

## **Inclusive Leadership: A Review**

James Ryan  
OISE/UT

*This article reviews the literature on inclusive leadership. It surveys those genres of leadership research that are very loosely concerned with issues of inclusion. They include those that go under the banner of teacher leadership, shared governance, participative leadership, student leadership, site-based management, community involvement and emancipatory or critical leadership. Each of these genres emphasize the different aspects of inclusive leadership. Some stress the process or governance side of leadership, while others attend to the ends of leadership – what leadership processes are organized to pursue. The only perspective that does address both the ends and process has other limitations. But while each standpoint represents only a partial and decidedly limited view of inclusive leadership, taken together, they provide considerable insight into it.*

Inclusion is increasingly being seen as an integral part of leadership. Many academics and practitioners believe that schools and the communities that they serve will be better places when parents, students, teachers and community members – and not just administrators – are included in schools' governance activities. But a view that sees leadership and inclusion, as most do, strictly in terms of participation in decision- and policy-making processes, is a narrow one. It ignores the fact that leadership activities occur within a context that is in many ways, exclusive. All men, women and children do not have the same opportunities to participate in various social processes and activities, including influence and governance matters; many are consistently excluded by virtue of the more global class, race, gender relationships in which they participate. If leadership activities do not at the same time address these and other wider exclusive practices, they will in the end defeat efforts to meaningfully include others besides administrators in leadership processes. Indeed there is little point endorsing inclusive processes of leadership if they are not at the same time organized to promote broader inclusive principles and outcomes. If educators are truly serious about promoting inclusion in leadership and governance activities, then they must attend not only to decision- and policy-making processes, but also the ends for which they strive. For leadership to be meaningfully inclusive, it must find a way to include everyone in governance processes and be organized to pursue inclusive principles.

There is no shortage of literature on inclusive leadership, that is, literature that explores or promotes participation of others besides administrators in governance processes, and/or advocates for leadership processes that promote the general principle of inclusion. Most of this literature, however, does not adopt the heading "inclusive leadership." It employs other names such as teacher leadership, shared governance, participative leadership, student leadership, site-based management, community involvement and emancipatory or critical leadership. The only group of studies that uses the title, inclusive leadership, employs the term, "inclusive," to refer to the education of

differently-abled students. Each of these genres emphasize the different aspects of inclusive leadership. Some stress the process or governance side of leadership, while others attend to the ends of leadership – what leadership processes are organized to pursue. The only perspective that does address both the ends and process has other limitations. But while each standpoint represents only a partial and decidedly limited view of inclusive leadership, taken together, they provide considerable insight into it.

This article reviews the ways in which the various genres of leadership treat inclusion. It looks at the manner in which each contributes to knowledge of the process and ends of leadership in schools. The review begins with a description and critique of emancipatory leadership.

### **Emancipatory Leadership**

Proponents of emancipatory leadership advocate for a more comprehensive view of inclusion than other theorists. Not only do emancipatory champions want educational leadership processes to be inclusive; they are also committed to working for more global forms of inclusion. They view leadership as only one element of a much wider concern with inclusion. Emancipatory promoters rightly believe that this concern is warranted because our institutions and communities are deeply unfair; some people consistently enjoy advantages at the expense of others (Ryan, 2006). The task for leadership then, is to get people to recognize these injustices and work together to change these widespread patterns. Only then can people become truly emancipated. To do this, emancipatory proponents appeal to theory. They employ theory to help people understand and critique the status quo and assist them in eventually changing oppressive structures. This has proven to be a difficult task, however. Few schools actually practice this form of emancipatory leadership. The consequence of this is that most of the studies in this area are theoretical and prescriptive, and not grounded in empirical evidence.

Many emancipatory proponents employ critical theory, which traces its roots to self-estrangement theory (Fay, 1987). Dating back centuries, the latter portrays humans as fallen creatures. Blinded to their true situation, they have lost their way. In the process, they have created forms of life that are unsatisfying. All is not lost, however. This theory goes on to say that if men and women can only rid themselves of their blinders, understand their true needs and capacities, then they can take action that will enable them to throw off the shackles that currently bind them (Ryan, 1998). Doing so will provide them with the individual and collective autonomy they need to be able to control how they will live their lives.

The humanist version of self-estrangement theory has taken many forms over the years. The earlier ones concentrated on the economy. Critical theorists maintained that the dominant economic system -- capitalism -- was unfair. This was because a few individuals profited from the work of many. These few got the most out of life, while the vast majority had to make do with considerably less. Critical theorists believed that for this injustice to come to an end, people had to first recognize how unfair this was, then take action to change this system (Giddens, 1981). Later versions of this theory branched out to include

the injustices associated with race, gender and sexual orientation. What all these theorists had in common was a concern for the less fortunate and the marginalized. They all agreed that these individuals were not to be blamed for their situations. Rather, it was the wider social structures of capitalism, sexism, racism, and homophobia, among others, that put these people at a disadvantage. Critical theorists recognized that people needed to be made aware of these processes so they could take action to change them.

These ideas were subsequently adapted and applied to education and eventually leadership. Over the years scholars have used them to illuminate the ways in which class, race and gender hierarchies work in schools. They have documented their different effects on students, teachers, parents and governance processes. Emancipatory leadership advocates call for collective over individualist forms of leadership, emphasize leadership's educative side and stress the importance of dialogue. Some also acknowledge the difficulty of putting their ideas into practice (Robinson, 1994).

Critical theories of leadership are, for the most part, consistent with the ideals of inclusion. To begin with, they reject individual and hierarchical views of leadership. Critical theorists distrust the hierarchies that accompany bureaucratic forms of organization. They correctly point out that these kinds of arrangements both reflect and reinforce wider social hierarchies and injustices (Corson, 1996). Some contend that these organizational hierarchies themselves display class and gender overtones (Blackmore, 1989; Grace, 1995). Feminists have been the most articulate about this. They have argued that this hierarchical division of labor is masculine in nature, and they criticize the ideals of power and control that are part of this corporate management view (Blackmore, 1999; Ferguson, 1984; Grundy, 1993; Ogza, 1993). Critical theorists also take issue with the heroic view of leadership. They point out that individual men and women who occupy positions of responsibility are seldom capable on their own of creating fundamental changes and producing new and better values. Few administrators are charismatic, but most can be competent. As a consequence, critical theorists call not for heroes, but for modest men and women to step forward (Tierney, 1989; Foster, 1989).

In an inclusive spirit, critical theorists favor collaborative, reciprocal and horizontal relationships over the more traditional management hierarchies. For them, leadership does not reside in a position or a person, but in equitable, caring and fluid relationships among various individuals (Rusch, 1998). In their view, everyone should have a voice and the opportunity to contribute in their own ways to what happens in schools. For this to occur, school communities need to nurture dialogue (Corson, 1996, 2000; Foster, 1994; Smyth, 1996; Ryan, 2002; Ryan, 2003). They need to work toward providing conditions that allow everyone to communicate with one another. Among other things, this requires that communities foster communicative virtues like tolerance, patience, an openness to giving and receiving criticism, a willingness to admit mistakes, listen thoughtfully and attentively, reexamine one's own presuppositions and compare them with others, and reinterpret one's own concerns in a style that makes them comprehensible to others (Burbules, 1993). Dialogue is also crucial to the educative part of emancipatory leadership (Ryan, 2002, 2003).

Emancipatory leadership emphasizes the educative side of leadership. It is perhaps this aspect more than any other that sets emancipatory leadership apart from other leadership perspectives. Critical theorists contend that the work of leadership is more educational than managerial; it is not about charisma or acting decisively, but about assisting members of school communities to learn about the world and to search out alternatives to the status quo (Grundy, 1993). The educative part of emancipatory leadership is first and foremost concerned with critiquing existing patterns of privilege. This is necessary, according to critical theorists, because most people do not notice that many of the things that they and others do are harmful. We take a lot of these things for granted, so we don't always notice when this is happening (Anderson, 1990; Blase & Anderson, 1995). The task for leadership, then, is to raise the consciousness of people so that they can recognize widespread and harmful exclusive practices like racism and sexism and do something about them. This requires that school communities perpetually raise questions about what they do and about the wider context within which learning and schooling occurs. Schools need to audit themselves, but these audits are not the kind that accountants do. "Schools need to be involved in questioning what it is they are doing, not from an accountant's point of view, but from the perspective of how their agenda fits with a broader view of what constitutes a just society. If there is any auditing of schools deemed necessary, then it needs to be educational, moral and democratic forms of auditing." (Smyth, 1996, p. 1111).

