Chapter 19: Race and educational leadership
Mark A. Gooden (Columbia University, USA) and Victoria Showunmi (University College London, UK).

What this chapter is about …

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a discussion on educational leadership in the context of race and leadership in the US and UK. The chapter will describe some of the key leadership issues facing leaders in the US and UK. As we move towards a more diverse understanding of leadership, it is timely to open up a dialogue on race and its importance in educational leadership while using two different countries as backdrops. Thinking about leadership through a critical lens will ensure that race is included in leadership development, research and theory.

The key questions this chapter answers are:

- Why is race important to leadership, both in the US and UK?
- How does race and educational leadership influence one another in these two countries?
- How might using a case study analysis clarify some of the concepts and issues in studying race and educational leadership?
- What can an autobiographical approach contribute to the study of race and educational leadership?

The research studies which have been included in the chapter will use the questions as a framework to address our respective perspectives as US and UK citizens who are considered racialized people. At this stage it would be useful to introduce us as the two authors. Dr. Mark Gooden is a professor based in Teachers College, Columbia University. His work focuses on anti-racist leadership, culturally responsive school leadership, and the law. Dr. Victoria Showunmi is an academic based at University College London in the Institute of Education. Her work focuses on gender, identity, and race and how it interconnects with educational leadership. Her scholarship is grounded in the use of auto ethnography which is a form of qualitative research in which an author uses self-reflection and writing to explore anecdotal and personal experience and connect this autobiographical story to wider cultural, political, and social meanings and understandings. Both authors use narrative as a way to present their work in educational leadership. Whilst we have given a brief background on race and educational leadership, it is important that we provide a rationale and whilst situating the work in the US and UK. Given that many of the

==scholars who research and publish on diversity, gender and or race and educational leadership in the UK have been White.== Therefore, the notion of race has floated under the banner of leadership and diversity. Marianne Colman was the first scholar in the UK to conduct research in diversity and leadership and challenge the status quo. Since opening up the debate much more research has been conducted on the sociological concepts of leadership and the need for leadership to reflect the diverse communities in the UK. Before we continue with the chapter it is necessary to give a brief discussion on race / racism and how this interconnects with leadership.

Definition Box

Diversity refers to difference pointing to a person or group of persons that is unlike, or differing from the majority. But viewed from those who are in power, diversity operates under a proliferation of (White) cultural norms often taken to be (race) neutral, and these dynamics are produced and reproduced in multiple aspects of society, without any provocation.

Equity refers to the appropriate treatment of those who have been historically and legally deprived of resources, access, and power. It seeks ideally to make the marginalised whole, or ultimately equal.

Race refers to all human beings belong to a single species and share a common origin. They are born equal in dignity and rights and all form an integral part of humanity. All peoples of the world possess equal faculties for attaining the highest level in intellectual, technical, social, economic, cultural and political development. The differences between the achievements of the different people are entirely attributable to geographical, historical, political, economic, social and cultural factors. Such differences can in no case serve as a pretext for any rank ordered classification of nations or peoples.

Racism refers to any action or attitude, conscious or unconscious, which subordinates an individual or group based on skin colour or race. It can be enacted individually or institutionally. Racism is a historical, social, cultural, political, and institutional relationship between White people and people of colour. The relationship

is built into the very fabric of society. Black Minority Ethnic (BME), Black, people of colour and African-American are used interchangeably throughout the chapter.

Gas-lighting refers to a form of psychological manipulation in which a person seeks to sow seeds of doubt in a targeted individual or in members of a targeted group, making them question their own memory, perception, and sanity.

Microaggression refers to a term used for brief and commonplace daily verbal, behavioural, or environmental indignities, whether intentional or unintentional, that communicate hostile, derogatory, or negative prejudicial slights and insults toward any group, particularly culturally marginalized groups.

Inclusion refers to a process of sharing power with previously excluded and marginalised people. It provides marginalised people with a sense of belonging, making them feel welcome and that they are an important part of the organization. Someone said diversity is inviting marginalised people to the party but inclusion is asking them to dance.

Institutionalised racism (also known as systemic *racism*) refers to a form of *racism* expressed in the practice of social and political *institutions.* It is reflected in disparities regarding wealth, income, criminal justice, employment, housing, health care, political power and education, among other factors.

Racially and ethnic consciousness refers to the **awareness** of membership in a **racial** or ethnic group that is displayed by both group members and the larger society in which they reside. The concept embodies both popular and social scientific understandings of classification and membership.

