

# Postmodern conceptions of power for educational leadership

Sackney, Larry; Walker, Keith; Mitchell, Coral E. EAF Journal : Journal of Educational Administration and Foundations; Winnipeg Vol. 13, Iss. 2, (1999): 33-57.

[ProQuest document link](#)

---

## ABSTRACT (ABSTRACT)

First, we provide a review of the postmodern phenomenon and an overview of power as espoused by selected postmodernists. Second, we explore the philosophic notions of power and its influences on structure, leadership, change, conflict, culture and processes. Third, we ask our readers to reflect on the benefits and problems that might attend the postmodern perspective of power for educational administration. We realize that for the scholars who work with or from postmodern perspectives, our article will deal all too briefly with some topics and leave too much unsaid about some important philosophers. Our intention is to concentrate our readers' attentions on the possible ramifications of various postmodern understandings of power for school organizations and educational leaders. We recognize that our attempt to reduce the notions of this complex phenomenon undermines some postmodern ideas and, ironically, tempts a postmodern critique of our representations.

Michel Foucault is a major contributor to notions of power from postmodern perspectives. His historico-philosophical studies have critiqued knowledge, rationality, discourses and social institutions. He claims that power and knowledge dominate our lives. Foucault (1977) tells us, "We had to wait until the nineteenth century before we began to understand the nature of exploitation, and to this day, we have yet to fully comprehend the nature of power" (p. 213). In this sentence, Foucault places the power-knowledge nexus at the center of human strivings. According to Foucault, power is non-totalizing and non-representational. He understands power to be "dispersed, indeterminate, heteromorphous, subjectless, and productive, constituting individuals' bodies and identities," rather than attached to macrostructures, classes of people or repressive ends (Best & Kellner, 1991, pp. 48-49). Foucault rejects notions of power that subordinate it to economic or legal rules of entitlement. Foucault's account of power goes beyond a negative force construction to an expression of power as productive-it is crucial to our constructions of reality, language, meanings and rituals of truth. He suggests that power is not an organization, its structures or a force that certain people are endowed with but rather it is the label given to a complex social condition where a multiplicity of discourses are at play.

Feminist theorists have also tackled the power problem from postmodern perspectives. [Tong] (1989) says that the roots of postmodern feminism are found in the work of Simone de Beauvoir who asked "Why is woman the second sex" or, as Tong's rephrase goes, "Why is woman the Other" (p. 219)? Although some feminist theorists have complained that "postmodern theory politically disables feminism" (Hartsook, cited in Best & Killner, 1991, p. 208), others have called for a naming of tensions, affinities and syntheses highlighted by feminists and postmodernists (Flax, 1990; Fraser & Nicholson, 1988; Hutcheon, 1989). For example, Gergen (1997) responds to Craig Owen's comment that "postmodernism may be another masculine invention engineered to exclude women" by suggesting that the postmodern framework is a skeleton "too lean for our tastes. Feminist social constructionists offer some meat for those bones. Something to hang on it ... but we simply won't be 'hangers-on'" (Gergen, 1997, p. 607). Davis and Gergen (1997, p. 23) say that "an issue of ongoing interest to feminists has been power. Multiple perspectives on power complicate understandings of this difficult notion." They say that to understand power in relation to behavior, one must "consider the conjunction of social hierarchies and an individual's social hierarchies and an individual's position with respect to them" (p. 23).

## FULL TEXT

### Abstract

This article explores the concepts of postmodernism and power. The paper provides the reader with a review of postmodernism and an overview of power, as espoused by selected postmodernists. The authors explore the influences of postmodern notions of power on structure, leadership, change, conflict, culture and processes. The authors ask their readers to reflect on the utility of and problems with postmodern perspectives of power for educational leaders. The article concludes with an examination of how power might be played out in postmodern school leadership. A view of schools as texts, in which transformative educational discourse and community exists, is proposed.

### Resume

Cet article explore les concepts de postmodernisme et de pouvoir, sous forme d'une critique du postmodernisme et d'une vue d'ensemble du pouvoir telles qu'exprimees par certains postmodernistes. Les auteurs explorent les influences des notions de pouvoir postmodernes sur la structure, les dirigeants, le changement, le conflit, la culture et les processus. On demande au lecteur de reflechir sur l'utilite des perspectives postmodernes sur le pouvoir pour les educateurs de pointe, et sur les problemes qui s'y rattachent. On conclut en examinant comment le pouvoir peut s'exprimer chez les dirigeants scolaires postmodernes. Et on propose de considerer les ecoles commes des textes dotes d'un pouvoir transformateur sur la communaute et le discours educatifs.

### Introduction

An interesting metaphor of power and postmodernism arises when Grentz (1995) contrasts the earlier Star Trek series with the Next Generation episodes. At the risk of being simplistic, we read Grentz' distinction between the two series as a contrast between modernist homogeneity and rationality, in Star Trek, and postmodernist diversity and intuition, in the Next Generation. We extend his metaphor to present our thoughts on postmodernism and power. In the Star Trek series, the universe was logical, the crew was individualistic, roles were distinct, relationships were hierarchical, issues were dichotomized, solutions were enforced, and power was consolidated. Mr. Spock, a dispassionate Vulcan, was the quintessential "rational man," and Captain Kirk the hero-leader. By contrast, in the Next Generation series, the universe was paradoxical, the crew was connected, roles were mutual, relationships were reciprocal, issues were complex, solutions were negotiated, and power was shared. Counselor Troi, an intuitive Betazoid, was the essence of diversity and collectivity, and Captain Picard was the facilitator-leader. In short, the social and political conditions in the two series embody many of the extant assumptions about power that we will delineate in this article.

For the educational context, Maxcy (1994) best sums up the differences between modern and postmodern perspectives on leader learning processes when he says that schools, like other areas of cultural life, are caught on the cusp of a new era, one between a modernist paradigm (characterized by professional values such as responsibility, meditative role, and concern for bottom-line results) and the postmodern pattern (with swift currents of institutional changes marked by decentralization, pluralistic demands from multiple voices, and school system redesign). (p. 3)

The arrival of virtual schools, the diversity of voices making demands on schools, the cyber-policy challenges of access and equity, the work place transformation that has resulted from technology and information overload illustrate that postmodernity has arrived and is not likely to go away (Caldwell & Hayward, 1998). Consequently, school leaders who ignore the import of postmodernity do so at their peril.

In a previous article, we addressed the broadly-cast question: What might the postmodern phenomenon mean for school leaders (Mitchell, Sackney & Walker, 1996)? We said that because the practice of educational administration has much to do with theories of organizations that are, in turn, based upon philosophies of science, theories of society (Burrell & Morgan, 1979), and philosophies of administration (Hodgkinson, 1978), the postmodern phenomenon should be of interest to both school personnel and those who prepare them for this work. In this article, we continue to address this question but cast our attention more narrowly on the construct of power and

its relationship to the postmodern phenomenon. "It is perhaps axiomatic that administration is about the exercise of power. What remains at issue is how power is to be conceived and to what purpose it is used" (Johnston, 1994, p. 126). Dunlap and Goldman (1991) state

the conceptualization of power as legitimated domination is a 'blackhole' of non explanatory capacity from which generations of leadership theorists have not escaped. The very phenomenon sought in analyses of leadership, the extraordinary capacity to lead others to desired consequences or remarkable efforts, is not explainable by hierarchical domination no matter how participative or critical that domination is in scope. (p. 8)

They say that we need to look at power through alternative frames. This is what we intend to do by raising a variety of postmodern perspectives and explanations.

