Semiotic Analysis of a Foundational Textbook Used Widely Across Educational Supervision

Dwayne Ray Cormier
Virginia Commonwealth University, cormierd2@vcu.edu

Toshna Pandey
University of Virginia, kmg6dr@virginia.edu

Semiotic Analysis of a Foundational Textbook Used Widely Across Educational Supervision

Dwayne Ray Cormier[1] [iD] **and Toshna Pandey[2]**

Abstract

This article details a semiotic analysis of a foundational textbook used widely across the field of supervision. The purpose of this study was to explore how signs associated with key concepts in education may actualize through the work of supervision. The textbook served as a proxy for supervisors' professional disposition and subsequent praxis within educational leadership and teacher education programs and U.S. PreK-12 school systems. Additionally, investigators served as proxies for equity-minded supervisors through an analytical framework, which centers race and cultural differences within the broader context of social justice. This investigation drew from the following theoretical constructions: (a) Sociocultural Theory, (b) Critical Pedagogy, and (c) Culturally Responsive School Leadership. Investigators used mixed research methods to analyze and quantify qualitative data. Findings from this investigation illustrated supervision's capacity to facilitate praxis aimed at disrupting ideologies of whiteness within the process and context of school. This article concludes with a discussion of opportunities for the field of supervision to consider for broadening its impact by utilizing asset-based pedagogies and centering race and cultural differences within the broader context of social justice and society at large.

Keywords

supervision; mixed research methods; semiotic analysis; equity-mindfulness; centering race; asset-based pedagogies

[1] Virginia Commonwealth University
[2] University of Virginia

Corresponding Author:
Dwayne Ray Cormier (Virginia Commonwealth University, School of Education, Department of Foundations of Education, 1015 West Main Street, Box 842020, Richmond, VA, 23284-2020, USA)
email: cormierd2@vcu.edu

Introduction

As of 2014, the U.S. public school population has transformed from a White majority to a *majority-minority*[3] demographic composition (Digest of Education Statistics, 2016). Stated simply, White students are no longer the majority student group within U.S. public schools. A "minority group" is any group of people singled out and treated unequally by others in society because of their physical or cultural characteristics; therefore, they regard themselves as objects of collective discrimination (Wirth, 1945). Notwithstanding, the term "minority" is pejorative and "usually equated with being less than, oppressed, and deficient in comparison to the majority (i.e., White people)" (American Psychological Association, 2020, p. 145). Thus, in this article, the term *minoritized* acknowledges that non-White individuals (e.g., Black, LatinX) are minoritized, rendered less than, through historical, legal, political, social, and cultural constructs and processes (Cormier, 2021). Precisely, the use of minoritized acknowledges that the characterization of non-White individuals as minorities is a byproduct of systemic systems of oppression.

An additional phenomenon of interest together with the majority-minority demographic transformation in U.S. public schools is the makeup of the current teacher workforce. Hussar et al. (2020) reported in 2017–18, "about 79 percent of public-school teachers were White, 9 percent were Hispanic, 7 percent were Black, 2 percent were Asian, 2 percent were of two or more races, and 1 percent were American Indian/Alaska Native; additionally, those who were Pacific Islander made up less than 1 percent of public-school teachers" (p. 58). Implicit within the overwhelmingly White teacher workforce is that majority-minority students' race, ethnicity, and culture are not physically and socially represented in their PreK-12 schools and classrooms (Easton-Brooks, 2019). Endemic to the lack of racial, ethnic, and cultural representation within the teaching workforce when compared to the majority-minority student population is the phenomenon of the *sociocultural gap*. The sociocultural gap is the social and cultural distance between teachers, most of whom are White and female, and their students from diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds. Prophetically, Gay (1993) signaled that the sociocultural gap would be one of the most compelling concerns regarding the majority-minority demographic transformation in U.S. public schools. Further, Gay explained that the sociocultural gap would bring about a host of challenges that would cause an "alarming schism in the instructional process" (p. 287) together with student achievement for majority-minority students as well as those who are marginalized and otherized. Ladson-Billings (1998) added that many White teachers have difficulty closing the sociocultural gap within the U.S. public schooling context because they "possess only a surface understanding of culture—their own or anyone else's" (p. 261).

The observations made above are not to suggest that White teachers cannot teach students from diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds. Instead, these observations illustrate that White teachers and others often lack the capacity given their lived experience to effectively teach and engage with students from backgrounds different from their own (Emdin, 2016). Much of this lack of capacity is linked to how individuals in the United States are socialized to think along with

---

[3] Majority-minority is a term used to characterize a demographic composition in which one or more racial or ethnic minorities are greater relative to the current White majority U.S. population.

various social binaries (e.g., Black-White, Democrat-Republican, rich-poor, us-them (Delgado & Stefanic, 2017). Most often, these binaries, deficit-minded paradigms, are sustained in school via school and instructional supervision (Khalifa et al., 2016). Consequently, binary thinking negatively affects the sociocultural process and products of supervision, especially for students from diverse racial or ethnic backgrounds and economically disadvantaged households (Milner IV, 2020). The continued propagation of problematic binaries often leads White teachers and others into adopting counterproductive frameworks (e.g., colorblindness, the myth of meritocracy, ableism, xenophobia), none of which are beneficial in addressing the learning needs, styles, and outcomes of students who are subjected to systems of oppression within U.S. PreK-12 public schools and classrooms (Gay, 1998; Khalifa et al., 2016; Milner IV, 2020).

In this article, we investigated how supervision (i.e., instructional leadership) as a field of study and practice, through the analysis of a supervision textbook, has maintained or disrupted the sociocultural gap within PreK-12 education. The textbook subject of this inquiry is *SuperVision and Instructional Leadership: A Developmental Approach* (Glickman et al., 2018), a foundational and seminal text within supervision. Supervision, as a field of study and practice, is "concerned with [the] concepts and techniques that help teachers examine their teaching and student learning" (Glanz & Hazi, 2019, p. 2). Intended praxis[4] within supervision is made at the intersection of curriculum, school and instructional leadership, cognitive psychology, and andragogy together with concepts of democracy and citizenship (Cogan, 1973; Gay, 1998; Glanz & Hazi, 2019; Glanz & Zepeda, 2015; Glickman et al., 2018; Mezirow, 2002; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007). Subsequently, we want to understand if the signs (i.e., semiotics) within the Glickman et al. (2018) textbook resonate or correlate with the signs within Gooden and Dantley's (2012) educational leadership framework aimed at bridging the sociocultural gap within U.S. public education.

The authors believe this investigation is warranted because of the longstanding role supervision plays, via the Glickman et al. (2018) textbook, in human resource development within educational leadership and teacher education programs and PreK-12 school systems. Additionally, this investigation is warranted because of the perceived value of the textbook, which has sold more than 250,000 copies since its inception and has remained the field's bestseller for over 30 years (Kao, 2020). Further, we believe this inquiry is warranted because phenomena such as the majority-minority demographic transformation in U.S. public schools, the overwhelmingly White composition of the teaching workforce, and America's current sociopolitical climate (e.g., the murders of George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, and others, U.S. Capitol Riot, Critical Race Theory bans, etc.) that has seen invigorated attention towards equity-mindfulness and social justice. Thus, this investigation addressed the following research question:

> Does Glickman et al.'s (2018) *SuperVision and Instructional Leadership: A Developmental Approach* textbook, through the semiotic analysis of key concepts used broadly across education and within the textbook, resonate[5] semiotically with the Gooden and Dantley's (2012) educational leadership analytical framework?

---

[4] The term praxis refers to a process of reflection and subsequent human action, which is informed by theory aimed at transforming social and cultural structures that propagate and maintain forces of oppression (Freire, 1970).
[5] Resonate within this article is a sociocultural phenomenon that connotes correlation, agreement, or consensus.

This investigation's intended consequences are first to understand supervision's capacity to mitigate the sociocultural gap within U.S. PreK-12 school systems. Second, we hope findings provide a catalyst for the field of supervision to (re)imagine new forms of praxis through the use of asset-based pedagogies (e.g., Culturally Responsive School Leadership/Teaching, Critical Whiteness Studies, AntiRacist Education). Please note that the authors' motivation for this investigation was not with malice but rather for the high esteem we have for Glickman et al. (2018) and their contributions to the field of supervision and the broader context of education. Lastly, we hope this article bridges stakeholders (e.g., school and instructional leaders, teacher educators, policy advocates) within educational leadership and supervision discourse communities, especially individuals who center race and challenge hegemonic structures that propagate within educational leadership and teacher education programs and PreK-12 school systems.

A Contemporary Understanding of Supervision

The ideas and methods (i.e., oversight to cooperative) for supervision have transformed over the years. Supervision, traditionally, is principle-centered, relies on hierarchically differentiated roles, focuses on supervisory behavior, and uses extrinsic motivational tools (e.g., what gets rewarded gets done) to drive teaching and learning outcomes (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007). To put it simply, supervision from the perspective explained above, teleologically, focuses on managing curriculum and instruction with the intent to "control teachers' instructional behaviors (Glickman et al., 2010). Moreover, supervision from this perspective espouses "dominant hegemonic (often, White, Westernized) ways of understanding and practicing school leadership" (Khalifa et al., 2016, p. 1286). Notwithstanding, in light of the current racial and political unrest, supervision is still framed and maintained by Eurocentric ideologies since its colonial American origins (Glanz & Hazi, 2019).

A progressive view of supervision is teacher-centered, which emphasizes action (i.e., intentionality and free choice), recognizes the importance of emotions and values in decision making processes, and uses intrinsic motivations tools (e.g., what is rewarding gets done) to drive schooling outcomes (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007). This form of supervision aims to implement cooperative and democratic approaches for arriving at desired teaching and learning outcomes. This supervision approach empowers all school staff within a given teaching and learning context (Glickman et al., 2010; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007). However, from our perspectives and others, progressive forms of supervision still miss the mark on developing educational stakeholders' cultural competence and racial awareness (Castro, 2010; Gay, 1998; Khalifa et al., 2016).

As such, supervision as a field of study and practice has not dissolved the sociocultural processes that enable problematic frames of references (e.g., colorblindness, social binaries) with their subsequent behaviors (e.g., deficit views, low expectations) aimed at minoritized students. Frankly, these frames of reference and subsequent behaviors are not addressed systematically through professional development within educational leadership and teacher education programs and PreK-12 school systems (Castro, 2010). It is the implication of the perceived consequences that this investigation seeks to understand within supervision. Precisely, supervisorial ideas and

practices that maintain the sociocultural gap and hinder effective instruction for all students, especially those from diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds.

