

Recognizing Each Others' Faces in Educational Leadership's Scholarship and Practice

Thienhuong Hoang

California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

Abstract

In an applied field, the persisting tension over the relative importance and influence of theory and practice often creates a crevasse between scholars and practitioners. While conflict can be destructive, this paper explores both the destructive and reconstructive means of bridging the theory-practice divide. The author reflects on her experiences moving back and forth between school leadership practice and academia. The author draws on literature and research expressing the conundrums of educational professional culture and historic caste system among scholars found in the academy. The purpose of this paper is to problematize the divisions between culture norms found among scholars and practitioners.

Purpose

Professional culture is a recurring topic of interest to education scholars, but many practitioners eschew what seems like non-productive and irrelevant academic musings from those in the ivory tower (Sykes, 1999). This paper represents an effort by a scholar-practitioner to expose the dividing norms between educational leadership practitioners and scholars. The purpose of this paper is to name the sources of divisions and in so doing to allow opportunities for reconciling or celebrating these persisting differences. An applied field needs to ease the passage of scholars and practitioners between the worlds of work and study of that work. The interdependence of scholarship and practice requires deeper understanding of the forces that separate these two contributing perspectives in the field of Educational Leaders.

The divisions have been part of the discussions about the goals and purpose of preparation of school administrators since the beginning. Levine (2005) described "sharp differences--which became fissures...James Earl Russell, dean of Teachers College, favored a practitioner-based program" (p. 15). Other deans, for example, at Harvard and University of Chicago would push for more rigorous academic models. "The education school deans agreed to disagree, thus laying the foundation for what has evolved into polar differences regarding the goals and purposes of educational administration programs" (Levine, 2005, p.16).

In response to the Broad Foundation and Thomas B. Fordham Institute's recent report *Better Leaders for America's Schools: A Manifesto*, Kowalski (2004) notes that a group of what he refers to as *anti-professionist* are currently raising the stakes in that they seek to deregulate

school administration, "This war for the soul of school administration has and continues to be centered on intractable conflict concerning tensions between democracy and professionalism in school governance" (p. 92). While this paper will not directly deal with this attack, what some are considering a crisis in the field, it does offer some direction for those who believe that education can and should strengthen the professional aspect of administration.

Perspectives

Teaching is one of several occupations, including the military, by which people can improve their social status (Lortie, 1975). As a result, members of any social strata may view educators' social status as pretentious. The dogged self-determinism of United States cultural values allow anti-intellectualism to simmer socially and cast more shadows over the esteem by which teachers are regarded (Boyer, 1990; Elazar, 1994).

The field of Educational Leadership assumes a traditionally defensive stance in relation to the field's stature in society as well as in the academy (McCarthy & Kuh, 1997; McCarthy, Kuh, Newell, & Iacona, 1988). This posture stimulated the drive for a scholarly foundation in the studies of educational leadership (Boyer, 1990; Clifford & Guthrie, 1988; Tyack & Hansot, 1982).

Pounder, Crow, and Bergerson (2004) imply that professors have moved further over the decades toward a scholarly approach valuing the importance of ideas and extending knowledge. In a survey of recent doctoral graduates, they found overall perceptions of the university professoriate were that "those job attribute items that were viewed most negatively included largely salary and working conditions items (objective domain). For example, 'pressure to publish' was evaluated least favorable of all 57 items" (p. 511). However, for the sub-group of graduates that went into the professorate, they found

Interestingly 'publication/work pressure' was positively related to intention to remain a professor, suggestion that perhaps those respondents who have already chosen to be educational leadership professors do not experience publication/work pressure as necessarily disadvantageous to staying in the professorate. (p. 523).

Even among recent graduates from doctoral programs, there seems to be some stark differences in dispositions between practitioners and professors.

The underlying viewpoint assumed in this paper is a critical perspective, one that questions the prevailing conditions and assumptions of a social system, class, or group (English, 1992, 1994; Greenfield, 1982, 1985; Foster, 1986). Educational Leadership studies have been called to task for either taking a more critical perspective or conversely not taking a critical enough perspective (Culbertson, 1988; Donmoyer, 1999a, 1999b; Griffiths, 1988; Lopez, 2003; Lugg, 2003).

Data Sources and Methods

Although this paper's prevailing perspectives critical theory, typically adopts analytic

approaches depending on deconstructing language and vocabulary in extant works, this work reports on a combination of hermeneutics in the dominant Educational Leadership literature and the author's experience. The author, a scholar in higher education, had practiced and experienced assignments as a public school educator and leader, before entering higher education. She recorded her experience in journals, saved memos and other school data records. These extensive data sets provided the basis for analyses presented in this paper.

