Leadership Multiplicities before and during the Post-Truth Era

Leonel Prieto

A.R. Sanchez, Jr. School of Business, Texas A&M International University, Laredo, TX 78041, USA;
lprieto@tamiu.edu

Abstract: Drawing from the ontology of the lack (Laclau and Mouffe 1985), aesthetic theory (Adorno 1997); practice theory (Bourdieu 2002), art perception theory (Bourdieu 1968), and storytelling theory (Boje 2001), we discuss leadership multiplicities and post-truth era phenomena. We conceptualize leadership as a heterogeneous field with an evolving incomplete set of contested narratives, at different development stages, entertained by different players. In the continuous re-occupation of the lack exists tensions, contradictions and conflicts within and between players' narratives. This situation generates a large variability that requires acknowledgement, promotion, and some management. We relate our discussion to education. We suggest ways to create unity within diversity and resolve some of these contradictions and tensions. The concept of parallax (Zizek 2006), which offers a new gaze, illustrates how to configure sets of related leadership narratives.

Keywords: leadership; multiplicity; post-truth phenomena; education; parallax

1. Introduction

Truth may be viewed as a system of procedures that are used to produce, regulate, and distribute certain statements (Foucault 2012). Nietzsche clearly described the social construction of truths: 'Truths are illusions which we have forgotten are illusions- they are metaphors that have become worn out and have been drained of sensuous force, coins which have lost their embossing and are now considered as metal and no longer as coins' (Nietzsche 1976, p. 46). Truth is made up and involves myth making; that is, it is socially constructed. Unfortunately, we tend to forget this. Of late, it is particularly concerning the diminishing reliance in "objective facts" and the increased importance of emotions and personal beliefs on shaping the collective imaginary (Davis 2017). Understanding truth's generation is fundamental for grasping and addressing 'post-truth' phenomena. Leaders need internalizing, and further development of narrative multiplicity. We suggest developing ways to institutionalize narrative contestation to move forward, and that education may play a central role in such institutionalization.

Perceived narrative heterogeneity has existed for years in most domains, although it seems to have increased in the last few decades (Derrida 1973; Lahire 2011; Laclau and Mouffe 1985; Taylor 1989; Keyes 2004; Davis 2017; Slavtcheva-Petkova 2018). Polysemy, an endemic result of our being in the world (Heidegger 1971), may create social problems such as hindering understanding and collective action.

Mainstream leadership research has not considered the enormous variability generated out of the relationships taking place between leader-follower-organization-context. Most leadership research has not sufficiently taken into account, among others, organizational dynamics, ontological-ontic-epistemic interrelationships, multiple level interrelationships, the symbolic, the informal, the organizational "dark side", the unmeasurable, the undecidable, and context (Derrida 1973; Gronn and Ribbins 1996; Conger 1998; Gabriel 1995; Boje 2001). Oversimplifying "reality" may result, among others, on lack

of practical relevance, low explanatory power, and questionable knowledge accumulation, as well as alienation of, and injustice for, certain stakeholders.

While post-truth phenomena entails multiple rationalities and reliance on beliefs and emotions (Zizek 2006; Bourdieu 2002; Nietzsche 1976; Davis 2017), mainstream leadership research has mostly ignored such factors, therefore, the nature of leadership in the post-truth era, and in general of leadership as a complex phenomenon, is by and large foreign to the dominant leadership paradigm. Undoubtedly, past and current, research about the main post-truth components and their relationships will help to foster both a better understanding of such phenomena and devising corrective measures. Nonetheless, given human complexity (Nietzsche 1976; Heidegger 1971) there will always be an unknown significant remainder. In addition, we must always care about individuals' autonomy, dignity, and respect while, at the same time, being guided by desirable social values (Castoriadis 1998; Emery and Purser 1996). The question is, how do we somehow deal with human complexity and desirable social values, while also considering, and promoting individuals' autonomy and self-development?

Variability, complexity, uncertainty, and ambiguity may be better approached by conceptualizing leadership as an open, creative, respectful, and well-informed process. Such a process requires psychologically mature individuals (Fromm 1956) who are continuously concerned with their development, and who are able, and willing to collaboratively engage in creative exercises geared to solve our social problems (Emery and Purser 1996; Zizek 2006). Education should play a central role in helping to generate such individuals and social processes. In order to do so, educational leaders need to deeply reflect about the required nature of education given our post-truth era situation. We suggest that educational leadership shall diminish its reliance on leadership's mainstream paradigm, and embrace and promote leadership as a creative, continuous, complex, diversified, and democratic process. Such leadership conceptualization entails, in education governance and administration as well as in learning processes, institutionalizing learning to think, narrative contestation, and narrative integration.

Education is a crucial life experience that may strongly shape our narratives. The educational system seems to lack the reflectivity, and adaption, that the post-truth era demands. Thus, the educational system needs to develop a stronger basis to better consider, theoretically and pragmatically, narrative fragmentation and integration. The school apparatus will mostly reproduce the dominant narrative. The dominant narrative is manifested in, and reproduced by, the habitus. The habitus refers to the values, attitudes, beliefs, expectations, dispositions, and ways of seeing of individuals and social collectives (Bourdieu 2002). Partly because of these effects, education may be viewed as one of the most important loci through which we may "see progress in the human condition" (Cooley 2009, p. 392). Thus, leaders in this domain have the responsibility to more fully realize the actual and the potential scope of their role, and to shape mechanisms that will help us to collaboratively formulate and approach the world that we want.

Post-truth era's heterogeneity manifests, among others, in the multiple meanings attributed to educational leadership, educational leaders, teachers, and students. Understanding heterogeneity in education is important, so that educational leaders and students will help to effectively deal with it in society. The challenge for educational leadership is to re-shape, using novel educational processes, the individual and collective habituses, through increased critical questioning of different narratives. This, conversely, will increase understanding of the dynamics of the educational field, which will lead to the creation of new, more inclusive and more interesting narratives, as well as improve effectiveness in working with other people.

According to Bourdieu (2002) and Foucault (2012), the educational field may be viewed as the social space where players, namely high-level federal and state government officials working in education, education board members, superintendents, principals, teachers, teaching assistants, teacher unions, students, parents, department chairs, deans, provosts, and college/university presidents, among others, maneuver to optimize their positions in terms of the relevant capitals.

The purpose of this paper is to discuss heterogeneity in leadership by framing it within the ontological lack (Laclau and Mouffe 1985) and conceptualizing it as a changing set of contested

narratives generated by different players (Boje 1991) who perceive differently. These narratives encompass tensions, conflicts, and contradictions (Adorno 1997) that may be somewhat resolved through their continual critique, rationalization, and integration.

The paper integrates an eclectic theoretical set that may be operationalized both in the educational field and society, which comprises 'ontological lack' (Laclau and Mouffe 1985), aesthetic theory (Adorno 1997), practice theory (Bourdieu 2002), art perception theory (Bourdieu 1968), storytelling theory (Boje 2017), and the parallax concept (Zizek 2006). It suggests conceptualizing leadership as a diverse, evolving, multiplicity. The paper proposes to positively deal with, and further develop, multiplicity by further institutionalizing contestation in the educational field. This contribution may help in dealing with post-truth era phenomena by improving governance, decision-making effectiveness and legitimacy in most societal realms. Educational leaders must increasingly contribute to develop a more critical educational system and, as a result, a more substantive politics in society.

We proceed by providing a brief summary of each of the components of our theoretical framework, while relating them to educational leadership. Thereafter, we sketch narrative variability and narrative dynamics in the educational field. Then, we provide examples of some leadership parallaxes, including one pertaining to leadership research. Next, we tentatively suggest some possible ways for educational leaders to address the apparent disarray of multiple narratives. Thereafter, we point out some limitations. Finally, we offer some concluding remarks.

2. Theoretical Framework

Theoretically, we draw from the 'ontological lack' (Laclau and Mouffe 1985), aesthetic theory (Adorno 1997), practice theory (Bourdieu 2002), art perception theory (Bourdieu 1968), storytelling theory (Boje 2017), and the parallax concept (Zizek 2006).

Perhaps the central problem of the post-truth era phenomena is one of the crucial features of postmodernism, namely, the increase in narrative fragmentation, which reflects a continuous narrative production process. Our set of conceptual tools helps to look at this problem, and attempt to address it. The 'ontological lack' provides the gestalt in which the other theoretical tools could be situated, and understood. It offers 'the empty structure' in which narrative multiplicity may be placed. Narrative evolution may be viewed as the continuous reoccupation of the lack that is partly derived from an abundant set of past narratives and those yet to become. Adorno's aesthetic theory reminds us of the embeddedness of the educational field in society's socio-historical process and highlights the centrality of examining tensions and contradictions within the educational field and related fields. In addition, these dialectics of the educational field relates to the evolutionary character of the lack that is generated by continuous critique. Bourdieu's practice theory, at a lower level than Adorno's aesthetic theory, gives the specific constituents of, and the basis for understanding, educational field dynamics, including the strategic moves of the different field players. It helps to operationalize both Laclau and Mouffe's ontology of the lack, and Adorno's aesthetic theory.

Bourdieu's art perception theory highlights that in understanding our own narratives and those of others, we must have the ability to 'decipher the code'. Furthermore, at a higher level, mastering the code of codes at the individual level, as well as collectively developed, will help to increase narrative integration. Boje's storytelling model sheds light on how field and inter-field dynamics may be operationalized through the generation and diffusion of narratives. This model highlights the constitutive nature of narratives at both the field and societal levels, and the endemic dynamics of narrative convergence and divergence. Finally, the parallax concept may be considered as a meso- or macro-view of a set of narratives constructed, by looking at their commensurability as well as at their lack of commensurability. The parallax concept offers a new way of seeing, a new narrative at a higher level.

Below, we provide a distillation of each of these theories and relate them to the multiplicity of the educational field.