Theoretical Framework

Glickman et al.'s (2018) *SuperVision and Instructional Leadership: A Developmental Approach* has been a mainstay within educational leadership and teacher education programs and PreK-12 school systems for over 30 years (Kao, 2020). Because of the permanence of the foundational text within supervision, we wanted to understand how the text in its current iteration (i.e., tenth edition), semiotically, might implicate the PreK-12 majority-minority student population, overwhelmingly White teaching workforce, and the current racial, social, and political climate in America. Semiotics involves the study of signs (e.g., words, images, gestures, acts) and how signs materialize in reality (e.g., supervision practices) (Chandler, 2002). Thus, we aimed to understand how supervisors might make meaning of the semiotic signs and codes embedded in sections of the Glickman et al. (2018) textbook that referenced key concepts (e.g., Citizenship, Culture, Democracy, Race) used broadly across education. Further, we wanted to understand how semiotics relevant to key concepts are interpreted and may play out in supervision practices. To accomplish this aim, we used three relevant theories and practices in education to construct a theoretical framework: (a) Sociocultural Theory, (b) Critical Pedagogy, and (c) Culturally Responsive School Leadership (Freire, 1970; Khalifa, 2020; Vygotsky, 1978).

Sociocultural Theory

First, we looked to Sociocultural Theory (SCT) to denote the context and process of supervision within educational leadership and teacher education programs and PreK-12 schools and classrooms. This point of view aligns with sociocultural theorists, which positions that supervision cannot be understood by studying an individual supervisor; researchers must also examine the context and process (e.g., lived experiences, professional preparation) in which the individual supervisor's dispositions were developed (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988; Wertsch, 1991). Accordingly, during this investigation, we considered the sociocultural factors (e.g., cultural, historical, and institutional) that inform supervisors' professional disposition and practice. Second, we looked to SCT to understand how semiotics (e.g., signs, signifiers, signifieds, codes) within the Glickman et al. (2018) textbook, a socially mediated tool, are interpreted and potentially actualized within the context and process of supervision.

Readers read text from multiple reading positions. Chandler (2002) offered three reading positions, which include the following:

- **dominant (or 'hegemonic') reading:** the reader fully shares the text's [semiotic] code and accepts and reproduces the preferred reading… a stance that seems 'natural' and 'transparent';
- **negotiated reading:** the reader partly shares the text's [semiotic] code and broadly accepts the preferred reading, but seems to resist and modifies it in a way which reflects their own experience and interest…;
- **oppositional ('counter-hegemonic') reading:** the reader, whose social situation places them in a directly oppositional relation to the dominant code, understands the

preferred racing but does not share the text's [semiotic] code and rejects this reading, bringing to bear an alternative frame of reference… (p. 192).

Throughout this investigation, we made meaning of semiotic codes (i.e., assumed or tacit rules) embedded in the text via key concepts (i.e., signs) from a negotiated reading position serving as proxies for supervisors who espouse a teacher-centered and collaborative form of supervision together with equity-minded and social justice outcomes. *Signs* are dyadic or composed of two parts, a signifier and the signified (De Saussure, 2011). Our reading position connotes that we broadly accept supervision's ideas but sometimes resist ideas (e.g., intended praxis) or semiotic codes relevant to key concepts because of our critical and equity-minded dispositions together with our lived experiences as people of color, Black male and Asian female, respectively.

Table 1

Chandler (2002) Semiotic Codes Types

Code type	Examples
Social	- verbal language (e.g., phonological, syntactical, lexical) - bodily codes (e.g., bodily contact, proximity, facial expressions, head-nods) - behavioral codes (e.g., protocols, rituals, role-playing, games)
Textual	- scientific codes (e.g., data, mathematics) - aesthetic codes within the various expressive arts (e.g., drama); including classism, romanticism, realism - genre, rhetorical and stylistic codes (e.g., exposition, argent, description, narration) - mass media codes (e.g., photographic, television, film, radio, newspaper, social media)
Interpretative	- perceptual codes (e.g., visual perception) - ideological codes (e.g., individualism, liberalism, feminism, racism, materialism, capitalism, progressivism, conservatism, socialism, objectivism, and populism)

Codes are fundamental in semiotics; they organize signs (e.g., words, acts) into meaning systems (e.g., educational supervision), which correlate signifiers and signifieds into both denotative and connotative meanings (Chandler, 2002). Semiotic "codes are not simply 'conventions' of communication but rather procedural systems," which operate at the nexus of cognitive and sociocultural processes (p. 148). Further, semiotic codes are dialectical, imbued with "tactic rules and constraints which underlie the production and interpretation of meaning within each code" (p. 148). Notwithstanding, we understand that supervisors bring various frames of reference (i.e., knowledge) to the meaning-making process of the key concepts (i.e., signs) within the Glickman et al. (2018) textbook. Chandler (2002) offered three kinds of knowledge individuals use to make meaning of text:

1. the world (social knowledge);
2. the medium and the genre (textual knowledge);
3. the relationship between (1) and (2) (modality judgements). (p.150)

Understandably, readers, through a sociocultural process, engage and make meaning of a range of semiotic codes embedded in text; see a list of commonly referenced codes shown in Table 1.

Critical Pedagogy

To increase SCT's scope and impact for this investigation, we look to Freire's (1970) concept *conscientização* to investigate if supervision, as a field of study and practice, has the capacity to develop equity-minded supervisors. This Freirean concept suggests supervisors should have the capacity to perceive and disrupt "social, political, and economic contradictions" (p. 35) within the context of supervision. Additionally, we look to Freire to identify and name the sociocultural phenomenon (e.g., whiteness, systemic oppression), that inhibit equity-minded supervisory outcomes for all students. Consequences of this perspective will lead to increased understanding, empowering supervisors to commit to equity-minded and social justice forms of praxis (Gooden & Dantley, 2012). However, such an outcome would have to be facilitated within a human and professional developmental context. Accordingly, a developmental context aimed for an equity-minded form of supervision (e.g., Culturally Responsive School Leadership/Teaching) would require not only critical self-reflection but also transformative action— "self-correction [that] is initiated through a spiritual motivation that celebrates [and privileges] the human dynamics of individuality and community at the same time" (Dantley, 2005, p. 665).

Culturally Responsive School Leadership

Last, we look to Culturally Responsive School Leadership (CRSL). CRSL is equity-minded and social justice-oriented supervisory "practices and actions, mannerisms, policies, and discourses that influence school climate, school structure, teacher efficacy, [and] student outcomes (Khalifa et al., 2016, p. 1274). Equity-mindfulness is a state of consciousness and critical self-reflection that is cyclical; a "continuous scrutiny and refinement of expectations based on [present and past] experiences, appreciation of the subtleties of context, and identification of novel aspects of context that can improve foresight and functioning" (Hoy et al., 2006, p. 238). However, equity-mindfulness that embodies CRSL does not materialize without intentionality and human and professional development, requiring supervisors to be open to and espouse asset-based pedagogical points of view and intended praxis. Equity-minded supervisory practices are derived from "concepts of fairness, social justice, and human agency articulated in several disciples, including philosophy, critical race theory, feminist theory, psychology, organizational behavior, economics, and education" (Bensimon et al., 2007, p. 5). Equity-minded supervisory practices within the broader context of social justice include the following:

1. Being color-conscious (as opposed to color-blind) ... viewing [racial] inequities in the context of a history of exclusion, discrimination, and educational apartheid.
2. Being aware that beliefs, expectations, and practices can be racialized unintentionally...

3. Being willing to assume responsibility for the elimination of inequality… allow for the possibility that they might be created or exacerbated by taken for granted practices and policies, inadequate knowledge, a lack of cultural knowhow, or the absence of institutional support.
4. Be able to demonstrate authentic caring [and Culturally Responsive School Leadership/Teaching practices] (Bensimon et al., 2007, p. 5-6).

The practice and actions detailed above are endemic to CRSL. Moreover, CRSL calls for supervisors to possess a deep understanding of social, political, and economic contradictions (i.e., critical consciousness) and high level of cultural competence, enabling them to bridge the sociocultural gap for minoritized, marginalized, and otherized stakeholders (e.g., faculty, staff, students and their families) within the scope and context of their supervision (Gay, 1993, 1998, 2018; Howard, 2010; Ladson-Billings, 1995, 2017). However, for supervision, as a field of study and practice, to be effective in facilitating equity-minded and social justice-oriented outcomes for students from majority-minority and economically disadvantaged backgrounds, we believe supervisors have to interrogate their racial and sociocultural identities. Villegas and Lucas (2002) further explained that supervisors need to:

> [E]ngage in autobiographical exploration, reflection, and critical self-analysis to develop that sense. They need to explore the various social and cultural groups to which they belong, including those identified with race, ethnicity, social class, language, and gender. They also need to inspect the nature and extent of their attachments to those groups and how membership in them has shaped their personal and family histories. (p. 22)

Method

In this investigation, we used *qualitative dominant* mixed research methods (e.g., Johnson et al., 2007) to analyze semiotic signs and codes of key educational concepts within Glickman et al.'s (2018) *SuperVision and Instructional Leadership: A Developmental Approach*. Johnson et al. (2007) described:

> Qualitative dominant mixed methods research is the type of mixed research in which one relies on a qualitative, constructivist-poststructuralist-critical view of the research process, while concurrently recognizing that the addition of quantitative data and approaches are likely to benefit most research projects. (p.124)

Precisely, we conducted a semiotic analysis of the Glickman et al., (2018) textbook (e.g., Schreire, 2012). We established criteria and procedures to identify, collect, and analyze qualitative data for this investigation.

Data Source

First, we identified key concepts (i.e., signs), which are endemic to broad conceptions and aims of schooling within the United States. The key concepts identified for this investigation were *Citizenship, Cultural Responsiveness, Culture, Democracy, Diversity, Equity, Gender, Inclusion*, and *Race*. These concepts are highly referenced and situated within the academic discourse

communities (supervision, educational leadership, equity-mindfulness, social justice) relevant for this investigation (Ayers et al., 2009; Bensimon et al., 2007; Hooper & Bernardt, 2016; Glickman et al., 2018; Gross & Shapiro, 2016; Khalifa, 2020). Second, after purchasing an electronic version of the Glickman et al. (2018) textbook, we located each key concept and corresponding excerpts using the search tool. Excerpts (e.g., titles, sentences, paragraphs) specific to each time a key concept emerged through the search tool were copied and pasted into a corresponding spreadsheet (e.g., Citizenship, Cultural Responsiveness, Culture). Table 2 illustrates the number of excerpts that emerged for each key concept. Additionally, we noted the book section, chapter, and page number(s) that corresponded with each excerpt. Lastly, spreadsheets were formatted into nine PDF documents representing a key concept and uploaded to NVivo 12 for data analysis.