White racial avoidance refers to an exertion of power. It is the proposed idea by a person working within a White supremacist system that s/he can use the privileged power of that system to employ an authority that avoids discussing race, thus re-directing the conversation away from race, or ignoring it altogether. It is an invoking of one's power and recognized authority within a White system, though it might not be exclusively practiced by Whites.

White privilege-refers to the legitimization of one's entitlement to resources, it does not require awareness or agreement by benefitting Whites to exist.

White ignorance- implies the possibility of a contrasting "knowledge," a contrast that would be lost if all claims to truth were equally spurious, or just a matter of competing discourses

Introduction

In workplaces around the world, organizations are characterised by 'inequality regimes' (Acker, 2006), with '… loosely interrelated practices, processes, actions and meanings that result in and maintain class, gender and racial inequalities within particular organisations' (ibid, p.443). Diversity as a science recognises that individual attitudes and behaviours surrounding difference occur in the context of historically, culturally and socially embedded realities/beliefs/frameworks.

For tackling these inequalities, scholars worldwide are likely to start with the North American literature, the primary source of organisational research on ethnicity and diversity (Jonsen, Maznevski & Schneider, 2011). In the US, there are differential social and economic experiences between Hispanic, African-American, Asian and White ethnicities, among others. Typically, African Americans are disadvantaged with regard to employment, health, housing and education (Plaut, 2010). However, the ethnic group distribution differs between the US and the UK. In the US, the largest racial minority group is Black (African- Caribbean, African or African American (12.6%). In contrast, the largest minority ethnic group in the UK is the South Asian population (5.9%). Context-sensitivity is necessary for all locations in which diversity management and research is conducted (Özbilgin, 2009).

In the UK between 1997 and 2006, almost all Vice-Chancellors (VCs) appointed were White, 23% had studied at Oxford or Cambridge universities, and 85% were male. Until 2011 there had only ever been one VC from a Black and minority ethnic background – a male and non-UK national, (Bahra, 2011) however during the past 24 months, there have been three new BME VC appointments, two female and one male made in England.

The pattern of hierarchical segregation across gender and racial/ethnic lines encountered in higher education careers is similar in the UK political sphere. In the UK, Black Minority Ethnic (BME) members of parliament currently number only 27 out of 649 (4.2%) (Sealy et al, 2012). Of these, only eight are BME women – under a third of all BME Members of Parliament (MP's). In contrast to education and politics, there is cause for guarded optimism in the business sector in regards to women in the most senior positions in the largest companies. In 2012, 15% of directorships of FTSE[i] 100 companies are held by women (Sealy et al, 2012), representing a 2.5% increase from a three-year plateau. However, when taking into account gender, nationality and ethnicity of FTSE 100 company directors, only 9.9% of female directors are from minority ethnic groups, and only one of these is a UK national. The pattern evident in business thus replicates the gender and ethnic profiles of leadership in higher education and politics, whereby career progression reflects ethnic and gender penalties.

Organisations are microcosms of societies within which they are embedded, and work cannot be understood outside the context of the socio-cultural arena in which it is enacted. Organisational dynamics often mirror societies' structures, beliefs and tensions, including less favourable outcomes for minority ethnic individuals and women in many Western societies. As such, ethnicity scholars are continuously urged to acknowledge the socially-constructed and contextual nature of ethnicity in organisations. There are many scholars such as Acker (2006) who have noted that hierarchies are gendered, racialised and classed, especially when it comes to leadership in Europe and the US.

Leadership theory, however, has traditionally suppressed and neutralised 'difference', including gender and race/ethnic dimensions. Much of the data collected on early leadership research was gathered in business, military and government settings, from White, Anglo-Saxon men in leadership positions. Leadership publications have reflected this bias. Osler (2006) points out that textbooks aimed at aspiring school leaders published in the 1980s and 1990s in Britain rarely referred to equity, even though by then minority ethnic communities were well-established in this country. This was mirrored in academic journals and educational management courses where race equality was rarely a topic of interest even though ethnicity was known to be a factor in student attainment.

