Journal of Economy Culture and Society

Structural Inequalities in Educational Leadership: Addressing Social and Professional Identities and Recognitional Power

Duygun GÖKTÜRK[1] , Özge ÇOMAK[2]

[1]Assist. Prof. Dr., Middle East Technical University, Faculty of Education/ Educational Sciences, Ankara, Turkiye

[2]Res. Assist., Gazi University, Faculty of Education/ Educational Sciences, Ankara, Turkiye

ORCID: D.G. 0000-0003-0184-6326; Ö.Ç. 0000-0002-2727-2001

Corresponding author:
Özge ÇOMAK,
Gazi University, Faculty of Education/ Educational Sciences Educational Administration, Ankara, Turkiye
E-mail: comakozge@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

In this article, we aim to work toward a rich theoretical understanding of the relationship between social identity, professional identity, and school leadership in the context of recognitional power. We approach the relationship the study constructs by problematizing the traditional areas of leadership literature that is marked by veneration of leadership and its functional toolkit that includes traits, attitudes, behaviors, efficiency, productivity, mastery, etc. as antecedents to the leadership process. In addition, the article aims to capture the intersection of professional and social identity considering the relations of domination and everyday practices of recognition. These goals are reflected in two research questions: (1) How do we understand the relationship between school leadership, social identity and professional identity? (2) How do we approach social and professional identities in educational leadership studies in terms of recognitional power? We propound that leadership literature should include diverse epistemic approaches, problematize the structural inequalities and the institutionalized relations of recognition and recognitional power, and problematize the intersection of social identity, professional identity, and recognitional power.

Keywords: School leadership, social identity, professional identity, recognitional power

1. Introduction

In a school setting, multiple identities interact with each other and are organized by social, cultural, and political contexts. Different lines of inquiry indicate that there is a diverse literature on identity construction and development in a school setting (Crow et al., 2017; Ryan, 2007; Nielsen, 2016). This literature deals with school leader's or teachers' social, personal, professional, emotional or role identities and argues that identities are in a constant negotiation with various social and cultural contexts in different ways (Crow et al., 2017). The concept of identity is framed in multiple ways. One of the basic definitions of identity is "the set of meanings that define who one is when one is an occupant of a particular role in society, a member of a particular group, or claims particular characteristics that identify him or her as a unique person (Burke & Stets, 2009, p. 3). In another context, Hall (1996) argues that "identities constructed within, not outside, discourse, we need to understand them as produced in specific historical and institutional sites within specific discursive formations and practices, by specific denunciative strategies" (p.4). In addition, identity is conceptualized as "a multi-dimensional classification or mapping of the human world and our places in it, as individuals and as members of collectivities" (Jenkins, 2008, p.5). This definition maps the collective and personal aspects of identity. In a study of Parekh (2009), identity is two-dimensional, personal and social, the former denotes individuals who have unique subjectivity, the latter addresses how identity is socially embedded and has relationships with different collectivities. In this context, the dispositifs of identity are in contact with social, cultural, and historical structures which are constantly in the process of change and reformation.

In this article, we approach the relationship between social identity, professional identity, and school leadership by questioning the traditional areas of leadership literature that is marked by veneration of leadership and its toolkit that includes traits, attitudes, behaviors, efficiency, productivity, mastery, etc. as antecedents to leadership process (Göktürk and Ağın, 2020). In this respect, we argue that there is a need for employing a pluralistic logic in epistemic formation of educational leadership literature based on the intersection of social identity, professional identity, and recognitional power. This goal is animated by addressing these research questions:

1. How can we understand the relationship between school leadership, social identity, and professional identity?
2. How can we approach social and professional identities in educational leadership studies in terms of (mis)recognitions of leadership power?

In the first place, we approach the relationship between social identity, professional identity, and school leadership by questioning the emergence of the epistemological field that is markedly organized around the orbit of leadership and its characteristics. Through practicing a pluralistic logic, we propose that there is a need to revisit traditional areas of leadership literature and generate responsive and responsible remapping of the epistemic terrain with including diverse voices that consider social and cultural elements of epistemic activity. This goal is animated by becoming involved in and rethinking the debates on the relationship between identity forms, recognition of identities, and the structural identity prejudice as part of this relationality. In line with this, Kidd, Medina, and Pohlhaus (2017) propose some central questions: "Who has voice and who doesn't? Are voices interacting with equal agency and power? In whose terms are they communicating? Who is being understood and who isn't (and at what cost)? Who is being believed? And who is even being acknowledged and engaged with?" (p. 1). Keeping these questions alive, we adapt the same questions for a leader: Who has voice and who doesn't as a leader? Are leaders' voices interacting with equal agency and power? In whose terms are leaders communicating?

Who as a leader is being understood and who isn't (and at what cost)? Who as a leader is being believed? And who as a leader is even being acknowledged and engaged with? Analyzing these questions with attention will enhance our understanding of the critical importance of identity in educational leadership studies.

