

The Dynamism of the Current Global (and Globalized) Moments: Implications for Teachers, Administrators, and Other Educational Leaders

Duncan WAITE¹

ABSTRACT

This article deals with the current conditions that have an impact upon teachers and their teaching. These global conditions are influenced by corporatist, corporativist, and neo-liberal forces, which are also discussed here. These global and increasingly globalizing trends make teaching difficult, even dangerous work, especially for the conscientious teacher, who must mediate helping the student in his/her becoming and doing the state's work. Doing the state's work generally involves disciplining the student and others, or policing the distribution of the sensible, and mediating these competing interests is difficult. Instructional supervision, educational leadership and educational administration are taken up, informed, especially, by Hazony's discussion of the shepherd and the farmer.

Key Words: Instructional supervision, educational leadership, administration, neo-liberalism

 DOI Number: <http://dx.doi.org/10.12973/jesr.2013.323a>

¹ Professor - Ph.D. - Texas State University - dw26@txstate.edu

INTRODUCTION

In looking, the lenses we use, our theories in use, affect both what we see and how we frame what we see. So how are we to think about teachers' work today, work which transpires within globalized and globalizing contexts? How are we to think about education? About leadership?

Teachers are on the front lines of social change, both as recipients and as agents of change. For instance, teachers and other educators are intimately involved in and affected by societal demographic changes. Teachers and other educators feel demographic shifts, such as changes in birth rates, early in the life cycle of such changes. Teachers deal with newly-arrived immigrants or internally-displaced children and their families all the time.

To underscore these points, one need only open a daily newspaper or catch an international news program. Recently, the National Public Radio network in the US carried stories highlighting how, for refugees and internally-displaced persons, getting children enrolled in school is one important milestone along the road to normality (Hodgin, 2013). Another recent news story noted how the civil war in Syria has put tremendous pressure on the schools in Lebanon, as refugees from Syria enroll in Lebanese schools in large numbers. It is estimated that when school opens in the fall, Syrian children will outnumber Lebanese children in the Lebanese classrooms (Amos, 2013). Besides all the issues that this demographic change presents to the teachers, administrators and education policy makers in this locale (these demographic changes being the result, unfortunately, of a human tragedy on a massive scale), this particular situation also presents problems for the other sectors of Lebanese civil society, as infectious diseases are left unchecked and establish themselves in the Syrian population. Due to a breakdown in the Syrian public health systems (Amos), and traveling with the emigrants and refugees, these infectious diseases threaten the Lebanese school children and general population. Lebanese teachers, other school officials, and school and public health officials are left to deal with this crisis as well, and teachers, for their trouble, are put at risk of contracting measles, TB, leishmaniasis, typhoid and cholera. And it's not just Lebanon: this crisis threatens to tax the resources of the public institutions throughout the region, including those in Turkey. According to the report,

diseases move easily across boundaries along with the refugees. . . . This could lead to a public health crisis for the entire region. By the end of this year, the Syrian refugee population is expected to reach more than 3 million.

In Jordan, the patient load in hospitals has jumped 250 percent in the past five months. Lebanon's health system is under strain with more registered refugees than any of its neighbors. "With this huge influx of refugees now in Lebanon . . . the number will come to change the whole system."
(p. 10)

Roles change, too. Teachers move easily and seamlessly from being concerned primarily with pedagogy and academics to being focused on a student's health and wellbeing. They become, in a sense, teacher-nurses, just as nurses and other health care professionals may act as educators and educational leaders.

We might recall, as an example of the point I wish to make here, how, in the US, teachers and administrators were on the front lines—“first responders” in a sense—of the most radical social changes, including the forced federal racial integration of schools in the South, sometimes violent anti-war demonstrations (including the killings of four students by the army at Kent State University) during the Vietnam War, and, today, shifting and dynamic redefinitions of gender identity for a substantial number of the younger generation (Adler, 2013). And it is not just the teachers, administrators and other educational leaders in the primary and secondary schools worldwide who must confront, adopt, adapt to and even foment or incite these sometimes radical or drastic demographic, political-ideological and ontological shifts; faculty and administrators at the tertiary level (i.e., so-called higher education) do so as well. Education at all levels is shot through with this type of dynamic.²

Teachers are in a unique position—socially, relationally, pedagogically. They are agents of the state, yet their professional ethos and their personal, human impulses impel them to care for the whole child and his or her actualization. Though teachers’ professional lives play out on a stage fraught with societal demographic changes—changes occasioned, in part, by the growth or decline in ethnic or cultural group make-up and other changes, social-bureaucratic and policy responses always everywhere fail to keep up with changes in the lived world (Simmel, 1950). Teachers, being of a different generation than their charges, the students, and having been educated some time before, are often ill-equipped and/or not supported adequately to deal with the issues they face on a daily basis.