The author combed through journal entries and post-field experiences to reveal vignettes of problematic postures between scholars and practitioners. The findings expose the unhelpful divisions in the applied field of Educational Leadership. The following provides an example and summarizes findings. Then, the author provides personal reflections on how her movement between both worlds increased her capacity as scholar-practitioners.

Practitioner Vignette

The setting is a professional development session with university professors giving information about two topics: (a) teacher selection and (b) a teaching model designed to foster reading skills--Concept Attainment (Lasley and Matczynski, 1997). I was now part of the practitioners, not on the scholars' side. It felt good to be part of a group of principals that I respected and had worked with in a different role and for the most part from the reactions of the principals it seemed I was accepted as a peer in the group. While I did not find everything covered in this professional development session to be earth shattering, I did find a few good ideas that I thought to myself, "I may use that some day."

What most struck me about this meeting was in an informal feedback session with the whole group. One of the more veteran members of the group laughed boisterously and made a comment to the effect that university professors were in for a surprise implying naiveté on their part. That comment and many others like it, which have been made to me and continue to be made to me about how many professors would not survive the rigors of the principalship indicate how some professors are viewed as being out of touch with reality. This lack of relevance is a major problem for the profession which provides strong ammunition to those who would like to see the demise of university preparation programs.

What Practitioners Say About Scholars

Practitioners are bombarded by demands from many directions and constituents (e.g. parents, community members, politicians, businesses, students, teachers, unions, board members, and universities to name a few). Just one example is the licensure requirements of each state and the federal legislation that demands teachers meet politicians' definition of highly qualified teachers. Pressure for accountability has increased and it seems as if time has become a luxury seldom available to practitioners.

When university professors say that they should not have to prepare administrators to manage the daily problems of practice in the systems for which school leaders are responsible, those scholars seem to be out of touch with the world in which schools operate. Theory for its own sake does not have much value. What schools need are ways to help real live students now.

Crisis after crisis represent pressing demands that make scholars' emphases on reflection and ivory tower-ish theory seem too abstract or like arguments about how many angels can fit on the head of pin. At best scholars are out of touch, at worst they are a drain on vital resources and time that needs to be spent helping children. In a discussion of the problems practitioners have with university programs, Stein and Gewirtzman (2003) state, "University incentive structures do not encourage or require participation in school leadership practice on the part of professors. Faculty members are typically hired based on their record of publication, not on their ... school-based leadership" (p. 4). They further posit that, "At best, the process of generating new knowledge is rigorous, systemic, and slow. By the time a research finding is published, the empirical world of practice has moved on, confronting new challenges and new realities" (Stein & Gewirtzman, 2003, p. 4).

The idea that "professors are parasites," which develops from the feeling among many practitioners that researchers arrive at schools, take data out, contribute very little in return, and write articles that earn them prestige in the research community when their name becomes associated with the exemplary practice of school-based practitioners schools (since the "research subjects" must typically remain anonymous), must be challenged. (Stein & Gewirtzman, 2003, p. 8).

In the conclusion of Levine (2005)'s critique of school leadership programs, it is stated, "Because they have failed to embrace practice and practitioners, their [the leadership programs'] standing has fallen, and school systems have created their own leadership program" (p. 68).

Scholar-Practitioner Vignette

The setting is an international peer-refereed scholarly conference where few practitioners venture. Many of those that do grace the sessions appear due to pressure from their professors and advisors as they seek terminal degrees. In public spaces, they offer positive, even approval-seeking, comments such as, "I've read about these people and now I get to see them." or "I'm a bit overwhelmed by all the brain power here." In the few moments they grab with the scholars, they sometimes confess that the conference is very different from their experiences with professional conferences. For one thing, the exhibit hall offers very few free samples of anything. In short, the Kudzu of academe drapes every aspect of scholarly conferences.

I went to both professional and scholarly conferences. Not surprisingly, I felt at home in both, until one post-session conversation with several colleagues, among which exist respected researchers on the roles and politics associated with positions in school leadership. My colleagues began comparing notes about the policy environment for their programs in school leadership from state regulations to accreditation requirements. Naturally, the topic of current pressure for alternative career paths to the principalship and superintendency arose. One of my colleagues noted the irony in a local press for alternative certification that had played out in a state regulation and accreditation requirements for professors of educational leadership to possess some form of practitioner license. The perversity of policy that eschews a core prerequisite for school leadership as teaching experience, but insists that professors of educational leadership possess such credentials provoked both laughter and concern.