Another key question is how to approach social and professional identities in educational leadership in terms of recognition of leadership power. This question is also critical to identify the intersection of professional identity and social identity in understanding a leader's recognitional power and its constitutive elements such as credibility, authority, and testimony. Beginning from the concept of recognition, Michèle Lamont (2018) issues some critical warnings about the unfair distribution of resources while drawing attention to the recognition gaps in society. According to Lamont (2018), disparities in worth and cultural membership resulted in recognition gaps and growing inequalities and injustices in society. Therefore, social dimensions of institutionalized orders of recognition organize symmetrical and asymmetrical distributions of power and privilege in society and in institutions which, in the meantime, reposition and revalorize who has voice and who does not as a leader and questions whether leaders have voices interacting with equal agency and power. Drawing on the current literature on educational leader's identities and how they are being negotiated and constrained through engaging in multiple domains, this article illustrates that the intersection of social and professional identity forms is strongly related to the recognition of leadership power which differs along the nexus of asymmetrical organization of power and privilege structures in society based on social identity. Considering these aspects, in the following part we aim: a. to capture the relationship between professional identity, social identity and recognition of leadership power in educational leadership through extending the leadership literature beyond the issues of leading and its characteristics; b. to navigate through the issues of structural inequalities in society with an emphasis on the institutionalized relations of recognition and identity forms.

2. Are "Educational" Organizations Identity-Neutral? Professional Identity, Social Identity and Recognitional Power

2.1. On Professional Identity

The literature on the professional identity of school leaders is diverse. Professional identity is defined as the combination of personal identity and professional way of becoming; it is not stable and is composed of sub-identities; and it interacts with multiple social contexts (Beijaard et al., 2004). In another definition, professional identity is defined as "a product and an agent of the systems and structures within which the individual's working life is located" (Briggs, 2007, p.473). In a study by Crow and Møller (2017), they acknowledge that professional identity is in a relationship with other identity forms, such as social identity and personal identity. Identity, interacts with and establishes a strong link with individual and collective dimensions of society; different from the role identity which is a "social structural position" defined by the organizations or institutions (Burke & Stets, 2009, p. 112); is socially constructed which means need an approval of others to legitimize itself; is fluid and dynamic; and "is not solely an individual construction of meanings...formed, revised, repaired, maintained and strengthened in the social context of communities of practice" (Crow & Møller, 2017, p. 754). It seems that while technocratic leadership skills and competencies consolidated by power are critical to building a leader profile, normative foundations such as beliefs, values, habits, and identities as part of larger cultural, social, political contexts can be considered as the constituent units of all these skills, competencies and leadership

practices (Crow & Møller, 2017). So, the question of whether identity is individually or socially constructed is a valid concern for the current understanding of a leader profile and its practices. In their study, Crow, Day and Møller (2017) outline four contexts of principal's everyday life in a school setting that portray how all these domains are intertwined: personal context as the combination of home and educational background of a principal; community context based on family and teachers; institutional context including the people in positions of power and structural regularities of schools and the environment; and social and historical context that encompass all other factors. The interplay between these contexts also elucidates the contours of agency of a leader and the structural forces it encounters that mobilize identity formation within the patterns of self, power relations, ideology, and culture (Crow et al., 2017).

Leadership literature also highlights the emotional aspects of identity formation as the critical component of principal's professional identity development in everyday interactions, communications and leading practices (Crow et al., 2017; Beatty, 2000; Nordholm, Arnqvist & Nihlfors, 2020). Blackmore (2013) problematizes the literature on emotions in educational leadership due to its incapability to reflect "actual struggle or conflict of interests which may produce emotional responses, for example, anger over discrimination" (p. 144). In detail, according to Blackmore (2013), it focuses on the "capacity to read and manage others and one's own emotions" which, thus, considers the contexts as regular, homogeneous, and stable, and therefore reinforces "existing structures of inequality around gender, class and race and the standardization of emotional functioning as a leadership skill in leadership studies" (p. 144). The articulation of emotions in this way invites us to question the position of emotions in a school setting as personal displays so erasing the collective feelings of identities resulting from the ongoing structural inequalities such as those based on race, gender, and class. For Blackmore (2013), considering emotions as part of the learning and teaching process will also enable us to understand the reality behind the feelings of the pleasure of success and pain of failure, the fear of exclusion and stigmatization, the organization of hate and shame, or the will to control and manage in a school setting. According to Zorn and Boler (2007), in educational leadership, "emotions need to be understood as publicly and collaboratively formed, not as individual, private and autonomous psychological traits and states," so emotions have cultural and historical legacies (p. 137). Such a conceptualization of emotions, according to Zorn and Boler (2007), accepts the political force of emotions and will also bring forth the question of power and cultural hierarchies in educational leadership. In their study, Crow and Møller (2017) address that the exclusion of values, beliefs, morals or identities from leadership practices in turn carries the field of educational leadership to a technocratic orientation moment which is organized around the technical calculations of school leader's professional identity, role identity, and practices in a school setting.

