Power, Politics, Foucault, and Community College Leadership

Jill Channing*, East Tennessee State University, channing@etsu.edu

The purpose of this qualitative research study was to better understand the ways community college administrators navigate power, politics, and human relations in the workplace. Community college administrators shared narratives of learning leadership and navigating power and politics. Participants described the circulation of power among college stakeholder groups, as well as power struggles between administrators and other stakeholder groups. Foucault's conceptualizations of power, discipline, discourse, and ethics underpin this study's theoretical framework. These conceptualizations are useful in studying community college leaders' development and leadership practices because they provide a perspective for critiquing community college's underlying structures and the ways these structures shape leaders' and others' actions. Administrators' uses of and subjections to power vis-à-vis economic, ethical, political, and educational discourses problematize traditional constructions of leadership and management. There are no current narrative analyses or studies on higher education and community college leaders' leadership development and navigation of power and politics. Specifically, this study's results address the gap in the literature on community college administrators' leadership development and on theoretical understandings of power relations in the community college context. Some implications of these findings are strategies for community college leaders' negotiation of power relations, development of ethical selves, and communication and relationship development with constituency groups.

Keywords: community college leadership; Foucault and educational leadership; higher education administrators; narrative analysis; ethical leadership; leadership and communication; leadership and power

The purpose of this qualitative research study was to better understand the ways community college administrators navigate power, politics, and human relations in the workplace. Community college administrators shared narratives of learning leadership and navigating power and politics in their contexts. Participants described power struggles and instances and outcomes of resistance among administrators and other employee groups. Foucault's (1982, 2000, 2007) discussions of power, discipline, discourse, and ethics underpin the theoretical framework for this study. Foucault's theorizations of power problematize leadership and management, specifically administrators' uses of and subjections to power vis-à-vis economic, social, political, and educational discourses. These discourses define and confine organizational leaders. In the community college context, democratization of education is emphasized due to its open-access mission, and shared governance is valued (Gibson-Benninger et al., 1995).

In this context, administrators are as much subjected to power as subjects who exercise power. Higher education administrators are subject to the power of governments, external agencies and constituencies, higher-level administrators, governing boards, colleagues in equivalent administrative roles, and subordinates and their organizations such as unions and faculty and staff senates. Any decision or power they assert is shaped by others' power and may face opposition and resistance from those at any level in the organizational hierarchy, disciplining administrators' words and actions (Bento, 2011; Mifsud, 2015). Mifsud (2015) summarized Foucault's theorization of power: "power … is both coercive and enabling, in that it is not imposed from 'outside' or 'above', but circulates within institutions and social bodies, producing subjects who exert a 'mutual 'hold' on one another" (p. 56). In their discussions of administrative power, higher education scholars have noted the tensions between managerialism,

associated with greater calls for accountability in educational settings, and a distributive model of leadership, associated with shared governance models frequently found at higher education institutions such as community colleges (Beattie, 2020; Bento, 2011; Eddy, 2013; Mifsud, 2015).

This study addresses the gaps in the literature on community college administrators' leadership development and theoretical understandings of power relations in the community college context. There are few studies and theoretical works on leadership learning (Channing, 2020), adaptive community college leadership (Channing, 2021), and community college leadership development (Eddy, 2010; Boggs & McPhail, 2016; Weatherspoon, 2010). Prior research evaluated professional development for community college administrators (Bresso, 2013; Gibson-Benninger et al., 1995; Robinson et al., 2010) or described the need to increase the number of individuals in the leadership pipeline at community colleges (Wrighten, 2018). Other research has examined educational leaders' discourses and the ways discursive practices inform power struggles over meaning and ideology (Anderson & Mungal, 2015; Mautner, 2010). Niesche (2016) and Niesche and Haase (2012) discussed the ways Foucault's fourfold ethical conceptualization could help explain teachers' and principals' formation of ethical selves. No study has specifically examined power relations and leadership learning in the community college context. Northouse (2019) claimed, "Although there are no explicit theories in the research literature about power and leadership, power is a concept that people often associate with leadership" (p. 9). Foucault's (1982) conceptualizations of power, discourse, and ethics are useful in studying community college leaders' development and leadership practices because they provide a perspective for critiquing community college's underlying structures and the ways these structures shape leaders' and others' actions. According to Eddy (2013), "Power becomes manifested in the organizational structures and roles of institutions, as well as in communication

and the value placed on expertise and products" (p. 122). Identifying and critiquing power

relations, as well as "by recognizing the sources of power within their institutions, managers can

adjust dysfunctional or deleterious operations, particularly those with imbalances in power,

which typically are not addressed when power remains unquestioned" (p. 122).

Theoretical Framework

Several studies focus on Foucault's work and education (Bouvier, 2017; Fejes & Nicoll,

2008; Mayo, 2000; McNichol, 2005) and Foucault's application to educational leadership in the

K-12 context (Anderson & Mungal, 2015; Giles, 2013; MacKinnon, 2018; Mifsud, 2015;

Mifsud, 2017; Niesche, 2010; Niesche, 2013; Niesche, 2015; Niesche & Haase, 2012; Niesche &

Keddie, 2016; Sackney et al., 1999; Thomson et al., 2013; Wilkinson et al., 2018; Winkelmans,

2014). However, little attention has been paid to the implications for Foucault's work in the

higher education context (Beattie, 2020; Bento, 2011; Morrissey, 2013), and no previous study

has substantially applied Foucault's conceptualizations of power, discourse, and ethics to the

community college or community college leadership context.

