University of Nebraska - Lincoln

# DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Faculty Publications in Educational Administration

Educational Administration, Department of

5-2020

# What is the meaning of educational leadership in a time of policy engineering?

Taeyeon Kim

# What is the meaning of educational leadership in a time of policy engineering?

Taeyeon Kim

Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, USA

*Current address* — Department of Educational Administration,
University of Nebraska-Lincoln, 126 TEAC, Lincoln, NE 68588-0360,
*email*  tkim@unl.edu

**ORCID** Taeyeon Kim http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2020-9851

**Abstract**
This philosophical essay explores the purpose of educational leadership with a particular focus on where and how leaders interact with education policy. Building on the idea that the purpose of educational leadership should differ from that of business management, this paper analyzes how mechanisms of policy engineering might construct educational leadership as instrumental to serving predetermined policy goals. Using Stephen Ball's concept of policy technologies and Herbert Marcuse's idea of one-dimensional thinking, I analyze the ways education policy controls school leaders. In response to these mechanisms of control exerted through policy engineering, I explore where and how school leaders can challenge such mechanisms and create new possibilities for educational leadership.

## Introduction

It was a beautiful fall day. Walking from Gwan-ak Mountain to the College of Education at Seoul National University, I was asking Dr. Jin, my advisor from my master's degree program at that time, why do educational researchers say school organizations manage or respond to social changes and external environments? Can education lead to changes or innovations instead of catching up to what industries or others are doing? In short, the question in my mind was, can schools be pro-active instead of reactive? (Here, I admit that my understanding of educational leadership at that time assumed multiple characteristics of business leadership contextualized in neoliberal times). Jin *seon-saeng-nim* (Teacher Jin in Korean) thought for a while, looking at the clean, deep blue, Korean fall sky. After a moment of silence, he looked into my face, saying that, 'If the school loses the function of preserving certain types of heritage of the society and tries to be like a business industry, what would it be like? While there are multiple roles of schools, you may think about this perspective, as well, in schooling.' I did not answer the question. I was still thinking education can initiate changes and not be driven by external changes, but I did not articulate any words. My own questions had taken a back seat while I breathed in the green-smelling breeze and I listened to our steps across the flowing springs swirling around until they settled. I almost forgot this scene until I read Tosas (2016), when they stirred and reentered my thoughts.

Now, I find my muddled thoughts relating to the question that Biesta (2017) asks, 'What ought educational leadership to be *for*' considering the long-term goals and direction of education (p. 15). However, I have not been able to clearly articulate answers to the question for over a decade while I have been *responsive* to other research projects and fulfilling requirements stated in institutional policies. This may, in itself, be part of the answer I was seeking.

My recent reading of Tosas (2016) reminded me of this fall walk. I realize that the majority of research in educational administration remains trapped in the management mind and is not free from the *bio-capitalistic* logic (Foster, 1986; Wilkinson & Eacott, 2013). Under this logic, educational leadership seems to be subordinated to the logic of educational management (Tosas, 2016). Tosas argued that educational

leadership ought to be regarded as 'a discipline that is independent from management' (p. 354). In this paper, I draw from Tosas (2016), Ball (2003, 2015), Marcuse (1991), and Arendt (1958) to show how current policy discourses are shaped by technologies of management, which restrict possibilities for educational leadership.

According to Tosas (2016), educational management should serve educational leadership rather than commerce because the ends of education and businesses are not the same. For Tosas, educational leadership should not depend on institutional goals and loyalty from followers but should be 'a matter of promoting the pupil's autonomy' (p. 355) and a function of creativity that prompts a 'new beginning,' following what Hannah Arendt says (Tosas, 2016, p. 355). By investigating Augustine's concept of 'natality' from the view of the human existence, Arendt (1958) saw being born as a new beginning that gives uniqueness and freedom to humans, and abilities to create something new (see Kong, 2017). Complicating this notion with Agamben's theory of impotentiality and Bauman's idea of unfulfilled possibilities, Tosas concluded that educational leadership should aim to cultivate 'an attitude, which is crucial in resisting biocapitalism and its resulting dangerous side effects, such as desubjectification' (Tosas, 2016, p. 368).

Specifically, Tosas (2016) paid attention to Giorgio Agamben's ontology of impotentiality. Informed by Lewis (2014) application of Agambennon's impotentiality to education, Tosas argued that thinking about impotentiality helps us to move beyond problematic notions of learning and to avoid harnessing students with the discourse of the 'child genius' as a continuous desire. He demonstrated that Agamben's ontology can be similar to the three common states about education that;

> First, by arguing that any educative process lacks an identifiable telos, one might be simply saying that education lacks a goal because it is a life-long process . . ..Second, one might be arguing the process of learning will never be completed because objects resist being thoroughly apprehended, . . . and third, the statement might describe the fact that the more we learn, the more possibilities and angles of knowledge appear, that is, the more one examines an objects, the deeper the object appears. (Tosas, 2016, p. 362)

With this notion, Tosas (2016) turned to Zygmunt Bauman's notion of *unfulfilled possibilities*. Bauman (2011) views that, in the liquid modern era, the individuals are enclosed by a great constellation of possibilities, which results in 'unfulfilled possibilities.' Given this context, individuals are supposed to believe that they possess multiple chances to commit themselves to something, even though the accumulated experiences might have shown that 'most chances tend to be wrongly prejudged, overlooked, or missed' (Bauman, 2011, p. 4). With these unfulfilled possibilities, Bauman (2011) is concerned that individuals think investing time in them is a waste of time for them, thus choosing 'to be abandoned rather than sharpened and tried again with a greater skill' (p. 5). According to Bauman (2011), education needs to choose some of these possibilities and invest in them, such as teaching students how to use some of the given information.