Traditional ontology reaffirms rather than challenges the status quo (Bourdieu 2002). In our case, the ontology of lack (Laclau and Mouffe 1985) focal category is educational leadership. Thus, followers', leaders', and leadership's narratives are always lacking completeness (Laclau and Mouffe 1985), while the category is partly, and continuously, "filled" with different (ante) narratives (Boje 2017). Incompleteness allows for the continuous generation of narratives, accommodates narrative heterogeneity, and permits, among others, paradigm interplays (Schultz and Hatch 1996), creative conjunction of interstices (Remy 2015), construction of parallaxes (Adams 2005), and consideration of external–internal duality effects (Laclau and Mouffe 1985). Similarly, learning may be conceptualized, among other ways, as conversation (Pask 1976), as being social (Damico 1978), as a dialogue, as meaning-making, as a generative process, as a process of critique, deconstruction, and the reformulation of narratives (Boje 1991) and as a way of being in the world (Heidegger 1971). This conceptualization of learning highlights its polysemic abundance and incompleteness, as well as its continuous becoming. Incompleteness implies openness toward the other, and invites the external to become internal and vice versa. In other words, the ontological lack allows for past multiplicity to be explained, and offers the opportunity to create future multiplicities. Furthermore, the ontology of the lack is in line with our view of truth as a socially constructed system aimed at producing, regulating, and distributing statements (Foucault 2012).

Drawing from Adorno (1997), we characterize the educational field as embedded in society. As such, it reflects the tensions, contradictions, and conflicts of society's socio-historical process. As a field, its relative autonomy partly derives from its reliance on science. This autonomy is necessary for learning and criticality, which then gives education its intellectual value. The contradictions and conflicts in this field result from interactions among biased narratives held by different players. Evidently, among field players, just by being different and by using different but not omnipotent gazes, bias will always be present. Players' misrecognitions of the field, and as such, of its other players, of related fields and/or the interactions of the field with society generate, among players, different interpretations of the educational field. Although education is a somewhat contested field, it requires further consideration of multiplicity. Thus, educational leaders require an understanding of the complex dynamics of the educational field, and how they relate to societal dynamics. In so doing, they need to master a larger set of narratives.

Bourdieu's practice theory (Bourdieu 2002) posits that action by (educational) leaders is a function of the leader's habitus; the leader's cultural, social, economic, and symbolic capitals; and the leader's positioning in the educational field. Following Bourdieu (2002), we briefly define each type of capital. Economic capital includes owning economic and financial resources. Cultural capital refers to skills and knowledge. Social capital entails current and future resources stemming from social networks. Symbolic capital involves recognition, prestige, and social status derived from cultural, social, and economic capitals. Cultural and symbolic capitals are the most relevant capitals in the educational field. Cultural capital is, by definition, strongly positively related to school success. Symbolic capital, by itself and in amalgamating all types of capital, epitomizes the constitutive power of language.

Bourdieu (1968) art perception theory postulates the proper understanding of a narrative as being necessary to decipher its code. Not knowing the code may lead to misunderstanding, misrecognition, and possibly rejection. Deciphering the code depends on the player's cultural capital, willingness to listen to others, relevant prior life experiences, and a promoting environment, among other factors. 'Mastering of the code of codes' is the ability to understand the tensions and contradictions, and to play with them, to rationalize narratives and to reformulate new ones. In this sense, we may view education as learning codes, learning languages, and learning narratives. Mastering the code of codes is what education is about. However, such mastery entails going beyond merely human capital; it will encompass an augmented multi-field-based human capital, together with the ability and willingness to use such capacity in interacting with other field players. Playing with narrative differences, tensions and similarities enhance criticality and creativity. These capacities are crucial to better relating to and changing the multiplicity of narratives in the educational field. This ability to relate multiplicity

resources will be higher in individuals with high cultural capital. Such ability can be developed, collectively, for instance, via substantive democratic processes, which require, and, at the same time, help to expand social capital.

For humans, the centrality and constituting function of language has been noted by, among others, Derrida (1973), Heidegger (1971), Barthes (1991), and Rorty (1991). Boje's storytelling process model (Boje 2017) departs from antenarratives (antecedents, what is yet unstoryable), some which fully develop into narratives, which are told, and retold, thereby creating retrospectives and prospectives, which then change the narrative of the situation. This multi-stage narrative development is ongoing at different levels and domains. Narratives are also multiplicities stemming, via intertextuality, from many (prior) narratives conjoining human interactions, and generating, in turn, new narratives (Boje 2001). Likewise, new narratives may spring from examining boundary conditions, contributions, limitations, missing factors, or dimensions later incorporated, and by using the degrees of commensurability among narratives (Dervin 1999). Continuous narrative fragmentation, contradictions, and changing partial degrees of narrative commensurability produce the continuous occupation and re-occupation of the lack, by generating abundant new narratives.

3. The Habitus–Field Duality

Narratives are tools used by players in the educational field to move strategically. Every player in the educational field acts in the space between constraints that are set by specific conditions of the field and by expectations of her/his own habitus. Players positioning themselves in the educational field each seek to optimize, dynamically, via the habitus-field duality, their total relevant capital, given their perceived capitals and capital exchange rates that are pertinent to the field. In field relationships, players, using narratives, situate themselves and contemplate their positions in the field, as well as their power, or lack thereof, in their actions (Bourdieu 2002). Strategically, and at a higher level of thinking, certain players in education may exploit contradictions, tensions, and ambiguity in narratives, as they seek to better position themselves in the field. Properly reading the landscape of narrative differences is part of mastering the code of codes. The post-truth era seems to reflect a misrecognition excess, not enough narrative sharing, and an alienated, wrong, way of socially constructing reality.

Taylor (1989), among others, called for a wider recognition of narrative multiplicity in society, as a way of increasing narrative legitimacy and improving society's governance and condition. Interplays between habitus heterogeneity and perceived field variability continuously generate narrative diversity. Paradoxically, narrative generation while producing variability is an effort to reduce it. Below, we discuss narrative variability by using a habitus–field framework. First, we briefly discuss narrative variability. Thereafter, we discuss the habitus of individuals, and the collective habitus of education in the educational field.

3.1. Narrative Variability

We argue that educational leaders need an increased awareness of narrative multiplicity's existence, accept its legitimacy, and use it to situate and to increase knowledge, and institutionalize it in the field. This section discusses, in general, the constitutive character of narrative, and some sources and effects of its variability.

Narrative variability in the educational field originates from, among other factors, the agent's position in the field; habitus, amount, proportion, and exchange value of cultural, social, economic and symbolic capitals; and ability to decipher the relevant code(s).

Narratives are the constitutive parts of the social realm (Wittgenstein 1986; Boje 1991; Fairclough 1996). Thus, narratives constitute the educational field and its components. We use the term 'narrative' in a comprehensive manner to denote all stages of text development, namely, ante-narratives (Boje 2001), partial narratives and fully developed narratives. Despite the constitutive power of language, we acknowledge, as another instantiation of the lack, that language cannot do full justice to what may be, and it cannot totally depict realit(y)(ies) (Adorno 1997; Derrida 1973).

There is a multiplicity of narratives about the educational leader, the teacher, and the student; that is, there is an evolving multiplicity of multiplicities (see Section 4). There are overlapping, antagonistic, and agonistic narratives within and between both players and fields. Such multiplicity may be viewed as constitutive of, and as a response to, polycentric normative environments that increasingly characterize diverse social realms in an increasingly globalized world (Blommaert and Rampton 2011).

Increased multiplicity both favors and hinders educational practices. Variability may be considered affirmatively (e.g., enhances learning, promotes creativity, develops the student's entrepreneurial spirit, helps solve complex problems increasingly found in a diverse globalized world) or negatively. Concerning the latter, effects of narrative variability may include dissonance in reaching and getting involved in, knowingly and unknowingly, agreements and disagreements, as well as difficulties in determining what is defensible, objectionable, or how and to what degree value is to be assigned. Effects may also include misrecognizing our own values and value, and/or those of the other. Similarly, given our limited cognitive capacity, increased uncertainty and noise due to increased variability may limit effective cognitive processing. These effects seem exacerbated in the post-truth era. Similarly, multiplicity may make finding common ground harder, thereby slowing 'progress' in collective endeavors, and increasing confusion and inefficiency. On the other hand, variability reflects both the richness and realized potential of human imagination interplaying with realities. Heterogeneity adds flexibility, as well as adaptive capability to respond to contingencies in a diverse set of players and in different contexts. However, appropriate use of variability presupposes in-depth knowledge of each narrative form considered, which implies the ability to learn and invest substantial resources in continued learning. The appropriate use of variability demands openness, being well informed, and willingness to work with others. It entails a special type of responsibility from each player in the field. It involves a leadership type that is different from the mainstream perspective. Essentially, we need to directly deal with differences, contradictions, and ambiguities, if people are to work and live together. In other words, instituting contestation requires unorthodox leaders and followers.

3.2. The Habitus

Illustrating the continual heterogeneity of the habitus, this section describes the core of the habitus, highlights the importance of family and school experiences in shaping it, and discusses habitus variability at the individual (and the educational field) level. It shows that narrative differences, contradictions, and power asymmetries, among others, generate narrative variability.

The core idea of the habitus is grounded in a lack (Laclau and Mouffe 1985); as a result, the social relations that will influence the constitution of the habitus will encompass conflict, antagonism, tensions, and conflicts (Bourdieu 2002; Adorno 1997). The habitus develops through intense struggle for dominance among values, assumptions, expectations, dispositions, and narratives. This struggle occurs within us, at the individual level, and between us, at the collective level. Habitus development is the source of the novel.

There is habitus variability within and between each of the players and their perceptions of field constituents. Different habituses, resources, and contexts may generate different narratives. Different narratives result in and are constituted by tensions, conflicts, uncertainties, ambiguities, and contradictions (Adorno 1997) and they reflect different positionings in the field of education in terms of players' cultural, social, economic, and symbolic capital optimizations (Bourdieu 2002), or other purposes. For instance, variability in resources, in terms of teachers' cultural and symbolic capitals as well as schools' economic and social capitals, expressed in the form of teachers' qualifications and expertise, level, and quality of courses offered and school funding, generates heterogeneity in educational outcomes (Darling-Hammond 2001).

