

The Cultural Ecology of Scholar-Practitioner Leaders: An Ethnographic Study of Leadership

This manuscript has been peer-reviewed, accepted, and endorsed by the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA) as a significant contribution to the scholarship and practice of school administration and K-12 education.



Patrick M. Jenlink
Stephen F. Austin State University

The purpose of this critical ethnographic study was to examine the nature and meaning of cultural ecology in relation to preparing scholar-practitioner leaders. The ethnography focused on how the discourses and practices within the disciplinary setting of leadership preparation shape the identity of social scholar-practitioner leaders. The ethnographic study drew from Steward's (2005) writings on cultural ecology and Foucault's (1979, 1980) writings on "regimes of truth" and power/knowledge relationships, to frame a lens for examining the cultural forces at work in and through an ecology of the leadership preparation program. The author examined the cultural ecology of leadership preparation that is defined, in part, by developing scholar-practitioners as democratic, socially just leaders. Also examined is the evolution of a cultural ecology within the Department and the doctoral program.

Editors Note: *Patrick M. Jenlink* is a distinguished Professor of doctoral studies in the Department of Secondary Education and Educational Leadership and Director of the Educational Research Center at Stephen F. Austin State University. In each ELRDR issue, we will highlight an exemplary model of doctoral research. He has authored numerous articles, guest edited journals, authored or co-authored numerous chapters in books, and authored, edited or co-edited several books. Along with his accomplishments in our field, Dr. Jenlink's stellar study serves as a model for the recent doctoral graduates whose research and writing is featured for this ELRDR issue.

Introduction

Conceptions of educational leadership are embedded within the culture that surrounds them. This may be said of leadership preparation as well. There is, in this sense, a cultural ecology of leadership preparation and practice. Social psychological and cultural approaches to leadership preparation and practice often highlight the relational aspects of leadership, focusing on that which transpires between individuals in relationships of varying natures.

Within the cultural contexts of leadership as a discipline situated in educational settings, shifting patterns of social practice among educational leaders suggest a concern for naïve overspecialization engendered by disciplinarity; a affect of discourses and practices that work within a cultural ecology (Steward, 2005) of leadership preparation.

NCPEA Education Leadership Review of Doctoral Research, Vol. 1, No. 1 – March 2014
ISSN: 1532-0723 © 2014 National Council of Professors of Educational Administration

This manuscript may not be used commercially or edited. When quoting portions of this text, attribution to the author/s is required.

Herein lies an important consideration for what Foucault (1979) termed “disciplinary practices” and how these practices inform or otherwise shape the preparation of educational leaders, particularly when “disciplinary practices” are viewed as forms of knowledge. Disciplinary or disciplining practices refer “to a set of discourses, norms, and routines that shape the ways in which a field of study such as educational administration and its related practices . . . constitute themselves” (Anderson & Grinsberg, 1998, p. 330).

Educational administration/leadership, as a field of study and practice, is a discipline that has a culture defined, in part, by its theoretical, epistemological, and pedagogical practices. Within these disciplining practices there are preparation concerns related to “regimes of truth” (Foucault, 1980) that shape the social identity and the social practices of educational leaders. Disciplining practices and discourses, embedded in policy/procedure and curriculum and pedagogies, reflect a politics of truth (ideologies) in a society or a culture within society, and the discourses that are accepted as “truth” to the discipline, or functions as a surrogate for truth.

In this study the author examined the nature of a cultural ecology of leadership preparation, with specific consideration for how the discourses and practices within the discipline of educational administration/leadership shape the identity of educational leaders. Foucault’s (1979, 1980) work on “regimes of truth” and power/knowledge relationships served as a theory base for critically examining the cultural forces at work in and through an ecology of preparation programs, in particular focusing on discourse and practice as cultural influences that shape a sense of “self.” As well, the author was concerned the importance of framing and examining the cultural ecology of leadership preparation that is defined, in part, by developing democratic, socially justice leaders.

Purpose/Objectives

The purpose of this ethnographic study was to examine the nature and meaning of cultural ecology in relation to preparing scholar–practitioner leaders. The ethnography focused on how the discourses and practices within the disciplinary setting of leadership preparation shape the identity of scholar–practitioner leaders. The study draws to the foreground a concern for how “regimes of truth”, bound in ideological and political beliefs, influence leadership as democratic and socially justice practice. Objectives of the study included:

- to explore the nature of and need for understanding the cultural ecology of educational leadership preparation;
- to examine, through a cultural ecology lens, the nature of “regimes of truth” in educational leadership preparation programs and how these regimes translate into disciplining discourses and practices; and
- to analyze, through a lens of cultural ecology, the conceptualization of scholar–practitioner leadership in relation to the curricular and pedagogical discourses and practices in leadership.

Theoretical Frame

The theoretical framework for this study focused on the cultural ecology of leadership preparation (Bligh & Meindl, 2004). Cultural ecology is the human interaction with the environment (Sutton & Anderson, 2010), or in the case of leadership preparation, cultural ecology concerns the interaction between the individuals (faculty and students of leadership programs) and the social and cultural contexts within which leadership preparation takes place. The framework also considered the importance of examining the “regimes of truth” that impact the conceptualization of leadership, in particular as related to shaping the social identity of practitioners who are preparing to be democratic, socially just leaders (Bogotch & Roy, 1997; Giroux, 1994).

Cultural Ecology

Cultural ecology is the study of “the role of culture as a dynamic component of any ecosystem of which humans are a part” (Frake, 1962, p. 53). As a field of study, cultural ecology examines the relationship between a given society and its natural environment, or in the case of educational leadership, it translates into the relationship between leaders and their practice and the environment of the school or educational setting. By extension, then, cultural ecology also studies the individuals that populate a preparation program in relation to the program being the pedagogical environment. Cultural ecology, then, is concerned with the culture of both preparation and practice. In this sense, cultural ecology is concerned with how the “social self” of the leader is developed in both the preparation and practice contexts; how leader identity is shaped.

Cultural ecology of leadership preparation is concerned with cultural consciousness, which is more than cultural assumptions, espoused values, and established practices and processes (Galpin, 1996; Schein, 1999; Zachary, 2005). Understanding the cultural ecology of leadership preparation and practice means examining the “regimes of truth” that define the culture of leadership preparation, ideologically and pedagogically. The study of the culture, examining the discourses and practices that shape the relationships between individual and environment, provides insight about the factors affecting the development of self within socio-cultural contexts (Chabal & Daloz, 1999; Zachary, 2000).

Sutton and Anderson (2010), in examining cultural ecology, explained that ecological work has focused on subsistence as a complex system that includes resources, technology, social and political organizations and forces internal and external to those organizations, and related cultural structures and artifacts. Bligh and Meindl (2004), in examining the cultural ecology of leadership knowledge, noted that complex systems of knowledge are part of the cultural ecology and therein knowledge becomes central to the subsistence of leadership preparation and practice. Importantly, as knowledge patterns within the cultural ecology of leadership have shifted, so too has the nature of discourse—discursive practices or rules of discourse are important considerations in the shaping of an ecology of leadership preparation (Cherryholmes, 1988; Foucault, 1980; Frattura & Capper, 2007).

Cultural ecology, with respect to “regimes of truth” and disciplining discourses and practices within preparation programs, is concerned with the relationships between individuals (students and faculty, as well as other cultural participants) and the presence and growth of politics and political complexity of identity formation, respectively (St. Pierre & Pillow,

2000). The development of the “social self” or “identity” occurs within and in relationship to the cultural ecology, and therein resides, in part, the importance of understanding the cultural anchors of preparation. If democracy and social justice are cultural anchors for leadership preparation, then the value for democratic, socially just leadership gives direction to and at the same time provides the basis for challenging the curricular and pedagogical practices of the preparation program and the faculty responsible for that program (Jenlink, 2013b).