First, we provide a review of the postmodern phenomenon and an overview of power as espoused by selected postmodernists. Second, we explore the philosophic notions of power and its influences on structure, leadership, change, conflict, culture and processes. Third, we ask our readers to reflect on the benefits and problems that might attend the postmodern perspective of power for educational administration. We realize that for the scholars who work with or from postmodern perspectives, our article will deal all too briefly with some topics and leave too much unsaid about some important philosophers. Our intention is to concentrate our readers' attentions on the possible ramifications of various postmodern understandings of power for school organizations and educational leaders. We recognize that our attempt to reduce the notions of this complex phenomenon undermines some postmodern ideas and, ironically, tempts a postmodern critique of our representations.

#### The Postmodern Phenomena

We use the expression "postmodern phenomenon" to mean both "postmodernity" and "postmodernism." We have indicated previously (Mitchell et al., 1996) that no uniform expression of the phenomenon is found in the literature. With others, we understand the postmodern age as a cultural phenomenon which began as an architectural and literary movement, and progressed to a "turn" or a "movement" in thought and sensibilities (Gergen, 1990, p. 168). This shift resulted from the search for a single grand theory to an appreciation of multiple perspectives, voices and rationalities. There are no adjudicative plumb lines (Mitchell et al., 1996). For the sake of convenience, we define "postmodernity" as an historic era and a human social condition, and postmodernism as a set of critical ideologies that reject, in whole or in part, ancient, medieval and modern/enlightenment world views.

While the modernist world view holds that people are shaped by the inputs into their social institutions, the postmodernist world view says that social institutions are shaped by individual and group constructions and deconstructions of organizational reality. The modernist world view holds that people and the organizations in which they work and go to school are rational, predictable, knowable and controllable; the postmodernist world view says that neither people nor organizations are so. Instead, the postmodern views individuals not as actual but as virtual. The person is not a fixed entity, but forever a possibility in motion-actualized as perspectives are adopted and realized in action. And this actualization in situations is often seen to depend on the complicity of others. (Gergen, 1990, p. 170)

The postmodern phenomenon alerts us to a world of paradoxes (not dualities): a world of fragmentation and disintegration; of wholeness and interdependence; of chaos and uncertainty; of symmetry and pattern; of multiplicity and complexity; of relationship and process; and of connection and elegant simplicity.

We see postmodernism as a response to crises of cultural authority. Many postmodernists say that things are neither as they appear nor as we have been told they are by those "in power." We ought to question the sources of cultural authority that have too easily become "over-powering" and undeservedly legitimate for us. People seem to be torn and taken up with wars of cultural diversity, orchestrated by disputation between conservative and progressive factions. In the face of such crises, people have tended to rely on "habits of the heart," "sacred canopies," and other defense mechanisms, while others become skeptical or critical of the modern-age ideals. Postmodernism finds its adherents from those associated with the latter responses.

Postmodernism does not seek to make fixed, precise, or foundational metaphysical, epistemological, or axiological statements or claims. There are several hallmarks of modernism that are particularly irksome to the

postmodernist: meta narratives, representationalism and objectivity. The modernist period is characterized by its attempts to explain or make sense of the world by scientific and social means whereas the postmodernist disdains these modern meta narratives and sees them as obsolescent (Lyotard, 1984). Postmodernism is disenchanted with approaches that attempt to homogenize and to explain human nature, society, or the foundations of knowledge.

When the hegemonic narratives of modernism are eclipsed by a view that every event, circumstance, or reality is "situated" or "nested" within its unique particulars, then discourse and reality become "de-centered." In other words, the center no longer completely holds. The reality of our lived North American culture is not really the homogenous monolith that modernity has encouraged us to assume. Postmodernists embrace epistemological pluralism and methodological diversity in their approach to interpreting reality. Postmodernists encourage us to note otherness, difference and marginality. These writers argue that any view of reality as being directly given, without mediation by people, is cause for concern (Beyer & Liston, 1992). In other words, our interpretations of lives' texts are our only sources of meaning. "Every experience, then, becomes some sort of text, its meaning uncovered through the play of signifier and signified ... different forms of language can result in different understandings, and may even disclose features of our world previously hidden" (Beyer & Liston, p. 379).

In recent years, ideological complaints from postmodernist-oriented philosophers have given rise to at least three different responses to the postmodern phenomenon: embracing postmodernism, using postmodernism to restore modernity and retreating to pre-modern philosophies. Expressed differently, Maxcy (1994) says postmodernism is "the sense of populist attack upon elitism found in modernism," "a critical deconstruction of and resistance to modernity," and "the sense of neo-conservative antimodernism" (p. 7). Postmodernists have challenged the boundaries created by modernism in its discourses of mastery, totalization, representation, subjectivity and history.

Whereas modernism builds its dream of social engineering on the foundations of universal reason and the unified subject, postmodernism questions the very notion of meaning and representation. Postmodernism not only opens up a new political front within discourse and representation, it also criticizes the notion of the unified subject as a Eurocentric construct designed to provide White, male, Christian bosses and workers with a legitimating ideology for colonizing and marginalizing those Others who do not measure up to the standards of an "I" or "We" wielding power from the center of the world. (Giroux, 1990, p. 12)

Grentz (1995) says that "in the end, the postmodern world becomes merely an arena of dueling texts" (p. 94). Henry (1995) divides postmodernist views into two camps: cold-blooded (destructivist) and warm-hearted (constructivist) views (p. 48). He says cold-blooded postmodernism eliminates God, freedom, purposive agency, good and evil, and historical meaning. There are no shared values and no universally agreed facts, because objective truth is either depreciated or avulsed. Renaissance and Reformation ideals, together with modern scientism, are not rational because no truth exists, outside ourselves, to be discovered. He says "cultural dialogue is a cosmic talk show: interpretation is king, and everyone sponsors his or her own" (p. 39). With respect to the warm-hearted and constructivist versions of postmodernism, Henry indicates that while the sensate self exists without any transcendent, scientific, or subjective authority, resulting in the denial of shared truths and values, a shared content or "common sense" is practiced in order to provide some "escape from unrelieved relativism" (p. 39).

With all its limitations, Nielsen's (1993) identification of three branches of postmodernism-unfriendly deconstruction, friendly reconstruction and civil experimentation-is useful for sorting through the diversity of perspectives. Unfriendly deconstruction (associated with Nietzsche, Heidegger, Derrida and Foucault) holds that one should "live in and appreciate one's own and others' centerlessness," "mock individual people who speak from mainstream, majority, and/or dominant tradition-system frameworks," and sustain "adversarial criticism of negative biases/oppressions of traditions-systems" (Nielsen, p. 256). For Dockery (1995), deconstructive postmodernism attacks the premise that objectivity is possible (p. 16). Therefore, criteria of consistency and coherence are fundamentally devalued and rendered inapplicable. Friendly reconstruction (associated with

Kierkegaard) claims that, despite our fundamental differences, temporary progress can be made by reconstructing "emotional and cognitive bridges for mutual problem solving" (Nielsen, pp. 264; 256-257) and by abandoning traditional patterns. Civil experimental neopragmatism (associated with Rorty) "recognize[s] that there are both positive and negative prejudices in operation ... focus is on nonjudgmental co-existence and marginal improvement through detached and civil experimentation... one negotiates relative and temporary win-win solutions ... one side does not question the needs of the other" (Nielsen, p. 257).

Borgmann (1992) argues that recently realism, universalism and individualism "have become the subject of withering critiques" (p. 5). And although modernism is still a force in the political and economic movement, "it has lost its theoretical confidence and credibility" (p. 5). Yet the postmodern critique offers us the weakest of constructive proposals. He contends the way out of the morass is one of two ways

One, which is the direct descendant of modern technology and is much more prominent at the surface of recent developments, I call hypermodernism. It is devoted to the design of a technologically sophisticated and glamorously unreal universe, distinguished by its hyperreality, hyperactivity, and hyperintelligence.