The habitus' striving within and between us develops as a two-level open system in a dual fashion. The habitus' own internal dynamics, as well as its relations with both the educational field and other fields, impact the habitus. A current example of the latter is the questioning, by "popular postmodernists", of the value of education and science. Likewise, the dynamics of the

players' habituses, particularly its leaders, impact the educational field. These struggles, and their potential positive outcomes, increase, and improve, with reflectivity. Such reflectivity should be continuously developed, and properly used, both internally and externally, in relating to others. Reflectivity outcomes improve when narratives' mastering increases.

For reasons of intimacy, the high degree of sensitivity of children, and the relative completeness of the family experience, among other factors, the family is perhaps the most influential institution in shaping the habitus (Archer et al. 2012; Schmutz et al. 2016); thereby, having properly educated parents is fundamental. Nonetheless, educational leaders, explicitly and implicitly, can substantially influence the habitus of the student. For example, childhood and adolescence are crucial stages for habitus formation (Archer et al. 2012; Jaeger and Møllegaard 2017), and school experience constitutes a crucial factor in the shaping of the student's habitus (Bourdieu 2002). The habitus' shaping by the school experience is bound to be stronger at the lower educational levels. Learning processes, including the student's direct interactions with teachers and peers, may strongly shape character formation and the students' perspectives. The habitus is propagated by the educational system which the student internalizes, to a certain degree, and its shaping will depend on the school experience of the particular habitus that the student brings to school. Educational leaders can substantially influence the student's habitus. Such shaping will take place mainly through content and learning dynamics, which, in turn, are shaped by the dominant narrative as expressed in educational policy. Even when the core habitus of education is set by a (few) top leaders, other educational leaders can imprint, to a degree, their own twists, expectations, and perspectives on the student's habitus (e.g., the enduring positive effects of outstanding teachers).

Lahire (2011) emphasized the multiplicity of the habitus. This diversity in unity (multiple selves in the individual and/or multiple individual selves in the collective) (Lahire 2011; Miner 2011) helps in the understanding of variability, a key feature of our post-truth era. Different contexts may produce different habituses, which in turn may be reflected in different selves. Partly because of heterogeneity, grand narratives' (Lyotard 1993) effects become diversified, and their expected impacts are not fully realized. The variability of constraints and opportunities, particularly at the micro-level, offers opportunities for responding to and resisting dominant narratives (De Certeau 1988), thereby helping to explain the variability of educational policies and other interventions. In the United States, keeping education local and in private schools (Cucchiara 2016) will partially limit the general effects of education in shaping the habitus, potentially allowing for the manifestation of a large, diverse set of possibilities at local level. Certain versions of controversial issues, like evolution and climate change, may be more openly expressed in contexts where the nation state power is weaker. However, such tactical moves at the micro-level, while somewhat liberating or offering some degree of 'lesser controlled response', are, by having little power, unable to substantially influence the dynamics of the socio-historical process. This seems to be the case for narratives located outside the dominant collective habitus. The challenge for educational leaders is to utilize habitus and narrative multiplicities by promoting narrative's contestation, translation, and creation in school learning and governance.

Playing within possibilities afforded by local, private, state and federal domains, educational leaders may generate new interesting narratives by engaging students; highlighting the value of becoming and remaining educated (Cooley 2009); situating knowledge in its contingency, contributions, limitations, incompleteness, and ongoing nature (Morin 1999); and emphasizing the importance of actively engaging in rational, well-informed, open, respectful conversations that will heed the humanity of the other and promote social solidarity (Emery and Purser 1996). For more details, see Section 5.

Playing specific positions stemming from the habitus–job role duality results in heterogeneous loci. For some educational leaders, complete agreement between the demands of the job and their habitus may exist, while for others, the distance between both may be large. Concerning the latter, entrepreneurial leaders (e.g., outstanding teachers) may have little or no time left for attempting new things or trying the same things anew. Furthermore, even if time were available, experimenting is risky, given the standardized examinations requirements. Nonetheless, owing to practical needs,

educational leaders will conform to the dominant narrative. However, in doing so, they will leave out entrepreneurial spirit, exploration, creativity, risk-taking, and experimentation. Thus, in order to maintain the status quo, many leaders do not really lead.

In developing a more appropriate leadership type than the traditional, we must experiment collaboratively with processes, effectively addressing difficulties that arise in the evolution of social processes. We, and only we, working together, can devise processes to address ambiguities, uncertainties, tensions, and contradictions of life at school and elsewhere.

The dominant habitus of the educational field is always incomplete and changing (Laclau and Mouffe 1985; Bourdieu 2002), while concurrently, it is partly pre-determined by the socio-historical process (Adorno 1997). The potential abundance of narratives in the habitus is restricted by power dynamics. The most influential habitus shapers mold it according to their interests (Bennett and Silva 2011). Therefore, the degree to which players with interests that are different from those of the dominant narrative may manage strategic changes in the habitus and the educational field remains an open question. Multiplicity may offer some opportunities in this regard. Some phenomena of the post-truth era challenge, in both a fundamental and simultaneously shallow way, parts of the dominant narrative (e.g., questioning the value of education). It is ironic that this challenge is receiving more attention than the by-far-higher-quality and better elaborated post-modernist critique of the dominant narrative (Deetz 1996; Lyotard 1993; Rorty 1991) in the educational system. It is unfair to analyze only one end of the political spectrum, that is, the 'populist postmodernists', and to continue making invisible many others who have proposed truly insightful and interesting ideas for a long time. This unfairness reflects power asymmetries among players.

Education is only one among many social institutions shaping the habitus. Examining the consistency, or lack thereof, between the habituses promoted by education, and those shaped by other players (e.g., family, the media) by looking for synergies, cancelling-out, or no effects, is important. Given the multiple differential effects that shape the student habitus, it may be difficult and unfair to expect too much from educators (e.g., it seems that an important part of the habitus is shaped during early life, in which family experience is central). Similarly, the media presents different narratives influencing symbolic capital, thereby shifting capital accrual to different players and doing so on ideological grounds. Ubiquitous Internet use facilitates information sharing from questionable sources. Among other factors, lack of resources (e.g., to obtain the code, that is, the cultural capital that is required to decipher information and assess its reliability, lack of time to verify truthfulness, and the lack of financial resources to buy high quality information), has resulted in the dominance of questionable information and the shrinking importance, in relative terms, of high-quality information. The sharing of information that is low quality, inexpensive, and easily understood may produce a vicious circle, potentially crowding out high-quality information. The number of people sharing, and producing cheap and low-quality information is far greater than the number of those sharing and producing high-quality information. This situation becomes worse over time. Educational leaders need to be informed, and to be prepared to intelligently respond to such challenges. Our inability to control, up to a degree, narrative quality, may create a "wrongful hyperreality" that may historically preclude the realization of better potentialities.

The interplay between the imagination of the habitus and of different realities creates possible narratives. Social media substantially increased this creative potential. Similarly, information technologies exacerbated learning potential and changed the means, methodologies, and at times, the content of learning (Castaneda and Selwyn 2018). Undoubtedly, educational leaders should be current on the learning-and-technology interface. However, attention to technology should not detract from engaging in more fundamental and profound discussions, such as acknowledging the "human aspects", pedagogy, individualization, commercialization, and the need to exercise constructive criticism of digital technologies in education (Castaneda and Selwyn 2018). After all, technology is just a means. The potentiality stemming from the interplays between imagination and realities increases with the number of viewpoints, and decreases with closeness and the abuse of power. Thus,

narrative diversity should be encouraged, but addressed democratically. Educational leaders that are proficient with cutting-edge discussions about crucial philosophy of science issues (e.g., critical learning as it relates to, among other topics, multiple paradigms, boundary conditions, the triad of ontology-epistemology-methodology, and self-development) will have more degrees of freedom to exercise their imagination, and to increase student potentiality. These suggested dynamics of the educational field may be viewed as a necessary condition that will have positive future effects on societal development.

3.3. The Educational Field: Narrative Dynamics

In this section, we note that due to pragmatic reasons and/or ignorance, we have tended to simplify reality. This simplification of reality has possibly manifested in our inability to 'decipher the code' of certain narratives, misrecognition and biases, narrow narratives, lack of awareness about the field, lack of attunement with followers, improper strategic positioning, and suppression of certain narratives exacerbating the informal, resistance, and the dark side of organization. Arguably, the ability to decipher the code, and if possible, mastery of the code of codes, as manifested in the ability to read, translate, and play with multiple narratives, constitutes the core of education. They are necessary abilities to produce quality arguments, and to understand and work with others. Institutionalizing narrative contestation in the educational field will positively affect learning; it will help to create higher-order rationalities, and it will increase narrative abundance and integration. In addition, we discuss narrative's enabling and constraining effects in meso- and macro-fields and institutions. All of the above should be internalized, and further develop, by educational leaders and teachers. This is a necessary condition for the student habitus to be properly influenced. Finally, we indicate that despite the hard work entailed by high-quality education and mastering the code of codes, all can be easily ignored by the exercise of political/economic power, thereby highlighting the centrality of politics in the dynamics of the educational field. Considering multiplicities may be viewed as impractical; however, post-truth era phenomena suggests that we are required to work with it.

Historically, for pragmatic reasons, among others, we simplified reality (e.g., by using heuristics, preferring the simplest model, mostly using linear central-tendency statistical measures, and with research that studies only a few factors at a time) and tended to produce simplified narratives. Thus, we may argue that the post-truth era phenomena are a reminder that we have always had variability but have tended to sideline it, a reminder that we must pay attention to what we have had for a long time, in practice, ignored. This entails, to be fair, paying attention not only to the powerful voices of the recent post-truth upsurge, but also to many other narratives that have been ignored. If the multiplicity of narratives has always been present, then paraphrasing Latour (1993), we can argue that we have always been in the post-truth era. This realization shakes and questions the status quo, while also opening many possibilities. Increased awareness about multiple narratives helps us to properly position ourselves by becoming cognizant of our assumptions, myths, and limitations, which may make it easier and more effective to engage with others in myth co-construction. In other words, there are many worlds other than the 'traditional' one, and we need to openly and seriously, consider and understand, more of them.

