



# Constructing the Humanistic Knowledge Amidst Crisis Periods: The Role of Leadership in Formulating Democratic Educational Culture

Evaggelia Kalerante

*University of Western Macedonia, Kozani, GREECE  
School of Social Sciences and Humanities*

Received: 11 May 2022 ▪ Revised: 10 July 2022 ▪ Accepted: 12 July 2022

## *Abstract*

This paper highlights new elements about the role of leadership in education. The consequences of multiple crises are analyzed in direct interrelation with economic, social and educational factors. Based on the interpretative framework of the discussion about functional education, the single-sided focus on the association between knowledge and labor market is deconstructed. The necessity for a socio-political view tied to understanding the social role of education and the shift to the humanistic construction of knowledge is pursued. The concept of progress is redefined with emphasis on the structural interpretative criticism so that the educational capital becomes meaningful on the basis of political morality, inter-culturalism and social equality as democratic educational values. Besides, the individual liberal model of personal success is revisited, without any negations, so that within a globalized environment the individual element is embedded in the collective element of social happiness for people through the coexistence of different social subjects.

*Keywords:* education, leadership, humanism, democracy, globalization, multiculturalism.

## 1. Introduction

The centrality of the economic paradigm originates an artificial concealment of broader social consequences resulting in the interpretation of success, identified with happiness, in economic terms. At the same time, adverse ecological phenomena occur as climate change effects which are no other than the outcome of uncontrollable exploitation of wealth-producing resources.

A new glossary, in economic terms, has been evidently embedded in the communicative discourse in an attempt to describe considerations of everyday life. Meanwhile, the emphasized economic paradigm has legalized a series of choices and standpoints that negate the policy of rights through abolished welfare policies. The society observes the various groups of marginalized people that have resulted from the economic crisis.

Within a deregulating process, certain considerations have arisen tied to education so as to showcase issues about the content of knowledge and the democratic orientation of the education policy (Apple, 2018).

Public education – as a series of economic and educational measures that form the education policy – should prevent the shrinking and undermining of the educational capital, a right distributed to all social groups. In other words, it should not contribute either to maximizing social inequality or negating the mainstream policy of social mobility, in liberal terms. The educational leadership, based on the social theory about the role of education as an institution, highlights its important intermediary role so that people from various social classes can benefit from the opportunity structures that enable them to work in desirable places, to act as citizens, to sensitize and socialize in a number of humanitarian, political, social and ecological values.

Furthermore, the combination with the macro-level of social and political economic crisis effects should allow us to take into consideration the “hidden” conditions of acute social inequalities. The limited sources of education theoretically reinforce social inequality and, therefore, reconstruct, in competitive terms, “superior” and “inferior” students and citizens. Therefore, based on these cases, the role of educational leadership is highlighted because political and social responsibilities are implicitly or explicitly forwarded to the leaders. Based on scientific criteria and political insight, they can utilize the material resources and human force in favor of the educational community and the society.

After all, amidst the economic crisis period, new policies have been developed, driven from the economic paradigm, meaning that functions and regulative applications are differentiated through the revaluation of relevant or irrelevant return in terms of targeted reduced expenditures. In this field, the role of educational leadership is crucial to utilize resources in the sense of material resources and human force. The active role of leadership becomes clear even in cases of deregulation or lack of coordination. Thus, the educational leadership should primarily emphasize innovation, differentiation, the introduction of advantages and the reinforced perspectives through a supportive opportunity system.

### *1.1 Political discourse on knowledge in the broader perspective of social equality*

Knowledge, with its political and social effects, determines expectations for social action and defines roles. The perception of equality or inequality is determined by knowledge, regulated by legislation and reflected in the norms of social organization. Education is showcased as an important carrier of knowledge, because education picks the content to be taught or not. The content to be taught, distinctive of the educational culture, derives from the education policy and acts, directly correlated, with other political structures.

The educational legislative interventions towards knowledge, that formulates the social and political capital, is characterized by several interpretations. The education policy cannot obviously be differentiated from broader policies of other institutions. At this level, leadership intermediates to diffuse the education policies and demarcate the normality – legality of the system. The substantial managerial role secures the rational function of education through the implemented constitutional principle of equality in education. Therefore, the right to education is not merely a vague reference, but a political value, either strengthened or weakened within the educational institutes. Leadership is not simply associated with the implementation of legislation, but also with the intervention in every new condition, problem, incident or phenomenon.

Complex situations, such as the economic crisis and the presence of migrants, generate various conditions and the demand for a combination of scientific capitals and legislative expertise. Different representations of the migrants’ social and political role are being shaped, compounded with elements of their political capacity as social subjects and citizens in the reception country. At the same time, amidst the economic crisis period, a form of “internal conflict” is seemingly being developed between natives and migrants (Sylvain & Tamerat, 2022).

These issues are also transferred to the educational environment both in the micro and macro-level of education.

The educational discourse about leadership is both political and social discourse, including relevant content for the interpretation and understanding of various settings. Communicational systems are demarcated through the educational discourse along with the diffusion of social emotions conducive to defining attitudes, actions and behaviors. This is not an artificial remark since the specific population on the one hand and the highlighted meanings within an active environment of interaction – of various carriers of educational leadership – are defined in discourse articulation. Argumentation is essential for functional education while emphasis is placed on deliberation. Conflict and contradiction management is a structural democratic element, necessary to transcend passivity and silence, which are not functional for the composition of collectivities and the promotion of democratic values (Berger, Strasser & Woodfin, 2015).

