A Bourdieusian Approach to Educational Leadership in Culturally Diverse Schools

Peter Moyi, Rose Ylimaki, Suzy Hardie, and Jingtong Dou

Abstract As student populations become increasingly diverse, there is urgency to explain relationships between leaders and students from culturally diverse backgrounds. While many leadership scholars have recently drawn attention to student diversity and the need for culturally responsive leadership, few researchers have theorized leadership from a Bourdieusian perspective. A Bourdieuian perspective explains leadership-student relations considering capital, fields, and habitus. We argue these concepts are essential for contemporary leadership theory, policy, and practice in diverse schools. Capital is at the core of Bourdieu's theory of social reproduction. (Bourdieu, P. (1977a). Cultural reproduction and social reproduction. In Karabel, J. & Halsey, A.H. (Eds.), Power and ideology in education (pp. 487–511), New York: Oxford.) argues upper-class students are advantaged not by the merit of their experiences but by the unequal value bestowed to these experiences by schools. He introduces the concept of habitus as the dispositions acquired through life experiences in different dimensions, and theorizes that the social world is divided into fields. Each field has a set of practices, and people who dominate and are dominated. Using habitus and field, researchers can examine the dispositions, traits, and practices of school leaders, as they operate across a number of fields, each with different power structures and properties. This chapter lays the groundwork for theorizing relationships among individual educational leaders and increasingly pluralistic communities so as to further inform empirical research. We construct a framework grounded in the theoretical logic of sociology beyond organizational and critical theories that explains relationships between leaders and students from culturally diverse backgrounds

P. Moyi (✉) · R. Ylimaki · S. Hardie · J. Dou
University of South Carolina, Columbia, US
e-mail: moyi@mailbox.sc.edu

R. Ylimaki
e-mail: ylimakir@mailbox.sc.edu

S. Hardie
e-mail: sehardie@mailbox.sc.edu

J. Dou
e-mail: jdou@email.sc.edu

1 Changing Demographics, Changing Cultures, and the Need for a New Leadership Approach

The world is being reshaped by global migration. According to the data from the United Nations, there are more than 250 million migrants worldwide who are living outside of their birth countries (Pew Research Center 2018). In 2017, about 49.7 million people living in the United States were born in other countries (Pew Research Center 2018). The U.S. Census Bureau (2014), projects the number of foreign-born United States residents will rise to 78.2 million by 2060 (Colby and Ortman 2015). As the United States becomes more pluralistic, school leaders need to be prepared to lead schools with greater student diversity in ways that bring education and democracy closer together. If we are to fulfill the democratic prospect articulated by John Dewey (1916), educational leaders must be able to mediate among culturally diverse individuals, schools, and communities.

Pierre Bourdieu was an influential social theorist of the twentieth century (Calhoun and Wacquant 2002; Grenfell 2010). In education, Bourdieu is best known for his theory of social and cultural reproduction. Bourdieu's research identified the central role that schools play in reproducing social and cultural inequalities. The work of Bourdieu is also useful for theorizing educational leadership (Lingard and Christie 2003). Bourdieu's theoretical approach sought to go beyond the structure-individual agency conundrum in sociology using his "thinking tools"—habitus, capital, and field. According to Lingard and Christie (2003), Bourdieu provides "a way through that central sociological conundrum and a way to allow for contextual constraints and individual possibilities within the work of principals" (p. 319). Yet few researchers (Lingard and Christie 2003) have theorized leadership from a Bourdieusian perspective using habitus, capital, and field. Habitus, capital and fields are concepts that we argue are essential for contemporary leadership theory, policy, and practice in diverse schools. Due to the changing demographics and culture of students attending public schools in the US, school leaders more than ever, need to be aware of their own identity and how their self-concept impacts those who are following (Turbin 2017). Moll et al. (1992) drew on Bourdieu's notion of cultural capital, and Vygotsky (1978) to conceptualize funds of knowledge; however, leadership received little attention.

We ask: How can we construct a framework grounded in Bourdieusian theoretical logics beyond the current literature that theorizes relationships between leaders and frequently marginalized students? How do we theorize leadership for education and social inclusion that explicitly considers the cultural background of the students in an increasingly diverse democratic society? In our view, such theorizing of leadership calls us to look beyond theories that explain practice from organizational or political theories alone. This chapter will lay the groundwork for theorizing relationships between the individual educational leader and increasingly pluralistic communities that might inform future empirical research.

2 Leadership Literature Over Time

Organizational theorists (Fayol 1949; Simon 1958) influenced the educational leadership field with many empirical studies focused on relationships among the school or district as a micro organization, leaders and other school participants, and the broader social, economic and political environment or context. For example, leadership scholars such as Hoy and Miskel (2005) synthesized organizational theories from business and sociology and applied these theories to the work of leaders in school organizations defined as systems. Here Hoy and Miskel (2005) explained relations between inputs (e.g. economic resources, policies) and outputs (student outcomes). More recently, a growing number of educational leadership scholars have utilized various social theories to consider relations among social structures, politics, policies and schools. With an increasing plurality of students in educational organizations/schools worldwide, we see a significant need to bring these two strands of leadership literature into dialogue and theorize the relationships among the individual, school structure, and the broader society, including multiculturalism and multilingualism. In the following paragraphs, we further discuss leadership literature over time and then present a leadership approach that extends existing literature with deeper theorizing of culture.