Hypermodernism derives much of its energy from its supposed alternative, a sullen resignation to the decline of the modern era, a sullenness that is palpable, particularly in this country. There is, however, a way of life beyond sullenness and hyperactivity. It is a recovery of the world of eloquent things, a recovery that accepts the postmodern critique and realizes postmodern realism and points up its emerging characteristics-focal realism, patient vigor, and communal celebration. (p. 5)

In essence, Borgmann's contention is if postmodernism is to have any impact on society there is a need to focus on his three emerging characteristics. Borgmann contends that we have to utilize technology to foster and enrich critical and constructive discourse.

In summary, these diverse and, at times, contradictory responses to the postmodern phenomenon conjure up images of a "cacophony of carnival callers" or a "kaleidoscope of chaos" (Walsh & Middleton, 1993). This is an important backdrop to our description of postmodern perspectives on power. Whether or not Henry's postmodern camps, Nielsen's branches of postmodernism, or Borgmann's delineation of the postmodern divide are agreeable, it is both obvious and inherent that postmodernism itself accommodates a wide-range of perspectives.

#### Various Conceptions of Power

There exists a great deal of variation among postmodern writers with respect to the concept of power. To demonstrate the variety of perspectives we have selected a number of philosophers, including Foucault, Derrida, Tong, Deveau, Baudrillard and Rorty. In the following pages, we briefly survey various elements of their critiques. Michel Foucault is a major contributor to notions of power from postmodern perspectives. His historico-philosophical studies have critiqued knowledge, rationality, discourses and social institutions. He claims that power and knowledge dominate our lives. Foucault (1977) tells us, "We had to wait until the nineteenth century before we began to understand the nature of exploitation, and to this day, we have yet to fully comprehend the nature of power" (p. 213). In this sentence, Foucault places the power-knowledge nexus at the center of human strivings. According to Foucault, power is non-totalizing and non-representational. He understands power to be "dispersed, indeterminate, heteromorphous, subjectless, and productive, constituting individuals' bodies and identities," rather than attached to macrostructures, classes of people or repressive ends (Best & Kellner, 1991, pp. 48-49). Foucault rejects notions of power that subordinate it to economic or legal rules of entitlement. Foucault's account of power goes beyond a negative force construction to an expression of power as productive-it is crucial to our constructions of reality, language, meanings and rituals of truth. He suggests that power is not an organization, its structures or a force that certain people are endowed with but rather it is the label given to a complex social condition where a multiplicity of discourses are at play.

For Foucault, power and knowledge are bound up together and constitute technologies of power. In other words, power and knowledge imply one another. He has undertaken to trace the genealogy of knowledge and power, to complete the work of Nietzsche, and to chart the ways and effects of power as it functions in institutions (i.e., prisons, medical and psychiatric institutions), discourses and practices. In this view, Foucault claims that the

possession of knowledge inevitably leads to greater misuses of power. Interpretations are put forward by those who are in power. Lyotard (1984) resonates with this. Accordingly, knowledge is always the result of the use of power to name something and this does violence to that which is named. Foucault is especially critical of social institutions that violently impose their own understandings on the human experience by their assertion of knowledge, which is to say by their acts of power (Foucault, 1980). In the context of the school, the "administrator" may act out certain discourses (e.g., "I am the 'administrator' and this is how you will do it"). Foucault's work shows how discipline and power segregate, differentiate, create hierarchies, marginalize and exclude (Foucault, 1979). He demonstrates how power creates knowledge, disciplinary mechanisms and subjects through his analysis of institutions and practices (Best & Kellner, 1991, p. 123).

Jacques Derrida (1976) says that modern philosophy ought to be thoroughly deconstructed, especially with respect to its root assumptions. His critique is based on the view that foundationalist presuppositions construct violent hierarchies of values and interests. These power hierarchies attempt the impossible (to guarantee truth) and either exclude or devalue other "less worthy" perspectives.

For Derrida, power that is based on binary oppositions has suppressed, privileged, excluded, and marginalized. His maxim, "there is nothing outside the text," views interpretation as an extension of the text, an endless process, and a growing into the text from which it wants to set itself apart. According to Grentz (1995), Derrida holds to the dictum that "all is difference." He sweeps away the "uni" of the "universe" sought by the Enlightenment project and replaces it with a world having no center, only differing viewpoints, perspectives, and infinite texts (p. 93). Derrida advocates an infinite "play" of interpretation and "reading" of the "texts," without being bound by the strictures of a priori correctness. Power resides in the player, in the reading, and in the text itself.

Feminist theorists have also tackled the power problem from postmodern perspectives. Tong (1989) says that the roots of postmodern feminism are found in the work of Simone de Beauvoir who asked "Why is woman the second sex" or, as Tong's rephrase goes, "Why is woman the Other" (p. 219)? Although some feminist theorists have complained that "postmodern theory politically disables feminism" (Hartsook, cited in Best & Killner, 1991, p. 208), others have called for a naming of tensions, affinities and syntheses highlighted by feminists and postmodernists (Flax, 1990; Fraser & Nicholson, 1988; Hutcheon, 1989). For example, Gergen (1997) responds to Craig Owen's comment that "postmodernism may be another masculine invention engineered to exclude women" by suggesting that the postmodern framework is a skeleton "too lean for our tastes. Feminist social constructionists offer some meat for those bones. Something to hang on it ... but we simply won't be 'hangers-on'" (Gergen, 1997, p. 607). Davis and Gergen (1997, p. 23) say that "an issue of ongoing interest to feminists has been power. Multiple perspectives on power complicate understandings of this difficult notion." They say that to understand power in relation to behavior, one must "consider the conjunction of social hierarchies and an individual's social hierarchies and an individual's position with respect to them" (p. 23).

Elements of postmodern theory have been used to deconstruct socially generated and imposed ideologies of power (e.g., male domination) and used to ameliorate negative or positive valences between the sexes. Deveaux (1996) says that feminist analysis of power seeks to avoid the omissions and problems of postmodern philosophy (such as presented by Foucault) in a number of ways

By conceptualizing women's relationships to their bodies as both a reflection of social construction and of their own responses to the cultural ideals of femininity; ... [by] attend[ing] to the myriad sources of disempowerment and oppression experienced by ... women; ... [by] tak[ing] seriously the issue of women's empowerment, their capacities for self-determination and freedom, and the conditions that facilitate their growth; ... [and finally, by] disput[ing] the assertion that the category of "women" should be displaced from the centre of feminist politics. (p. 234)

Increased levels of awareness are believed by some feminists to be powerful instruments for identifying oppression. This is exemplified by the statement that "a multiperspectival social theory will [help us] conceptualize multiple axes of power and domination and multiple modes of struggle against them" (Best & Kellner, 1991, p. 213). On the other hand, authors, such as Sommers (1994), have deconstructed various strains of feminism, giving

specific attentions to the bureaucracies and "power structures that have been colonized by women of the right consciousness" to the exclusion of those who would criticize particular feminist rhetoric or rubrics (p. 119). Jean Baudrillard is said to have developed "the most striking and extreme theory of postmodernity yet produced" (Best & Kellner, 1991, p. 111). He conceptualized the disappearance of production, "the real," "the social," "the historical," and other key features of modernity. This is to say that humans have dropped out of history and entered a posthistorical existence, except for what is barely kept alive through simulation or a series of special effects (Baudrillard, 1987, pp. 68, 134). For Baudrillard, power is dead and he thinks Foucault and other "ultramodernists" have stopped too short in their postmodern thinking. Their discussions are obsolete. Power is no longer disciplinary, but "dead power" moves through the indeterminate circulation of signs and pretenses (p. 59). According to Best and Kellner (1991, p. 123), Baudrillard "offers an abstract semiotic theory of power" (1987, p. 36). He asserts that we should avoid fetishizing "molecular politics" because power is dispersed and pulverized to the state that one can not struggle with it-or even talk about it.