Similar to the "suppression" mentioned above, many US school leaders and preparation programs have embraced a race-neutral, post-racial, or colorblind approach to leadership. Unchallenged and uninterrogated views assume that 60 years after the now famous *Brown v Board of Education* (1954) case, all have equal access to education and schools are welcoming places. Here we introduce the *Williams v. Port Huron School District*[1] (2012) (hereinafter *Williams*), which, along with contemporary US literature thusly challenges those assumptions by showing an outward and explicit occurrence of how racism impacts leadership in contemporary times, in egregious and subtle ways. In fact, the *Williams* case reveals how Whites not only can and do maintain control over districts, but how they use their power to ignore or redefine power relationships in schools, actions that lead to what we refer to as White racial avoidance.

White racial avoidance, as defined above, is an exertion of power but it is often difficult to detect. To help with this task, we below consider the Williams case in detail in the U.S. context. It is a legal case that was appealed from a federal district court to a higher federal court of appeals. The case identifies how White racial avoidance surfaces, builds momentum, and continues unabated. That lower court had found that the school officials were entitled to qualified immunity.

More Reflecting on the *Williams* case

Our case study illustrates some troubling realities. The school district, Port Huron Northern High School is predominantly White (approximately 89%). The school resides in an area that is also predominantly White, also reflected in the racial make-up of school. There are about 3% Black students. This percentage is so small that it is easy to understand why those Black students would feel isolated or unwelcome. Adding to this sentiment, the school administration's response to the racial harassment by the White students is ineffective. Is it reasonable to expect school leaders to protect these Black students from student to student racial harassment, or racial bullying, a term we have defined as being bullied because of your race?

---

[1] *Williams v. Port Huron School District*, No. 10-1636 (6th Cir. Jan. 9, 2012).

Reflecting on the Wiliams case

In *Williams,* a 6th Circuit Court of Appeals ruled that individual school administrators and school board members were entitled to qualified immunity from a suit brought by a group of African-American students. Their parents alleged that the school officials in the Port Huron School District had violated their children's Fourteenth Amendment equal protection rights by acting with deliberate indifference to student-on-student racial harassment. According to the African-American students who attended the school, their White classmates subjected them to constant peer racial harassment that ran the gamut from name-calling, especially free use of the word "nigger," displays of the Confederate flag on campus, to several instances of vandalism on school grounds involving racial slurs as graffiti. Court records indicate that Cheryl Wojitas, the principal during the first 2 years of this harassment, did absolutely nothing to address an unwelcoming and unsafe environment. One wonders whether Principal Wojitas was prepared to address racial issues at the school or was afraid, or simply unwilling to do so. Regardless, she took no official action and failed to launch any investigations into the troubling behavior. In a puzzling but not uncommon display of power, district officials promoted Wojitas within the district to a central office position.

After the Wojitas promotion, the district hired Principal Dahlke, and though it was rather easy to raise the bar and make more of an effort than the first principal, he at least acknowledged the school's racial issue by his efforts. For example, Dahlke installed surveillance cameras in an attempt to catch those students who committed infractions and plastered the school with racist graffiti. Strangely, after one year of trying, Dahlke was unable to find any students guilty of wrongdoing. These events all happened during the 2003-2006 time period. For three years, school leaders did not punish a single White student for serious infractions that undoubtedly impacted the climate of the school, especially for Black students.

Why not? Officially, the court of appeals concluded that the Black students failed to establish a violation of their constitutional rights based on the school administrators' deliberate indifference to the harassment because they could not show that the administrators' response "to the harassment or lack thereof [was] clearly unreasonable in light of the known circumstances." As noted in the case, at one point in these events, the Principal Dahlke appears to justify White students' use of racial slurs as he expresses confusion while implying that African American students who refer to themselves using the N-word may be contributing to the issue[2]. While admittedly this case is an contains some odd behaviour by leaders, it reifies and explains two major issues in race and leadership. First, school leaders can use power to invoke racial avoidance and even go unpunished when they fail to do this part of their job as principals. Second, leaders who have not explored racial issues and how to respond can very well respond in inappropriate ways, and thus maintain the safety of unruly White students at the cost of creating an unsafe and unwelcoming environment for other students. For instance, the noncompliant White students were interestingly presumed innocent and remained as such for three years, even as the Black students, presumed responsible for using the N-word at a point, found no justice and were even accused of being complicit in their own punishment within this school. In another type of example of oppression, the administrators' response would be commonly referred to as "blaming the victim."