Many, though certainly not all, of the issues with which teachers deal daily are occasioned by globalization, internationalization, and neoliberalism. Often these issues play out in increased local multiculturalism—with the potential for intercultural conflict, misunderstanding, and misrecognition. And as the policy-makers and the bureaucrats (technocrats and educrats) are so far removed from the teacher’s lived world, and as the politicians don’t have the teacher’s sensibilities, priorities or compassion, the mandates, policy and directives conjured up by the politicians don’t address the issues that the teachers face, as they perceive the issues to be. In fact, these directives may exacerbate the problems. For these and other reasons, teachers find themselves caught between their bosses in the education hierarchy and their charges, the children for whom they are responsible. (That is, if they take their responsibilities seriously.) This is one of the reasons why teachers are often perceived to be, or even need to be, transgressive, even revolutionary, or at least resistant. For it is they, the teachers, who must mediate the educational system for the child, just as administrators must mediate that selfsame bureaucracy for the teacher, only at the next hierarchical level. Let’s be clear, not all administrators are either able or willing to mediate the bureaucracy and its (often unreasonable, even insipid) demands equally well. Not all teachers are equally adept at mediating the system for the child; not all are willing to or see this as part of their job. And even if the teacher sees mediating the bureaucratic educational system and its demands for the child as part of his/her job, the lengths to which he/she will go in mediating the system for the child

² To be clear: education and educators are not simply or solely a progressive force or dynamic. Education—and teachers, administrators, and other educational leaders as its agents—can be also conservative forces, and at the same time.

will vary tremendously among teachers and, likely, will vary according to the teacher's perception of and relationship with each individual student.³

Teachers are being squeezed. They are asked to work wonders locally, with ever-decreasing resources and with severely diminished freedom, autonomy and respect—while being compared (and being held accountable, in a way) to some vague (international) other on some arbitrary scale, such as the PISA or other rankings. Policy makers around the world use the jingoistic rhetoric of international competition to stir up public sentiment for increasingly stringent control over teachers, teacher preparation programs, and the curriculum they are permitted to teach. Fortunately for us and for our children, many teachers act transgressively—putting themselves at risk by refusing to teach or otherwise subverting the canned and sterilized curricula approved by government technocrats and the neo-liberal policy-makers and business lobbyists who manipulate public education and educational policy to benefit themselves and their constituents and to fill their pockets or satisfy their imperialist tendencies to impose their religious or political ideologies on generations of innocent children.

The distractions of schooling children through narrow, accountability-driven curricula blind teachers, and hobble, constrain and enslave both them and, through them, the children they teach. These curricula are some of the most potent tools neo-liberal regimes have at their disposal (and of their making) to propagate their ideologies and social-economic policies. The power of these curricula (both the explicit or formal and the hidden or implicit curricula) as tools of domination for the neo-liberal regimes comes from, first, their ubiquity, the coverage allowed the official state curricula, and, second, and perhaps more importantly, their power as tools of neo-liberalist regimes is due to their invisibility, for being almost second nature. That is, these neo-liberal (and today progressively militaristic) narratives both propagate and tap into other deeply-seated narratives within each of us—individually and collectively. They serve the powerful and relegate the relatively powerless to subservient roles and status, making of us vassals and serfs to the corporations and the cabals and the 'upper' strata of society who work to wield power over us and our lives.

Teachers and educational leaders must try to see beyond the distractions of schooling for accountability and unmask and disrupt these hegemonic forces and systems. But teachers' days are so packed with fulfilling bureaucratic mandates, with scrambling to 'get it all in' and with dealing with larger and larger classes of ever more needy students, that often they don't have time to think, let alone respond to the extensive and immediate human needs of their students, their families and themselves.