Foucault revolutionized ways of thinking about power, discourse, and social structures

and institutions. He did not provide solutions. Rather, he problematized the way we think of our

world, compelling those of us who study his work to examine culture and society through a

critical lens (Beattie, 2020; Niesche, 2018). For the purposes of this study, Foucault's ideas about

education, discourse, discipline, ethics, and power are particularly important. Foucault (1977)

argued there was no separation between knowledge and power. Rather, he sought to examine the

relationship between power and knowledge and to challenge assumptions about power,

knowledge, and discourse. Foucault (1996) argued that education specifically permitted and

prohibited knowledge and that "every educational system is a political means of maintaining or

of modifying the appropriation of discourse, with the knowledge and the power it carries with it" (p. 351). Education is a social institution associated with what Foucault (2007) called "governmentality." Social institutions aligned with governmentality discipline people's behavior so as to maintain social control and proliferate the use of individuals' skills to serve dominant social institutions. Within these social institutions, power and knowledge are intertwined and are, at the same time, both productive and restrictive. "Power and knowledge directly imply one another … there is no power relation without the relative constitution of a field of knowledge, nor any knowledge that does not presuppose and constitute at the same time power relations" (Foucault, 1977, p. 27). In educational leadership fields, and in leadership disciplines in general, discourses related to control and authority are prevalent (Humphreys, 2016; Mifsud, 2015). However, through the Foucauldian lens, leadership can be seen as not only in the actions taken to discipline others' behaviors and discourses but also in the ways leaders are subject to power relations and the circulation of power. For example, leaders' power is expressed through their language and communication strategies, and social structures and other people "discipline" leaders' language and behavior. Foucault (1980) described the power dynamics between leaders and subordinates as "a mutual and indefinite 'blackmail,'" creating "a relationship of mutual support and conditioning" (p. 159). Within institutions' webs of social networks, leaders learn to navigate power, relationships, and discourses, as well as develop ethical senses of themselves that go beyond traditional prescriptions for ethical leadership behavior. Traditional leadership ethics are focused "on altruism as a fundamental principle of moral behaviour" and underscored ethics as one's relationship with others (Mendonca & Kanungo, 2006, p. 21). Foucault's (1992) fourfold ethical framework moves beyond the altruistic tradition and emphasizes one's

relationship with oneself in the development of ethical precepts, testing ethical beliefs, and acting on one's beliefs.

Research Methodology

This qualitative study was guided by the following research questions: (1) How do community college administrators navigate power, politics, and human relations in the workplace? (2) In what ways do Foucault's theorizations of power, discipline, discourse, and ethics inform analyses of community college administrators' leadership development and navigation of power and politics? To learn more about the ways community college administrators navigate power, politics, and human relations in their contexts, after securing IRB approval, I interviewed twelve community college administrators, serving at the director level or higher. I used the snowball-sampling method, whereby participants recommended others. Table 1 details background information for each participant. Nine participants served as presidents, two served as vice presidents, and one served as a director. Five participants identified as women, and nine identified as men. I used participant-selected pseudonyms to protect participants' confidentiality. During approximately hour-long interviews, I asked participants open-ended questions about their backgrounds; experiences learning leadership; experiences navigating power, politics, and human relations; and strategies for communication. Interviews were recorded and subsequently transcribed.

Table 1

Participants

Pseudonym	Age Group	Gender	Position	Years of Leadership Experience	Race
Andrea	40's	Female	Vice President	10 years	White
Cassandra	40's	Female	Director	10 years	White
Charles	60's	Male	President	40 years	White
Kano	60's	Male	President	30 years	Black
Dolores	60's	Female	President	40 years	Black
Louis	50's	Male	President	30 years	White
Lee	50's	Male	President	20 years	White
Lynn	40's	Female	Vice President	20 years	White
Mary	50's	Female	President	30 years	White
Michael	60's	Male	President	40 years	White
Sunny	60's	Male	President	20 years	American Indian/White
Tony	50's	Male	President	20 years	White

Narrative inquiry and analysis are particularly appropriate for studying community college administrators' leadership learning because narrative methodology gives participants the opportunity to respond to open-ended prompts in ways meaningful to them and allows the researcher to present and extensively analyze narratives. The narrative data presentation and analysis provides "thick descriptions," supporting the study's trustworthiness and credibility and enabling readers to discern transferability to other contexts (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). According to Freeman (2017), through narrative analysis, researchers study "the way action unfolds in a given account, and the complex ways various events and characters intersect with these actions, [and] whether what constitutes action is a series of events or a reflective account" (p. 32). Although emergent themes were developed through coding strategies, this study's narrative analysis focused on "connections between" narratives "rather than looking primarily at patterns of similarities and differences in the content of the talk" (Paulus & Wise, 2019, p. 169).

Using ATLAS.ti (version 9), I analyzed codes for intertextuality and emergent themes among the narratives collected. "Using software tactics of ATLAS.ti," I combined "conceptual and analytical links in the data to demonstrate the meaning as it is constructed from the dataset" (Bower et al., 2021, p. 11). I collaborated with participants to give them opportunities to reflect and to add analysis. I recognized my own agenda while privileging the narrators' analyses of their stories and experiences. As I engaged in reflection, I acknowledged my positionality as person with middle-class (formerly working-class), multi-ethnic, professional, and queer identities, as well as my positions as a university academic leader and a previous community college administrator. Although these identities informed my analyses, to mitigate bias, I used a systematic reflection process, including reflexive journaling, re-coding transcripts to check for consistency, member checking, and keeping transcript notes. I also collaborated with two research assistants to code interviews and compared codes to ensure inter-coder reliability and representation of codes reflecting emergent themes across transcripts (MacPhail et al., 2016). After first order codes were established, the transcripts and first order codes were examined again to develop second order codes. From these, I recognized several emergent themes: the circulation of power, ethical self-development, and discourses of communication and relationships.

Results and Findings

Participants discussed the significance of the circulation of power among stakeholder groups in their development as leaders and their negotiation of institutional politics. Administrators were confronted with the circulation of power among all stakeholder groups including faculty, staff, other administrators, governing bodies/agencies, and superiors. Participants often described the ways the scarcity or perceived scarcity of resources created

tensions and influenced power relations among groups, and administrators developed strategies to distribute resources and to mitigate effects of limited resources. Participants reported the ways they developed ethical selves through their experiences and relationships with themselves. Relatedly, participants' communication and approaches to relationship-building demonstrated administrators' ethical orientations and strategies for relating to and reaching stakeholder groups.

Theme 1: Circulation of Power

Community colleges have often been touted as democratic institutions because of their open access missions (Cohen & Brawer, 2014), and power at higher education institutions is usually distributed by forms of shared governance (Cramer & Knuepfer, 2020). Foucault (1980) emphasized that "power is not totally entrusted to someone who would exercise it alone, over others, in an absolute fashion; rather, this machine is one in which everyone is caught, those who exercise power as well as those who are subjected to it" (p. 156). Higher education administrators are often seen as those in authority and those who exercise power. Participants acknowledged that hierarchies still exist and play roles in the ways power is exercised at community colleges. However, administrators are subject to the power of subordinates, superiors, colleagues in parallel positions, and social and institutional structures. Participants' reflections upon the ways power circulated revealed the significant and relational influence of others on their leadership learning and navigation of power and politics in their settings.