3 Organizational Theory Approach to Leadership

Hoy and Miskel (2005) argued that organizational theories evolved from rational to human relations to open systems approaches. A rational approach uses a formal organizational structure and ontology to define the role of organizational members (Taylor 1947; Fayol 1949). In a rational approach to organizational theory, administrators are managers or instruments for the attainment of formal organizational rules and goals. Natural systems perspectives emerged in response to rational system approaches to organization, positing that individuals in organizations do not always adhere to formal rules (Follett 1918). According to natural systems theory (Follett 1918), the informal structure of relations among participants is more influential in guiding the behavior of participants.

In addition to natural system theorists, some organizational theorists conceived organizations as open systems that combine both rational and natural system assumptions about reality (Simon 1958). From this perspective, while schools are organizations that are shaped and defined by the actors within the local school, they also are shaped and defined by the larger societal context within which they exist. Empirical studies of leadership from an open systems perspective resulted in combinational leadership approaches within organizations. This included early approaches to management in transactional leadership and more relation-oriented and inspirational approaches such as transformational leadership that mediates the external (context) and internal factors that contribute to organizational learning (Leithwood 1992).

Many leadership scholars have used organizational theories to understand leadership in effective schools located in communities with a majority of families with lower socioeconomic status. For example, Hallinger and Murphy (1986) analyzed differences in the operation of school effectiveness factors in effective elementary schools of differing student socioeconomic status (SES). Their findings indicate transformational leaders fostered a well-coordinated curriculum which emphasized the achievement of basic reading and math skills.

Organizational theories have an underlying rationality theory in theoretical logic and provide conceptual tools to understand relations between organizations and the external environment. Rational and open systems theories tend to focus attention on the organizational unit and actors within them with open systems acknowledging a greater role for the external environment. While natural systems theorists such as Follett (1918) explicitly considered informal structures and power relationships, they did not integrate understandings of individuals' habitus and cultural capital into their explanations regarding the creation of informal structures.

4 Empirical Studies in Culturally Diverse, High Needs Schools

Over time, scholars have applied organizational theories and other social theories that emphasize the external environment, including students' socioeconomic and racial/ethnic backgrounds. Since the 1970s, many scholars have examined effective schools in which students perform better than expected given the prerequisites. Classic school effectiveness studies of leaders in high-needs schools (Edmonds 1979; Levine and Lezotte 1990) were conducted in the wake of the Coleman Report (1966) that identified students' socioeconomic background as more important to student success than the work of schools. Thus, Edmonds (1979) and Levine and Lezotte (1990) among many others studied those schools there were effective for all students regardless of socioeconomic status. More recently, the term "turnaround school" has emerged as a description of schools in which school principals led declining schools with high populations of children living in poverty and children of color to educational improvement in a short amount of time (Peck and Reitzug 2014).

Research on effective schools and turnaround schools (and leaders thereof) focuses on characteristics and practices of school organizations that contribute to student outcomes, including the development of a clear school mission, monitoring of student progress, protection of instructional time from interruptions, and maintenance of high standards for teachers and students (Bossert et al. 1981; Brookover and Lezotte 1979; Murphy at al. 1985; Stallings and Mohlman 1981; Wellisch et al. 1978). These studies demonstrated the quality of the school principal plays a central role in school management, facilitating effective teacher instructions, and improving student learning outcomes (Chapman at al. 2016; Edmonds 1979; Teddlie & Reynolds, 1999). Studies conducted in the US, Canada and England concluded

that student learning outcomes and school improvement cannot be achieved without effective school leaders; leadership has direct and indirect positive effects on student outcomes (Day et al. 2016; Louis et al. 2010). While the above literature refers to the external environment, until recently, few scholars have specifically examined the ways in which school participants, including leaders, respond to student culture.

Johnson (2007) applied the notion of culturally responsive pedagogy (Ladson-Billings 1995) to leadership in high needs schools, defining culturally responsive leaders as those who support high academic achievement, value and affirm the home cultures of their students, empower parents from all economically and culturally diverse settings, and actively seek societal change in an effort to make the surrounding communities better places for all. However, even in schools identified as highly successful, principals were inhibited in their abilities to provide a multicultural curriculum and involve parents in a meaningful way due to the high stakes policy environment focused solely on closing the achievement gap (Johnson 2007). Johnson (2007) contends, "Culturally responsive leaders also need models of how they might challenge the status quo of inequitable assessment practices, incorporate students' cultural knowledge into the school curriculum, and work with parents and community activists for social change in the larger community" (p. 55). Since 2007, leadership scholars such as Khalifa, Gooden and Davis (2016) also posit the importance of culturally responsive leadership in schools. However, we see a continued need to theorize and apply explanations of culture from Bourdieu as part of leadership capacities needed in effective schools.