Richard Rorty (1979) holds to the epistemic premise that foundationalism should be rejected and pragmatism should be put in its place. The search for truth through systematic philosophy ought to be replaced with an edifying philosophy that is content with interpretation and a continuing conversation. He is a champion of plurality and diversity of voices in what he calls "the great cultural conversation." Rorty wants abnormal discourse (where someone who is not aware of or constrained by social conventions) quieted, and instead have all join in the conversation without stifling the discourse (Rorty, 1979, p. 320). He indicated that power is dispersed from the center. Rorty contends that all human interpretations are equally valid because all are equally invalid (meaningless terms), so interpretations are judged according to pragmatic standards.

Rorty does not deal with asymmetrical power relations where some people are in privileged positions politically, economically and psychologically. He does tell us, however, that listening to people and weighing the potential consequences our actions might have on others are important. For Rorty (1989) the modernistic language of necessity, certainty and absolute truth cannot but articulate humiliation-of the other, of the different, of the not-up-to-the-standard. The language of contingency creates the likelihood "of being kind, by avoiding humiliation of others" (p. 91). Rorty advocates a kindness and tolerance that goes beyond the avoidance of humiliating others by asserting the need to respect others "precisely in their otherness, in the preferences they have made, in their right to make preferences" and to interpret for themselves (cited in Bauman, 1991, p. 235).

Just as there is no one view of postmodernism, there is no consensus on the notions of power as espoused by postmodernists. We do, however, tend to appreciate more the views of Foucault and Rorty for the purposes of examining power in school leadership. Against these progenitive ideas, we proceed with our descriptions of power in the contexts of postmodern social organizations and in postmodern educational relationships. In the two sections that follow, we elaborate on these conceptions of power derived from postmodern perspectives.

#### Aligning Organizational Elements Within a Postmodern Context

If we think of modernist organizations in terms of Weber's typification of bureaucratized and mechanistic structures of control, such structures are erected upon a fully rationalized base of a divided and deskilled labor force (Clegg, 1990, p. 177). Power rests at the top of the institution. What facilitates power is rules and rules are institutionally structured. The bureaucratic organization is held in place not only by its internal coherence and power, but also by the external pressures of the social institutions that interact with it. The key to the bureaucratic type is the rational definition of offices; jobs are defined by the needs of the organization rather than by the people in them (Block, 1998; Heckscher, 1994).

A fundamental problem of bureaucracies is segmentation (Heckscher, 1994; Wheatley & Kellner-Rogers, 1998). Segmentation results in a waste of human intelligence. Because strategy and direction come from the top, the system uses only a small fraction of its members capacity. All other levels deal with implementation only. Segmentation results in a formal-informal split. If everyone in the organization were to follow rules, and if everyone went through the boss to work out relations with their peers, "the system would grind to a halt" (Heckscher, p. 21). Consequently, a set of informal systems and relationships is essential if a bureaucracy is to work at all.

Bureaucratic organizations do not manage change easily. The structured rigidity of organizations tends toward inertia, which can only be countered by a "shaping up" from above. As a result, bureaucratic organizations move in fits and starts.

Furthermore, in a bureaucratic organization power is asymmetrical. Power is vested at the top of the organization and can result in what Weber called the "iron law of the oligarchy." Those who achieve positions of power work to hold on to the power. All Weber's form of legitimate authority are essentially structures of domination. Rational legal authority is accepted as valid if organizational members conform to the impersonal rules defining appropriate powers of an office. The content of these rules is not subject to examination by subordinates as long as it comes through the proper channels and in the proper form; it is to be obeyed.

On the other hand, postmodernists view power as being effusive. "Postmodern imagery of social life as fragmented and pluralistic is echoed in analyses of power as diverse, shifting, unstable, and with no originating source of action, but rather as a series of contingencies" (Thompson, 1993, p. 193). Power is not possessed by individuals, "but is always a relationship, implying positive-sum rather than zero-sum" (Thompson, p. 199). Power is understood without reference to agency, its mechanisms impersonal and independent of conscious subjects. Language is seen as the central discursive constitution of power (Corson, 1995). "There is no power relationship or change in power without a correlative constitution of language or field of knowledge" (Thompson, 1993, p. 200). According to this view, multiple fields of power reside within the organization as a whole. A Foucauldian analysis of power does not imply the domination of one group over another, but rather illustrates the omnipresence of power through language. Foucault contends that it is inescapable that discourses are materially produced by specific social, political and economic arrangements. These social, political, and economic arrangements reflect the unequal distribution of power in a society. Paradoxically, power is a relationship but it is also controlled and administered by individuals or collectivities (Clegg, 1990).

Consensus in a postmodern organization is created through institutional dialogue which is defined by the use of influence rather than power (Clegg, 1990; Goldsmith, 1998). Influence is based on benefit rather than on personal gain. Consequently, postmodernists would argue that there is no need to vie for power, since power is positive and productive, while resistance is a reaction to its productions (Foucault, 1980). The breaking down of the conventional notion of resistance makes space for the concept of difference (Gergen, 1992). Meaning is achieved through a collaborative effort when the dialogue operates from trust and respect. Consequently, organizational sense making will rely more heavily upon building of relationships, meanings and connections than on structures and rules.

How then might power be played out in the postmodern organization? Characteristics of "flexible specialization" and "post-Fordism" emphasis on intelligibility imply that organizational problems are confronted by transient "self-managing teams" based on knowledge and expertise (Hassard, 1993). What this means is that power is based on knowledge and flexibility of forms.

People are empowered through social complementarity. Thus administrators do not control the fate of their decrees; power is a matter of social interdependence (Hassard, 1993, p. 21). As sub-units achieve power, they simultaneously contribute to their downfall. The dynamic tension between empowerment and disempowerment leads to the restoration of difference (Hassard, 1993). Gergen's (1992, p. 217) analysis from the postmodern theory of knowledge, especially reflexivity, difference and the decentering of the subject, suggests that organizational survival depends upon the prevalence of creative confusion and diffused power.

#### Decision Making

The postmodern organization shifts the use and understanding of power. Again, the bureaucratic notion of power claims there will always be people who seek to subjugate others, and a system that ignores power will be vulnerable to them. Postmodernists argue it is possible to make binding decisions through the process of "consensual legitimacy" rather than reliance on office (De Pree, 1997, pp. 129, 134; Heckscher, 1994). By bringing together those with knowledge and interest in the problem, the group works out an agreement on action. The process relies on discourse, high trust and common understandings. In this interactive process, responsibility is



shared and consensus is needed for a binding decision (Hassard & Parker, 1993; Rost, 1993, pp. 120-123). In such a system, control turns not on the management of tasks, but the management of relationships. Because of the fluidity of influence of relationships as opposed to offices and authority, decision-making processes are frequently reconstructed. The choice of whom to go to is determined by the problem.

#### Culture

When one talks about culture, one generally refers to the meaning-making systems in the organization and the process by which problems are solved. The culture metaphor is compatible with the postmodern organization. The development of a unitary, but inclusive culture can resolve the paradox of order and disorder (Clegg, 1990; Martin & Frost, 1996). Power is manifested through language, metaphors, symbols, norms, values, and assumptions. The understanding of power in organizations is simultaneously a study of the organization of understanding. Shared meaning is the deferral of difference.

Diversity is held together by a combination of strong cultures and information networks. The world of flexibility with no clear center or location of power, requires a collaborative culture to hold together the decentralized parts. Organizational mission based on common understandings and collaborative processes produce greater unity by reducing dysfunctional politics (Heckscher, 1994). As conflicts are resolved, solutions are supported by the continual process of cultural construction, deconstruction and reconstruction. These behaviors become inculcated into the norms, values and assumptions as the "correct" way to behave. Through the process of social interaction the new behaviors become articulated as the culture of the organization (Blacker, 1992).