In extending the issue of educational leader's professional identity development, we communicate with the fieldwork on professional identity development of educational leaders. For instance, in their study, Murakami and Törnsen (2017) examine female principals' development of professional identities with a focus on equity issues in terms of the recruitment, hiring, and evaluation process. The study indicates that gender discourses are decisive in educational leadership due to the unequal distributions of resources, the competitive nature of leadership, performing male-like leadership qualities as a survival strategy, unfair solidarity network with peers and mentors, and developing fragmented identities (Murakami & Törnsen, 2017). In another study, Johnson (2017) remarks on the intersection of professional and social identities through addressing Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic school principals' life experiences of leadership. The re-

sults show that school principals' professional identities differentiate based on the generational gaps, are intertwined with multiple roles in a school setting such as parents, ambassadors, community advocate, etc., and interact with social identity that accommodates the collective feelings resulting from the masked racial contracts in organizations. Given this backdrop, it is important to understand how intersections between race, gender, class, and ethnicity are constitutive of educational institutions, organize the distribution of resources, designate the credentialing mechanism, and shape the agency of actors (Blackmore, 2006).

2.2. On Social Identity

Within the frames of modern society, individuals happen to be in various social groups depending on their demographic categories such as their race, ethnicity, social class and gender; or on their professional or academic careers in several organizations and teams in which those individuals develop a sense of membership. Through this sense of membership, individuals tend to define themselves to different extents; in other words, they tend to identify themselves within and through the groups that they belong to (van Knippenberg, 2018). This tendency emerging as a consequence of the different group memberships within society has resulted in a distinction for the terminology: the personal identity, which refers to the individual characteristics or traits of a person, and the social identity, referring to the group-self or defining oneself through specific social categories (Hornsey, 2008). Starting from Henri Tajfel's and John Turner's studies in the 1970s, scholars in sociology, psychology, and organizational studies have addressed this social identification phenomena which paved the way for some groundbreaking theories such as the social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1986) and the self-categorization theory (Turner et. al, 1987). These two successive theories -which together became known as the social identity approach - basically attempted to analyze and interpret the group behaviors of the individuals concerning their perception of these social groups with the purpose of illuminating the dynamics of psychological group formation.

Throughout the history of this specific area of study, different aspects of social identity, intergroup and intragroup behavior patterns have been remarked upon. During the late 1970s and 1980s, there have been attempts (Brewer, 1979; Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979, 1986) to bring a new interactionist perspective to understand the individuals' psychology through groups and membership notions instead of the earlier reductionist and individualist approach. During the interpretations of these studies, it was argued that people have a double-edged interaction pattern which varies within the individual behavior and the collective behavior. Through this spectrum which was called "interpersonal-intergroup continuum," Tajfel and Turner (1979) claims that it is a rare possibility for people to establish a pure interpersonal interaction -in which individuals solely exist and interact with their individualistic and idiosyncratic aspects without awareness of social categories- within the society due to the demand of a collective psychology in human interaction in the social structure. More precisely, people tend to position themselves through the group memberships they possess, and they move towards the pure intergroup interaction –in which individuals identify themselves within the norms and qualities representing their own groups-, depending on the extent and amount of their groups' salience and legitimacy. In 1974, Tajfel asserted the concept of social identity by associating it to the positive distinctiveness desire of individuals. In other words, Tajfel (1974) claimed that individuals desire a positive social identity; therefore, they tend to practice in-group bias, intergroup discrimination, and ethnocentrism in order to underscore their in-groups' positive distinctiveness (Brewer, 2010). As an extension of the social identity theory which emphasizes the

motivational and intergroup aspects of the group member behavior, the self-categorization theory was developed by Turner et al., (1987) through focusing on the cognitive dimensions and specifying the role of social categorization in producing prototypes which are the cognitive reflections of the social groups. Hornsey (2008) explains the concept of prototypicality, which basically considers the individual members of a group as representatives of that group in terms of attitudes, behaviors, and emotions. Depending on these categories and prototypes, the idiosyncratic features yield to in-group and out-group category attributes through the depersonalization of self-conceptualization and perception of others (Hogg & Terry, 2000). In order to form a sense of identification and belongingness with the group, and individual needs to initiate social categorization of self (self-categorization) through which he or she "cognitively assimilates self to in-group prototype" (Hogg & Terry, 2000, p. 123). In particular, there is a need to fit the target (individual) and relevant prototypes of in-group or out-group which are represented in the perceivers' minds in order to be recognized as an in-group member or out-group member, with the result of producing a firm social identity. Consequently, through depersonalization, individual group members are expected to behave prototypically and normatively with the cost of changing their self-concept. People tend to adjust themselves to the characteristic categories of the group; therefore, they also attempt to rearrange their intragroup identities.