As the International Schools Leadership Development Network (ISLDN) researchers and others (Belchetz and Leithwood 2007; Bennis and Thomas 2002; Gurr and Drysdale 2018; Mayo 2007) argue, the vast literature regarding school leadership frequently identifies the importance of context regardless of specific leadership approach (instructional, transformational, transformative, or culturally responsive), but the relationship between leadership and community/cultural context is not fully (theoretically) explained nor understood. As Gurr and Drysdale (2018) put it, "The interplay between leadership and context to some extent remains a 'black box': a process whose inputs and outputs (and the relationships between them) are known, but whose internal structure or working is not known or well understood" (p. 149).

The ISLDN was developed as a joint initiative of the British Educational Leadership, Management, and Administration Society (BELMAS) and the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) (Baran and Berry 2015). The aim of ISLDN is to contribute to knowledge in the field of educational leadership by facilitating an international comparative study of how those involved in school leadership are supported in their preparation and development as leaders (Barnett and Stevenson 2011).

Selection criteria for participants in ISLDN research across countries such as Mexico, Sweden, USA, and Australia include high percentages of individuals from families with incomes below the poverty line; high teacher/leader turnover rates; and high percentages of historically socially excluded groups. More specifically, in terms of leadership, research teams in the participating countries focused on new principals or principals with greater than two years in their post where the school showed signs

of improvement. Data collection sources featured interviews with the school leader, teachers and other senior staff members, parents, and students as well as observations and relevant document analysis. Interview questions focused on learning, leadership, and context. In ISLDN literature and related leadership literature (Hallinger 2018a, b), context is challenging to define, as context can be an element or layer or conceived as several layers. Findings from ISLDN scholars (Gurr and Drysdale 2018; Okilwa and Barnett 2018) indicate, not surprisingly, that school leaders adapt their leadership practices to suit the context. Okilwa and Barnett (2018) describe this leadership ability as contextual acuity. Contextually driven leadership practices include entrepreneurial strategies such as marketing to neighboring schools for students, strategic interventions to improve student outcomes, adaptability to changing circumstances, building trust and relationships to bring people together around a common purpose of providing quality education, and transformative leadership practices aimed at equity and social justice.

This literature not only synthesized current school leadership practices, but also pointed out the direction of future inquiry and capacity development for leadership culturally diversity, responsiveness, and social justice. And while we appreciate extant attempts to define culture as part of the context for empirical study, we see the need to extend and enhance this work theoretically and empirically in light of the contemporary situation of increasing cultural diversity among students. For this, we draw primarily on the work of Pierre Bourdieu (1977a) as well as Lingard and Christie (2003), two scholars who have applied Bourdieu's theories to educational leadership.

4.1 Leadership Approaches from Social Theories

Beyond ISLDN, a growing number of educational leadership scholars have proposed leadership approaches in schools aimed at societal transformation, most often using various critical theory lenses that expand functionalist organizational theory and the role of leadership (Theoharis 2007; Shields 2010). Here scholars seek to explain and promote individual school leaders and social justice work in schools. Drawing on empirical findings and other scholarly models or approaches (Burns 1978; Freire 1970; Foster 1986; Leithwood 2010), Shields (2010) highlighted the differences among the three approaches that have dominated the educational leadership field for three decades, transactional, transformational, and transformative leadership. According to Shields (2010), transactional leadership involves a reciprocal transaction; transformational leadership focuses on improving organizational qualities, dimensions, and effectiveness; and transformative leadership begins by challenging inappropriate uses of power and privilege by challenging inappropriate uses of power and privilege that create or perpetuate inequity and injustice. In Shields' (2010) approach to transformative leadership, the fundamental task is to ask questions, for example, about the purposes of schooling, about which ideas should be taught

and about who is successful. Her critique lays the groundwork for the promise of schooling that is more inclusive, democratic, and equitable for more students.

> Transformative leadership, therefore, recognizes the need to begin with critical reflection and analysis and to move through enlightened understanding to action—action to redress wrongs and to ensure that all members of the organization are provided with as level a playing field as possible—not only with respect to access but also with regard to academic, social and civic outcomes. (Shields 2010, p. 572).

Shields (2010) argues for a careful and consistent deconstruction of old knowledge frameworks that perpetuated deficit thinking and inequity, creating new frameworks of inclusion and equity that undergirded the continuous improvement mentality. Although, Shields (2010) enhances leadership approaches to include aims toward social transformation, we still do not see the educational leadership literature as complete in terms of understanding leadership practice in a cultural context.