Properly understanding narratives requires the ability to grasp them. Average citizens' inability to decipher the code (Bourdieu 1968) is a barrier to understanding others' narratives. The potential danger is that one-sidedness and over-simplification may produce reality. Thus, a set of over-simplifications may produce a distinct reality other than that generated from a set of thoroughly elaborated accounts. The narrowness and hubris of the dominant narrative in education does not do justice to learning in its groping in the dark, in its risk-taking and experimentation, in its creation of new narratives, or in the development of its entrepreneurial spirit for expanding and changing knowledge, as well as contributing to building a better society. Thus, over-simplifying not only precludes us from creating more 'truthful' and interesting narratives, but also reduces human intelligence.

Misrecognition, according to Bourdieu (2002), is not recognizing our biases, beliefs, and assumptions. A slightly different meaning of misrecognition entails ignoring, twisting, and/or wrongly interpreting others' narratives, either on purpose, or because of a lack of ability to decipher the codes of those narratives. Misrecognition is endemic and present in each gaze, viewpoint, and narrative (Barthes 1991). Misrecognition is also necessary to construct a given gaze. Similarly, because different observation angles entail a certain degree of incommensurability (Zizek 2006), misrecognition is constitutive of the parallax (Zizek 2006). Misrecognition effects will increase with increases in domains, dimensions, levels, and time. Thus, we may obtain a sort of 'butterfly effect' narrative that, in terms of 'veracity', originated and developed out of very weak bases. Alas, such created reality may have significant social ill effects. Because truth is collectively and subjectively produced, several contradictory truths may peacefully co-exist. However, current post-truth phenomena involve an increase in the clashing of narratives, resulting in the challenge of bridging and consolidating narratives, which becomes more difficult with increases in communication events. Failure to bridge and integrate narratives may correlate with injustice and immorality.

Biases are necessary to generate narratives. However, considering such shortcomings, particularly when relating to others, is necessary. While narrative narrowness may allow some to wield power over biased results, such semi-closure precludes generating diverse and innovative narrative sets (DeBacker and Crowson 2007). Simplistic narratives may be ambivalent and confused, with narrow ambitions and horizons. They may warrant elaboration. If we continue trivializing our arguments and going to the bottom, we will not only under-develop our code-deciphering ability, but we will also harm our essential ability to further understand the world and to develop the human imagination. In this sense, 'trashing' education and going for the lowest common denominator may be viewed as being against the human spirit. Developing a code of codes will greatly help in understanding the other. In addition to optimizing our cultural capital, and thereby our deciphering ability, developing affirmative dialogues, thereby requiring interplay and work with others' narratives, is important. Civil, respectful, social relationships are fundamental for peaceful co-existence. These endeavors will amount to collectively develop the mastering of the code of codes at the meso- and macro-levels. Education is crucial in progressing toward such a goal.

Given the constitutive power of language, nuanced wording of narratives may be necessary to generate insights, and to illustrate a complex issue. Thus, by furthering education, formal and informal, we will increase our ability to decipher and understand the other. Unfortunately, high-quality narratives are being simply dismissed by 'populist postmodernists' without the effort being made to understand them. Educational leaders need expertise, not just about the dominant narrative, to apply in recurrent conversations with students. Similarly, well-informed leaders have more degrees of freedom to make connections and elaborate more interesting and persuasive narratives. Therefore, educational leaders must become proficient in inter-narrative conversations.

Nuanced inter-narrative understanding and cross-narrative interplay entail being able to translate between multiple narratives, which the mastery of the code of codes enables. Mastering the code of codes may be education's ultimate goal. Such mastery has strategic value, because it will enables effective navigation of the landscape, constituted by a set of relevant narratives in a specific field or situation. Navigating among narratives will entail the proper scrutinization of the relevant narrative field, that is, examining and working with narrative differences, tensions, and contradictions. Such a navigation may purposefully attempt to be creative, theoretically and/or in the field, at the interstices (Zizek 2006), and to resolve some of the differences in narratives (Adorno 1997). Creatively criss-crossing narratives, at the scholarly level, requires mastering the code of codes (Bourdieu 1968) so the creative translator is familiarized with the multiple 'languages' concerned (the codes of several fields), and is able to both fill the gaps and generate new narratives.

Mastering the code of codes may take place at scholarly and educational fields and societal levels. At the individual level, mastering the code of codes will entail maximizing individuals' cultural capital. The scholarly level is manifested in, among others, extending narrative boundary conditions, creating

new interesting narratives, and increasing inter-paradigm bridging. At the educational field level, it will entail educational leaders mastering inter-paradigmatic translation and its use in increasing student learning and thinking abilities. Similarly, mastering the code of codes, at the collective level, will amount to having an effectively working substantive democracy. This achievement will optimize, at the collective level, social capital. Clearly, mastering the code of codes is different at the individual and collective levels. Thus, contrary to what "populist postmodernists" propose, what is seemingly required in the post-truth era, is more (critical) education, not less.

Particular narrative sets, at a given point in time, reflect the socio-historical process (Adorno 1997). The educational system will reproduce the dominant narrative (Bourdieu 2002; Bennett and Silva 2011). That narrative will be characterized by positivism, individualism, instrumentality, and scientism, particularly by attempting to emulate natural science, highlighting educational standards, certifications and competences, over-valuing the pragmatic and the here and now, emphasizing quantitative-based assessment, and satisfying the skill demands of the market. Education has become increasingly commodified, economized, and framed within a business model (Holert 2009; Clegg et al. 2011). Increasing partnerships between private and public educational institutions increase the influence of the private sector and decrease the critical space and degrees of freedom for thinking. Such partnerships change the nature of social relationships, which constitute the core of learning; for instance, these partnerships emphasize contracts over collegiality, and profit over knowledge. Alternatively, education may emphasize responding to the needs and interests of the individual within a framework of the greater good, thus preparing the student to become an engaged citizen, and promoting their overall capacity to learn to think and adapt quickly (Hu et al. 2013; Morin 1999).

Generally, dominant narratives give too much weight in explaining the success or failure of educational efforts to the teacher, the student, and/or the student-teacher relationship, while underemphasizing the influences of the educational system and society (Moore 2004; Bourdieu 2002; Goodpaster 2012).

Macro-level narratives may circumscribe the work of educational leaders at lower levels by setting the rules of the game (e.g., setting the language categories to be used, predetermining what is important, what is valuable, and how value is to be assigned). Alternatively, excellent teachers working in dissonant environments (e.g., low-achieving, educational policy values not attuned to their habitus) may contribute minimally, considering the specifics of the educational field. A lack of attention to the meso- and meta-levels, thereby ignoring actual and potential emergent phenomena (Goldspink and Kay 2007; Sawyer 2005), accompanies the excessive emphasis that is given to the micro-level, perhaps reflecting the influence of the most powerful players. Thus, the individual is commonly taken as the unit of analysis, whereas if we view individuals as constituents of society, the emphasis changes. In particular, the practical power implications of an open, well-informed, inclusive and respectful dialogue are avoided. While such move is required, it lacks the necessary power for its realization. The expansion of globalization processes (Nerad 2010; Brown and Labonté 2011) and the surge of post-truth phenomena, which pertain, mostly, to the collective level, exacerbated the deficits generated by over-emphasizing the micro-level; thus increasing the need for multi-level collective dialogues. A multi-point collective narrative will help us to understand and act more effectively.

Narratives that are suppressed, sidelined, or made invisible (e.g., those produced by less powerful players, accounts critical of the status quo) may become part of the 'dark side', the informal realm, the realm of unintended consequences, the unmanaged, and the unmanageable (Gabriel 1995) or not survive. Suppressed narratives may remain dormant, as part of reality, and as part of the potentiality 'waiting' to develop further. Embracing multiplicity, thereby, minimizing suppressed narratives, will have a positive social psychoanalytical effect, consequently increasing social health and stability.

Government retrenchment in the form of giving up social space to the market has increased the legislative power of corporations. For example, some corporations—which are not accountable to the public—have substantially increased their power to shape culture (and this does not only refer to media corporations) (Mcmahon 2012). Coincidentally, this is happening at a time at which the

extent and legitimacy of democratic 'control' by elected officials are being increasingly questioned worldwide. This is an example of narratives that are rarely discussed that nonetheless have a substantial social impact.

Owing to survival needs, most strategic moves that are undertaken by the less powerful players in the field are weak and inconsequential. Exhibiting a 'pragmatic' position, in order to comply with the game, legitimizes and helps cement the dominant narrative. This pragmatic attitude contributes to hiding differences and problems, thereby maintaining or increasing the unhealthy social, as well as helping to maintain the dominant narrative and status quo. At the same time, there are practical considerations substantially limiting a more pro-active stance. Although the majority of field players generate numerous narratives continually, such accounts lack originality and autonomy, because the less-powerful players are essentially followers (Fromm 1956; Parvin 2018), and they become alienated and bogged down for most of their lives while struggling for everyday survival. Thus, they participate poorly and weakly in the political game.

This struggle may be positively steered by educational leaders. Education may be viewed as being governed by multiplicities of dynamic and complex interactions that require an ability to adapt, rather than to preserve the dominant narrative. Therefore, leaders need to understand complex competing subjectivities, and to help co-create new ones. Thus, leaders may critically review narratives, borrow from some, slightly modify them, and put them together in new and interesting ways. Educational leaders may help to develop such abilities in their students and subordinates by de-emphasizing instruction and promoting the ability to think and self-develop. All this may generate a more civilized, well-informed, open, and respectful politics.

3.4. In the End, It Is All Politics

Evidently, given the poor-quality argumentation on some fronts of the post-truth era, the societal discussion about post-truth phenomena is not mainly about knowledge claims and truth, but rather about political power. Within the educational field policy, the dominant minority creates policy biases against less powerful groups. Teachers and administrators, although still important in implementing policy, are by and large following, and having to comply with, the important decisions that are made by the dominant players in the field.