Table 2
Excerpts of Key Concepts

Key Concept	Number of Excerpts
Citizenship	9
Culturally Responsive	21
Culture	51
Democracy	43
Diversity	25
Equity	31
Gender	16
Inclusion	11
Race	28
Total	**235**

Analytical Framework

For this investigation, we adapted an already existing analytical framework (see Table 3) for educational supervision. The leadership framework is pragmatic, equity-minded, and centered on the "specificity of race within a broader context of social justice holds all of the players in the educational process accountable for creating equitable spaces for children and youth to learn" (Gooden & Dantley, 2012, p. 241). Further, the framework is a socially mediated tool that carries a challenge for educational leaders and practitioners to engage in the sociocultural realities of individuals who are minoritized, marginalized, and otherized within the scope and context of their supervision (Howard, 2010; Vygotsky, 1978; Wertsch, 1991).

Table 3
Framework and Analytical Lens for Supervision adapted from (Gooden & Dantley, 2012)

The Charge	Intended Outcome
a prophetic message,	A message that carries a challenge, and "demands a radical and indeed revolutionary response to its call. A prophetic message… requires stark changes in sedimented rituals, practices, and institutionalized behaviors. [Such message is] radical because it demands substantive change at the root or the core of the motivations of these educational practices" (Gooden & Dantley, 2012, p. 241).
self-reflection serving as the motivation for transformative action,	A process of thinking/reflecting that is the epicenter of a disorienting dilemma (e.g., a difference in educational values, beliefs, and practice) and is the catalyst for transformative action (Taylor, 2002). Transformative action understood as self-correction, is "a courageous step often initiated through a spiritual motivation that celebrates the human dynamics of individuality and community at the same time" (Dantley, 2005, p. 665).
a grounding in a critical theoretical construction [together with appropriate pedagogical orientations],	The adoption and implementation of leadership and instructional practices rooted in critical theoretical constructions (e.g., any variation of critical theory—critical race theory, critical Latino(a) theory, and critical feminist theory, etc.) (Gooden & Dantley, 2012, p. 241) together with appropriate pedagogical orientations (e.g., Critical Pedagogy, Multicultural Education, Culturally Responsive/Relevant Teaching) that affects positive change for all students, especially those who are minoritized, marginalized, and otherized within PreK-12 schools and classroom.
a pragmatic edge that supports praxis, and	The product of communal and practical activity aimed to resolve problematic sociocultural interactions and reproductions within the context of a community or organization (Glaude Jr., 2007). However, products of communal and practical activities should not lie dormant or static within the context of educational supervision or policy, but rather are products which are observable and felt within the context of school (Freire, 1970; Gooden & Dantley, 2012).
the inclusion of race language [within the broader context of social justice] (Gooden & Dantley, 2012).	An inclusive practice that is intentional in naming and situating, cognitively and organizationally, the lived realities of students who are minoritized, marginalized, and otherized based on racial, ethnic, linguistic, and religious differences as well as their ability and sexual preference within the process and context of supervision (Banks, 2013). Furthermore, with such inclusive practices, educational stakeholders (e.g., school and instructional leaders, teacher educators, and teachers) must understand that difference along—racial, cultural, economic, political, etc.— lines is a critical asset and resource, which is essential in developing culturally inclusive and responsive schooling context (Gay, 2010).

Semiotic Analysis

Semiotic analysis, rather than content analysis, was used to conduct this investigation. Content analysis is a qualitative method used for "systematically describing the meaning of qualitative material" (Schreier, 2012, p. 1). We believe the Glickman et al. (2018) text and the key concepts, depending on individuals' epistemological stance, used for this analysis were straightforward. Thus, describing the meaning of the Glickman et al. (2018) text was not a primary motivation. Instead, our motivation for this investigation was to understand how semiotics embedded within

the Glickman et al. (2018) text might implicate supervisors' professional disposition and practice. Thus, our decision to use semiotic analysis enabled us to situate ourselves via an analytical framework (see Table 3) within the Glickman et al. (2018) text as proxies for supervisors with equity-minded and social justice orientations to engage in the process of meaning production specific to key concepts used broadly in education. Additionally, we wanted to see if the perceived semiotics had the potential to facilitate the bridging of the sociocultural gap within educational leadership and teacher education programs and PreK-12 schools and classrooms.

Semiotic Analysis with NVivo

NVivo coders. NVivo 12, a qualitative data analysis computer software package, was used to conduct semiotic analysis specific to this investigation (Bazeley & Jackson, 2013). In NVivo, the authors created a codebook adapted from Gooden and Dantley (2012) analytical framework (see Table 3). Using the codebook, we semiotically analyzed the 235 excerpts specific to key concepts (e.g., Citizenship, Cultural Responsiveness, Culture) identified in the Glickman et al. (2018) text. We coded the excerpts independent of one another to compare percent agreement/disagreement and establish inter-rater reliability.

In NVivo, we conducted a coding comparison, which calculates percent agreement and disagreement between two coders. Our estimated agreements are as follows: 80% agreement and 20% disagreement. Additionally, a range of percent agreement (68.96 % - 87.80%) and percent disagreement (12.20% - 31.04%) was calculated. In addition to percent agreement, a Kappa coefficient was calculated in NVivo, resulting in an overall weighted Kappa of 0.34, categorized as a fair score by Landis and Loch (1977). These values (i.e., percent agreement and disagreement and Kappa) illustrate how consensus or discord might play out in the context and process of supervision, resulting in various forms of observed and muddled praxis.

NVivo coding process. Nine spreadsheets (i.e., NVivo Files), each representing a key concept, shown in Table 2, were uploaded and filed in NVivo. Additionally, each excerpt was linked to case files that corresponded to the section the excerpt was found in the textbook. Next, using the analytical framework shown in Table 3, a list of codes (i.e., NVivo nodes/codes) was constructed to facilitate the coding or semiotic analysis process. Like the Glickman et al. (2018) text, the analytical framework shown in Table 3 is a socially mediated tool grounded in critical and pragmatic ways of knowing and doing—praxis—aimed at assisting educational supervisors to develop, implement, and analyze equity-minded and social justice aims and outcomes.

Via NVivo, we used two qualitative coding methods (i.e., provisional coding and magnitude coding) for this investigation. Provisional coding connotes a "predetermined start list of codes" (Saldaña, 2016, p. 168) and was used to code (i.e., conduct semiotic analysis) excerpts from the Glickman et al. textbook. The provisional codes for this investigation are represented by each charge and intended outcome shown in Table 1. We created an additional provisional code (none of the intended outcomes were present) to illustrate when an excerpt did not include any of the five predetermined codes. In addition to provisional coding, magnitude coding was used to illustrate the frequency of each provisional code, a numeral or percent representation for each key concept within each section of the textbook (Saldaña, 2016).

Findings

In this section, we share findings from this investigation. First, we present and discuss a schema that illustrates the sociocultural process that facilitated our semiotic analysis. After, we present a table of key concepts with their corresponding connotative and denotative meanings via our semiotic analysis. Last, we share descriptive statistics that illustrate the frequency of semiotic codes (i.e., NVivo nodes/codes) found within each key concept (e.g., Citizenship, Culture, Democracy, Race) throughout the Glickman et al. (2018) textbook.

Orders of Signification via Gooden and Dantley's (2012) Critical Analytical Framework

Drawing from Vygotsky, Radford (2000) explained that our "cognitive functioning is intimately linked, and affected by, the use of signs" (p. 240). To state simply, signs are socially mediated tools, inferring that an individual's interpretation (i.e., signifying) of signs can yield diverse meanings (i.e., signified) and subsequent praxis (Chandler, 2002; Wertsch, 1991). Further, individuals' interpretations of signs, a sociocultural process, are affected by historical, cultural, and institutional factors (Howard, 2010; Wertsch, 1991). Moreover, signs with their socioculturally constructed meanings propagate context to context; in some instances, signs remain fully intact, and in other instances, signs are modified to serve an informed and contextual purpose—praxis.

Barthes (1972) referred to this process as orders of signification. Barthes' conception of the orders of signification illustrates how signs are encoded and decoded via an iterative and dynamic meaning-making process between connotative and denotative meanings. Denotative meaning is described as the descriptive or colloquial meaning of a sign (Chandler, 2002; Schreier, 2012). At the same time, connotative meaning is the sociocultural ascriptions or associations [e.g., worldview, espoused paradigm(s)] of the sign (Chandler, 2002; Schreier, 2012). Figure 1 illustrates how Barthes' orders of signification played out in the meaning-making processes (i.e., semiotic analysis) used for this investigation.

Figure 1
Orders of Signification from Semiotic Codes to Praxis [adapted from Barthes (1957)]

signifier; <u>*key concepts*</u>	*signified*; *Glickman et al., (2018) socioculturally constructed meaning of key concepts*	
SIGN (i.e., <u>key concepts</u>); *as represented in Glickman et al., (2018);* ***signifier***	*signified;* *(coders + critical framework); proxies to equity-minded and social just supervision*	
SIGN (i.e., <u>key concepts</u>); *a socioculturally constructed and practical meaning (e.g., consensus or modification) and subsequent praxis*		

Barthes (1972) explained that there are two orders of signification. The *first order of signification* is that of denotative meaning, which at this level is a sign (i.e., key concept) consisting of a signifier and a signified. This signification is shown in Figure 1, which includes both the signifier and signified in the top row and the first box, shaded grey, in the second row, resulting in a sign and subsequent signifier put forth by Glickman et al. (2018). The *second order of signification* is that of connotative meaning. Note that secondary within this context does not connote significance. In this order of signification, the investigators used the "denotative sign (signifier and signified)" (Chandler, 2002, p. 142) put forth by the authors of the supervision textbook as our signifier. Next, we attached an additional signified utilizing Gooden and Dantley's (2012) critical analytical framework (see Table 3) adapted for this investigation, resulting in a connotative sign of the key concept. It is important to note that the second order of signification is unique to the investigators for this semiotic analysis, indicating that the frames of reference (i.e., reading positions) supervisors bring to the Glickman et al. (2018) textbook will significantly impact their interpretations and subsequent praxis.