Other scholars have proposed transformative leadership approaches (e.g. Dantley and Tillman 2006; Fuhrman and Gruenewald 2004;) to shed light on how the school social and cultural context influences the operation of effectiveness in elementary schools. In our view, the significance of their findings is limited in terms of explicit explanations of students' social and cultural capital in instructional improvement programs and leadership as it emerged from the effective schools' literature. Besides focus on the development of curriculum, the following studies indicate the characteristics of transformative leaders.

Transformative principals develop a clear school mission, monitor student progress, protect instructional time from interruptions, and maintain high standards for teachers and students (Bossert et al. 1981; Brookover and Lezotte 1979; Murphy et.al. 1985; Stallings and Mohlman 1981; Wellisch et al. 1978). Dimmock and Walker (2004) aligned school leadership with reflection of strategic intents, values, and connectivity, emphasizing the importance social-cultural context in contemporary multiethnic communities. Research (e.g. Hallinger 2016) regarding knowledge-based educational leadership and management drew on the way school context (community, socio-cultural, political, and economic) influences leadership practice, thus illustrating the nature of successful leadership practice. Khalifa et al., (2016) also discusses culturally responsive school leadership and argues that culture plays a significant role in shaping the thinking, behaviors, and practices of school leaders and other school stakeholders. Theoharis (2007) concept of social justice leadership illustrates how principals develop and sustain their social justice work in order to lead their schools to transform and to benefit the marginalized students. Hallinger's (2017) systematic review of research on educational leadership and management in Africa shows the increasing need to diversify the corpus of studies beyond the traditional Anglo-American centers of knowledge production. We see Bourdieu's theories and thinking tools as a way to diversify the corpus of studies beyond the Anglo-American centers of knowledge production as we shall discuss below.

5   Bourdieu's 'Thinking Tools'

Many education researchers know Pierre Bourdieu for his work on social and cultural reproduction. For example, Bourdieu (1990a, 2008, 1974, 1977a, 1986) describes how schools are not agents of social mobility but rather perpetuate existing societal inequalities. According to Bourdieu, the concepts of habitus, capital, and field are integral in understanding practice. Bourdieu (1977a, 1984, 1990a) explained that practice was the complex interplay of these main concepts. These concepts help make sense of the relationship between objective social structures (like institutions) and everyday practice.

6   Habitus

Bourdieu describes habitus as "socialized subjectivity" (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, p. 126). Bourdieu suggests that through the experiences of everyday life social agents (individuals and collective) unconsciously adopt the norms of the society. In society, social practices are characterized by regularities despite there being no explicit rules that dictate these practices (Bourdieu 1990b). Conceptions of what is right and/or appropriate become embedded, instinctive patterns of thought and behavior. According to Bourdieu (1990a), habitus constitutes,

> Systems of durable, transposable dispositions, structured structures predisposed to function as structuring structures, that is, as principles which generate and organize practices and representations that can be objectively adapted to their outcomes without presupposing a conscious aiming at ends or an express mastery of the operations necessary in order to attain them. (p. 53).

To Bourdieu, habitus constrains but does not determine thought and action; it operates at the subconscious level. Bourdieu (1984) writes, "The schemes of the habitus, the primary forms of classification, owe their specific efficacy to the fact that they function below the level of consciousness and language, beyond the reach of introspective scrutiny or control by the will" (p. 466). For Bourdieu, habitus defines the dispositions through which we perceive and act in the world through lasting exposure to particular social conditions and conditionings. The habitus is not just the producer of actions, but it is a product of the structural conditions a social agent encounters. Bourdieu (1990b) also describes habitus as a "feel for the game" or a "second sense" that equips social agents with practical knowledge to navigate the social field.

The concept of habitus confronted organizational theorists' assumptions that individuals and organizations make rational decisions. According to Bourdieu the theorists ignored the socio-economic conditions that shaped the actions they take (Bourdieu 1990b; Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992). Bourdieu concludes that habitus is the result of social conditionings or history but it can be transformed as it encounters different types of fields (Bourdieu 1990a, 1990b; Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992).

Not only can habitus be transformed by new experiences, it can also be "controlled through awakening of consciousness and socio-analysis" (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, p. 116).

6.1 Capital

Capital is anything that has been designated to have value in a particular social field. Capital is context specific, transferable, and convertible (Bourdieu 1993a). Bourdieu (1986) identifies three primary forms as, economic capital, cultural capital and social capital. Economic capital can be directly converted into money social capital can be defined as connections or networks that can be converted into economic capital. Bourdieu defines cultural capital as background, knowledge, dispositions, and skills. Cultural capital has three distinct forms: embodied, objectified and institutionalized (Bourdieu 1986). Embodied cultural capital consists of dispositions and competencies. Objectified cultural capital consists of physical possessions, such as books and works of art. Institutionalized cultural capital consists of institutional recognition, in the form of academic qualifications of the cultural capital held by an individual.