The educational leadership is neither piecemeal nor outside the educational environment because it includes dynamic roles. Thus, the elements at the leader's disposal are the fast-changing conditions, the management of social equality issues, the prevention of social exclusion and the orderly system functionality (Kalerante & Gogou, 2020). The involvement of educational carriers and broader groups engaged in education occurs as a democratic necessity, so that the meaning and content of education is not volatile or trapped in the legal – theoretical construction. The role of leadership is obviously complex because it does not include only the resolution of limited legal issues. The management of educational issues does not presuppose a political solution only, but rather the effective reinforcement of the humanistic capital and democratic discourse. Therefore, the educational leadership is continually readapting and reshaping leadership models, based on theoretical principles and modified in partial issues stemming from interaction of various individuals involved in the development and implementation of education policy.

The educational and systemic adaptation towards empowered relations among leaders, educational carriers, parents and the broader society through intervening functional arrangements is more than necessary. Political perceptions on rights, self-expression and satisfaction can be fulfilled within the expanded societies in political terms. It can be said that ideas about modernized structures and the communicative culture can be the foundation beyond single-sided viewpoints conducive to excessive invocation of disciplinary systems of authoritarian impositions. The topic of this paper can be correlated with the preceded legislative processes on evaluation and the oncoming implementation of policy (Sandel, 2020). This chapter focuses on the necessity for knowledge utilization in an attempt to expand the perceptive fields for democracy and political humanism. Thus, the productive model is emphasized as a means for leadership-related interventions that can combine legislation with broader educational objectives.

All in all, the education system should function as an apparatus to reinforce adaptability by personalizing and moralizing political structures along with knowledge-based upgrading. The upgraded processes have a different functional meaning because they include cognitive fields as a means to promote moral values and develop moral consensus.

### *1.2 Humanistic capital management through education*

The escalation or mitigation of collaborative or conflicting relations among social groups and citizens is mainly an institutional and educational issue. This means that identities are constructed, privileges are reproduced and inequalities are legalized and naturalized through education.

The formation of the social field includes multidimensional processes of exclusion and inclusion, therefore, equivalence and difference that define the form of juxtaposition based on the social gender, social class, ethnicity, etc. Thus, every time one refers to the concepts of inclusion, social coexistence or citizenship, two different perspectives occur. The first one refers to the management of the existing political system through welfare interventions (opportunity structures, social mobility) and the second one refers to processes of increased democratization through the diffusion of social rights and the simultaneous mitigation of social inequalities (Gómez & Halberstadt, 2021). Both perspectives presuppose a different educational political paradigm, capable of promoting other institutional structures as the outcome of expanded socio-political developments. This is actually the role of educational leadership, which, as foretold, plays a structural functional role conducive to readapting and upgrading the educational work. It is well-understood that different social classes, different social genders, different social ethnic groups form a complex educational space. The educational leadership understands, interprets and provides solutions to an open collaborative democratic educational environment. The concept of democratic function should not be misinterpreted with the ineffective lawless function of educational leadership. In this sense, limits are the basic ingredient so that the basic guidelines of educational leadership are not negated and the democratic rights of the educational community are not circumvented.

The limited education of socially underprivileged students defines their future by reinforcing, through education, their unequal access to opportunity structures and the consequent negation of their social mobility. In Goodhart's terms (2017), the "Anywheres", distinctive of their high educational capital, can enjoy the privileges in contrast to the "Somewheres", distinctive of their low educational capital and illiteracy, who experience uncertainty and insecurity.

A democratic education addresses all citizens; therefore, it is evidently the education of all people in all educational grades. Political humanism, in the form of analytical democratic discourse, supports the political narrative for the policy of rights. Eventually, based on the macro-narrative on democracy, the focal point is the development of policies that multiply equal opportunities for the "weak" of societies (Przeworski, Alvarez & Cheibub, 2000).

Based on the above remarks, educational leadership should intervene in the construction of a differentiated political discourse that can generate knowledge through educational multi-selective apparatuses. The policy of rights in education is tied to democratized societies, prevention of exclusions, an established political environment with supra-national principles that can define justice, freedom, equality and solidarity as democratic values towards balanced relations among people (Smith, 2018).

The discussion on the democratic culture rejects all forms of racism, weakening of political violence and cancellation of the "back-to-the-roots" model. Beck's political narrative on the necessity to associate cosmopolitanism with supra-national patriotism should, perhaps, be given a new meaning that can prevent any versions of nationalism (Beck & Cronin, 2014). Based on this view, the discourse of educational leadership is transformed into productive discourse through the jointure of knowledge – democracy, by composing a differentiated model of people's equal socio-political positioning and the political "truth" in the social transformation.

Educational leadership, through knowledge, legalizes and forms interactive relations and reference systems by correlating actions, emotions and thoughts. The individual's identity is defined by the educational discourse, meaning knowledge environments that create emotional and intellectual situations. The emotional conceptualization and the intellectual composition define the subject as an entity. In the school environment particularly, performative processes can define relations, primarily based on the interpretation of reality by educational leadership.