Through specific prototypes, groups happen to reiterate norms and rules; and encourage their members to adopt them. If a group member fails to be perceived as an embodiment of the group's prototypes, he or she faces being non-prototypical and even being marginalized by the other group members, which will probably cause exclusion from the group (Hogg, 2010). As Turner and Reynolds (2010) state, "a shared social identity emerged on the basis of cognitive criteria such as shared fate, shared situation, or shared attributes (positive or negative)" (p.20). According to the social identity approach originated from the elaborations on the intergroup relations and the self-categorization theory by John Turner, Michael A. Hogg and their further colleagues (Ellemers, 2010), individuals tend to categorize people in terms of particular group characteristics and to compare both the groups they involve (in-groups) with the ones they do not belong to (out-groups) and their members through specific social perceptions in their mindsets (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). As a result, individuals end up favoring their own groups or even labelling them as superior over the out-groups by referring to the in-group distinctiveness (Ashforth & Mael, 1989); in other words, they practice "in-group favoritism." This attitude of in-group favoritism can be understood as a projection of -*centrism* (such as white-centrism, male-centrism, ethno-centrism) of which biases lead the individuals to embrace a cooperative attitude towards the in-group members by regarding the in-group's well-being and success and by creating a privileged status of this group. On the contrary, through *centrism*, individuals are more likely to follow a competitive attitude toward the out-group members by denigrating the out-group (Brewer, 2010). In this context of identity and forms of *centrism* and its reflection; in-group favoritism arises from the intergroup social comparisons which are processes pursuing the production, retention, and amelioration of a positive social identity and positive social distinctiveness for the in-groups (Turner, 1975). According to social identity theory, individuals who are the members of specific in-groups are motivated by this notion of positive social identity enhancement in order to maintain their self-enhancement; that is, their self-esteem (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). In other words, the social identity theory proposes that since the individuals identify themselves through their group membership merging personal and social identities, their positive or high self-esteem perceptions eminently depend on the positive social identity.

The arguments of social identity theory, self-categorization, and group prototypicality also appear in the organizational literature (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Hogg, 2001; Hogg & Van Knippenberg, 2003; Van Knippenberg et. al, 2004) and have been addressed in order to provide a further understanding and a psycho-social perspective for the interpretation of organizational behavior, leadership, followership, identification, and recognition constructs. Specifically, the literature on understanding how leadership impressions form within organizations, studies predominantly refer to the leadership categorization theory and the social identity theory of leadership. The Leadership Categorization Theory (Lord et. al, 1984) proposes a model depicting the process of an individual's *recognition* and acceptance as the leader of the group by other members –particularly, followers– through the fit between the traits and behaviors of the target individual and the general leader category which is perceived by the followers. The Social Identity Theory of Leadership (Hogg, 2001) proposes a model outlining the same *recognition* and acceptance process of leaders associated with possessing prototypical properties of the in-group. More precisely, complying with leadership prototypes and group prototypes becomes an ultimate condition for the target individuals.

Through the convergence of these two theories which prioritize the match between the perceived prototypes and the target individual, members of the organization, especially the followers, are centralized (Brown, 2018). In other words, recognition and acceptance by the followers become the processor factor for leadership. According to Knippenberg (2018), in a situation where the target leader is a minority group member in society, that individual will be accepted and recognized as the leader if he or she possesses the in-group prototypicality. However, a considerable number of studies in the literature (Carli & Eagly, 2018; Gündemir, 2015; Rosette et al., 2008) indicate that target individuals who are minority members of society (i.e. gender, race, ethnicity) are not favored for leadership in the organizational in-group. In other words, demographically non-prototypical individuals in terms of generic leader categories are more likely to face intergroup discrimination (Brewer, 1979) by followers who possess the privileged prototypes of the society (i.e. male, white, middle-class, etc.). The under-representation of the minority members of society in managerial positions can be traced back to the aforementioned leadership biases (Eagly & Chin, 2010). The global statistics indicating that women are outnumbered at managerial levels can be referred to as examples. According to the ILO 2020 report, women held on average 32.4% of the managerial and leadership roles in G20 countries in 2019 (International Labor Organization, 2020). The largest share of women in executive positions was recorded in Russia (42%) and the United States (40.9%), whereas in Turkey (17.5%) and Japan (14.5%) women were under-represented with the lowest rates among other G20 countries (International Labor Organization, 2020). Although more optimistic numbers are indicated by European countries, the average share of women in managerial positions was only 34% in 2020, ranging from 45% (Latvia) to 24% (Croatia) among the individual countries (Eurostat, 2021).

In order to extend the role of social identity in educational leadership studies, we engage in bodies of literature that portray the social identity-related experiences of educational leaders and offer critical tools to shed light on the issues about the social identity aspects of educational organizations. One of the main criticisms of leadership studies is its organization and formation around the issues of individual factors and leadership characteristics (Bolden et al., 2008). When the leadership literature concentrates on the personal characteristics, traits, and behaviors as antecedents of being a leader, social influence processes (such as power, privilege) on agency go missing from the picture of leading itself (Bolden et al., 2008; Brass 1984; Sturm & Manzoni,

2018). In sum, the recruitment, selection and appointment processes in the selection of a best fit for school leadership position has multiple contexts and the current literature demonstrates the intertwined relationship of professional identity and social identity and shows that these identities are constitutive units of school management and leadership in many aspects.