Bourdieu (1986) used cultural capital to explain differences in educational outcomes between children of different classes. According to Bourdieu, children from upper class households inherit a substantially different cultural capital than do those from poor working-class households. Schools reward the cultural capital of the upper classes at the same time they devalue or misrecognize that of the poor working classes. Cultural capital allows those well endowed to benefit from education in ways those without cannot.

Bourdieu (1986) defines social capital as "the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition" (p. 248). The amount of social capital will depend on the size of the network and the capital (economic and cultural) members of the network possess. This network is the product of investment strategies.

6.2 Field

Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992) describes fields as microcosms in which the social agents (individuals or social institutions) interact and struggle with each other in accordance with field-specific rules and hierarchies. The struggle within the fields is for control of resources (economic, cultural and social capital). Bourdieu (1998) describes a social field as,

> A structured social space, a field of forces, a force field. It contains people who dominate and people who are dominated. Constant, permanent relationships of inequality operate inside this space, which at the same time becomes a space in which various actors struggle for

the transformation or preservation of the field. All the individuals in this universe bring to the competition all the (relative) power at their disposal. It is this power that defines their position in the field and, as a result, their strategies. (p. 40–41).

Therefore, a society can be viewed as a system of interconnected fields; each field has its own characteristics, hierarchies and laws of functioning (Bourdieu 1990a). Although fields are autonomous, they are embedded and influenced by other fields. For example, the educational leadership field may also be influenced by the political and the economic fields. According to Bourdieu, society can be thought of as one large field; within the field, there is a struggle skewed in favor of those with economic, social and cultural capital (Bourdieu 1991; Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992). In each field the social space is stratified. Capital determines the dominant and the dominated social agents.

One can only determine what constitutes a field by studying empirical work; however, Bourdieu cautions researchers about the complexity of the relationships between fields (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992). Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992) suggest three necessary and interconnected steps that could be used to study a field. The first step analyzes the positions of the field vis-à-vis the field of power. The second step maps out the objective structures of relations between the positions occupied by the social agents (individuals or institutions) who compete for power in the field. And, the last step analyzes the habitus of social agents. Bourdieu studied many fields including, education, art, television, journalism, religion, housing construction, and literature (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992).

In sum, we see Bourdieu's (1977b, 1984, 1986, 1990a) concepts of habitus, field and social capital as critically important to understanding the relationships the individual has with schools and society. Bourdieu's theories extend and enhance sociological perspectives on schools as societal institutions and leaders as agents within these institutions (Fayol 1949; Simon 1958), yet few scholars have explicitly applied Bourdieu's theories to schools and school leadership.

7 The Interconnectedness of the Thinking Tools

The formulation "(Habitus x Capital) + Field = Practice" helps us to see how the thinking tools are interconnected (Bourdieu 1984). The equation can present the relationship between the tools: practice is the result of relations between one's habitus (dispositions) and the quantity and quality of one's capital within the current field. Bourdieu uses the thinking tools to understand social practice, and particularly to uncover the inequalities in particular social spaces. The thinking tools cannot be examined in isolation from one another. Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992) emphasize, "Such notions as habitus, field, and capital can be defined, but only within the theoretical system they constitute, not in isolation." (p. 96).

The value of capital hinges on the existence of a field or game that allows the possessors to wield power; thus "capital does not exist and function except in relation

to a field" (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, p. 101). Therefore, any strategies of social agents in the field depend on the quantity and quality of capital they possess. While most social agents play the game to increase or conserve their capital, others play to transform the existing rules of the game (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992). Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992) argue that "in order to construct the field, one must identify the forms of specific capital that operate within it, and to construct the forms of specific capital one must know the specific logic of the field" (p. 108).

Habitus can be seen as the theoretical bridge between capital and field because it explains why within a particular field social agents' actions or decisions are based on the types and quantity of capital they possess (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992). Therefore, as we work with Bourdieu to understand educational leadership, we must examine the relationships that exist between the thinking tools in the context of schooling.

8 Extant Scholarship on Bourdieu and Leadership

In an introductory essay for a special issue on Bourdieu in the *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, Lingard and Christie (2003) present the case for using Bourdieu's theoretical framework to examine the work of school principals. The special issue sought to explore how Bourdieu's conceptual frameworks and methodological approaches might be applied in educational leadership research. Lingard and Christie (2003) articulate substantively how Bourdieu enhances the educational leadership field with attention to relationships between individuals and social structures within the context of schooling. They argue that Bourdieu's theoretical approach will "enable us to move beyond trait, situational and transformational leadership theories, emphasizing instead the recursive relationship between agency (individual leader habitus) and structure (field) in the broader social context" (p. 319).

Lingard and Christie (2003) develop a 'productive leadership habitus' as a way in which school leadership ought to be practiced. This principal leadership habitus has three main elements. The first, reflexivity, is derived from the work of Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992) and Brubaker (1993). According to Lingard and Christie (2003), reflexivity allows productive leaders to acknowledge the logics of practice, "challenging them, utilizing them, mediating them, rejecting them, selectively working with them, reflecting on them, segueing between them, in terms of keeping their eye on the central purposes of schooling" (p. 328).

