EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP FOR SALE: SOCIAL JUSTICE, THE ISLLC STANDARDS, AND THE CORPORATE ASSAULT ON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Fenwick W. English
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Recently while reviewing some legal cases in education I came across *Mendez v. Westminster*. This was the first case in which a federal judge ruled that the segregation of Mexican-American students into all Mexican schools in Santa Ana, California was unconstitutional, a violation of the Fourteenth Amendment. The judge's ruling struck at the heart of *Plessy v. Ferguson* (separate but equal) eight years before *Brown v. Board* in 1954. The difference was that the judge's decision was upheld by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals and never got to the U.S. Supreme Court (Wollenberg, 1974).

What struck me was the testimony of one of the superintendent's of the four school districts brought into court. In defending the practice of segregating Mexican students this superintendent stated for the record:

> *Mexicans are inferior in personal hygiene, ability, and in their economic outlook. Youngsters need separate schools because of their lack of English proficiency…(http:www.mendezvwestminster.com/).*

The superintendent then went on to describe how Mexican children possessed deficiencies such as dirty hands, lice, tuberculosis and impetigo. As someone who is engaged in the preparation of educational leaders the quotations from this educational leader made me cringe. Here is a superintendent who was undoubtedly educated in a school of education somewhere. He probably had at least a master's degree. The three general tacks he and the other school district leaders and their attorneys' took to defend segregation were: (1) that the community wanted segregated schools (white racism); (2) that there was a better education for Mexican students in separate schools because they were inferior, and; (3) I.Q. testing confirmed their inferiority.

At first blush one would like to try and excuse these superintendents by saying something like they were a product of their times and that their preparation was also a product of the times. If that's the case, then the lesson is clear. These leaders were not only wrong, but their preparation failed them. We are left with the historical record which demonstrates that they were defending racism, stereotypes of a people rooted in prejudice, and standing by an agenda of I.Q. testing anchored in eugenics. That's why professional preparation can't

be just current and about the times, it must be a product of the times to come. To be preparation for the times to come, it must engage in healthy and sustained criticism of its own norms, beliefs, and "rules of thumb" (craft knowledge), and it must be deeply suspicious (I would argue even antagonistic) of current practice and beliefs as the central focus for future preparation.

This is my basic criticism about professional preparation today. Much of what we profess to be about not only lacks empirical verification, but it remains rooted in cultural forms and perspectives that are themselves barriers to the very agendas (such as social jsutice) we say we support. Our standards and our tests of them reflect the times. Undoubtedly, we are just as wrong on some issues as our predecessors were in 1945 in defending school segregation in Santa Ana, California. But nowhere in the creation of preparation standards do we interject the scrutiny that the standards and the beliefs which support them deserve. The standards are about what we know, not what we should know. What we do know is tiny and much of it will be shown to be dead wrong, and what we should know goes undocumented and unhonored, censored because it has no name or currency.

I would like to position this paper as a place where the skepticism regarding what we have done is placed within the intellectual geography of our field. But, unlike the already named places in that geography, it can bear no name. But we must reserve space for it or we shall be like the California superintendents defending racism in 1945 for we shall pass off prejudice as truth. Georges Canguilhem (1988) observed, "But what is now obsolete was once considered objectively true. Truth must submit itself to criticism and possible refutation or there is no science" (p.39). I would argue that what we have constructed today in the way of the standards for the preparation of educational leaders is an example of an *ideology* parading as a science.

> *Ideology is an epistemological concept with a polemical function, applied to systems of representation that express themselves in the language of politics, ethics, religion, and metaphysics. These languages claim to express things as they are, whereas in reality they are means of protecting and defending a situation, that is, a particular structure of the relations between men and things.* (Canguilhem, 1988, p.29)

One of the hallmarks of an ideology is not what it reveals, but it conceals. One should be supremely skeptical of an ideology, especially when it is proffered as the basis for preparing a profession's future leaders.

Perspectives About the Status Quo

One of the lessons about the past is that we haven't learned much from it. We also mischaracterize it (English, 2001). How we look at the present is mostly determined by what we seek. If we are in search of respectability, stability, and power, we are quite likely to characterize our current position in terms which are largely linear with a penchant towards advancing agendas which continue to privilege the status quo and enhance the position of those already enjoying hegemony. If, however, we see the current position as simultaneity which includes multiple perspectives and possibilities, and that scenario as not only realistic but desirable, then we are quite likely to see the current position and current intellectual geography in very different terms.

As a field of study, educational administration has consistently sought intellectual refuge in the respected terrain of academia, first on the coattails of scientific management and later in social science theory (Culbertson, 1988). It also nearly has always been seduced by the latest business fads (Callahan, 1962), from management by objectives to TQM, and now is firmly in the thralldom of the ideology of the market place. Marketing metaphors are liberally larded throughout our discourse without very much thought about the hidden agenda which those metaphors embrace (see Saltman, 2000). And some of the criticism of our field comes from those who want to completely privatize public education and see us as impediments to that agenda (English, 2004a).

The ISLLC Standards: The Question Which Won't Go Away

Let us track back through the creation of the standards which have come to be incorporated into many state licensure requirements and accreditation strictures. The history of this movement has been recounted many times (Murphy 1990; Murphy 1999; Murphy and Shipman, 2002; Murphy, Yff, & Shipman, 2000; Murphy, 2005). Suffice it to say that the methodology involved with these standards (Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium-ISLLC) is the culling of selected extant research, some of which is empirical and some not, and much craft knowledge (Murphy, 2000, p. 412; Murphy, 2005, pp. 169-170), "validated" by various forms of consensus, from "representative" individuals and agencies, to samples of "expert" audiences selected from time to time (Murphy, 2005, p. 166, 179).

For example, ETS (Educational Testing Service) recounts that they engaged in a "job analysis" involving fourteen "subject-matter experts" who defined the domains of responsibilities and knowledge areas for all beginning school administrators. The result was then "mailed to a national sample of more than 10,000 school principals" (p. 6). The "result" was that 97 percent judged the responsibility statements to be important and 95 percent judged the knowledge areas to be important (p.6). It is instructive to know what we have and have

not done here. The exercise is a validation exercise. It is not a measure of the truthfulness of the responsibilities or knowledge areas per se. Murphy (2000) himself conceded the point when he said, " No one associated with the ISLLC has ever claimed that the Standards are 'actually true'" (p. 412).