Unfortunately, it is difficult to find examples of emancipatory leadership practices in schools; they are few and far between. There are a number of reasons for this. Perhaps the most obvious is that educators work in culturally conservative institutions that value homogeneity, resist change and look unfavorably on challenges (Rizvi, 1993; Ryan, 2003; Walker & Walker, 1998). Moreover, many of the people who can do the most to introduce this kind of leadership -- most of them administrators -- are themselves conservative, socialized into a system that rewards supporters (Ryan, 2003). An administrator's job is generally one that puts out fires rather than starts them. Unfortunately, those who actually do adopt adversarial stances to force through progressive reforms may find themselves looking for work; many of the best adversarial leaders have been fired (Blase & Anderson, 1995). Challenging the system can be risky business. So the answer, at least in part, is to set up leadership dynamics that are not based on the personality of a single individual, but on processes that involve everyone (Blase & Anderson, 1995). This way such organizations can survive the loss of any single individual and be true to inclusive principles.

The emancipatory leadership literature contributes many things to our knowledge of inclusive leadership – especially its balanced account of inclusive leadership. It attends to both the process and the end-values of leadership. In this view, leadership processes are just one part of a greater concern with inclusion. Leadership processes are organized not only to reflect inclusion within school governance structures, but also to pursue it in communities and the world generally. Toward this end, leadership processes educate members of the school community to recognize the often hidden forms of exclusion, and to make changes that promote inclusion. The slim amount of evidence available and the more theoretical and prescriptive accounts point to ways in which school communities might do

this. Dialogue is crucial. So too is the idea that leadership is best thought of not in terms of heroic individuals, but as collective and equitable processes.

Emancipatory leadership approaches also display weaknesses. There is a significant gulf between theory and practice. Critical theorists rely heavily on theory and prescription. This preoccupation sometimes blinds proponents to other insights and realities. At the same time, dependence on theory is also a result of there being so few examples of emancipatory leadership practices in schools. If inclusive leadership is to become a reasonable alternative, school communities need to take steps to embrace what can potentially be a misunderstood and threatening set of arrangements. Not everyone is likely to acknowledge criticism of current practice and embrace changes that may threaten them. For example, principals are generally reluctant to admit to the presence of racism in their schools, and this affects the ways in which they respond to suggestions for change (Ryan, 2003). To increase the chances that people will embrace inclusion, leadership practices also need to be organized to advocate for inclusion, something that few address seriously.

Other areas of literature address a number of these shortcomings. First, they provide more detail on the unique circumstances associated with the inclusion of different groups of people in leadership processes. The literature on teacher and student leadership and parental involvement give us insight into the circumstances surrounding the inclusion of these particular groups. Second, the more plentiful empirical studies in these areas supply evidence about leadership processes themselves, including what it means to include people in leadership processes, the reasons for and benefits of inclusion, the difficulties associated with inclusion, and the actions that help inclusive practice. Finally, this body of literature provides more detail on achieving the end-values of leadership. In particular, the literature on leadership and inclusion of differently-abled students presents a number of strategies for promoting inclusion.

### **Teacher Leadership**

The teacher leadership literature provides, by far, the largest body of work that touches on inclusion. It includes research on teacher leadership, shared governance and participatory leadership. By definition, all of this work concentrates primarily on teachers. With a few exceptions (see for example, Blasé & Anderson, 1995), it focuses almost exclusively on the process rather than the ends of leadership, exploring how teachers do or do not become involved in influence processes, but generally not attending to more global matters of inclusion and social justice.

Most studies in this area examine experiments of teacher leadership in schools, of which there have been many in recent times. While teacher leadership has a long history, it has become a more common practice following the so-called second-wave of reform (Blase & Blase, 2000). Prompted in part by the recommendations of second-wave reformers, many schools have initiated changes to their governance structures. By the late 1980s just about every state in the United States had adopted or was studying some form of teacher leadership (Smylie, Conley, & Marks, 2002). My task here is to examine those parts of the

teacher leadership literature that help readers understand and promote inclusive leadership, especially the nature of teacher leadership, the problems associated with it and the strategies employed to introduce, implement and sustain it.

### **What is Teacher Leadership?**

Despite all the research and differing views about what teacher leadership is or should be (Bacharach, Bamberger, Conley & Bauer, 1990; Somech, 2002; Smylie, 1997), most research in this area agrees that the purpose of teacher leadership is to provide teachers with power in settings where traditionally they have not had it. The aim of this redistribution of power is to allow teachers to make decisions in a variety of areas that are relevant to their work (Short & Rinehart, 1992), by participating in decision-making processes, having authority over professional issues at the classroom and school levels, and obtaining opportunities to acquire knowledge that warrants this authority (Kirby, 1992).

Teacher leadership can be formal or informal (Leithwood, Jantzi, & Steinbach, 1999). Informal leadership can occur outside of officially designated roles and responsibilities. It may include sharing expertise, volunteering for new projects, bringing new ideas to school, helping colleagues carry out classroom duties, assisting in improvement of classroom practice, accepting responsibility for professional growth, promoting the school's mission and working for improvement of the school and system (Leithwood, et. al., 1999). Teacher leadership may also involve other pursuits like conducting research in one's own classrooms and schools (Smylie, et. al. 2002).

Formal leadership generally involves teachers working in officially designated capacities. These positions may include acting as a department or division head, union representative, member of a school governance body, representative of the school and district, among many others (Leithwood, et. al., 1999). Perhaps the most attention in this area, however, has been given to initiatives that involve lead or master teachers, career ladders and mentorship programs. The lead teacher position was designed to allow particularly able teachers to develop curricular and instructional programs, organize staff development and perform various administrative duties (Smylie, 1997). Career ladder programs emphasize job enlargement and new evaluation systems that provide opportunities for teachers to develop and implement projects that enhance student learning, improve the total school program, design curricula and share expertise with teaching colleagues (Smylie, 1997). Teacher mentoring programs provide opportunities for experienced teachers to share their expertise with less experienced colleagues.

The nature of teachers' involvement in activities and decision-making varies. The extent to which they may participate tends to be related to the nature of the issue, the degree to which their interests are affected and their willingness to take risks associated with assuming responsibility (Blase & Blase, 1997). Teacher involvement may be passive and hidden or overt and active (Imber & Duke, 1984). Those who participate, however, do not always have influence. Teachers who sit on committees, for example, may not be able to influence in any meaningful way the decisions that are eventually made. These kinds of

situations may prompt teachers to avoid or oppose opportunities for participation (Blase & Dungan, 1994; Epp & MacNeil, 1997; Kirby, 1992; Short & Greer, 1997).

One way of categorizing levels of involvement is in terms of a continuum that goes from autocratic (the principal makes the decision on his or her own), to information-sharing (the principal obtains information from teachers and makes the decision on his or her own), to consultative (the principal shares the problem and makes a decision which may or may not reflect the teachers' views) to democratic (the principal shares the problem, analyzes and comes to a decision with teachers) (Somech, 2002; See also Short & Greer, 1997; and Crockenberg & Clark, 1979). On the other end of the continuum, teachers make decisions on their own, after sharing information or after consultation.

There are many potential areas for teacher participation (Barth, 2001; Bredeson, 1989; Conley, 1991; Crockenberg & Clark, 1979; Duke, 1980; Goldman, Dunlap, & Conley, 1993; Imber & Duke, 1984; Rinehart, Short, Short, & Eckley, 1998; Short & Greer, 1997; Somech, 2002). One typology, for example, specifies that teachers can become involved in decisions relating to curriculum and instruction, personnel, goal-setting, student conduct, scheduling, extra school relationships and facilities (Imber & Duke, 1984). Research indicates, however, that teachers are not always keen to participate in decisions that do not directly concern them. For example, they prefer not to take part in more administrative-type decisions (Epp & MacNeil, 1997; Blase & Blase, 1999). On the other hand, others maintain that teachers need to become involved in areas central to the school's health. These include choosing instructional materials, shaping the curriculum, setting standards for student behavior, deciding whether students are tracked in special classes, designing staff development, setting promotion and retention policies, deciding school budgets, evaluating teacher performance and selecting new teachers and administrators (Barth, 2001).