Let's look at some aspects of the current situation. Teachers, especially public school teachers, are at the bottom of the heap: They are paid little—relative to other professions. Teachers (and schools) are differentially resourced. That is, some schools are relatively better resourced, and those which serve disenfranchised, minority students are generally less well resourced: they get the crumbs. Whether in the state of Texas (USA), where I live, or in schools

³ Multiculturalism and a truly multicultural environment ensures that the teacher's or student's biographical, biological and genealogical characteristics—things such as skin tone, 'ethnicity' and tribe, clan or religious affiliation— won't be a factor in how either is treated or how one views the other, or, ultimately, in one's life chances.

such as the Arab Israeli school in Jaljulia run by my colleague and friend Dr. Khalid Arar that I visited, the situation is the same. Schools in poorer neighborhoods, with populations of high needs students, get almost nothing, while schools in wealthier neighborhoods have much, much more. This is not to say that schools in the wealthier neighborhoods are adequately funded, because governments around the world don't put enough into the schools, whether primary schools or colleges and universities. I suspect that this, too, is a consequence or even the intent of the neo-liberals who set the agenda. Also, I don't mean to say that the schools I've alluded to as being in poorer neighborhoods are without resources, are somehow deficient: I don't mean this at all. Simply put, and owing to the social construction of social status hierarchies (see Waite, 2010, in press a), schools, neighborhoods, organizations, institutions and their leaders perceived to be or constructed to be higher or of more status in the social hierarchy, receive more resources than those further down. It's an irony of human nature and human social organization that the rich get richer and the poor get poorer; that more resources accrue to those entities or individuals who are already advantaged.

And as income disparities grow wider in most every country of the world—from Chile, to Israel, Russia, China, Turkey and the US, among so many others (Wilkinson, 2005; Wilkinson & Pickett, 2009), the resource gaps translate into yawning opportunity gaps, making it more difficult than ever for teachers in the less well-resourced schools to instill any sense of hope at all in their students for their life chances. Large income disparities dampen aspirations and make for numerous other social ills as well (see Wilkinson and Wilkinson & Pickett).

This situation makes it difficult to teach, to take responsibility, as Hannah Arendt (1961) noted, for a system of schooling that we teachers didn't create. How do we, as agents of the state, get up in front of our classes and teach, knowing the obstacles many of our students face? How do administrators rationalize the system in their dealings with teachers?

In education, especially educational leadership, the impulse to act can have unwanted consequences. Action and the impulse to act—whether self-initiated or in response to a command or directive—can divert, say, the teacher's attention and energies from better considered options, strategies and/or plans. Said another way, when teachers' or other public intellectuals' hours are filled with minutiae, with administrivia, paperwork and other meaningless tasks, they have precious little time to foment resistance, to organize or to even think about alternatives to the way things are done routinely, alternatives to the way things are.

In education, Arendt (1961) viewed experiential epistemologies and the pedagogies derived from them as a bit of a distraction, as contributing to the crisis of education. She wrote of this privileging of experience—a basis of pragmatism, as she saw it, as one of the foundational assumptions contributing to the crisis in education. In her opinion, “the assumption . . . that you can know and understand only what you have done yourself, and its application to education is as primitive as it is obvious: to substitute, insofar as possible, doing for learning” with the “conscious intention [being] . . . not to teach knowledge but to inculcate a skill” (pp. 182-183). Thinking and learning through thinking are necessary complements to action—for the student, for the teacher, and for the 'leader' (see Waite, 2009a, 2009b, 2012, in press b).

One reason that teaching is such difficult work is that, done well, it requires thinking, and thinking takes time. Thinking, reflection and analysis are undone by distraction(s). Action,

while benefitting from thinking (thinking, in Schön's scheme, on and in action), is possible despite distractions. Habit and routine guide us and make a type of action possible even when distracted. But thinking is hampered by distraction and deep or, in Kahneman's (2011) terms, slow thinking, withers and is hobbled by distraction.