Power Struggles Between Equals

Several participants discussed power struggles among equals and specifically pointed to power struggles between academic affairs and student affairs vice presidents. Lee described the tensions and successes that we witnessed:

I think there's some natural tension at institutions that exists between academic affairs

and student affairs, and I've seen circumstances where even individuals who have very

similar concepts in terms of the basic beliefs about student success and how the

institution should go about achieving that and how we ought to be organized as a way of

doing that. Sometimes they let their seat in those different divisions create political

tension that can be unhealthy. I think when you can find a circumstance where you've got

the Vice President of Academic Affairs and Vice President of Student Affairs who are

sort of in concert and working together and creating a very positive environment for the

institution as a whole, it creates a very dynamic positive growth opportunity for the

institution, but I also think there are times where that tension exists. And it sometimes has

to find a way to relieve itself. And so certainly, I've seen examples of that over the years.

Lynn's narrative echoed Lee's, and she emphasized that the irony of the conflicts between vice

presidents was that their central goals are the same.

I think every institution has tensions between student services and academic affairs, and

so most of the tensions are … between leaders of … the student services and then the

leaders of academic affairs, and the sadness or the challenge with that is that we're all

here for the same reason, right? We're all here to support our students, and to do what's

best for our students. But sometimes we talk across each other and talk at each other,

instead of talking to each other.

Lynn described an organizational structure that she thought would eliminate this situation and

create more effective and efficient communication between units. She suggested that some

institutions:

asked their top vice president to oversee both areas, and so sometimes it's a centralized

versus decentralized model of leadership, and you have a vice president of academic and

student affairs. Well, that person [does] this whole job, [and their] responsibility is to

bring those two into conversation. … So, so I've seen it work well when it's one huge

job, right? I've seen it work really well when there's one person who has that job.

Andrea shared her experience in such a position and subsequent power struggles when her

position changed due to reorganization.

When I was initially hired to the institution, I was over both student services and

academics. And last year … the president came to me. He was a new president to the

institution [and] had decided that he needed to separate my position in half, and I would

just have academics, and he was going to hire someone else in for student services. And

even at this point in time, I feel like there's often times when we are in a power struggle

as to what are areas that are under her purview [and] what are areas that are under my

purview.

Tony suggested that when "the vice president of one area [was] warring with the vice president

of the other, and it happens every year [during] budget season we sit down and say, 'This is how

much money we have,'" the solution was to "hit them with data" to convince them what needs

must be prioritized.

Power Struggles Between Hierarchical Levels

Many of the power struggles that participants mentioned involved groups at all levels of

organizational hierarchy vying for scarce resources and sometimes power or authority. For

example, Tony repeated his suggestion for the use of data to convince people when there were

power differentials and when there were scarce resources. Faculty argued for higher salaries, but

according to him, "we don't have it. So, you'd be upfront and transparent with any of these groups. It's amazing how data changes their mind." He reported that faculty often think that the college has more funds for salaries than they do and that administrators refuse to use funds to increase faculty salaries. Rather than simply saying that there are not funds, and, thereby, exercising his authority as a leader to make such a statement, Tony said:

> Look, this is how much money we have. Here is a copy of the budget. Read through it at your will. Here's what we spent money on. Here's where it came from. It came from this fee account, not from the general fund. That's why we're able to do this cafeteria, because the kids paid for it out of their dining hall fees, so I'm not going to take dining hall fee money and give [it] to you as a raise. That's not fair to the kids nor to the dining hall. So that's the kind of thing, data, data, data is one of the things that we use to convince people [when there] are… power differences that you may feel that that it's not right. But the truth is what the data says, and throw it open to them. … These are all educated people so it's hard for them to say, 'I don't want to see the data. I don't believe it.'

Recognizing subordinates' power, Tony was careful not to dismiss their concerns. He addressed concerns with persuasive counter arguments, using evidence. He spoke to subordinates through a discourse that they value—empiricism. Educators value knowledge gained from research and data, and he used this framework to make the case for not giving raises.

Cassandra also shared a narrative about the tensions created by scarce resources. State funding for colleges declined sharply, and Cassandra's college struggled to gain more funds through property taxes.

So, for the last six years we've been trying to get this levy, and if you don't get the levy, you're out the money. And it's just something that the Board of Trustees has to say, 'yes, we will do the levy'… but because of the finances and everything else, they have not done the levy for five to six years, which means we've been out [millions of] dollars that we could have collected where the state is not increasing any money to us. So … our expenses keep going up and our revenues keep coming down. So, the cushion that we've had for several years is starting to deplete. … Since I started here and was in charge of the program to now, our overall budget has decreased by 40%, so when you keep decreasing that money and decreasing the line items, it's to the point now where they're actually … not giving me enough money for accreditation.

The power struggles and tensions created by scarce resources undermined community colleges' central missions focused on student learning and success and compromised program and accreditation requirements.

Sunny described power struggles between his supervisor and him. He described his supervisor as undermining program success and development and as requiring a perfect plan prior to execution, resulting in difficulty

… trying to meet training needs … not to have a program initiative five years... in the future that would meet the needs of now, and she's constantly slowing everything, and you have to constantly just keep plugging away. Do the right things. Be persistent, and eventually, you'll accomplish your goals.

Although Sunny's supervisor exercised power overtly by thwarting program development, he and others resisted her authority by pushing forward with plans despite her directives so that he could achieve his unit's goals.

Kano, a college president, held authority and power by virtue of his position, yet he described many situations when his decisions, language use (discourses), and behavior were heavily influenced by external stakeholders and subordinates. In these instances, he described struggles and tensions between groups or individuals and him.

> You learn how to hold your mouth because once you say it, it's out there. And you learn to be politically savvy to survive in both internal, external world, because you will be criticized as the leader. I don't care how good you are, how fair you try to be. Someone will always find a way to challenge you publicly.