I have repeatedly indicated that this is a telling point in this discourse (English, 2000; 2003c; 2004b). Why is this so critical? I recount here Georges Canguilhem's (1988) work on ideologies in the life sciences. Canguilhem (1988) says that if one took all of the most outstanding medical practitioners of the seventeenth, eighteenth and even early nineteenth centuries, one would still not have anything approaching modern medical practice. Nor would contemporary physicians at that time have recognized a major medical breakthrough that would result in modern medicine. Prior to that time, doctors who were instructed in what today would be routine medical practice like washing their hands prior to surgery, rejected such a practice as unnecessary. The advent of modern medicine came in a remote field, far from the interactions of doctors and patients. Its theoretical base was not even in living things, but in minerals (pp. 69-70). So let's imagine us polling 10,000 physicians prior to Pasteur about the "responsibilities" of doctors and the "knowledges" necessary to practice medicine. We would have a collection of believed therapeutic practices resting on theories which were patently false. Summing them would not make them true. Expanding them to 25,000 doctors would not make them truer. Yet the summing was rooted in practice and "real medicine." Without ever knowing if our codified practices are "actually true," what makes us believe we have not replicated educational practice that is false or even harmful? In fact, we would be in the same position as the California superintendents in 1945 testifying about the "inferiorities" of Mexican-Americans and justifying segregated schooling.

The pursuit of the standards resulting in ISLLC was never a pursuit of truth, it was a pursuit of power, privilege and position within a community of practice. It has been and continues to be an exercise in normative political policing. It is an example of an ideology posing as science and as such, it ought to be viewed with the greatest of skepticism. To vitiate this conjecture, one would have to posit that modern educational leadership is in some sort of "post-Pasteur" age for which there is not a shred of evidence, and much to suggest we are "pre-Pasteur" as a field. Furthermore, the application of the ISLLC standards in the accreditation process is anti-change and has incorporated no mechanism for altering the standards with evidence. The only evidence that is "acceptable" is that which can be folded into the standards. There is no mechanism for systematic self-correction, a telling earmark of an ideology.or pseudo-science (see English, 2004b). The absence of a strategy of correction based on evidence is revealing. The ISLLC standards are not part of an experiment to determine their efficacy. Nothing has been done to compare exam scores to curricula or preparation or to be used to alter the standards themselves. The standards are true by definition so no empirical verification is necessary.

The Epistemological Problems of Basing Preparation Objectives on Existing Practice

The methodology of the construction of the standards and its translation into courses and curricula in educational administration has historical precedent conveniently forgotten by those involved in its creation and construction. At the turn of the last century, Franklin Bobbitt (1918/1971) penned his famous work on curriculum. Infatuated with scientific management, he set forth a position which divided those working in the field into two camps. There were those who saw education as a process which was good by itself, and there were those who saw education as a practical means to improve work and enhance productivity. Calling this latter camp, "the utilitarians," Bobbitt (1918/1971) specified how such work should be defined:

> *They would have an accurate survey made of the science-needs of each social class; and to each they would teach only the facts needed; only those that are to be put to work. In an age of efficiency and eco nomy they would seek definitely to eliminate the useless and the wasteful*. (p.4)

We see the same rationale in the ISLLC standards, i.e., the conjecture of a "core technology" (Murphy, 1999; Murphy, Yff, & Shipman, 2000) which subordinates all other concerns as either secondary or trivial. The erasure of context as unimportant and the creation of a set of rubrics good for all times, places and leaders, is the essence of standardization, i.e., one size "fits all." In looking closely at ISLLC methodology, that is the strategy of moving from practice to standards, we see Franklin Bobbitt's signature everywhere. Bobbitt spoke of the work of the "curriculum discoverer," as someone who wanted to discern the objectives of work. While Bobbitt's work was more encompassing than Murphy's work, the strategy was the same.

> *His* [the curriculum-discoverer] *first task rather, in ascertaining the education appropriate for any special class, is to discover the total range of habits, skills, abilities, forms of thought, valuations, ambitions, etc. that is members need for the effective performance of their vocational labors.* (p.43)

The process involves a method to discern what kinds of (in our modern parlance knowledges, skills and dispositions) are necessary to do a certain form of work, and then to set up education to prepare someone for that work. Bobbitt (1918/1971) goes on to elaborate his approach as follows:

> *Education is established upon the presumption that human activities exist upon different levels of quality or efficiency; that performance* o*f low character is not good; that it can be eliminated through training; and that only the best or at least the best attainable is good enough.* (p.49)

Bobbitt (1918/1971) often used farming and agriculture as metaphors for his curriculum work.

> *The curriculum-discoverer, therefore, will not investigate just any agricultural situation. He will go to the farms that are the most productive and most successful from every legitimate point of view… When the farming practices are already upon a high plane, education has but a single function: it is to hand over to these practices unchanged to the members of the new generation…What we have said concerning agriculture is generally applicable throughout the occupational world.* (p.49)

The so-called "effective school research" which is the empirical centerpiece of the ISLLC standards (Murphy, 2005, p. 169), are the epitome of Bobbitt's methodology. These are schools *as they exist* and the idea of practice is to replicate them "intact." The entire approach rests on assumptions that are concealed in the standards.The most trenchant criticism of the standards viz. Bobbitt comes from Boyd Bode (1930) at Ohio State. Bode took Bobbitt's "job analysis" strategy to deriving training objectives from job analysis [Murphy, 2005, describes this as "backward mapping from administrative action to student outcomes", p. 159], and which are specified by ETS as their validation strategy for test development of the standards (ETS, 1997, p. 6) and commented, "It would not be far wrong to say that job analysis…aims at the mechanization of conduct, at providing a substitute for intelligence" (p. 100). He then observes:

> *But if by specific activity…is meant an activity that can be laid out in advance, at least in its main operations, like baking a pie from a recipe, then life clearly does not consist of specific activities.* (Bode, 1930, p.111)

And concludes, "The notion that life consists of specific activities may have some sort of validity in a society that is stratified in fixed classes. It has no place in a democracy" (Bode, 1930, p. 111).