### *1.3 Cross-curricular correlation of democracy and political morality*

Based on the afore-mentioned approaches to democracy, humanism and the role of the education system in shaping the citizen, the coordinating role of educational leadership is well-understood. The basic principle of political morality is political happiness, meaning the citizen's fulfillment. The concept of fulfillment has been defined with reference to what they provide to the system and what the system has to return. Therefore, the meaning of happiness, as discourse, is constructed within education and is interrelated with other relevant discourse (Kalerante, 2016). The concept of happiness assimilates elements from knowledge environments in the education system. In the Western culture, happiness is tied to accessing labor market, while the pertinent social status is established through certain professional roles. Educational practices and professional choices are showcased within the competitive environment of different social groups.

Amidst the economic crisis period, volatile and incomplete in social terms, the generalized insecurity maximizes the number of "exposed", underprivileged social groups, who find themselves within uncertainty, as they are forced to readapt their choices due to the shrunk welfare state and the negated policy of rights. People are entrapped without being able to acquire meaningful possibilities in differentiated political interpretations. This view, as scientific research results, is highly considered by educational leadership since education is not an isolated and fragmented environment. Educational leadership interprets, settles and readapts processes and practices through the educational environment.

An issue of exploration could be the model of consumption, the culture of consumption and the association between consumption and happiness. As regards the juvenile culture, the model consumption – happiness corresponds to the political morality tied to happiness, knowledge, and participation. In particular, the establishment and reproduction of consumption models has been based on a fundamental view that consumption, as human act tied to social reactions, leads to the person's emotional fulfillment. In the juvenile culture, the concept of consumption has been promoted through social networks. In this sense, technical knowledge and diffusion of messages in the form of advertising discourse within the globalized environment have been conducive to an emphasized consumption model. The unified process of consumption is closely interweaved with the a-politicalized discourse, an abstract social mapping that conceals the differentiated social classes, negates the dynamics of human capital, distances the individual from the interpretation of social problems (impoverishment, climate decay, etc.) and contributes to the connection between consumption and happiness.

The educational environment must put forward representations that reflect the political composition of reality. The role and discourse of educational leadership is crucial to reforming knowledge and restructuring educational culture in an attempt to redefine issues of political morality and humanism in scientific terms (Odden, 2011). The society should not be presented as a uniform system of social conventions that support its operability through highlighted dysfunctions of social identities and relations.

Educational leadership should be involved with issues of marginalization and exclusion of social groups that have eventually disorganized education and social systems (Killen & Rutland, 2011). Those excluded by the system, migrants, the unemployed and the poor, are presented as the "others" of the system, the failures, incapable, ineffective, etc.

Educational leadership should be concerned with the emotionally "dead subjects" who maneuver discourse and communicate in their everyday life while having rejected emotions such as love, sadness and understanding. The delineation of the juvenile culture includes a reformed communicative discourse through social networks. The present is formulated through unfolded experiences and the reproduction of discourse which, as a-political content, does not co-articulate political interpretations while the realization of the consequences of the imposed model driven from political and economic crises is absent. Social networks, as an apparatus of "joint" messages,

unify the young and eventually secure the concealed political pathogenesis by transforming communicative moments into opportunistic titles of happiness.

To sum up, an effective educational leadership should be concerned with the educational processes to be chosen, so as to develop discourse on democratic education. The educational culture is part of modern issues tied to everyday non-arbitrary processes. Within the educational environment, the conceptual frames of including the “others” should be redefined through the realization that happiness is beyond consumption and material resources towards creative co-existence (Webb & Norton, 2012). Amidst a period of self-centered approaches for people – entrapped in their ego and marginalized – processes of collective identity formation should be activated.

#### *1.4 From theory to humanistic practice for democracy*

The basic element that forms positive social emotions of solidarity and humanism should be defined by the education policy. The idea of universal solidarity is interpreted on the basis of democratic ideals and is reproduced through educational interactive models. The aim of educational leadership is to anticipate distorted negative models and inflows of competitive discourse that reinforce juxtapositions, differentiations and inequalities based on social class, social gender, race, language, nation, etc. (McEntarfer, 2016).

In terms of an effective educational leadership, the broader educational environment can be modified and the normative expectations can be differentiated. Scientific theoretical capitals are revisited while actions and ritualistic incidents are invented towards a climate of understanding, agreement and cooperation. The diffused racist discourse within the educational community cannot be reversed only through theoretical juxtaposition. Differentiated, readapted educational practices redefine the educational discourse through interactive conditions in which different groups of students with different socio-cultural features communicate and transfer different value elements to a structural interpretative exploration of cultural and social elements that include them in common environments.

In this respect, interest in knowledge, sharing of positive social emotions and communication are constructed through a reformed syllabus, artistic forms and a more general change of the educational environment. Within an exemplified case of a functional social presence of migrants – refugees, it is necessary for the school and reception classes to communicate and interact by resetting objectives and redefining the functional environment of the educational community (Kalerante & Tsantali, 2020).

The above example can be implemented in any case, as it refers to the management of “otherness”. Educational leadership intervenes in the educational environment by determining issues of scientific view and educational practice in an attempt to restructure the educational culture. The association between education and democracy is an expression of the necessity of social self-fulfillment, in which individual objectives are transformed into social intentions and educational practices (Fagothey, 2000).

The education policy, as a privileged space to exercise policy on knowledge, could contribute to a complete plan of real inclusion of culturally and socially diverse people. In this case, the democratic intention for the function of the civil society is maximized. In particular, educational leadership could showcase diversity as an advantage, leading, this way, other institutional carriers to policies of appreciating the “others” and their social inclusion by putting forward the concepts of freedom and humanism as suggestive values of the democratic political truth.