2.3. Why does "Recognitional Power" Matter in Educational Leadership? Based on Social Identity and Professional Identity

The literature on identity has shown recognition and acceptance as the leader of a group is related with social and professional identity. We assume that a leader is the person who holds power, has some sort of privileges, patterns of authority, and has credibility. All these characteristics of a leader forge viable alliances with the social aspects of identity power, recognitional power, and social power. Then, how can we understand the relationship between professional identity, social identity, recognition, and social power?

Miranda Fricker (2007) generates a distinctive link between social power and identity power. For Fricker (2013), power is a capacity which persists through periods and operates actively or passively. What is critical for Fricker is the "dyadic" nature of power that is perceived as a capacity exercised on the social agents (individuals, communities, institutions). In this form, a dyadic relation is established between the one side who is exercising power and the one who is influenced by it. In Fricker's terminology, *agential power* is used to identify this type of dyadic power. By contrast, Fricker (2013) addresses another form of power which is not exercised by a social agent *but operates in a structural mode*. In this form, power as a capacity is not exercised by one of the social agents but by the social system even without a subject. Then, "wherever power is at work, we should be ready to ask who or what is controlling whom, and why" (Fricker, 2007, p. 13). While this question proposes a connection between leadership categorization theory (Lord et al., 1984) and social identity theory of leadership (Hogg, 2001), in the meantime, it characterizes a new model that centralizes power both as exercised by one of the social agents and the social system even without a subject. This model does not reduce leadership to a process designated by follower-*centrism*, leadership prototypes, and group prototypes, but it traces coalition movements between agential and structural forms of power and their role in designating, "who has voice and who doesn't as a leader? Are leaders' voices interacting with equal agency and power? In whose terms are leaders communicating? Who as a leader is being understood and who isn't (and at what cost)? Who as a leader is being believed? And who as a leader is even being acknowledged and engaged with?"

In understanding recognitional power, the social aspects of recognition are related with social power and identity power. As Fricker (2007) notes that the agential forms of power are visible, traceable, on the contrary there is another form of power which is not exercised by a social agent but operates in a structural mode. Any equation of a struggle for recognition should take into consideration the scope and limits of this structural mode of power. For us, one of the principle standpoints here is that the school leadership role is not power-neutral and identity-neutral hence it is vital to formulate the social construction of leaders taking into account the relationality between power, social and professional identity, and recognitional power.

In the first place, how can we outline power? There are diverging accounts of power and the prominent ones are social power and personal power. One of the basic definitions of social power is "the ability of a person to influence others and make them do things they would not do otherwise" even these others resists to power holder (Lammers et al., 2009, p. 1543; Van Dijke & Poppe,

2006). In another study, social power is defined as "asymmetric control over valued resources in social relations" considering the relative dependence between the actors in any power equation (Emerson, 1962; Magess & Galinsky, 2008). For instance, the power exercised by a CEO over employees can be considered as social power since it includes control over people and resources and it has also a connection with both social and professional identity (Lammers et al., 2009). Another type of power is about personal power which is the ability of doing something without being influenced by someone else, a form of constructing self-autonomy and having control of yourself (Lammers et al., 2009). Autonomy and interdependence is the arbiter of power. In social power, the capacity and possibility of affecting, controlling, ruling, or leading others is the result of *dependence of targets* due to the resources and outcomes power holder possess (Van Dijke & Poppe, 2006). In this case, power holders are also dependent on the targets, therefore there is a mutually dependent relationship and contract. On the contrary, in personal power, actors have the capacity to act with agency without depending on the other. Van Dijke and Poppe (2006) argue that one of the limitations of personal power is that it can be restricted by social power and insufficient feedback about the actions of others. Then, social power becomes more instrumental for possessing, increasing, and securing personal power (Van Dijke & Poppe, 2006). In another study, for Brass (1984), while the research on organizational level examines the structural sources of power, individual and personal level analysis of power rather focuses on personal traits and behaviors. For Brass (1984), what is missing in the literature is the structural analysis of personal power. While formulating a conception of recognitional power in educational leadership, a viable alliance between power, social and professional identity, and recognition should be questioned in terms of uneven distribution of privilege, credibility, authority, and testimony. In the following part, we aim to outline the constitutive elements and issues of this alliance through engaging in the literature on recognition. Then, we will trace the link between social identity, professional identity, and recognitional power of a school leader.

In the work of Axel Honneth (1995, 2001), the scope and the limits of justice are characterized based on the influential concept of recognition. Honneth (2001) argues that the idea of justice should be interpreted beyond the categorical limits of equal distribution or economic equality, and the core categories of justice should be recognition or dignity. In Honneth's approach to justice, individuals recognize one another reciprocally. In line with this, Honneth (2001) points out a central structure for building a just society: mutual recognition based on respect and dignity. In his formulation of recognition, Honneth (2001) warns us about a critical point: social recognition cannot be reduced to the single aspects of cultural recognition or different forms of life but should be treated "as a normative category, which corresponds to all those political demands raised today under the banner of a 'politics of identity'" (p. 52). Therefore, the struggle for recognition,

> represents a conflict over the institutionalized hierarchy of values that govern which social groups, on the basis of their status and their esteem, have legitimate claim to a particular amount of material goods. In short, it is a struggle over the cultural definition of what it is that renders an activity socially necessary and valuable (p. 54).