While it might be easy for many of us to conclude that the US principals in this case were just a case of poor leaders and/or bad people who refused to act, we argue that there is another truth here that likely supports their invoking of racial avoidance. Our study of education leadership as practiced in schools and as taught in leadership preparation programs in the US teaches us that racial avoidance, though not expressly named, is common-place in many educational leadership K-12 and higher education campuses. Another way to consider racial avoidance is to recognize it is an attribute where school leaders and/or their teachers fail to adroitly, intentionally, or routinely engage in conversations about race, racism, or racist

---

[2] *Id.* at 4.

occurrences in schools, and therefore take no action. This separation of race from leadership work can be generally learned from society but it is often reinforced by faculty, albeit tacitly, who teach these students in leadership preparation programs.

The school leaders in this case study are asserting White racial avoidance as a basis of power, which is supported by their positional power as White administrators to virtually ignore the safety and welfare of the Black students in the school, primarily. Additionally, they are failing to ensure the safety of a Black assistant principal on their leadership team, and the other students in the school as they witness this behaviour with no consequences at first, and only minor admonishment subsequently. We will use this US case study to demonstrate how that power is constructed in contemporary thinking and practice in educational leadership through three commonly used terms: Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion. In addition we will also show how even with these terms in play, Whites who wish to are able to use their power in particularized ways to control the narrative and how it operates within organizations, including schools.

In the US, **racism and racialization** play out across these three terms that are intended to be helpful to address historic inequities. However, due to power dynamics, the goals of the following terms are easily co-opted and thus become weakened and even used against people of colour, who are supposedly intended as beneficiaries. Terms **Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion a**re generally taken to address challenges stemming from racism, such as discrimination and historic inequities. However, we have found instances where the terms, at a minimum, fail to engender impactful conversations and for sure stop short of bringing about large-scale changes. Why? Because all of these terms gather different meanings, especially relative to power of the actor who has various degrees of agency within the system. For us, race is ultimately about power arrangements in society and leadership, and we hope to demonstrate that in what follows.

Let's start with **Diversity**, which refers to difference pointing to some person or group of persons that is unlike, or differing from the majority. Viewed from those who are in power, diversity operates under a proliferation of (White) cultural norms often taken to be race neutral, and these dynamics are produced and reproduced in multiple aspects of society, without any provocation. Such norms have influenced

everything in education from housing patterns, schooling arrangements, distribution of resources, and hiring patterns. Consequently, it creates and influences controlled diversity approaches, which have supported the maintenance of homogeneity, causing well-meaning Whites to realize that having a lack of difference is not only problematic, but it looks strange. Diversity, along with racial avoidance, creates a world that shows a set of beliefs reified in determining who gets access, if we examine the visible indicator of race. Diversity, then, becomes limited to adding a small percentage of people of colour. So, who controls diversity and who benefits from it?

In the case study, Black students were not the only ones subjected to racial harassment. Note that then Assistant Principal, Marla Philpot, was also left unsupported by her principal. Note that as a Black woman, she was the only "professional staff" who was Black, yet she was being racially harassed and bullied. For instance, when Assistant Principal Philpot was hired in 2003, within her first week at Port Huron Northern, she found Ku Klux Klan paraphernalia and White supremacist literature placed on or around her desk. Before that school year ended, both students and parents had blatantly and repeatedly called Ms. Philpot a "nigger". In fact, one parent showed up at the school spewing racial slurs with the expressed intent to assault Philpot after she disciplined her son, presumably as a requirement of her job as a principal. We provide this vivid account to illustrate the kind of climate that proliferated at the school. Why would the head principal allow such egregious behaviour to continue?

Instead of Ms. Philpot's fellow principals arguing that more teachers and leaders of colour must be hired as an effort to support her feeling less isolated, they largely ignored the racial animus directed at the only Black principal. Again, the term diversity has been defined in the context of racial avoidance and the school leaders take it no further than hiring one Black school leader. Practices that result from racial avoidance often leave school leaders confused when they set out to hire teachers and diversify their teaching force in the process. Those leaders who have not reflected upon race are extremely proud when they hire *the one* Black teacher or one Black principal, never pausing to consider what life must be like for those individuals being one of a few, or worst, the only one. Though played out in silent ways, these

power dynamics are indeed no less harmful, and using diversity, diverse, or difference in this way undermines true efforts to achieve equity and truly do little to nothing to disturb the taken for granted power structure. Regardless of school demographics, many leaders subscribed to this view of diversity and apply this principle of racial avoidance in hiring practices.