Under biocapitalism, where there is a prevalent narrative of personal fulfillment as economic ends (Masschelein & Simons, 2008), Tosas (2016) argued that education becomes instrumental to prepare individuals for the market, and therefore, the subject of education is wiped out. Thus, for Tosas, education leadership should reject thoughts and behaviors of pursuing unattainable goals established by biocapitalistic norms and, instead, to inspire pupils to think of new possibilities of education beyond existing paradigms.

Building on Tosas (2016), this essay explores the purpose of educational leadership with a particular focus on where and how leaders interact with education policy. While Tosas (2016) focused on education in general, I bring in educational policy as an object which can constrain and/or enable educational leaders to complicate the relationship between leadership and policy by going beyond the conflation of leadership with management. As Ball (1995) noted, policy is instrumental in governing researchers and shaping the landscape of research, particularly in the field of educational administration.

My arguments in this essay are interwoven with the four steps of analysis. I begin by mapping three different conceptualizations of policy – policy as text, policy as discourse, and policy as lived experience. I argue that all the three concepts are not mutually exclusive in practice, but the majority of the policy implementation studies have focused on policy as text by overlooking discourse and lived experience. This oversight may result in subordinating the purpose of

educational leadership to *policy engineering*. Second, to support this claim, I attempt to theorize leaders' interactions with policy. I propose using the term 'interaction' in this paper rather than implementation or enactment to address reciprocal influences between educational leadership and policy. When educational leadership interacts with education policy, school leaders can be described as actors who create dynamics in policy and policy environments and who change and/or make policy. Third, I turn to Stephen J. Ball's concept of policy technologies to analyze how education policy controls school leaders. Drawing from Foucault, Ball argues that market form, management, and performativity represent three key mechanisms constructing possibilities for subjectivity that permeate our life in education. I argue that the technologies employed in constructing this subjectivity bind educational leadership within a management framework. By applying Herbert Marcuse's (1991) idea of *one-dimensional thinking*, I examine how policy engineering can frame educational leadership as being instrumental in serving policy goals. Fourth, given the notion of conceptualization of policy and policy technologies, I investigate creative possibilities for school leaders in their interactions between leadership and policy. Relying on Hanna Arendt's notion of a 'new being' for educational leadership proposed by Tosas (2016), I examine where and how school leaders can exert creativity when leadership interacts with policy. Research on leadership argues that one of the critical roles of school leaders is inspiring others and providing visions. I posit that this argument has been limited, given the existing systems or policy paradigms in the field of educational leadership.

### Conceptualizing policy

I first map policy analysis approaches in general and then summarize three different conceptualizations of policy – policy as text, policy as discourse, and policy as lived experience.

### Mapping policy analysis approach

One of the images reflected in the policy literature views on policy as something 'out there' to be utilized 'clinically and instrumentally'

(Shore & Wright, 2000, p. 5). Shore and Wright (2000) describe this conventional perspective casts policy as 'authoritative instrumentalism' (p. 4);

> it assumes that there are 'objective entities' out there called 'policies' that are the result of decisions made by some rational authority (e.g., a government, committee, management board or chief executive) and which reorganise bureaucratic action to solve particular 'problems' and produce a 'known' (or desired) outcome. (p. 4)

The underlying assumptions regarding this prevalent view of policy are that (1) individuals make rational choices for their own purposes, (2) technical or economic rewards/sanctions can change individual actors' behaviors, and (3) government elites, as policymakers, make and re-make policy by measuring policy effects (Shore & Wright, 2000). Using other words, Carusi et al. (2018) commented on these traditional approaches as policy without humanity.

Although this conventional view is still dominant in policy literature, interpretive policy analysis literature has suggested alternative views on policy by challenging 'the implicitly authoritarian concept of policy as a process that is not only linear and logical but also hierarchical' (Shore & Wright, 2000, p. 8). In this view, policy formulation begins with a vision statement (*text*) and its legislation, then follows 'a chain of command' (Shore & Wright, 2000, p. 8) from the top (national civil servants) down to local officers, and finally to local practitioners – what Lipsky calls 'street level bureaucrats' who interact with people on the ground in 'making' policy (Lipsky, 2010).

In challenging the traditional ways of policy analysis, anthropologists' perspectives have brought a sociocultural understanding to policy by focusing on what people say and do and how they interact in the process of policymaking, which often includes multiple policy actors – the governed, as well as the governing – and the technologies that arbitrate between them (Levinson et al., 2009; Shore & Wright, 2000). Scholars have also added critical perspectives in policy analysis (e.g., Apple, 1982; Gale, 2007; Ball, 1991, 1993; Ozga, 1999; Stein, 2004), focusing on 'practice of power' (Levinson et al., 2009, p. 787). Leaning on Gramscian and Foucaultian views, these

critical studies offer a view of policy as a process of (re)-producing the interests of dominant groups and subordinated political subjects (Levinson et al., 2009).

For example, in education, policy implementation studies often focus on the ground where policy is practiced, particularly schools, assuming that teachers and school leaders are policy actors who have agency to negotiate and make sense of the policy messages carried down from the top (e.g., Coburn, 2001; Nolan, 2018; Spillane et al., 2002). These approaches have broadened our understanding of policy as situated practice that is influenced by individuals' cognitive process of meaning-making in situations where the  cognitive process occurs; however, these frameworks are limited in that they overemphasize the cognition of individuals and overlook the implied dynamics of power that 'implicitly [ratify] existing political, technocratic arrangements for the production of policy' (Levinson et al., 2009, p. 773). In this vein, some scholars suggest ethnographic approaches in accordance with critical perspectives as one of the alternative methodologies for analyzing policy (Levinson et al., 2009).

### Conceptualizing policy: multiple forms

Given the map of policy analysis approaches, I address three different ways of conceptualizing policy: *policy as text, policy as discourse, and policy as lived experience*. I argue that these conceptualizations are not mutually exclusive *and* may be interwoven in analyzing policy. However, I attempt to conceptualize these three different terms to understand the multi-faceted features of policy, which will aid me in specifying the relationship between policy and school leaders in the sections to follow.