Murphy's (2005) argument that the ISLLC standards are sufficiently broad to "allow concepts to evolve" (p.173) is deceptive. A perusal of the proposed scoring rubrics developed by Hessel and Holloway (2002) leave little ambiguity for "concepts to evolve." For example, this publication states:

> *The school leader systematically collects and analyzes data on the school progress towards realizing the vision. This monitoring and evaluation must be tied directly to objectives and strategies. Demonstrating a clear understanding of the link between effective teaching and student learning, the school leader also regularly collects data on both student achievement and teacher performance.* (p.42)

I suppose that there could be some "evolution" in the types of monitoring and the content and range of data examined, but that is pretty small indeed in this type of training objective. What seems to have escaped Murphy and the others who created the ISLLC edifice is the contradiction raised by Boyd Bode of Bobbitt's "job analysis" as the method to derive educational objectives. To specify in advance the range of objectives that are required to perform a job requires one to freeze it. When the duties are fixed to a role that is fixed, the school and the society in which it functions must also be fixed. This is a socially static view of these relationships. And in this mixture the social order is also fixed, as it is. We have validated the status quo (once again). Despite Murphy's (2005) claim "social justice" is part of the ISLLC standards (p. 169, 172), all of the devolutions of the idea he explains are contained within the schools as they exist. In fact, in 1999, Murphy subordinated "democratic community" and "social justice" to the concept of "school improvement" (p.54). In this deft maneuver, he avoided having to deal with larger social inequities which the schools may reinforce. By focusing solely on the interiorities of schooling for the centering of the standards, any concept of social justice dealing with the school's exteriorities is vitiated, or in Murphy's (2005) words, "…to set up community independent of measures of student learning---and the metrics that assess such learning---seemed to the Consortium not to be an especially good idea" (p. 172). Here the standards fail to differentiate between what Shields (2004) has called "transformative" as opposed to "transformational" leadership. "Transformative" leadership signifies that needed changes "go beyond institutional and organizational arrangements" (p. 113). This is a significant line of demarcation. It separates schooling interiorities from schooling exteriorities.

If this decision had been followed in 1945, the ISLLC standards could be used to support the segregation of Mexican students. The standards would be the major defense against admitting "inferior" Mexican-Americans into Anglo schools. All of the arguments used by the school superintendents in 1945 were about the "harmful" effects of school de-segregation on student's learning, both for the Anglos and the "inferior" Mexicans. Anglos would be held back, and Mexicans would be pushed further behind and suffer even more devastating injuries to their learning because of their inherent genetic and cultural "deficits." Successful learning was best accomplished through segregation of both races.

It is instructive here to review the ISLLC standards and ask from the 1945 historical context, how they would have changed the superintendents'

promotion, support, and actions to enforce segregated schools for Mexicans based on suppositions of their racial and cultural "inferiority." In-other-words, if the 1945 superintendents had been prepared with the present day ISLLC standards, would their actions have been different? I think this is a fair question because it tests the limits of the standards to adequately prepare administrators to deal with the issues of their times, especially moral issues which deal with an obvious example of social justice. The use of "historical case studies" also has been used by epistemologists as a way of testing the adequacy of scientific theorizing. For example, Feyerabend (1993) used such an approach to test Kuhn's notion of paradigm change with the trial of Galileo. Lakatos (1999) employed the same methodology in testing paradigm change with advent of Copernician notions of the solar system. So here is a brief exposition of the ISLLC principles and standards/*Principles* (from Murphy 2005):

> *1. Standards should reflect the centrality of student learning.*
> *2. Standardsshould acknowledge the changing role of the school leader.*
> *3. Standards should recognize the collaborative nature of school leadership.*
> *4. Standards should be high, upgrading the quality of the profession.*
> *5. Standards should inform performance-based systems of assessment and evaluation of school leaders.*
> *6. Standards should be integrated and coherent.*
> *7. Standards should be predicated on the concepts of access, opportunity, and empowerment for all members of the school community.*

The "principles" of the ISLLC standards speak to schooling interiorities, that is, practices and suppositions of work in the school itself. The standards are about the basis for the professionalization and attributes of leadership. Only principle seven comes even close to the 1945 case of *Mendez v. Westminster.* If one reviews the arguments of the school superintendents at the time, the superintendents were not denying schooling for Mexican-Americans. Rather, they were using the concepts of access, opportunity and empowerment as the basis to support segregated schooling. Mexicans learned best when they were kept apart from Anglos. Segregation provided the best opportunity. It was segregation which was "empowering," i.e., not going to school which would clearly indicate how inferior Mexican-Americans were compared to Anglo students. So the ISLLC principles would not provide the basis to alter the segregation practices in schools and which were everywhere else in society at the time. It was common fifty years ago to see signs in business establishments which read " No dogs or Mexicans allowed."

Now for the ISLLC standards themselves. Read them over. Ask whether or not an administrator adhering to the standards would be propelled by them to end the socially accepted practice of segregation based on racial prejudice in 1945.

> *1. A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community..*
> *2. A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.*
> *3. A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.*
> *4. A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.*
> *5. A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.*
> *6. A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.*

It is clear from the historical record of the Mexican families who pursued an alternative to their children being segregated in the four school districts in Santa Ana, California in 1945 that the school administrators with whom they interacted would have conformed to all of the ISLLC standards. First, the school superintendent met with the Mendez family. As a result of that meeting and later interactions with the Board, a bond issue was proposed which would have built an integrated school. When that failed in a community referendum, no further actions were taken by the board or the superintendent. Here is Shields' (2004) line of demarcation between "transformational" versus "transformative." The failure to cross the line led to the lawsuit by the Mexcian-American families.

The only question which might be raised in this historical case study would be with the last ISLLC standard. But even here, that superintendent would not have been propelled by the language to end school segregation. An examination of the "level of performance" stipulated in Hessel and Holloway (2002) is instructive. Hessel and Holloway (2002) show four themes and

indicate what would be the highest level of meeting the standard. These are shown in Exhibit 1 below:

ISLLC STANDARD SIX ***The Political, Social, Economic, Legal and Cultural Context of Learning*** ***Judging the Level of Performance (from Hessel and Holloway, 2002, p.111)***	
Central Theme	**The "Accomplished" Level of Performance According to Hessel and Holloway**
A Vision of Success	There is clear, convincing, and consistent evidence that the school leader maintains an ongoing dialogue with members of the school and community about external forces that impact work toward the school's vision.
A Focus on Teaching & Learning	There is clear, convincing and consistent evidence that the school leader identifies external forces that might challenge or support instructional programs and student achievement. Communicates this information to the community, and collaborates to assess the impact of these forces and plans accordingly.
An Involvement of all Stakeholders	There is clear, convincing, and consistent evidence that the school leader continuously involves appropriate stakeholders in communicating any changes in the environment that might impact the operation of the school. In addition, the leader provides opportunities for members of the community to engage in a dialogue about these changes and adjust plans in light of them.
A Demonstration of Ethical Behavior	There is clear, convincing, and consistent evidence that the school leader communicates changes in the environment on an on-going basis that is readily accessible to all diverse community groups in a manner that is honest, ethical, and unbiased.