The political dimension is sidelined in education (Clegg et al. 2011). However, it is crucial to discuss post-truth phenomena, although the question of whether the latter is 'naturally occurring' and/or intentional seems to be compounded by ignorance. Thus, knowledge and politics (Foucault 2012) are at the heart of the discussion. The narrative concept encompasses these two important dimensions. Unfortunately, history shows plenty of instances in which poorer narratives, in terms of quality of argumentation and in terms of their ethical grounds, have been imposed over better-developed narratives. Thus, political power appears to have a stronger effect on narrative success than does the quality of the narrative. Although it seems the high quality of some narratives and the corresponding difficulty of deciphering their code may be problematic, the crucial problem is ideology rather than lack of understanding. This situation calls for the development of societal mechanisms that out of multiple narratives will co-produce new, more interesting ones.

It is necessary to openly discuss politics in education. Values and ideology are endemic in the learning process (Foucault 2012), even if educational leaders, teachers, and students are unaware. Knowledge in narratives may be conceived as the exercise of power. Positivism claims to be value-free (Drezin and Lincoln 2011). Nonetheless, any narrative includes values, either implicitly or explicitly. For instance, in science, the power of gatekeepers, perhaps in seeking to exercise quality control, apparently makes them blind to other narratives, which, in turn, narrows the potential for asking (other) interesting questions (Gippel 2015). Changes in the values that are supported by the incentive system of the educational field will change what and how much it is valued, and the exchange rates among the different types of capitals. Since ideology is unavoidable, it should be openly acknowledged and dealt with.

Recognizing that each player in the educational field has interests that circumscribe what each player can view and how it is viewed, implies that educational practices that may be viewed positively from a certain angle may be viewed from another angle, as contributing to social inequality. For instance, teachers and other educational leaders have interests, and they must legitimize their work. As a result, they tend to view their work positively, and they will not be likely to see it as contributing to reproducing some deficits of the socio-historical process (Cooley 2009). Openly discussing ideology will substantially enhance learning, since clarity about our perspective and those of others may help in understanding differences, contradictions, and similarities.

Power facilitates and constrain, narrative development and success. Which antenarratives become fully developed and which become dominant is a function of the balance between novelty and familiarity (Shklovsky 1991) and of power. Shklovsky (1991) stressed that the higher the degree of narrative novelty, the more difficulty in deciphering the code, thereby, reducing potential audience, whereas a high degree of familiarity implies uninteresting narratives. Therefore, increasing the dominance of low-complexity narratives may lead us toward the more comfortable, the less interesting, and the dwarfing of our thinking capacity. Dominant narratives become naturalized, are rarely scrutinized, and are viewed as "the way things are" (Bourdieu, 2002). This naturalization makes changing them difficult. Consequently, educational leaders and students must (a) scrutinize narratives' political economy: "which narratives are being diffused?", "which narratives are being suppressed?", and "who is telling/spreading a given narrative?" (Boje 1991); (b) deconstruct narratives by examining their premises, strengths, and weaknesses (Derrida 1973); (c) translate narratives, making them intelligible for the audiences concerned (Butler et al. 2000); and (d) re-construct narratives, both individually and collaboratively. In addition to taking part in learning, the latter may be based on participative processes that will, collectively, formulate and enact feasible and desirable worlds (Emery and Purser 1996; Boje 2001; Mcmahon 2012).

Given the multidimensionality of complex problems such as education, and thus, the corresponding 'lacks' (e.g., uncertainties, contradictions, disagreements), a 'faith jump' (Zizek 2006) is required to work with others, and this jump entails believing that it is worth finding, creating, and strengthening commonalities, while simultaneously abandoning differences (Emery and Purser 1996). We start by agreeing, at the macro-level, on the following: "what type of world do we want to share?", and given that, "what type of education do we need to have?". Answering these two fundamental questions will pre-define the remainder.

Recognizing and respecting the other opens up huge potential that may be positively developed. Acknowledging and promoting diversity while devising ways in which people can create common narratives despite their diversity is the challenge. Engaging different groups in the co-construction of narratives entails generating common ground among the groups involved. Crossing and changing, boundaries in social interactions change the meaning of terms such as 'insiders', 'outsiders', 'we', and 'them (Hogg 2001), and moves the creative collective forward. In considering the other, we need to critically look at narratives (Derrida 1973; Boje 1991, 2001), translate between groups' narratives to look at such narratives together with others' narratives (Butler et al. 2000), and reformulate and integrate those narratives (Boje 1991, 2001), particularly at the meso- and meta-levels.

Multiple 'translations' may be carried out by the people who are involved in the collective process, so that in working together, doubts are clarified, agreements are reached, and commitments and responsibilities are self-determined (Emery and Purser 1996; Funtowicz and Ravetz 1994). In dealing with post-normal science issues, in which stakes, uncertainty, and ambiguity are high, science may be just a subset that may help solve social problems (Funtowicz and Ravetz 1994). In the grand scheme of life, the effects of science/scientific knowledge may be, not infrequently, less important than those of politics.

Calls for substantive democracy based on trust, mutual respect, reciprocity, common ground, and regular communication, among other factors, have been made throughout human history, but they remain by-and-large a utopia (Zizek 2006; Adorno 1997; Emery and Purser 1996). Structural and other environmental barriers, the unwillingness of individuals to participate and take responsibility, and the

unwillingness of powerholders to redistribute power, have resulted in some analysts doubting the feasibility of substantive democracy (Parvin 2018). Despite problems in operationalizing substantive democracy (Johnson 2006; Emery and Purser 1996), its merits in terms of human development and ethical grounding makes it perhaps the best ideal when trying to solve the critical problems of the post-truth era. We must collectively work toward making the system more amenable to substantive democracy, while at the same time increasingly develop, through learning and other means, a habitus of psychologically mature individuals who increasingly enact their global citizenship.

Globally, the dominant leadership narrative devalues "the rest" and overvalues "the West" (Said 1988; Foucault 2012; Bhabha 1988). It sees the world as being limited by the Western gaze, and at the same time, it affects other gazes. In addition, it uses science politically to sanction Western values, legitimize capitalism, and promote hegemonic groups (Ailon 2008). Respectfully dealing with others at the global level is both a huge multi-dimensional challenge and an ethical imperative, which educational leaders may help to tackle.

4. Some Leadership Parallaxes

In this section, we use the concept of parallax to partly address narrative variability, that is, as a means to achieve narrative coherence by providing a vision of a new multiple-view narrative at a higher level, a meta-narrative. We also discuss how leadership research has misrecognized and suppressed others' narratives.

Zizek (2006) defines parallax "as the apparent displacement of an object, caused by a change in observational position" (pp. 20–21). Changes in observational positions (e.g., paradigms, narratives, schools, metaphors) may produce "parallax gap(s)" for which no, or only partial, syntheses or mediations are possible. The parallax set is a higher-level complex reality constituted by multiple, but somewhat related narratives. The whole set provides a more encompassing—and new—view, compared with particular subset(s). Unfortunately, the parallax rarely belongs to the many, that is, it may be just a theoretical exercise. Alternatively, a set of players may co-create, and collaboratively implement, it. This is a key challenge in resolving some crucial issues of the post-truth era. However, the parallax concept is rarely entertained. The co-construction of parallaxes, in its potential inter-leveling and intersectionality, may be viewed as a way to diminish narrative fragmentation, to increase narrative consolidation, and to generate interesting new sets of narratives. The most impactful realms of the parallax in education are at the meso- and meta-levels which are beyond the power of educational administrators and teachers.

Next, we illustrate the large variability of leadership research "as is", suggest that such variability could be larger and offer simple examples of variability consolidation in the form of leadership parallaxes. While achieving coherence usually implies exclusion, we propose the increase of both coherence and inclusion.

A large number of attributes, traits, and characteristics have been used to characterize leaders and followers, reflecting both abundance and incompleteness. Part of this multiplicity can be seen in the categories used in the diverse set of leadership theories (see Section 4.2). For example, the GLOBE research program, based on implicit leadership theory, used 112 leader attributes and behaviors consolidated into 21 primary leadership dimensions, which, in turn, were consolidated into six global leadership dimensions (e.g., charismatic value-based leadership, team-oriented leadership, participative leadership, humane-oriented leadership, autonomous leadership and self-protective leadership) (House et al. 2004). The 21 primary leadership dimensions included administratively competent, autocratic, autonomous, charismatic/visionary, charismatic/inspirational, charismatic/self-sacrificial, conflict inducer, decisive, diplomatic, face saver, humanely oriented, integrity, malevolent, modest, non-participative, performance-oriented, procedural, self-centered, status-conscious, team collaborative, and team integrator (House et al. 2004).

Similarly, followers' diversity, whether they are educational leaders at lower levels or students, is illustrated by characterizing them as: industrious, craftspersons, enthusiasts, good citizens,

conformists, competent, incompetent, insubordinate, loyal, having a positive attitude, able to exercise good communication, showing initiative, obeying established arrangements, having integrity, being responsible, flexible, effectively engaging in teamwork, expressing their opinion, being reflective practitioners, task-conscious, and owning their work (Sy 2010; Carsten et al. 2010; Moore 2004). These categories stem mostly from a managerialist perspective. Thus, the categories depend on the position of the gazer, but the gazer is not alone.

Attribute consolidation, through construct construction, leaves out part of the rich and nuanced information that is contained at the lower levels. In this sense, some post-truth phenomena may be viewed as a type of 'reverse engineering' of higher-order categories. Certainly, constructs are necessary for producing order out of chaos. However, the nuanced and rich information that is present at lower levels, particularly individual heterogeneity, needs consideration. Complementing the search for generalizability/universality and the thick information that is present in less generalizable forms of knowledge seems necessary. Jointly entertaining narratives at these two levels will help us to better understand leaders, followers, and leadership in education.