### Policy as text

Rooted in the traditional approach, policy often holds 'the status of a governing text' in accordance with 'a set of laws or normative guidelines' (Levinson et al., 2009, p. 767). In this way, policy as text illuminates a *technicist* view that policy represents an objective truth out there – 'the will in policy' that needs to be mandated and achieved by others (Levinson et al., 2009, p. 770). That is, policy is considered as the input to produce predetermined outcomes.

Ball (1993, 2015) differentiated policy as text and policy as discourse, proposing a distinction between what policy documents show and how actors make meaning from those documents. To this effect, in his interview with Avelar (2016), Ball noted that:

> I wanted to think about the difference between positioning the subject in the center of meaning as an interpretive actor, somebody who is an active sense maker, an active translator of the social world; over and against a view of them as a subject produced by discourse, who is spoken by discourse, rather than a speaker of discourse. (p. 5)

This comment generates a question as to whether 'policymakers' are actively interpreting the world, or whether they are the product of discourse with limited possibilities for sensemaking. In such cases, meaning is determined for them by others in discourse. Building on this idea, Ball (1993) distinguishes between policy as text and policy as discourse. *Policy as text* means written texts in policy documents, which is represented in different ways by multiple actors (Ball, 2012, 2015). From this viewpoint, policies are 'textual interventions' and pose solutions to the framed problems through the texts (Ball, 1993, p. 12). In the practice of policy, a variety of actors differentially challenge, mediate, and represent policies in multiple contexts.

*Policy as discourse*

To conceptualize policy as discourse, it is important to understand what 'discourse' means, in this context. Poststructuralist researchers often consider discourse as  productive (Remling, 2018). From this perspective, discourse is 'a constitutive dimension of social relations' (Griggs & Howarth, 2013, p. 17), beyond linguistic understanding of text or beliefs that narrate 'reality.' Thus, *policy as discourse* involves producing ideas through policy, which reveals 'ways of thinking and talking about our institutional [selves], to ourselves and to others' (Ball, 2015, p. 307). Given this notion, Ball (2015) challenged the studies drawing upon Foucaultian discourse analysis using policy text as the object of study because he questions whether discourses can be assessed by recurring words and phrases in policy documents.

Ball argues that policies are 'differentially represented by different actors in different contexts (policy as text), but on the other hand, at the same time produced and formed by taken-for-granted and implicit knowledges and assumptions about the world and ourselves (policy as discourse)' (Ball, 2015, p. 311).

Drawing upon Foucault, Ball views discourse as what 'constrains and enables us writing, speaking, and thinking' (Ball, 2015, p. 311). Thus, an analysis of policy as text focuses on a reader's control in reading the policy, while an analysis of policy as discourse focuses more on the capacity of readers to make meaning in discourse (Ball, 1993). From this perspective, policy aggregates the exercise of power through knowledge in discourses; thus, the effect of policy is essentially discursive (e.g., Ball et al., 2012; Stein, 2004).

*Policy as lived experience*

The third conceptualization, policy as lived experience, informed by Werts and Brewer (2015), prioritizes local actors' representations of their lived experiences over cognitive dimensions of policy implementation. This idea aligns with anthropological approaches to policy analysis – policy as practice (see Shore & Wright, 1997; Sutton & Levinson, 2001) – and also relates the notion of informal policy that is locally structured and enacted in daily practice (e.g., Anderson-Levitt, 2003). The most notable idea in this view – policy as lived experience – challenges undemocratic views of local actors' contributions to policy, which is often reflected in existing policy studies, even in so-called policy implementation studies.

For example, in framing policy analysis, Werts and Brewer (2015) bring Rancière's (1991) presupposition of equality, which contains an 'open set of practices driven by the assumption of equality between any and every speaking being and by the concern to test this equality' (as cited in Werts & Brewer, 2015, p. 208). This orientation assumes local actors (e.g., school principals) have the ability to interpret, enact, and make policy equal to that of state or national level policymakers. Once we accept the implicit assumption that policy is an object truth, rationally formed by government elite groups, it is hard to fully understand policy from the view of local actors. The other important notion in this orientation is understanding policy as an embodiment within

policy analysis. Werts and Brewer (2015) argue that, even though recent scholars conceptualize policy change as a co-constructed process between policy actors, their analytic focuses remain limited to cognitive processes while making sense of the policy. To address this problem, they employed Merleau-Ponty's (1968, 2002)) notion of body arguing that 'people are located within a world and inhabit space, not only that, but they are also implicated in this space' (p. 210). With this view, they conclude that policy is embodied, as well as cognitively recognized by school leaders.

While all three concepts are not mutually exclusive in actors' practice, I argue that the majority of policy studies has focused on policy as text by overlooking the perspectives of policy as discourse and policy as lived experience. This oversight may result in subordinating the purpose of educational leadership to policy engineering, particularly in the field of educational administration. To support this claim, in the following section, I attempt to theorize this aspect of educational leaders' interactions with policy

## Leaders interacting with policy: other than policy implementation

In educational policy literature, policy implementation studies have accumulated evidence about how policies are implemented by local actors in schools or districts focusing on their meaning-making processes. This line of research has often used James Spillane's sense-making framework and established a genre of so-called 'policy implementation studies' in education. Based on the three different conceptualizations of policy articulated above, however, I want to problematize the term 'policy implementation' because the underlying assumptions of this term imply that there is a policy 'out there' and that actors need to make it active (Lynn Fendler, personal communication, 18 April 2018).