Kano's description of the ways stakeholders discipline his discourses, the ways he frames and uses language, reflects the circulation of power (Foucault, 1980). "It is never monopolised by one centre. It is deployed and exercised through a net-like organization" (p. 98). Through experience with subordinates and others challenging him, Kano learned to shape his discourse "to survive" and thrive in his contexts.

Theme 2: The Ethical and Authentic Self

Niesche (2016) described Foucauldian ethics as referring to "the formation of oneself as a subject according to rules or codes of action. That is, Foucault considers ethics to be concerned with the relationship one has with oneself with respect to codes of action" (p. 3). Participants related the development of their ethical precepts to their experiences and to relationships with themselves. Foucault (1997) described ethics as "the kind of relationship you ought to have with yourself, rapport a soi" (p. 263) and as a process

> in which the individual delimits that part of himself that will form the object of his moral practice, defines his position relative to the precept he will follow, and decides on a certain mode of being that will serve as his moral goal. And this requires him to act upon

himself, to undertake to know himself, to monitor, test, improve, and transform himself.

(Foucault, 1985, p. 25)

Foucault's fourfold ethical framework includes a focus on the development of the self for ethical

judgment; understanding of one's moral obligations; ethical self-development activities; and

telos, being the ethical subject (Foucault, 1985).

Experiences and Ethical Self Formation

Kano's ethical self was also developed through a series of experiences that were, like

other participants', often negative. Through these experiences, he developed precepts to follow,

test, and act upon in an environment where power clearly circulated among all hierarchical

groups. He encountered "resistance from a long serving faculty staff or administrator," which he

attributed to an attitude of "because that's what I've always done. I have no interest in doing it

any differently." They would "come at you every way that they can" in their efforts to resist his

leadership and initiatives. He reported, "You have to learn how to navigate that." He developed

an ethical stance in response to these situations with a recognition that his identity played a role

in how others perceived him and interacted with him.

> Now, I've had some challenges and those challenges are still being addressed. … I've
>
> worked at primarily white institutions where I have been the primary African American
>
> in the executive team, and … that also presents challenges in which one's willingness to
>
> see a person for who he or she is versus seeing a person as being African American.

He perceived that the predominantly white institutions' cultures where he served were places

where white people did not consider his and other African Americans' perspectives. He

described these people as "you never have really pushed yourself to better understand persons

that look different than you." However, he developed an ethos of working with people despite any implicit or explicit racial biases.

> And I have always gone by, 'you do not have to like me; I do not have to like you, but between the hours of eight and five, we will work together. At 5:01, you go home. I go home, and I'll see you tomorrow.

This ethos is reflected in his determination to "treat everyone with respect" despite any "opposition that one may present to me."

Authentic Ethical Leadership and Relationships

Mary told stories about the development of her ethical self, resulting from negative experiences and aligning with the development of her authentic self. These experiences influenced the formation of her ethical understandings, obligations, and actions.

> And so, I think sort of these early really negative experiences really … made me want to do things differently. I know I got told one time by somebody that I really, really admire. She was a dean. She … said, 'never apologize for anything. … And especially for women, you don't want to apologize. It's a sign of weakness.' And I thought about that for a long, long time. And I thought, 'You know, that doesn't work for me. If I've made a mistake, I need to apologize. And I do that, you know, to this day. … I'm going to stand up there and say, 'I'm sorry I made a mistake. Here's what I'm going to do [to] fix this mistake.' And I understand what she was telling me and what she wanted me to understand, especially for a woman. … That power differential is so skewed especially in Appalachia, where … women are already at a deficit anyway. … But I think sort of my very first thoughts about this [a leadership trajectory] were, 'I have to be able to do this my way, in a different way.'

Mary learned from an example that stood in opposition to the self she wished to create.

Intertwined into her creation of an ethical leader self are the power dynamics related to

geography and gender. The codes of gender, power dynamics, and ethical self-development were

repeated throughout her narrative. She was told that she "was too nice to ever be a president" by

a "very well meaning" person, but she recognized that people "wouldn't tell a man that he's too

nice to be a president." She reported, "I thought, well, if I can't be nice and be a president, then I

don't want to be a president." She developed ethical codes such as humility and kindness and

rejected others' constructions of "president," often associated with traditionally "masculine"

ideals about leaders and leadership. She set out to "do" leadership "in a different way." Mary

discussed the ways she could be mission-driven and authentically herself, which reflected an

ethical understanding of herself in relation to others.

> Just because I'm a president doesn't mean that I can't be … gracious and thoughtful and
>
> considerate and … all those things that one might consider nice and still be able to have
>
> the respect that I need to do my job.

Mary described deriving power from the development of an ethical self. She described this as

"the ability to have that sense of power, that power comes, I think, from being authentic, and if I

can't be who I am, then I don't need to either be at that institution, or I don't need to have that

job."

> Dolores described her ethical leadership precepts and, like Mary, associated them with

authenticity. She strived "to be an authentic leader" with clearly defined precepts:

> So, my word is my bond. I hold everybody accountable. … I don't show favoritism. …
>
> We're here to do a job, and I expect all of you to do it. And you can count on me, and

you all have a personal relationship with me. But I'm not one that's afraid to tackle

challenging situations or make sure that everybody's doing what they're being paid to do.

Through his genealogical studies, Foucault (1977, 1980) argued that ethical choices require more

varied and complex approaches than ethical traditions or un-spoken ethical norms may provide.

Dolores related her ethics to authenticity and relationship development with herself and others,

and she underscored her ability act dynamically. She embraced the balancing act of maintaining

relationships while being mission-focused and emphasized that she is not "afraid to tackle

challenging situations." She acknowledged her position of authority at the institution and the

ways she may exercise that authority to ensure people are "doing what they're paid to do" while

also maintaining strong "personal" relationships with others.

Theme 3: Discourses of Communication and Relationships

"Nothing has any meaning outside of discourse" (Foucault, 1972, p. 45). Discourse,

according Foucault (1970; 1972), shapes our ideas, our use of language, our behavior, and the

behavior of others. Although there are many discourses represented in these narratives, two

prominent and related ones were discourses of communication and relationships. Relationships

and communication often went hand in hand throughout these participants' narratives. These

were central to the leaders' exercising and maintaining power and authority, as well as being

subjected to the power of others. At times, too, these discourses reflected ethics of care and

communication of others' value.