This is exemplified by unemployment, according to Honneth (2001), unemployment cannot be reduced to the cycles of economic variables but is structural since it is the case for someone who does not have an opportunity to gain a form of recognition for acquired abilities. In leadership studies, the constitutive elements of recognitional power - power, credibility, authority, and testimony - can be considered as a set of inhering capacities in a leader. As Honneth (2001) argues social recognition cannot be grasped only in material form but also exercised as a normative cat-

egory which is part of imaginative aspects of social power. In this respect, the link between educational leadership, social identity and professional identity is in connection with non-material form of identity power as a social construct. How does this non-material/imaginative form function in educational leadership studies?

In their study Ispa-Landa and Thomas (2019) examine how race and gender intersect in women principals' professional development through questioning the managerial authority they exercise in a school setting. The results of the study indicate that the associations of expertise, power, and authority with masculinity restrain the professional development of women school principals which differentiate based on race and emotional labor. The authors address that women principals' demand for recognition in terms of authority in a school setting varies based on race and gender identity performances (Ispa-Landa and Thomas, 2019). In another study, English (2012) proposes the concept of misrecognition in understanding uneven distribution of recognition in educational leadership. For English (2012), "misrecognition explains how the fundamental structure of socio-economic inequality, defined and working within distinctive social/professional fields, is reproduced in the schools" (p.155). In this definition there is a special place for the concept of Bourdieusian *field* which addresses "constant, permanent relationships of inequality operate inside this space, which at the same time becomes a space in which various actors struggle for the transformation or preservation of the field" and the struggle between the actors depends on particular forms of capital inherited from family or as a form of identity (Bourdieu, 1998; English, 2012, p. 156). In the study by Ispa-Landa and Thomas (2019), being a woman school principal requires a form of reconciliation with masculine performances and this resulted in a depersonalized sense of self to be recognized as a woman school principal within the existing power structures. In another study, Ridgeway (2014) extends the debate towards the issue of social inequality by addressing the effects of status "inequality based on differences in esteem and respect" (p. 1). Ridgeway (2014) argues that: at the macro level, social status hierarchy mobilizes resource and power inequality through being transformed into "cultural status beliefs" over group differences (such as race, gender, social class); at the micro level, status beliefs incorporate and regulate group-based inequality. In this sense, Ridgeway (2014) concludes that

> cultural status beliefs about groups or 'types' of people shape individuals' social relations through three processes that are consequential for inequality among individuals and groups in society. Status biases shape implicit assumptions about who is "better," more competent, and more deserving of jobs, promotions, money, and power. Associational preference biases shape who people form ties with and favor for exchange of information, opportunities, and affection. And, resistance reactions to status challenges act to constrain lower status people who go too far (p. 12).

Then, the questions of how we can understand the structurally prejudiced identity's agency and struggle within the structures of domination and how we can understand the distribution of credibility, authority, and testimony in relation to educational leadership, social identity, professional identity can also be explained based on the workings of status (beliefs) based distribution of resources and recognition.

3. Conclusion

In many spheres of life, we have had to face instances of injustice, for example, "exclusion and silencing; invisibility and inaudibility (or distorted presence or representation); having one's meanings or contributions systematically distorted, misheard, or misrepresented; having diminished status or standing in communicative practices; unfair differentials in authority and/or epistemic agen-

cy; being unfairly distrusted; receiving no or minimal uptake" (Kidd et al., 2017, p. 1). All acts of exchange between two sides require self-conscious recognition by both parties to secure a just relation. On the other hand, structural inequalities resulting in unequal distribution of recognitional power obscure a group's social experiences from collective understanding and eliminate the means of being recognized as a social agent. This is critical to educational leadership studies. In this article, the aim was to bring to light the debates on recognition of social identity, professional identity, and structural identity prejudice in line with the literature on educational leadership. Consequently, we tried to concentrate on epistemic terrains that enable us to extend the existing mapping of the epistemic operations in educational leadership studies. Since leadership and social identity in question have a contact with the operations of social power and identity power, tracing the structural preoccupations of this contact can approximate us to open theoretical space in which a *new educational leadership epistemology* can be generated. In sum, we propose that:

1. Educational leadership studies should construct a responsible approach to subjectivity in leadership by collaborating and communicating multiple forms of structural injustices considering the aspects of social identity, professional identity and recognitional power. For this purpose, the guiding questions might be: "Who has voice and who doesn't 'as a leader'? Are voices interacting with equal agency and power? In whose terms are they communicating? Who is being understood and who isn't (and at what cost)? Who is being believed? And who is even being acknowledged and engaged with?" (Kidd et al., 2017, p. 1).