Secondly, leaders need to be prepared to "do the most good and cause the right change" (p. 329). Lingard and Christie (2003) argue that as school leaders develop and improve school practices, they must not lose sight of the capacity of schools to reproduce social and economic inequalities. Principals need to be cognizant of the central role that schools have in changing and reproducing social and economic inequalities.

Thirdly, schools are complex and operate within different fields. The school principal must be aware of the different fields, their logics of practice, and, in many cases, their competing demands.

9 Extending the Bourdieusian Approach to Leadership Agency in Diverse, Democratic Schools

While Lingard and Christie (2003) provide critically important insights from Bourdieu for educational leadership, we extend their productive leadership habitus and give explicit consideration to engaging with the cultural capital from increasingly diverse students. Specifically, we focus on the relationship between the school and the community in terms of how leaders mediate between diverse students' cultural capital and habitus and the common culture of schools in democratic societies. Bourdieu's (2008) theoretical work explains how schools produce and reproduce social and cultural inequalities from generation to generation. According to Bourdieu schools are structured to favor those with the cultural capital of the dominant classes (Bourdieu, 1974, 1977a, 2008). In other words, schools convert social hierarchies into academic hierarchies, and in so doing, legitimate the social inequalities of society.

Specifically, Bourdieu suggests that there are two main ways in which schools reproduce existing social inequalities. First, by ignoring the differences in children's backgrounds. Bourdieu (1974) posits, "by treating all pupils, however unequal they may be in reality, as equal in rights and duties the educational system is led to give its de facto sanction to initial cultural inequalities" (p. 38). Secondly, teachers (and by extension school principals) are the products of the education system hence they are likely to unconsciously transmit the culture of the dominant class. Bourdieu (2008) argues,

> It would no doubt be abusive in summary to describe relations between the upper classes and teachers as some kind of conspiracy. What is rather involved, though, is something most serious, *complicity* that is unconscious, and often hidden beneath generous professions of faith, the complicity based on an affinity of lifestyle and values. (p. 38).

The culture of the dominant class may come naturally to teachers and principals meaning they do not see the fundamental inequality in the system. Ease with the culture of the dominant class occurs because the habitus of most teachers and principals are in part the result of success in schools; they are products of the system. Therefore, according to Bourdieu, social reproduction is inherently embedded in the structure and functioning of schools, and as such social reproduction occurs largely in spite of the good intentions of teachers and school administrators.

A closer examination of Bourdieu's work suggests that for students to be successful in school they must adopt the cultural capital and habitus of the dominant classes, typically at the expense of their own culture. This may explain the "acting white" phenomenon; a reference to situations where some minority students ridiculed their minority peers for engaging in behavior that was perceived to be characteristic

of whites (Fordham and Ogbu 1986). In part, Bourdieu's assumption was that the cultural values promoted at school were different from those of the minority and/or low-income communities. Schools tend to embody the cultural capital of the dominant class. Schools may ignore the cultural resources of children for minority and/or low-income households because they are structured to reproduce the cultural capital of the dominant class. Thus, Lingard and Christie's (2003) approach is important as it illuminates the importance of the individual leader's consciousness about the community they serve.

Next, we take Lingard and Christie's (2003) argument a step beyond leader consciousness to leader agency and mediation, by changing the logic of practice or the rules of the game (Bourdieu 1977b). As noted earlier, Bourdieu viewed society as a system of fields; each field with its own logic of practice. Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992) argue that a field "follows rules or better, regularities, that are not explicit or codified" (p. 98). The school leader must understand these rules or regularities both in the school and the community. According to Bourdieu, fields are contested social spaces where those with the capital (economic, social and cultural) have the ability to influence the rules of the game within the fields. People and institutions individually or collectively implement strategies in order to improve their positions in relation to others within the field (Bourdieu 1993b). Therefore, to a certain degree, school leaders have the capital within the school and the community to influence and change the logic of practice. Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992) note that there are social agents that can,

> Transform, partially or completely, the immanent rules of the game. They can, for instance, work to change the relative value of tokens of different colors, the exchange rate between the various species of capital, through strategies aimed at discrediting the form of capital upon which the force of the opponents rests and to valorize the species of capital they preferentially possess. (p. 99).

School principals can change the relative value of tokens; in this case, increase the value of the cultural capital of students. Given this influence, school leaders can ensure the cultural capital of all students is embodied in schools. Since schools mainly embody the cultural capital of the dominant group, school leaders need to engage with the school community so that local funds of knowledge become part of the school.

Each member of the school community brings a habitus formed under specific economic and social conditions and within diverse fields. Some will be shared with other members and some will differ from them significantly. Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992) posit, "Human action is not an instantaneous reaction to immediate stimuli, and the slightest 'reaction' of an individual to another is pregnant with the whole history of these persons and of the relationship" (p. 124). School practice cannot be fully understood without including the habitus of the members.