Many of the tasks set for teachers by neo-liberal- and accountability-driven curricula distract teachers from deep thinking and from attending to deeper, more meaningful goals, such as those of caring for and connecting with children. Administrators at all levels and policy-makers heap more and more of this relatively meaningless work on teachers, and teachers struggle to respond. By combining the thought and decision-making processes Kahneman (2011) described as intensity matching and substitution, policy makers substitute a simpler question or issue for a more complex one (say, choosing to let student *achievement* stand in place of student *learning*, and likewise allowing raising achievement test scores to stand in place of teaching), answering the simpler question or issue as though it were the more complex one. In this way we all delude ourselves, or are deluded. Teachers can easily fall into this trap, and accept the sleight of hand, the diversion of one's attention from a more worthwhile, though amorphous goal, to one that is simply more attainable (or seemingly so) because it is measurable. Again we see the intrusion of neo-liberalist thinking in education through the imposition of standards, measurement, accountability (for mainly those in the lower echelons of the education status hierarchies) and control.

Teaching is difficult work because it requires thinking, but also, in order to do it right, to be more meaningful in the lives of both the teacher and the students he or she teaches, teachers need to connect the student with the global, macro contexts of the lived world by way of the curriculum. An analysis of the conditions which work against a student's self-actualization (and that of the teacher, as social agent), includes consideration of both processes *and* structure(s). This thorough critical analysis requires that the teacher fight through the distractions and the obfuscations—the fog of ideologies, propaganda and neoliberal rationalities—to a clear-eyed analysis of the micro, meso, and macro forces at play in students' and teachers' lives. This difficult work also asks that the teacher articulate his or her analysis to the student. Action comes into play when the teacher helps the student in fashioning a curriculum (or *curriculum vitae*) that lays out a path, a plan of action he or she can take toward realizing his or her self. This is the subjectification of which Biesta (2010) wrote.

Subjectification has to do with becoming, with the development of a student's or teacher's unique dispositions, over and above (sometimes in opposition to) the student's society-assigned social role or slot—his/her 'place.'⁴ As Biesta (2010) put it, subjectification is "the process of becoming a subject . . . understood as the opposite of the socialization function. It is precisely *not* about the insertion of 'newcomers' into existing orders, but about ways of being that hint at independence from such orders" (p. 21, emphasis in original).

⁴ Societies are characterized by, among other traits, how rigid they are or, on the contrary, how flexible they are and how mobile the people are or can be in changing their social status. Caste and feudal societies are among the most rigid, and there is increasing suspicion that we, everywhere, are becoming more feudal, with more and more of us being paid a pittance or mere subsistence-level wages to work *other people's land*.

Teachers, as public intellectuals, can act to better their position within social-political systems. In many parts of the world, especially Turkey and other countries with strong teacher collaborative action, teachers organize to work for better conditions. Some teachers in some parts of the world (such as in the US) are less active, politically, and are more complacent and compliant. But, as Rancière (2004, 2010) observed, we are all already part of the police, implicated in the policing of the boundaries of the sensible. This duality causes no small amount of confusion and consternation for many, if not most, teachers. That is, teachers feel the pull to aid the student in his/her becoming or subjectification. Yet, and at the same time, the teacher is called upon, or feels societal and professional and administrative pressure to socialize, discipline and control the student—this nascent, budding person in the teacher’s care and, ostensibly anyway, under her authority.

This dual function confuses some teachers: When does the teacher inspire the student to try her wings? When does the teacher encourage her to rail against the injustices of the system the teacher him/herself is a representative of? When does the teacher castigate or correct the student, and does s/he do so gently or more forcefully? Some teachers never get it right. Some do most of the time. Administrators, for their part, have given themselves over to the state, and so are more solidly on the side of disciplining and controlling both the student and the teacher. Rare is the administrator who still fans the flame of individuation or subjectification even when that requires acts of resistance. Even rarer is the administrator who him/herself will name injustice, unmask it and act to right social wrongs.

The political involves changing the boundaries, the status quo that benefits some at the expense of others. This, teachers must do for themselves and their students. Education is change. The question is toward what kind of change do we wish our energies to be invested: Maintaining the status quo or attempting to better the life chances for those on more difficult paths?