Regimes of Truth in Leadership

Anderson and Grinberg (1998) explained that the complexity and heterogeneity of experiences necessitates consideration of diverse theoretical and philosophical notions of discourse and practice within a discipline such as educational administration/leadership. Anderson and Grinberg (1998) further argued that disciplinary “regimes of truth” define, in part, knowledge in relation to leadership preparation and practice, and work to shape the social “self” of leaders; the identity of social justice leaders. In the cultural ecology of leadership preparation there are disciplinary discourses and practices at work in and through the curriculum and pedagogy that shape the social identity of educational leaders; discourses and practices that the culture “accepts and makes function as true” (Foucault, 1980, p. 131).

Advancing democracy and social justice as disciplining discourses in educational leadership preparation requires an inside out process whereby doctoral students concretize and internalize educational justice leadership systematically to new levels of thinking, patterns of internalized social justice discourse, and conscious habits of practice (Bogotch, Beachum, Blount, Brooks, & English, 2008; Brown, 2004; Frattura & Capper, 2007; Korthagen & Vasalos, 2005; Lindsey, Roberts, & Campbell-Jones, 2005). Preparing democratic, socially just leaders requires curricular and pedagogical considerations for translating social justice into the disciplinary discourses and practices that define and articulate courses.

Cultural Ecology of Leadership

The culture of contemporary education poses dramatic challenges for the educational leader. Shifting political discourses and pedagogical practices work to shape individual’s understanding of leadership in cultural contexts, and to shape the individual’s understanding of the leader’s social self—the identity as democratic, socially just leader (Bogotch, Beachum, Blount, Brooks, & English, 2008).

The ecological approach to leadership suggests that there is a critical point in space and time, a practiced place where an organization can dwell for an extended period through a process of continual learning and renewal (Hurst, 2012). The length of this period depends on many factors, but the key issue of concern here is the ability of leaders to be effective architects of choice, designing contexts with the optimal combinations of passion, reason, and power.

Importantly, an ecological perspective enables the educational leader to understand relationships. In this sense, the leader is constantly engaged in assessing the situations he/she is in, gauging how he/she feels about them, looking for systems of cause and effect, and trying to understand the power dynamics present. Whenever the educational leader interacts with people – students, teachers, parents, other cultural workers – in the educational setting, he/she is necessarily thinking in contexts of emotion, reason, and power (Hurst, 2012).

The educational leader, situated in the cultural ecology of the school or educational setting, takes on the identity of cultural ecologist. As cultural ecologist, the educational leader necessarily understands the cultural ecology, and with that ecology he/she necessarily focuses on three aspects of the ‘cultural core’: firstly, the relationship between the mode of subsistence and the socio-cultural context of the school or educational setting; secondly, the behaviour patterns associated with this, including the disciplinary practices and discourses and “regimes of truth;” and finally, how the cultural patterns affect other cultural features of the school or educational setting, such as teaching and learning (Steward, 2005; Sutton & Anderson, 2010).

Research Design/Methods

This study incorporated a critical ethnographic approach guided by poststructural concerns for the relationship of knowledge and power and the “politics of truth”. First, using a critical ethnographic approach (Carspecken, 1996; Foucault, 1972, 1980; Giroux, 1988; Kincheloe & McLaren, 2000; McLaren, 1995; Quantz, 1992), it draws on the experiences of doctoral faculty and students who were/are primary participants in the implementation of the new doctoral program. The critical ethnographic approach was used to make visible those social constructs (Anderson, 1990) essential in the framing of critical narratives of faculty and students. Second, it draws on a poststructural lens (Anderson & Grinsberg, 1998; Foucault, 1980, 1984a, 1984b) to examine the “regimes of truth” and the shaping of scholar–practitioner leadership as a construct.

Woven into the methodological considerations for critical ethnography was an agenda of legitimating participant’s voice and locating the participant’s meanings in larger impersonal systems of cultural ecology of leadership preparation (Anderson, 1989; Frake, 162; Steward, 2005). Examining social constructs created by participants, as elements of the social and cultural ground, requires the use of a critical hermeneutic lens. The lens selected to guide the inquiry was grounded in Foucault’s (1979, 1980, 1982, 1988a, 1988b) views of “regimes of truth” as rules for discourse. Relevant issues associated with “disciplinary practice” and “disciplinary discourse,” the politics of truth also figured largely in the inquiry process. The influence of Foucault shaped the critical ethnographic approach.

Equally important to shaping the ethnographic lens was the use of a “cultural ecology” frame that guided the inquiry with respect to examining the “regimes of truth” within the curricular and pedagogical discourses and practices. The cultural ecology frame was informed by the work of Bogotch and Roy (1997), Bligh and Meindl (2004), Steward (2005), and Sutton and Anderson (2010), from which a cultural ecology heuristic was delineated and used to inform the development of interview questions, and guide the analysis of the data. The heuristic elements emphasized the societal, cultural, political, ideological, and environmental factors that shape discourses about leadership in the preparation program. The heuristic also considered questions related to the role curriculum and pedagogy play in translating leadership theory into learning and practice.

The participants included 27 doctoral students and 5 faculty members. Data sources for this study included: cultural artifacts (curricular and pedagogical as well as policy), transcripts of audio recorded conversations, transcripts of individual and focus group interviews of the participants, written artifacts from meetings, participants stories of their experiences and critical moments, personal journals, policy discourse (correspondence), and

reflexive journals. A critical inquiry into and analysis of the multiple data sources was used to examine for “regimes of truth”, key questions, themes, and emerging patterns related to the formation of “social self” or “identity”, and the role and relationship of social justice as a form or “truth” in leadership preparation.

Cultural Ecology of the University

It is important to situate the reader within the cultural ecology of the geographical region and university. Stephen F. Austin State University is located in Nacogdoches, the oldest town in the state of Texas. Nacogdoches is a city that has a demographic profile of approximately 63 percent White, 25 percent African American, and 11 percent Hispanic. The demographic profile is shifting rapidly, with the Hispanic population growing steadily each year. With a population of approximately 30,000, Nacogdoches lies in the center of the eastern region called the Piney Woods. The people of Nacogdoches identify their location as Deep East Texas. Being less than an hour’s drive from western Louisiana, some Texans, who live west of Interstate 35, refer to Deep East Texas as being “behind the Pine Curtain,” a phrase suggesting less than positive interpretations of Deep East Texas culture and geography.

The dominant culture of Deep East Texas is reflective of the Deep South, and represented by “a preference for the concrete over the abstract that places concern with personal, family, and community relations” (Kincheloe & Pinar, 1991, pp. 12-13). There is a prevalence of conservatism tempered by a strong sense of utilitarianism and anti-intellectualism that defines a southern epistemology of life, practice and activity. Deep East Texas, over time has grown into a cultural homogenization—a sameness that permeates all aspects of culture. Although there is a range in demographic diversity, the Deep East Texas cultural homogenization permeates the human geography.

Historically, SFA could be characterized as a small regional university that is not part of any one of several formal university systems that dominate higher education in Texas. SFA prides itself on not being part of a system, enjoying an identity as an independent institution that serves the needs of Deep East Texas, but recognizes its role in serving the broader needs of Texas albeit often in the shadow of Deep East Texas. SFA can also be characterized as a university in which service and teaching—in other words, practice—are valued more than scholarship. Faculty who arrive from the outside and who are not sensitive to the need to become part of the “place”, risk being assigned to a category of “placelessness” described by Kincheloe and Pinar (1991, p. 13). Such placelessness is reminiscent of the ethnographer’s “outsider” who is not part of the culture, and who is viewed with suspicion and distrust. Sensitivity to the local culture is essential if outsiders are to win acceptance by the locals who see themselves as insiders, and who demonstrate the clear hegemony of power often experienced as part of the larger cultural context of Deep East Texas, and the university. Importantly, one doctoral faculty member shared a critical perspective on the place,

The institution, the culture of this PLACE has had significant influence because the program had to develop within an environment that did not have a rigorous doctoral program . . . This region, university, and department did not really value academic rigor because it was not present in the programs. Rigorous requirements were not in place for any program, department, or course. It was an anti-reading, anti-writing, and anti-intellectual environment.