4.1. Some General Leadership Parallaxes

Leadership in general, and in the educational field, in particular, is a multiplicity of heterogeneous narratives. Paraphrasing Mintzberg et al. (2005), and following Laclau and Mouffe (1985), leadership 'may be far more and less than you ever imagined'. The following set of sketched parallaxes illustrates, through a few "helicopter views", the variability and richness of narrative in the leadership field, while also illustrating some new and interesting narrative sets.

Leadership as social pathology and as a control mechanism. Leadership's dominant narrative, through reification, creates and maintains the social fiction that the leader, leadership, and hierarchy are necessary (Gemmill and Oakley 1992); in this narrative, leadership is an alienating social myth. Likewise, leaders may be overrated in their supposed effects on the performance of schools and organizations (Meindl et al. 1985). The mainstream view of educational leadership considers it as the actions of a leader that is aimed at influencing other educators and students to improve learning at educational institutions (Hoyle et al. 2005). Similarly, leadership may be viewed as an agenda to control and to dominate a contested field by certain individuals and agencies (English 2012, p. 155).

Leadership and human development. The dominant educational leadership narrative relies, wrongly, on the assumption of nobility of command, which is always destructive of the human spirit (March and Weil 2005). The 'ability to influence' is paramount in the traditional view of leadership. In an effective and humane society, the lesser the degree of traditional leadership exercised, the higher the level of society's human development. In this vein, traditional leadership may be viewed negatively (Gemmill and Oakley 1992) since it preclude us from taking the required path for achieving deep human development. Likewise, leadership's dominant narrative is frustrating and disadvantageous for women and minorities, detrimental to human development and for society, and morally disagreeable (March and Weil 2005). Moreover, in a sort of unethical double gain, the dominant narrative gains legitimacy, while at the same time, excluding others. Alternatively, we may argue that we need all individuals to become 'good' leaders in all domains, levels, and moments of life to really furthering human development.

Leadership as life. Educational leadership entails multiple narratives, such as exuberance for life, commitment to prosaic duties, courage, poetry, art, routine, action, process, exploitation, exploration, beauty, truth, complexity, simplicity, contradiction, coherence, grace and control, and more (March and Weil 2005). Leadership involves both the private and public spheres (March and Weil 2005). Different players may emphasize different dimensions and facets, reflecting their idiosyncratic habituses and contexts.

Additional (fragmented) views of leadership. Educational leadership may be faked (Civitella 2018), absent (Alvesson and Sveningsson 2003), viewed as necessary or as a social disease (Gemmill and Oakley 1992), manifested in different ways (see below), and to different degrees, and exercised by different

individuals (e.g., distributed or team leadership vs. the solo leader) at different times. It seems clear that educational leadership is a multiplicity that we have simplified as the ability to influence others. Considering the rich leadership's polysemia will help our understanding, strategic moves, and success.

4.2. Narratives in the Leadership Research Field

A substantial part of the habitus that is inculcated to educational leaders in their higher education experience derives from leadership research. What follows is a brief presentation of the doxa of leadership research, which is followed by a short critique of it.

Drawing from the reviews of Dinh et al. (2014), Uhl-Bien et al. (2014), and House and Aditya (1997), the main models created by leadership researchers are as follows: trait theory (Hollander and Offermann, 1990), behavioral theory (Fleishman 1953; Stodgill 1950), contingency theory (Fiedler 1981), and transformational leadership theories (Conger and Kanungo 1987). The former set emphasizes the leader, whereas relatively more recently, the attention given to the follower has increased. In this set, we find implicit followership theories (Sy 2010), social identity theory (Hogg 2001), and the romance of leadership (Meindl et al. 1985). Although the above theories are also relational, at least implicitly, researchers have long highlighted the importance of the leader–follower duality. In this set, we may find research work carried out by, among others, Follett (1949), Hollander and Offermann (1990), and Graen et al. (1982) leader-member exchange theory, which highlights the desirability of co-working on a power-with mode, rather than on a power-over mode.

In leadership research, the critique against the hegemonic order, represented by realism and positivism, and put forward mainly by Continental philosophers, was not well received; it was considered to be a dangerous attack against the status quo. It was neither understood (Deetz 1996), or simply ignored. In academia, the direction taken by some postmodernist thinkers (i.e., Derrida 1973, 1997; Lyotard 1993; Foucault 2012), although present mainly in some humanities departments, seems to have almost disappeared. Thus, despite the insightful criticism of the dominant leadership paradigm, a criticism carried out by some postmodernist thinkers, there was, by and large, no paradigm shift, and not even a significant overhaul of the dominant paradigm.

Research parallaxes provide a new perspective and a new narrative, by pointing out the sequence and main body of theories, as well as their differences, even within the same paradigm. Parallax development requires openness, which contrasts with research's (relative) closure. Different researchers, at different times, have called for, among others, increasing multi-trial-multi-method research (Campbell and Fiske 1959), supplementing (the highly criticized) null hypothesis testing (Denis 2003) with effect size and variance information, including missed dimensions and context information, minimizing distortions created by research's over-reliance on the empirical and the quantitative (Drezin and Lincoln 2011), further developing middle-level theories (House and Aditya 1997) as well as increasing interdisciplinary, transdisciplinary, qualitative, mixed-methods, and multi-paradigmatic research (Nietzsche 1976; Van de Ven and Poole 2005; Calas and Smircich 1999; Drezin and Lincoln 2011). However, these calls, made long ago, have been hardly heeded. Certainly, perspectives, theories, categories, and languages have only certain uses. Perhaps, as Derrida (1973) suggested, we have yet to invent new languages.

Calls for paying more attention to, among others, dynamics, complexity, and context, have had little impact, probably because they go against the established incentive system in academia. Although there has been little or no attention paid to criticism, the foundations of positivism have been strongly shackled and exposed as weak (Deetz 1996). If academicians, fundamentally their leaders, basically ignored other perspectives in a domain such as leadership research, where peer review is one of the most important tenets of knowledge generation, how can we expect a reasonable response to calls for open, well-informed cross-boundary conversations from less well-informed individuals like the 'average citizen'?.

Leadership theory is grounded, mostly, in positivism. Its development has been based on its power over others; that is, it has largely ignored other narratives. It continues working as if the sharp critique of realism and positivism has not occurred (Deetz 1996). As a result, theoretical formulations

have deepened at the micro-level and failed to ask other, perhaps more enthralling and important, questions that might generate more interesting narratives. Indeed, the formulation of a diverse set of narratives, which is currently being highlighted in the political domain using a very different quality of argumentation, has been taking place for quite some time in the processes generating knowledge in the leadership domain (e.g., leadership models that are different from the Western model). However, lack of dialogue, and lack of inclusiveness, sometimes in the name of quality control, seems to have prevailed (Conger and Kanungo 1987).

The above suggests that we rarely seriously consider the other in leadership research, both between and within paradigms.

5. The Way Forward: Some Suggestions

Conceptualizing and operationalizing leadership as a diverse evolving multiplicity in the educational field require a series of changes. In addition to some of the suggestions above, there is a plethora of possibilities, many of which may come from educational leaders. What follows is a small sample of some of these possibilities. We draw from, among others, the work of Morin (1999) and Cooley (2009). Due to space limitations, we only sketch them. The set includes the following:

(1) Creating an educational leadership up to par in dealing effectively with education in this post-truth era will require pertinent actions in education that should be consistent with the dynamics of other realms (e.g., legislation, value systems promoted at the societal level, creating synergies geared to achieve higher-end social values). Households, friends, social networks, and social media have a large impact on the values, assumptions, and perspectives that are entertained by individuals (Bourdieu 2002). Crucial questions to examine will include the following: "what are the potential, and limitations, of education given the current socio-historical system?", and "what actions may need to be taken to positively direct the shaping of the student by realms other than education" (e.g., social media effects on culture, family, friends, and social networks)?.

(2) The situation that we face today is largely derived from what we had yesterday. Thus, we need to seriously reflect on what values, assumptions, and narratives are promoted by our socio-historical system. We seem surprised by what we have inherited, but we should have known better. Societal outcomes are the result of society's incentive system (Baumol 1990; Wennekers and Thurik 1999). The post-truth surge of the present times suggests that we have not seriously taken into account an important subset of existing narratives. Consequently, change was too slow, and/or changes already made are in the wrong direction.

(3) Given that the increased retrenchment of nation states and that the corresponding decrease in their social responsibilities has been accompanied by the increased legislative power of corporations, and an increased impact of social media on shaping culture (Mcmahon 2012), nation states ought to bestow greater responsibility on and limit the effects of corporations, in general, and on social media giants, in particular, by, among other actions, regulating the quality of information.

(4) Our most valuable resource is probably the potentiality that could be realized from being engaged in continuous, open, respectful, and well-informed conversations, that is, by conjointly creating narratives. Thus, new venues for conversation and dialogue must be created. It is necessary to instill more politics (Zizek 2006) in a substantive democracy that is practised by psychologically mature individuals with high cultural capital, who may eventually become imbued with brotherly love (Fromm 1956) and open up a huge set of possibilities.

(5) Strategically, it may be healthy and illuminating for educational leaders to reflect on the explicit and implicit value system of education and its most relevant features, according to different players in the educational field. Educational leaders may be surprised by such an exercise. For many educational leaders, it may be enlightening to examine the implications of the ubiquity, and implications of, race privilege, or lack thereof, for social studies (Kendall 2002; Gündemir et al. 2014), the disadvantages accruing from too much emphasis on technology, the effects of

grand narratives in teaching history, and the accompanying disrespect and ignorance about the micro-history of minority groups (Cooley 2009) and the petite man (Boje 2001), as well as the implications of considering science as just another language, as just another knowledge, rather than "the knowledge", or a privileged language (Rorty 1991). As a result of such conversations, we may agree that it is necessary to re-conceptualize how civics, social studies, and history can be rethought to more fully account for historical contingency (Cooley 2009). Educational leaders' familiarity with discussions about paradigmatic multiplicity will result in a more intelligent, and more interesting, type of learning; that is, a type of learning that is at the cutting edge.