The lack of humanistic capital related to the acceptance of “others” and the aim of democratic coexistence within a model of common expectations and vindications should be of primary concern for educational leadership, so that amidst periods of crises, education could function on a democratic basis by creating conditions of coexistence. The “others” are targeted due to acute social inequalities and the exclusion of social groups from social and economic structures by shifting responsibilities from institutional systems to persons (Conchas & Gottfried, 2015).

As foretold, the lack of humanistic capital, democratic principles and a multicultural ethos have contributed to an exemplary targeting of the “others” with concurrent reinforcement of extreme right political attitudes and behaviors (Beverley, McGrath & Sarup, 2008; Gollnick & Chinn, 2016). The extreme right political discourse evidently transcends the close pattern of political party representation meaning that extreme right narratives are also spotted in other political parties. Therefore, one can refer to clusters of narratives that legalize and naturalize normative – legal arrangements of excluding social subjects. Educational leadership is not distanced only within the educational space. The scientific role and the leading presence engage leaders in a broader environment of institutions and political functions. The periods of crises can obviously function as an opportunity for education which, through its leaders, can promote a supportive discourse for institutional interventions and educational intentions.

#### *1.5 Reconstruction of educational discourse on happiness – progress*

The concept of happiness in the education system is tied to the theoretical structure about happiness in society, meaning that interpretative components are embedded in the political morality. The concept of the happy citizen is part of the democratic function of the system that promotes happiness as the citizen’s right. Happiness is presented as a symbolic element and the rational practices towards its achievement are pre-constructed and reproduced through the subject’s placement in certain frames characterized by the conceptualization of good or bad or by happiness as the outcome of political democratic reinforcement. For instance, taking into consideration contemporary researches on child melancholy – depression, social isolation, the weak association between knowledge and everyday life, child abuse and other relevant researches on the teachers’ psychological, social and cultural problems, the educational leadership should intervene with functional arrangements. The leader monitors, gets informed, intervenes and is differentiated from the bureaucratic entity because of their dynamic role in a system of citizens who are part of the social whole and actually reproduce value normative models.

The articulation of political discourse constructs and deconstructs interests, conceals the structure of social inequality and makes variable moral signifiers by turning the economic, political and social issues, arbitrarily and misleadingly, into moral or psychological issues. People’s competitive identities and economic interests are concealed by the deconstructed scientific discourse. The moral symbolic constructions utilize selected texts as discursive fields towards the composition of the “a-political” individual (Scalet & Arthur, 2012). The approach is differentiated by the educational leadership that addresses the forms of social inequality, racism, acute marginalization based on the scientific capital. It recognizes these phenomena through various scientific fields: pedagogy, sociology, psychology and intercultural studies while it interprets them and intervenes so that the educational environment evolves into a normative system of underlined democratic cultural elements.

Amidst an economic crisis period, the focal point is the strategies to be chosen by the educational leadership so that the education system confronts the “negative status” of marginalization or racism, gathers people in collectivities, provides profound descriptions and interpretations on institutional functions and the welfare state by defining the concept of happiness in a different way. Thus, emphasis should be placed on functional prerequisites of perceiving and understanding the economic and political conditions through knowledge as a

means to define forms of authority and create interactive institutional structures through the composition of a different paradigm about people's political role. Understanding problems, participating and interacting define happiness in political terms: inclusion in groups, perception of the socio-cultural issues, taking action towards resolution (classic model of policy for democracy – Ancient Greece participatory models).

The cognitive prerequisite for educational leadership should be its political capital as a means to understand the functional conditions that organize differentiated systems. Since the political capital is referred to, the definition of this concept is identified with the concept of citizen, an integral part of humanities studies. Understanding the political field can be conducive to reinforcing democracy, limiting authoritarianism and bringing back the discussion on a balanced democratic process tied to inclusion in political actors and political control in a different paradigm of democratic composition characterized by converged humanistic, scientific and psychological standpoints.

Therefore, quality education can include knowledge towards increased opportunity structures for all so that they perceive themselves as complete socio-political subjects, share viewpoints and select professional spaces. The mitigation of social inequalities presupposes practices within the educational system because education is not identified with the limited content of “knowledge” needed for examinations. Students are tested in the educational environment, develop attitudes and behaviors and establish a socio-political perception of their positioning in the system.

All in all, the concept of happiness, as people's objective, includes secret moral codes, which, as political practices, becloud the political situation, create conditions for “individual, experiential incidents”, construct superficial meanings, disorientate people, create passive citizens and underline conservative systemic structures. Amidst an economic crisis period, educational leadership is tied to personal happiness and the mitigation of social inequalities, so that institutional policies for balance become functional through a supportive social mobility in favor of people and society.

## 2.

### *2.1 The intervening discourse and role of leadership in the globalized political discourse on education*

The educational leadership, as a structure, transfers viewpoints and content of knowledge to different educational environments while it receives feedback from considerations generated by the expanded educational community. Interweaved relations define the dynamics of a system whose happiness is based on the carrier's work. The educators' viewpoints on the evaluation of the educational leadership model and their proposals for an effective educational leadership model can decisively contribute to the creative reorganization of educational leadership (Shapiro & Stefkovich, 2016).