Although the Oxford dictionary defines 'implementation' as 'the process of putting a decision or plan into effect' (Oxford Dictionary, 2020), the term itself – policy implementation – suggests that the use of a tool; the tool is clearly the policy, but the use is left to the person utilizing the policy and using it in a way to be projective and to create an outcome. From this, policy is understood as 'something,' a

fixed object to be executed by someone (Carusi et al., 2018). In this view, 'policy implementation' has limited capacity to embrace policy as discourse and policy as lived experience by prioritizing policy as text when local actors encounter that policy. While some researchers have analyzed policy implementation from the perspective of school and district leaders, most studies are guided by these questions: Why the (written) policy does not work in practice, how the leaders accept and make sense of the policy intention differently, and how we can narrow gaps between policy (as text) and practice. These hidden assumptions here are problematic in two folds. First, to some extent, these guiding questions illuminate 'what works' and 'how it works' to 'fix' the problems framed by policymakers. Relatedly and secondly, this approach reflects the notion that local actors, such as school principals and teachers, are policy implementers but *no*t policymakers.

As an alternative perspective, Ball (1993, 2012, 2015) suggests using the term *enactment* in lieu of *implementation* in policy analysis. Ball (1993, 2015) defines *enactment* as a process that provides space for creativity and context to be reflected, which includes *interpretation* and *translation* processes. In the process of interpretation, policy actors make sense of policy by recognizing what the policy expects of them, and then, in the process of translation, actors link their interpretations to practices, utilizing various methods (Avelar, 2016; Ball, 1993, 2015). *Translation* involves multiple practices or institutional efforts, such as in-service training, formal meetings, and developing plans, to make abstract necessities into something workable and achievable (Avelar, 2016). The idea of policy enactment brings historic and contextual dynamics into policy analysis, as critical sources in relation to policy texts and discourses (Ball et al., 2012).

It appears that policy enactment implies 'policy as an actor' (Heimans, 2012, p. 315) and promotes more active engagements from actors than mere policy implementation.  Indeed, policy enactment literature differentiates enactment from implementation by arguing that policy studies need to understand policy process as multiple directionalities of enactment and a reciprocal process (Ball et al., 2012; Heimans, 2012). However, I argue that both the terms, 'implementation' and 'enactment,' maintain a nuance that imposes a fixed object, binaries policy and practice, and posits unidirectional communication between policy and actors. While Ball (1993, 2015)

indicates that translation (part of enactment) is an active method that entails creativity of actors in dealing with policy and reflects policy contexts, I argue that the idea of and the language translation itself assumes existence of the original text or object; therefore, it has limited reflections regarding the conceptualization of policy as lived experience.

In this article, I propose using the term *interaction* rather than implementation or enactment to address reciprocal influences between educational leadership and policy. When educational leadership interacts with education policy, school leaders can be described as actors who create dynamics in policy and policy environments and who change and/or make policy. From this point of view, I argue that the three conceptualizations of policy outlined above differently construct the purpose of leadership and leaders' subjectivities when school leaders interact with education policy.

First, from the view of policy as text, the distance between leaders and policy is far. Policies, as written texts, are the end product of policy making processes at multiple levels (state, local, or school levels). School leaders are expected to interpret and translate policy to make them work in multiple contexts. Policy language tends to be unclear or vague in framing problems and solutions and lacks specificity in order to generalize across different groups (Ball, 1993; Rizvi & Lingard, 2009). For example, how do you define 'students at risk'? Are they students from families with lower income? If it is, what does 'lower income' mean? If their income is not officially documented because of the reluctance of parents, are the students excluded? Are these students lagging far behind on academic achievements or standardized tests? If it is measured by metrics, how do you categorize students who are in the gray areas? In this process, school leaders possess agency in interpretation and translation, but these actions are not counted as policy unless school leaders participate in the process of developing policy documents. As Ingram and Schneider (1993) said, 'public policy almost always attempts to get people to do things that they might not otherwise' (p. 513). In this case, the purpose of leadership can be understood as interpreting policy intentions appropriately and implementing the policy as a resource to 'fix problems' in schools within the established 'rules of the game,' as dictated by state policy (Ball, 1993, p. 14).

Second, policy as discourse adds more layers to policy as document. According to Foucault (1977), discourses are about our ways of thinking and speaking, what can be said and who can speak. With this view, discourse constructs certain possibilities relating to thoughts and knowledge (Ball, 1993, 2015); therefore, individuals can be seen as products of discourse, and, at the same time, as creators of discourse. Thus, school leaders generate and utilize policy discourse. At the same time their thoughts and actions are shaped by discourse. In this case, it raises the question of whose ideas become dominant in policy discourse, and this reveals power dynamics among policy actors. In comparison to school leaders, state (national)-level policymakers are more likely to have greater access to resources (e.g., medias, networks, financial resources) in framing problems, developing solutions and disseminating these ideas widely (e.g., Kim, 2019). In addition, policy as discourse suggests that leaders can recognize and question what leads to and/or constrains their ways of thinking and acting as critical thinkers.

Third, policy as lived experience requires a shift in viewpoint from the commonly held perception that policy determines the knowledge to be used by actors (Werts & Brewer, 2015). The view of policy as lived experience values local actors' contributions to policy by assuming the possibility of democratic politics. Thus, the distance between policy and actors is close, and school leaders are regarded as political agents who should be treated similarly to policymakers at the state level. Policy is not fixed; rather, it takes multiple forms, depending on leaders' experience. This implies that educational leadership should engage in democratic processes of developing policy, and school leaders should be regarded as equally important as state legislators and policymakers.