### **Why Teacher Leadership?**

Many who write in the area of teacher leadership make cases for why it is a good thing. Fewer refer to its mixed blessings, while virtually no one recommends that teacher leadership be avoided. The cases that writers make can be classified as either practical or moral. The moral argument states that teacher leadership should be adopted because it is good for schools or that everyone should have the right to participate in influence processes, especially in decisions that affect their lives and work (Somech, 2002), particularly in democratic countries (Wallace, 2001). Others maintain that teaching is a moral activity, and for moral agents to be responsible for their acts, they must be free to act according to their best judgments, and not have others make decisions for them (Bolin, 1989).

Writers also encourage schools to embrace teacher leadership for practical reasons. Their argument is that teacher leadership will improve the ways that schools work. However, these claims are not consistently supported by the evidence. Studies that explore the relationship between teacher leadership and organizational effectiveness and student achievement are inconclusive (Blase & Blasé, 1997; Blase & Dungan, 1994; Bredeson,

1989; Frost, Wakely, & Ruh, 1974; Glickman, Allen, & Lunsford, 1994; Leithwood et. al., 1999; Leithwood & Jantzi in Riley & Louis, 2000; Smylie, 1997; Smylie et. al., 2002). The same holds for the effects on relationships within the school community (Blase & Blase, 1997; Bredeson, 1989; Rinehart et. al., 1998; Smylie, 1997). The most consistent results concern the positive effects of teacher leadership on teachers' demeanor and opportunities for professional learning (Blase & Blase, 1997; Blase & Dungan, 1994; Conley, 1991; Epp & MacNeil, 1997; Frost et. al., 1974; Kirby, 1992; Rice & Schneider, 1994; Rinehart & Short, 1994; Smylie, 1997). One notable finding is that increased opportunities for participation result in greater conflict (Blase & Blase, 1997; Rinehart et. al., 1998; Smylie, 1997). This conflict is related to role ambiguity and increases in workload, something that I follow up on in the next section.

### **What are the Barriers that Inhibit Teacher Leadership Initiatives?**

Experiments with teacher leadership are not always successful (Kirby, 1992). One reason for failure has to do with the ideas and feelings participants bring to these experiments. Administrators and teachers may have difficulty working outside of the traditional bureaucratic cultures and structures to which they are accustomed. Administrators are not always willing to surrender power to others (Blase & Blase, 1997; Blase & Blase, 1999; Bolin, 1989; Kirby, 1992). But even those who are able to do so find that it is difficult to escape the authority and responsibility that accompanies their position because they will inevitably have to answer for others if things go wrong (Bolin, 1989; Bredeson, 1989; Wallace, 2001). Teachers may also not be keen to abandon the comfort of having others make decisions and take responsibility (Epp & MacNeil, 1997; Blase & Blase, 1999). Teachers are also sometimes reluctant to participate in governance activities and they may not want to break solidarity with colleagues by assuming authority that their colleagues do not have (Conley, 1991; Datnow & Castellano, 2001; Duke, Showers & Imber, 1980).

In these unfamiliar situations of teacher leadership teachers and administrators may not know what their respective roles are, or should be (Blase & Blase, 1997; Bredeson, 1989; Clift, Johnson, Holland, & Veal, 1992; Datnow & Castellano, 2001; Epp & MacNeil, 1997; Leithwood et. al., 1999). Teachers and administrators often have different ideas about what their respective roles should be. This ambiguity generates conflict and anxiety on the part of both teachers and administrators (Blase & Blase, 1997; Blase & Blase, 1999; Clift et. al., 1992; Glickman, Allen, & Lunsford, 1994; Smylie & Brownlea-Conyers, 1992). Still, conflict is not just the result of uncertainty around roles; it also emerges as participants move into positions where they disclose their differences more overtly (Blase & Blase, 1997; Glickman et. al., 1994). This conflict is not necessarily always a bad thing.

Attempts at implementing teacher leadership arrangements also face other impediments. Two of these are time and work (Blase & Blase, 1999; Bredeson, 1989; Clift et. al., 1992; Conley, 1991; Duke et. al., 1980; Epp & MacNeil, 1997; Short & Greer, 1997). Leadership activities require extra work and this work requires additional time. Not surprisingly, teachers often find they simply do not have enough time to devote both to teaching and to these activities. Traditional school time patterns do not always help.



Inflexible schedules make it difficult for those who teach to engage in other activities (Conley, 1991). Also, teachers tend to resent activities that cut into time normally spent on classroom-related activities, particularly if they do not have any apparent effect on the classroom (Leithwood et. al., 2001). Implementing teacher leadership arrangements also becomes more difficult when teachers feel their opinions are not valued and acted upon and when they receive little support and few resources (Blase & Dungan, 1994; Epp & MacNeil, 1997; Kirby, 1992; Short & Greer, 1997).

### **What Strategies Work Best in Implementing Teacher Leadership?**

Although schools often face difficulties when they attempt to implement teacher leadership, some schools have been able to overcome them. There are many examples of successful or partially successful teacher leadership endeavors. And this is perhaps where the research on teacher leadership is most helpful. Researchers have studied many initiatives of this sort in schools, and they have documented their successes and failures.

For teacher leadership to succeed, teachers and administrators need to approach changes with certain kinds of attitudes. It is difficult, if not impossible, for them to cope with substantial changes without these attitudes. To begin with, principals and teachers have to be prepared to share power and they need to be willing and committed to the new arrangements (Blase & Blase, 1997; Blase & Blase, 1999; Bredeson, 1989; Epp & MacNeil, 1997). The uncertainty generally associated with changes of this nature also requires them to be patient and tolerant (Blase & Blase, 2000). Communication is also important in these scenarios (Blase & Blasé, 1997; Blase & Blase, 2000). Those involved need to acquire or develop the skills that enable them to collaborate effectively (Datnow & Castellano, 2001). For this to happen, they need to be open and honest with others (Short & Greer, 1997).

School administrators have a crucial role to play in this process because they have more influence than teachers. One of the key things they must do is learn how to share their legal power with others, to shift their orientation from decision-makers to facilitators (Blase & Blase, 1997; Blase & Blase, 1999; Datnow & Castellano, 2001; Epp & MacNeil, 1997; Glickman et. al., 1994; Short & Greer, 1997). Administrators also need to be well informed, understand all the new roles and be able to explain them to others (Bredeson, 1989). It is also important is for administrators do what they can to shape a school culture that supports teacher leadership (Datnow & Castellano, 2001; Short & Greer, 1997). But it is not just building administrators who ought to become involved in these tasks. If teacher leadership initiatives are to succeed, then district administrators also must do what they can to support them (Crockenburg & Clark, 1979).

More important than individual administrators in this process are institutional arrangements. Those involved in teacher leadership initiatives need to ensure that the institutions in which they work support these initiatives. This means entrenching, and as far as possible, formalizing such practices in these institutions (Blase & Blase, 2000; Crockenburg & Clark, 1979). These practices include:

- decision-making arrangements that give teachers real power (Duke et. al., 1980; Short & Greer, 1997);
- a locally controlled process that allows teachers to frame a definition of empowerment (Crockenburg & Clark, 1979; Epp & MacNeil, 1997; Short & Greer, 1997);
- roles that are clearly specified, yet not overly constraining (Leithwood et. al., 1999);
- a climate that supports risk-taking (Datnow & Castellano, 2001; Short & Greer, 1997);
- processes for helping participants problem-solve and manage conflict (Short & Greer, 1997);
- a mechanism for providing adequate resources (Blase & Blase, 1997; Bredeson, 1989; Short & Greer, 1997);
- schedules that allow teachers the extra time they need to participate in leadership activities (Blase & Blase, 1999; Short & Greer, 1997);
- an ongoing process for educating participants (Short & Greer, 1997).

Those involved in teacher leadership initiatives need help to implement and sustain them. These arrangements will be new to participants and many will not know what to expect from them or how to deal with the novel situations that inevitably arise. Hence, they will need to be provided with ongoing professional development that prepares them for what to expect ahead of time and provides them with assistance with ongoing issues that arise. Professional development is most effective when it helps participants understand how to set up and engage in problem solving and decision-making processes and when it is locally run and directly relevant to the situations that teachers and administrators face (Bolin, 1989; Goldman et. al., 1993; Short & Greer, 1997). These activities are most helpful when they focus on the interpersonal and communication skills that are required to deal with the inevitable conflict and uncertainty (Blase & Blase, 1999; Blase & Blase, 2000). Learning should also be organized to help teachers and administrators critically reflect on their experiences with teacher leadership and to learn from them (Blase & Blase, 1999).