School Social Groups Mirror Society’s

It has been some time since various authors worked to distinguish instructional supervision from educational administration (e.g., Oliva, 1989; Pajak, 1989). In fact, since then, there have been some rather weak attempts at rapprochement (e.g., Murphy, 2002). But just as Foucault (2008) questioned the dialectical logic which forces a “homogenization of the contradictory” (p. 42), I challenge any move which domesticates supervision, folding it together with administration into a category called educational leadership. Though there are certainly conservative elements within the field of supervision, progressive, revolutionary sensibilities have a better chance of finding a place there than they would in the field of educational administration or leadership, at least to the extent that leadership and its practitioners are seduced into thinking that they and their field are leaders when, in actuality, they may be simply performing administrative tasks and functions, sugar-coated to make them more appealing, more palatable.

One reason instructional supervision has more creative, revolutionary potential than does educational administration is that administration, by definition, supports, furthers and fosters the status quo—the state and the people, positions and systems that support the state, such as the master, the owner, and the capitalist. Hazoný’s (2012) distillation of the philosophy

of the Hebrew scripture provided us with two archetypes or models for how to conduct one's life —both the personal and the professional— in the biblical figures of Cain and Abel. Cain, for Hazony, represented the first and the archetypal farmer: he eked out a meager existence by following the word of the father (and his god) and tilling the soil.

By contrast, Abel was a shepherd. The parallels we might draw from the example set by the shepherd and farmer and those we see between the supervisor and the administrator are so stark, relevant and timely as to be worthy of further discussion and application.

The farmer, as represented by Cain, for Hazony (2012), manifests “obedience, piety, stability, (and) productivity” (p. 139). The farmer's ethics, particularly in the ancient Near East, dictated that “all action was ultimately directed toward the maintenance of the state since all goodness was flowing from it” (p. 129). The shepherd's attributes, virtues and dispositions, differ markedly from those of the farmer.

The shepherd, represented by Abel, as nomad and outsider, and again according to Hazony (2012), manifests ethics that prize dissent from the supposedly unalterable authority of the god(s) or the state, and hesitation to accept custom as authoritative. Dissent, initiative and creativity are hallmarks of a shepherd's ethics and his/her way of being in the world. Freedom of movement and autonomy are the shepherd's, and

independence of judgment and action . . . depends on an ability to resist the creeping advance of justified fears and unjustified commitments to human beings and their institutions—which together work to deprive the individual of his [/her] freedom to discern what is right and to act in its name. (p. 135)

The shepherd's ethics include “generosity and bravery in assisting those in distress; avoidance of needlessly harming others; insistence on establishing and observing property boundaries and marital boundaries; piety; loyalty; a willingness to admit errors in judgment; and so on” (p. 134).

Short of supporting the state and working for its maintenance, the shepherd dissents and resists when necessary or right. For him or her, “the indispensable root of right action is the maintenance of independent moral judgment and action in the face of the quite formidable forces that are perpetually arrayed against it” (p. 135). There can be no accommodation with evil and, as Hazony put it when discussing the case of Joseph—the Jew who became the Egyptian Pharaoh's chief counsel and overseer: “the first among slaves may be powerful, but a slave he remains, subject to annihilation by this master at a moment's notice” (p. 128).

For the farmer, as for the slave, there is a road that beckons to a good man who believes he can harness the power of an empire for the good of his people and of mankind. . . . (who) will serve the king building up his state. . . . But this road is illusory. It is the retention of one's shepherd freedom, the ability to act against the interest of worldly power in the service of something higher, that is the source of man's capacity to act justly. And this is something that no man, if he is in service of the state idols erected on their empires of grain, can in fact achieve. To serve them is to become like them, and thereby, to lose everything (Hazony, 2012, 129).

Administrators serve the state, the king, the gods and the status quo, but supervisors, being more shepherd-like, may actually work best when endowed with and/or exercising some autonomy, and may actually work against the state and the state's interests in favor of the individual in his or her struggle for freedom in the process. A critical difference between the supervisor and the administrator was driven home to me by one of my students early in my career. In response to an assignment in the supervision class I was teaching, students interviewed a principal of a school and asked him/her whether he/she was more of a supervisor or an administrator. I can still remember one student who recalled how the principal he interviewed responded "when I sit, I'm an administrator. When I get up (and move about), I'm a supervisor."