In our view, a leader's mediation between the school and the community must focus on pedagogical practices. We are not the first to argue for bridging marginalized students' cultural capital or funds of knowledge with the academic knowledge reflective of the common state and national culture. Referring to teachers, Moll et al. (1992)

highlighted how collaborations between the schools and the community can promote learning for students from minority communities. Similarly, Ladson-Billings (1995), also in reference to teachers, argues that teachers need to think about the teacher-student relationship in terms of culture, curriculum, and teaching. Here teachers need to have consciousness of their own culture in relation to students' cultures and bring that consciousness into their pedagogical practices.

In our Bourdieusian approach to leadership, we argue that school leaders also have the responsibility to recognize, understand and integrate the cultural funds of knowledge of the community they serve into their school practices. Such recognition begins with consciousness and reflexivity as well as an awareness of the inequalities and differing logics of practice in schools. For Bourdieu it is the interaction of the thinking tools, habitus, capital and field, that enables us understand the logic of practice. Bourdieu (2008) argued "it is by knowing the laws of reproduction that we can have a chance, however small, of minimizing the reproductive effect all of the educational institution" (p. 53). Specifically, we see the role of today's school leader as a mediator between the fields of school and community, using Bourdieusian thinking tools to influence change in schools and communities. Drawing on Bourdieu (1977b), leaders engage diverse cultures in ways that connect schools and communities, supporting students toward autonomy, freedom and equality toward the democratic prospect (Dewey 1916). We are currently working as a research team to apply the Bourdieusian theories and thinking tools to empirical case studies in ISLDN.

References

Barran, M. L. & Berry, J. R. (2015). The International School Leadership Development Network (ISLDN) high needs schools group research protocol and members' guide.

Barnett, B., & Stevenson, H. (2011). *The international school leadership development network: A BELMAS-UCEA collaborative research project paper presented at the values and leadership conference.* British Columbia: Victoria.

Belchetz, D., & Leithwood, K. (2007). Successful leadership: Does context matter and if so, how? In C. Day & K. Leithwood (Eds.), *Successful principal leadership in times of change* (pp. 117–138). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.

Bennis, W., & Thomas, R. (2002). *Geeks and geezers: How era, values and defining moments shape leaders.* Boston, MA: Harvard Business Review Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1974). The school as a conservative force: Scholastic and cultural inequalities. In J. Eggleston (Ed.), *Contemporary research in the sociology of education* (pp. 32–46). London: Methuen.

Bourdieu, P. (1977a). Cultural reproduction and social reproduction. In J. Karabel & A. H. Halsey (Eds.), *Power and ideology in education* (pp. 487–511). New York: Oxford.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). *The outline of a theory.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgment of taste.* Richard Nice (tr.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241–258). New York: Greenwood Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1990a). *The logic of practice.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

References

Bourdieu, P. (1990b). *In other words: Essays towards a reflexive sociology*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Oxford: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1993a). *Sociology in question*. London: Sage.

Bourdieu, P. (1993b). *The field of cultural production*. Cambridge: Polity.

Bourdieu, P. (1998). *On television*, (trans.) Priscilla Parkhurst Ferguson. London: Pluto.

Bourdieu, P. (2008). *Political interventions: Social science and political action*. London: Verso.

Bossert, S. T., Dwyer, D. C., Rowan, B., & Lee, G. V. (1981). *The instructional management role of the principal: A preliminary review and conceptualization*. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

Brookover, W., & Lezotte, L. (1979). *Changes in school characteristics coincident with changes in student achievement*. East Lansing: Michigan State University.

Brubaker, R. (1993). Social theory as habitus. In C. Calhoun, E. LiPuma, & M. Postone (Eds.), *Bourdieu: Critical Perspectives Chicago* (pp. 212–234). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.

Calhoun, C., & Wacquant, L. (2002) Social science with a conscience: Remembering Pierre Bourdieu (1930–2002), *Thesis Eleven*, *70*, 1–14. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1177/072551360 2070001002.

Chapman, C., Reynolds, D., Teddlie, C., & Stringfield, S. (2016). Effective school processes. In C. Chapman, D. Muijs, D. Reynolds, P. Sammons, & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Routledge International handbook of educational effectiveness: Research, policy, and practice* (pp. 77–99). New York, NY: Routledge.

Colby, S. L., & Ortman, J.M., (2015). Projections of the size and composition of the U.S. population: 2014 to 2060, *Current Population Reports*. Retrieved from https://www.census.gov/content/dam/Census/library/publications/2015/demo/p25-1143.pdf.

Coleman, J. S. (1966). Equality of educational opportunity summary report. *Equity & Excellence in Education*. *6*(5), 19–28. Retrieved from https//doi.org/10.1080/0020486680060504.