The culture of Deep East Texas, and therefore SFA to a degree, is one dominated by historical discourses that reflect arrangements of power and the hierarchy of participation, within and across the community and university. There are rules of discourse distinctly Deep East Texas, which, as Cherryholmes (1988) stated, “govern what is said and what remains unsaid. They identify who can speak with authority and who must listen. They are anonymous because there is no identifiable author” (p. 34). The condition of governance described by Cherryholmes is indicative of East Texas in that the historical context of this place has produced a hegemonic and hierarchical society with rules about participation that guarantees the reproduction of the dominance by one segment of the population. The rules of discourse contribute to the invisibility of social phenomena that seek to control and otherwise direct the activity of a Deep East Texas human geography.

Programmatic Ecology

Situating the reader within the programmatic ecology is equally important. In simple terms, sharing the pedagogical, ideological, and political orientations of the program provides insight with respect to the culture within which the doctoral students and faculty interact. The doctoral program is an Ed.D. and is one of three doctoral programs in the university. Of the three doctoral programs, the Ed.D. program has the largest enrolment and is recognized for its high completion rate.

The preparation of scholar–practitioner leaders in SFA’s doctoral program began in the summer of 1997 with fourteen students and six faculty members. Subsequently, fifteen additional cohorts of doctoral students have been admitted across as many years at the time of this study, each cohort varying in size and demographic profile with African American, Hispanic and White students, and varying ratios of male and female students. The admissions process is a three-phase process. Phase one is characterized as more traditional with graduate application forms and materials submitted to the Graduate School. Phase two is at the Department level and requires a completed application form to the doctoral program along with a narrative leadership profile, resume, and references. Phase three is on-campus and includes a formal presentation, interview and writing sample. Each point of information collected in the application process is wholistically assessed by the individual faculty members and then collectively by the Doctoral Faculty Council.¹

The cultural underpinnings – the values and beliefs – that guide the doctoral studies curriculum are instructed by the construct of scholar–practitioner leadership. The construct of

¹ Doctoral Faculty Council references all faculty teaching core doctoral courses. It is important to note that the Doctoral Faculty profile in the early stages of the doctoral program was 100% White. The gender ratio was approximately 60% male and 40% female. As the program evolved, over time and in concert with each successive cohort of doctoral students, so too did the demographic profile of faculty. One African American female faculty member joined the doctoral program, and over time the gender balance has shifted to a female dominant profile. It is also important to note that in the early stages only two doctoral faculty members had doctoral teaching and dissertation experience, whereas now all faculty are experienced in teaching doctoral courses, however two have yet to chair dissertations. There has been a constant pattern of doctoral faculty joining the program for 2-5 years, then leaving. At this time, only one doctoral faculty remains of the original six that began with the program 17 years ago.

scholar–practitioner leadership² is premised on an alternative epistemology of *inquiry as practice*, wherein the leader as scholar and her/his leadership practice are inseparable from scholarly and critically oriented inquiry. Scholar–practitioner leadership is grounded in a postmodern—post-positivist view of leadership, which seeks to blur boundaries in the knowledge–practice and inquiry–practice relationships.

Historically, the “scholar” has most often been associated with academe and the university setting, and therefore her/his practice was understood as one of formal research and the development of formal knowledge (codified knowledge). Herein the “scholar” may be viewed as having a form of power. Foucault (1980) argued that, by its analysis, the relationship of knowledge and power might be understood. He explained: “Once knowledge can be analysed in terms of region, domain, implantation, displacement, transposition, one is able to capture the process by which knowledge functions as a form of power and disseminates the effects of power” (p. 69). Challenging the historical notions of “scholar,” recent efforts have been undertaken to reexamine the meaning of “scholar” within the context of educational leadership preparation and practice (Anderson & Jones, 2000; Jenlink, 2001a, 2001b; Jenlink, 2003a, 2003b; Riehl, et al., 2000).

Whereas historical notions of knowledge as “formal” or “codified” dominated the epistemological and cultural ecology of educational administration preparation and practice, what have been subjugated knowledges³ with respect to leadership, i.e., “the historical contents that have been buried and disguised in a functional coherence or formal systemisation” (Foucault, 1980, p. 69), are now emerging and are being recognized as legitimate and important forms of knowledge, in particular as the relationships of knowledge, inquiry, practice, and theory move to the foreground of discourses on and in educational administration and leadership.

A scholar–practitioner leader is aware of the origins, contexts, and patterns of the knowledge related to an issue; social problems that interpret as justice and equity issues in school and educational settings. Equally important, the scholar–practitioner leader works from a repertoire of inquiry methods to explore, create, and transform social relations and knowledge within the larger political, economic, and cultural struggles of education and society. What being critical implies is that at the same time as the questioning and researching

² Leadership has been variously researched and written about for decades and therefore will not be explored within this paper in that such an activity in and of itself would fill volumes. However, for purposes of this study, leadership as used throughout connotes the practices and activities of individuals at all levels of the school and educational system that, through their actions, demonstrate an understanding of purpose and moral imperatives that guide and facilitate the practices and activities of others. Therein, leadership is premised on making permeable traditional role boundaries often associated with the authoritarian figure of the person in leadership roles in the school or educational setting. As well, leadership as used herein is understood as transcending the differentiation of traditional roles/responsibilities that set hierarchical structures in schools and define leadership identity, such as principal and teacher. As used in concert with scholar–practitioner, leadership denotes the processes and actions of any person (teacher, principal, parent, or student) who seeks cultural and social change through social critique and praxis. Leadership also connotes symmetry with respect to distribution and use of power and acknowledges that teachers as well as principals and parents are responsible for leadership within the school and educational systems. Bligh and Meindl (2004), in conducting an analysis of leadership books, historical and contemporary, provided insight to the patterns of knowledge and discourse that have shaped a cultural ecology of leadership.

³ Knowledge domains that fall outside of the codified or formal knowledge accepted by positivistic and traditional orientations to administration and leadership preparation and practice, such as cross-disciplinary (Kincheloe, 2001), indigenous, and practitioner-based inquiry as discussed by Anderson and Herr (1999).

occurs, the knowledge, values, and beliefs that are uncovered must be framed within a consideration of their implications for social justice, caring, and democracy. This framing, questioning, and researching activity is embedded within a continuous critical reflection on what is uncovered.

To accomplish his/her work, the scholar–practitioner necessarily engages in critical inquiry to disembed ideologies that work to control culture and practice. Simultaneously, he/she exhibits an epistemological curiosity necessary to understanding and examining the origin of forms of knowledge dominant in the educational setting, and what other sources and forms of knowledge are necessary to creating learning experiences that are just and equitable for students from social groups of difference.

The scholar–practitioner leader understands the complexity of social relations and in general the complex nature of political and cultural struggles in which education is engaged within society. Pragmatically, the scholar–practitioner is consciously aware that every action has critical implications for themselves and others. He/she also realizes that reality is not something external to human consciousness that can be discovered through some scientific process. To be a scholar–practitioner leader implies that knowledge, values, and beliefs cannot be given or transmitted to others, but that these other individuals must be allowed participation in the construction of meaning, definition, knowledge, or action. Simultaneously, the scholar–practitioner understands the import of facilitating a critical literacy, for her/himself and for others. The scholar–practitioner leader embodies the values of social justice, caring, equity, self-criticality, and democracy and he/she understands that their role as leader is equally one of cultural worker and scholarly practitioner within the classroom, school, educational community, and in state and regional/national policy making contexts.