Teacher leadership initiatives are most likely to succeed when they are implemented gradually (Blase & Blase, 1999; Blase & Blase, 2000; Clift et. al., 1992; Keedy & Finch, 1994). Whether they are introduced as part of a system-wide effort or initiated within individual schools, ideas about these sorts of arrangements ought to be gradually nurtured in ways that garner much needed local support. Imposition from above without support from below limits the survival chances of these sorts of endeavors. As support grows, discussion and planning need to take place, and everyone affected should be involved. When plans are in place, then schools can begin the incremental adoption of teacher leadership practices (Blase & Blase, 2000). This stage takes time. It involves experimentation, trial and error and considerable negotiations, even when arrangements are clearly laid out (Blase & Blase, 2000; Clift et. al., 1992; Keedy & Finch, 1994). And this is the time when conflict is most likely to surface. So those involved need to be patient as people orient themselves to situations that are new to them. In some schools, consensus about roles may begin to emerge as early as the second year (Clift et. al., 1992). But not all schools are the same, and those involved need to realize that schools spawn different forms of leadership in their own ways and time (Blase & Blase, 2000; Glickman et. al., 1994).

The extensive research into teacher leadership has much to offer inclusive leadership by providing useful information about why schools should adopt teacher leadership practices and what they look like. They also supply insight into potential barriers to successful implementation and outline what needs to be done for teacher leadership to work. On the other hand, the preoccupation of teacher leadership research with influence processes precludes inquiry into leadership goals or ends, and in particular, social justice and inclusion issues. Moreover, it only focuses on the inclusion of one group -- teachers -- and provides little, if any, information on other groups, including students and parents.

Despite shortcomings, the empirical research into teacher leadership has provided useful insight into inclusion. Among other things it has generated evidence that challenges an individualistic view of leadership. This evidence suggests that there is a difference in the way many people think about leadership and what actually happens in schools and other organizations (Gronn, 2002; Smylie et. al, 2002). Research into teacher leadership has revealed that leadership is not simply a function of an individual leader's ability, knowledge, charisma and cognition, but is something that is part of a socio-cultural context. In other words, influence is more than the product of an individual's actions. It is best understood as a distributed or organizational practice that is "stretched over" varieties of artifacts, tools, language, people and relationships (Gronn, 2002; Pounder, Ogawa & Adams, 1995; Spillane, Halverson & Hiamond, 2001). These findings have implications both for the practice of leadership and for school improvement. They point to the fact that schools improve not necessarily as the result of individual people doing remarkable things in isolation, but as the consequence of a variety of people working together in many different ways and roles, using the multitude of different resources that are available to them (Leithwood et. al, 1999; Smylie et. al, 2002).

### **Student Leadership**

Student leadership in schools has become more visible in recent years. Where once adults who ran these organizations gave little consideration to student input, now they are making efforts to include students in various aspects of schooling. Students are beginning to have more say in the actual running of schools, in the curriculum and how it is taught. Despite these changes, however, questions remain as to the real impact of this sort of inclusion. Indeed, instances of influential student participation remain far and few between (Blase & Blase, 1999; Blase & Dungan, 1994; Critchley, 2003; Levin, 2001; Levin, 1998; Short & Greer, 1997), and in most parts of the Western world this participation is not entrenched in policy (Critchley, 2003). In some instances, initiatives that look to involve students are seen as mere tokenism.

Despite the cynicism in some quarters over student leadership, school systems have in recent years taken steps to introduce mechanisms that allow students to participate in influence processes in schools. These include representation on school councils, student councils, school improvement teams, advisory teams and school boards (Bechtel & Reed, 1998; Critchley, 2003; Fletcher in Jensen & Walker 1998; Furtwengler, 1996; Levin, 1998;

Young & Levin, 1998). Students have also been asked to complete surveys and participate in round table discussions; they have had the opportunity to serve on government commissions and school accreditation panels; and they have been part of various student associations and groups (Critchley, 2003). They have also had the opportunity, at least in principle, to influence decisions about curriculum content and organization, textbooks, evaluation practices, school rules, discipline and controversial issues (Levin, 1998). Unfortunately, these measures do not always ensure real student influence. Student roles of this sort are rarely entrenched in policy, and when they are, they are generally of an advisory nature. For example, a recent policy initiative in the province of Ontario has made a place for students on local school boards, but only in an advisory capacity.

One reason that student leadership is not more common is that some educators oppose it, believing that students are not capable of making sound educational decisions, lack confidence, cannot handle the heavy workload associated with this sort of involvement and are only around for a few years (Wood, 1977). Other educators are put off by young people's tendency to challenge traditions and injustices, a lack of time, heavy teaching loads, tight school schedules, potential conflict between teachers and students and a lack of knowledge about how to include students in policy processes (Osler & Starkey, 1998; Critchley, 2003; Wood, 1977).

Those who argue in favor of student leadership generally cite three kinds of arguments. First, students have a right to be involved in decisions that affect them. The Convention on the Rights of Children recognizes that children not only have the rights of protection and provision (of educational services), but also the rights of participation and citizenship. Schools cannot ignore the views of these young people just because they are young (Osler & Starkey, 1998). Second, student input can improve schools (Levin, 2001; Furtwengler, 1996). Students have valuable knowledge of classrooms and school processes which can be used to make schools better places (Levin, 2001; Levin, 1998; Weber, 1996). Students' involvement in determining learning opportunities also increases their motivation to learn. When those involved in the learning process have some input into it, they will be more likely to feel that they belong and become engaged (Kohn, 1999; Levin, 2001). Finally, students can learn valuable lessons about democracy in schools that actually practice democratic values (Levin, 1998; Scane & Wignall, 1996; Treslan, 1983).

There are a few examples of student leadership initiatives in the literature (see, for example, Mackin, 1996, pp. 9-16; Lee and Ursel, 2001, pp. 12-13; Leisey et. al. (in Critchley, 1999), and Trafford, 1997). One of these describes the efforts of a number of schools to involve students in a school improvement plan, the Reaching Success through Involvement (RSI) program (Furtwengler, 1996). This initiative improved student discipline, sense of belonging, perceptions of control and feelings of personal responsibility for the school. Unfortunately, students were not encouraged to extend their democratic attitudes into the classroom. The same could not be said of student-educator relationships in "School X," a high school in Japan (Hirata, 2003). Students and teachers believed that their relationship was "more equal," both in and out of the classroom. They also believed that students exerted real influence in the school.

The literature on student leadership has provided a number of insights into inclusive leadership. It has shown that there are many ways in which students can become involved in the operation of schools and there are very good pragmatic and moral reasons for including students in influence processes. The arguments behind these justifications outweigh the objections that some educators have over student input. Research has revealed that students are knowledgeable about school processes and they also have the interests of schools at heart (Levin, 2001, 1998). This does not mean that including students in school operations will be easy. Students and educators may not know how to approach student leadership initiatives, and conflict may ensue when they do proceed. One way to deal with this is to involve students, teachers and administrators in activities that will teach them how to conduct themselves in these sorts of initiatives. But for student leadership to work, it also has to become part of the normal operations of a school, which means that students' formal participation needs to be entrenched in policy.

### **Community Involvement**

Like student leadership, the idea and practice of including parents in the operation of schools has become more popular over the past few years. Not only have parents been encouraged to venture into their children's schools, they have also been asked to participate in policy and decision-making processes (see for example, Epstein, 1997; and Leithwood, Jantzi & Steinbach, 1999, pp. 467-493). Initiatives to include the community in school operations have taken two forms -- *empowerment* and *enablement* (Lewis & Nakagawa, 1995).

Strategies associated with empowerment target what its advocates see as the main problem – the lack of power that various individuals and communities have over educational institutions (see for example, Carmichael and Hamilton, 1967, Fine, 1993, pp. 682-710, and Levin, 1970). The main culprits in this scenario are self-absorbed educational bureaucracies. These entities seek to retain power for themselves, excluding already powerless parents, particularly those who are poor and those who belong to particular ethnic groups. Ensuring meaningful inclusion, then, requires the empowerment of these otherwise powerless parents. This will happen only when school systems display alternate structural arrangements that give parents a voice in the governance of educational institutions. These changes would help parents to become more satisfied with their children's schools and committed to education, and students to increase their academic achievement (Lewis & Nakagawa, 1995).