Postmodern organizations deal with fragmentation, chaos and complexity; and routinization is neither desirable nor workable. To embrace conflict is a useful impetus for learning and growth. By facing openly and honestly the conflicts and the challenges encircling us, we are better equipped to avoid the temptation of considering the familiar to be the correct. This orientation requires a view whereby power is shared equally by the various agents.

#### Leadership

In the modern organization, power is vested in the leader. Postmodernism sees a flattening of the organization. Organizational structures become a transient by-product of employee action, as opposed to a normative model for this action (Nohria & Berkley, 1994). In essence, we are empowered through the actions of others. Because knowledge can reside anywhere in the organization, the role of leaders shifts. Teamwork is a necessary component of the postmodern organization. This, of course, requires a paradigm shift in the way leaders work (Champy, 1997; Rost, 1993; Sackney, 1995). Their role is to tolerate and facilitate ambiguity, fragmentation, process and visioning. The postmodern leader "will acknowledge and even anticipate the occurrence and impact of vague events" (Bergquist, 1993, p. 97) and make spaces for the transformation of the organization into a "professional community" (Louis, Marks & Kruse, 1994), a learning community (Mitchell & Sackney, 1996), or a community of citizens (Block, 1998).

Postmodern leaders come from anywhere in the organization. These leaders are in charge, not because of the positions they occupy, but because of the knowledge and expertise they bring (De Pree, 1997; Mitchell, Sackney & Walker, 1996). Leaders encourage two-way communication and the formation of networks; they help people to live with structural chaos and ambiguity; and they assist the group in deriving a sense of mission to guide their work.

#### Structure and Change

Whereas the bureaucratic organization is hierarchical, rule bound and role-segmented, the postmodern organization is open at the boundaries (Heckscher, 1994), holistic and de-differentiated (Clegg, 1990). Differentiation is reversed and the division of labor no longer inexorable. Structure is inscribed in relationship, not in position. Consequently, power as a construct loses importance because power resides in the individual and in the relational.

Organizations seem to undergo radical transformation when the old model no longer matches the demands of a dramatically different environment. Kuhn (1962) contends that when survival is threatened, a radical "paradigm breaking" is required. The emerging postmodern organization is based on an interactive model with consensus-

based committees, task forces, product development teams and problem-solving groups (Heckscher, 1994; Heckscher & Donnellon, 1994). Much of the literature on the postmodern organization argues that organizational structures and the use of power are different in a postmodern organization. In such an organization, influence depends upon trust. Everyone seeks mutual benefit rather than personal gain, and individual jobs are linked to mission. The expectation of fluidity impels the organization to attach time frames to actions rather than structures.

For the postmodern organization change is inevitable: change and chaos are the modes of operation. Whereas in the bureaucratic organization change is initiated from the top, in the postmodern organization change can be initiated from anywhere. Change is not based on power but on consensual relational determinants (De Pree, 1997; Gergen, 1992). Change occurs in many sectors of the organization and individuals are confronted with multiple changes rather than a single change.

In this section we have briefly reconsidered power and selected elements of organizational life in a postmodern organization. Postmodern configurations of power disturbs modernist assumptions of power. The very act of organizing brings with it the effects of power: We organize in order to achieve tasks and power is the ability to get the job done. Power in the postmodernist organization resides with the individuals. It is not vested in the top of the organization, but rather evolves from the dynamic, collaborative activities of the group as they confront the problems in their work. In the following section, we discuss what some of those dynamics might look like in practical terms for school leadership.

#### Implications of Postmodern Power for School Leadership

Notions of power go to the heart of the practice of educational administration. Whether we view the concept in terms of "power over," "power to," or "power with," (Mitchell, 1993), administrators are typically placed in positions to which power customarily accrues. The postmodern phenomenon nudges us toward understanding power as relationship rather than as position. As Delpit (1988) suggests, issues associated with power are enacted at every level of the school system and involve all stakeholder groups. Because school leaders operate at the nexus of these groups, they are well situated to recreate existing power relationships. Postmodern educational leaders need to establish relationships that break down the power differentials between positions. This task is not an easy one. Practices need to be reconstructed in order to harmonize with the postmodern world. We would argue that the processes of individual and group reflection, professional conversation, invitation and affirmation help to deal with school issues, needs and concerns in ways that honor the social context within which we live. But before these processes become viable in a school setting, some hurdles need to be jumped and some new leadership functions need to be undertaken. What we are talking about is a fundamental shift in how we think about school leadership and the concept of power.

#### Fragmentation

One troublesome aspect of the educational system is the artificial fragmentation and stratification inherent in the existing structures (O'Neil, 1995). Modern school systems tend to be hierarchically organized, school subjects separated from one another, students grouped into distinct grade levels, teachers isolated from their colleagues and parents relatively uninvited into the schools (Fullan & Hargreaves, 1996). Fragmentation may be antithetical to the notions of connection and relationship inherent in the postmodern world view. Current educational structures tend to entrench the assumptions that educational tasks are individual activities and that power is the privilege of the administrative and professional elite. Attempts to restructure schools are unlikely to redistribute power unless fundamental assumptions are deconstructed (Day, 1993; Dunlap & Goldman, 1991; Hargreaves, 1995). While we are unable, at this time, to break down the bureaucratic structures, we ought to be able to confront the outmoded assumptions.

Within fragmented educational systems have arisen norms of individualism and independence. For the most part, teachers pay attention to their classroom duties and they seldom look beyond their immediate space to the needs of the school or to the functions of their staff role (Mitchell, 1995; O'Neil, 1995). Furthermore, the myths of the perfect teacher, inherent in many school cultures, keeps teachers from seeking advice, support, or guidance, for

fear of being considered incompetent (Osterman, 1990). Such strong traditions of individualism and independence pose serious difficulties for the development of collaborative cultures or collaborative leadership in schools. The notion of collaboration has received considerable attention in the literature as a fundamental vehicle for effectively managing today's turbulent times (e.g., Fullan & Hargreaves, 1996; Lieberman, 1990; Sergiovanni, 1992), but educational studies have found its development to be severely limited (Macleod, 1994; Sackney & Dibscki, 1994). Until we confront the norms of individualism and independence, the postmodern press toward transformative leadership and shared power is likely to go unheeded.

Osterman (1990) says "symptoms of powerlessness-low morale, lack of innovation and creativity, alienation, and depression-persist among teachers, administrators, and students" (p. 149). These feelings are not exclusive to the people housed in the schools, but appear to characterize individuals in most stakeholder groups, because "they don't think they have leverage to make any difference" (O'Neil, 1995). These symptoms suggest that power relationships are not adequately balanced, nor is power appropriately distributed in the educational world. In fact, Hajnal, Walker and Sackney (1998) found that many school leaders were reluctant to share power. A sense of powerlessness leads people to externalize problems and to deny personal responsibility for improving conditions (Senge, 1990). But the complex issues and multiple perspectives nudge us past powerlessness to a position of personal efficacy and responsibility (Wheatley, 1992). Postmodernity reminds us to question the place of individuals within power dynamics.

At issue in developing greater personal efficacy and responsibility is the degree to which school personnel have access to current research in educational matters. Firestone (1993) questions the assumption that educators have sufficient pedagogic knowledge to improve teaching and learning conditions in schools. He argues that lack of access to new ideas places teachers and administrators in a position of simply reshaping the same practices. We keep on getting what we have been getting because we keep on doing what we have been doing. In contrast, the postmodern world tends to be inclusive of a wider range of knowledge and foster diverse possibilities. New ideas present alternative ways of approaching the tasks of teaching, learning, and urge us to reflect critically on what we do. Teachers and administrators tend to be event-driven and event-oriented (Mitchell, 1995) and, consequently, run the risk of losing sight of larger pedagogic and philosophic concerns and possibilities. In its place a postmodern discourse centering on issues of care, concern and connectedness provide more capacity for teaching and learning (Maxcy, 1994).