Relationship-Building with Subordinates

Throughout Tony's narrative are discourses about the circulation and reciprocal nature of

power. He described his ethical point of view in relation to his employees.

> And then make it personal. … Always recognize that your power derives from them and
> their hard work and as president, you don't generate a single credit hour, not one single
> one, they do all the work.... So your job is to support them and make it a … great place to
> … work for them. As long as you communicate … that you're coming from that
> perspective, they appreciate you a little bit more.

Tony recognized that he is not a leader without followers and that his power is derived through his followers' activities. He communicated an ethic of care, relating to his followers that he valued their activities. In return, he received appreciation for his work.

Relationships and communication mattered also when circumstances were not positive. For example, Louis described a situation between two vice presidents. "There was one VP, who had been there… had sort of seniority." He had to "do a lot of mending of those fences between the two." He described his team as having "gone through some team building exercises because … there is a lack of trust between a few members of our executive team." He viewed his role as serving as a mediator between administrators in conflict due to declining enrollment and scarce resources.

> I think that … at the times where … enrollment in community colleges across the nation
> have been down, how tight budgets are, etc. I think everybody is feeling stressed because
> … they're expected to do more work with fewer people, so … I am seeing some of …
> those struggles right now, and I am trying to be the go-between. But we also have hired a
> consultant to assist us with that.

Louis described his role as facilitator of communication between employees and employee groups. He recognized that relationships mattered for the campus's smooth operation and was willing to invest resources to cultivate effective relationships.

Dolores reported that conversation was the best way to overcome power struggles. She said:

> I've seen power struggles between students and administration, especially in the early part of my career, because students were demonstrating to be able to have co-ed living. Can you imagine? And they would storm meetings, like the board [of trustees] meeting, and then the vice president would have to come out. So, I find that that power struggles can be overcome with conversation. So you invite students and you invite the faculty, and you talk to them, or you have an issue with a colleague you talk to them about what the challenges are, and then you get over it. You move on to the next thing.

Dolores's story indicates the ways she and others have communicated in the face of power differentials. The students have power to disrupt board meetings despite board members' privileged positions and authority. When faculty members have conflicts with colleagues, departmental or unit relations become strained. Dolores described a communication strategy: acknowledge issues, work through them, and then help people "get over" issues to move forward and do their work. From both of her examples, her perspective is not as an authority figure simply exercising power. Rather, she used communication and relationship-building as strategies to negotiate power struggles and tensions between groups or individuals.

Communication Challenges and Resistance

Lee also referred to communication as one of the greatest challenges he faced as a leader despite "the different kinds of communication we have with faculty and staff and making sure folks know what's going on at the institution and have an opportunity to provide feedback." He attributed this challenge to "the rate of change." However, he also saw the role of communication in developing relationships within and outside of his institution. He learned to

develop relationships with administrators outside his organization as a "support system" to walk

him through "tough situations" and assist him as he developed relationships and communication

strategies within his college.

Michael also reported challenges associated with communication and relationship-

building.

> There's a constant tension … between having to be concerned about the viability of the
>
> institution financially and otherwise and building and maintaining a trusting relationship
>
> with faculty and trying to ensure that the decisions you make are educationally sound and
>
> have integrity. And then sometimes the mistrust, or lack of communication that can
>
> exacerbate all that, look, I learned a lot within the fabric of that kind of tension.

Michael learned to maneuver within the dynamics of various constituencies. He reported that

transparency was particularly important for "each of those sets of relationships [that] has its own

dynamics, which include its own tensions and also its own joys." He reported that his goal and

key to his success was his "need to be completely transparent." He claimed:

> I'm probably transparent to a fault. I've come to believe that it is less risky and often
>
> attorneys aren't on the same page here, but it's less risky to be guarded even about
>
> sensitive information than it is to put it out there and own it, and to the fullest extent
>
> possible, let everybody know what the challenges and dynamics are.

Michael recognized the circulation of power among groups and the tensions that arise among

groups. He described communication as important in negotiating these challenges. Rather than

being guarded, he shared knowledge. He reported that people trusted him and developed stronger

relationships with him because of his transparency in communication.

Kano further described the importance of communicating transparently and developing relationships with his college's board of trustees. He stated, "I have an exceptional working relationship with the board." He described his strategy:

One of the practices that I've done as a president is on a weekly basis, I send out a weekly update on any institutional updates to keep them informed. If there is any event or challenge or issue that's occurring, they are informed before we hit the paper, before you hit the news, so they're not caught off guard. I'm transparent in regards to discussing the budget or challenges and so that they are aware, where we stand and issues we are facing and strategies we put in place to address the challenge. So, I keep an open communication at all times with all board members; the board chair is a key person.

Kano presented discourses of transparency to develop trusting relationships that would, in turn, assist him in his role as president. By giving his board forewarning of issues, he could anticipate how they might respond. He also recognized the "key" role of the board chairperson and communicated to cultivate positive and well-functioning relationships.

Andrea's discourses of communication and relationships related to "figuring out how to communicate, figuring out how to build the relationships with people, how to earn individuals' trusts." She endeavored to help others understand that she wanted "everyone's opinion, but I know … I need to hold the decision in the end." She sought first "to gather everyone's information and make the best decision possible." The challenging part was "then having everybody go forward and … for lack of better term … singing from the same hymnal." She reported:

I felt like it was always easier when [I was] working directly with faculty, but I'm finding as you add a couple more layers in there, it becomes a little bit more difficult to help

ensure that you've got … that message and ensuring that people understand that they

were heard, even if what they wanted, wasn't necessarily what the end result was.

The layers of hierarchy affected Andrea's ability to reach her audience, in this case, faculty, and

she found herself in a balancing act, attempting to ensure people felt heard but ultimately taking

responsibility for decisions and creating an environment where people can move forward with

decisions even when they disagree.

Communication and Persuasion

Tony described how he interacted with constituencies. He said this all depended on

knowing the audience.