The language of this last ISLLC standard does not posit an "activist" orientation to social justice. It says that a school administrator is an educational leader who *understands, responds to*, and *influences* the larger socio-political-economic-cultural context. The highest level of performance as indicated by Hessel and Holloway (2002) shows that the school leader dialogues with, identifies external forces that "might" challenge or support instructional programs, involves stakeholders, and communicates changes in the environment on an on-going basis.

That is, in fact, what the superintendent of the times did. He understood racial segregation. He responded to it. He proposed to the board an integrated school. When that failed he washed his hands and went to court to defend racial segregation. There is nothing in the ISLLC standards that goes any further now

than in 1945. Then as now social injustice would be continued in what Shields (2004) has called a "pathology of silence" (p.117).

This stance by the superintendents of 1945 was echoed by contemporary educational leaders nearly fifty years later. In a study by Marshall and McCarthy (2002), after extensive interviews of educational leaders, they concluded that:

> *Performance-based licensure seems to be supported mainly as a vehicle to make administrative preparation more rigorous rather than as a strategy to nuture a commitment to social justice.* (p.495)

Marshall and McCarthy (2002) report that most of the leaders they interviewed did not even mention the need to address school practices to eliminate inequities:

> *No one mentioned how the administrative standards and performance based assessments and the school accountability legislation will ensure that school leaders are exposed to and gain respect for multiple voices and perspectives and consider race, gender, ethnicity, and social class in their daily decisions.* (pp. 497-8)

There is precious little transformative "social justice" in the ISLLC methodology. Any approach to social justice that does not examine the school's role in perpetuating the larger social inequities which exist on the political-economic terrain serve to reinforce and perpetuate them. The ISLLC standards represent conservative political doctrine writ large. Boyd Bode's (1930) words are prescient:

> *The significance of the democratic movement lies in the notion that training for specific objectives cannot be the whole aim of education, for the reason that the purpose of this movement is to make over the social order and our present modes of living so that we may progressively substitute new objectives for old ones. Any scheme of education that fails to make provision for this element of progress is, so far forth, hostile to the democratic purpose of humanizing both education and life. An educational ideal which is content to train pupils* [or in our sense educators] *for specific objectives is better suited to a static than to a dynamic social order*.(p.79)

It is this sense of fixity, stability, and immobility that pepper Murphy's explanation of the decisions which lie behind the creation of the ISLLC standards and the work of the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium. His choice of metaphors is revealing. He writes (with Yff & Shipman, 2000) of revealing the "pillars" that support the Standards (p.18). Earlier, Murphy (1999a) spoke

of "pillars" as "foundational." In a variety of explanations the metaphor " foundational pillars" (Murphy, 2005) are used interchangeably with "core," such as the "core of productive leadership" (2000, p. 23)"core technology, " (1999a; 2005) "central tenets,"(2000) "ISLLC architecture,"(2005) "rebuilding foundations," (2005) changing the "taproot" (1999a); and "knowledge base" (1999a) resulting in " a new center of gravity" (1999a). These metaphors strongly suggest a view of the ISLLC standards as something quite enduring, stable and fixed. None would indicate that change would occur easily, if at all. Altering "pillars," "cores," " central tenets," " foundations" and "taproots" would amount to a revolution, none of which is suggested as possible or desirable in the creation of the standards themselves. In fact, there is no strategy included in the standards for systematically changing them (English, 2004a). As Bode's (1930) criticism of Bobbitt's (1918/1971) activity analysis indicates, objectives derived from job analysis within the existing social order are anchored to a changeless notion of society, the antithesis to social change and to democracy. We have shown how Murphy (1999a) has subordinated social justice and democratic community to school improvement (p.54). This subordination effectively eliminates any challenge to the status quo in the larger social order. School improvement models that subordinate social justice and democratic community leave intact larger social inequities in social power. It is profoundly anti-change and fundamentally socially and politically conservative.

Educational Administration for Sale: The Rise of the Market Theory of Educational Leadership

The current situation also reveals another change taking place which impacts educational leadership, that is, the abandonment of democracy and the service ethic for public education in favor of the market theory of leadership. The market theory of educational leadership may be defined as a mindset that looks at all situations, interactions and potentialities as an economic exchange resulting in the maximization of profit. In this view schools are simply one kind of organization to be positioned in a market. In the pursuit of profit one examines any means to reduce variance. Differences are "smoothed out." The cost of labor is reduced by lowering wages and fringe benefits accompanied with the standardization of roles and the erasure of specialization by breaking jobs into smaller ones. Training costs are then reduced because the jobs are simpler and standardized. The ISLLC standards represent the epitome of this approach. In this equation children become products, teachers become workers and principals become factory foreman. The bottom line is always efficiency, that is, the reduction of costs to maximize profits.

That this is the prime and only motivator for business has been advanced by writers in *The Economist* (2005) who flatly declare that efforts by companies to engage in corporate social responsibility (CSR) is a scam and unnecessary

because " the selfish pursuit of profit serves a social purpose" (p.11). This selfish pursuit, however, must be balanced by government intervention because "businesses cannot be trusted to get it right, partly because they lack the wherewithal to frame intelligent policy in these areas" (p. 19). The recent spate of government interventions required to deal with the disasters of Enron (Fox, 2003) and WorldCom (Jeter, 2003) and dozens of other businesses in which legions of corporate officers are being indicted for fraud, forgery, and greed, provide examples of profit making run amuck. And corporate work in education has likewise seen its share of profiteering come under scrutiny. The Apollo Group, which runs the University of Phoenix, was recently fined $9.8 million dollars by the U.S. Department of Education because it used pressure to recruit students who were not academically qualified to apply for federal funds to enhance enrollment and profits (Blumenstyk, 2004b). This was the second fine on the Apollo Group. Earlier, Apollo had been fined $4.4 million based on an audit of their Institute for Professional Development.

The Apollo Group was not the only education related for profit enterprise in trouble. The ITT Educational Services Group was recently raided by federal agents armed with subpoenas looking for records which related to student recruitment, attendance records, placement of graduates and admissions materials (Blumenstyk, 2004a, p.A29). The Edison Schools were investigated by the Securities Exchange Commission for failing to disclose "that as much as 41 percent of its revenue consisted of money it never saw" (Saltman, 2005, p. 55). The eight largest education industry companies now have a combined market value of more than $36 billion, based on shareholder payments (Blumenstyk, 2004a, p.1).

Saltman (2000) avers that "democracy is under siege" (p.ix). He indicates that we are witnessing the "transfer of public institutions into private hands" which is "fundamentally at odds with democracy" (p. ix). Saltman (2000) avers that the appearance of superintendents who were former corporate CEOs, ex-generals, or politicians is indicative of a rapid privatization of public education in which according to one critic the compassionate functions of the state are being gutted (Saltman, 2000, p.; xvii).