The barriers of artificial fragmentation and stratification, individualism and independence, powerlessness and divested responsibility, and a circumscribed knowledge base and "business as usual" hinder a postmodern view of power in contemporary school systems. "When power is located in relationship, empowerment is simply a consequence of participation in the social order" (Johnston, 1994, p. 129). While these present significant dilemmas for the practice of educational administration, school leaders need to approach leadership functions in different ways and with different perspectives.

#### Ways of Leading

Postmodernity conjures up images of diversity, multiplicity and possibility, thereby suggesting that one's assumptions, biases and beliefs represent only one perspective on the world. We are admonished, then, to be continually reflexive in our approaches to practice (Edwards, 1992; Lather, 1991). Educational leaders are not exempt. As Edwards (1992) points out, personal frames of reference "are inescapably political constructions of reality" (p. 6). We argue that the postmodern condition urges leaders to uncover assumptions about power and position, to reflect critically on the effects of assumptions upon their administrative practices, and to examine the effects of current practices upon those with whom they work. Delpit (1988) argues that people in positions of power are the least likely to be aware of power imbalances. Ideally, a postmodern leader's reflexivity can break through such blinders and bring power differences to the forefront. Reflexivity goes beyond the traditional understandings of reflective practice by examining the effects of practice, the tacit assumptions and the deep psychological structures underlying practices. Although this is not a comfortable process, it does move us into an awareness that requires reconstruction. This is not an easy task because of the blinders we wear. Moving into

reflexivity sometimes requires a critical friend.

Educational leaders need to confront their own frames of reference, and to encourage reflexivity and reflective practice among the teaching staff (Reitzug & Burello, 1995). Reflexivity is best able to flourish when personal reflection is accompanied by professional dialogue (Day, 1993; Lippucci, 1992; Senge, 1990). Of course, teachers can do these things for themselves, but the current work structures do not facilitate individual or group reflection (Mitchell, 1995; O'Neil, 1995). Leaders need to provide opportunities during the work day for teachers to talk together about pedagogic and philosophic issues (Duke, 1993; Hargreaves, 1995; Louis et al., 1994) and to signal to the staff the importance of these processes (Hajnal et al., 1998; Mitchell, 1995). Explicit opportunity and encouragement to engage in reflective conversation helps teachers to break through the characteristic "conspiracy of silence ... in which problems are denied and hidden" (Osterman, 1990, p. 147). However, Smyth (1992) warns that reflection and conversation must be authentic and not driven by compliance or force.

Postmodern notions of power imply the development of and commitment to shared power and transformative leadership. Although such leadership has received much attention in recent years, it has often been discussed in terms of positional leaders "giving" power and leadership opportunities to other individuals (e.g., Glickman, 1992; Reitzug & Burello, 1995). From that perspective, power and leadership are still under the control of the designated leaders, who distribute them-or not-as they see fit (Foster, 1986; Quantz, Rogers & Dantley, 1991). When power is viewed in these terms, fundamental assumptions about hierarchical position have not been addressed and such an approach is not in the spirit of postmodern thought. From a postmodern perspective, all constituents ought to have opportunities for their voices to be heard, such that they exercise difference-making leverage.

Such an environment is likely to generate some tension as conflicting opinions and wishes emerge. How do decisions get made within a conflicted arena? Postmodernity calls us to recognize that differences are always and already present, and we ignore them at our peril. Unilateral decision making may be more efficient, but it is not necessarily more effective, nor is it necessarily ethical (Edwards, 1992; Lippucci, 1992). Postmodern notions of leadership do not imply an incremental tinkering of operations to get people more involved in decision making, but, rather, a belief that the educational "elite" do not have the right to make unilateral decisions that affect the lives of others. Yes, we still need educational leaders. They serve at the nexus of constituent groups and play a necessary role in "pulling the strands together," especially the conflicted strands. But the key word is "serve." Postmodernity calls us to break down the distinctions among individuals and groups, to challenge traditional beliefs about "leaders and followers," and to create environments where leadership emerges naturally, from different places in the school system, and in response to current needs (Garmston & Wellman, 1995).

If school leaders are to operate within an environment of modernist distinctions and dichotomies, then little is likely to be accomplished. Differences and disagreements become obvious when many voices speak. We cannot ignore the differences, but we need ways to resolve them. The generation of common understandings, shared visions and common purposes (Hargreaves, 1995; Mitchell, 1995; Senge, 1990) act as reference points from which to evaluate alternative ideas, opinions, or wishes, and to bring coherence to the diversity (Wheatley, 1992).

Community ideals need to be continually reviewed and renewed in order to hold in common the amalgam of peoples' hearts and minds (Hargreaves, 1995). Leaders have an important role to play in vision-building processes by providing opportunities for people to meet together in reflective conversation and by focusing the conversations on the primary function of the school-that is, to educate the children (Joyce & Calhoun, 1995). Vision-building is not a process of "getting buy-in" to the leader's vision, but rather a dynamic and interactive process whereby individuals grapple with what they really want to have happen for the children in the school. At the heart of it, it is an exercise in valuing diversity and in honoring the best interests of children.

A basic ingredient of the postmodern world is the transforming presence of information that can energize educational visioning and practice. Wheatley (1992) says, "The fuel of life is new information-novelty-ordered into new structures. We need to have information coursing through our systems, disturbing the peace, imbuing everything it touches with new life" (p. 105). She attacks the traditional management of information for creating "information chastity belts" (p. 105) that control and contain information. She encourages leaders to be

"equilibrium busters" (p. 116) by actively seeking out new information, new research and new ways of looking at their work. Certainly, educational writers have commented on the need for teachers to have access to a larger pedagogic knowledge base (e.g., Duke, 1993; Elmore, 1992; Firestone, 1993; Joyce & Calhoun, 1995). Wheatley's ideas suggest that connecting members of the various stakeholder groups with the new "stuff" of education is a leadership function that goes to the heart of Foucault's power-knowledge nexus. We do not wish to underplay the individual's responsibility for staying abreast of current research, but we argue that leaders play a critical role in encouraging, promoting, and supporting the search; in providing opportunities for others to share their discoveries; and in facilitating personal and group reflection on the new information. In Senge's (1990) words, leaders are "designers, stewards, and teachers... [who] are responsible for learning" (p. 340).

Implicit in what we have said is the extension of the educational system into the larger community. Postmodern realists (i.e., Borgmann, 1992) compel us to acknowledge the right of community members and students to be heard, and for us to celebrate the eloquence of these voices. After all, "postmodern realism is not an ideology of platforms and programs but a matter of flexibility and cooperation (Borgmann, 1992, p. 144). The task of constructing a more inclusive social and political school context is a fundamental leadership task, largely because the existing "culture of power" follows the rules of those who have been designated as leaders (Delpit, 1988). To break through the traditional exclusive context of the educational world, school leaders are charged with the responsibility for building a school community that hears the voices of parents and students-as well as of teachers; that values, honors and embraces diversity; and that values participation, communication and shared power (Osterman, 1990; Quantz et al., 1991). From that foundation, some of the barriers of cultural disadvantage are removed (Delpit, 1988), and the educational system can be more responsive to current needs and conditions of a postmodern world.

#### Conclusion

We began this article with Grentz's Star Trek metaphor to illustrate the shift in social paradigms. The postmodern paradigm is not a fictional one. In dealing with the postmodern paradigm we have grappled with what power might look like in schools. The implications for school leaders are profound. Because postmodernists reject the Weberian association of power with authority/domination, power is considered as a strategy, or cluster of relations, rather than a property of institutional position. To view power as strategy suggests that discourse is central to its exercise. "Moreover, if one assumes that social consciousness will be determined in part by the structures of discourse that convey knowledge then power and knowledge are inseparable in the form power/knowledge" (Johnston, 1994, p. 124).