Dantley, M., & Tillman, L. (2006). Social justice and moral transformative leadership. In C. Marshall & M. Olivia (Eds.), *Leadership for social justice: Making revolutions happen* (pp. 16–29). Boston: Pearson.

Day, C., Gu, Q., & Sammons, P. (2016). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: How successful school leaders use transformational and instructional strategies to make a difference. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 52*(2), 221–258 https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X1561 6863.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

Dimmock, C., & Walker, A. (2004). A new approach to strategic leadership: Learning-centredness, connectivity and cultural context in school design. *School Leadership & Management*, *24*(1), 39–56. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1080/1363243042000172813.

Edmonds, R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. *Educational Leadership, 37*(1), 15–24.

Fayol, H. (1949). *General and industrial management*. London: Pitman.

Follett, M. P. (1918). *The new state, group organization the solution of popular government*. Bombay: Longmans, Green and Co.

Fordham, S., & Ogbu, J.U. (1986). Black students' school success: Coping with the burden of "acting White." *Urban Review*, *18*, 176–206. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10/1007/BF01112192.

Foster, W. P. (1986). *Paradigms and promises: New approaches to educational administration*. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Herder and Herder.

Furman, G. C., & Gruenewald, D. A. (2004). Expanding the landscape of social justice: A critical ecological analysis. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 40*, 49–78.

Grenfell, M. (Ed.). (2010). *Pierre Bourdieu: Key concepts*. Durham, UK: Acumen.

Gurr, D., & Drysdale, L. (2018). Leading high needs schools: Findings from the international school development network. *International Studies in Educational Administration, 46*(1), 147–156.

Hallinger, P. (2018). Bringing context out of the shadow. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 46*(1), 5–24. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143216670652.

Hallinger, P. (2018). Surfacing a hidden literature: A systematic review of research on educational leadership and management in Africa. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, *46*(3), 362–384. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143217694895.

Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. F. (1986). The social context of effective schools. *American Journal of Education, 94*(3), 328–355. Retrieved from https://dx.doi.org/10.1086/443853.

Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2005). *Educational administration theory, research, and practice.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Johnson, L. (2007). Rethinking successful school leadership in challenging US schools: Culturally responsive practices in school-community relationships. *International Studies in Educational Administration, 35*(3), 49–57.

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.

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

Levine, D. U., & Lezotte, L. W. (1990). Unusually effective schools: A review and analysis of research and practice. *Journal of School Effective and School Improvement*, *1*(3), 221–224. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1080/092435900010305.

Lingard, B., & Christie, P. (2003). Leading theory: Bourdieu and the field of educational leadership. An introduction and overview to this special issue. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 6*(4), 317–333.

Louis, K. S., Leithwood, K., Wahlstrom, K. L., & Anderson, S. E. (2010). *Investigating the links to improved student learning: Final report of research findings.* New York, NY: Wallace Foundation.

Mayo, T. (2007). Context-based leadership. Management Digital Article. *Harvard Business Review*, 24 July, np.

Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into Practice, 31*(2), 132–141.

Murphy, J., Hallinger, P., Wil, M., & Mitman, A. (1985). School effectiveness: A conceptual framework. *The Educational Forum, 49*(3), 361–374.

Okilwa, N., & Barnett, B. S. (2018). Four successive school leaders' response to a high needs urban elementary school context. *International Studies in Educational Administration, 46*(1), 45–85.

Pew Research Center. (2018). Origins and destinations of the World Migrants, 1900–2017. Retrieved from https://www.pewglobal.org/2018/02/28/global-migrant-stocks/?country=US&date=2017.

Peck, C., & Reitzug, U. C. (2014). School turnaround fever: The paradoxes of a historical practice promoted as a new reform. *Urban Education, 49,* 8–38. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085912472511.

Shields, C. M. (2010). Transformative leadership: Working for equity in diverse contexts. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *46*(4), 558–589. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X10375609.

Simon, H. A. (1958). *Organizations.* Oxford, England: Wiley.

Stallings, J. A., & Mohlman, G. G. (1981). School Policy, Leadership Style, Teacher Change and Student Behavior in Eight Schools. Final Report. Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED209759.

Taylor, F. W. (1947). *Scientific management.* New York: Harper and Row.

Teddlie, C., & Reynolds, D. (Eds.). (1999). *The international handbook of school effectiveness research.* London, UK: Falmer Press. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203454404.

Theoharis, G. (2007). Social justice educational leaders and resistance: Toward a theory of social justice leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 43*(2), 221–258. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X06293717.

References

Turbin, D. (2017). Leadership identity construction practices: The case of successful Israeli school principals. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 45*(5), 791–805.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2014). Projecting minority-majority. Retrieved from https://www.census.gov/content/dam/Census/newsroom/releases/2015/cb15-tps16_graphic.pdf.

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

Wellisch, J. B., MacQueen, A. H., Carriere, R. A., & Duck, G. A. (1978). School management and organization in successful schools. *Sociology of Education, 51*(3), 211–226. https://doi.org/10.2307/2112666