The job titles, the roles within organizations evolve (or are continually in negotiation, being socially constructed). In each particular case, role enactment is negotiated between the role incumbent and the gatekeepers for the organization. Some roles are highly codified, with written job descriptions, often in prescriptive, legalistic terms. Some roles are much more informally defined.⁵ Within certain degrees of freedom, people are attracted to jobs that fit their personalities, or, once on that job, continue to negotiate and modify the job, its tasks and timing, and its scope to more closely fit them, their personality, their interests, and their understanding of what their job is. This, too, is continually negotiated, in social interactions (i.e., on stage) and behind the scenes or off stage (Goffman, 1959).

Some of the considerations, a part of the calculus that the individual must make revolves around the issues of authority, obedience, loyalty, allegiance, freedom and autonomy. As we have shown, the administrator is more attached to the organization and/or to the state (the state bureau in which s/he is employed, for example), and derives some part of his/her identity from that association. Today, as opposed to the biblical times Hazon (2012) wrote of, it is unlikely that anyone, shepherd included, can exist outside all organizational entanglements, 'off the grid' so to speak (Whyte, 1956/2002). The best that one can hope for is to have some autonomy, some freedom of movement both *within* and *between* organizations, associations, nation-states, and other formalized and bureaucratized entities. For instance, as people today are simultaneously members of multiple communities (e.g., organizations, institutions and other forms of association), the worker may use his/her membership in and obligations attached to such membership in leveraging some freedom, rights or privileges from, say, his or her primary employer. As an example, a teacher may use a socially-warranted obligation to care for and ailing and aged parent or the birth of a child (invoking obligations owing within the social institution of the family) to garner some leave or other understanding and/or consideration from his/her employer, and vice versa.

Again we come to the question of individualization versus communitarianism—each with its distinct advantages and disadvantages. Implicit within these concepts are those having to do with rights and responsibilities. For instance, if the shepherd (an instructional supervisor or whatever) values autonomy and freedom of movement, to what degree should he/she take up the organization's mission? What if that mission and/or the means chosen to pursue it are

⁵ But, in line with Harold Garfinkel's (2002) ethnomethodology, we must keep in mind that all rules, regulations, standards, laws, codes and the like are highly interpretable and their understanding and enactment have innate and indispensable *subjective* components.

misguided? Does it matter whether the mission and the means are only slightly off, as judged by the supervisor or shepherd? What if the mission and the means are woefully misguided? Or are maleficent or even evil? What is the supervisor's responsibility then? What of the administrator's? Are they the same or are they different?

The administrator is more deeply committed to the organization, more indebted to it, more encumbered and more wedded to it, its missions, its structure and its processes (see Coser, 1974; Whyte, 2002). Principals, assistant principals, school heads, superintendents and deputy superintendents, and department chairs to a lesser extent are caught up in the dilemma—whether they explicitly recognize and deal with it or even if they ignore it or feign ignorance of it—of juggling both their own rights and those of their charges, the children and students, and the mission and means of the organization. Administrators, bureaucrats and managers in all types of corporate and corporatist organizations (Waite, in press a) are daily being asked to perform tasks that are borderline unethical, sometimes clearly so, and all too often illegal (Stewart, 2013). In many cases, the performance of these tasks by a school principal, or whomever, involves a moral or ethical compromise. Many principals are raising children of their own, or have home mortgages, children at university, are caring for an aging parent or have some other heavy financial burden they are bearing—one which would make it difficult to simply give up a steady and substantial paycheck.

What Can Be Done?

Rather than criticize the individual who compromises his/herself in return for a paycheck, we ought to work to call attention to conditions of servitude, even economic serfdom, where all too many are subjugated in 'dirty jobs' or unsatisfying employment, often at menial wages. We might strive to expose these and even worse conditions in our efforts to alter the structures, the processes and even the mindsets that result in such distasteful treatment of great numbers of persons (as both agents of and subjects of such mistreatment) no matter their position in the social or educational hierarchical scheme.