A fundamental concern for social justice and democracy is at the heart of scholar–practitioners’⁴ work in schools. Inseparably linked with this concern is the question of whether schools are to serve and reproduce the existing society or to adopt a more critical role of challenging the dominant social order so as to develop and advance society’s democratic imperatives (Giroux, 1992a, 1992b, 1994; Kincheloe, 1999). The educational leader recognizes, as Niebuhr (1946) argued, that as a society our “capacity for justice makes democracy possible; but [our] inclination to injustice makes democracy necessary” (Niebuhr, 1946, p. xi). A more passive role lends to reproduction of the existing society, with its injustices, whereas a critical active role that challenges dominant social orders lends to transformation and the realization of a just, democratic society.

The scholar–practitioner understands that when social justice and democracy are central to the purpose of education, then schools enable the widest diffusion of teaching and learning as “a model of cultural renewal, in effect, to support something peculiarly consonant with the democratization of culture” (Scheffler, 1960, p. 57); democratization that mediates

⁴ The scholar–practitioner construct, as used throughout the reporting of this study, is based on the author’s work, conjoined with colleagues, over 17 years in conjunction with developing and implementing a doctoral program in educational leadership. Scholar–practitioner connotes a professional practitioner who moves beyond the casual consumer level of research, scholarship, and knowledge (inquiry and knowledge for practice) to practitioner level of inquiry, scholarship, and knowledge (inquiry and knowledge of practice) are integral to the leader’s practice, concerned with creating just, equitable, caring, democratic schools (including the administrator and the teacher-as-leader) on a day-to-day basis. For a comprehensive examination of scholar–practitioner leadership see Jenlink (1999, 2001a, 2001b, 2002, 2003a, 2003b, 2003c, 2004a, 2004b, 2005, 2010, 2011, 2013a, 2013b).

social inequities and injustices reflective of deeply entrenched social issues in society. The scholar–practitioner recognizes, as did Dewey (1916, 1927), the importance of making political and moral considerations an integral element of their practice, distinguishing between education as a function of society and society as a function of education. A scholar–practitioner stance is grounded in an understanding of theories of social justice and democracy; an awareness of the principles upon which justice and democracy are founded, and the practices through which they are lived.

A Critical Ethnography

The disciplinary discourses⁵ of leadership preparation within practical and academic cultures of students and faculty members often influence the construction of social reality, shaping the meaning of social constructs that form the foundation for leadership practices. There is often a legitimation of social reality (Anderson, 1989) by individuals in power that also shape the construction of meaning related to social constructs. The construct of scholar–practitioner leadership, although idealized as a set of antecedents by faculty in the design of the program⁶, evolved through student interaction with faculty members, shaped by a constant critical self-examination on the part of the individual and collective faculty. Students often found the construct of scholar–practitioner leadership to be abstract and too theoretical, often juxtaposing what faculty posited as meaning against a critically pragmatic ground of day-to-day practice in schools.

We are now with our sixteenth doctoral cohort. The first and subsequent cohorts of doctoral students each experienced changes in faculty members, simultaneously experiencing a type epistemological uncertainty at times. Students and faculty members each brought forward their own signifier for scholar–practitioner leadership, yet there appeared to be underlying beliefs and values that provided coherence, albeit at times a coherence challenged by individual faculty members own ideological positions.

Explicit in the narratives of students and faculty are epistemological, methodological, and pedagogical considerations experienced as students and faculty members conjoined in socially constructing meaning for the construct of scholar–practitioner leadership. The following narratives are emblematic of considerations experienced:

⁵ Discourse in this sense refers to a culturally and historically located system of beliefs, values, and practices (including language), which produces particular subject positions that individuals take. Discourse makes it possible to give speaking authority to some while others must remain silent, and are anonymous because “there is no identifiable author . . . nor do they have a clear-cut beginning” (Cherryholmes, 1988, p. 34). It is important to note that understanding doctoral students and faculty members as subjects of discourses challenges the dominant belief that speaking (thinking) individuals are the origin of true statements, suggesting instead that there is a limited range of possible true statements within any given discourse (which exists independently of individuals) and that speakers are subject to and constrained by these limitations. In this analysis there is an inevitable relationship between power and truth because those who are given authority/power can speak and what they say becomes truth although the guarantee of this truth is materially based in the power given the speaker.

⁶ See Jenlink (2001a) for full description of the antecedent knowledge base that guided, in the early years of the doctoral program, the development of the scholar–practitioner construct. It is noted that the antecedent knowledge has evolved in concert with the doctoral program.

Scholar–practitioner leadership embraces both scholarship and practice to create the space within which to engage others in developing co-constructed meaning around a shared purpose. Within this space of scholarship and practice, the leader builds community within and capacity of the organization. Leadership activities are framed within an ethic of care and defined through continual inquiry into the processes and patterns of the organization. The authentic self of the leader is grounded on a personal set of beliefs that seek moral excellence and goodness for individuals within, individuals served by, and the organization as a whole. (Keith⁷)

I would define scholar–practitioner leadership as a concept or an ideal that stresses the importance of reflective-reflexive inquiry in practice. It is leadership that seeks to look at the implicit dynamics of an organization as well as the explicit. It grounds educational practice in scholarship by drawing on scholarly research to inform practice and contributing to scholarship by critically researching practice and engaging in continuous critical reflective-reflexive inquiry and thinking about how people learn, what it means to be human and live in a dialogical community/society. (Trent)

My thoughts are that SP [scholar–practitioner] is a melding of the mind and the body—knowledge with practice—a cycle of obtaining knowledge and applying knowledge. The idea of it stems back to John Dewey, who stressed that there were things that were perhaps best learned through traditional academics, but others that were best learned through direct experience, and then intermingled with academics. Before Dewey, some of these approaches go back to Pestalozzi, then back to Rousseau, and then again back to Socrates. I also relate the SP [scholar–practitioner] ideology back to Zen, and some of the ancient Eastern philosophies. Zen emphasizes the merging of the mind and the body into one—at its naked core, that is what the SP [scholar–practitioner] framework promotes. (Stephanie)

Scholar–practitioner leadership has attributes of dialoguing critically, a conscious recognition of moral obligations to students and others, the ability to engage in self-critical, reflective practices and to apply this skill to political and social issues. (Martin)

Analysis of the student’s construction of meaning for scholar–practitioner leadership suggested a discourse rich with the language of scholarship, inquiry, reflection, criticality, and value for caring, and a sense of moral obligation. It is important to note that the narratives represented in this study reflect a type of coherent understanding shared by cohort members later in their doctoral studies experiences rather than earlier. The fact that students did not come to the doctoral program with an understanding of the scholar–practitioner leadership construct, and therefore socially constructed their individual meaning, brings to the foreground some concern for the signifiers that students might apply to the construct. As one doctoral student critically noted, “I actually think we should have had more antecedents than

⁷ Pseudonyms are used for all participants.

we had . . . some early readings and discussions surrounding the scholar–practitioner ideals would have been extremely helpful in my understanding of the construct.”

Faculty members’ constructed meanings, while sharing some epistemological grounding, tend to reflect some disparities in terms in how they understand scholar–practitioner leadership. Granger, a faculty member that joined the program faculty later in his career, explained scholar–practitioner leadership as “Leadership that is characterized by inquiring into professional practice through scholarly reading and research. The findings are applied to improve leadership practice.” Other doctoral faculty members elaborated on the scholar–practitioner construct.