2. Educational leadership studies should construct a responsive approach to the intersection of social identity, professional identity, and recognitional power which are constitutive of the possibility of respectful coexistence and integral to holding a respected and recognized school leader position.

3. Educational leadership studies should question and problematize the structural inequalities in society considering social and professional identity and with an emphasis on the institutionalized relations of recognition, social power, credibility, and authority.

References

Ashforth, B.E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review, 14*(1), 20–39.

Blackmore, J. (2006). Deconstructing diversity discourses in the field of educational management and leadership. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 34*(2), 181–199. https://doi.org/10.1177/17411432 06062492

Beatty, B.R. (2000). The emotions of educational leadership: breaking the silence. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 3*(4), 331–357. https://doi.org/10.1080/136031200750035969

Beijaard, D., Maijer, P. J., & Verloop, N. (2004). Reconsidering research on teachers' professional identity. *Teacher and Teacher Education, 20*, 107–128.

Bolden, R., Petrov, G., & Gosling, J. (2008). Tensions in higher education leadership: Towards a multi-level model of leadership practice. *Higher Education Quarterly, 62*(4), 358–376. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468 -2273.2008.00398

Brass, D.J. (1984). Being in the right place: A structural analysis of individual influence in an organization. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 29*(4), 518–539.

Brewer, M.B. (1979). In-group bias in the minimal intergroup situation: A cognitive-motivational analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 86*, 307–324.

Brewer, M.B. (2010). Ethnocentrism. In J.M. Levine & M.A. Hogg (Eds.), Encyclopedia *of Group Processes and Intergroup Relations* (pp.247–252). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Briggs, A.R.J. (2007). Exploring professional identities: middle leadership in further education colleges. *School Leadership and Management*, *27*(5), 471–485.

Brown, D.J. (2018). In the minds of followers. In J. Antonakis & D.V. Day (Eds.), *The Nature of Leadership* (pp. 82–108). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Burke, P. J., & Stets, J. E. (2009). *Identity Theory.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Carli, L.L., & Eagly, A.H. (2018). Leadership and gender. In J. Antonakis and D.V. Day (Eds.), *The Nature of Leadership* (pp.244–271). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Crow, G., Day, C., & Møller, J. (2017). Framing research on school principals' identities. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, *20*(3), 265–277.

Eagly, A.H., & Chin, J. L. (2010). Diversity and leadership in a changing world. *American Psychologist*, *65*(3), 216–224. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018957

Ellemers, N. (2010). Social identity theory. In J.M. Levine and M.A. Hogg (Eds), *Encyclopedia of Group Processes and Intergroup Relations* (pp. 797–801)*.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Emerson, R.M. (1962). Power-dependence relations. *American Sociological Review, 27*(1), 31–41.

English, F.W. (2012). Bourdieu's misrecognition: Why educational leadership standards will not reform schools or leadership. *Journal of Educational Administration and History, 44*(2), 155–170. https://doi.org/10.1080/002206 20.2012.658763

Eurostat. (2021). *Eurostat News: Women remain outnumbered in management.* Retrieved February 23, 2022, from https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-eurostat-news/-/edn-20210305-2

Fricker, M. (2007). *Epistemic Injustice: Power and the Ethics of Knowing.* New York, USA: Oxford University Press.

Fricker, M. (2013). Evolving concepts of epistemic injustice. In I.J. Kidd, J. Medina and Pohlhaus, G. Jr (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Epistemic Injustice* (pp.53–61)*.* New York City, NY: Routledge.

Göktürk, D., & Ağın, E. (2020). Liderlik çalışmalarında takipçi (follower) merkezli yaklaşıma ilişkin bir değerlendirme. *Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 20*(4) , 191–210. https://doi.org/10.18037/ ausbd.845781

Gündemir, S. (2015). *The minority glass ceiling hypothesis: Exploring reasons and remedies for the underrepresentation of racial-ethnic minorities in leadership positions* (Doctoral dissertation, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam). Retrieved from https://research.vu.nl/en/publications/the-minority-glass-ceiling-hypothesis-exploring-reasons-and-remed

Hall, S. (1996). Introduction: Who needs "identity"? In S. Hall and P. Du Gay (Eds.), *Questions of Cultural Identity* (pp.1–17). London, UK: SAGE Publications.

Hogg, M.A. (2001). A social identity theory of leadership. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 5*, 184–200.

Hogg, M.A. (2010). Social identity theory of leadership. In J.M. Levine and M.A. Hogg (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Group Processes and Intergroup Relations* (pp. 801–805). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Hogg, M.A., & Terry, D.J. (2000). Social identity and self-categorization processes in organizational contexts. *The Academy of Management Review, 25*(1), 121–140.

Hogg, M.A., & van Knippenberg, D. (2003). Social identity and leadership processes in groups. In M.P. Zanna (Eds.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (pp. 1–52)*. Academic Press.

Honneth, A. (1995). *The Struggle for Recognition: The Moral Grammar of Social Conflicts*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.