The conversation turned as colleagues compared notes on their practitioner backgrounds, and I remarked on "retooling" in the field. One of those present shocked me with this outburst, "Why on earth would you do that?" Turns out that outburst was a rhetorical question as this well respected scholar began to list a variety of reasons why time in leadership roles in the field was a worthless and wasteful use of time. The litany went something like this:

1. Research is the focus of professors and principals do not have time to research anything
2. The petty logistics of school days provide no insights into the principal position that can't be gathered in rigorously designed surveys or other studies
3. Professors represent a level of scholarship that requires no further credentials
4. The public and policy makers need no other evidence of professorial productivity than that which academic freedom protects through the process of promotion and tenure
5. It doesn't take a cook to recognize the quality of the food, and finally
6. My brain was probably soft to start with.

Obviously, I have thought a lot about this incident. Especially in comparison to the numerous vignettes I could recite about how practitioners reacted to my "retooling" in the field. I think both sectors of our field suspected that I had suffered some kind of brain malfunction. Ultimately, the scholar to practitioner message carries the edge of intellectual elitism that inappropriately privileges one perspective as well as violates some of the basic scholarly tenets of knowledge construction in any field.

What Scholars Say About Practitioners

Scholars seem constantly affronted by practitioners' demand for expediency and convenience in addressing the daily problems of practice. Kowalski (2005) provides two positive purposes for the use of practitioners as part-time faculty; that of increasing clinical education and making instruction more practice-based, but he notes that "the deployment of part-time faculty has been used to erode full-time positions and when this occurs, school administration departments are even more likely to become 'cash cows'" (p. 6). Although many institutions employ an underground staff of adjuncts whose day jobs include every category of school and district professional positions, full-time tenure-track faculty distance themselves from those worker bees in numerous ways (Schneider, 2003; Shakeshaft, 2002).

Practitioners are anti-intellectual. Such anti-intellectualism borders on malpractice. They may be limited in their ability to solve problems. Practitioners are uncritical about the status quo and often perpetuate poor and abusive practices (Ackerman, & Maslin-Ostrowski, 2002; Blase & Blase, 2002, 2003). Practitioners who are unethical with ideas may be unethical in other aspects of practice. Practitioners are apt to steal educational practices from the Internet. In addition, their propensity for a quick answer to complex problems may cause harm. Many Internet web sites on education represent political or even entrepreneurial positions rather than tested and appropriate educational practices. Practitioners' indiscriminate acceptance of these site's recommendations may exacerbate individual student, school, and community issues.

Reflections

The knowledge for Educational Leadership cannot be incubated in a sanitized library. As an applied field, Educational Leadership offers the most opportunities for scholars and practitioner to collaborate in knowledge production. Arguably, the realms of practices and scholarship must intersect along at least three vectors: (a) the deepening of relevant research agenda for the field, (b) the refinement of preparation and development for practitioners, and (c) the united and informed guidance of policies directed at education in general.

Improving and refreshing a research agenda. Educational Leadership scholars need excursions into the field to refine their research agenda and test their assumptions about the saliency of their scholarship (e.g. Walcott, 1973). Without a field-based understanding of the pressing problems of practice, scholars are irrelevant to both practitioners and other scholars. Levine (2005) states, "Educational administration scholarship is atheoretical and immature; it neglects to ask important questions; it is overwhelmingly engaged in non-empirical research; and it is disconnected from practice" (p. 44). There are many ways that professors can connect and reconnect with the real world of practice. Practitioners need to accept and work with those in the university that are willing to try and make these efforts.

Some have called for more accessibility of research to practitioners as well as the involvement of practitioners in the development of research (Creighton, Busch, MacNeil & Waxman, 2005). They state, "One of the great ironies of the culture of educational administration in higher education is the exclusion of practicing school leaders in the development of and the access to the knowledge base (K.B) of the field" (p. 2). This can happen as Willower (1994) pointed out one superintendent, "W.T. Harris, one of the earliest writers in the field, was, after all, a Hegelian scholar and long-time editor of the *Journal of Speculative Philosophy*, as well as an educational administrator" (p. 467). Harris may have been exceptional, but the profession does need to access the practitioners' perspective. Kowalski and Place (1994) raise some questions about research standards that may be relevant to finding a balance:

1. Which research standards best serve society and schools?
2. Which research standards best serve the needs of practitioners?
3. Which repeats standards best serve the profession?
4. Which standards are most apt to guide practitioner-scholars toward using research to solve problems in daily practice?
5. Which standards will be accepted by university cultures? (p. 40).