It is noteworthy that various teacher groups are distinctive of their high educational capital along with educational conceptualizations and an internalized tension in multiple fields of their work. In this respect, educational leadership is considered necessary because it associates the educational process with special guidance for an effective crises management.

Educational leadership is part of a broader model of designated work and responsibilities. The pivotal element for new teachers is understanding the complex political, social and economic conditions. The educational leadership model within the educational environment is defined as a legalized system of processes to handle dysfunctions that derive from anomy and psychological deregulation.



The function of the educational leadership model should be revisited towards the establishment of a super-structure so that people, practices, schools and mediating carriers are interconnected. The organization of an effective educational leadership should be distanced from economic processes of decreased expenditures and take into consideration the broader teacher needs. Educational procedures and counseling are unified on the basis of redefined objectives and perspectives in which the development of educational leadership is explicitly or implicitly relevant to the reformed educational culture.

Importantly, educational leadership is approached through its alternative possibilities. The teachers' high educational capital is obviously significant, as they conceptualize the various levels of knowledge, recognize the role of experts and invest in knowledge transferred from experts to the educational community.

Educational leadership, as a process in the educational environment, is virtually necessary for new teachers who, due to their high educational capital, understand the complexity of the educational role and redefine the concept of expertise by focusing on the multidimensional approach established through the co-articulation of various discourses, rather than on the single-sided interpretation of social and political reality. It is also implied that they approach the educational culture in a sense of transcending the accumulation of cognitive fields and perceive the complexity of their educational role through the need to intervene in various fields. They perhaps regard educational leadership as a process through which they can develop the corresponding social status that suits their high educational capital, seemingly not utilized in the educational environment.

The educational dysfunctions, as foretold, do not maximize the benefits neither for the individual nor for society. Within contemporary conditions, the institution of educational leadership should be activated towards the resolution of various issues. It is well-understood that the irrational institutional function at a micro and macro-level reinforces social inequality. A deficient and limited distribution of knowledge provided by public education is conducive to maximized social inequality. Interestingly enough, strategic professional definitions and setting personal goals becomes the work of educational centers outside the school environment; thus, not monitored by public education. The issue of professional goals, choices and preferences and the related generalized values and cognitive orientation refer to public education.

The formulated complexity along with the underperformed globalized situations should be interpreted by educational leadership. Education must adapt to technical changes and the politically and culturally differentiated conditions of the globalized system. Educational leadership plays a significant intervening role in a series of processes, as foretold, with emphasis on functional internal arrangements so that students do not miss any opportunities. This is a new condition, not merely the protection of the right to education, but in a broader sense the benefits for the socio-political system. Our argumentation is supported by economic studies because limited education, meaning limited knowledge, is considered to marginalize individuals and collectivities that could possibly work towards economic development and modernization within a democratic pluralistic model that promotes democratic composition.

At a micro-level, educational leadership is crucial because it is based on the functional inclusion of broader values so that the concept of opportunity or success, at a personal level, is tied to the socio-political and cultural environment. It should be made clear that the provision of education as a right refers to people's efficient – effective education and not merely to their physical presence in educational institutes. Thus, the generalized value of education as a right is not part of the contemporary political morality attempting to maintain the association between education and personal fulfillment, economic development, social inclusion and democratic organization.

The scientific discourse on educational leadership cannot function as a close system. On the contrary, it is interpreted, re-approached and re-structured within the broader educational environment. The change of the educational discourse on leadership presupposes a change of the educational culture. Therefore, the educational community is invited to transcend compromises and social fragmentations, by redefining its attitude and naturalizing behaviors through a dynamic involvement in the educational affairs.

As regards the issue of school extroversion, educational leadership can contribute to creating bonds with policy, economy and the broader socio-political web so that individuals can be self-determined and autonomous within changing conditions of uncertainty and insecurity that shape their life and choices. The single-sided economic settlement or re-adaptation of education should be obviously avoided. Thus, within a developing democratic upgrading the modernization of education can be achieved through a model of functional educational leadership. Moreover, multi-productive arrangements can be reinforced with focus on the concept of citizen, in an attempt to avoid the rejection of individual fulfillment and emphasize social coexistence.

Based on the functional arrangements for a dynamic educational leadership, the model presented in this chapter associates various objectives and perspectives that could upgrade the educational work and interconnect the institution of education with other institutions (Shapiro & Stefkovich, 2016). As regards broader arrangements, the contribution of leadership has been highlighted in an effort to mitigate social inequalities emphasizing the generation and provision of knowledge that enhances social cohesion and structural, political and cultural osmosis. The model of collaboration among broader educational carriers is eventually based on the shift to a developed and reformed educational community by inserting new trains of thought and highlighting flexible cognitive fields and relevant educational practices. At the same time, the processes of planning and implementing the educational work focusing on reformed institutional structures are mainly based on developing patterns that enhance the democratic social composition through comparisons within a pluralistic system of mutual communication among people, actors and carriers.

Therefore, the exemplary processes of articulating education policies on leadership go beyond the policy for a special category of leaders because it is connected through theoretical and political approaches to the structure and content of democratic education. In particular, the transparency of processes is a necessity in schools, as they become visible to broader population groups and the school work is appraised. The concept of transparency – evaluation goes beyond the linguistic interpretation and, eventually, reflects features of educational leadership as educational signifiers for a panoptic supervision of education. Thus, the educational space is divided in schools, individuals and services that analyze situations, make meaningful choices and reset goals within a theoretical reconnection of the educational work with broader objectives of the political system.

