American public education*. Beacon Press.

Kathryn, B. M., & Scheurich, J. J. (2004). Equity traps: A useful construct for preparing principals to lead schools that are successful with racially diverse students. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 40*(5), 601-632.

Koppich, J. (1994). The politics of policy making for children in Adler, L. & Gardner, S. (eds) *The politics of linking schools and social services,* Philadelphia, PA: Falmer Press.

Kouzes, J.M. & Posner, B.Z. (1995). *The leadership challenge: How to keep getting extraordinary things done in organizations* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Josey-Bass.

Kowalski, T.J. & Reitzug, U.C. (1993). *Contemporary school administration: An introduction. New York*: Longmans.

Kowalski, T.J. (2006). *The school superintendent: Theory, practice, and cases.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Khan, R.L., Wolfe, D.M., & Snoak, J.D. (1964). *Organizational stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiguity*. New York: Wiley and Sons Inc.

Kim, K.T. (2010). 'Panoptic accountability: Supervisory leaders normalizing or resisting professionals. *Journal of Education Policy, 7*(1), 67-90.

Kizlik, B. (2008). *Measurement, assessment, and evaluation in education*.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lamb, E.C. (2013). Power and resistance: New methods for analysis across genres in critical discourse analysis. *Discourse Society. 24*(3), 334-360

LaVenia, M., Cohen-Vogel, L. & Lang, L. (2015). The common core state standards initiative: An event history analysis of state adoption. *American Journal of Education, 121*(2), 145-182.

Lazarus, Richard S., and Susan Folkman. 1987. Transactional theory and research on emotions and coping. *European Journal of Personality, 1*(3), 141-169.

Lee, V. Smith, J., & Cioci, M. (1993). Teacher and principals: Gender related perceptions of leadership and power in secondary schools. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 15*(2), 153-180.

Lemke, T. (2002). Foucault, governmentality, and critique. *Rethinking Marxism, 14*(3), 49-64.

Leithwood, K.A. & Montgomery, D.J. (1986). *Improving principal effectiveness: The principal profile*. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Li, T.M. (2007). Governmentality. *Anthropologica, 49*(2), 275-281.

Lightfoot, S.L. (1978). *Worlds Apart*, New York: Basic Books.

Lindle, J.C. (1993). *Surviving school micropolitics: Strategies for administrators*. Lancaster, PA: Technomic.

Lindle, J.C., & Mawhinney, H.B., (2003). Introduction: school leadership and the politics of education. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 39*(1), 3-9.

Litwak, E. & Mayer, H.J. (1974). *School family and neighborhood: The theory and practice of school community relations,* New York: Columbia University Press.

Lezotte, L. & McKee, K. (2006) *Stepping up: Leading the charge to improve our schools*. Okemos.MI: Effective Schools Products.

Louden, William, and Helen Wildy. 1999. "Circumstance and proper timing": Context

and the construction of a standards framework for school principals' performance. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 35*(3), 398-422.

Luke, A. (1996). Text and discourse in education: An introduction to critical discourse analysis. *Review of Research in Education, 21*, 3-48.

Marcoulides, G.A., Larsen, T.J. & Hekc, R.H. (1995) Examining the generalizability of a leadership model: Issues assessing administrator performance. *International Journal of Educational Management, 9*(6) 4-9.

Marks, M. & Printy, S. (2013). Principal leadership and school performance: An integration of transformation and instructional leadership. *Administration Quarterly, 39*, 370-397.

Martinez-Alfaro, M.J. (1996). Intertextuality: Origins and development of the concept. *Asociacion espanola de estudios anglo-americanos, 18*(1), 268-285.

Mawhinney, H.B. (1999). What can the study of micropolitics contribute to the practice of leadership in school reform? Introduction to a collection of reflections on micropolitics. *School Leadership Management, 19*(2).

Maxcy, S. (2000, November). *Leadership clones, copies and mutations: Scientific management and leadership philosophy in educational administration*. Paper presented at the American

Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, New Orleans, LA.

Maxwell, J.A. (2005). *Qualitative research design*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

McGough, D. (2003). An inquiry into the formation and transformation of principals' professional perspective. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 25*(4), 449-471.

McInerney, R. (2011). The docile body of the brain: a Foucauldian critical discourse analysis of capacity. https://www.academia.edu/1033677/The_Docile_Body_of_the_Brain_A_Foucauldian_Critical_Discourse_Analysis_of_Capacity

Merton, R.K. (1957). The role set. *British Journal of Sociology*, *8*, 106-120.

Miles, R. (1977). Role-set configuration as a predictor of role conflict and ambiguity in complex organizations. *Sociometry*, *40*(1), 21-34.

Morgan, G. (2006). *Images of organization*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Murphy, J. (2003). *Tracking the development of comprehensive school reform designs*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press.

Murphy, J. (2005). Unpacking the foundations of ISLLC Standards and addressing concerns in the academic community. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *41*(1), 154-191.

Murphy, J. (1988). Methodological, measurement, and conceptual problems in the study of international leadership. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *10*(2), 117-139.