So if I'm talking to a conservative Republican group like, let's say … [the] Chamber of

Commerce, who are so tight with money, they can rub the brown off a penny. Right? So

when I talk to them, what do I talk about? What's our job as a college? Workforce

development! Our job is to get you the employees cheaply and quickly and get those

people off assistance because you know those people, those people are draining us, and

we need to do what we can to get them off assistance, and we're turning tax consumers

… into tax payers overnight … with our nursing program. And … they love it … because

nothing's their fault. It's those people. And, therefore, when I deal with Democrats, it's

just the opposite. It's that the emotional aspect of it. Look, you guys, a single mom of

two, barely making it, right, and she is on assistance, and thank goodness for those

programs that are there, but that's not a way to live your life, and so help us help her get

herself out of poverty and change. And studies show that if you go to college, chances are

your children are going to go to college one day, so there you have broken generational

poverty for that family. So … that is fantastic, right, the anecdotal stories, and they love

that. And so, it's you show both sides of the aisle that you are critical to accomplishing their goals. Educated workforce that's cheap and gets people off assistance or you're battling poverty to make the world a better place. … So that's what you learn as president, who's in the room. Sometimes they're both in the room right when you're doing a hearing, so you make sure that both talking points are right there. While some of you believe that our job is this, others believe, guess what we're doing, both at the same time. You're both getting what you want.

To gain political favor or funds, Tony learned to tailor his discourse to the audience, even when speaking to audiences with multiple perspectives. His communication strategy emphasized specific aspects of a narrative to persuade particular audiences, each audience with its own needs and preferences.

Charles also reported the importance of knowing one's audience. He said, "The power is in the mind of the receiver and that you need to understand who your receiver is and their abilities on that, on that spectrum." He described discourses he used for specific audiences. "And there might be some elected officials that you might need to use more the five-cent terminology, the lowbrow terminology and others that you need to use that 99-cent vocabulary and go more on the highbrow statement." Charles's expertise in communication helped him understand that the power is "in the mind of the receiver." He contended that "you need to evaluate the mental state of the receiver before you would have any idea of how to persuade [him or her]." Charles used discourses of persuasion and emphasized analyzing the mental state of the receiver before considering ways to persuade him or her. In other words, his language use depended on the audience's knowledge of discourses and their mental states.

Discussion

Foucault (1970, 1972) argued that institutions such as schools are "riddled with power, because they privilege particular ideologies, social structures, institutional practices and groups over others" (as cited in Cunliffe, 2014, p. 68). Although educational institutions exercise control over and "discipline" faculty, staff, students and administrators' behaviors and language, participants described power as circulating among institutions' stakeholders and not simply hierarchical. They described power struggles that did not simply stem from leaders' activities or ways they exerted their power as leaders; rather, participants' narratives suggested ways power circulates within networks. Foucault (1982) argued that power relations "are rooted in the system of social networks" (p. 224). Foucault (1982) contended that analysis of power must go beyond examining those who "steer" institutions by examining network of power. These networks and their inner workings are actually quite messy. For example, participants described conflicts among the vice presidents as influenced by the zero-sum game associated with neoliberal capitalism. According to this model, there is a constant scarcity of resources and competition for available resources, and the one who is able to make the best argument or have the most influence is the one who obtains the most resources (Davies & Bansel, 2007). The participants also addressed the need for communication and cooperation among units, and one participant identified the consolidation of power as an appropriate way to achieve this aim.

Economics and stakeholders heavily influence power relations, leadership, and leadership development. Dennis (2016) argued, "Consideration of their ethical substance, the processes through which they become a subject, the purposes a college leader is at liberty to pursue, self, and a professional life are all subsumed beneath an ethics of survival. Education is reduced to a set of market-based relationships" (p. 126). Garza Mitchell (2014) contended:

Increasingly limited resources have resulted in college leaders being more selective in

their responses to stakeholder needs. The types of decisions faced by leaders today

require a delicate balance of stakeholder need versus college resources, mission, vision,

and values. The manner in which presidents share information with others inside and

outside the organization, frame the information that is shared, and interpret the college

mission and their own role as leader all stem from one's ethical perspective. (p. 64)

Participants described this delicate balance of stakeholders' needs and colleges' fiscal viability;

however, they also described value systems that overlap in many ways, as was evident through

their ethical precepts related to transparent communication and care for and value of

subordinates and others. While participants were heavily influenced by a market-based economy

and the tensions it creates, their ethical development and expression cannot be reduced to

survival or market forces such as the ones resulting in the scarcity of resources mindset.

Participants developed ethical precepts from positive and negative experiences and challenged

prescriptive models for ethical leadership. These leaders' ethical perspectives were developed

from relationships with themselves, moving beyond the servant leadership ethic of putting

others' needs ahead of one's own. Participants developed relationships with themselves to

achieve a sense of authenticity to which they tied their ethical precepts. Christie (2005), Davies

(2006), and Niesche and Haase (2012) argue that Foucauldian ethics suggest a continual

examination of one's own responsibilities "to and for oneself in relation to others" (Niesche &

Haase, 2012, p. 278). The significance of this Foucauldian notion of ethics is that it moves

beyond ethics as "little more than sets of competencies or capabilities and a set of moral codes to

which principals and teachers must ascribe" (Niesche & Haase, 2012, p. 278) to activities that

compel educational leaders to monitor, test, and improve themselves and to act upon the percepts that they develop through their relationships with themselves and others (Foucault, 1992).

Mifsud (2017) described Foucauldian power as "ubiquitous, anonymous and comprehensive and [as] exercised unconsciously with its effects being often repressed" (p. 57). Participants rarely described times when they exercised power overtly. Rather, their communication strategies reflected a knowledge of their stakeholders' power, no matter their places in the institutional hierarchy. By acknowledging concerns and perhaps repressing others through persuasive discourses, participants described the ways they masked their authority through communication strategies such as tailoring messages to audiences. According to Foucault (1981), covert power relations are tolerable because they "mask" themselves (p. 86). Although Foucault (1981) argued that "where there is power, there is resistance" (p. 95), he (1979) also argued that "if power was never anything but repressive, if it never did anything but say no, do you really believe that we should manage to obey it?" (p. 36). In other words, "Power is not only, (therefore) negative, repressing what it seeks to control. It is also productive" (Hall, 1997, p. 77). Participants used their positions and associated power to persuade, influence, act ethically, and develop relationships with stakeholder groups so as to further their colleges' missions and support student success.