The orders of signification shown (see Figure 1) serve as a proxy for supervisors with equity-minded and social justice orientations, demonstrating how such supervisors may interpret and actualize key concepts in the Glickman et al. (2018) textbook. Further, Figure 1 precisely illustrates how signs (e.g., words, acts) theoretical intent might get lost in translation, resulting in actions that inhibit equity-minded and social justice outcomes within the context of supervision.

Orders of Signification of Key Concepts

In this section, we offer products (i.e., meanings; see Table 4) of 'key concepts' matriculation through the orders of signification shown in Figure 1. Specifically, Table 4 depicts our perceived denotative and connotative meaning and inferred praxis for each key concept referenced in the Glickman et al. (2018) textbook. Teleologically, Table 4 was constructed to provide readers insight into how we made meaning and inferred praxis from a negotiated reading position of each concept referenced in the textbook (Chandler, 2002).

Table 4 is organized into four columns and reads from left to right depicting key concepts, the first-and second-order of signification (i.e., denotative and connotative meanings or signs), and inferred praxis. Also found within each denotative, connotative, and synthesized meanings are semiotic codes (e.g., protocols, rituals; practices) embedded explicitly, implicitly, or null within each key concept or sign advanced in the textbook. Precisely, Column 1 lists each of the key concepts (i.e., sign) used for this investigation. Column 2 are excerpts (i.e., signifieds) illustrating denotative meanings or signs put forth by Glickman et al. (2018) for each concept, products of the first order of signification illustrated in Figure 1. We based the selection of excerpts for column 2 on the ease of observing and deducing denotative or colloquial meanings and inferred praxis from the selected text. Column 3 is a depiction of investigators' ascribed meaning (i.e., connotative meaning) to denotative meanings or signs for each concept put forth by Glickman et al. (2018) (Chandler, 2002; Schreier, 2012). The analytical framework (see Table 3) adapted from Gooden and Dantley (2012), a socially mediated tool, was used to ascribe meaning to denotative meanings or signs. Investigators in column 3 offered concise descriptions of connotative meanings for each of the key concepts. Lastly, Column 4 depicts investigators'

synthesis of signifiers (Column 2; denotative meaning or sign) and signifieds (Column 3; connotative meaning or signs), effectively, the second-order of signification, together with inferred praxis and consequences. The completion of the second-order signification yielded a new or augmented sign specific to each key concept (Geertz, 1973).

Table 4
Perceived Meanings of Key Concepts Within the Glickman et al. (2018) Textbook

Key Concept (SIGN)	Signifier [denotative meaning via Glickman et al. (2018)]	Signified [connotative meaning via analytical framework (see Table 3)]	Inferred Praxis (SIGN; denotative & connotative with inferred outcomes)
Citizenship	"Citizens need to understand how others' actions affect them and how their actions affect others. In an authentic democracy, citizens seek to understand the experiences, values, and needs of others and balance their interests with those of others…" (Glickman et al., 2018, p. 443)	Citizenship in this context signified a broad and non-targeted conception of the act.	Citizenship in this context is contingent on individuals' complicity in assimilating, socially and culturally, into the dominant culture view of school in the United States (Jay, 2003). Subsequently, we believe supervisors, in most cases, would enact praxis (e.g., color/cultural blindness, race neutrality) that would regress to the mean of whiteness (Milner, 2020).
Culturally Responsive	"Cultural responsiveness is integrated across the curriculum in dynamic schools. The curriculum incorporates the values, customs, and languages of diverse students and their families. Supervisors, teachers, and students from different cultures learn about each other's cultures, families, and lives outside of school" (Glickman et al., 2018, p. 48). "Teachers in culturally responsive schools have an understanding of their own cultural backgrounds, the cultures of the students they teach, and cultural issues that need to be addressed in the classroom. Teachers have conversations with their students about their lives outside of the classroom, listen to their students, and treat students' concerns seriously. Teachers in dynamic schools both nourish and hold high expectations for their students" (Glickman et al., 2018, p. 48).	Cultural responsiveness in this context signified a comprehensive and emancipatory pedagogical framework and practice.	Cultural responsiveness in this context is contingent on individuals' commitment to making classroom instruction more consistent with the cultural orientations of students from diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds, together with removing organizational barriers that inhibit praxis that leads to achieving equity and school transformation (Gay, 2018; Hooper & Bernhardt, 2016). If committed to equity-minded and social justice aims and practices, we believe supervisors would enact praxis that is emancipatory for educational stakeholders from diverse racial and ethnic and economically disadvantaged backgrounds (Banks, 2013; Gay, 2018).

Culture	"It may seem technically incorrect to apply the term culture to professional settings; the term is appropriated from the anthropological studies of largely intact and isolated communities of people. However, the concept of culture helps us reexamine schools as places of human community with peculiar histories and stories" (Glickman et al., 2018, p. 24). "There are a variety of different cultures within the student population of any school. The different cultures may be based on race or socioeconomic status, but even in a school that is homogeneous in terms of race and class there are differences in gender, sexual orientation, and religion, among others" (Glickman et al., 2018, p. 33).	Culture in the context signified two meanings. First, culture signified that school is a culture all to itself (i.e., organizational culture), operating historically and socioculturally through written (explicit) and hidden (implicit) codes embedded in policy, curriculum, and leadership and teaching practices (Geertz, 1973). Second, culture signified a concept at the minimum, others persons from diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds or economically disadvantaged, resulting in these persons often being minoritized and marginalized within schools (Lindsey et al., 2009, 2019).	Culture in this context has dual meanings; the use of either is contingent on semantics. The first use of culture refers to school culture, connoting professional norms and values of schooling, which are historical and systemic, reflecting the ideologies of the dominant culture within the United States; a process of assimilation rather than enculturation. The second use of culture connotes that individuals within the context of school are perceived primarily on conceptions of race and class or demographically. Subsequently, both forms of culture would enact praxis that would lead to the use of ahistorical and color/cultural blind conceptions and inequitable educational policies and practices (Milner, 2020).
Democracy	"Dewey (1916) wrote, "A democracy is more than a form of government; it is primarily a mode of associated living, of conjoint communicated experience" (p. 93). In other words, democracy is about the social relationships of community members. Citizens need to understand how others' actions affect them and how their actions affect others. In an authentic democracy, citizens seek to understand the experiences, values, and needs of others and balance their interests with those of others…" (Glickman et al., 2018, p. 443).	Democracy in this context signified a practice, a call to action, within the United States, among citizens to work in collaboration around a set of shared values and understandings towards a shared goal, solidarity.	Democracy in this context conveys that democracy within the United States is an inclusive phenomenon and practice. However, history has shown otherwise (e.g., opportunity gaps). Further, democracy within this context, in its ambiguous and non-critical form, connotes that democracy is obtainable if individuals are willing to accept axiologies that are ahistorical and remain blind to the implications of race, ethnic, and cultural differences within the context of school (Gross & Shapiro, 2016). Subsequently, democracy in this form would enact praxis that would lead educational stakeholders from diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds to make concessions, yield critical components of their racial and cultural identities to partake in the democrat project within school supervision (Stovall, 2006).

Diversity	"Given the growing diversity in the United States, and the continuing achievement gap between different student groups, addressing diversity in our schools is an increasingly critical need. People are not born with the prejudice and bias that contribute to the achievement gap. These attitudes are taught, and schools can teach future citizens different attitudes about those who belong to different cultures. Also, students from diverse cultures do not underachieve because they are less intelligent or less interested in learning than students from the dominant culture, but because of the incompatibility between their culture and traditional schooling in U.S. society" (Glickman et al., 2018, p. 412).	Diversity in this context signified a problem or barrier that needs to be addressed rather than an asset that adds value to the context and process of schooling.	Diversity in this context suggests that efforts addressing diversity specific to persons from diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds are standard practice in U.S. school systems. Further, diversity in this context continues to problematize students and families through the gaze of the achievement gap, rather than problematizing the structures and social force within schools that inhibit equity-minded and social justice outcomes (Milner, 2011). Thus, diversity in form would enact praxis that leads supervisors to offer remedies for diversity that lead students and family to fit within a schooling context that is not responsive to their unique racial and ethnic backgrounds, rather than problematizing the school context (e.g., curriculum, practices, policies) and subsequent barriers (e.g., systemic racism, xenophobia) that sustain issues associated with diversity.
Equity	"...a series of questions about changing the system too increase equity: ● How can we include parents and students in decisions about how best to meet student learning meets? ● How can the diverse learning needs of students be met in an emancipatory way? ● What ways of grouping students will benefit the least advantage students? ● How can student grouping promote democracy and social justice? ● How can the growth and development of all students be placed in the center of the decision-making process at this school" (Glickman et al., 2018, p. 377)?	Equity in this context signified a broad call to action via a set of problem-posing questions (Freire, 1970). However, in their current form, the problem-posing questions do not signify the cause of inequities found in schools.	Equity in this context connotes supervisors should address equity devoid of cultural, historical, and institutional factors, which positions supervisors to be reactive rather than proactive toward inequities found in school. Thus, the ambiguous and null concepts concerning equity observed within this context, together with the current sociopolitical climate, would enact praxis, leading supervisors to take the path of least discord to address inequities found in school, especially inequities due to factors related to race, class, and language (Howard, 2010).