Scholar–practitioners are individuals in any leadership capacity who utilize research and experience in a dynamically mutually related interaction to inform their practice and scholarly inquiry. Critical reflection and reflexion are ongoing generative activities that are ubiquitous in all aspects of the scholar–practitioner’s life. (Paul)

Critical scholar–practitioners are scholar–practitioners who utilize their scholarship and practice to promote social justice, caring, and issues of equity. Critical scholar–practitioners employ postpositivistic techniques to constantly critique their critical center, and are pragmatically aware of the elusive nature of one’s critical center. (Albert)

A definition is quite complex but involves the idea that education is a scholarly business and needs and deserves scholars to become the practitioners who lead the education enterprise in this great country. We can no longer depend on the management mentality to lead the vast and complex resources available to teaching and learning in today's world. Schools must become learning centers and should display the values, attitudes and concepts of scholarship if we expect to continue to grow as a leader nation. (Mark)

Scholar–practitioner leadership is leadership characterized by an emphasis on critical reflection and informed practice as well as informing practice. The scholar–practitioner leader makes decisions based on an analysis of both the situation and the research literature pertinent to the situation. He or she models scholarship and ethical behavior. The modeling includes sharing ideas with the larger audience through publications and presentations to assist in influencing the direction of educational leadership. The ideal scholar–practitioner leader is also grounded in care and advocacy for the good of students and models the learning that we would hope that all would aspire to. (Sherri)

What surfaces, in the critical analysis of doctoral faculty member’s explanations of scholar–practitioner leadership, are foci of critical, ethical, and reflective practices and connections with care and advocacy. Each of these foci reflects, in part, the cultural ecology of the program, emergent over time. The philosophical and ideological underpinnings of a culture emerge – “regimes of truth” for leadership preparation – as discourse and are embedded in the curricular and pedagogical structures and strategies, respectively. The value for scholarship, critical reflection, applications of criticality, an ethic of care, etc. acknowledges the

foundational coherence, in part, that the students and faculty members shared within the program culture.

Legitimation of Social Reality

When considering the power/knowledge issue raised by Foucault (1980) in his examination of disciplinary power, and examined by Anderson and Grinberg (1998) in their application of Foucault's power/knowledge relationship in the study of disciplinary practices in educational administration, analysis of narratives reveal an important discourse pattern that implicates itself in the legitimation of social reality as well as emerging as an issue of power. Faculty members and students share a perception based on their experiences in the program, that the department chair has provided much of the direction (sense of vision) and at times intellectual support for the idea of scholar-practitioner leadership⁸.

A closer critique of disciplinary practices and discourses revealed that students and faculty members viewed the department chair in dual roles of guiding the development of the doctoral program, while nurturing and mentoring faculty members and students in creating a scholarly inquiry culture. As one faculty member suggested, "Without his intellectual support the idea of the scholar-practitioner would not have evolved." Another characterized the chair this way, the Chair's "ongoing emphasis on scholarship and his resulting study and writing relative to the scholar-practitioner leader has further clarified the construct for students and faculty." The Chair advanced an understanding of "regimes of truth" that served to guide the faculty in creating a foundation for scholar-practitioner leadership as a construct that animated doctoral studies in the preparation program.

Analysis of Contexts

An analysis of contexts, from a cultural-historical position reflected in faculty narratives, provides a contrasting and critical perspective of the context of the program/department as each has evolved in concert. In part, what is reflected is the dynamic nature of context as a component of the ecosystem of the program (Frake, 1962). As would be expected, the program has not been without challenges. As one doctoral faculty member who joined the department in 1999 reflected retrospectively, "the department was wrapped in a struggle to define itself as a major player of graduate education and the meaning of a productive entity". Reflective of the early days of developing the program, Bernice, a doctoral faculty member who had been integral to the preparation of the proposal for the program noted,

. . . doctoral studies were just a proposed idea when I first joined the department. As I think of the early meetings concerning the program, I think a descriptor of the proposed program would be pragmatic. The program was conceived as a means of preparing educational leaders who would make a positive difference in public schools. Scholarship and critical inquiry were not referenced as primary components of the

⁸ It is important to note that this perception originated early in the doctoral program, focusing on the then sitting Department Chair. A number of department chairs have succeeded the chair in reference and subsequently the emphasis on scholar-practitioner has shifted, in some sense as the cultural ecology of the Department has evolved. The Chair in reference continues in the Department as a doctoral faculty member, and the only member remaining from the original faculty members that helped implement the doctoral program.

program. More often terms such as field-based, relevant, action-oriented were descriptors used when describing the program. This was in keeping with the service orientation of the department. For the student and faculty member, service was the primary expectation. There is a much greater emphasis on scholarship in the program as it has evolved. While the focus is still on preparing educational leaders, a clearly evolved focus of the program is on scholarship and critical inquiry.

Albert, a doctoral faculty member who joined the program several years after the implementation of the program, offers a contrasting description of the program, lending a critical perspective. He described the program as

. . . optimistic, idealistic/not pragmatic in relation to maintaining the ideal in every aspect of the program; unsettled in that there were no graduates from the program and the program was still developing; administrative support for the program; 5 of 6 doctoral faculty positions filled; two views of a doctoral program evident among the faculty—the distinction being more in methodology (quantitative and traditional qualitative vs. alternative inquiry methods) than in flexibility to meet challenges to the program and to “grow the program.” the SFA program as a local phenomenon.

Reflecting on the program’s evolution two years into his tenure in the department, Albert went on to share that his perceptions and understanding had changed. He now believed the program was

. . . moving toward a more pragmatically contextualized idealism, at least in the area of the elective problem [no other doctoral level courses available]; the biggest success has been with student performance and student acceptance of high academic rigor; inability to develop strong support networks among students, department faculty, within the college, and within the university (the program as exclusive rather than inclusive); the growing national recognition of the SFA program through 2 journals and scholarly publications, predominately generated by 2 doctoral faculty.

Analyzing historical factors, which shaped the development of the program as well as impacted the evolution of the program, are important considerations in understanding the constraints of creating a new doctoral program. The history of a culture – the cultural consciousness – and the “regimes of truth” exemplified in the culture and through the programmatic structures draw attention to the cultural anchors (Zachary, 2000) that position the program. Albert, shared an important observation:

Historically, SFA has not had a scholarly culture, and has not had their cultural traits critically challenged. The plantation mentality (servitude, hierarchy, resistance to change) is firmly entrenched in almost a feudal system, in that the university is not a functioning interactive, synergetic whole, but rather a collection of lords who have total control over their own manors and retain that control as long as there is not a problem with or for the lords above them. This contributes to a rigid and systemic resistance to change, as well as enervating inequities.

Reinforcing this perception of historical factors, Bernice, who, as noted earlier, had been with the program from its inception stated:

The historical purpose of the department was to provide teachers and principals to this area a certification university, a regional university that served the school districts in the area. Because of this emphasis, the Higher Education Coordinating Board put program restrictions on us that exist today.

The constraints referenced include a condition for no changes in the program until a fifth year was completed, at which time the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB)⁹ would give final approval.

Understanding the etymology of a construct that has been foundational to the development of the doctoral program in educational leadership. The historical factors that have challenged the programs development are important, particularly within an institutional culture that has a long history of service and teaching, but less of a history in doctoral studies and scholarship and research associated with doctoral studies.

In the section that follows, social and cultural patterns are examined in relation to the doctoral program and the implications that developing and implementing the program portends for the department, college, and university. Illuminating changes in cultural patterns offers insight into the symmetry of relationships between faculty and students, as well as between an academic unit's culture, the culture of the college, and the larger university culture.