For the educational leader, the current view is one of managerial activity-oriented toward social order. In the postmodern context, one might approach schooling as a social text to be engaged in dialogue—a place where multiple meanings occur.

The view of schools as texts reflects a view of administration oriented toward facilitating conditions under which transformative educational discourse and practices may emerge; a view in which social order/text is continually written and revised by those who live that order/text. This is a conception of administration as cultural leadership, practiced in an area of contestation over social meaning and purpose. (Johnston, 1994, p. 127)

In schools, the struggle for truth is a struggle for power because different truth games establish different relations between people. However power can never be totalized (Maxcy, 1994). Consequently, in schools no one group can control the truth making. There is always some fluidity in roles and relationships.

The postmodern critique developed in part because of the unequal distribution of power in society. Schools are no different. Women in administrative positions have typically been underrepresented. It is only recently that their numbers have increased largely as a result of the feminist critique.

We recognize that educational administration is about the exercise of power. The leadership task ahead is to create the sociopolitical conditions under which others may raise their voices. We suggest that the assumption of power-as-command be replaced with an ethic of care, concern and connectedness. We need to replace the metaphor of the school as institution with that of the school as moral learning community (Mitchell & Sackney,

1996). This metaphor assumes that sustainable change, resulting in improved organizational performance, is best generated when people engage in collective learning processes characterized by reflective analysis of current conditions, by experimentation with new possibilities for practice, and by ongoing assessment of the relationship between practice and the effects of practice within the communal context. There is some limited data to indicate that such notions have an impact on student learning (Newmann & Wehlage, 1995).

Interestingly, Borgmann (1992) also contends that if postmodernism is to have any impact, then a postmodern realism is necessary. The way to achieve this end is through "focal realism" and "communal celebration." He states

Unless we are able to discover and nourish in the community ... those focal things and practices that are thriving in the family and in the country, the underlying reality of the postmodern era will languish everywhere. (p. 128)

Certainly, postmodern notions of power are complex. Our attempts to sift through the strands of those notions may have served to reduce a complex phenomenon beyond recognition, but in our sifting, we have found some strands that can speak to educators. The postmodern world is, at a fundamental level, a world of relationships, meanings, connections and processes (Hargreaves, 1995; Wheatley, 1992). It is a dynamic, interactive and paradoxical place that we constantly revise and reconstruct together, but it is not a place that can be controlled and contained. In such a world, educators are challenged to move past traditional assumptions, norms and meanings, and to facilitate the development of more symmetrical relationships, more inclusive meanings, more productive connections and more sustainable processes.

In conclusion, we contend that a different form of educational leadership is required—one that is transformative in nature (Leithwood, 1994) and fosters a moral learning community. The leadership challenge is great but, in our estimation, worth the effort.

#### References

- Bauman, Z. (1991). *Modernity and ambivalence*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Baudrillard, J. (1987). *Forget Foucault*. New York: Semiotext.
- Bergquist, W. (1993). *The postmodern organization: Mastering the art of irreversible change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Best, S., & Kellner, D. (1991). *Postmodern theory: Critical interrogations*. New York: Guildford Press.
- Beyer, L., & Liston, D. (1992). Discourse or moral action? A critique of postmodernism. *Educational Theory*, 42(4), 371-393.
- Blacker, F. (1992). Formative contexts and activity systems: Postmodern approaches to the management of change. In M. Reed & M. Hughes (Eds.), *Rethinking organization: New directions in organization theory and analysis* (pp. 273-294). London: Sage.
- Block, P. (1998). From leadership to citizenship. In L. Spears (Ed.), *Insights on Leadership: Service, Stewardship, Spirit, and Servant-Leadership* (pp. 87-95). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Borgmann, R. (1992). *Crossing the postmodern divide*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Burrell, G., & Morgan, G. (1979). *Sociological paradigms and organizational analysis*. Hants, UK: Gower.
- Caldwell, B., & Hayward, D. (1998). *The future of schools: Lessons from the reform of public education*. London: Falmer Press.
- Champy, J. A. (1997). Preparing for organizational change. In F. Hesselbein, M. Goldsmith & R. Beckhard (Eds.), *The organization of the future* (pp. 9-16). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Clegg, S. R. (1990). *Modern organizations: Organization studies in the postmodern world*. London: Sage.
- Corson, D. (Ed.). (1995). *Discourse and power in educational organizations*. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Davis, S., & Gergen, M. (1997). Toward a new psychology of gender: Opening conversations. In M. M. Gergen & S. N. Davis (Eds.), *Toward a new psychology of gender* (pp. 1-27). New York: Routledge.
- Day, C. (1993). Reflection: A necessary but not sufficient condition for professional development. *British Educational Research Journal*, 19(1), 83-93.