(6) By entertaining multiplicities in educational leadership, we can substantially increase the narrative potentiality that is both realized and realizable, by tapping into what we already have, as well as into the missing connections between the yet-to-become-new and -old ideas, visions, concepts, and theories. Given the state of the field and the implications of such discussions for learning, it may be argued that (top) educational leadership has failed, given the infrequency of profound meso- and meta-level discussions, because educational institutions are the type of societal institutions for which we must have the highest expectations with regard to promoting such deep-level conversations.

(7) There is the need to refocus on what, how, and when to teach. Responding to these questions requires an inclusive democratically developed process involving all the players in the educational field. For instance, considering that it is uncertain which future skills, abilities, and competencies may be required, we may emphasize developing students with strong bases and the ability to adapt quickly and to learn to think. However, the players of the educational field should thoroughly discuss which type of student we may help to develop.

(8) It is necessary to promote critical thinking by deconstructing narratives, translating between them, and creating new ones (Boje 1991, 2001; Clegg et al. 2011) among both educational leaders and students. We will greatly benefit from intelligent and well-informed post-modernist conversations at all educational levels.

(9) It is essential to instill becoming and remaining educated (Cooley 2009) as valuable ideals, and to provide support for these ideals via societal reward systems. Educating about the value of education will have limited effects if it is not accompanied by the proper societal incentive system (Baumol 1990).

(10) Increasing awareness of the incompleteness of knowledge and its never-ending quest, based on the abundance of rationalities, well-informed, quality argumentation, and open inquiry (Morin 1999; Cooley 2009; Drezin and Lincoln 2011) is essential. Similarly, it is important contextualizing learning to grasp the relations between the general and the particular as well as developing strategies for dealing, theoretically and practically, with uncertainty, ambiguity, and the unexpected.

(11) It is essential to integrate diverse fields to grasp the unity and diversity of the human condition (Morin 1999). Developing social solidarity through moral attitudes that will recognize the humanity of the other (Cooley 2009) is necessary.

(12) It is required that education for peace is encouraged, and for the joint development of the individual, society, and the Earth (Morin 1999). Similarly, we need to develop interesting ways in which global citizenship may be taught and realized (Morin 1999; Sloterdijk 2013).

6. Limitations

This paper's narrative, despite being comprehensive, is just one among many, is biased, and incomplete. Undoubtedly, several components of this narrative need further development. Our suggestions reflect our preferences, with which some readers may disagree (e.g., our preference for promoting individual self-development and an ongoing creative and democratic leadership process may contrast with some readers who may prefer top-down leadership, or just to be left "alone"). In addition, by being an unorthodox account, it may lack anchorage on the background of some readers. Finally, given that it is a conceptual piece, some of its components may need empirical verification.

7. Concluding Remarks

Using Laclau's ontological lack, Adorno's aesthetic theory, Bourdieu's practice theory, Bourdieu's art perception theory, and Boje's narrative process model, we discuss the multiplicity of educational leadership, and suggest ways to expand, consolidate, and improve it.

Perhaps the most important challenge of the post-truth era is to devise mechanisms that will allow us to, at a higher degree, collectively continue co-creating meaning. Paraphrasing Nietzsche (1976), we require organizing ourselves, so that we collectively want to create knowledge (truths) for the sake of collective development. As suggested earlier, we require working in a duality that is both bottom-up and top-down. Regarding the former, we need psychologically mature individuals (Fromm 1956) who should be aware of the human condition (Cooley 2009) and who show social solidarity (Morin 1999). In this endeavor, education may play a fundamental role by increasing knowledge and both the individual and collective capacity for creation. It is necessary to promote these capacities, a socio-historical system with, among others, an incentive/reward system to promote the features that are desired for the individual and collective habituses. However, the transformations that are needed appear unlikely, given society's current status.

Educational leaders and students are in a central position to steer this type of change. For such an endeavor, we require new approaches in education, and in teacher and student training, as well as different governances in the educational field and in society. Both educational leaders and students need to undergo theoretical development; for instance, by being exposed to interesting and challenging narratives, as well as practical development through (certain) training and classroom dynamics (e.g., highlighting the abilities to learn to think). It is also important that learning not only focuses on traditional skills and competences, but also emphasizes how the educational leader and the student will position themselves, over time, in their relevant fields and in the world.

Considering our brief characterization of the educational field and related societal factors, the socio-historical process that is required to obtain the change suggested, seems, in agreement with Adorno (1997) and Fromm (1956), difficult to obtain. In dealing with post-normal science issues, as are those of the educational field, science may be just a subset that may help in solving social problems (Funtowicz and Ravetz 1994). In the grand scheme of life, the effects of science/scientific knowledge may be less important than those of politics. However, realizing our, existing and the yet to become, human potential, which is partly manifested in multiplicities, shall prompt us to be both optimistic and creative. Despite the constraints, leaders in the educational field are fundamental to making progress on all of these important challenges.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

Adams, Annmarie. 2005. Peter Collins: A study in parallax. *Journal of Architectural Education* 59: 22–31. [CrossRef]

Adorno, Theodor. 1997. *Aesthetic Theory*. Translated by Robert Hullot-Kentor. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Ailon, Galit. 2008. Mirror, mirror on the wall: Culture's consequences in a value test of its own design. *Academy of Management Review* 33: 885–904. [CrossRef]

Alvesson, Mats, and Stefan Sveningsson. 2003. The great disappearing act: Difficulties in doing "leadership". *The Leadership Quarterly* 14: 359–81. [CrossRef]

Archer, Louise, Jennifer DeWitt, Jonathan Osborne, Justin Dillon, Beatrice Willis, and Billy Wong. 2012. Science aspirations, capital, and family habitus: How families shape children's engagement and identification with science. *American Educational Research Journal* 49: 881–908. [CrossRef]

Barthes, Roland. 1991. *Mythologies*. New York: The Noonday Press.

Baumol, William J. 1990. Entrepreneurship: Productive, unproductive and destructive. *Journal of Political Economy* 98: 893–921. [CrossRef]

Bennett, Tony, and Elizabeth Silva. 2011. Introduction: Cultural capital- Histories, limits, prospects. *Poetics* 39: 427–43. [CrossRef]

Bhabha, Homi K. 1988. The commitment to theory. *New Foundations* 5: 5–23.

Blommaert, Jan, and Ben Rampton. 2011. Language and superdiversity. *Diversities* 13: 1–21.

Boje, David M. 1991. The storytelling organization: A study of story performance in an office-supply firm. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 36: 106–26. [CrossRef]

Boje, David M. 2001. *Narrative Methods for Organizational & Communication Research*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.

Boje, David M. 2017. Process Model of Storytelling. Available online: www.davidboje.com/ (accessed on 17 September 2018).

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1968. Outline of a sociological theory of art perception. *International Social Science Journal* 20: 589–612.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 2002. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, Garrett W., and Ronald Labonté. 2011. Globalization and its methodological discontents: Contextualizing globalization through the study of HIV/AIDS. *Globalization and Health* 7: 29. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

Butler, Judith, Ernesto Laclau, and Slavoj Zizek, eds. 2000. Restaging the universal: Hegemony and the limits of formalism. In *Contingency, Hegemony, Universality: Contemporary Dialogues on the Left*. London: Verso, pp. 11–43.

Calas, Marta B., and Linda Smircich. 1999. Past postmodernism? Reflections and tentative directions. *The Academy of Management Review* 24: 649–71. [CrossRef]

Campbell, Donald T., and Donald W. Fiske. 1959. Convergent and discriminant validity by multitrait-multimethod matrix. *Psychological Bulletin* 56: 81–105. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

Carsten, Melissa K., Mary Uhl-Bien, Bradley J. West, Jaime L. Patera, and Rob McGregor. 2010. Exploring Social Constructions of Followership: A Qualitative Study. *The Leadership Quarterly* 21: 543–62. [CrossRef]

Castaneda, Linda, and Neil Selwyn. 2018. More than tools? Making sense of the ongoing digitizations of higher education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*. [CrossRef]

Castoriadis, Cornelius. 1998. *The Imaginary Institution of Society*. Cambridge: MIT press.

Civitella, A. 2018. The Real Difference between True and Fake Leadership. Available online: www.forbes.com/sites/forbescoachescouncil/2018/02/02/the-real-difference-between-true-and-fake-leadership/#6d9af182c1 (accessed on 20 September 2018).

Clegg, Stewart R., Chris Carter, Martin Kornberger, and Jochen Schweitzer. 2011. *Strategy: Theory & Practice*. London: Sage Publications.

Conger, Jay A. 1998. Qualitative research as the cornerstone methodology for understanding leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly* 9: 107–121. [CrossRef]

Conger, Jay A., and Rabindra N. Kanungo. 1987. Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review* 12: 637–47. [CrossRef]

Cooley, Aaron. 2009. Is education a lost cause? Žižek, schooling, and universal emancipation. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* 30: 381–95. [CrossRef]

Cucchiara, Maia. 2016. Thinking locally: Attending to social context in studies of marketing and public education. *Peabody Journal of Education* 91: 121–30. [CrossRef]

Damico, Alfonso John. 1978. *Individuality and Community: The Social and Political thought of John Dewey*. Gainesville: University Presses of Florida.

Darling-Hammond, Linda. 2001. Inequality in learning and schooling: How opportunity is rationed to students of color in America. In *The Right Thing to do, the Smart Thing to do: Enhancing Diversity in the Health Professions*. Edited by Brian D. Smeldey, Andrienne Y. Stith, Lois Colburn and Clyde H. Evans. Washington: National Academies Press, pp. 208–33.

Davis, Evan. 2017. *Post-Truth: Why We Have Reached Peak Bullshit and What We Can Do About It*. Little: Brown Book Group.

De Certeau, Michel. 1988. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Translated by Steven Kendall. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

DeBacker, Teresa K., and H. Michael Crowson. 2007. Measuring need for closure in classroom learners. *Contemporary Educational Psychology* 33: 711–32. [CrossRef]

Deetz, Stanley. 1996. Describing differences in approaches to organization science: Rethinking Burrel and Morgan and their legacy. *Organization Science* 7: 191–207. [CrossRef]

Denis, Daniel J. 2003. Alternatives to null hypothesis significance testing. *Theory and Science* 4: 1–23.