Patterns—Social and Cultural

As students and professors interacted across the first decade of the doctoral program, social and cultural patterns have changed, albeit in the context of a larger university culture and perhaps more importantly East Texas culture. Understanding the cultural ecology of a doctoral program is, importantly, about understanding the people who populate a program in relation to the program being the context for interaction; interacting with others (faculty and students) and interacting with the value/beliefs and by extension the curricular and pedagogical practices (Galpin, 1996). Perceptions of these changing patterns, are telling of ideological shifts, as noted in the narratives of faculty and students:

The most significant change brought by the doctoral program has been in our students. This change is in relation to how their perception of the culture in which they live has changed, and also in how they personally perceive the world. Whether a Baptist or Pentecostal Minister, a Black man or woman, or a “good old boy” bubba, how they see their lives and their region has changed. I have often characterized this change as the same kind of change that occurs from “missionary work.” Doors have been opened,

⁹ The Coordinating Board is a state level entity that has authority over all higher education institutions and which makes decisions related to approval of a new program. As was the case with SFA, a doctoral program is typically granted approval for a period of five years, during which time the institution must demonstrate that the program has met all criteria for full approval. This would include having qualified doctoral faculty with dissertation experience, an appropriate doctoral faculty to student ratios, and a capacity to provide the necessary fiscal support.

views have been broadened, and old life-long beliefs have been problematized. (Albert)

Faculty study groups were formed, program areas met weekly, and departmental meetings were more frequent. In addition, program area retreats for planning were instrumental in helping the faculty gain a shared vision for the department. From this shared vision for increased scholarship, partnerships were forged. As individuals worked on collaborative projects in pairs and in larger teams, social and cultural patterns began to change. (Bobbie)

One distinctive pattern is that the program has successfully established itself as a rigorous and personally as well as professionally enhancing scholarly culture. If the cultural context (university and region) in which the program is nested were like one found in a doctoral research institution, then the program would thrive. Unfortunately, because of the provincial and regressive culture at the SFA, the doctoral faculty did not realize the urgent necessity to form support networks. (Albert)

Here it is important to understand that, for the doctoral faculty, the task at hand was, in the words of Judith Butler, “to interrogate what the theoretical move that establishes foundation authorizes, and what precisely it excludes or forecloses (1992, p. 7). As the faculty members experienced the provincial culture of the university, the problematic nature of establishing a scholar–practitioner culture was made evident. With respect to social and cultural patterns, faculty members found that “one regime of truth simply replaces another” (St. Pierre & Pillow, 2000, p. 4). The task of doctoral faculty, in a poststructuralist sense of revealing the “regimes of truth,” was to “look awry” and ask questions that produced different knowledge and produced knowledge differently, thereby producing different ways of living in the world of academe, that is, creating reinscriptions that contributed to a changing cultural ecology of the department (St. Pierre & Pillow, 2000). Emblematic of this reinscription are faculty members shared experiences and understanding of those experiences.

Over time the social and cultural patterns in response increased knowledge about doctoral studies and what a doctoral program can and should be. Just as students were learning, so were faculty members. Discussion and debate still existed, but the addition of dialogue changed the patterns of interaction (a hard one to accomplish). (Gwen)

The department is moving toward a culture that values scholarship and research. When I first joined the program, this was held as a goal, but there was still visible evidence of a service-oriented culture, void of scholarship and research. I have seen progress made in practice towards the goal of developing a culture that values scholarship and research. More faculty members are involved in scholarship and research now than when I first joined the program. (Jasmine)

I see scholar practitioner as operating at a meta-cognitive level of understanding the way power shapes our lives. The world is our text to read, with acts to be recognized and values to be critiqued. We will be charged to help students in forming a new interpretation of their own lives and uncover new talents from their encounter with

school knowledge. Social justice and caring are displayed as the guiding principle to ensure equal power relationships in schools. The program and faculty in the department have shaped my understanding. (Heather)

Social and cultural patterns follow, in part, the rules of discourse. As Cherryholmes (1988) explained, “The rules of discourse govern what is said and what is unsaid. They identify who can speak with authority and who must listen (p. 34). These rules of discourse formulate what Foucault called discursive practice – or historically and culturally determined ways of acting – which in turn creates a specific discourse – or set of rules about what can be said (or written) and by whom. The doctoral faculty members, in a poststructural sense, interrogated the rules of discourse – the discursive practices as important forces in contributing to and/or resisting a foundation of the doctoral program that authorized the scholar–practitioner stance.

Scholarly Patterns

In the evolution of scholarship in the department, as it relates to the development of a doctoral program, of particular importance was a focus on preparing scholar–practitioner leaders for schools in rural East Texas. Sharon, a doctoral faculty member, one of the original six that contributed to the program for a number of years, described the culture of the department as “one of high expectations for scholarship and research. Study, research, peer-reviewed presentations and publications have become the expected performative patterns of faculty members. This just continues to increase as the program evolves.” Reflecting, as faculty member, on the changing patterns in the scholarly culture of the department, Albert noted,

Scholarly activity represents a significantly different pattern. The sincere attempt to use consensual decision-making is also different from the extremely hierarchical university and regional culture. The pattern of criticality that pervades the curriculum is also different. The isolation of the department from others is similar to the larger cultural pattern. The relationship between faculty and students is similar. The liberal and radical ideological patterns evident in the courses, in faculty research, and in student dissertations are different. One pattern is the department’s inability to move from an idealized view of the program to a critically pragmatic view, which could potentially counteract the vulgar pragmatism, which characterizes the university. One emerging pattern is the doctoral faculty’s interrogation of the historical structures that mediate our current program. This is a pattern of inquiry that is not found or valued in the larger culture.

Ronald, a doctoral faculty member who had been with the program from its inception, and who had been in the department prior to the implementation of the doctoral program, noted that,

In the program, we have tried to increase the number of students who publish and participate in conferences; faculty members have increased participation in research and presenting research; faculty members have participated in the development of journals. Strong leadership and encouragement from the chair has sustained the research, presenting and writing activities. Emphasis when selecting new faculty who

value scholarship has sustained these activities; emphasis of scholarship on promotion and tenure has sustained these activities; new faculty with new ideas about publication has sustained these ideas; and the graduation of doctoral students who want to publish and research have sustained these ideas.

The pattern of scholarship and research runs deeply in the program culture; interaction between students and faculty with respect to research activity and publishing scholarly products is a significant transformation of the department culture. The cultural ecology of the department/program, while evolving as an ecosystem, retains only small components of the older, historical “regimes of truth” that dominated the daily activity of faculty. It is perhaps the evolution of what Anderson and Grinsberg (1998) referred to as “disciplinary practices” that has most contributed to the scholarly patterns. Routines and performative standards have changed, and the ecological balance in the culture of the department has shifted.

Knowledge and Learning Patterns

A poststructural position on knowledge is concerned with critiquing institutionalized practices that marginalize and categorize knowledge (and knower) seen as extraneous (or dangerous) to the status quo. Cherryholmes (1988) noted structural approaches, or metanarratives, remove the individual from the center of the experience, adding, “. . . we have internalized appropriate rules and ideologies, have accommodated ourselves to dominant power relationships, and are more concerned with performing expected actions than with analyzing them” (p. 6). Integral to the scholar–practitioner construct as a centering of the doctoral program was an understanding of how metanarratives in the knowledge base dominate learning. The faculty took a position of interrogating, along with students, metanarratives.

Patterns in knowledge and learning provide critical insight into the doctoral program and the relationships that students share with faculty. One doctoral Student, Phoebe, noted:

When the patterns of knowledge and learning began to change to a shared responsibility within the community, I was able to see the possibility of a social construct of scholar–practitioner-leadership actually working. When faculty collaborated with students, when students shared the responsibility for the classroom and when dialogue was encouraged my understanding was clarified.