Conclusions and Implications for Future Research and Practice

Although there have been some studies—theoretical and empirical—on Foucault and educational leadership (Anderson & Mungal, 2015; MacKinnon, 2018; Mifsud, 2015; Mifsud, 2017; Niesche, 2010; Niesche, 2013; Niesche, 2015; Niesche & Haase, 2012; Niesche & Keddie, 2016; Sackney et al., 1999; Thomson et al., 2013; Wilkinson et al., 2018; Winkelmans, 2014), these studies tend to focus on tensions created by government accountability mandates and

policies rather than multi-directional or circulating power relations. Research and theoretical studies of Foucault's work in the higher education context are largely absent (Beattie, 2020; Bento, 2011). Additional qualitative studies focused on leadership discourse analysis, analysis of leadership as disciplinary practices, and intersections of power and resistance at all hierarchical levels of higher education institutions do not currently exist and are needed. Such studies could provide further insights into various constituencies'—such as leaders', followers', and governing boards'—perceptions of power, discourses, and ethics in educational leadership.

This study's results suggest several practical implications. Community college leaders can gain much from critical and reflective educational leadership practices. Leaders and aspiring leaders can develop reflective practices of their own, through consultation with others such as mentors or peer advisors, and through leadership professional development and education programs. For example, reflective practices such as talking through dilemmas can assist educational leaders as they examine and navigate complex power relations. Foucault's work lends itself to thinking about and exercising educational leadership in ways that critique and question traditional leadership theories and practices. In other words, Foucault would encourage leaders not to take for granted how they ought to act or govern others. As a practical application, leadership educators could assign case studies to encourage the recognition of inequalities in hierarchies, development of more equitable work environments, and transparent communication at all levels. Participants consistently identified conflicts between academic affairs and student affairs vice presidents. Communication and collaboration professional development workshops could target vice presidents to mitigate tensions. Foucault's work as applied to educational leadership also provides a framework for leaders' development as ethical beings that goes beyond traditional prescriptions for ethical leadership. Leaders' ethical principles are shaped by

experience and reflection and not confined to restrictive definitions of educational leadership. Several participants described the ways they resisted narrow definitions of leadership and re-defined ethical leadership through their authentic approaches, focused on caring for and supporting others. Seeing themselves as ethical subjects, leaders may further interrogate their actions to discern their alignment with their ethical percepts and their colleges' missions.

These participants learned much about leadership from experiences, interactions, and communications with all constituency groups. The discourses related to power struggles, ethics, relationships, and communication all reflect the circulating nature of power that Foucault (1980, 1982) described throughout his work. Biesta (2008) argued for "a new kind of analysis of practices of governing" that "does not simply look at the activities of those 'in power'" and their exercise of power over others (p. 194). I attempt to provide such an analysis and description of "the ways in which power 'circulates' in relationships and social networks and on how the circulation of power is the result of what free subjects do to others and to themselves, not its precondition" (p. 194). Significantly, these narratives demonstrate the relational nature of power, institutions, and people. These participants discuss their ethical formation, not only through traditional discourses of "how one ought to behave" but also through narratives about their experiences of external and internal forces shaping their discourses, behavior, and ethical development. As leaders, they have power and are subjects to power, creating situations where "a vast network of actors is involved more points of resistance can emerge as the relationships become more complex" (Gorman, 2012, p. 59). Through their communication and relationship-building strategies, these participants not only exercised "disciplinary control," they learned to navigate forces that disciplined their discourses and their behavior.

References

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

Beattie, L. (2020). Educational leadership: Producing docile bodies? A Foucauldian perspective on higher education. *Higher Education Quarterly, 74*, 98–110.

Bento, F. (2011). A discussion about power relations and the concept of distributed leadership in higher education institutions. *The Open Educational Journal, 7,* 17-23.

Boggs, G. R. & McPhail, C. J. (2016). *Practical leadership in community colleges: Navigating today's challenges.* Jossey-Bass.

Biesta, G. J. J. (2008). Encountering Foucault in lifelong learning. In A. Fejes and K. Nicoll (Eds.), *Foucault and lifelong learning: Governing the subject* (pp. 193-205). Routledge.

Bower, K. L., Lewis, D. C., & Paulus, T. M. (2021). Using ATLAS for Mac to enact R narrative analysis: metaphor of generativity from LGBT older adult life stories. *Qualitative Research,* 1-18. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794121999008

Bouvier, C. (2017). *Reading Dewey and Foucault together: Towards a philosophy of discipline as production in schools.* [Dissertation, University of Alabama]. https://ir.ua.edu/bitstream/handle/123456789/3563/file_1.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowe=y

Bresso, M. (2013). *Building for the future: Community college leadership development program evaluation.* [Dissertation.] ProQuest. 3549739.

Davies, B. & Bansel, P. (2007). Neoliberalism and education. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 20,*(3), 247-259. https://doi.org/10.1080/09518390701281751

Channing, J. (2020). How can leadership be taught? Implications for leadership educators. *The International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation, 15*(1), 134-148.

Channing, J. (2021). Tackling higher education adaptive leadership challenges. *The Department Chair, 32*(2), 7-8.

Cohen, A.M. & Brawer, F.B. (2014). *The American community college* (6th Edition). Jossey-Bass.

Cunliffe, A. (2014). *A very short, fairly interesting and reasonably cheap book about management.* Sage.

Cramer, S. F. & Knuepfer, P L. K. (2020). *Shared governance in higher education: Vitality and continuity in times of change.* SUNY Press.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). Sage.

Christie, P. (2005). Education for an ethical imagination. *Social Alternatives, 24*(4), 39–44.

Davies, B. (2006). Subjectification: The relevance of Butler's analysis for education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 27*(4), 425–438.

Dennis, C. A. (2016). Further education colleges and leadership: Checking the ethical Pulse. *London Review of Education, 14*(1), 117-130.

Eddy, P. L. (2010). *Community college leadership: A multidimensional model for leading change.* Stylus Publishing.

Eddy, P. L. (2013). Developing leaders: The role of competencies in rural community colleges. *Community College Review, 41*(1), 20-43. https://doi.org/10.1177/0091552112471557

Fejes, A. & Nicoll, K. (Eds). (2008). *Foucault and lifelong learning: Governing the subject.* Routledge.