Privatization is being advanced upon the wings of a variety of "crises" of various sorts. The connection between such crises and school reform has been a tactic classically exposed in Berliner and Biddle's (1995) famous work *The Manufactured Crisis.* The "crises" continue to be manufactured and re-appear in attacks on public education and its leaders, from Checker Finn, onetime Edison school guru (Saltman, 2005) and now President of the Fordham Foundation which with the Broad Foundation recently released the *Manifesto for Better Leader's for America's Schools,* to Arthur Levine (2005), President of Teachers College, who recently released a critical study of educational leadership programs. That study was financed by corporate interests and is being advanced as another in a long line of crises, this time with recommendations to drop the Ed.D. and

replace it with something akin to an MBA.The Broad Foundation, backers of Checker Finn's agenda, also believes that corporate style leadership is the solution to education's problems and started a program to attract talented young MBAs to assume management positions in urban school systems, paying them 75 percent of their $80,000 residency salary (Emery & Ohanion, 2004, p. 93).

The National Alliance of Business was a key supporter of the NPBEA (Murphy, 2005, p. 155) and the Educational Leadership Constituency Council, which is a group linked to program accreditation via the NCATE (National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education).

Behind this collection of "crises" being advanced to privatize public education is the agenda of the National Alliance for Business and the Business Roundtable (BRT). The Business Roundtable developed a plan for transforming public education involving nine essential components which involved the promulgation of standards, state wide testing, and accountability for results among others (Emery and Ohanian, 2004, p. 35). A close examination of corporate goals for education reveals a tight linkage to the provisions of NCLB (see Emery and Ohanian, 2004, pp. 36-37) and the ISLLC standards for educational leaders and the programs which prepare them.

Furthermore, the ISLLC standards and the work of the ELCC have been heavily infused with the market theory of leadership and the new corporate consumerism model for public education. Murphy (2005) explained that the ELCC was influenced "by significant shifts in the economic, political, and social environments in which education is nested" (p. 161). Among these historic shifts were "a decline in the prominence of the democratic welfare state" and "an increase in the use of markets to achieve public objectives and a crumbling of the firewall that stood between the government and market spheres of activity" (p.161). Murphy (2000b) has admitted that, "…we are already in a state of professional meltdown, brought on largely because of the control exercised by the educational cartel (university plus state government). My conclusion is that, given our history, states and universities alone cannot be relied on to successfully overhaul the profession. The monopoly power enjoyed by the cartel needs to be reined in…"(p.467). These are precisely the sentiments and vocabulary expressed in the Broad Foundation's and Thomas B. Fordham Institute's *Manifesto for Better Leaders for America's Schools* (2003).

Murphy's (1999a) call for a new center of gravity for educational administration included being responsive to these forces and he cast them as "a demand for reform is heard on all sides" (p.15). The equation of the market theory of leadership and the need for reform, which translated means reshaping educational leadership to the market theory of leadership of the corporate world, were made synonymous here and elsewhere. In his chapter in the *Second Handbook of Educational Administration* (1999b), Murphy spoke of the "new consumerism" and free market ideology in the larger socio-economic sphere. While conceding that "many scholars, for example, see consumer-grounded

institutional dynamics as antithetical to public meaning and, therefore, as the death knell for public education," (p.405), Murphy is not so sanguine about these developments. Murphy (1999b) highlights the "emerging sociopolitical infrastructure" with "the one piece of the foundation that shines most brightly" which is quoted from Tomlinson (1986) as the "ascendancy of the theory of the social market" (Murphy, 1999b, p. 414). Murphy (1999b) sees these not as trends, but as a kind of foundational shift in "the altered habitat of educational control" (p. 414). Once again, Murphy's (1999b) use of "pillars" as a metaphor to describe "the economic explanation for the emergence of market-oriented operating principals and models in the public sector" (p.411) is instructive.

Kenneth Saltman (2000) indicates that "extreme privatizers" proffer claims that market forces can provide better-quality education, more universal education, and that these efforts will produce improved educational equity than the current form of public education. No where does Murphy contradict such assertions. His exploration and explanation of the market theory of leadership and the new consumerism is a backdrop to the work of crafting a set of national standards resting on these very same principles. Or as Murphy (2005) explains that the crafting of ISLLC standards "is an analysis of a concerted effort to rebuild the foundations of school administration, both within the practice and academic domains of the profession" (p.154). In short the "pillars" of the market theory of leadership centered on market driven operating principles have become the "pillars" of the ISLLC standards. The "new" foundation of educational leadership has been grounded in the principles of educational consumerism.

One of the very first moves of the Consortium was to conceal its ideological foundational shift. That occurred when the focus of the tasks of leadership were divorced from any larger socio-economic relationships and issues. School leadership was not to be concerned with these socio-political-economic relationships and exteriorities, but by embracing the idea of a "technological core" centered only on learning outcomes, so that educational leadership was not to be about fixing the disadvantages for whole classes of people in the larger economic spheres, but only as they can be treated as individuals, i.e., consumers pursuing "individual liberty." The focus of the ISLLC standards is "pillarized" on interiorities and individuals best epitomized in "No Child [singular] Left Behind." What is profound about this approach that it dovetails so nicely with the National Alliance for Business' agenda that the relationship of the school to the corporate economic agenda becomes isomorphic. The possibility of the school being the grounds for contestation of corporate control is removed. The role of the school is to become the grounds for producing corporate workers who will "fit in" to the existing economic hegemonic order. Within this approach "social justice" becomes one of harmonizing the interiorities, that is "smoothing" them out so they are least disruptive to the schooling process, all under the rhetoric of choice and a liberty within a carefully controlled notion of corporate consumerism. Murphy (2005) decomposes the idea of social justice into (1)

access to conditions of classrooms that explain learning time, (2) access to the conditions of learning and (3) access to resources (p. 164).

Kenneth Saltman (2000) notes, the seven watchwords of the corporate agenda for education are *efficiency, competition, the failure of public education, equity, accountability, democracy,* and *individual freedom of choice* (pp.3-4). We see all of these themes displayed prominently in Murphy's writings (1999a, 1999b,) and a recent *Education Week* op-ed piece by Alan Bersin (2005), the departing CEO of the San Diego City Schools. Bersin, a non-educator and the darling of the corporate sector scions who see privatization as the cure for the ills of the "failing" schools, castigates employee unions for standing in the way of productivity gains. While stressing the need to be centered on student outcomes solely as the measure of productivity, he embraces competition "which will be crucial to the reinvention of public education" (p. 30). All of the watchwords of the new consumerism rooted in the pillar of privatization are at work in Bersin's op-ed piece. The example also serves to mark the ideology of the debate itself. When market language and logic come to define the terms, the possiblities, and the problems, it also privileges the chosen solutions because they are the only ones that "fit" the definitions of the problems.