Gender	...to address gender issues in school is "not to treat boys and girls equally, but to create equity by purposely addressing the particular needs of each gender…" (Glickman et al., 2018, p. 429).	Gender in this context signified a concise call to action for how issues regarding gender should be addressed via an equity lens rather than a lens of equality.	Gender in this context offered an exacting call to action for how to address gender issues within schools, precisely aims that result in equity rather than equality. Thus, gender in this context connotes solutions aimed at gender inequity are purposeful, allowing benefactors of such gender-informed praxis to be seen and heard regarding their gendered identity and circumstantial needs.
Inclusion	"Inclusion, as a moral principle, combines the beliefs in equality and equity. It begins with equality. All students are of equal worth as human beings and as members of the school community. A belief in equality leads to a commitment to equity. Those who have physical, cognitive, emotional, or social challenges should be provided the necessary assistance, including extraordinary measures if necessary, to enable them to remain members of the community and to lead fulfilling lives first as students and later as adults. The moral school responds to all cultures and all students—low-socioeconomic students, racial and ethnic minorities, immigrants, non-English-speaking students, gay and lesbian students, and so on…" (Glickman et al., 2018, p. 446).	Inclusion in the context signified a moral dilemma that juxtapositions the act of inclusion between the concepts of equality and equity. Further, inclusion in this context illustrated how the concept is used within two educational discourse communities. The first use of inclusion illustrated how the term is used in disability studies (e.g., Davis, 2016; Goodley, 2016). The second use of the term illustrated how inclusion is used in multicultural education through broad diversity, equity, and inclusion programs (Banks, 2013).	Inclusion in the context conflates two broad meanings of the term within two prominent discourse communities within education. Further, the discourse around equality and equity can confuse persons in supervisory roles within schools. Inclusion in both contexts are programs aimed at addressing two broad forms of inequities (disability and racial and ethnic discrimination) found in school. Ideally, benefactors of such programs most likely would receive additional resources and supports to facilitate equitable educational opportunities and outcomes. However, for those supervisors who are focused on "fairness," we believe the discourse around equality and equity is confusing and would lead to a form of praxis that demonstrates equality rather than equity, resulting in further inequality, especially through educational programs that address racial and ethnic discrimination.

| Race | "Responsive teachers do not ignore issues of race and culture but rather engage students in critiquing the status quo, in learning how to cope with prejudice and discrimination, and in working to bring about change…" (Glickman et al., 2018, p. 422). | Race in this context signified that race and culture are synonymous, a common misconception within educational discourse. These concepts should be understood independently, especially within the context of school supervision. Race is a concept that is constructed historically, physically, and socially, subsequently, these constructions are used to subjugate racialized individuals within schools and broader society (Milner, 2020). Conversely, culture is concept, which is dynamic and shapes an individual's identity and cognition through a host of dependent variables (e.g., geographic location, immigration status, age, social class, gender, language, religious affiliation, etc.) (Howard, 2010). | Race in this context connotes conceptions of race and culture as synonymous. This pairing of these two concepts appears to be a pragmatic move to mitigate discord or cognitive dissonance on behalf of the reader. Effectively, leaving it up to the reader to decide what concept to internalize and explore. Subsequently, addressing race from this perspective would enact a form of praxis that does not deal with issues related to race at all, resulting in muted efforts and the propagation of problematic sociocultural interactions (e.g., stereotypes, macro-and microaggressions, deficit views/frameworks) within the context and process of supervision (Milner, 2020; Khalifa, 2020). |

Illustrated in Table 4 are the orders of signification of key concepts (i.e., signs) used broadly within education, illustrating a sociocultural phenomenon that is dynamic and consequential (Golombek & Johnson, 2004). Specific to this investigation, the orders of signification illustrated, overwhelmingly, that semiotic meaning made from a negotiated reading position yields interpretation and intended praxis that does not align with equity-minded and social justice aims for supervision. Of the nine investigated key concepts, only two (Culturally Responsive and Gender) matriculated through the orders of signification in a manner that would yield emancipatory forms of praxis. Essentially, the semiotic codes embedded within these two concepts (i.e., signs) correlated with the aims prescribed via Gooden and Dantley's (2012) analytical framework shown in Table 3. Semiotic codes, which are unspoken rules or conventions embedded within each sign (Culturally Responsive Teaching and Gender), correlated the signifier [i.e., Glickman et al. (2018)] and signified [Gooden and Dantley (2012)] (Chandler, 2002). Essentially, regarding the aims of equity-minded and social justice orientated supervisors, our semiotic analysis found that the discourse and intended praxis for culturally responsive practices and addressing gender inequity, both Glickman et al. (2018) and Gooden and Dantley (2012) were on the same page.

Conversely, the remaining seven key concepts did not correlate semiotically with the Gooden and Dantley's (2012) educational leadership critical analytical framework. Broadly, these seven concepts possessed semiotic codes that would, unintentionally or intentionally, lead to hegemonic praxis influenced by white supremacy. White supremacy in this context is understood as a "socio-historical process that works to ensure… domination through various social institutions and through the maintenance of a white racial common sense [i.e., denotative

meanings and signs] …" resulting in a dominant "ideology of whiteness, [which] mediates individual and collective development" (Leonardo & Manning, 2017, p. 16). Ideologies of whiteness via the seven concepts or denotative meaning and signs found in the Glickman et al. (2018) textbook (see Table 4) martialized in the following forms: (a) color and cultural blindness, (b) race neutrality, (c) deficit views, and (d) the myth of meritocracy (e.g., Bonilla-Silva, 2017; Lindsey et al., 2009, 2019; Lynch, 2018; Milner, 2020). Ideologies of whiteness were not explicitly or denotatively stated within the seven key concepts referenced in the Glickman et al. (2018) text, but rather these ideas or semiotic codes were implicit or tacit or null via connotative meaning made via Gooden and Dantley's (2012) analytical framework.

Implicit ideas of whiteness were found within the concepts of Citizenship, Democracy, Diversity, and Inclusion. Implicit, in this context, is understood as the hidden curriculum, which serves as a "hegemonic device [a socially mediated tool] for the purposes of securing, for the ruling class (and other dominant groups in society), a continued position of power and leadership" (Jay, 2003, p. 6). The implicit devices found within the concepts referenced above, broadly, are binary constructions, which in this investigation was between citizens (White) or other (non-White), a construction which is analogous to the White-Black binary. For example, the signifiers associated with Citizenship and Democracy used acontextual and ahistorical semiotic codes to put forth denotative meaning and signs. This contextual and ahistorical semiotic construction signified what Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995) referred to as the "property issue" or whiteness as property. Ladson-Billings (2016) explained that property ownership as a prerequisite to citizenship was tied to the British notion that only people who owned the county, not merely those who lived in it, were eligible to make decisions about it" (p. 22) through democratic participation and processes. This notion, historically, has implicated educational policy and subsequent supervision. Aggarwal (2016) explained that whiteness as property within education has resulted in "how the status quo comes to be produced as a neutral baseline, grounded in—yet masking—the racial domination exclusion" (p. 131). Accordingly, readers of these excerpts, notions of Citizenship and Democracy, most of whom are White women and reading from a hegemonic reading position (Chandler, 2002), would not challenge the ahistorical and acontextual semiotic codes, seeing it as normal. Said another way, supervision via sociocultural processes which are not explicit will default to the ideologies of whiteness and subsequent praxis (e.g., color/cultural blindness, race neutrality), a constant phenomenon observed within U.S. education (Cabrera et al., 2017; Leonardo & Manning, 2015; Lynch, 2018; Milner, 2020).

Embedded within the concepts of culture, equity, and race were semiotic codes which are null. Each of the three concepts presented in the Glickman et al. (2018) textbook devoid of cultural, historical, and institutional factors, resulting in ahistorical and acontextual constructed meanings. The most notable null factor concerning these concepts is the centrality of race within the broader context of social justice. Authors often conflate concepts of race and culture into a singular idea; a pragmatic move we argue is used to circumvent the tensions associated with racialized dialogue (Singleton, 2015). We, the investigators, understand race and culture do intersect (e.g., Leonardo, 2013), but semiotically, these concepts should be understood as two separate concepts (Howard, 2010). As used here, "culture refers to a dynamic system of social values, cognitive code, behavioral standards, worldviews, and beliefs used to give order and meaning to our own lives as well as the lives of others" (Gay, 2018, p. 8). On the other hand, the

concept of race is a physical, social, legal, and historical construction developed by humans to privilege or benefit individuals at the expense of others (Milner IV, 2017). Thus, the consequences of "race are developed and constructed by human beings, not by genetics or some predetermined set of scientific laws" (Milner, 2017, p. 6). Subsequently, understanding culture and race independent of one another endows supervisors with semiotic codes (e.g., tacit nuances) that enables them to "draw on and from the cultural and racial assets or strengths of students, families, and communities… [allowing supervisors] to make sense of, nuance, and name instructional and relational moves of educators in real classrooms" (Milner, 2017, p. 7). Furthermore, understanding culture and race independently will enhance praxis aimed at addressing racialized issues within the broader context of social justice in education.

Descriptive Statistics of Semiotic Codes Within Key Concepts

Using the analytical framework (i.e., codebook) shown in Table 3, we found 917 semiotic codes (i.e., NVivo nodes/codes) across the 235 excerpts. These data, shown in Table 5, illustrate the frequency of semiotic codes associated with each key concept found in the Glickman et al. (2018) supervision textbook (Saldaña, 2016). Further, Table 5 illustrates the frequency of semiotic codes for each key concept collectively (vertically) and independently (horizontally). For this article, we will highlight focal observations.

Table 5 shows that 75% of semiotic codes were associated with five of the nine key concepts: (a) Culturally Responsive, (b) Culture, (c) Democracy, (d) Equity, and (e) Race, illustrating that these concepts were highly referenced in the textbook. Of the five key concepts (i.e., signs) referenced above, semiotically, culturally responsive was the only concept that aligned or resonated (see Table 4) with the aims of the analytical framework adapted from Gooden and Dantley (2012). Glickman et al., (2018) advanced culturally responsive semiotic codes that connote supervisors must "structure schools in ways that not only accommodate but also incorporate and celebrate aspects of [students and families] community" (Khalifa, 2020, p. 40) and cultures. Culturally responsive, relatively, had an even distribution of semiotic codes and had the highest frequency of semiotic codes referencing the use of frameworks grounded in a critical theoretical construction together with an appropriate pedagogical orientation (e.g., Culturally Responsive Teaching).

Likewise, Table 5 shows that approximately 75% of the semiotic codes came from three of the six NVivo nodes used for coding: (a) a prophetic message, (b) a pragmatic edge that supports praxis, and (c) the inclusion of race language. Through their textbook, Glickman et al. (2018) aim to inspire individuals in supervisory roles to facilitate school change and increase student achievement through collegial and developmental forms of supervision. Thus, the number of semiotic codes found for prophetic messaging and a pragmatic edge supporting praxis is expected. Further, these findings correlated with expectations put forth by Gooden and Dantley (2012), in which they stated that "educational leaders must [use] a prophetic and a pragmatic voice" (p. 241) to facilitate school change and increase student achievement. On the other hand, the semiotic codes relating to the inclusion of race language within the broader context of social justice, the term race, including stems, mostly used the term demographically (e.g., "racial/ethnic minority groups," "disaggregated by race"). Largely, the way Glickman et al. (2018) referenced race in their textbook demonstrated what Leonardo (2013) refers to as race-evasion, which

"testifies to a fundamental discomfort Americans, particularly Whites, feel about labeling" (p. 125) or acknowledging racial phenomena within schools and the broader society. Subsequently, with the understanding that school leadership and teaching workforces are mostly White, we, and others offer that supervision via the Glickman et al. (2018) textbook, will have challenges empowering the critical mass of educational stakeholders needed in school to "confront systems of oppression that have afflicted minoritized students and communities" (Khalifa, 2020, p. 53).