Honneth, A. (2001). Recognition or redistribution? Changing perspectives on the moral order of society. *Theory, Culture & Society, 18*(2–3), 43–55.

Hornsey, M.J. (2008). Social identity theory and self-categorization theory: A historical review. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 204–222.

Hornsey, M.J., & Hogg, M.A. (2000). Assimilation and diversity: An integrative model of subgroup relations. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 4*(3), 143–156.

International Labor Organization. (2020). *Women in managerial and leadership positions in the G20.* Retrieved February 23, 2022, from https://www.ilo.org

Ispa-Landa, S., & Thomas, S. (2019). Race, gender and emotion work among school principals. *Gender & Society, 33*(3), 387–409. https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243218821920

Jenkins, R. (2008). *Social Identity.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Johnson, L., & Crow, G. M. (2017) Professional identities of school leaders across international contexts.*Educational Management Administration & Leadership. 45*(5), 747–748.

Kidd, J.I., Medina, J., & Pohlhaus, G. (2017). Introduction to the Routledge handbook of epistemic injustice. In I.J. Kidd, J. Medina and G. Jr. Pohlhaus (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Epistemic Injustice* (pp.1–11)*. New York City, NY: Routledge.

Lammers, J., Stoker, J.I., & Stapel, D.A. (2009). Differentiating social and personal power: Opposite effects on stereotyping, but parallel effects on behavioral approach tendencies. *Psychological Science, 20*(12), 1543–1549.

Lamont, M. (2018). Addressing recognition gaps: Destigmatization and the reduction of inequality. *American Sociological Review, 83*(3), 419–444.

Larson, J.R., Foster-Fishman, P.G., & Keys, C.B. (1994). Discussion of shared and unshared information in decision-making groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*(3), 446–461.

Lord, R.G., Foti, R.J., & De Vader, C.L. (1984). A test of leadership categorization theory: Internal structure, information processing, and leadership perceptions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 34*, 343–378.

Magess, J.C., & Galinsky, A.D. (2008). Social hierarchy: The self-reinforcing nature of power and status. *Academy of Management Annals*, *2*(1). https://doi.org/10.5465/19416520802211628

Murakami, E. T., & Törnsen, M. (2017). Female secondary school principals: Equity in the development of professional identities. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, *45*(5), 806–824.

Nielson, A. (2016). Second career teachers and (mis)recognitions of professional identities. *School Leadership & Management*, *36*(2), 221–245.

Nordholm, D., Arnqvist, A., & Nihlfors, E. (2020). Principals' emotional identity – the Swedish case. *School Leadership & Management*, *40*(4), 335–351.

Parekh, B. (2009). Logic of identity. *Politics & Philosophy & Economics*, *8*(3): 267–284.

Ridgeway, C. L. (2014). Why Status Matters for Inequality. *American Sociological Review, 79*(1), 1–16.

Rosette, A.S., Leonardelli, G.J., & Phillips, K.W. (2008). The White standard: racial bias in leader categorization. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*(4), 758–777. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.4.758

Ryan, J. (2017). Dialogue, identity, and inclusion: Administrators as mediators in diverse school contexts. *Journal of School Leadership, 17*, 340–369.

Sturm, R.E., & Manzoni, L. (2018). Leadership and power. In J. Antonakis and D.V. Day (Eds.), *The Nature of Leadership* (pp. 272–300). SAGE Publication.

Tajfel, H. (1974). Social identity and group behaviour. *Social Science Information, 13*, 65–93.

Tajfel, H. (1978). *Differentiation between Social Groups: Studies in the Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Academic Press.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J.C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W.G. Austin and S. Worchel (Eds.), *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations* (pp. 33– 47). Pacific Groove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J.C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel and W.G. Austin (Eds.), *The Psychology of Intergroup Relations* (pp. 7–24). Chicago, Illinois: Nelson-Hall.

Turner, J.C. (1975). Social comparison and social identity: Some prospects for intergroup behavior. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 5*, 5–34.

Turner, J.C., Hogg, M.A., Oakes, P.J., Reicher, S. D., & Wetherell, M. S. (1987). *Rediscovering the Social Group: A self-categorization Theory.* Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Turner, J.C., & Reynolds, K.J. (2010). The story of social identity. In T. Postmes and N.R. Branscombe (Eds.), *Rediscovering Social Identity: Key Readings* (pp. 13–32). East Sussex, UK: Psychology Press.

Van Dijke, M., & Poppe, M. (2006). Striving for personal power as a basis for social power dynamics. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 36*, 537–556.

Van Knippenberg, D. (2018). Leadership and identity. In J. Antonakis and D.V. Day (Eds.), *The Nature of Leadership* (pp. 300–326). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publication.

Van Knippenberg, D., Van Knippenberg, B., De Cremer, D. & Hogg, M.A. (2004). Leadership, self, and identity: A review and research agenda. *Leadership Quarterly, 15*, 825–856.

Zorn, D., & Boler, M. (2007). Rethinking emotions and educational leadership. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 10*(2), 137–151. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603120601174345