## *2.2 Contemporary political democratic function of leadership in educational institutes*

Personal trajectories, goal achievement and fulfillment, as an individual affair, are showcased as an end in itself for the education system in which sadness, disappointment, exclusion and marginalization are defined as institutional weakness in educational terms. Therefore, the educational discourse and educational leadership, as a construction, are part of the socio-economic “repertoire” in which descriptions and interpretations, in the form of economic definitions, classify people’s educational issues by simultaneously determining the educational capital to be applied so that social inequality and people’s marginalization is not legalized.

The issue of happiness is theoretically redefined and re-organized through argumentation about the ideal content of policy for leadership. Internalized values, emotions and the development of related meanings for life are socially determined and legalized within various environments, educational institutes included.

The economic crisis as well as relevant crises (COVID-19 pandemic) have imposed a number of choices within the limits of the system, by regulating, even with stricter terms, the unequal relations among social groups. The education policy gave meaning to the political and social difference as well as to various emerging educational objectives of people coming from different social groups.

The formulated education policy driven from the economic paradigm – using a series of laws on shrinking or abolishing schools, reducing the educational force and limiting school infrastructure – contributed to escalating social inequality. The unequal distribution of resources has been maximized amidst a period of increased social problems. According to researches, impoverishment, abuse and unemployment are tied to low educational capital (Coppola & O’ Higgins, 2015). It is noteworthy that lack of skills is a serious problem, let alone lack of human educational capital.

As regards inclusion in the labor market, the underprivileged social classes with low economic capital face the effects of the low educational capital, too, because the deficient welfare state causes a limited distribution of educational capital. Decreased expenditures on education establish an education system that supports social inequality, as people’s success shifts to knowledge and educational practices outside the official educational environment.

Educational leadership should be involved with the content of the educational capital, meaning the knowledge distributed within the educational environment that generates discourse and determines the educational action. At this point, one could refer to the communication between the leaders and the stakeholders of the educational political planning. Educational leadership does not depend merely on quantitative data, but it intervenes with proposals on the qualitative characteristics. As foretold, its performative role does not adhere to processing, supervision and disciplinary control. It is more creative through the combination of the micro and macro level. Thus, the educational structures and system functionality are based, explicitly or implicitly, on the new paradigm that is co-formulated by the intervening discourse and role of educational leadership.

A different paradigm about the function of educational leadership through deliberation at all levels, communicative discourse and social practices could contribute to structural changes of the educational culture. Some teachers are virtually entrapped in the performative processing of textbook modules. This processing coupled with the examinations system reinforce this entrapment and lead to passivity in the educational community.

In particular, interactive processes do not take place resulting in isolated individuals within educational spaces not able to articulate educational discourse based on relevant argumentation. This means that the educational discourse is limited to administrative discourse without any political connotations. Their presence in the educational environment is not necessarily tied to relevant active positioning regarding educational issues. A rather fragmented self typically and meaninglessly moves across educational institutes; thus, the consensus in the form of creative composition of competitive discourse is not secured. The educational community does not function as a field of dialogue and negotiation with the educational leadership. On the contrary, each member is involved in processes without critical appraisal. Teachers become the consumers of the imposed political discourse, exempt themselves from responsibilities and follow the generalized “privatization” of human problems.

Besides, the same applies for students who perceive the particular time and space as a coincidence, while focusing on the arbitrary examinations-related success. Semantically speaking, time and space apparently unify logical associations of success – happiness and create a web of individual – psychological relations. These relations correspond to a hybrid discourse that leads all educational stakeholders' action. Instruction and examinations become a kind of regulative means that cannot contribute to a meaningful democratic educational model and understanding of the relations among teachers, students and the broader society.

At a practical level, it should be made clear that knowledge should not generate passivity. The democratic educational discourse supports the redistribution of rights to education through preferences and choices, beyond social differentiations. Educational leadership should gradually be orientated towards a political humanistic depiction of the social conditions and transform individuals into political subjects of a democratic system. Adhering to the specific political system should be done through a humanistic democratic syllabus and the corresponding everyday political practice. Knowledge should be active in the educational environment and any individual process of coexistence, by recognizing the “others”, should be reinforced.

### *2.3 Collaborative – Humanistic discourse in the educational communities*

The proposals on collaborative discourse showcase political discourse patterns that include transformations for a more general functional model of public carriers. The emerging political discourse of various groups puts forward meanings for rights, decisions for the legalized status of knowledge and the productive development of education. Educational leadership apparently seeks the “truth” that associates the necessity for orderly and effective function in education through political processes and legislative verbal constructions.

The collaborative discourse on education is differentiated from the collaborative discourse of other public carriers because the negotiation of meaning includes all students involved with knowledge. The selection of knowledge is guided by the political leadership and regulated by the educational leadership at a micro-level (Owens & Valesky, 2014). The teachers are found in a dialectical interaction between the imposed process of knowledge diffusion, including the state of truth, and the parallel discourses that are eventually rejected.

The concept of collaborative discourse is divided into focal points based on certain meanings for effective knowledge transfer to students. In this sense, the teacher manages knowledge and is evaluated for the constructionist platforms that stabilize knowledge through conventions of legalization and acceptance. Teachers' collaborative discourse should be determined within a wholeness defined by different economic, social and political signifiers. The concept of wholeness provides the possibility to determine the co-articulated practices and the different discourses involved in the generation of meaning through deliberations, as performative elements of collaborative discourse.