While spending time in the field helps to gain perspective on these issues, not all professors will be taking time to reconnect. Therefore, it is even more important that university researchers ask these types of questions of their own and others work.

Aligning professional curricula. Practitioners need the safety of the university to hone their skills in problem identification and analysis. Learning to think quickly requires time and space to practice incisive and acute data collection for the purpose of reaching reliable conclusions. We need to develop space where practitioners can work on relevant issues and develop skills that are better developed in the safer environment of academia vs. the high stakes world of their practice. For example, if students work on a selection project in a personnel class,

they could improve their decision making by taking time to apply theory and make their assumptions explicit without actually hiring someone that they and the students will have to live with for an extended time.

Scholars need the field to test curriculum as well as problem finding and problem resolution strategies. Universities need to do more, but have started to make some of efforts to make programs and experiences inviting and relevant to real world issues. For example, Milstein and Krueger (1993) note, "Many universities have begun to experiment with ways of shifting the balance of preparation towards more focus on clinical activities and to explore methods for enriching the activities and learnings that take place during the clinical experience" (p. 19).

Shakeshaft (1993) describes one program that made "an effort to move the program out of the classroom and to emphasize experiential learning, we have linked each new community of students that we admit with a local school district" (p. 216). These efforts need to include a balance and not lose the advantages that reflection and connecting with scholarship can provide. For example, Levine (2005) laments the problem of "The adjunct professoriate consisted largely of local superintendents and principals. Their dominant mode of instruction was the telling of personal anecdotes about their adventures as administrator" (p. 36).

United we stand--in the present volatile educational environment practitioners and scholars need to work together not against each other. The political realities are making the world an uncertain place for educators. This uncertainty comes in the form of funding, but perhaps even more importantly in terms of legislative demands placed on the field (e.g. in terms of teacher or administrator licensure requirements or in terms of accountability requirements, or as Levine (2005) points out, "programs are being bypassed as states approve alternative routes and waive traditional certification requirements for principals and superintendents" (p. 49).

Scholars and practitioners need to respect each other at a basic level or our differences may cause those outside education to push for and attain cuts in funding or increased governmental restrictions at both the university and P-12 levels of schools. The public image of the field is under attack from segments of society, other professions, and governmental forces. If we attack each other, that provides great momentum to those who would trivialize or de-professionalize education. In a discussion of the different perspectives on research and reform, Ferrero (2005) makes a comment that is relevant to this discussion: "if educators and reformers could become more self aware and more articulate about their values and their philosophical underpinnings, they could defuse tensions among themselves and channel those values more productively" (p. 427). Levine (2005) suggests that a good model is available in England where the recently opened National College for School Leadership (NCSL) is attempting to "bind together research and practice, believing that research should drive practice and practice should fuel research" (p. 56).

Conclusion

There are three points from Levine (2005)'s "nine-point template for judging the quality of school leadership programs" (p. 12) that deal with the needed practitioner scholar balance. Specifically,

3. Curricular balance: The curriculum integrates the theory and practice of administration... 4. Faculty composition: The faculty includes academics and practitioners, ideally the same individuals... 7. Research: Research carried out in the program is of high quality, driven by practice, and useful to practitioners and/or policy makers" (p. 13).

In this paper, the author has dealt with curriculum and research directly, and while the author strongly encourages all faculty to seek ways to connect or reconnect with the field, it is the author's contention that if we really balance the field's curriculum for development and preparation with research, then faculty will be forced to connect with practice.

Just as schoolyard fights result from status-seeking individuals who can be simultaneously bully and victim, the divisions between scholars and practitioners in Educational Leadership may be symptomatic of a dysfunctional caste-seeking system. Scholars and practitioners in an applied field need to promote their duality and interdependence.

References

- Ackerman, H., & Maslin-Ostrowski, P. (2002). *The wounded leader: How real leadership emerges in times of crisis*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Blase, J., & Blase, J. (2002). The dark side of leadership: Teacher perspectives of principal mistreatment. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(5), 671-727.
- Blase, J., & Blase, J. (2003). *Breaking the silence: Overcoming the problem of principal mistreatment*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Boyer, L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Clifford, J. & Guthrie, W. (1988). *Ed School: A brief for professional education*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Creighton, T., Busch S., MacNeil, A., & Waxman, H. (2005). Establishing the knowledge base to narrow the disconnect existing between university educational administration preparation programs and practicing school leaders. *NCPEA Educational Leadership Review*, 6(1), 1-8.
- Culbertson, J. A. (1988). A century's quest for a knowledge base. In N. Boyan (Ed.), *Handbook of research on educational administration*, (pp. 3-26.) New York: Longman.
- Cunningham, L. L. (1969). Hey, man, you our principal? Urban education as I saw it. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 51(3), 123-128.