Foucault, M. (1970). *The order of things: An archaeology of the human sciences.* Random House.

Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge.* Harper & Row.

Foucault, M. (1977/1979). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). Penguin.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977*. Pantheon

Foucault, M. (1981). The order of discourse. In R. Young (Ed.), *Untying the text: A post-structuralist reader*. Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Foucault, M. (1982). The subject and power. In H. L. Dreyfus & P. Rabinow (Eds.), *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics* (pp. 208-226). Harvester.

Foucault, M. (1985). *The history of sexuality: The use of pleasure* (R. Hurley, Trans.; Vol. 2). Penguin.

Foucault, M. (1992). *The Use of Pleasure: The history of sexuality*. Vol. 2. Penguin.

Foucault, M. (1996). *Madness only exists in society. In S. Lotringer (Ed.), Foucault live: Interviews, 1961–84* (2nd ed., pp. 7–9). Semiotext(e) Foreign Agents Series.

Foucault, M. (1997). The ethics of the concern for self as a practice of freedom. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *Ethics: Subjectivity and truth* (pp. 281–302). The New Press.

Foucault, M. (2000). Polemics, politics, and problematizations. In Rabinow, P. (Ed.), *Michel Foucault: Ethic,* (pp. 111-120). Penguin.

Foucault, M. (2007/1978), Governmentality (a lecture at the College de France given on 1 February 1978). In M. Foucault (Ed.), *Security, territory, population: Lectures at the College de France, 1977-78* (pp. 126-145). Palgrave-MacMillan.

Freeman, M. (2017). *Modes of thinking for qualitative analysis.* Routledge.

Garza Mitchell, R. L. (2012). Doing the right thing: Ethical leadership and decision making. *New Directions for Community Colleges,* (159), 63-72. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/cc.20027

Gibson-Benninger, B., Ratcliff, J. L., & Rhoads, R. A. (1995). *The implications of a democratic vision of community college leadership.* Pennsylvania State University Center for the Study of Higher Education.

Gilles, G. (2013). *Educational leadership and Michel Foucault.* Routledge.

Gorman, B. (2012). *Governmentality in higher education: a critical analysis of the National Survey of Student Engagement.* [Dissertation]. Digital Commons. https://digitalcommons.mtu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1085&context=etds

Hall, S. (1997). *Representation: cultural representations and signifying practices.* Sage.

Humphreys, D. M. (2016). *Discourses of educational leadership the under-explained influence of context.* [Dissertation, Liverpool John Moores University]. http://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/id/eprint/4421/

MacKinnon, K. H. (2018). *"Thank goodness you are a man!": Troubling gender and principal leadership in elementary schools*. [Dissertation, The University of Toronto]. https://tspace.library.utoronto.ca/bitstream/1807/89714/3/MacKinnon_Kenneth_H_201806_EdD_thesis.pdf

MacPhail, C., Khoza, N., Abler, L., Ranganathan, M. (2016). Process guidelines for establishing intercoder reliability in qualitative studies. *Qualitative Research, 16*, 198–212. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794115577012

Mautner, G. (2010). *Language and the market society: Critical reflections on discourse and Dominance.* Routledge.

Mayo, C. (2000). The uses of Foucault. *Educational Theory, 50,* 103-116.

McNichol, J. G. (2005). *Foucault & education.* Peter Lang.

Mendonca, M., & Kanungo, R. (2006). *Ethical leadership*. McGraw-Hill Education.

Mifsud, D. (2015). Circulating power and in/visibility: Layers of educational leadership. *Journal of Workplace Learning, 27*(1). https://doi.org/10.1108/JWL-09-2013-0065

Mifsud, D. (2017). *Foucault and school leadership research: Bridging theory and method.* Bloomsbury.

Morrissey, J. (2013) Governing the academic subject: Foucault, governmentality and the performing university. *Oxford Review of Education, 39*(6), 797–810.

Niesche, R. (2010). Discipline through documentation: A form of governmentality for school principals. *International Journal of Leadership in Education: Theory and Practice, 13*(3), 249–263. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603121003692967

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

Niesche, R. (2015). Governmentality and my school: School principals in societies of control. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 47*(2), 133–145. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2013.793925

Niesche, R. (2016). Foucault and educational administration. In M. Peters (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Educational Philosophy and Theory* (pp. 1-5). Springer. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-532-7_286-1

Niesche, R. (2018). Critical perspectives in educational leadership: A new 'theory turn?' *Journal of Educational Administration and History, 50*(3), 145-158.

Niesche, R., & Haase, M. (2012). Emotions and ethics: A Foucauldian framework for becoming an ethical educator. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 44*(3), 276–288. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-5812.2010.00655.x

Niesche, R. & Keddie, A. (2016). *Leadership, ethics and schooling for social justice.* Routledge.

Northouse, P. G. (2019). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. Sage.

Paulus, T. M. & Wise, A. F. (2019). *Looking for insight, transformation, and learning in online talk.* Taylor & Francis.

Robinson, G., Sugar, W., & Miller, B. (2010). Fostering community college leaders: An

examination of leadership development programs. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 34*, 605-623.

Sackney, L., Walker, K. & Hajnal, V. (1999). Principal and teacher perspectives on school improvement. *Journal of Educational Management, 1*(1), 45-63.

Thomson, P., Hall, C., & Jones, K. (2013). Towards educational change leadership as a discursive practice—or should all school leaders read Foucault? *International Journal of Leadership in Education: Theory and Practice, 16*(2), 155–172. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2012.693204

Weatherspoon, C. (2010). *Community college leadership defined* (1st ed.). Lambert.

Wilkinson, J., Niesche, R., & Eacott, S. (Eds) (2018). *Dismantling public education: Implications for educational leadership, policy and social justice.* Routledge.

Winkelmans, P. T. (2014). *High school principal and student power relationships when students choose distance education courses.* [Unpublished doctoral thesis]. University of Calgary, Calgary. https://prism.ucalgary.ca/handle/11023/1579

Wrighten, K.C. (2018). *Developing a diverse pipeline for community college leadership* [Doctoral Dissertation]. Proquest Dissertation Publishing.