Thus, the collaborative discourse presupposes the conjunction with the interpretation of reality. The educational community, knowledge, and metacognition are all in direct conjunction with forms of authority that legalize the process of democratic deliberation in education. The issue of collaborative discourse and deliberation puts forward different categories of discourse about the symbolic construction of relations and forms of authority. The conceptualization of educational leadership is defined by its participation in educational performance. Thus, issues of subject monitoring with the parallel restart of institutionalized relations between authority and individuals are interconnected.

Therefore, the collaborative discourse is integrated into the educational political culture whose value and normative system are formulated by educational leadership. Consequently, the institutional framework for the implementation of collaborative discourse and

deliberation presupposes interactive interventions towards a reinforced symbolic discourse on the principles and functionality of democracy, guided by relevant political moral values. The prerequisites of collaborative discourse and deliberation also include the issue of trust. The evaluation of the political system, affected by the economic crisis, pertains to testing political narratives that refer to the maintenance of harmonious relations of the educational human force.

Even when collaborative discourse is a necessity, as a beneficial process for the system, a social disapproval is seemingly formulated as part of a broader environment of political indifference and apathy. Political interactive processes of subversions and questioning within the developed political game of uncertainty and insecurity cast doubt on the theoretical models of discipline. At this point, educational leadership intervenes through redefined objectives at the micro-level of the educational system (Marion & Gonzalez, 2013). As foretold, one of the basic characteristics of leadership is the utilization of scientific discourse and its application in the educational environment. The number of individuals experiencing an ideological gap (a condition of burnout in psychological terms) is well-known. This means that their discourse and actions gradually turn into uncertainty and reflection processes are undermined. Thus, their inclusion in collective objectives becomes difficult and self-centered approaches to crisis management increase. Teachers are apparently marginalized within a structured space in which the disconnection among subjects and the differentiated individual definitions do not contribute to enhanced communication and dialectical situations. On the contrary, personal trajectories are formulated. Therefore, educational leadership should be concerned with the establishment of trust in the educational community towards a collective goal setting for teachers, students and the society. The humanistic capital, in terms of knowledge, and teachers' involvement in the function of educational institutes can redefine roles and contribute to the democratic function of educational structures.

In an attempt to put forward policies, change structural issues and transform perception, educational leadership should consider the human force as a collectivity, based on economic and psychological terms as well as modified emotions and perceptions. The collaborative discourse and deliberation are not fragmented processes, but rather developed collaborative processes that presuppose changes and reforms.

#### *2.4 Redistribution of opportunity structures for the underprivileged as a goal of the educational leadership*

Educational leadership contributes to the construction of the students' narrative about the political and social conditions and shapes reality. Knowledge and performative processes in the students' everyday life help build their experiences. School, as a mediator, supports student socialization through the construction and reconstruction of political and social segments of the political narrative. Talents, behaviors, preferences and choices, in the form of internalized considerations, are the outcome of socio-political processes of the educational environment.

The subject's self-image and truth are based on the imposed authoritarian discourse developed within education. Amidst a crises period, the issue of self-fulfillment in the juvenile culture acts as an end in itself due to fear of marginalization. An effective political system cannot support an ineffective educational model because it maximizes people's exclusion and marginalization since the deficient educational structures cannot meet the new normative conditions.

The effectiveness of the education system lies exactly at this point by modifying and transforming deficient or ineffective educational structures that do not coincide with democracy in political terms. The role of educational leadership is to understand and interpret social inequality so that policies mitigating social inequality become meaningful through targeted

interventions. As foretold, the role of educational leadership is not exclusively the implementation of policies, but rather the appraisal and utilization of policies emphasizing the choices and limits for the function of the system.

In social and psychological terms, educational leadership can interpret and define the individual's real needs, their personal choices and integration into the labor market. The principles of democracy about rights as well as about the responsibilities of the state towards citizens and students are not silenced by the democratic leadership, in political and social terms. The uniqueness and self-awareness of every individual are highlighted in the educational community in an attempt to empower collectivities and the political cohesive discourse.

Contemporary researches refer to increased rates of unemployment, suicides and marginalized people, defined not as a failure of the political system, but rather individual incidents that stigmatize people themselves. Educational leadership should be concerned with these issues because this is actually the shift from research to educational act. Therefore, the field of educational act should not be limited to the single-sided process of evaluation; success, failure, examinations, etc.

The dominant educational discourse should highlight system pathogenesis so as to establish new fields of people's inclusion emphasizing collaboration, creativity, interaction, etc. Personal pursuits to integrate into the labor market, beyond the authentic need in social terms, express the necessity for inclusion in a social whole. Thus, the role of educational leadership is not merely the evaluation of the educational work – within the limited field of grades, evaluation and personal goals – but rather the more general appraisal of productive and creative work, social inclusion and personal fulfillment. Educational leadership is concerned with contemporary theoretical fields for the interpretation of socially underprivileged people's choices, as they are not able to form their narratives outside the space of work. It has already been noted that the fear of marginalization depends on the social class so that underprivileged social classes feel excluded and marginalized from work spaces.