The ISLLC standards are replete with the same ideology. Murphy (2005) has conceded that the major impetus for a change in the foundational pillars of educational leadership were in the marketplace, that is, outside education (p. 161):

> *Finally, on the economic horizons, we perceived a postindustrial world in which globalism, competition, and market forces would be more pronounced and would continue to exert even greater influence over schooling (e.g., standards, accountability, choice).* (p. 161-2)

So the ISLLC standards reposition an educational leader working in a competitive market place. Much of the rationale for the standards is non-empirical. Murphy (2005) admitted that " While no one on the ISLLC team set out to create a religion, we certainly did attempt to privilege 'ideals' and 'nonempirical beliefs'" (p.170). Thus, we have an ideology, a platform of values and beliefs, not the stuff of empirical science, but a values based linch pin which had four broad objectives according to Murphy (2005): (1) facilitating the development of inquiry skills; (2) developing a robust understanding of education defined as learning, teaching, and school improvement; (3) promoting the development of broad-based knowledge of people including the ability to work with others; (4) assisting candidates to develop an explicit set of values and beliefs (e.g.student learning) is the fundamental purpose of schooling (p. 165). This is the National Alliance for Business' agenda as well. All of these positions focus on the interiorities of schooling, leaving the exteriorities to the control of

the forces of privatization and corporate control. What the Consortium didn't embrace is just as important as what it did. It did not call into question the huge wealth disparities in U.S. society where "1.6% of the population own 80 % of all stock, 100% of all state and municipal bonds, and 88.5% of corporate bonds" (Lundberg, 1968, p. 144). Thus, educational leadership is not expected to do anything about such disparities and their impact on a society increasingly split between the haves and have nots.

And educational leadership isn't supposed to know or complain about the decreasing level of corporate support for public education. As Kate Rousmaniere (2005) notes:

> *At the federal level, corporate contributions to total federal tax receipts have lessened by more than half since World War II. In 1950, corporate taxes contributed 26% of the federal tax receipts. In 1970 they contributed 17%; in 2000, 10%…Between 1947 and 2001, corporate contributions to all states' tax revenue declined from 47% to 6%.* (p.5)

Concomitant with the reduction of corporate support for public education via federal and state taxes is the drive by the corporate sector to shift the tax burden altogether. Under the guise that the schools are failing, the agenda is to reduce the overall level of public support required by privatizing them (see Carnoy, 1999, p.42). Privatization reduces the urgency for better public support and begins to divide up the largesse which public schools now command because of their legal/social position. But let there be no mistake about it, the public school is under a fall scale attack. As Martin Carnoy (1999) summarized the impact of privatization internationally:

> *In a nutshell, globalization enters the education sector on an ideological horse, and its effects on education and the production of knowledge are largely a product of that financially-driven, free-market ideology, not of a clear conception for improving education.* (p.59)

The ISLLC standards represent just such an ideological Trojan horse. Parading under the guise of raising standards, they have actually lowered them in the following ways:

> 1) Standardizing Administrative Roles
> The ISLLC standards are premised on a reduced role of the school administrator, called by its backers as "the technological core" (Murphy, 2005, p. 159). This core not only reduced the complexity of the entire range of responsibilities of school leaders, it created a "one size fits all" mold for them (Murphy, 2000, p. 23) and erased

> context as important in determining administrative actions (English, 2003c; 2004b). The first goal of standardization is to reduce job complexity and lower the requirements for training. The reduction of the costs of preparation, remuneration and replacement are the goals of standardization in practice. A key position in the ISLLC standards, especially when taken by NCATE to evaluate preparation programs, is the jettisoning of the independent knowledge production function of university faculty (English, 2003b; 2004b). When this function is removed, the costs of supporting a research focused faculty are effectively eliminated. Preparation is immensely cheaper when faculty possess no research skills and do not have tenure.
>
> 2) Making Administrative Practice Transferable: The Digital Doctorate
>
> By reducing the complexity of leadership responsibilities and downgrading and/or removing the independent knowledge production function, the hallmark of university preparation, lots of agencies in the private sector can go into the leadership preparation "business." We now enter the age of the "digital doctorate" (Fusarelli, 2004), including the national administrative associations like AASA, the Apollo Group, Sylvan and Wal Mart. Few of these sites would have been considered as professional places of preparation in the past. All that is required in preparing leaders to the ISLLC standards are adjuncts who do no research and who are hired out without any of the labor fringe benefits that drive up costs for universities. The ISLLC standards are the bridge to completely privatize leadership preparation as a for profit enterprise. They put the "profit" in "for profit" business. The ISLLC standards are the foundation to the globalization/privatization of leadership preparation.

At the 2003 AASA Convention in New Orleans, an announcement was made that AASA, Canter/Sylvan Corporation and Vanderbilt University were going into a partnership to offer an on-line MA program (English, 2003b). The interesting situation was that AASA, as a member of the ELCC, was also participating in NCATE and judging whether preparation programs were meeting the new ISLLC standards, a clear conflict of interest in the new market of competition.

What is concealed in the ISLLC ideology is that the standards themselves are set on privatization pillars, they kowtow to corporate interests, fail to deal with the larger exteriorities of social justice, and, ironically, fail to assist the prospective school leader to be effective in a competitive market place. Not one of the standards or indicators requires any special expertise in marketing, merchandising, advertising, cost-cutting, or union busting, tactics

which Wal Mart employs (Head, 2004). Founded on the tenets of globalization and competition, the ISLLC standards do nothing to prepare school leaders to be effective as corporate leaders. By solely focusing on schooling interiorities, future educational leaders are "babes in the woods" in the kind of cutthroat, do anything to make a buck including cooking the books environment of big business (see Henry, France & Lavelle, 2005), a charge which has been leveled at more than one for profit ventures in education (Anderson, 2005, p. 229; Saltman, 2005). And if Murphy (2005) is correct that all major forces that have shaped education occurred outside the profession, then school leaders will continue to be disadvantaged as external changes proliferate, unless one sees the privatization of the public education as capitalism's final moment of triumph. As Saltman (2000) indicates, "when this happens, there is nothing left to discuss" (p.ix). So the contradiction is this: The ISLLC standards which prepare future educational leaders are truncated to allow educational leaders to only deal with schooling interiorities, while systematically underpreparing them to deal with schooling exteriorities of the very market in which they must survive and prosper. Dropping the Ed.D. in favor of an MBA as Arthur Levine proposes (2005) might better prepare future education leaders for this kind of environment. But it would do nothing to retain the democratic public service aspects of public education. What the ISLLC standards do is to legitimate the privatization of public education, enshrining the profit motive as the calculus for educational change.