We might continue to strive after our own freedom, autonomy and independence, while recognizing our obligations to the communal and to each other. We might heed the advice of the great American poet, Walt Whitman (1855/2013), who, in his preface to his magnum opus, *Leaves of Grass*, wrote:

This is what you shall do: Love the earth and sun and the animals, despise riches, give alms to everyone that asks, stand up for the stupid and crazy, devote your income and labor to others, hate tyrants, argue not concerning God, have patience and indulgence toward the people, take off your hat to nothing known or unknown or to any man or number of men, go freely with powerful uneducated persons and with the young and with the mothers of families, read these leaves [pages] in the open air every season of every year of your life, re-examine all you have been told at school or church or in any book, dismiss whatever insults your own soul; and your very flesh shall be a great poem and have the richest fluency not only in its words but in the silent lines of its lips and face and between the lashes of your eyes and in every motion and joint of your body (p. 2).

We must all find our way in the world—sometimes with the help of others, sometimes working against the common, we must walk alone, making our own path. Education is no different. It remains hollow and vacuous if we don't continually imbue it with meaning and fill our days with meaningful work—both for ourselves and for others.

REFERENCES

- Adler, M. (2013). Young people push back against gender categories. National Public Radio's. *All Things Considered*, July 16, 2013. Available: <http://www.npr.org/player/v2/mediaPlayer.html?action=1&t=1&islist=false&id=202729367&m=202729369>
- Amos, D. (2013). As doctors leave Syria, public health crisis looms. *Weekend Edition Saturday*, National Public Radio, June 29, 2013. Available: <http://www.npr.org/2013/06/29/196911708/public-health-crisis-looms-in-syria>
- Arendt, H. (1961). *Between past and future: Eight exercises in political thought*. New York: Viking Press.
- Biesta, G. J. J. (2010). *Good education in an age of measurement: Ethics, politics, and democracy*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm.
- Coser, L. A. (1974). *Greedy institutions: Patterns of undivided commitment*. New York: The Free Press.
- Garfinkel, H. (2002). *Ethnomethodology's program: Working out Durkheim's aphorism*. Lanhan: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.
- Hazon, Y. (2012). *The philosophy of Hebrew scripture*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Hodgin, G. (2013). IKEA designs new refugee shelters. *The Take Away*, June 21, 2013. Available: <http://www.thetakeaway.org/2013/jun/21/ikea-designs-new-refugee-shelters/>
- Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, fast and slow*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Murphy, J. (2002, April). Rapprochement between instructional supervision and administration. Paper presented to the business meeting of the Instructional Leadership and Supervision Special Interest Group of the American Educational Research Association. New Orleans, La.
- Oliva, P. F. (1989). *Supervision for today's schools* (3rd ed.). New York: Longman.
- Pajak, E. F. (1989). *The central office supervisor of curriculum and instruction: Setting the stage for success*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Rancière, J. (2004). *The politics of aesthetics*. (G. Rockhill, trans.). London: Continuum.
- Rancière, J. (2010). *Dissensus: On politics and aesthetics*. (S. Corcoran, trans.). London: Continuum.
- Simmel, G. (1950). The field of sociology. In *The sociology of Georg Simmel* (pp. 3-25). K. H. Wolff (trans., ed.). London: Collier-Macmillan Limited.
- Waite, D. (2009a). LDR 2 LDR: University faculty communicating practice through theory. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 3 (2), 56-57.
- Waite, D. (2009b). Teaching theory: A response to Nelson, Henry, Holcomb, Guajardo, and Jenlink. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 3 (2), 79-83.

Waite, D. (2012). Who controls our knowledge? *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 15, 505-508.

Waite, D. (in press a). Imperial hubris: The dark heart of leadership. *Journal of School Leadership*.

Waite, D. (in press b). Teaching the unteachable: Some issues of qualitative research pedagogy. *Qualitative Inquiry*.

Whitman, W. (1885/2013). *Leaves of grass*. Originally published in 1885 by Whitman, republished in 2013 by CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform. <https://wwwcreatespace.com/>

Whyte, W. H. (1956/2002). *The organization man*. Originally published by Simon and Schuster, New York, later edition published by University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, PA.

Atıf için / Please cite as:

Waite, D. (2013). The dynamism of the current global (and globalized) moments: implications for teachers, administrators, and other educational leaders. *Eğitim Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi - Journal of Educational Sciences Research*, 3 (2), 35-46. <http://ebad-jesr.com/>