While some researchers have proposed critical analysis (e.g., Anderson & Mungal, 2015; Levinson et al., 2009; Young & Diem, 2017) or shifts in view regarding policy implementation (e.g., Ball et al., 2012; Nolan, 2018; Werts & Brewer, 2015), the majority of policy implementation studies has focused on policy as text in analyzing policy. Focusing on policy as text is problematic for two reasons. First, policy implementation studies binarize policy and practice by conceptualizing them as inherently different. This relates to issues of hierarchy that view policy as the work of government officials who

represent the positions and political philosophies of the dominant and current government's perspective. This means that policies are placed into the system by the establishment that places individuals in charge of the education oversight, who will implement the current political agenda. Second, when they argue for coherence between policy and practice, they tend to prioritize policy as will in documents, thereby perpetuating the view that policy is a fixed object rather than embodied practices. Such a trend may result in conceptualizing school leaders as 'policy implementers' who are supposed to (re)interpret and realize the policy within the bounded rules and territories, as opposed to leaders as critical thinkers or creative agents who can actively engage in the policy process. Indeed, Niesche (2013a) showed that leaders can take a role as politicians, and leadership can be seen as a form of political subjectivity. However, the dominant views regarding school leaders in relation to education policy have tended to exclude this possibility; prioritizing policy as text in education research may perpetuate irresolvable inequality between school *leaders* and *policymakers*, maintaining subordination of educational leadership in ways that become concrete and permanent (e.g., Bogotch, 2012; Niesche, 2013b)

**Policy technologies: school leaders as technicians**

Viewing school leaders as policy implementers, whether it assumes they are creative or not, aligns with subordinating the purpose of educational leadership to the logic of *policy engineering or management*, particularly in the field of educational leadership and administration. According to Fay (1975), the 'policy engineer . . . is one who seeks the most technically correct answer to political problems in terms of available social scientific knowledge' (p. 14). Using this notion of policy engineering, Ball (1995) problematized the rampant problem-solving technicism in educational studies. He described management theories as influencing this problem-solving technicism in education research, which centers schools as the 'focus of causation' to help explain the relations between inputs and student achievement (Ball, 1995, p. 260). For example, the rise of management  theories defines 'human being as subjects to be managed,' and has influenced reconceptualizing

'schools with the explanation of student performance and variations in levels of achievement' (Ball, 1995, p. 260).

As a result, the purpose of leadership in education studies often relates to the 'efficient achievement of pre-defined educational goals,' especially goals that have been set by politicians, not by educators or students (Berger, 2015, p. 478). Given the perspective of policy engineering shared among educational researchers, policymakers, and school leaders, I argue that *policy technologies* are influential in establishing the assumption that school leadership is instrumental to policy goals, regardless of the conceptualization of policy (text, discourse, and lived experience).

### *Policy technologies*

I turn to Stephen J. Ball's concept of policy technologies to explore the mechanism of policy in imposing certain thoughts and actions for policy actors. Ball (2003) recognizes, within contemporary policy environments, the idea of new forms of control, which represents a process of re-regulation and what Du Gay (1996) calls controlled decontrol. This means that states generate new types of control strategies, such as 'less visible, a much more hands off, and self-regulating regulation,' which appears as if nation-state governments devolve authority and promote flexibility in governance (Ball, 2003, p. 217).

Under these new forms of control, Ball (2003; 2017) argues that there are three policy technologies in reforming relationships, subjectivities, and re-invented disciplines to which this control gives rise: market form, management, and performativity. The first technology, market form, conceptualizes actors as consumers, producers, and entrepreneurs relying on economic values, such as competition, incomes, and interests. Competition is considered to be an effective device for market form to force individuals and institutions to believe that they have to maximize interests in order to survive through the competition (Ball, 2017). Within this environment, people are supposed to pursue their self-interest and the internal well-being of the institution or its members rather than consider the public good (Ball 2017). Teachers and leaders are considered to be entrepreneurs for the school, rather than servants of the school (Scott, 1996).

In the second technology, management constructs a mind-set of finding 'what works.' This concept of management was influenced by the new public management theory which arose in 1990s. New public management has several features: (1) emphasis on outputs rather than inputs, (2) viewing organizations as chains of low-trust relationships based on contracts, (3) the separation of purchaser and provider or customer and contractor roles, (4) the use of competition to provide choice for customers, and (5) decentralization of authority and budget decisions to line managers (Clarke et al., 2000). Relying on these bases, management influences educators to wear away the professional ethic regime in schools and inserting the entrepreneurial-competitive regime by framing management as a positive mechanism against bureaucracy and professionalism (Ball, 2017). This management view shapes actors as managers who follow the discipline of efficiency, effectiveness, and corporate culture. For instance, Gillies (2011) argued that schools and educators are expected to 'become "agile" – creative, innovative, self- managing, alert and responsive to opportunities, proactive and flexible' encapsulating all of the roles within the corporate world (cited in Ball, 2017, p. 57).

Third, performativity is understood as a mechanism, 'a form of indirect steering or steering at a distance which replaces intervention and prescription with target seeing, accountability, and comparison' (Ball, 1998, p. 123). Under performativity, performance of individuals or institutions becomes a measure of productivity and quality (Ball, 2017). The function of performativity can be exemplified by accountability policies in education, which promotes productivity, setting targets, increasing achievement, and comparing with rewards with sanctions. The impacts of performativity entail change in social and interpersonal relationships because performativity establishes norms in which only observable and measurable performance in the data metrics should be counted as achievement; thus, these norms disregard individuals as ethical subjects (Ball, 2017). For example, Elliott (1996) argued that performativity requires energy being used by teachers and leaders in collecting, monitoring, and reporting performance data, but this reduces the energy they have available to improving the inputs such as developing curricula required by performativity standards.

These technologies are interactively woven into education policies (Ball, 1998, 2003, 2017). For example, school-based management

policies are introduced as a part of decentralization and devolution of authority in multiple places in the world (Kim & Yun, 2019). Many accountability policies expect schools to differentiate themselves from other schools and improve themselves by employing the mechanism of competition. Teachers and leaders recognize the responsibility to increase the measurable 'performance' of their students and schools individually and collectively. School leaders, who take on role as managers, are expected to develop a school culture where teachers hold themselves accountable to meet policy standards placed on them as well as continuously investing in themselves and their schools (Ball, 2003; 2017). Under the environment shaped by policy technologies, educators can challenge forced indicators from policies and debate ethical decision makings. However, it is easy for them to follow rules and specific measures in accountability policies because policy technologies are not simply a means for structural change but also can be mechanisms for transforming the subjective existence of teachers, leaders, and researchers (Bernstein, 1996; Holloway & Brass, 2018; Ball, 2003).