That this is the national agenda of conservative think tanks was recently underscored by a "study" in which the thirty largest foundations who gave over $600 million to K-12 education were "researched" by the conservative American Enterprise Institute (see Conason 2003) as to whether their donations would or would not "spur changes in how public resources are spent" (Hendrie, 2005, p.20). Among the papers in the AEI collection was one by Jay Greene, controversial writer for the Manhattan Institute (see Cavanagh, 2004) who criticized philanthropists for not promoting new types of public schools and administrative structures or initiatives "that have the potential of altering the political activities of educators or government regulations affecting who can become an educator" (Hendrie, 2005, p. 20). Among the foundations which were praised by Greene were the Gates and Walton (Wal Mart) Foundations giving patterns. The Walton group has spent heavily on promoting charter schools and supporting tuition vouchers for low income students to attend private schools. The Gates Foundation has also given to charters and private education initiatives. These two foundations have spent heavily to promote choice initiatives.

Monica Pini (2001) spent time analyzing the claims and practices of the emerging EMOs (educational management organizations) in the private sector. Her analysis is instructive because she dissembles the reality from the rhetoric. When the EMOs claimed they introduced innovation in education, they applied programs already implemented in the public schools or they did not innovate. When EMOs claimed they addressed student and community needs, in reality

they addressed their own companies needs. When they likewise stated they increased efficiency and cost-effectiveness, they increased bureaucracy and used voluntary work of parents and teachers to cut costs. When they heralded school based decision making, decisions were instead centralized, hierarchical structures were installed and the economy of scale implemented. When EMOs proffered that they were a good place to work, Pini (2001) observed overwork, longer work days, lower salaries and no unions. When statements were made about hiring experienced teachers, the reality showed that a high percentage of teachers were younger and less experienced. When EMOs alleged that there achievement was higher and they had better test scores, research failed to substantiate their claims. Instead of public accountability, EMOs produced corporate confidentiality. And instead of "transforming public education" EMOs not only privatized schooling and enjoyed profits, but introduced the agenda of the Christian coalition into the public schools (from Anderson, 2005, p. 230).

Pini's (2001) observations regarding EMOs were similarly underscored for charter school claims. The rhetoric for charter schools extolls some of the same "benefits" of the market theory of management as advanced by the corporate sector. In a systematic study of charter school claims Carnoy, Jacobsen, Mishel and Rothstein (2005) wrote:

> *We conclude…based on 19 studies, conducted in 11 states and the District of Columbia, there is no evidence, on average, charter schools out-perform regular public schools. In fact, there is evidence that the average impact of charter schools is negative. This evidence of a negative effect comes particularly from those studies that use the strongest methodologies to discover causal effects, although the evidence of a negative effect is somewhat localized to specific states.* (p.2)

In addition, this report emphasized that there was no evidence to support the assertion that Charter schools helped improve public schools via competition, nor did the evidence support the idea that charter schools were more accountable for their outcomes than public schools. In short, the "crises" of public education and alleged deficits of the leadership in public schools has been trumped up by those who have another agenda. If what is desired are educational leaders who mimic corporate leaders, working to fatten their paychecks and those of their stockholders by ruthlessly cutting costs in the pursuit of profits, then I would agree. We aren't producing those kinds of leaders in schools of education. In my judgment they are the leaders we don't need in public education. And if my refusal to prepare educational leaders along the lines of the profit motive is the signal of a crisis, then I would concur we have one. And if my reluctance to embrace the market theory of leadership is an impediment to those who seek to apply it to public education then I plead guilty. But this situation is not in need

of "reform." Those espousing market models of leadership are not reformers. They are ideologues in pursuit of a set of values and biases which are the antitheses of the public education that suits a democracy.

Democracy is probably the least efficient of all forms of government which are available to a people to select. Authoritarian forms are far more efficient, and while they may be suitable in forums of business and productive in the market place, they are antithetical to an enterprise that has as one of its purposes the erasure of class, gender, and social class prejudices in dispensing essential public social services, education being one. Such a concern is far beyond the designation of "technical cores" and minimalist skill levels required for schools to be technically efficient places. Market theory is neither democratic nor driven by concerns for social justice. It is driven by the quest for profits. Being profitable is the answer to the question, "what business are we in?" And while some of it may be transformational, it is not transformative. Even with the ISLLC standards, we will still be looking for social justice, and without government/judicial intervention, segregated schools would still be legal for Mexican-Americans in California and elsewhere for African-Americans. The trend lines are glaring because the successful privatization of public education requires the privatization of its leadership. Make no mistake about it, educational leadership is up "for sale." The transference of leadership preparation to privatization sites away from university graduate education programs is a full scale assault on the idea of social services and social justice in a democratic society. The ISLLC standards have intentionally facilitated that movement, while ironically fostering an educational environment in which those being examined on its "standards" are ill prepared for the kind of unbridled market place being promulgated by its advocates. These are not "friends" who want a dialogue with us. They are working hard for our demise. There is an old Russian proverb that sums it up well: "All those with long knives are not cooks." We need to unmask the reform rhetoric being used as camouflage for the corporate agenda being pushed to privatize American public education. And we need to thoroughly understand how our efforts to put an end to shoddy preparation programs have led to their multiplication by the privatizers. It may almost be too late to do anything about it.

References

Anderson, G. & Pini, M. (2005). Educationa leadership and the new economy: Keeping the 'public' in public schools. In F. English (Ed.) *The SAGE handbook of educational leadership* (pp.216-236). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Bersin, A. (2005, April 20). Making schools productive: The point of accountability and the key to renewal. *Education Week*, 24 (32), p. 40, 30.

Blumenstyk, G. (2004, May 14). For-profit colleges face new scrutiny. *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 50 (36), A1, 29.

Blumenstyk, G. (2004, October 8). U. of Phoenix uses pressure in recruiting, report says. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*,51 (7) A1, A27.

Bobbitt, F. (1918/1971). *The curriculum.* New York: Arno Press & The New York Times.

Bode, B. (1930). *Modern educational theories.* New York: The Macmillan Company.