The other approach to community inclusion is enablement. Advocates of the enablement perspective do not believe that the cause of exclusion is powerful, professionally staffed, self-absorbed bureaucracies (see for example, Comer, 1986, pp. 442-446, Epstein, 1997, and Lightfoot, 1978). In some situations, however, certain people can have too much power, and others too little, and power can sometimes be abused. Bureaucracies can be unresponsive and sometimes dysfunctional, but these power differentials and bureaucratic shortcomings can be resolved from within the system. Thus, the emphasis is not on power *per se*, but on commitment to schools in a rapidly changing social environment. It is up to educational professionals to change themselves and the

organizations in which they work to reach out to the community and draw it into the school enterprise. Educators are encouraged to provide incentives for parents to become involved in their children's education for educational rather than political ends. Getting parents to work as educational resources in their children's education, eliciting their commitment to the educational enterprise and working out more collaborative arrangements among the school, parents and the community will ultimately enhance student achievement (Lewis & Nakagawa, 1995).

Not all inclusive school-community proposals or practices turn out to be exclusively of the empowerment or enablement variety. Some include elements of both, and so-called enablement programs sometimes value empowerment. Perhaps the reforms that resemble most closely the empowerment model occurred in large urban American centers in the 1980s and 1990s. Looking for alternatives to systems that had failed the largely Black populations of these areas, various groups in such cities as Philadelphia, Baltimore, New York, Detroit and Chicago banded together to make changes to what were once large bureaucratic systems (Fine, 1993; Lewis & Nakagawa, 1995). Variations among districts notwithstanding, new legislation paved the way for massive decentralization that allowed local parents a voice in the governance of their children's schools.

Not all urban American centers sponsored empowerment reforms, however. Educational reforms in Miami and Los Angeles followed more closely an enablement model. In these cities "insiders" rather than "outsiders" controlled the decentralization process, and as a result, they were able to make changes administratively and control the inclusion process. Many inclusive school-community reforms in the Western world have combined these two models. In some areas, like Ontario for example, although parental roles have been legislated, parents still remain relatively powerless. In the United Kingdom, on the other hand, legislation has provided parents with more power than what they previously had, and undoubtedly more power than Ontario parents currently have. In both cases, though, a strengthening of central powers has rendered any gains parents have made relatively meaningless (see, for example, Apple, 2000, pp. 84-107, Hatcher, Troyna and Gewirtz, 1996, and Leithwood et. al. 1999).

While enabling tactics and events are important in getting parents – particularly those who are reluctant – involved in school activities, they only constitute part of inclusive practice. Inclusion goes beyond bake sales, cultural events, parent nights and the like. Enabling strategies of this sort are designed almost exclusively to help diverse groups adjust to what will be new and very different environments. The educators who use them generally take for granted that it will be these families and not the school that must change; diverse community groups are expected to acclimatize themselves to practices that do not include their own. While some schools may make valiant efforts to include the languages, cultures, values and knowledge of the respective community groups in the content and process of schooling no guarantee can be made that any of this will occur. So if school knowledge is to be consistently inclusive in ways that empowerment advocates would recommend, power relationships cannot exclusively favor an (Anglo-European based) school system. Rather, these power relationships must make it possible for community groups to make decisions that will allow school knowledge to be inclusive. If schools are

to pay more than lip service to the idea of inclusion, then these groups need to be genuinely empowered.

Unfortunately, recent research indicates that the participation of parents in governance does not necessarily ensure inclusion or that marginalized students will succeed. Studies of school councils in Chicago (Lewis & Nakagawa, 1995), Ontario (Leithwood et. al., 1999) and the United Kingdom (Hatcher , Troyna, & Gewirtz, 1996), illustrate that even in situations where parent councils have power over finances, school programs and personnel, relationships between community and schools have not changed all that much (Lewis & Nakagawa, 1995), and student achievement gains are inconsistent at best (Hess, 1999; Shipp, Kahne & Smylie, 1999). Local community management generally has floundered in three areas – participation on school councils, power on the school councils and the relationship of governance to teaching and learning.

School councils tend to be populated and dominated by Anglo and middle class parents and even when “minority” parents do participate, they often have difficulty with the group interaction (Chambers, 2001; Delgado-Gaitan, 1991; Delhi, 1994; Hatcher et. al., 1996). In the United Kingdom, this happens because “minority” parents are not part of the influential informal parent, business, political and educational networks that generally place individuals on the councils. Asian parents, for example, do not participate on school councils because they lack confidence in their language abilities and in their ability to interact in the white-dominated formal environment of the school. Work commitments and the reluctance of women to go on their own also account for this low turnout. But even when “minority” parents do participate, they often find that they are unable to penetrate the language and forms of interaction that councils generally adopt (Hatcher et. al., 1996).

Those with little experience of formal meetings, like many minoritized, working class, and immigrant parents, have difficulty with the procedures of chaired meetings (Delhi, 1994; Hatcher et. al., 1996) and with “middle class proceduralism” (Lewis & Nakagawa, 1995). Not only do many of these parents have to struggle with language barriers, but they also have difficulty with the peculiar types of interaction that this setting engenders and with the informal types of talking that go on. These incongruencies routinely obstruct the voices of parents and block or filter issues of race (Hatcher et. al., 1996). One Philadelphia council member expresses his frustration with the process by saying that

Due to the fact that the participants of the Governance Council are from a very specific situation – all are teachers/administrators, are from the same school, and have been oriented through the years to a particular system and culture – the language, thinking and dialogue left me always playing catch up ball with such important subjects as meaning of words and concepts, philosophy of education, and contextual questions that relate [to this high school]. This promotes a high level of frustration. (Fine, 1993, p. 468).

While parents – particularly minoritized and working class parents – generally do not have the resources or skills to influence governance situations, principals do. Principals have

demonstrated a remarkable capacity to either derail community-dominated councils in order to retain decision-making control for themselves or ensure council effectiveness (Dehli, 1994; Hess, 1995; Leithwood et. al., 1999; Malen & Ogawa in Bacharach, 1992). On the positive side, they can help create participatory decision-making structures and foster collaborative work among council members (Odden & Wohlsletter, 1995), clearly define goals and roles for parents and for the council, and act as an information provider, motivator, and friend of the council. On the other hand, principals' unique access to information, their positional power, their ability to use abstract language to talk about educational issues, and to set meeting agendas make it possible for them to smother or exclude individuals and initiatives that do not meet with their approval.<sup>1</sup> Even when parents do attempt to speak out their efforts may be undermined. Hyacinth, a mother, community liaison work and educator in the African-Caribbean community in this urban environment says that

In my school the principal is so dominant that the other poor parents are afraid to speak up. When they do, he speaks in jargon so we can't understand, or ignores us. Because I speak up, they (the principal, vice-principal, and one teacher) gang up on me, or "forget" to tell me when the next meeting is to occur. I find that I have to look on the bulletin boards and call other parents to find out where the meeting is – and I was elected to be part of the council; the other parents don't have much of a voice at all. (Dei & James, 2002, p. 77).

Despite these obstacles, a few schools like La Escuela Fratney in Milwaukee, have made attempts to overcome these power imbalances (Peterson, 1999). While schools like La Escuela Fratney have attained a measure of success, they still face many obstacles in making education a truly equitable and inclusive enterprise. In some respects, decentralization has masked rather than resolved issues of race and class in inclusive policies by using the idea of inclusion to give the appearance of change without much resource redistribution; Whites maintain their hegemony, while Blacks maintain their "control" of the public schools. This continuing relationship has made it difficult for parents to assume a role in governance that they neither wanted nor were prepared for. In addition to this, decentralization has not had a noticeable impact on student achievement (Hess, 1999; Shipps et. al., 1999).

Changes in the relationship between schools and communities will also require changes in society generally. Not only should parents organize and schools and communities be restructured to work towards democracies of difference (Fine, 1993), but everyone needs to work to develop conditions of life that facilitate these inclusive practices. In order to achieve this end, parents, community members and educators have to work together. Parents should not be saddled with running schools, nor should they be subordinated to the existing structure. Instead, a model needs to be developed that allows for parents and educators to collaborate in certain parts of children's education (Lewis & Nakagawa, 1995). This involvement, however, should not be mandated; rather, policy should merely set the stage for parents and schools to work together. Moreover, this collaboration needs to make children's learning a priority. In this regard, it ought to acknowledge the necessity of finding ways to accommodate both professional and nonprofessional commitment and expertise.