### *Leadership as an instrument to serve policy?*

Given the notion of policy technologies, the following question is, how do these technologies govern school leaders' thoughts and ways of thinking when they interact with policies? Herbert Marcuse's theory of the one-dimensional man can provide one of the possible explanations for it. Marcuse (1991) theorized mechanisms of shaping one-dimensional thinking in advanced industrial societies, where the goal is the 'end' of technological rationality. In order to do this, he separates two different human needs – true needs and false needs – which can be distinguished only by the individuals, themselves, when they are autonomous to provide their own answers, away from indoctrination and manipulation by others. However, disguised by media or other technologies, individuals tend to misrecognize false needs as their true needs (Marcuse, 1991). He states that 'the more rational, productive, technical, and total the repressive  administration of society becomes, the more unimaginable the means and ways by which the administered individuals might break their servitude and seize their own liberation' (Marcuse, 1991, pp. 6–7). That is, continuous

commodities accompanied by false needs convey socially 'prescribed attitudes and habits,' limiting reactions ranging from intellectual to emotional; this adheres the consumers to the producers, regardless of consumers' needs regarding the producer and the system as a whole (Marcuse, 1991, p. 12).

When his analogy is applied to educational policies, these three policy technologies can endlessly produce false needs for school leaders. It is possible that leaders recognize the needs for pursuing competitiveness, efficiency, and performativity reinforced by policy, as their true needs. This may lead school leaders to serve policy goals continually and to lose what Marcuse (1991) calls the 'inner dimension' that contains abilities to think critically. This manipulation of needs can perpetuate the labor of school leaders within the technical rationality of education policy. Regardless of views of policy – policy as text, discourse, and lived experience – interactions between leadership and policy encourage injecting one-dimensional thinking into school leaders, following Marcuse's thought. This can occur through the selection of policy languages that prioritize certain values, the creation of discourses in framing problems and solutions in education systems, and the embodied habits and actions consciously and unconsciously imposed by policy technologies. Thus, the logic of policy engineering in education constructs not only set up educational researchers as policy technicians, as Ball (1995) notes, but also establishes the purpose of educational leadership as a way of serving policy intentions instead of promoting multi-dimensional thinking as educational leaders.

## Educational leadership as a new being

If policy technologies govern individuals, what are the possibilities to think about educational leadership? I argue that Hannah Arendt's idea of 'new being' can be useful to explore a possible creativity for school leaders when they interact with policy. For Arendt, a leader initiates something new, which did not exist before, making each leader a beginner (Berger, 2015; Tosas, 2016). Unlike authoritative views of leadership, Arendt's view of leaders depends on relations with others and actions with others (Berger, 2015). This view appears to be similar to languages frequently used in educational leadership studies, such as

'inspiring others' and 'setting visions' (e.g., Avolio, 2010; Bass & Avolio, 1993). However, according to Berger (2015), these perspectives on leadership in education often relate to 'administrative power and assumptions that effective leadership results in efficient achievement of pre-defined educational goals,' as opposed to Arendt's new beginning that supposes 'opening possibilities for renewing our common world' (p. 478). Thus, it is worth exploring the purpose of educational leadership beyond the existing systems that are shaped by policy control and management mind-sets.

Perhaps efforts in Byrne-Jimenez and Yoon's (2019) recent essay about 'Leadership as an Act of Love' can be an example that aligns with Arendt's new beginning. Beyond the conventional framing of school principals as managers, instructional leaders, and social justice leaders, they argue that the core of leadership needs to be centered on the school leaders' 'love for children, for their work, and a deep belief in the power of education' (Byrne-Jimenez & Yoon, 2019, p. 3). For Byrne-Jiménez and Yoon, love, as an active form of leadership, can challenge the present schooling status that prioritizes efficiency and  effectiveness and may help leaders seek joy in their work and maintain personal as well as professional integrity. This framing of leadership is grounded in the relations with others and allows us to view another dimension of leadership in a holistic view, away from leadership as a reactive response to 'problems' framed through policy engineering.

When educational leaders interact with policy, there is a never-ending process of fixing problems because policy itself has a self-generating function in framing problems and solutions through a constant cycle of reforms (Biesta, 2017; Tyack & Cuban, 1995). Policy technologies contribute to establishing biocapitalistic norms and multiple forms of policy in order to encourage leaders to keep pursuing 'unattainable goals.' According to Tosas (2016), educational leadership should aim to cultivate 'an attitude, which is crucial in resisting biocapitalism and its resulting dangerous side effects, such as desubjectification' (p. 368). This desubjectification encourages educational leaders to focus on 'false needs' rather than digging into inner dimensions of educational leadership – asking what ought educational leadership to be for? In other words, I would say that educational leadership needs to challenge the thinking and behaviors related to pursuing predetermined policy goals and to initiate new possibilities of education policy

with others (Niesche, 2013b; Waite, 2016). This echoes Biesta's (2017) argument that educational leaders have duties not only 'to critically examine all the demands and desires that society puts to them' but also 'to resist' with which leaders 'cannot treat students as mere customers whose wishes have to be obeyed' (p. 24). In this way, we may also revisit the idea of developing leadership standards as a taken-for-granted approach to leadership preparation because this adherence can inhibit imagination and alternative understandings of leadership as complex and creative phenomena (Niesche, 2013b).