The reinforced humanistic capital is a matter of educational leadership regarding the organization of the educational space, the function of collectivities, the interaction with other communities and setting environmental, social, political and cultural goals. Crises management is a matter of educational leadership. The combination of educational capital and implementation of strategic decisions determine the choices beyond crises in the educational environment. Education is an institution and the educational institutes act, at the same time, as spaces of social, political and cultural research. This means that certain situations are explored, phenomena and incidents are interpreted and legislation is utilized so that educational leadership can activate deliberation strategies in the educational community and policies for the implementation of the educational model.

### 3. Conclusions

It seems that the dominant moral “myths” in education, such as social equality as truth, humanism and fraternity depicted as piecemeal repertoires should be showcased as choices or consequences of political considerations in political terms. In this respect, the role of educational leadership is arguably to reorganize the meanings for the humanistic role of education so that social equality, solidarity and interest in the environment should be autonomous themes in the form of everyday practice in the educational environment and not merely subjects to be examined.

The educational intervention – the action of leaders as carriers of a different discourse – can establish dominant meanings in the education system and contribute to the deconstruction of a negatively interpreted reality. Highlighting meaningful issues in the educational community

is rather challenging because teachers can experience solidarity in the society through verbal discourses that correlate happiness with action and participation as the outcome of understanding social and political problems.

It can be said that the concept of crisis is tied to the latent negation of democratic composition, as the outcome of questioning political normality defined by the convergent social and political structures. The democratic discourse is shrunk while racist extreme right political discourse is articulated.

Within a system of deregulation and questioning of the institutional function, the model of educational leadership is not easily applicable in case it does not take into consideration people's normative expectations and correlate the complex relation of institutionalized roles in education through the functional political rationale of re-inventing democratic solutions. The radical reconstruction of educational leadership can be the result only of a complex endeavor beyond the single-sided representation of the legislative regulation of monitoring and supervision and through an exemplary new narrative on the function of education based on the correlation between the micro-level of education and the macro-level of policy.

#### Acknowledgements

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

The author declares no competing interests.

#### References

- Apple, M. (2018). *The struggle for democracy in education: Lessons from social realities*. London: Routledge.
- Beck, U., & Cronin, C. (2014). *Cosmopolitan vision*. New York: Polity.
- Berger, R., Strasser, D. & Woodfin, L. (2015). *Management in the Active Classroom*. London: EL Education.
- Beverly, J., McGrath, M., & Sarup, R. (2008). *Ethical dilemmas in education*. USA: R&L Education.
- Conchas, G., & Gottfried, M. (2015). *Inequality, power and school success: Case studies on racial disparity and opportunity in education*. London: Routledge.
- Coppola, G., & O' Higgins, N. (2015). *Youth and the crisis: Unemployment, education and health in Europe*. London: Routledge.
- Fagothey, A. (2000). *Right and reason: Ethics in theory and practice*. USA: TANbooks.
- Gollnick, D., & Chinn, P. (2016). *Multicultural education in a pluralistic society*. London: Pearson.
- Gómez, J. M., & Halberstadt, J. (2021). *Progress in sustainable mobility research: Interdisciplinary approaches for rural areas*. New York: Springer.
- Goodhart, D. (2017). *The road to somewhere*. London: Hurst.
- Kalerante, E. (2016). Educational mediation in differentiated narratives on the culture of happiness. *Journal of Research in Education and Training*, 9, 182-207.
- Kalerante, E., & Gogou, L. (2020). Greek Higher Education Institutes' young male and female students' interpretative repertoire on the development and meaningfulness of their education. In E.

- Kalerante, P. Giavrimis, S-M. Nikolaou, Th. Eleftherakis & L. Gogou (Eds.), *Applied qualitative studies in education* (pp. 17-34). Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Kalerante, E., & Tsantali, C. (2020). Developing educational discourse on refugees: from the “others” to cinema meta-language on refugee citizens In *Crisis’ representations: Frontiers and identities in the contemporary media narratives* (chapter 10, pp. 167-188). Brill Editions.
- Killen, M., & Rutland, A. (2011). *Children and social exclusion*. New York: Wiley.
- Marion, R., & Gonzalez, L. D. (2013). *Leadership in education*. Chicago: Waveland Pr Inc.
- McEntarfer, H. K. (2016). *Navigating gender and sexuality in the classroom: Narrative insights from students and educators*. London: Routledge.
- Odden, A. (2011). *Strategic management of human capital in education*. London: Routledge.
- Owens, R., & Valesky, T. (2014). *Organizational behavior in education: Leadership and school reform*. London: Pearson.
- Przeworski, A., Alvarez, M., & Cheibub, J. (2000). *Democracy and development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sandel, M. (2020). *The tyranny of merit: What's become of the common good?* New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Scalet, S., & Arthur, J. (2012). *Morality and moral controversies*. London: Pearson.
- Shapiro, J., & Stefkovich, J. (2016). *Ethical leadership and decision making in education*. London: Routledge.
- Shields, C. (2017). *Transformative leadership in education: Equitable and socially just change in an uncertain and complex world*. London: Routledge.
- Smith, E. (2018). *Key issues in education and social justice*. New York: Sage.
- Sylvain, P., & Tamerat, J. (2022). *Education across borders: Immigration, race, and identity in the classroom*. USA: Beacon Press.
- Webb, L., & Norton, M. (2012). *Human resources administration: Personnel issues and needs in education*. London: Pearson.