Long-term improvement in student achievement will require the development of the capacity of professional educators because constraints on the exercise of these capacities will inevitably limit the improvement in student learning opportunities (Shipps et. al., 1999). But practices geared to improve the professional expertise and commitment of educators cannot be exclusive, as they have traditionally tended to be. Rather, professional teaching practice needs to be inclusive; it must incorporate a range of diverse community knowledge, practices and values. In order to ensure that this happens, parents and community members have to play some part in collaborative governance arrangements. Only in this manner can parents, community members and educators expect to improve learning for all students, and to address and alleviate the inequalities that have plagued educational institutions and the conditions of life generally.

The literature in the area of community inclusion provides a number of useful ideas. First, it recognizes the value of including parents in the operation of schools. Parents have much to offer schools and they need to have meaningful opportunities to make these contributions. But their participation needs to go beyond mere enablement roles. For their voices to be heard and their perspectives to be fairly represented in both governance and the curriculum, they need also to be genuinely empowered. Getting parents involved in influence processes, however, is not always easy, particularly in the case of immigrant, minoritized and working class parents. Because some members of these groups tend to shy away from governance roles, school councils are usually composed of members of the majority culture. For community inclusion to work, school communities have to work together to insure that everyone has the opportunity to either participate or be fairly represented in governance processes.

Second, even when members of marginalized groups do participate, they frequently find themselves at a disadvantage. They cannot always influence decisions because they may find it difficult to penetrate the language that people use and the procedures that meetings regularly adopt. People may be excluded from influence (leadership) processes for reasons other than those relating to traditional organizational and bureaucratic hierarchies. They are regularly excluded by barriers associated with class, ethnicity, gender and so on. The sooner that schools and educators recognize this, the sooner they can work to address this issue.

Third, parent, student and teacher inclusion in governance and influence processes will mean very little if such participation does not at some point find its way into the classroom. Schooling is fundamentally about student learning, and the way in which schools are organized will mean little if at some point this organization does not have an impact on student learning.

### **Leadership and the Inclusion of Differently-Abled Students**

The research in the area of leadership and differently-abled students is both similar to, and different from, the view of inclusive leadership that I am advocating. It resembles the latter in the way that it emphasizes the end-values of the leadership process. All of the

literature in this area promotes a view of leadership that aims to include all students in the process of formal education. This view of inclusion, however, is more acutely focused than the general view of inclusion that I favor. It emphasizes primarily the prospects of differently-abled students rather than all marginalized students. On the other hand, this view of leadership also highlights the process of leadership. In doing so, though, this largely empirically-based body of research promotes a very diverse set of approaches to leadership. While some of these views are inclusive, others are decidedly exclusive. Despite these inconsistencies, this body of literature has much to offer, particularly with regard to the strategies for pursuing the end-values of leadership.

This view of leadership is part of a movement that seeks to include differently-abled students in regular schools and classrooms. Originating in Scandinavia and known by different names such as mainstreaming and integration, it advocates that these students should not be segregated from their peers. Instead, its central principle is that special needs students should be integrated into regular classrooms in their local schools (Thomas, 1997). Proponents believe that inclusion should be pursued because differently-abled students have more to gain from being educated with regular students than they do in segregated environments (Thomas, 1997; Bailey & du Plessis, 1997), all students have a right to be educated in regular school settings (Thomas, 1997; Bailey & du Plessis, 1997) and peers, the school community and society benefit from these arrangements (Bailey & du Plessis, 1997).

Leadership is the key to successful inclusion programs (Doyle, 2002; Ingram, 1997; Bailey & du Plessis, 1997; Keys, Hanley-Maxwell, & Capper, 1999; Guzman, 1997), (Thomas, 1997). It can address the many challenges that educators face in inclusive environments such as the extra and sometimes extraordinary efforts required of educators (Ingram, Mayrowetz, & Weinstein, 1999; Thomas, 1997). Educators have to deal with changes in instructional techniques and classroom routines, additional planning efforts and time, accommodating adults in the classroom and training in the use of medical equipment (Ingram, 1997). They also have to regularly cope with a lack of human and physical resources, and a lack of training and support (Bailey & du Plessis, 1997).

Leadership is also needed to deal with negative attitudes toward inclusion. Resistance to inclusion is common. Teachers who are not special education specialists tend to oppose inclusion (Boucher, 1981; Ingram, 1997; Rizzo, 1984). Many believe that they are not prepared to receive these students and that inclusive environments will bring on extra work and stress for them (Bailey & du Plessis, 1997; Ingram, 1997). But teachers are not the only ones who do not support inclusion. Administrators are sometimes hesitant to embrace it (Bailey & du Plessis, 1997; Doyle, 2002). And even when they do endorse the principle of inclusion, their support is often qualified. Most principals are pragmatic, and given the opportunity, they will evaluate students on a case-by-case basis, even when they express support for inclusion (Bailey & du Plessis, 1997). This is significant because the success or failure of inclusion efforts in schools will depend, to some extent, on the beliefs and actions of administrators (Doyle, 2002; Guzman, 1997).

Leadership practices for the inclusion of the differently-abled champion the attainment of inclusion. They revolve exclusively around efforts to mobilize support for inclusion, implement inclusive practices and monitor efforts. Given the challenges of, and resistance to, inclusion, however, much text is devoted to garnering support for it. The recommended leadership approaches for attaining this goal vary. They range from transformational, individualistic practices to emancipatory, collective processes. Researchers who favor transformational leadership do so because they believe the behaviors associated with it represent the best chance of marshalling support for inclusive ideals and practices. More specifically, they feel that charismatic leaders stand the best chance of motivating teachers to go beyond the call of duty, which in this case would include supporting inclusion and doing the extra things that need to be done in inclusive classrooms (Ingram, 1997). Emancipatory proponents, on the other hand, maintain that support for inclusion can only come through dialogue and inquiry over a period of time (Doyle, 2002).

Regardless of philosophy or allegiance, the literature has many suggestions for garnering support for inclusion. These include

- Making inclusion a non-negotiable option (Keys et. al., 1999);
- Sharing with others the theoretical, ethical and research-based rationales for inclusive education (Thousand & Villa, 1994);
- Involving school and community stakeholder groups in formulating objectives for supporting all students (Thousand & Villa, 1994); and
- Creating cognitive dissonance, discomfort and a sense of urgency (Thousand & Villa, 1994).

The research indicates that educators need to believe in inclusion for it to succeed in schools. But this in and of itself is not enough. Leadership practices also have to entrench this belief and the related practices in the culture and structure of schools (Doyle, 2002; Keys, 1999; Mayrowetz et. al., 1999; Thousand & Villa, 1994). Ideally, schools need to develop a culture and *esprit de corps* that embraces the values and practices of inclusive education (Thousand & Villa, 1994). In order to do this, teachers need support in the form of physical and human resources, which includes support for critique, for making their own decisions, for solving their own problems and for taking risks (Keys et. al., 1999). Teachers and administrators must be provided with in-service programs that address issues in conflict resolution, staffing management, problem solving, collaborative decision-making, student discipline, relationships with parents and instruction and curriculum in inclusive environments (Guzman, 1997). Finally, inclusive practices need to be monitored (Mayrowetz et. al., 1999).

Research in this area has provided much useful information about leadership and inclusion. Like other approaches, though, it has its drawbacks. For example, researchers in the area promote a variety of very different and often inconsistent approaches to leadership processes. Some are compatible with inclusion, but others are not. The most valuable contribution of this area to inclusive leadership is in the area of the end-values of leadership. Researchers in this area are preoccupied with achieving particular goals, and

they believe that leadership efforts are key to attaining them. These ends, however, are somewhat narrow, directly as they are toward the differently-abled. Even so, those interested in promoting more general inclusive ends have much to learn from the manner in which these goals are emphasized and pursued. On the other hand, proponents of a more general approach to inclusion have to acknowledge the inevitable resistance to inclusion. Many will oppose inclusive gender, class and anti-racism initiatives. But this resistance will come not just from overtly sexist, racist and homophobic individuals. It will also come from supporters of gender, class and race rights who take for granted the subtle privileges that they enjoy from their membership in certain groups. So it is important for leadership processes to acknowledge this resistance and to find ways to advocate for inclusive ideals and practices.