Another doctoral student, Roberta, explained the patterns of knowledge and learning that helped her as related to the dialogical nature of the program:

For me personally as a student, the dialogical learning environment helped to shape the social construct of scholar–practitioner leadership. Instrumental for me, were the foundational readings that provided a rich source of internal dialogue in my thinking and a source for stimulating dialogue with peers in the classroom setting. The combination of learning in the academic setting through reading and dialogue, and the experiential learning through summer internships contributed to my understanding of scholar–practitioner leadership. Reflective-reflexive writing helped to shape my concept of scholar–practitioner leadership. Conversations with scholars and classroom teachers also helped me to form my perspective.

Jessica offered this insight in terms of knowledge and learning:

The desire to have a democratic society does shape the types and patterns of knowledge. This requires us to understand the connecting patterns and relationships that undergird the live world. This formal thinking leads to the discernment of hidden patterns with an ultimate goal of enhancing empowerment and justice for people involved.

Social and cultural patterns, patterns of scholarship, and patterns of knowledge and learning that have been examined from the narratives of faculty members and students, reflect a culture in the program and department that is supportive of the preparation of scholar–practitioner leaders. However, a question is raised by these patterns that focuses attention on the college and institutional culture, and relatedly on institutional support for the doctoral program. The cultural resistance of change, within the institution (perhaps influenced by the regional culture of the State of Texas—behind the “Pine Curtain” of East Texas) and the need for increased scholarship, particularly within a dominant culture of service and teaching, illuminates the problematics associated with developing a doctoral program.

Final Reflections

A foundation for the doctoral program was constructed through the work of doctoral faculty members early on; work focused on identifying and developing a construct of scholar–practitioner leadership. This work was situated within the existing cultural ecology of the department, which could be characterized as rigid with “regimes of truth” predicated on more traditional educational administration perspectives and knowledge. Interestingly, the “regimes of truth” were deeply embedded in the cultural ecology.

Initially, the discourse and collective thinking that shaped the scholar–practitioner leadership construct, guided students and faculty as they shared through coursework, and the larger work of growing a scholarly culture, in the constructed reality of a preparation program premised on the ideals of scholar–practitioner leadership. It is important to note that the continued construction of meaning has been affected by shifts in power/knowledge within the cultural ecology of a department/program where faculty turnover is relatively high, five new doctoral faculty members in the past seven years, with only one faculty member remaining that had a primary role in originally implementing the doctoral program. Interestingly, an emergent pattern in the shifting of faculty has been the positioning of non-doctoral faculty in the exchanges of political currency. What became evident, and continues to do so, is the resistance – i.e., continued advocating of more traditional administrative “regimes of truth” – from non-doctoral faculty in the department; faculty in principal and superintendent programs.

The affect of a changing faculty has been experienced at the most critical level, with the students in each cohort and by those students completing dissertation research. Notwithstanding the problematic of destabilizing student relationships with faculty, diminishing trust as a form of power struggle occurred in the shifting patterns of control. Importantly, students have often been the more resolute in mediating tensions associated with the growth of the doctoral program as they experience it over time; through and within the flow their preparation and practical experiences.

The cultural ecology of the leadership program was defined by curricular and pedagogical discourses and practices, not unlike that described by Anderson and Grinberg

(1998). It was evident that during the time frame for this study, when the doctoral student participants were in their program, the discourses and knowledge structures of the program were shifting in response to the political and ideological positioning of the academic setting, in part driven by accrediting agencies, impart by change in faculty, and in part by a shifting emphasis with respect to leadership literature and research. As participants reported in this study, the work of educational leaders must consider the dynamics of such positioning, in particular as he/she examines the “regimes of truth” at work within the preparation program, juxtaposed to the “regimes of truth” at work in his/her respective places of practice.

Shifting curricular and pedagogical discourses and practices worked to shape the individuals understanding of social justice leadership, and to shape the individuals social self – the identity as social justice leader. Such shaping of the “social self,” and related disciplinary discourse and practice was perceived as a form of cultural anchor within the ecology of the program. Often the question surfaced as to what stands as “truth” in relation to social justice leadership, which was perceived as resulting from conflicting frames of “truth” presented by faculty members in the different courses. “Regimes of truth” surfaced as dominant beliefs with respect to democracy, social justice, caring, community, and ethical/moral leadership surfaced and became patterns in faculty, students and faculty and students conversations. These patters reflected epistemological and pedagogical conflicts in relation to forming the leader “self” or “identity” as scholar–practitioner leader. Equally important, both faculty and students in the program reflected the importance of cultural consciousness as a primary ecological factor in shaping the identity of scholar–practitioner leaders.

About the Author

Patrick M. Jenlink is Professor of doctoral studies in the Department of Secondary Education and Educational Leadership and Director of the Educational Research Center, Stephen F. Austin State University. His university teaching experience includes Northwestern Oklahoma State University, Western Michigan University, and assignments in Europe with University of Oklahoma and NATO. Dr. Jenlink’s teaching emphasis in doctoral studies at Stephen F. Austin State University includes courses in ethics and philosophy of leadership, research methods and design, and leadership theory and practice. Dr. Jenlink’s research interests include moral literacy, politics of identity, democratic education and leadership, and critical theory. He has authored numerous articles, guest edited journals, authored or co-authored numerous chapters in books, and authored, edited or co-edited several books. Currently, Dr. Jenlink serves as editor of *Teacher Education & Practice* and co-editor of *Scholar-Practitioner Quarterly*, both refereed journals. Books published include *Dialogue as a Means of Collective Communication*, Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishing, *Dialogue as a Collective Means of Design Conversation*, Springer Publishing, *Equity Issues for Today’s Educational Leaders: Meeting the Challenge of Creating Equitable Schools for All*, Rowman & Littlefield, *Dewey’s Democracy and Education Revisited: Contemporary Discourses for Democratic Education and Leadership*, Rowman & Littlefield. Dr. Jenlink’s current book projects include a co-authored book, *Developing Scholar-Practitioner Leaders: The Empowerment of Educators* (forthcoming from Falmer Press), *Ethics and the Educational Leader: A Casebook of Ethical Dilemmas* (forthcoming from Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group), and

Educational Leadership, Moral Literacy, and the Dispositions of Moral Leaders (forthcoming from Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group).

References

- Anderson, G. L. (1989). Critical ethnography in education: Origins, current status, and new directions. *Review of Educational Research*, 59(3), 249-270.
- Anderson, G. L. (1990). Toward a critical constructivist approach to school administration: Invisibility, legitimation, and the study of non-events. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 26(1), 38-59.
- Anderson, G. L., & Grinberg, J. (1998). Educational administration as a disciplinary practice: Appropriating Foucault's view of power, discourse, and method. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 34(3), 329-353.
- Anderson, G. L., & Herr, K. (1999). The new paradigm wars: Is there room for rigorous practitioner knowledge in schools and universities? *Educational Researcher*, 28(5), 12-21.
- Anderson, G. L., & Jones, F. (2000). Knowledge generation in educational administration from the inside out: The promise and perils of site-based, administrator research. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 36(3), 428-464.
- Bligh, M. C., Meindl, J. R. (2004). The cultural ecology of leadership: An analysis of popular leadership books. In D. M. Messick & R. M. Kramer (Eds.), *The psychology of leadership: New perspectives and research* (pp. 11-52). Athens: LEA Press.
- Bogotch, I., Beachum, F. D., Blount, J., Brooks, J., & English, F. (2008). *Radicalizing educational leadership: Dimensions of social justice*. Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense Publishing.
- Bogotch, I. E., & Roy, C. B. (1997). The contexts of partial truths: An analysis of principal's discourse. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 35(3), 234-252.
- Brown, K. M. (2004). Leadership for social justice and equity: Weaving a transformative framework and pedagogy. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40(1), 77-108.
- Carspecken, P. F. (1996). *Critical ethnography in educational research: A theoretical and practical guide*. New York: Routledge.
- Chabal, P., & Daloz, J-P. (1999). *Africa works: Disorder as political instrument*. Oxford: James Currey.
- Cherryholmes, C. (1988). *Power and criticism: Poststructural investigations in education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy in education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York: Macmillan.
- Dewey, J. (1927). *The public and its problems*. New York: Henry Holt and Company.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The archeology of knowledge and the discourse of language*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1979). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. A. Sheridan (Trans.). New York: Vintage.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977*. New York: Pantheon Books.