Table 5
Frequency of NVivo Nodes Within each Key Concept

NVivo Nodes/Codes

Key Concepts	prophetic message	self-reflection	grounded in a form of critical theory	pragmatic edge	the inclusion of race language	none	Total
Citizenship	6	1	1	7	3	3	21
Culturally Responsive	25	15	22	38	40	2	142
Culture	34	19	2	48	37	15	155
Democracy	36	11	5	36	9	29	126
Diversity	13	3	2	25	10	13	66
Equity	25	14	11	43	40	8	141
Gender	14	8	6	20	35	0	83
Inclusion	9	4	1	15	8	7	44
Race	24	15	13	27	57	3	139
Total	186	90	63	259	239	80	917

Note. The inclusion of the race semiotic code was primarily used demographically rather than a signified that connoted the need to center race as a pathway to facilitate school supervision or problematize racialized phenomenon within the United States' broader context.

The last focal point we will discuss has to do with the scarcity of semiotic codes found within the nine excerpts that correspond with Citizenship. Semiotic codes, prophetic message and pragmatic edge, were used the most, making up 62% of the semiotic codes associated with Citizenship. Embedded within the referenced semiotic codes are tacit rules (e.g., challenge, communal practices) that should inspire educational leaders to enact a Freirean (1970) form of citizenship, which problematizes and mitigates social, political, and economic contradictions found within school supervision. Gooden and Dantley (2012) explained:

> pragmatic leaders, who are concomitantly operating within a prophetic frame, see the work of schools as being a partner in transforming society, interrogating the very

structures and predispositions that undergird so many institutions and societal rituals while at the same time implementing a transgressive agenda aimed at transforming the ways, attitudes, and structures that have for so long propagated a racist, classist, and sexist ideology. (p. 243)

However, due to the lack of equitable representation of semiotic codes (see Table 5) found within excerpts corresponding with Glickman et al. (2018) use of citizenship, we argue the tacit rules associated with prophetic messages and pragmatic edge from Gooden and Dantley's (2012) point of view would not materialize. Rather, we know the tact rules associated with prophetic messages and pragmatic edge without a balanced representation of the other semiotic codes (e.g., grounded in a critical theoretical construction, the inclusion of race language) would lead to praxis that would ultimately regress to the mean of whiteness and continue to facilitate the assimilation into the dominant White culture. With this said, given the current sociopolitical dynamics together with divergent forms of citizenship, we offer that the field of supervision must ground its work in Critical Theory and its offshoots (e.g., Critical Race Theory, (Dis)Crit, AsianCrit, LatCrit, BlackCrit) to facilitate critique within supervision that "aims at material or institutional changes, a process which begins with... [semiotic signs and codes] that penetrates the core of relations of domination, such as race, class, and gender" (Leonardo, 2009, p. 17).

Discussion

Glickman et al.'s (2018) textbook is a socially mediated tool within the field and practice of supervision endowed with semiotic signs and codes, a catalyst for subsequent praxis. We believe it is essential to discuss the magnitude of semiotic codes within each section of the textbook. Magnitude within this investigation is understood as the amount or extent (e.g., explicit, implicit, or null) semiotic codes materialized throughout (see Figure 2) the supervision textbook (Saldaña, 2016; Schreier, 2012).

Broadly, the Glickman et al. (2018) textbook is a call for a collegial approach to instructional supervision. The textbook is organized into six sections, each with a specific aim.
The aims for each section are listed below:

- **Part 1: Introduction:** Teacher leadership as a critical component of collegial supervision.
- **Part 2: Knowledge:** Knowledge necessary for successful supervision.
- **Part 3: Interpersonal Skills:** A discussion of interpersonal skills of supervision.
- **Part 4: Technical Skills:** A discussion of technical skills of supervision.
- **Part 5: Technical Task of Supervision:** A discussion of technical tasks of supervision.
- **Part 6: Cultural Task of Supervision:** A discussion of cultural tasks of supervision.

Figure 2 illustrates the percentage of semiotic codes for each NVivo node/code and section of the supervision textbook, findings, opportunities, and considerations within each section (i.e., Parts 1 - 6) will be discussed accordingly.

Figure 2

Percentage of Semiotic Codes Within Each Section of the Glickman et al. (2018) Textbook

Cases	a prophetic message,	self-reflection serving as the motivation for transformative action,	a grounding in a critical theoretical construction [together with appropriate pedagogical orientations],	a pragmatic edge that supports praxis, and	the inclusion of race language [within the broader context of social justice].	none of the intended outcomes were present	Total
Preface	2.68%	0%	0%	1.82%	5.74%	6.45%	2.9%
Contents	0%	0%	0%	0%	0.82%	1.61%	0.32%
Part 1 Introduction	10.07%	5.88%	10.91%	11.52%	3.28%	9.68%	8.7%
Part 2 Knowledge	18.12%	23.53%	25.45%	21.82%	27.05%	25.81%	22.87%
Part 3 Interpersonal Skills	2.68%	4.41%	0%	3.64%	3.28%	4.84%	3.22%
Part 4 Technical Skills	2.68%	0%	0%	5.45%	0.82%	6.45%	2.9%
Part 5 Technical Tasks of Supervision	11.41%	11.76%	12.73%	10.91%	7.38%	11.29%	10.63%
Part 6 Cultural Task of Supervision	48.99%	47.06%	41.82%	41.82%	47.54%	30.65%	44.12%
Appendix	3.36%	7.35%	9.09%	3.03%	4.1%	3.23%	4.35%
Total	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**

The first section or the introduction of the textbook, which includes Chapter 1, provides an overview of the field and practice of supervision. This section provides the fundamentals for communal and distributed supervision and the textbook's organization. The authors also presented broad conceptions of issues and tasks (e.g., democratic decision making, addressing diversity, building community) to address within supervision. Semiotically, Section 1, as shown in Figure 2, presented prophetic messages and was grounded in critical theoretical constructions or used appropriate pedagogical orientations (i.e., Culturally Responsive Teaching). However, reading from a negotiated reading position via Gooden and Dantley's (2012) critically framed analytical framework (see Table 3), we found Section 1 yielded few semiotic codes to invoke critical self-reflection together with centering race within the broader context of social justice. Textbook introductions are designed to hook the reader, tell them what they will learn, and present a call to action; the authors accomplished this expertly from a traditional or mainstream point of view. However, the lack of semiotic codes invoking critical self-reflection and the centering of race for organizational and personal transformation, from our perspectives, is a missed opportunity and offered consideration for subsequent editions of the textbook.

Section 2, *Knowledge*, which includes Chapters 2-5, broadly presents prerequisite knowledge about ineffective schooling, andragogy, and educational beliefs. The authors presented "knowledge" in a manner that connoted the "knowledge" presented in the textbook as a comprehensive pathway (i.e., turnkey) to facilitate successful school supervision. Considering the broad audience for this textbook, we offer that the authors did so effectively. Semiotically, within the context of this textbook, we found that the authors presented semiotic codes that would resonate with a supervisor aiming to facilitate equity-minded and social justice outcomes in education. The authors produced semiotic codes that connoted prophetic messages and a pragmatic edge that supports praxis. Further, the authors produced semiotic codes that connoted the importance and need of critical self-reflection (e.g., Mezirow, 2002), use of different forms of Critical Theory (e.g., Critical Race Theory, Critical Multiculturalism) and appropriate pedagogical orientations (e.g., Culturally Responsive/Relevant Teaching), and the inclusion of race language within the broader context of social justice (e.g., Alston, 2014; Helms, 1993).

The following section, Section 3, yielded few semiotic codes corresponding with Gooden and Dantley (2012) analytical framework. Section 3, *Interpersonal Skills*, includes Chapters 6-11 and broadly discusses conceptions of self, a host of supervisory behaviors (e.g., directive control and informational behaviors, collaborative behaviors, nondirective behaviors), and developmental supervision. This section yielded nine excerpts that included an analyzed key concept, representing only 3.22% of the semiotic codes found within the Glickman et al. (2018) textbook. When reading this section from a negotiated reading position, together with the hegemonic construction of schooling, one may expect to see semiotic codes that would facilitate practices (e.g., critical self-reflection, racial and cultural awareness) that acknowledge and rid structures rooted in hegemony. Instead, we found that Section 3 grounded most of its conjecture in conceptions of democratic ways of knowing and doing (e.g., collaboration, finding consensus). We found notions of democracy (see Table 4) advanced by Glickman et al. (2018) were ambiguous, not critical, and did not center race or disrupt whiteness. Understanding that U.S. public schooling is a social institution with a majority-minority student population, we believe this to be a missed opportunity for the field and practice of supervision. In subsequent editions of this textbook, we offer that the authors consider adding scholarship (e.g., AntiRacist Education, Critical Whiteness Studies, variations of Critical Race Theory) that has semiotics that would empower supervisors to disrupt ideologies of whiteness with centering conceptions of race while understanding self within the context of their school supervision. Such additions could facilitate ridding a host of opportunity gaps (e.g., Ladson-Billings, 2006; Milner, 2020) observed in educational leadership and teacher programs and PreK-12 school systems.

Section 4, which includes Chapters 12-14, much like the previous section, yielded few codes via our semiotic analyst, representing 2.9% of semiotic codes found within the supervision textbook. This section, *Technical Skills*, broadly deals with formative teacher observation and evaluation. Within a progressive view and praxis of supervision, traditional teacher evaluation forms (e.g., summative evaluation) are a point of contention (e.g., Burns & Badiali, 2015; Mette et al., 2017). Glanz and Hazi (2019), in a historical overview, stated that "supervision neither narrowly and exclusively focuses on teacher evaluation" (p. 2); rather, supervision is a developmental context that privileges formative observation and evaluation processes, working with teachers to improve their teaching and enhance student learning. Notwithstanding, the semiotic codes yielded in this section, holistically, did not resonate with the aims put forth by Gooden and Dantley (see Table 3; 2012). In this section, semiotic codes, prophetic messages and pragmatic edge were present. However, virtually no semiotic codes singled the need to be critically self-reflective, a grounding in Critical Theory or appropriate pedagogical orientation, and inclusion of race language within the broader context of social justice. Educational theorists and scholars (e.g., Khalifa, 2020, Ladson-Billings, 1998) have offered conceptions of alternative formative assessments and observations (e.g., Culturally Responsive School Leadership, Culturally Relevant Teacher Assessment) that center students' race, cultural differences, and lived experiences. One may argue that the lack of culturally appropriate teacher assessments is a key factor in why supervision travels incognito (e.g., Glanz & Hazi, 2019) or is not situated prominently within mainstream educational leadership discourse communities. Accordingly, we see this as an opportunity or consideration for the authors of this textbook as well as the field of supervision to offer conceptions of culturally appropriate formative teacher observation, assessment, and evaluation.