Diversity in American schools is usually considered a forced goal to consider because demographers continue to state that students in US school districts are becoming more and more racially and culturally diverse, especially those learning in the urban context. However, as student diversity increases, the teaching and leading workforce remains largely White (80% White and female; and 80% White, respectively). That means the leaders in Port Huron, like those across the US, have to work with intentionality to recruit teachers of colour, a goal that is easily undercut by using race-neutral or racial avoidance techniques. What else does it mean? While teachers who are White are not necessarily ill-prepared to teach children of colour, many have not been exposed broadly to children of colour. Therefore, the teachers, regardless of race, often end up being culturally very different from those students they have set out to teach. Hence, diversity in the US context around race becomes challenging because there is a cultural mismatch between those educators and their students.

This leads to **inclusion**, which is a process of sharing power with previously excluded and marginalised people. It presents them with a sense of belonging, making them feel welcome and that they are an important part of the organization. Someone said diversity is inviting marginalised people to the party, but inclusion is asking them to dance. While some school districts have attempted to be more inclusive and invite more teachers of colour into their schools, those districts have failed. Before we elaborate, let us recognize that in the US, a number of teachers of colour were fired soon after the famous *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954) decision. This history is important because it gives us an example of how school boards used their power to demonstrate their dissatisfaction with the *Brown* decision and to again punish the supposed beneficiaries of the edict to desegregate schools. When teachers of colour were retained, many were reduced in job status and often not given teaching positions at all. What happens to Philpot next demonstrates that

history is not too far from the present for Black educators because as the only Black administrator she indeed experienced diminished status. Moreover, her inclusion in the process of decision making, that is, the dynamic power structure, is very limited. For example, Philpot is the target of multiple, racially charged attacks from White parents that openly and irreverently question her authority and her leadership. Though it is hard to imagine she received absolutely no support, there is little evidence from her principal defending her against her attackers.

So, Ms. Philpot has to work at the school and withstand the abuse from White students and their parents. This, as in US history, is an example of a Black educator being demeaned by students with no comradery on the side of the principal to support her. Hence, inclusion, when considering impact is more salient than diversity alone. Alas, in this case, inclusion benefits the school district more than the Black educator. In other words, the school district gets to say that we have included our diverse (difference of one) principal on our administrative team, but we have not provided her with power or truly recognized her authority(inclusion) to serve as a school leader. In essence, few benefits came to Philpot in this arrangement, so one has to wonder does she feel included or tokenised.

Finally, we address the idea of **equity** and power. To define, we first note that equity is different from equality. Equality purports to treat everyone equally, and it assumes that we all start from the same place in time, space, resources, access, etc. In other words, it says in the eyes of the system, we are all equal and have equal chances. Whilst this sounds very good, it is squarely challenged by evidence that marginalised people have been historically and legally deprived of resources, access, and power for many decades. Equity, then, is defined as the appropriate treatment of those who have been historically and legally deprived of resources, access, and power, seeking ideally to make them whole, or equal. From the perspective of a person of colour, Philpot would like to be included with the full privileges and the idea to be recognised and respected as a leader in her own right. From the perspective of the White administrator, he gathers the benefit of her presence and sets out to treat her equally. However, without an analysis of race infused in his work, specifically the goal of supporting her, he fails to consciously recognized this mishap. Principal Dahlke may genuinely want Ms. Philpot to be there

but he offers no solution for the racially-tinged issues that crop up and threaten the quality of her experience and her well-being. Recall that equity is about providing people with what they are entitled too even if we treat them differently. Even though Ms. Philpot is situated differently because of her (mis)treatment due to racism (stemming from hate of her skin colour), the principal treats her "equally". The actively engaged quest for equity is a stronger action than diversity and inclusion, as it assumes power is truly being shared as a result of historical, legal, and social deprivations. Principal Dahlke's acknowledgement of equity fails.

Using **Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion** we have tried to demonstrate with a critical lens the crucial focus on power that Whites hold in this paradigm, especially if they innately choose racial avoidance. White leaders are not required by US society to admit that they possess power within the system, or even assert they have power and activate it, for it to work. In fact, most do not unless they feel threatened, or deprived because of "unfair independent actions" in the system. Accordingly, in the Port Huron case, White leaders decide to use their power of "silence" to say little to criticize the racial harassment initially. It is technically inaccurate to say they are doing nothing. Principal Dahlke is observing the occurrences, taking some steps, but ultimately stopping short of true, meaningful actions. Less can be said about the actions of Wojitas and others. Still, despite the transparent bullying behaviour that takes place at the school, the court still finds that the principals, superintendents, and the board are all entitled to qualified immunity (protection) from the threat of being sued for student on student racial harassment. After all, racial avoidance is not illegal and it can be and is performed frequently by Whites without social penalty as well. In other words, the school leaders exercised their power without taking a single impactful action to combat the harassment and protect Black students. Though this (il)legitimate use of power may be attractive to some as it is a path of least resistance, it is the wrong path to pursue if one desires to be a racially aware principal. Taking the race avoidance approach causes more challenges for current and practicing principals. School leaders must get the proper training to better address such difficult issues relative to race. After all, principals and other school leaders have agency to make major changes within their respective districts.