Derrida, Jacques. 1973. *Speech and Phenomena and Other Essays on Husserl's Theory of Signs*. Translated by David B. Allison. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

Derrida, Jacques. 1997. *Of Grammatology*. Translated by Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Dervin, Brenda. 1999. On studying information seeking methodologically: The implications of connecting metatheory to method. *Information Processing and Management* 35: 727–50. [CrossRef]

Dinh, Jessica E., Robert G. Lord, William L. Gardner, Jeremy D. Meuser, Robert C. Liden, and Jinyu Hu. 2014. Leadership theory and research in the new millennium: Current theoretical trends and changing perspectives. *The Leadership Quarterly* 25: 36–62. [CrossRef]

Drezin, Norman K., and Yvonna S. Lincoln, eds. 2011. Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.

Emery, Merrelyn, and Ronald E. Purser. 1996. *The Search Conference: A Powerful Method for Planning Organizational Change and Community Action*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

English, Fenwick W. 2012. Bourdieu's misrecognition: Why educational leadership standards will not reform schools or leadership. *Journal of Educational Administration and History* 44: 155–70. [CrossRef]

Fairclough, Norman. 1996. *Language and Power*. Essex: Addison Wesley Longman Limited.

Fiedler, Fred E. 1981. Leadership effectiveness. *American Behavioral Scientist* 24: 619–32. [CrossRef]

Fleishman, Edwin A. 1953. Leadership climate, human relations training, and supervisory behavior. *Personnel Psychology* 6: 205–22. [CrossRef]

Follett, Mary P. 1949. *Freedom and Co-ordination: Lectures in business organization*. (reprint 1987). New York: Management Publications Trust Limited.

Foucault, Michel. 2012. Truth and power (from Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972–1977). In *Contemporary Sociological Theory*. Edited by Ramón Flecha, Jésus Gómez and Lídia Puigvert. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., pp. 305–13.

Fromm, Erich. 1956. *The Art of Loving*. New York: Harper & Row.

Funtowicz, Silvio O., and Jerome R. Ravetz. 1994. Uncertainty, complexity and post-normal science. *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry* 13: 1881–85. [CrossRef]

Gabriel, Yiannis. 1995. The unmanaged organization: Stories, fantasies and subjectivity. *Organization Studies* 16: 477–501. [CrossRef]

Gemmill, Gary, and Judith Oakley. 1992. Leadership: An alienating social myth? *Human Relations* 45: 113–29. [CrossRef]

Gippel, Jennifer. 2015. Masters of the universe: What top finance academics say about the 'state of the field'. *Australian Journal of Management* 40: 538–56. [CrossRef]

Goldspink, Christopher, and Robert Kay. 2007. Social emergence: Distinguishing reflexive and non-reflexive modes. In *Papers Symposia Fall 2007*. Palo Alto: Association for the advancement of artificial intelligence, pp. 48–55.

Goodpaster, Kenneth E. 2012. Corporate responsibility and its constituents. In *The Oxford Handbook of Business Ethics*. Edited by Haridimos Tsoukas and Christian Knudsen. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 126–57.

Graen, George, Michael A. Novak, and Patricia Sommerkamp. 1982. The effects of leader-member exchange and job design on productivity and satisfaction: Testing a dual attachment model. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance* 30: 109–31. [CrossRef]

Gronn, Peter, and Peter Ribbins. 1996. Leaders in context: Postpositivists approaches to understanding educational leadership. *Educational Administration Journal* 32: 452–73. [CrossRef]

Gündemir, Seval, Astrid C. Homan, Carsten K. de Dreu, and Mark van Vugt. 2014. Think leader, think white? Capturing and weakening an implicit pro-white leadership bias. *PLoS ONE* 9: e83915. Available online: https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0083915 (accessed on 28 October 2018).

Heidegger, Martin. 1971. *Poetry, Language, Thought*. Translated by Albert Hofstadter. New York: Harper Collins Publishers.

Hogg, Michael A. 2001. A social identity theory of leadership. *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 5: 184–200. [CrossRef]

Holert, Tom. 2009. Art in the Knowledge-Based Polis. Available online: www.e-flux.com/journal/view/4041 (accessed on 26 August 2018).

Hollander, Edwin P., and Lynn R. Offermann. 1990. Power and leadership in organizations: Relationships in transition. *American Psychologist* 45: 179–89. [CrossRef]

House, Robert J., and Ram N. Aditya. 1997. The social scientific study of leadership: Quo vadis? *Journal of Management* 23: 409–73. [CrossRef]

House, Robert J., Paul J. Hanges, Mansour Javidan, Peter W. Dorfman, and Vipin Gupta. 2004. *Leadership, Culture, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Hoyle, John R., Fenwick English, and Betty Steffy. 2005. *Skills for Successful 21st-Century School Leaders*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

Hu, Weiping, Baojun Wu, Xiaojuan Jia, Xinfa Yi, Chunyan Duan, Winter Meyer, and James C. Kaufman. 2013. Increasing students' scientific creativity: The "Learn to Think" intervention program. *The Journal of Creative Behavior* 47: 3–21. [CrossRef]

Jaeger, Mads Meier, and Stine Møllegaard. 2017. Cultural capital, teacher bias, and educational success: New evidence from monozygotic twins. *Social Science Research* 65: 130–44. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

Johnson, Phi. 2006. Whence democracy? A review and critique of the conceptual dimensions and implications of the business case for organizational democracy. *Organization* 13: 245–74. [CrossRef]

Kendall, Frances E. 2002. Understanding White Privilege. Available online: https://www.cpt.org/files/Undoing%20Racism%20%20Understanding%20White%20Privilege%20-%20Kendall.pdf (accessed on 21 September 2018).

Keyes, Ralph. 2004. *The Post-Truth Era: Dishonesty and Deception in Contemporary Life*. New York: Macmillan.

Laclau, Ernesto, and Chantal Mouffe. 1985. *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. London: Verso.

Lahire, Bernard. 2011. *The Plural Actor*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Latour, Bruno. 1993. *We Have Never Been Modern*. Translated by Catherine Porter. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Lyotard, Jean-François. 1993. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Translated by Geoff Bennington, and Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

March, James G., and Thierry Weil. 2005. *On Leadership*. Translated by Matthew Clarke. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishing.

Mcmahon, Christopher. 2012. The public authority of the managers of private corporations. In *The Oxford Handbook of Business Ethics*. Edited by George G. Brenkert and Tom L. Beauchamp. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 101–25.

Meindl, James R., Sanford B. Ehrlich, and Janet M. Dukerich. 1985. The romance of leadership. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 30: 78–102. [CrossRef]

Miner, Robert. 2011. Nietzsche's fourfold conception of the self. *Inquiry* 54: 337–60. [CrossRef]

Mintzberg, Henry, Bruce Ahlstrand, and Joseph Lampel. 2005. *Strategy Bites Back: It Is Far More and Less, Than You Ever Imagined*. New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Moore, Alex. 2004. *The Good Teacher: Dominant Discourses in Teaching and Teacher Education*. New York: Routledge.

Morin, Edgar. 1999. *Seven Complex Lessons in Education for the Future*. Paris: UNESCO.

Nerad, Maresi. 2010. Globalization and the internationalization of graduate education: A macro and micro view. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education* 40: 1–12.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. 1976. *The Portable Nietzsche*. Translated by Walter Kaufmann. New York: Penguin Books.

Parvin, Phil. 2018. Democracy without participation: A new politics for a disengaged era. *Res Publica* 24: 31–52. [CrossRef]

Pask, Gordon. 1976. *Conversation Theory: Applications in Education and Epistemology*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Remy, Jean. 2015. *L'espace, un objet central de la sociologie*. Paris: Erès.

Rorty, Richard. 1991. *Contingency, Irony, and Solidarity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Said, Edward W. 1988. Representing the colonized: Anthropology's interlocutors. *Critical Inquiry* 15: 205–25. [CrossRef]

Sawyer, R. Keith. 2005. *Social Emergence: Societies as Complex Systems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schmutz, Vaughn, Elizabeth Stearns, and Elizabeth J. Glennie. 2016. Cultural capital formation in adolescence: High schools and the gender gap in arts activity participation. *Poetics* 57: 27–39. [CrossRef]

Schultz, Majken, and Mary Jo Hatch. 1996. Living with multiple paradigms: The case of paradigm interplay in organizational cultural studies. *Academy of Management Review* 21: 529–57.

Shklovsky, Viktor. 1991. *Theory of Prose*. Translated by Benjamin Sher. Mc Lean: Dalkey Archive Press.

Slavtcheva-Petkova, Vera. 2018. "Post-truth" politics, journalistic corruption and the process of self-othering: The case of Bulgaria. *Journalism Studies* 19: 1980–90. [CrossRef]

Sloterdijk, Peter. 2013. *In the World Interior or Capital: Towards a Philosophical Theory of Globalization*. Malden: Polity Press.

Stodgill, Ralph M. 1950. Leadership, membership and organization. *Psychological Bulletin* 47: 1–14.

Sy, Thomas. 2010. What do you think of followers? Examining the content, structure, and consequences of implicit leadership theories. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 113: 73–84. [CrossRef]

Taylor, Charles. 1989. *Sources of the Self: The Making of the Modern Identity*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Uhl-Bien, Mary, Ronald E. Riggio, Kevin B. Lowe, and Melissa K. Carsten. 2014. Followership theory: A review and research agenda. *The Leadership Quarterly* 25: 83–104. [CrossRef]

Van de Ven, Andrew H., and Marshall Scott Poole. 2005. Alternative approaches for studying organizational change. *Organization Studies* 26: 1377–404. [CrossRef]

Wennekers, Sander, and Roy Thurik. 1999. Linking entrepreneuriship and economic growth. *Small Business Economics* 13: 27–56. [CrossRef]

Wittgenstein, Ludwig. 1986. *Philosophical Investigations*. Translated by G. E. M. Anscombe. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Zizek, Slavoj. 2006. *The Parallax View*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.