Nanus, Burt. 1992. Visionary leadership: How to re-vision the future. *The Futurist*, *26*(5), 20.

National Policy Board for Educational Administration (2008). Educational Leadership Policy Standards: ISLLC 2008. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.http://www.ccsso.org/documents/2008/educational_leadership_policy_standards_2008.

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, 20 U.S.C. § 6319 (2008).

Normore, A.H. (2003). The edge of chaos: School leaders and accountability. *Journal of Educational Administration, 42*(1), 55-77.

Norton, R.W. (1975). Measurement of ambiguity of tolerance. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 39*(6), 607-619.

Oliver, R. (2003). Assistant principal job satisfaction and the desire to become principals. *NCPEA Educational Leadership Review, 4*, 38-46.

Oliver, R. (2001). Desire for the next level: Orange County, California, co-administrators perceptions. *Educational Leadership and Administration: Teaching and Program Development, 13*, 99-109.

Orr, M.T. (2003). Evaluation educational leadership preparation: a review empirical, conceptual, and methodological literature. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Ortiz, F. I. (1982). *Career patterns in education: Women, men, and minorities in school administration*. New York: Praeger.

Ortiz, F.I. & Marshall, C. (1988). *Women in educational administration. In N. Boyan (Ed.) Handbook of research on educational administration* (pp. 123-142). New York: Longman.

Oyinlade, A.O. (2006). A method of assessing leadership effectiveness: Interviewing the essential behavioral leadership qualities approach. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, *19*(1), 25-40.

Pellicer, L.O. & Stevenson, K.R. (1984). Do it first, Then talk about it: A Principalship practicum. *Phi Delta Kappan, 65*(6), 429.

Perryman, J. (2006). Panoptic performativity and school inspection regimes:

Disciplinary mechanisms and life under special measures. *Journal of Education Policy, 21*(2), 147-161.

Pfeffer, J. (1981). *Power in organizations*. Boston: Pitman.

Phillips, N., Lawrence, T. B., & Hardy, C. (2004). Discourse and institutions. *Academy of Management Review, 29*(4), 635-652.

Phillips, N., Sewell, G., & Jaynes, S. (2008). Applying critical discourse analysis in strategic management research. *Organizational Research Methods, 11*(4), 770-789.

Pongratz, L. (2007). Freedom and discipline: Transformations in pedagogic punishment. In: Peters, M.A. and Besley, T. (eds.) *Why Foucault? New Directions in Educational Research.* Peter Lang, New York, 29-53.

Popkewitz, Thomas S., and Marie Brennan. 1997. Restructuring of social and political theory in education: Foucault and a social epistemology of school practices. *Educational Theory, 47*(3), 287-313.

Porter, J.E. (1986). Intertextuality and the discourse community. *Rhetoric Review, 5*(1), 34-47.

Porter, A., McMaken, J., Hwang, J., & Yang, R. (2011). Common Core standards: The new U.S. intended curriculum. *Educational Researcher, 40,* 103–116.

Ranson, S. (2003). Public accountability in the age of neo-liberal government. *Journal of Education Policy, 18*(5), 459-480.

Reeves, D.B. (2005). Assessing *educational leaders: Evaluating performance for improved individual and organizational results.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Riehl, C.J. (2000). The principal's role in creating inclusive schools for diverse students: A review of normative, empirical, and critical literature on the practice of educational administration. *Review of Educational Research, 70*(1), 55-81.

Riley, S. C., Sims-Schouten, W., & Willig, C. (2007). The case for critical realist discourse analysis as a viable method in discursive work. *Theory & Psychology*, *17*(1), 137-145.

Rizzo, J., House, R., Lirtzman, S. (1970). Role conflict and ambiguity in complex organizations. *Administrative Quarterly*, *15*,150-163.

Rogers, R., ed. (2004) An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education. London,UK: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. http://www.contaduria.uady.mx/sec-cip/articulos/libros_online/educacion/LawrenceErlbaum2004AnIntroductiontoCriticalDiscourseAnalysisinEducation.pdf#page=50

Rogers, R., Malancharuvil-Berkes, E., Mosley, M. Hui, D., & Joseph, G.O. (2005). Critical discourse analysis in education: A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research, 75*(3), 365-416.

Rorrer, Andrea K., and Linda Skrla. 2005. Leaders as policy mediators: The reconceptualization of accountability. *Theory into Practice, 44*(1), 53-62

Rossi, P.H., & Freeman, H.E. (1993). *Evaluation a systematic approach.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Rousmaniere, K. (2007). Go to the principal's office: Toward a social history of the school principal in north America. *History of Education Quarterly, 47*(1), 1-22.

Sanders, M. (2003). Community involvement in schools: From concept to practice. *Education and Urban Society, 35*(2), 161-180.

Schnurr, S., & Zayts, O. (2012). You have to be adaptable, obviously: constructing professional identities in multicultural workplaces in Hong Kong. *Pragmatics, 22*(2), 279-300.