### **Understanding and Promoting Inclusive Leadership**

Meaningful pursuit of inclusive leadership practices requires that academics and practitioners attend to both the process and the ends of leadership. There is little point in promoting an inclusive process if it does not at the same time value inclusion and social justice generally. The literature on inclusive leadership has been useful in sketching out what this view of inclusive leadership should look like and in providing suggestions about how interested parties might proceed in promoting and implementing it. Most importantly, it gives us an idea of how leadership arrangements might be organized and implemented and how they might work for inclusion generally. Among other things, those interested in putting inclusive leadership into practice need to consider how they can: 1) view leadership as an equitable collective process rather than in terms of individuals who are hierarchically distinct from others; 2) include teachers, students and parents in school processes; 3) advocate for inclusion and for excluded individuals and groups; 4) educate the entire school community; 5) develop critical consciousness in the school community; 6) promote dialogue; 7) emphasize student learning; 8) adopt inclusive decision- and policy-making processes and 9) incorporate whole school approaches to inclusion.

---

### **References**

- Anderson, G. (1990). toward a critical constructivist approach to school administration: invisibility, legitimation and the study of non-events. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 26(1) 38-59.
- Apple, M. (2000). Racing toward educational reform. In R. Mahalingam and C. McCarthy (eds.), *Multicultural curriculum*. New York: Routledge (pp. 84-107).
- Bacharach, S., Bamberger, P., Conley, S., & Bauer, S. (1990). The dimensionality of decision participation in educational organizations: The value of a multi-domain evaluative approach. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 26(2) 126-167.

- 
- Bailey, J. & du Plessis, D. (1997). Understanding principals' attitudes toward inclusive schooling. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 35(5) 428-438.
- Barth, R. (2001). Teacher leader. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 82(6) 443-449.
- Bechtel, D. & Reed, C. (1998). Students as documenters: benefits, reflections and suggestions. *NASS Principals Bulliten*, 82(594) 89-95.
- Blackmore, J. (1989). Educational leadership: a feminist critique and reconstruction. In J. Smyth (ed.), *Critical Perspectives on Educational Leadership*. London: Falmer Press.
- Blackmore, J. (1999). *Troubling women*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Blasé, J. & Dungan, S. (1994). Tabla rasa: Case studies of shared governance. *School Organization* 14 (2), 207-218.
- Blasé, J. & Anderson, G. (1995). *The micropolitics of educational leadership: From control to empowerment*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Blasé, J. & Blase, J. (1997). *The fire is back? Principals sharing school governance*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Blasé, J. & Blase, J. (2000). Principals' perspectives on shared governance leadership. *Journal of School Leadership*, 10(1) 9-39.
- Bolin, F. (1989). Empowering leadership. *Teachers College Record*, 91(1) 81-96.
- Boucher, C. (1981). Teachers' decisions about mainstreaming. *Education Unlimited*, 3(1) 9-11.
- Bredeson, P. (1989). Redefining leadership and the roles of school principals: Responses to changes in the professional worklife of teachers. *The High School Journal*, 73, 9-20.
- Burbules, N. (1993). *Dialogue in teaching: Theory and practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Carmichael, S. & Hamilton, C. (1967). *Black power: The politics of liberation in America*. New York: Random House.
- Chambers, P. (2001). *Ontario school councils: Engaging diversity*. Unpublished master's project, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
- Clift, R., Johnson, M., Holland, P., & Veal, M. (1992). Developing the potential for collaborative school leadership. *American Educational Research Journal* 20(4) 877-908.

- 
- Comer, J. (1997). Parent participation in the schools. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 67(6) 442-446.
- Conley, S. (1991). Review of research on teacher participation in school decision making. In G. Grant (ed.), *Review of research in education*. Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association (pp. 225-265).
- Corson, D. (1996). Emancipatory discursive practices. In K. Leithwood, J. Chapman, D. Corson, P. Hallinger And A. Hart (eds.), *International handbook of educational leadership and administration*. Dordrecht: Kluwer (pp. 1043-1067).
- Corson, D. (2000). Emancipatory leadership. *International Journal of Leadership in Education* 3(2) 93-120.
- Critchley, S. (2003). The nature and extent of student involvement in educational policy-making in Canadian school systems. *Educational Management and Administration* 31(1) 97-106.
- Crockenberg, V. & Clark, W. (1979). Teacher participation in school decision making: The San Jose teacher involvement project. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 61(2) 115-118.
- Datnow, A. & Castellano, M. (2001). Managing and guiding school reform: Leadership in Success for All Schools.
- Dei, G. & James, I. (2002). Beyond the rhetoric: Moving from exclusion, reaching for inclusion in Canadian schools. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 48(1) 61-87.
- Delgado-Gaitan, C. (1991). Involving parents in schools: A process of empowerment. *American Journal of Education*, 100 (1) 20-46.
- Delhi, K. (1994). *Parent activism and school reform in Toronto: A report*. Toronto: Department of Sociology in Education, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education-University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
- Doyle, L. (2002). Leadership and inclusion: Reculturing for reform. *International Journal of Educational Reform*, 11(1) 38-62.
- Duke, D., Showers, B, & Imber, M. (1980). Teachers and shared decision making: The costs and benefits of involvement. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 16(1) 93-106.
- Epp, J., & MacNeil, C. (1997). Perceptions of shared governance in an elementary school. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 22(3) 254-267.
- Epstein, J. (1997). *School, family and community partnerships: Your handbook for action*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

- 
- Fay, B. (1987). *Critical social science*. Ithica, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.
- Ferguson, K. (1984). *The feminist case against bureaucracy*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Fiedler, F. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Fine, M. (1993). [Ap]parent involvement: reflections on parents, power, and urban public schools. *Teachers College Record*, 94(4) 682-710.
- Fletcher, S. (1998). Democratization on trial: Democratization in English secondary schools. In K. Jensen and S. Walker (eds.), *Toward democratic schooling: European experiences*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Foster, W. (1989). Towards a critical practice of leadership. In J. Smyth (ed.), *Critical perspectives on educational leadership*. London: Falmer.
- Foster, W. (1994). School leaders as transformative intellectuals: Toward a critical pragmatism. *Advances in Educational Administration*, 3, 29-51.
- Frost, C., Wakely, J., & Ruh, R. (1974). *The Scanlon plan for organizational development: Identity, participation and equity*. East Lansing: Michigan State University.
- Furtwengler, W. (1996). Improving secondary school discipline by involving students in the process. *NASSP Bulletin*, 80(581) 36-44.
- Giddens, A. (1981). *A contemporary critique of historical materialism*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Glickman, C., Allen, L., & Lunsford, B. (1994). Voices of principals from democratically transformed schools. In J. Murphy and K. S. Louis (eds.), *Reshaping the principalship: Insights from transformational reform efforts*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin (pp. 203-218).
- Goldman, P., Dunlap, D., & Conley, D. (1993). Facilitative power and nonstandardized solutions to school site restructuring. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 29(1) 69-92.
- Grace, G. (1995). *School leadership: Beyond education management*. London: Falmer.
- Gronn, P. (2002). Distributed leadership. In K. Leithwood and P. Hallinger (eds.), *Second international handbook of educational leadership and administration*. Dordrecht: Kluwer (pp. 653-696).