- Donmoyer, R. (1995). A knowledge base for Educational Administration: Notes from the field. In R. Donmoyer, M. Imber, & J. Scheurich (Eds.), *The knowledge base in Educational Administration: Multiple perspectives*, (pp. 74-95). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Donmoyer, R. (1999a). The continuing quest for a knowledge base: 1976-1998. In J. Murphy & K. Seashore Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of research on educational administration* (2nd ed., pp. 25-44). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Donmoyer, R. (1999b). Paradigm folk (and its absence) in the second edition of "The Handbook of Research on Educational Administration." *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 35 (4), 614-641.
- Elazar, D. (1994). *The American mosaic: The impact of space, time and culture on American politics*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- English, W. (1992). *Educational administration: The human science*. New York: HarperCollins.
- English, W. (1994). *Theory in educational administration*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Ferrero, J. (2005). Does 'research based' mean 'value neutral'? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 86(6), 425-432.
- Foster, P. (1986). *Paradigms and promises: New approaches to educational administration*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books.
- Greenfield, B. (1982). Against group mind: An anarchistic theory of organization. *McGill Journal of Education*, 17(1), 3-11.
- Greenfield, B. (1985). Theories of educational organization: A critical perspective. In *International encyclopedia of education: Research and studies*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Griffiths, E. (1988). Administrative theory. In N. Boyan (Ed.), *Handbook of research on educational administration*, (pp. 27-51). New York: Longman.
- Kowalski, J. (2004). The ongoing war for the soul of school administration. In T. J. Lasley (Ed.), *Better leaders for America 's schools: Perspectives on the manifests* (pp. 92-114, UCEA monograph series). Columbia, MO: University Council for Educational Administration.
- Kowalski, J. (2005). Developing policy for part-time school administration faculty. *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice*, 1(4), 3-7.
- Lasley, J. & Matczynski, J. (1997). *Strategies for teaching in a diverse society instructional models*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

- Levine, A. (2005, March). *Educating school leaders: The education schools project*. Retrieved March 18, 2005 from <http://www.edschools.org/pdf/final313.pdf>
- Lortie, C. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lopez, G. (2003). The (racially neutral) politics of education: A critical race theory perspective. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39(1), 68-94.
- Lugg, A. (2003). Sissies, faggots, lefties and dykes: Gender, sexual orientation, and a new politics of education? *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39(1), 95-134.
- McCarthy, M. & Kuh, D. (1997). *Continuity and change: The educational leadership professoriate*. Columbia MO: University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA).
- McCarthy, M., Kuh, D., Newell, J., & Iacuna, M. (1988). *Under scrutiny: The educational administration professoriate*. Tempe, AZ: University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA).
- Milstein, M. & Krueger, A. (1993). Innovative approaches to clinical internships: The University of New Mexico experience. In J. Murph (.Ed.), *Preparing tomorrow's school leaders: Alternative designs* (pp. 19-38). University Park, PA: University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA).
- Pounder, G., Crow, M., & Bergerson, A. (2004). Job desirability of the university professorate in the field of educational leadership. *Journal of School Leadership* 14, 497-529.
- Schneider, J. (2003). The unholy alliance between departments of Educational Administration and their "invisible faculty". *Occasional Paper*. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators (AASA).
- Shakeshaft, C. (1993). Preparing tomorrow's school leaders: The Hofstra University experience. In J. Murph (Ed.), *Preparing tomorrow's school leaders: Alternative designs* (pp. 205-223). University Park, PA: University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA).
- Shakeshafts, C. (2002). The shadowy downside of adjuncts. *School Administrator*, 59(10), 28-30.
- Stein, J. & Gewirtzman, L. (2003). *Principal training on the ground: Ensuring highly qualified leadership*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Stuart, J. (1976). *Mr. Gallion 's School*. Ashland, KY: Jesse Stuart Foundation.
- Sykes, G. (1999). The "new professionalism" in education: An appraisal. In J. Murphy & K.S Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of research on educational administration* (2nd ed, pp. 227-249). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

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

Walcott, F. (1973). *The man in the principal's office: An ethnography*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Willower, J. (1994). Values, valuation and explanation in school organizations. *Journal of school Leadership* 4, 466-483.