These new possibilities are not just about seeking alternative solutions or empowering others but also about recognizing the fact that realizing policy goals may not be fully achieved. Under the environments interwoven with policy technologies – market, management, and performativity, it is impossible to truly achieve 'policy goals' for several reasons. First, goals in education themselves are vague because not every educational goal and outcome can be clearly defined, observed, and agreed upon by all. The impacts of education may not be observable or generated immediately or within a certain period. This goal ambiguity or vagueness may be a reason that educational goals appear to be fulfilled, but it also suggests that there are areas left that cannot be measured; therefore, goals may not be fully achieved within the view of the technicist approach. Second, multiple policies can provide conflicting messages at the same time because there are multiple stakeholders in school education who advocate for the interests of individuals or groups. Additionally, policies produced at different administrative levels may not align with each other. Thus, multiple conflicting goals are served as policies continually exist in schools, and it makes it difficult for schools to fulfill some multidimensional goals at the same time (Biesta, 2017). Third, the logic of policy engineering (problem-solving) continues as far as the state exists because it is a typical mechanism for the state to govern (Shore & Wright, 2000). This is the most important reason for the purpose of this study because top-down policies that center on governmental elitisms still continue; even research tends to reduce the meaning of school leaders as 'mere policy tools' (O'Laughlin & Lindle 2015, p. 142). Thus, given the interaction between leaders and policy, the purpose of leadership needs to ask school leaders to initiate thoughts and actions that open a 'new beginning' by challenging the logic of policy engineering. This is

also related  to Marcuse's (1991) inner dimension of thinking that provides power to criticize the common world, where individuals search for 'true needs' and resist being blinded by imposed 'false needs.'

In this essay, I have attempted to reveal how the logic of policy engineering drives the purpose of educational leadership. My goal is not to offer specific directions for school leaders or policymakers within the logic of biocapitalism. Rather, I intend to lift veils that disguise our notion of policy and its mechanisms which influence the shape of the purpose of leadership under the logic of policy engineering. Reflecting on my conversation with Jin *seon-saeng-nim* in 2012, we could have arrived at different discussions if I had imagined leadership beyond the view of management. As Tosas (2016) suggested, in order to establish educational leadership as 'a discipline that is independent from management' (p. 354), I hope my efforts to examine school leaders' interactions with policy provide the possibility of new thoughts on the purpose of educational leadership.

**Notes on contributor** Taeyeon Kim is currently a PhD candidate in the K-12 Educational Administration program at Michigan State University. Her research interests include leadership development, the intersections of policy and leadership practice, educational accountability, and the links between education and social change. She will join the Department of Educational Administration at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln as an assistant professor.

# References

Anderson, G., & Mungal, A. S. (2015). Discourse analysis and the study of educational leadership. *International Journal of Educational Management*, *29*(7), 807–818.

Anderson-Levitt, K. (Ed.). (2003). *Local meanings, global schooling: Anthropology and world culture theory*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Apple, M. (1982). *Education and power*. Routledge.

Arendt, H. (1958). *The human condition*. University of Chicago Press.

Avelar, M. (2016). Interview with Stephen J. Ball: Analyzing his contribution to education policy research. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, *24*(24). https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.24.2368

Avolio, B. J. (Ed.). (2010). *Full range leadership development*. Sage.

Ball, S. J. (1991). *Politics and policy making in education*. Routledge.

Ball, S. J. (1993). What is policy? Texts, trajectories and toolboxes. *The Australian Journal of Education Studies*, *13*(2), 10–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/0159630930130203

Ball, S. J. (1995). Intellectuals or technicians? The urgent role of theory in educational studies. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, *43*(3), 255–271. https://doi.org/10.1080/00071005.1995.9974036

Ball, S. J. (1998). Big policies/small world: An introduction to international perspectives in education policy. *Comparative Education*, *34*(2), 119–130. https://doi.org/10.1080/03050069828225

Ball, S. J. (2003). The teacher's soul and the terrors of performativity. *Journal of Education Policy*, *18*(2), 215–228. https://doi.org/10.1080/0268093022000043065

Ball, S. J. (2012). *Global education inc: New policy networks and the neo-liberal imaginary*. Routledge.

Ball, S. J. (2015). What is policy? 21 years later: Reflections on the possibilities of policy research. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, *36*(3), 306–313. https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2015.1015279

Ball, S. J. (2017). *The education debate*. Policy Press.

Ball, S. J., Maguire, M., & Braun, A. (2012). *How schools do policy: Policy enactments in secondary schools*. Routledge.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership and organizational culture. *Public Administration Quarterly*, *17*(1), 112–121.

Bauman, Z. (2011, May). Liquid modern challenges to education. Lecture Given at the *Coimbra Group Annual Conference*. Padova University Press.

Berger, I. (2015). Educational leadership with an ethics of plurality and natality. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, *34*(5), 475–487. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11217-014-9448-x

Bernstein, B. (1996). *Pedagogy symbolic control and identity*. Taylor & Francis.

Biesta, G. (2017). Educational leadership for what? In D. Waite & I. Bogotch (Eds.), *The Wiley international handbook of educational leadership* (pp. 15–27). John Wiley & Sons.

Bogotch, I. E. (2012). Who controls our knowledge? *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, *15*(4), 403–406. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2012.707688

Byrne-Jimenez, M. C., & Yoon, I. H. (2019). Leadership as an act of love: Leading in dangerous times. *Frontiers in Education*, *3*(117). https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2018.00117

Carusi, F. T., Rawlins, P., & Ashton, K. (2018). The ontological politics of evidence and policy enablement. *Journal of Education Policy*, *33*(3), 343–360. https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2017.1376118

Clarke, J., Gewirtz, S., & McLaughlin, E. (Eds). (2000). *New managerialism, new welfare?* Sage Publications.

Coburn, C. (2001). Collective sensemaking about reading: How teachers mediate reading policy in their professional communities. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *23*(2), 145–170. https://doi.org/10.3102/01623737023002145

Du Gay, P. (1996). *Consumption and identity at work*. Sage.

Elliott, J. (1996). Quality assurance, the educational standards debate, and the commodification of educational research. *BERA Annual Conference,* University of Lancaster.