- 
- Grundy, S. (1993). Educational leadership as emancipatory praxis. In J. Blackmore and J. Kenway (eds.), *Gender matters in educational administration and policy*. London: Falmer Press.
- Guzman, N. (1997). Leadership for successful inclusive schools: A study of principal behaviours. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 35(5) 439-450.
- Hatcher, R., Troyna, B., & Gewirtz, D. (1996). *Racial equality and the local management of schools*. Staffordshire: Trentham Books.
- Hess, G. (1999). Expectations, opportunity, capacity and will: The four essential components of Chicago school reform. *Educational Policy*, 13(4) 494-517.
- Hess, G. (1995). *Restructuring urban schools: A Chicago perspective*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Hirata, J. (2003).. *Do school councils empower students? Two Japanese case studies*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education—University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
- Ingram, P. (1997). Leadership behaviours of principals in inclusive educational settings. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 35(5) 411-427.
- Ingram, P., Mayrowetz, D., & Weinstein, C. (1999). Sources of leadership for inclusive education: Creating schools for all children. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 35(3) 423-449.
- Imber, M., & Duke, D. (1984). Teacher participation in school decision making: A framework for research. *The Journal of Educational Administration*, 22(1) 24-34.
- Keedy, J. & Finch, A. (1994). Examining teacher-principal empowerment: An analysis of power. *The Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 27(3) 162-175.
- Keys, M., Hanley-Maxwell, C., & Capper, C. (1999). Spirituality? It's the core of my leadership: Empowering leadership in an inclusive elementary school. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 35(2) 203-237.
- Kirby, P. (1992). Shared decision making: Moving from concerns about restrooms to concerns about classrooms. *Journal of School Leadership*, 2(3) 330-345.
- Kohn, A. (1999). *The schools our children deserve*. New York: Mifflin.
- Lee, L. & Ursel, S. (2001). Individual learning, school environment, secondary schools. *Education Canada*, 40(4) 12-13.
- Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., & Steinbach, R. (1999). Do school councils matter? *Educational Policy*, 13(4) 467-493.



- 
- Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., Steinbach, R. (1999). *Changing Leadership for Changing Times*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Leithwood, K. & Jantzi, D. (2000). The effects of different sources of leadership on student engagement in school. In K. Riley and K. S. Louis (eds.), *Leadership for change and school reform: International perspectives*. New York: Routledge/Falmer (pp. 50-66).
- Levin, B. (1998). The educational requirement for democracy. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 28(1) 57-79.
- Levin, B. (2001). Putting students at the centre of educational reform," *The Journal of Educational Change*, 1(2) 155-172.
- Levin, H. (ed.) (1970). *Community control of schools*. New York: Clarion.
- Lewis, D. & Nakagawa, K. (1995). *Race and educational reform in the American metropolis: A study of school decentralization*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Lightfoot, S. L. (1978). *Worlds apart: Relationships between families and schools*. New York: Basic Books.
- Mackin, R. (1996). Hey Bob, can we talk? Toward the creation of a personalized high school. *NASS Bulletin*, 80(584) 9-16.
- Malen, B., Ogawa, R., & Kranz, J. (1990). What do we know about school-based management? A case study of the literature -- A call for research. In W. Clune and J. Witte (eds.), *Choice and control in American education volume 2: The practice of choice, decentralization and school restructuring*. New York: Falmer (pp. 289-242).
- Malen, B & Ogawa, R. (1992). Community involvement: Parents, teachers and administrators working together. In S. Bacharach (ed.), *Education reform: Making sense of it all*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Allyn and Bacon (pp. 103-119).
- May, S. (1994). *Making multicultural education work*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- May, S. (1998). On what might have been: some reflections on critical multiculturalism. In G. Shacklock and J. Smyth (eds.), *Being reflexive in critical educational and social research*. London: Falmer (pp. 150-170).
- Odden, E. & Wohlsletter, P. Making school-based management work. *Educational Leadership*, 52(5) 32-36.
- Ogza, J. (1993). *Women in educational management*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

- 
- Osler, A. & Starkey, H. (1998). Children's rights and citizenship: Some implications for the management of schools. *The International Journal of Children's Rights*, 6, 313-333.
- Peterson, B. (1999). La Escuela Fratney: A journey towards democracy. In M. Apple & J. Beane (eds.), *Democratic schools: Lessons from the chalk face*. Buckingham: Open University Press (pp. 68-97).
- Pounder, D., Ogawa, R., & Adams, E. (1995). Leadership as an organization-wide phenomenon: Its impact on school performance. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 31(4) 564-588.
- Reitzug, U. (1994). A case study of empowering principal behavior. *American Educational Research Journal*, 31(2) 283-307.
- Rice, E. & Schneider, G. (1994). A decade of teacher empowerment: An empirical analysis of teacher involvement in decision-making 1980-1991. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 32(1) 43-58.
- Rinehart, J., Short, P., Short, R., & Eckley, M. (1998). Teacher empowerment and principal leadership: Understanding the influence process. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 34(4), 630-649.
- Rizvi, F. (1993). Race, gender and the cultural assumptions of schooling. In C. Marshall (ed.), *The New Politics of Race and Gender*. Bristol, PA.: Falmer Press (pp. 203-217).
- Rizzo, T. (1984). Attitudes of physical educators toward handicapped students. *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly*, 1(4) 267-275.
- Robinson, V. (1994). The practical promise of critical research in educational administration. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 30(1) 56-76.
- Rusch, E. (1998). Leadership in evolving democratic school communities. *Journal of School Leadership*, 8, 214-250.
- Ryan, J. (1998). Critical leadership for education in a postmodern world: emancipation, resistance and communal action. *International Journal of Leadership In Education*, 3(1) 257-278.
- Ryan, J. (2002). Inclusive leadership for ethnically diverse schools: initiating and sustaining dialogue. In H. Fennell (ed.), *The Role of the Principal in Canada*. Calgary, Alberta, Canada: Detselig ( 119-141)
- Ryan, J. (2003). *Leading diverse schools*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

- 
- Ryan, J. (2003). Educational administrators' perceptions of racism in diverse school context. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, 6(2) 145-164.
- Scane, J. & Wignall, R. (1996). Students in school councils: The Clients Speak. *Orbi*, 27(4) 13-14.
- Shipp, D., Kahne, J., & Smylie, M. (1999). The politics of urban school reform: Legitimacy, city growth and school improvement in Chicago. *Educational Policy*, 13(4) 518-545.
- Short, P. & Greer, J. (1997). Leadership in empowered schools: Themes from innovative efforts. Columbus, Ohio: Prentice-Hall.
- Short, P. & Rinehart, J. (1992). School participant empowerment scale: Assessment of level of empowerment within the school environment. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 52, 951-960.
- Smylie, M. & Brownlea-Conyers, J. (1992). Teacher leaders and their principals: Exploring the development of new working relationships. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 28(2) 150-184.
- Smylie, M. (1997). Research on teacher leadership: Assessing the state of the art. In B. Biddle et. al. (eds.), *International handbook of teachers and teaching*. Dordrecht: Kluwer (pp. 521-592).
- Smylie, M., Conley, S., & Marks, H. (2002). Building leadership into the roles of teachers. In J. Murphy (ed.), *The educational leadership challenge: Redefining leadership for the 21st century*. Chicago: NSSE (pp. 162-188).
- Smyth, J. (1996). The socially just alternative to the "self-managing school". In K. Leithwood, J. Chapman, D. Corson, P. Hallinger and A. Hart (eds.), *International handbook of educational leadership and administration*. Boston: Kluwer (pp. 1097-1131).
- Spillane, J., Halverson, R., & Diamond, J. (2001). Investigating school leadership practice: A distributed perspective. *Educational Researcher*, 30(3) 23-28.
- Somech, A. (2002). Explicating the complexity of participative management: An investigation of multiple dimensions. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(3) 341-371.
- Trafford, B. (1997). *Participation, power sharing and school improvement*. Nottingham: Educational Heretics Press.
- Thousand, J. & Villa, R. Managing complex change toward inclusive schooling. In R. Villa and J. Thousand (eds.), *Creating an inclusive school*. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (pp. 51-79).

- 
- Tierney, W. (1989). Advancing democracy: A critical interpretation of leadership. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 66(3) 157-175.
- Thomas, R., with Macanawai, S. & MacLaurin, C. (1997) Editorial. *Journal of Educational Administration* 35(5) 385-396.
- Treslan, D. (1983). A mechanism for involving students in decision making: A critical issue in educational planning and administration. *Clearing House*, 57(3) 124-131.
- Walker, A. & Walker, J. (1998). Challenging the boundaries of sameness: Leadership through valuing difference. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 36(1) 8-28.
- Wallace, M. (2001). Sharing leadership of schools through teamwork: A justifiable risk? *Educational Management & Administration*, 29(2) 153-168.
- Weber, E. (1996). Creating communities in high school: An interactive learning and training approach. *NASS Principals Bulletin*, 80(583) 76-85.
- Wood, E. (1977). Student influence in decision making in secondary schools. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
- Young, J. & Levin, B. (1998). *Understanding Canadian schools: An introduction to educational administration*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Harcourt Brace & Co.