> **Reflection Box**
>
> Let's take a moment to use the questions and critically reflect on the case study which has been presented;
>
> - With a critical focus on power relations, structure and agency, how is the construction of race problematic in educational leadership?
> - What is the effect of this treatment of race and leadership on practice and conceptualisations?
> - What can you do to change the current state of affairs relative to race and leadership?

Engaging in conversations where leaders examine their practice will truly help them to develop a proactive approach which will enable them to better grasp some of these issues before challenges pop up, such as those discussed in the case above. In our view, the changing demographics in America and England point to the fact that the time is beyond ripe to deeply incorporate a proactive approach that integrates race within our work in educational leadership. The growing racial and cultural diversity of schools in the U.S. provides an opportunity to engage leaders in these conversations and related training. These conversations should be included in the training of aspiring principals, meaning those who are in graduate school working to obtain their principal certification. However, those who are currently practicing in the field can also benefit from this type of training. Therefore, we recommend making post-degree programs available to those school leaders who likely were not exposed to anti-racist conversations and work during their graduate programs. Though mere exposure to race conversations and ways to consider integrating this into her work are clearly no panacea, this approach represents a step in the right direction. Also note, absent any amount of exposure, we frequently see instances in the US and England where leaders become embroiled in "no response or confusing response" methodology in situations when race 'enters' the school setting.

There are some needed changes to mitigate the issues of racial avoidance. First, racial avoidance can be thought of as a broader scheme of White responses to

race and racism. We want to clarify that in the US this response is not just limited to White actors, though it is largely impacted by a system where White is regarded as the superior cultural norm. For example, Philpot responded to racial incidents but she had to respond within the paradigm that was (re)constructed within the school by the White school leaders, White children and their parents who were responsible for helping create the racially hostile environment and community. It is important to note that these actors all drew their power from a system of White supremacy. We acknowledge that *Williams* in some ways appears to be an extreme case study but we hasten to add that there are two relevant nuanced points to recognize and honour in its useful explanatory power. First, the *Williams* case represents an extreme illustration of what happens in much subtler, but no less powerful, ways each day in schools and society. Second, we have found that in the subtle cases that often are not broadcast loudly or broadly in the media, or that make it to court, that is where White cultural norms remain powerful at controlling resources, limiting access, and diminishing growth of children and professionals of colour.

To illustrate and provide some practical applications, we next select some options that speak directly to practice. First, we will choose some of the examples from the case. Where appropriate we will point to some examples in the media that also support our research and the case example. The hope here is to provide teachable moments by illustrating how some of the recommended approaches directly speak to actions that leaders and/or faculty can adopt to address issues before they blow out of proportion.

How does race leadership differ from other styles of leadership?

This section unpacks the range of concepts used when talking about race and leadership. Shedding light on the terms frequently used to communicate the differences in leadership to include terms such as **racially conscious, White racial dis-consciousness, and White privilege**. Individually, when used this terminology is empowering, however when used to describe race and leadership in contrast to White leadership the terms and practices in many cases lead to detrimental outcomes for race and leadership.

There is ample evidence to demonstrate that Black leaders are always working against the negative images and stereotypes presented in the media (Osler

& Webb, 2014). Black leaders are subjected to double minority discrimination along with micro-aggressions which "are the subtle verbal and nonverbal slights, insults, and disparaging messages directed towards an individual due to their gender, age, disability, and racial group membership often automatically and subconsciously" (Prieto, Norman, Phipps, & Chenault, (2016) p. 36) What happens when an individual occupies more than one of these categories, for example, is both gay and Chinese or both female and Black? Leaders like these exist at an intersection of recognized sites of oppression.