- Delpit, L. (1988). The silenced dialogue: Power and pedagogy in educating other people's children. *Harvard Educational Review*, 58(3), 280-298.
- De Pree, M. (1997). *Leading without power: Finding hope in serving community*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Derrida, J. (1976). *Of grammatology*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Deveaux, M. (1996). Feminism and empowerment: A critical reading of Foucault. In S. Hekman (Ed.), *Feminist interpretations of Michel Foucault* (pp. 211-238). University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Dockery, D. (1995). The challenge of postmodernism. In D. Dockery (Ed.), *The challenge of postmodernism* (pp. 13-18). Wheaton: BridgePoint.
- Duke, D. L. (1993). Removing barriers to professional growth. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 74(9), 702-704, 710-712.
- Dunlap, D., & Goldman, P. (1991). Rethinking power in schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 27(1), 5-29.
- Edwards, D. V. (1992, June). Ethics, efficiency, and reflexive reflective practice. Paper presented at the second International Conference on Public Service Ethics, Siena, Italy.
- Elmore, R. F. (1992). Why restructuring alone won't improve teaching. *Educational Leadership*, 49(7), 44-48.
- Firestone, W. A. (1993). Why "professionalizing" teaching is not enough. *Educational Leadership*, 50(6), 6-11.
- Flax, J. (1990). *Thinking fragments*. Berkeley: University of California.
- Foster, W. (1986). *Paradigms and promises: New approaches to educational administration*. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus.
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Language, counter-memory, practice*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Fraser, N., & Nicholson, L. (1988). Social criticism without philosophy: An encounter between feminism and postmodernism. In A. Ross (Ed.), *Universal abandon: The politics of postmodernism* (pp. 83-104). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Fullan, M., & Hargreaves, A. (1996). *What's worth fighting for in your school*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Garmston, R., & Wellman, B. (1995). Adaptive schools in a quantum universe. *Educational Leadership*, 52(7), 6-12.
- Gergen, K. (1990). Affect and organization in postmodern society. In S. Srivastva & D. Cooperrider (Eds.), *Appreciative management and leadership: The power of positive thought and action in organizations* (pp. 153-174). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Gergen, K. (1992). Organization theory in the postmodern era. In M. Reed & M. Hughes (Eds.), *Rethinking organization: New directions in organization theory and analysis* (pp. 207-226). London: Sage.
- Gergen, K. (1997). Skipping stones: Circles in the pond. In M. M. Gergen & S. N. Davis (Eds.), *Toward a new psychology of gender* (pp. 605-611). New York: Routledge.
- Giroux, H. (1990). The politics of postmodernism. *Journal of Urban and Cultural Studies*, 1(1), 5-38.
- Glickman, C. (1992). The essence of school renewal: The prose has begun. *Educational Leadership*, 50(1), 24-27.
- Goldsmith, M. (1998). Global communications and communities of choice. In F. Hesselbein, M. Goldsmith, R. Beckhard, & R. Schubert (Eds.), *The community of the future* (pp. 101-114). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Grentz, S. (1995). Star Trek and the Next Generation. In D. Dockery (Ed.), *The challenge of postmodernism* (pp. 89-103). Wheaton: BridgePoint.
- Hajnal, V., Walker, K., & Sackney, L. (1998). Organizational learning, leadership, and selected factors relating to the institutionalization of school improvement initiatives. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, XLIV (1), 7089.
- Hargreaves, A. (1995). Renewal in the age of paradox. *Educational Leadership*, 52(7), 14-19.
- Hassard, J. (1993). Postmodernism and organizational analysis: An overview. In J. Hassard & M. Parker (Eds.), *Postmodernism and organizations* (pp. 1-23). London: Sage.
- Hassard, J., & Parker, M. (Eds.). (1993). *Postmodernism and organizations*. London: Sage.
- Heckscher, C. (1994). Defining the post-bureaucratic type. In C. Heckscher & A. Donnellon (Eds.), *The post-bureaucratic organization: New perspectives on organizational change* (pp. 14-63). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Heckscher, C., & Donnellon, A. (Eds.). (1994). *The post-bureaucratic organization: New perspectives on organizational change*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Henry, C. (1995). Postmodernism: The new spectre? In D. Dockery (Ed.). *The challenge of postmodernism*. (pp. 34-52). Wheaton: BridgePoint.
- Hodgkinson, C. (1978). *Toward a philosophy of administration*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Hutcheon, L. (1989). *The politics of postmodernism*. London: Routledge.
- Johnston, B. (1994). Educational administration in the postmodern age. In S. Maxcy (Ed.), *Postmodern school leadership* (pp. 115-133). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Joyce, B., & Calhoun, E. (1995). School renewal: An inquiry, not a formula. *Educational Leadership*, 52(7), 51-55.
- Kuhn, T. (1962). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Lather, P. (1991). *Getting smart: Feminist research and pedagogy with/in the postmodern*. New York: Routledge.
- Lieberman, A. (1990). *Schools as collaborative cultures: Creating the future now*. New York: Falmer.
- Leithwood (1994). The move toward transformational leadership. *Educational Leadership*, 49(49), 8-12.
- Lippucci, A. (1992, June). Ethics and efficiency in the state: A postmodern critique. Paper presented at the second International Conference on Public Service Ethics, Siena, Italy.
- Louis, K. S., Marks, H., & Kruse, S. (1994). Teachers' professional community in restructuring schools. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Lytard, J. (1984). *The postmodern condition*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.
- Macleod, C. J. (1994). An investigation of the perceptions and experiences of professional collaboration among teachers in middle years settings. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, SK.
- Martin, J., & Frost, P. (1996). Organizational culture war games: Struggle for intellectual dominance. In S. Clegg, C. Harty & W. Word (Eds.), *Handbook of organization studies* (pp. 599-622). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Maxcy, S. (Ed.). (1994). *Postmodern school leadership*. Westport, CN: Praeger.
- Mitchell C. (1993). Redefining power, redefining leadership. *The Saskatchewan Educational Administrator*, 26(1), 4-17.
- Mitchell, C. (1995). Teachers learning together: Organizational learning in an elementary school. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, SK.
- Mitchell, C., & Sackney, L. (1996). Leadership for a learning community. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Louisville, KY.
- Mitchell, C., Sackney, L., & Walker, K. (1996). The postmodern phenomenon: Ramifications for school organizations and educational leadership. *The Journal of Educational Administration and Foundations*, 11(1), 38-67.
- Newmann, F., & Wehlage, G. (1995). *Successful school restructuring*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development..
- Nielsen, R. (1993). Varieties of postmodernism as moments in ethics action-learning. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 3(3), 251-269.
- Nohria, N., & Berkley, J. (1994). The virtual organization: Bureaucracy, technology, and the implosion of control. In C. Heckscher & A. Donnellon (Eds.), *The post-bureaucratic organization: New perspectives on organizational change* (pp. 108-128). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Osterman, K. F. (1990). Reflective practice: A new agenda for education. *Education and Urban Society*, 22(2), 133-152.
- O'Neil, J. (1995). On schools as learning organizations: A conversation with Peter Senge. *Educational Leadership*, 52(7), 20-23.
- Quantz, R. A., Rogers, J., & Dantley, M. (1991). Rethinking transformative leadership: Toward democratic reform of schools. *Journal of Education*, 173(3), 96-118.
- Reitzug, U. C., & Burello, L. C. (1995). How principals can build self-renewing schools. *Educational Leadership*, 52(7), 48-50.
- Rorty, R. (1979). *Philosophy and the mirror of nature*. Princeton: University of Princeton Press.
- Rorty, R. (1989). *Contingency, irony, and solidarity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rost, J. (1993). *Leadership for the twenty-first century*. Westport, CT: Praeger.



- Sackney, L. (1995). Decentralization and images of school leadership. A paper presented to the International Intervisitation Programme, Toronto, ON.
- Sackney, L., & Dibski, D. (1994). School-based management: A critical perspective. *Educational Management & Administration*, 22 (2), 104-112.
- Senge, P. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York: Doubleday.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1992). Why we should seek substitutes for leadership. *Educational Leadership*, 49(5), 41-45.
- Smyth, J. (1992). Teachers' work and the politics of reflection. *American Educational Research Journal*, 29(2), 267-300.
- Sommers, C. (1994). *Who stole feminism: How women have betrayed women*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Thompson, P. (1993). Postmodernism: Fatal distraction. In J. Hassard & M. Parker (Eds.), *Postmodernism and organizations* (pp. 183-203). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Tong, R. (1989). *Feminist thought: A comprehensive introduction*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Walsh, B., & Middleton, R. (1993, June 10). Christian worldview in a postmodern culture. Presentation at Learned Society Meetings (C.E.T.A.), Carleton University, Ottawa, ON.
- Wheatley, M. (1992). *Leadership and the new science: Learning about organization from an orderly universe*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Wheatley, M., & Kellner-Rogers, M. (1998). The paradox and promise of community. In F. Hesselbein, M. Goldsmith, R. Beckhard & R. Schubert (Eds.), *The Community of the Future* (pp. 9-18). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

## DETAILS

<b>Subject:</b>	Education; Leadership; Postmodernism; Power
<b>Classification:</b>	9172: Canada
<b>Publication title:</b>	EAF Journal: Journal of Educational Administration and Foundations; Winnipeg
<b>Volume:</b>	13
<b>Issue:</b>	2
<b>Pages:</b>	33-57
<b>Number of pages:</b>	0
<b>Publication year:</b>	1999
<b>Publication date:</b>	1999
<b>Publisher:</b>	Journal of Educational Administration and Foundations
<b>Place of publication:</b>	Winnipeg
<b>Country of publication:</b>	Canada, Winnipeg
<b>Publication subject:</b>	Education—School Organization And Administration
<b>ISSN:</b>	08313318

<b>Source type:</b>	Scholarly Journals
<b>Language of publication:</b>	English
<b>Document type:</b>	PERIODICAL
<b>Document feature:</b>	References
<b>ProQuest document ID:</b>	214078494
<b>Document URL:</b>	<a href="http://cyber.usask.ca/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/214078494?accountid=14739">http://cyber.usask.ca/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/214078494?accountid=14739</a>
<b>Copyright:</b>	Copyright Journal of Educational Administration and Foundations 1999
<b>Last updated:</b>	2015-01-17
<b>Database:</b>	Education Database,Canadian Business &Current Affairs Database

## LINKS

[Check Library Availability](#)

---

Database copyright © 2020 ProQuest LLC. All rights reserved.

[Terms and Conditions](#) [Contact ProQuest](#)