- Foucault, M. (1982). How is power exercised? In H. Dreyfus and P. Rabinow (Eds.), *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics* (pp. 226-226). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Foucault, M. (1984 a). The order of discourse. In M. Shapiro (Ed.), *Language and politics* (p. 109). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Foucault, M. (1984b). Space, knowledge and power. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *The Foucault reader* (pp. 239-256). New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1988a). *The care of the self*. New York: Vintage.
- Foucault, M. (1988b). Practicing criticism (Trans. A. Sheridan et al.). In L. D. Kritzman (Ed.), *Politics, philosophy, culture: Interviews and other writings* (pp. 152-158). New York: Routledge
- Frake, C. O. (1962). Cultural ecology and ethnography. *American Anthropologist*, 64(1), 53-59.
- Frattura, E. M., & Capper, C. A. (2007). *Leading for social justice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, a Sage Publications Company
- Galpin, T. (1996). *The human side of change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Giroux, H. A. (1988). Critical theory and the politics of culture and voice: Rethinking the discourse of educational research. In R. Sherman & R. Webb (Eds.), *Qualitative research in education: Focus and methods* (pp. 190-210). New York: The Falmer Press.
- Giroux, H. A. (1992a). *Border crossings: Cultural workers and the politics of education*. New York: Routledge.
- Giroux, H. A. (1992b). Educational leadership and the crisis of democratic government. *Educational Researcher*, 2(4), 4-11.
- Giroux, H. A. (1994). Educational leadership and school administration: Rethinking the meaning of democratic public cultures. T. A. Mulkeen, N. H. Cambron-McCabe, & B.J. Anderson (Eds.), *Democratic leadership: The changing context of administrative preparation* (pp. 31-47). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Hurst, D. K. (2010). *The new ecology of leadership: Business mastery in a chaotic world*. West Sussex, England: Columbia University Press.
- Jenlink, P. M. (1999, April 19-23). *Creating the scholar-practitioner department: A model of research and renewal*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada.
- Jenlink, P. M. (2001a, April 8-14). *Scholar-Practitioner Leadership: A Critical Analysis of Preparation and Practice*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seattle, Washington.
- Jenlink, P. M. (2001b). Beyond the knowledge base controversy: Advancing the ideal of scholar-practitioner leadership. In T. J. Kowalski (Ed.), *21st century challenges for educational administration* (pp. 65-88). Lanham, MD: The Scarecrow Press, Inc.
- Jenlink, P. M. (2002, November 1-3). Leadership as a *Bricolage* of scholarly practice: A critical examination of disciplinary discourses and practices. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) Pittsburgh, PA.
- Jenlink, P. M. (2003a, August 5-8). *Describing the leadership bricolage: Conceptualizing a new rigor in preparation and practice*. Presented at the 57th Annual Summer Meeting of the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration, Sedona, AZ.

- Jenlink, P. M. (2003b, April 21-25). *Conceptualizing leadership as a bricolage of scholarly practice: A critical examination of expanding disciplinary boundaries in preparation and practice*. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association annual meeting, session 41.022, Chicago, IL.
- Jenlink, P. M. (2003c). Identity and cultural work: The scholar-practitioner as public intellectual. *Scholar-Practitioner Quarterly*, 1(4), 3-8.
- Jenlink, P. M. (2004a). A scholar-practitioner stance: Practices of social justice and democracy. *Scholar-Practitioner Quarterly*, 2(2), 3-12.
- Jenlink, P. M. (2004b). Ensuring democracy in an era of standards and accountability: The scholar-practitioner's work. *Scholar-Practitioner Quarterly*, 2(4), 3-12.
- Jenlink, P. M. (2005). On bricolage and the intellectual work of scholar-practitioners. *Scholar-Practitioner Quarterly*, 3(1), 3-12.
- Jenlink, P. M. (2010). The scholar-practitioner's obligation: Freedom's poetic. *Scholar-Practitioner Quarterly*, 4(1), 1-10.
- Jenlink, P. M. (2011). Democracy preserved: Our obligation as scholar-practitioners. *Scholar-Practitioner Quarterly*, 5(2), 1-4.
- Jenlink, P. M. (2013a). Scholar-practitioner leadership as an enactment of 'presence'. *Scholar-Practitioner Quarterly*, 7(1), 4-6.
- Jenlink, P. M. (2013b). The scholar-practitioner leader as cultural ecologist. *Scholar-Practitioner Quarterly*, 7(3), 219-225.
- Kincheloe, J. L. (1999). Critical democracy and education. In J. G. Henderson & K. R. Kesson (Eds.), *Understanding democratic curriculum leadership* (pp. 70-83). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Kincheloe, J. L. (2001). Describing the bricolage: Conceptualizing a new rigor in qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 7(6), 679-692.
- Kincheloe, J. L., & McLaren, P. (2000). Rethinking critical theory and qualitative research. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 279-313). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Kincheloe, J. L., & Pinar, W. F. (Eds.). (1991). *Curriculum as Social Psychoanalysis: The Significance of Place* (1-23). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Korthagen, F., & Vasalos, A. (2005). Levels in reflection: Core reflection as a means to enhance professional development. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 11(1), p. 47-71.
- Lindsey, R., Roberts, L., & Campbell-Jones, F. (2005). *The culturally proficient school*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- McLaren, P. L. (1995). Collisions and otherness: "Traveling" theory, postcolonial criticism, and the politics of ethnographic practice—the mission of the wounded ethnographer. In P. L. & J. M. Giarelli (Eds.), *Critical theory and educational research* (pp. 271-300). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Neibuhr, R. (1946). *The children of light and the children of darkness. A Vindication of democracy and a critique of its traditional defence*. New York: Charles Scribner's sons.
- Quantz, R. A. (1992). On critical ethnography (with some postmodern considerations). In M. D. LeCompte, W. L. Millory, & J. Preissle (Eds.), *The handbook of qualitative research in education* (pp. 447-505). San Diego, CA: Academic Press, Inc.

- Riehl, C., Larson, C. L., Short, P. M., & Reitzug, U. C. (2000). Reconceptualizing research and scholarship in educational administration: Learning to know, knowing to do, doing to learn. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 36(3), 391-427
- Scheffler, I. (1960). *The language of teaching*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Schein, E. H. (1999). *Organizational culture and leadership* (2nd Ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- St. Pierre, E. A., & Pillow, W. S. (2000). Introduction: Inquiry among the ruins. In E. A. St. Pierre & W. S. Pillow (Eds.), *Working the ruins: Feminist poststructural theory and methods in education* (pp. 1-24). New York: Routledge.
- Steward, J. H. (2005). The concept and method of cultural ecology. In H. L. Moore & T. Sanders (Eds.), *Anthropology in theory: Issues in Epistemology* (pp. 100-106). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Sutton, M. Q., & Anderson, E. N. (2010). *Introduction to cultural ecology*. Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press.
- Zachary, L. J. (2005). *Creating a mentoring culture: The organization's guide*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.