More recently, research suggests that the social identity group to which a leader belongs is considered a significant factor in leader effectiveness and the extent to which a leader may feel able to enact that identity (van Knippenberg, 2011). From a sociological perspective, this is explained by the extent to which the leader and the group see themselves as part of a collective, or share the same social identity.

Given the information included in the critical racial autobiographical case study we need to consider points raised and the way in which racial avoidance played out in the everyday experience of the appointed leader. The lack of recognition given to racial avoidance contributes to the hostile environment the leader struggles to navigate to achieve the intended goals of the newly appointed post. The reoccurring question which needs to be addressed is what triggered the micro-aggression towards the Black female leaders? Let's take a moment to use the questions and critically reflect on the case study which has been presented:

Activity Box

- **How is the construction of White racial avoidance a problem in this narrative?**
- **What can be learnt from this experience?**
- **What must be in place when recruiting and developing Black leaders?**

Conclusion

This chapter has given the reader the opportunity to explore some of the issues and challenges relating to race and educational leadership. Using the two different examples in the form of a case study and narrative from each country illustrates how meanings and terms are situational and context specific. Drawing on both examples, we have tried to capture and critically analyse both presented experiences with the

aid of core questions to frame that analysis. Exploring and understanding how racial avoidance is a form of implicit racism involves an important set of actions. Doing so can support and understanding of how a person's unconscious negative evaluations of racial or ethnic minorities can be realised by a persistent avoidance of interactions with other racial and ethnic groups. When we reflect on the chapter, having the conversation on race and educational leadership is indeed an ongoing step towards change and progression.

What are the 3 'takeaways' learned from this chapter?

1. Racism is complex and requires an understanding of how it works on a systemic level in order to properly address it.

2. In a world that is becoming more racially and culturally diverse, it is irresponsible to train leaders without relevant engagement with race and culture.

3. It is possible to address race and leadership in a manner that is positive, productive, and supportive of leaders' development.

References

Acker, J. (2006). Inequality regimes: Gender, class, and race in organizations. *Gender & society*, *20*(4), 441-464.

Breakwell, G. M., & Tytherleigh, M. Y. (2008). UK university leaders at the turn of the 21st century: Changing patterns in their socio-demographic characteristics. *Higher Education*, *56*(1), 109-127.

Jonsen, K., Maznevski, M. L., & Schneider, S. C. (2011). Special Review Article: Diversity and its not so diverse literature: An international perspective. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, *11*(1), 35-62.

Van Knippenberg, D. (2011). Embodying who we are: Leader group prototypicality and leadership effectiveness. *The leadership quarterly*, *22*(6), 1078-1091.

Osler, A. (2006). Changing leadership in contexts of diversity: visibility, invisibility and democratic ideals. *Policy Futures in Education*, *4*(2), 128-144.

Özbilgin, M. F. (2009). From journal rankings to making sense of the world. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *8*(1), 113-121.

Prieto, L. C., Norman, M. V., Phipps, S. T., & Chenault, E. (2016). Tackling Micro-Aggressions in Organizations: A Broken Windows Approach. *Journal of Leadership, Accountability & Ethics*, *13*(3).

Sealy, R., & Vinnicombe, S. (2012). The female FTSE board report 2012: milestone or millstone?

Further reading

1) Curtis, S., & Showunmi, V. (2019). Black Women Leaders: Intersectional and Present in the Field of Education 'Hear Our Voice'. In Miller, P., & Callender, C. (Eds.), *Race, Education and Educational Leadership: An Integrated Analysis*. United Kingdom: Bloomsbury Academic.

2) Gooden, M.A., & Dantley, M. (2012). Centering race in a framework for leadership preparation. Journal of Research on Leadership in Education 7(2), 235-251.

3) Gooden, M.A. & O'Doherty, A. (2015). Do you see what I see? Fostering aspiring leaders' racial awareness. Urban Education 50(2), 225-255.

4) Miller, P. (Ed.). (2016). *Cultures of educational leadership: Global and intercultural perspectives*. Springer.

5) Showunmi, V. (2018). Interrupting Whiteness: An Auto-Ethnography of a Black Female Leader in Higher Education. In McNae, R., & Reilly, E.C. (Eds.), *Women Leading Education Across the Continents: Finding and Harnessing the Joy in Leadership* (pp. 128-135) London: Rowman & Littlefield.

---

i

Definition of **FTSE** 100. The **Financial Times Stock Exchange** 100 share index; an average of share prices in the 100 largest, most actively traded companies on the London Stock Exchange.