Broad Foundation & Thomas B. Fordham Institute (2003). *Better leaders for America's schools: A manifesto.*

Callahan, R. (1962). *Education and the cult of efficiency.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Canguilhem, G. (1988). *Ideology and rationality in the history of the life sciences.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Carnoy, M. (1999). *Globalization and educational reform: What planners need to know.* Paris: UNESCO.

Carnoy, M., Jacobsen, R., Mishel, L., & Rothstein, R. (2005). *The charter school dust-up: Examining the evidence on enrollment and achievement.* Washington, D.C. : Economic Policy Institute.

Cavanagh, S. (2004, October 14).Greene Machine. *Education Week*, 24 (7), 35-37.

Conason, J. (2003). *Big lies: The right-wing propaganda machine and how it distorts the truth.* New York: Thomas Dunne Books.

Culbertson, J. (1988). A century's quest for a knowledge base. In N. Boyan (Ed.) *Handbook of research on educational administration* (pp.3-26) New York: Longman.

Educational Testing Service (1997). *Candidate Information Bulletin for the school leaders licensure assessment.* Princeton, NJ: ETS.

Emery, K. & Ohanian, S. (2004). *Why is corporate America bashing our public schools?* Portsmouth, NH: New Hampshire.

English, F. (2000, April-June). Psst! What does one call a set of non-empirical beliefs required to be accepted on faith and enforced by authority? [Answer: a religion, aka the ISLLC standards] *International Journal of Leadership in Educaiton*, 3 (2), 159-168.

English, F. (2001, January-March). What paradigm shift? An interrogation of Kuhn's idea of normalcy in the research practice of educational administration. *International Journal of Leadership in Education: Theory and Practice*, 4, 7, pp. 29-38.

English, F. (2003). The ISLLC standards: The deskilling and deprofesionalization of educational administrators. In F. English (Ed.) *The post-modern challenge to the theory and practice of educational administration* (pp.102-131). Springfield, Ill: Charles C. Thomas Publisher.

English, F. (2003b, Spring). About the policing functions of ELCC/NCATE and the standardization of university preparation programs in educational administration. *School Leadership News. AERA Division A Newsletter*. pp. 5-8.

English, F. (2003c, March). Cookie-cutter leaders for cookie-cutter schools: The teleology of standardization and the de-legitimization of the university in educational leadership preparation. *Leadership and Policy in Schools,* 2 (1), 27-46.

English, F. (2004a). Learning 'manifestospeak': A metadiscursive analysis of the Fordham Institute's and Broad Foundation's manifesto for better leaders for America's schools. In T. Lasley (Ed.) *Better leader's for America's schools: Perspectives on the manifesto* (pp.52-91). Columbia, MO: UCEA.

English, F. (2004b, Spring). Undoing the 'done deal': Reductionism, ahistoricity, and pseudo-science in the knowledge base and standards for educational administration. *UCEA Review*, 46 (2), 5-7.

Feyerabend, P. (1993). *Against method.* London: Verso.

Fox, L. (2003). *Enron, the rise and fall.* Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Fusarelli, L. (2004, January 14). The new consumerism in educational leadership. *Education Week*, 23 (18). 29.

Head, S. (2004, December 16). Inside the leviathan. *New York Review of Books*, 49 (20), pp.80-89.

Hendrie, C. (2005, April 27) Researchers as tough questions of K-12 charities. *Education Week*, 24 (33), 1, 20-1.

Henry, D., France, M. & Lavelle, L. (2005, April 25). The boss on the sidelines. *Business Week*, 86-96.

Hessel, K. & Holloway, J. (2002). *A framework for school leaders: Linking the ISLLC standards to practice.* Princeton, NJ: ETS.

Jeter, L. (2003). *Disconnected: Deceit and betrayal at worldcom.* Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Lakatos, I. (1999). *The methodology of scientific research programmes.* London: Cambridge University Press.

Levine, A. (2005, April 15). Change in the principal's office: the role of universities. *The Chronicle Review*. Section B., p.B16.

Lundberg, F. (1968). *The rich and the super rich.* New York: Lyle Stuart.

Marshall, C. & McCarthy, M. (2002, September). School leadership reforms: Filtering social justice through dominant discourses. *Journal of School Leadership*, 12 (5), 480-502.

Murphy, J. (1990, April-June). Improving the preparation of school administrators: The national policy board's story. *The Journal of Educational Policy*, 5 (2), 181-186.

Murphy, J. (1999a). *The quest for a center: Notes on the state of the profession of educational leadership.* Columbia, MO: UCEA.

Murphy, J. (1999b). New consumerism: Evolving market dynamics in the institutional dimension of schooling. In J. Murphy and K. Louis (Eds.) *Handbook of research on educational administration, 2nd ed.* (pp.421-442). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Murphy, J. (2000, October-December). A response to English. *International Journal of Leadership in Education: Theory and Practice,* 3 (4), 411-414.

Murphy, J. (2000b, September). Notes from the Cell: A response to English's 'interrogation'. *Journal of School Leadership,* 10 (5), 464-469.

Murphy, J. (2005, February). Unpacking the foundations of ISLLC standards and addressing concerns in the academic community. *Educational Administration Quarterly,* 41 (1), 154-191.

Murphy, J. & Shipman, N. (2002). The interstate school leaders licensure consortium: A standards based approach to strengthening educational leadership. In K. Hessel J. Holloway (Eds.), *A framework for school leaders: Linking the ISLLC 'standards for school leaders' to practice.* (pp. 4-9) Princeton, NJ: ETS.

Murphy, J., Yff, J. & Shipman, N. (2000, January-March). Implementation of the interstate school leaders licensure consortium standards. *The International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 3 (1), 17-39.

Pini, M. (2001, April). Moving public schools toward for-profit management: Privatizing the public sphere. Unpublished paper presented at the American Education Research Association, Seattle Washington. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service, No. ED453603).

Rousmaniere, K. (2005, April). Money matters in educational history: Margaret Haley's call for school finance reform. Unpublished paper. American Education Research Association, Montreal, Canada.

Saltman, K. (2000). *Collateral damage: Corporatizing public schools; a threat to democracy.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Saltman, K. (2005).*The Edison schools: Corporate schooling and the assault on public education.* New York: Routledge.

Shields, C. (2004, February). Dialogic leadership for social justice: Overcoming pathologies of silence. *Educational Administration Quarterly,* 40 (1), 109-132.

The Economist (2005, January 22-28). *The good company: A skeptical look at corporate social responsibility.* Special insert, pp. 3-22.

Wollenberg, C. (1974, Winter). Mendez vs. Westminster, race, nationality and segregation in California schools. *California Historical Quarterly,* 53 (4), 324+.