Schuler, R.S. (1984). Organizational stress and coping: A model and overview. In A.S. Sethi and R.S. Schuler (eds.) *Handbook of Organizational Stress and Coping Strategies,* 35-68.

Schussler, D. L., & Collins, A. (2006). An empirical exploration of the who, what, and how of school care. *Teachers College Record, 108*(7), 1460-1495.

Scott, W.R. (1995). *Institutions and organizations.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Scriven, M. (1972). Objectivity and subjectivity in educational research. In L.G. Thomas (Ed.) *Philosophical redirection in educational research*, Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Search, T., (1889). Found in Herbert Kleibard's *Schooled to work: Vocationalism and the American curriculum, 1876-1946,* New York, NY: Teachers College Press

Sears, J. (1925). *The school survey*. Boston.

Seeman, M. (1966). Status and identity: The problem of inauthenticity. *The Pacific Sociological Review, 9*(2), 67-73.

Sergiovanni, T. (1992). *Moral leadership: Getting to the heart of school improvement.* San Francisco: Josey-Bass.

Senge, P. (1993). *The fifth discipline: The art & practice of the learning organization.* London: Century Business.

Shapiro, J.P., & Stefkovich, J.A. (2010). *Ethical leadership and decision making in education: Applying theoretical perspectives to complex dilemmas*. (3rd ed.). NY,

NY: Rutledge.

Sirotnik, K. A. (2002). Promoting responsible accountability in schools and education. *Phi Delta Kappan, 83*(9), 662-673.

Skrla, L., & Scheurich, J. (2001). Displacing deficit thinking in superintendent leadership. *Education and Urban Society*, *33*(3), 235-259.

Starratt, R.J. (1994). *Building an ethical school: A practical response to moral crisis in schools*. London: Falmer Press.

Staratt, R.J. (1993). *The drama of leadership*. London: Falmer Press.

Stefkovich, J. & Begley, P.T., (2007). Ethical school leadership. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 35*(2), 205-224.

Stets, Jan E., and Peter J. Burke. 2000. Identity theory and social identity theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly,* 63(3), 224-237.

Stufflebeam, D. (1971). The use of experimental design in educational evaluation. *Journal of Educational Measurement, 8*(4), 267-274.

Tannen, D. (1993). *Framing in discourse*. New York: Oxford University Press

Taylor, F. (1911). *The principles of scientific management*. Harper and Brother: New York and London.

Taylor, S. (2004). Researching educational policy and change in 'new times': using critical discourse analysis. *Journal of Education Policy, 19*(4), 433-451.

Tolbert, P.S. & Zucker, L.G. (1983). Institutional sources of change in the formal structure of organizations: The diffusion of civil service reform, 1880-1935. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 28*, 22-39,

Toolan, M. (1997). What is critical discourse analysis and why are people saying such

terrible things about it? *Language and Literature*, *6*(2), 83-103

Townly, B. (1993). Foucault, power/knowledge and its relevance for human resource management. *Academy of Management Review, 18*(3), 518-545.

Tyak, D. & Hansot, E. (1982). *Managers of virtue: Public school leadership in America*: 1820-1980. New York: Basic Books.

Usher, R. and Edwards, R. (1994) *Postmodernism and education*. London: Routledge

Vail, P. (1982). The purposing of high performing systems. *Organizational Dynamics*, *11*(2), 23-39.

Van Dijk, T.A. (2003). Critical discourse analysis. In Schiffrin, D., Tannen, D., & Hamilton, H.E. (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 352-371), Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Van Dijk, T.A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse Society, 4*(2), 249-283.

Vinson, K. D., & Ross, E. W. (2001). In search of the social studies curriculum: Standardization, diversity, and a conflict of appearances. In W. B. Stanley (Ed.), *Critical issues in social studies research for the 21st century* (pp. 39-71). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Wallace, M., and Eric H. (2012). The dynamics of irony in organizational change: Coping with a school merger. *Public Administration, 90*(12), 974-999.

Wickham, G. & Kendall, G. (2007). Critical discourse analysis, description, explanation, causes: Foucault's inspiration versus Weber's perspiration. *Qualitative Social Research*, 8(2), Art. 4, http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs070246.

Wiley, M.G., & Zald, M.N. (1968). The growth and transformation of educational accrediting agencies: An exploratory study in social control of institutions. *Sociology of Education, 41*(1), 36-56.

Williams, H. (2009). An evaluation of principal interns performance on the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards. *National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervision Journal*, *26*(4), 1-7.

Winton, S. & Pollock, K. (2013). Preparing politically savvy principals in Ontario, Canada. *Journal of Educational Administration, 51*(1), 40-54.

Wirt, F. & Kirst, T. (1997). *The political dynamics of American education*. McCuthchan Publishing Corporation: Berkley, CA.

Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. Eds. (2001). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis.* London, UK: Sage.

Young, M. D., & Grogan, M. (2008). Leadership preparation and development in North America. *International handbook on the preparation and development of school leaders*, 303-324.