The fifth section of Glickman et al. (2018), *Technical Task of Supervision*, includes Chapters 15-20. In this section, the authors, using ways of knowing and doing from previous sections and chapters, discussed and presented comprehensive concepts, methods, and case studies of how to facilitate collaborative and distributed forms of supervision expertly. Section 5 yielded the third most semiotic codes, representing 10.63% of codes found within the textbook. Semiotically, codes were evenly distributed across each of the NVivo nodes/codes (see Figure 2). Conceptions of key concepts of culture, democracy, and equity were prominent in this section, and in most cases, were serviceable in regards to equity-minded and social justice aims and outcomes. However, a missed opportunity or consideration was found in Chapter 19, in a discussion about curriculum and cultural diversity. The missed opportunity has to do with the discussion around Banks' (2013) four approaches to multicultural curriculum reform, which are listed below:

- **Level 1:** The Contributions Approach (e.g., acknowledging heroes, holidays, and discrete cultural elements specific to individuals from diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds)
- **Level 2:** The Additive Approach (e.g., adding culturally appropriate and congruent content and concepts to an already existing curriculum)
- **Level 3:** The Transformational Approach (e.g., changing the structure of the curriculum to reflect the perspectives of individuals from diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds)
- **Level 4:** The Social Action Approach (e.g., student-centered decision-making processes concerning important social issues)

Glickman et al. (2018), via Banks (2013), discussed how supervisors could integrate the above approaches within their supervision. Excerpts specific to this section in Chapter 19 yield each semiotic code or all of the tenets advanced by Gooden and Dantley's (2012) analytical framework. However, like other topics discussed in Section 5, we believe case studies or activities (e.g., role-playing) specific to the curriculum reform model advanced by Banks (2013) would have added immeasurable value to this section of the textbook and the field of supervision.

Lastly, Section 6, Cultural Task of Supervision, which includes Chapters 21-23, yielded the most semiotic codes, representing 44.12% of codes found within this section of the textbook. Further, semiotic codes, virtually, were evenly distributed across each NVivo node/code or tenants offered via Gooden and Dantley's (2012) analytical framework. The authors within this section, broadly, discuss how supervision as a field and practice can facilitate organizational and individual transformation through theory (e.g., Chaos Theory, Postmodern Theory, Education Change Theory), addressing diversity (e.g., Achievement Gaps, Gender Equity, Sexuality, Disabilities), and building community (e.g., Professional Learning Community, Community Engauge Practices). Accordingly, this section, semiotically, overwhelmingly aligns with tenets put forth by Gooden and Dantley (2012). Notwithstanding, we observed opportunities for the authors to consider. The first consideration has to do with Chapter 21: Facilitating Change, in which the authors offer theoretical pathways to facilitate change. The authors, in previous sections, explicitly offered discourse around Culturally Responsive Teaching, Multicultural Education, and Critical Theory variations (e.g., Critical Race Theory, Critical Feminism). Because of this observation, we believe further explanations of the theories and frameworks

mentioned above in Chapter 21 is warranted. Implicitly, we found that the authors broached topics associated with Cultural Competence, Critical Pedagogy, Critical Whiteness Studies, and AntiRacist Education. We believe considering these topics explicitly within Chapter 21 is also warranted. The next consideration we offer concerning this section has to do with Chapter 22: Addressing Diversity, specifically discussions associated with achievement gaps. Discussions around achievement gaps we feel are appropriate; however, we believe counter-narratives situated within discourse connected to opportunity gaps (e.g., Ladson-Billings, 2006; Milner, 2020) are equally important and needed. Last, we offer that semiotic codes in the vein of Gooden and Dantley's (2012) analytical framework ought to be increased and disseminated equitable throughout the whole supervision textbook. The textbook is used widely across the field and practice of educational leadership, and we believe taking into account the offered considerations will only broaden the textbook's impact. Further, these considerations can increase supervision situatedness or footprint within the broader educational leadership, equity-mindfulness, and social justice discourse communities, mitigating the field's current incognito status.

Implications

This investigation used semiotic analysis using Gooden and Dantley's (2012) analytical framework to understand how nine key concepts (e.g., Citizenship, Culturally Responsiveness, Equity, Race) or signs used broadly in education illustrate supervision's capacity to facilitate equity-minded and social justice schooling outcomes. Broadly, we found that the supervision by way of the Glickman et al. (2018) textbook illustrated the capacity to facilitate equity-minded and social justice outcomes through the following key concepts: Culturally Responsive Teaching and Gender equity. Conversely, we found limitations and opportunities associated with the remaining seven key concepts. Broadly, the limitations and opportunities for the seven concepts have to do with their ahistorical, apolitical, race-neutral constructions. Subsequently, we found such constructions, historically, have caused harm and widen opportunity gaps (viz., Ladson-Billings, 2006) for colleagues, students, and families from diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds and marginalized and otherized subgroups. However, supervision can and is beginning to play a central role in mitigating what Ladson-Billings (2006) referred to as the educational debt or unaddressed opportunities (i.e., opportunity gaps). Thus, we offer the subsequent implications and opportunities.

The implications and opportunities specific to this investigation, from our perspective, are one and the same. To explain further, supervision during the 2000s engaged in a paradigm shift, resulting in a "*shift away from conventional or congenial supervision toward collegial supervision*" (Glickman et al., 2018, p. 7). Through ongoing critical self-reflection and collegiality, this shift, which is teacher-centered, has endowed teachers with a sense of renewed agency and professionalism (Badiali et al., 2011; Zepeda, 2012). But, now, it is time for the field of supervision to situate itself prominently within educational discourses that center race and cultural differences within the broader context of social justice (e.g., Milner, 2017; Jacobs, 2014; Jacobs & Yendol-Hoppey, 2010). Supervision as a whole can no longer take ahistorical, apolitical, and race-neutral stances. The fact is, education is inherently political and is socially mediated by historical, cultural, institutional factors (e.g., race, class, gender, geography) (Howard, 2010). Ultimately, we believe that supervision can counter forces that maintain the sociocultural gap between school and students and families from diverse racial and ethnic

backgrounds and those who are marginalized and otherized in school. However, to do so, we must disrupt our notions which are informed by ideologies of whiteness, and (re)imagine and conduct new forms of supervision research and praxis. Further, we have to extend our discourse community to scholars who problematize and facilitate school change through critical and equity-minded frameworks, such as Critical Theory and its offshoots (e.g., Critical Race Theory, (Dis)Crit, AsianCrit, LatCrit, BlackCrit), Critical Whiteness Studies, and AntiRacist Education, Culturally Responsive School Leadership, Culturally Responsive/Relevant Teaching. Subsequently, we believe taking these actions will mitigate supervision's incognito status. Moreover, we believe these actions will provide Glickman et al. (2018) with additional semiotic signs and codes to help facilitate supervision in the spirit of Gooden and Dantley's (2012) analytical framework.

Conclusion

As discussed in the introduction and section above, implications for this article are intended to increase understanding around supervision's capacity to mitigate the sociocultural gap within U.S. PreK-12 school systems. Our proxy into the field and practice of supervision was through the seminal and foundational text authored by Carl D. Glickman, Stephen P. Gordan, and Jovita M. Ross-Gordon. Largely, we found opportunities for supervision to reestablish legitimacy by conducting research and facilitating praxis through the use of asset-based pedagogies together with centering race and cultural differences within the broader context of social justice. Ultimately, supervision as a field and practice aims to work collaboratively, empowering teachers to improve their teaching and enhance their students' learning. If the intent of this investigation is met with urgency, subsequently, we believe supervision will broaden its scope and observed impact, regaining prominence within the field of educational leadership and the broader context of education.

References

Aggarwal, U. (2016). The ideological architecture of whiteness as property in educational policy. *Educational Policy, 30*(1), 128-152. https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904815616486

Alston, G. D. (2014, May). Cross-cultural mentoring relationships in higher education: A feminist grounded theory study. *Doctoral dissertation*. Texas State University.

Ayers, W., Quinn, T., & Stovall, D. (2009). *Handbook of social justice in education.* Routledge.

Badiali, B. J., Nolan, J., Zembal-Saul, C., & Manno, J. (2011). Assessing the impact of the professional development school on mentors' classroom practice. In J. L. Nath, I. N. Guadarrama, & J. Ramsey, *Investigating university-school partnerships* (pp. 321-346). Information Age Publishing.

Banks, J. A. (2013). Multicultural education: Characteristics and goals. In J. A. Banks, C. A. Banks, J. A. Banks, & C. A. McGee Banks (Eds.), *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (8th Edition ed., pp. 3-23). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Barthes, R. (1972). *Mythologies.* Hill and Wang (Original work published 1957).

Bazeley, P., & Jackson, K. (2013). *Qualitative data analysis with NVivo.* Sage.

Bensimon, E. M., Rueda, R., Dowd, A. C., & Harris, F. I. (2007). Accountability, equity, and practitioner learning and change: In honor of William M. Plater. *Metropolitan Universities, 18*(3), 25-45.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2017). *Racism without racists: Color-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in America.* Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Burns, R. W., & Badiali, B. J. (2015). When supervision is conflated with evaluation: Teacher candidates' perceptions of their novice supervisor. *Action in Teacher Education, 37*(4), 418-437. https://doi.org/10.1080/01626620.2015.1078757

Cabrera, N. L., Franklin, J. D., & Watson, J. S. (2017). Whiteness in higher education: The invisible missing link in diversity and racial analyses. In K. Ward, & L. E. Wolf-Wendel, *ASHE Higher Education Report* (Vol. 42). John Wiley & Sons.

Castro, A. J. (2010). Themes in the research on preservice teachers' views of cultural diversity: Implications for researching millennial preservice teachers. *Educational Researcher, 39*(3), 198-210. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X10363819

Chandler, D. (2002). Textual interactions. In D. Chandler, *Semiotics: The basics* (pp. 175-206). Routledge.