Fay, B. (1975). *Social theory and political practice*. Allen and Unwin.

Foster, W. (1986). *Paradigms and promises: New approaches to educational administration*. Prometheus books.

Foucault, M. (1977). *The archaeology of knowledge*. Tavistock.

Gale, T. (2007). Critical policy sociology: Historiography, archaeology and genealogy as methods of policy analysis. In S. J. Ball, I. F. Goodson, & M. Maguire (Eds.), *Education, globalisation and new times* (pp. 148–166). Routledge.

Gillies, V. (2011). Social and emotional pedagogies: Critiquing the new orthodoxy of emotion in classroom behaviour management. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *32*(2), 185–202.

Griggs, S., & Howarth, D. (2013). "Between a rock and a hard place": The coalition, the Davies commission and the wicked issue of airport expansion. *The Political Quarterly*, *84*(4), 515–526. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-923X.2013.12041.x

Heimans, S. (2012). Coming to matter in practice: Enacting education policy. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, *33*(2), 313–326. https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2012.666083

Holloway, J., & Brass, J. (2018). Making accountable teachers: The terrors and pleasures of performativity. *Journal of Education Policy*, *33*(3), 361–382. https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2017.1372636

Ingram, H., & Schneider, A. (1993). Constructing citizenship: The subtle messages of policy design. In H. Ingram & S. R. Smith (Eds.), *Public policy for democracy* (pp. 68–94). The Brookings Institution.

Kim, T., & Yun, J. T. (2019). Logics of accountability: Cross-national patterns in school-level controls. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, *27*, 119. https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.27.4597

Kim, T. (2019). Revisiting the governance narrative: The dynamics of developing national educational assessment policy in South Korea. *Policy Futures in Education*, 1478210319873767.

Kong, B. (2017). *Philosphie der Natatität und der Sinn des Anfangs bei Hannah Arendt*. (Trans, Philosophy of natality and the meaning of beginning in Hannah Arendt). *Philosophical Investigation*, *46*, 95–127.

Levinson, B. A. U., Sutton, M., & Winstead, T. (2009). Education policy as a practice of power. *Educational Policy*, *23*(6), 767–795. https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904808320676

Lewis, T. E. (2014). It's a profane life: Giorgio Agamben on the freedom of impotentiality in education. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *46*(4), 334–347. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2013.779208

Lipsky, M. (2010). *Street-level bureaucracy*. Russell Sage.

Marcuse, H. (1991). *One-dimensional man: Studies in the ideology of advanced industrial society*. Beacon Press.

Masschelein, J., & Simons, M. (2008). The governmentalization of learning and the assemblage of a learning apparatus. *Educational Theory*, *58*(4), 391–415. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-5446.2008.00296.x

Merleau-Ponty, M. (1968). *The world of perception*. Routledge.

Merleau-Ponty, M. (2002). *Phenomenology of perception*. Routledge.

Niesche, R. (2013a). Foucault, counter-conduct and school leadership as a form of political subjectivity. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, *45*(2), 144–158. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220620.2013.768968

Niesche, R. (2013b). Politicizing articulation : Applying Lyotard's work to the use of standards in educational leadership. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, *16*(2), 220–233. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2012.688874

Nolan, K. (2018). The lived experience of market-based school reform: An ethnographic portrait of teachers' policy enactments in an urban school. *Educational Policy*, *32*(6), 797–822. https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904816673742

O'Laughlin, L., & Lindle, J. C. (2015). Principals as political agents in the implementation of idea's least restrictive environment mandate. *Educational Policy*, *29*(1), 140–161.

(1999). *Policy research in educational settings: Contested terrain*. Open University Press.

Rancière, J. (1991). *The ignorant schoolmaster*. Stanford University Press.

Remling, E. (2018). Logics, assumptions and genre chains: A framework for poststructuralist policy analysis. *Critical Discourse Studies*, *15*(1), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2017.1382382

Rizvi, F., & Lingard, B. (2009). *Globalizing education policy*. Routledge.

Scott, A. (1996). Bureaucratic revolutions and free market utopias. *Economy and Society*, *25*(1), 89–110. https://doi.org/10.1080/03085149600000004

Shore, C., & Wright, S. (2000). Conceptualising policy: Technologies of governance and the politics of visibility. In C. Shore, S. Wright, & D. Però (Eds.), *Policy worlds: Anthropology and the analysis of contemporary power* (pp. 1–25). Berghahn Books.

Shore, C., & Wright, S. (1997). Policy: A new field of anthropology. In C. Shore & S. Wright (Eds.), *Anthropology of Policy: Critical Perspectives on Governance and Power* (pp. 3–39). Routledge.

Spillane, J. P., Reiser, B. J., & Reimer, T. (2002). Policy implementation and cognition: Reframing and refocusing implementation research. *Review of Educational Research*, *72*(3), 387–431. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543072003387

Stein, S. J. (2004). *The culture of education policy*. Teachers College Press.

Sutton, M., & Levinson, B. A. U. (Eds.). (2001). *Policy as practice: Toward a comparative sociocultural analysis of educational policy*. Ablex.

Tosas, M. R. (2016). Educational leadership reconsidered: Arendt, Agamben, and Bauman. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, *35*(4), 353–369. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11217-015-9474-3

Tyack, D. B., & Cuban, L. (1995). *Tinkering toward utopia*. Harvard University Press.

Waite, D. (2016). The where and what of education today: A leadership perspective. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, *19*(1), 101–109. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2015.1096080

Werts, A. B., & Brewer, C. A. (2015). Reframing the study of policy implementation: Lived experience as politics. *Educational Policy*, *29*(1), 206–229. https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904814559247

Wilkinson, J., & Eacott, S. (2013). 'Outsiders within'? Deconstructing the educational administration scholar. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, *16*(2), 191–204.

Young, M. D., & Diem, S. (Eds.). (2017). *Critical approaches to education policy analysis*. Springer.