Cogan, M. L. (1973). *Clinical supervision.* Houghton Mifflin Company.

Cormier, D. R. (2021). Assessing preservice teachers' cultural competence with the cultural proficiency continuum q-sort. *Educational Researcher, 50*(1), 17-29. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X20936670

Dantley, M. E. (2005). African American spirituality and Cornel West's notions of prophetic pragmatism: Restructuring educational leadership in American urban schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 4*, 651-674. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X04274274

Davis, L. J. (2016). *The disability studies reader.* Taylor & Francis Group.

De Saussure, F. (2011). *Course in general linguistics.* Columbia University Press.

Delgado, R., & Stefanic, J. (2017). *Critical race theory: An introduction* (Vol. Third Edition). New York University Press. https://doi.org/10.18574/9781479851393

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education.* Macmillan.

Digest of Education Statistics. (2016). *National Center for Educational Statistics.* Retrieved from National Center for Educational Statistics: https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d16/tables/dt16_203.50.asp

Easton-Brooks, D. (2019). *Ethnic matching: Academic success of students of color.* Rowman & Littlefield.

Emdin, C. (2016). *For White folks who teach in the hood... and the rest of y'all too: Reality pedagogy and urban education.* Beacon Press.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* Bloomsbury Academic.

Gay, G. (1993). Building cultural bridges: A bold proposal for teacher education. *Education and Urban Society*, 285-299.

Gay, G. (1998). Chapter 50: Cultural, ethnic, and gender issues. In G. R. Firth, & E. Pajak, *Handbook of research on school supervision* (pp. 1184-1227). Macmillan Library Reference USA.

Gay, G. (2018). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice* (2nd Edition ed.). Teachers College Press.

Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures.* Basic Books.

Glanz, J., & Hazi, H. M. (2019). Shedding light on the phenomenon of supervision traveling incognito: A field's struggles for visibility. *Journal of Educational Supervision*, 1-21. https://doi.org/10.31045/jes.2.1.1

Glanz, J., & Zepeda, S. J. (2015). *Supervision: New perspectives for theory and practice.* Rowman & Littlefield.

Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. (2010). *SuperVision and Instructional Leadership: A Developmental Approach.* Pearson.

Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (2018). *SuperVision and Instructional Leadership: A Developmental Approach.* Pearson.

Golombek, P. R., & Johnson, K. E. (2004). Narrative inquiry as a mediational space: Examining emotional and cognitive dissonance in second-language teachers' development . *Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice, 10*(3), 307-327. https://doi.org/10.1080/1354060042000204388

Gooden, M. A., & Dantley, M. (2012). Centering race in a framework for leadership preparation. *The University Council for Educational Administration, 7*(2), 237-254. https://doi.org/10.1177/1942775112455266

Goodley, D. (2016). *Disability studies: An interdisciplinary introduction.* Sage.

Gross, S. J., & Shapiro, J. P. (2016). *Democratic ethical educational leadership .* Routledge.

Helms, J. E. (1993). Introduction: Review of racial identity terminology. In J. E. Helms, *Black and White racial identity: Theory, research, and practice.* Praeger.

Hooper, M., & Bernhardt, V. (2016). *Creating capacity for learning and equity in schools: Instructional, adaptive, and transformational leadership.* Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315668697

Howard, T. C. (2010). *Why race and culture matter in schools: Closing the achievement gap in America's classrooms.* Teachers College Press.

Hoy, W. K., Gage III, C. Q., & Tarter, C. J. (2006). School mindfulness and faculty trust: Necessary conditions for each other? . *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 236-255. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X04273844

Hussar, B., Zhang, J., Hein, S., Wang, K., Roberts, A., Cui, J., . . . Dilig, R. (2020). *The Condition of Education 2020.* National Center for Education Statistics.

Jacobs, J. (n.d.). Fostering equitable school contexts: Bringing a social justice lens to field supervision. *Florida Association of Teacher Educators Journal, 1*(14), 1-16.

Jacobs, J., & Yendol-Hoppey, D. (2010). Supervisor transformation within a professional learning community. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 37*(2), 97-114.

Jay, M. (2003). Critical race theory, multicultural education, and the hidden curriculum of hegemony. *Multicultural Perspectives, 5*(4), 3-9. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327892MCP0504_2

Johnson, R. B., Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Turner, L. A. (2007). Toward a definition of mixed methods research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research, 1*(2), 112-133. https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689806298224

Kao, K. (2020, June 3). *Textbook by Professor Emeritus reaches No. 1 on Book Authority.* Retrieved from University of Georgia: https://coe.uga.edu/news/2020/06/textbook-by-professor-emeritus-reaches-no-1-on-book-authority

Khalifa, M. (2020). *Culturally responsive school leadership.* Harvard Education Press.

Khalifa, M. A., Gooden, M. A., & Davis, J. E. (2016). Culturally responsive school leadership: A synthesis of the literature. *Review of Educational Research, 86*(4), 1272-1311. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654316630383

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal, 32*(3), 465-491. https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312032003465

Ladson-Billings, G. (1998). Teaching in dangerous times: Culturally relevant approaches to teacher assessment . *Journal of Negro Education , 67*(3), 255-267. https://doi.org/10.2307/2668194

Ladson-Billings, G. (2006). From the achievement gap to the education debt: Understanding achievement in US schools. *Educational Researcher, 35*(7), 3-12. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X035007003

Ladson-Billings, G. (2016). Just what is critical race theory and what's it doing in a nice field like education? In E. Taylor, D. Gillborn, & G. Ladson-Billings, *Foundations of Critical Race Theory in Education (Critical Educator).* Routledge. https://doi.org/10.1080/095183998236863

Ladson-Billings, G. (2017). The (r)evolution will not be standardized. In D. Paris, & H. S. Alim, *Culturally sustaining pedagogies: Teaching and learning for justice in a changing world* (pp. 141-156). Teachers College Press.

Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. F. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Teachers College Record , 97*(1), 47-68.

Landis, R. J., & Koch, G. G. (1977). The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *Biometrics*, 159-174. https://doi.org/10.2307/2529310

Leonardo, Z. (2009). *Race, whiteness, and education.* Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203880371

Leonardo, Z. (2013). *Race frameworks: A multidimensional theory of racism and education.* Teachers College Press.

Leonardo, Z., & Manning, L. (2017). White historical activity theory: toward a critical understanding of white zones of proximal development. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 20*(1), 15-29. https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2015.1100988

Lindsey, R. B., Robins, K. N., & Terrell, R. D. (2009). *Cultural proficiency: A manual for school leaders.* Corwin.

Lindsey, R. B., Robins, K. N., Terrell, R. D., & Lindsey, D. B. (2019). *Cultural proficiency: A manual for school leaders.* Corwin.

Lynch, M. E. (2018). The hidden nature of whiteness in education: Creating active allies in white teachers. *Journal of Educational Supervision, 1*(1), 18-31. https://doi.org/10.31045/jes.1.1.2

Mette, I. M. (2017). The wicked problem of the intersection between supervision and evaluation. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education, 9*(3), 709-724. https://www.iejee.com/index.php/IEJEE/article/view/185

Mezirow, J. (2002). Learning to think like an adult: Core concepts of transformation theory. In J. Mezirow, & Associates, *Learning as transformation: Critical perspectives on a theory in progress* (pp. 3-34). Jossey-Bass Inc.

Milner IV, H. R. (2011, May 06). Let's focus on gaps in opportunity, not achievement. *Education Week*.

Milner IV, H. R. (2017). Where's the race in culturally relevant pedagogy? *Teachers College Record, 119*, 1-32.

Milner IV, H. R. (2020). *Start where you are, but don't stay there: Understanding diversity, opportunity gaps, and teaching in today's classrooms.* Harvard.

Radford, L. (2000). Signs and meanings in students' emergent algebraic thinking: A semiotic analysis. *Educational Studies in Mathematics, 43*(3), 237-268.

Saldaña, J. (2016). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers.* Sage.

Schreier, M. (2012). *Qualitative content analysis in practice.* Sage.

Sergiovanni, T. J., & Starratt, R. J. (2007). A framework for supervision. In T. J. Sergiovanni, & R. J. Starratt, *Supervision: A redefinition* (pp. 3-23). McGraw Hill.

Singleton, G. E. (2015). *Courageous conversations about race: A field guide for achieving equity in schools* (2nd Edition ed.). Corwin.

Stovall, D. (2006). Forging community in race and class: Critical race theory and the quest for social justice in education. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 9*(3), 243-259. https://doi.org/10.1080/13613320600807550

Tharp, R. G., & Gallimore, R. (1988). *Rousing minds to life: Teaching, learning, and schooling in social context.* Cambridge University Press.

Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (2002). Preparing culturally responsive teachers: Rethinking the curriculum. *Journal of Teacher Education, 53*(1), 20-32. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487102053001003

Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes.* Harvard University Press.

Wertsch, J. V. (1991). *Voices of the mind.* Harvard University Press.

Wirth, L. (1945). *The problem of minority groups.* Bobbs-Merrill Company Incorporated.

Zepeda, S. J. (2012). *Instructional supervision: Applying tools and concepts.* Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315855523

Author Biographies

Dwayne Ray Cormier is an assistant professor of education in the Department of Foundations of Education and a member of the iCubed Urban Education and Family Transdisciplinary Core at Virginia Commonwealth University. He received his Ph.D. in Curriculum and Instruction with an emphasis in Curriculum and Supervision from The Pennsylvania State University. Prior to his doctoral studies, Dwayne was a middle school science teacher in New Orleans, LA and Jacksonville, FL. Dwayne's research interest involves developing pedagogical structures and processes that bridge sociocultural gaps between educational stakeholders and students and families who are minoritized, marginalized, and otherized in school.

Toshnay Pandey is a Postdoctoral Research Associate at the University of Virginia with Drs. Catherine Bradshaw and Jessika Bottiani on projects seeking to improve teachers' and students' equity stamina and literacy, redirect challenging behaviors in the classroom, and facilitate positive student-teacher engagement. She received her Ph.D. in Special Education at Virginia Commonwealth University, where she studied school-based behavior interventions and educational equity and served as a teacher coach for Pre-K and Early Elementary school teachers. Her research interests include investigating culturally-responsive behavior interventions for racially and ethnically minoritized students and teacher professional development to enhance students' socio-emotional competencies and teachers' equity-mindfulness.