Chapter 5
Culturally Responsive Practices

Lauri Johnson, Jorunn Møller, Petros Pashiardis, Gunn Vedøy and Vassos Savvides

5.1 Introduction

This chapter aims to explore how successful leadership for diversity is defined, negotiated, and addressed in selected policy documents and culturally diverse schools across three countries—Norway, the USA, and Cyprus. This analysis of leadership practice is based on data from selected International Successful School Principalship Project (ISSPP) case studies. We start by outlining the theoretical framework and our methodological approach. In order to provide the reader with a better understanding of the three national contexts within which the study is located, we provide a brief overview of governance and public educational policy in Norway, the USA (New York State) and Cyprus. In our cross-country analysis we focus on national and local policy issues related to cultural inclusiveness and diversity. We then summarize findings from the case studies. Above all, we will discuss how school leaders negotiate a balance between honouring student home cultures and emphasizing students' learning and achievement in the mainstream culture, as well as the role that all stakeholders play in the democratic life of the school. We argue that principals who are deemed successful because of increased student achievement must also be evaluated in light of their ability to respond to the needs and perspectives of students and their families from diverse racial, ethnic, and religious groups.

5.2 Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework for this chapter combines two complementary lenses for understanding leadership practices in diverse schools that were developed in previous studies of the ISSPP case studies in the USA and Norway and reported in a special issue of the *International Studies in Educational Administration* (see Johnson

L. Johnson (✉)
Boston College, Chestnut Hill, USA
e-mail: lauri.johnson@bc.edu

R. M. Ylimaki, S. L. Jacobson (eds.), *US and Cross-National Policies, Practices, and Preparation,* Studies in Educational Leadership 12,
DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-0542-5_5, © Springer Science+Business Media B.V. 2011

2007; Vedoy and Moller 2007). These are culturally responsive leadership (Ladson-Billings 1995a, b; Johnson 2007) and leadership for democratic education (i.e. Furman and Starratt 2002; Møller 2002, 2006; Vedøy and Møller 2007). These two perspectives are combined in the present chapter to illustrate the significant dilemmas educational leaders have to manoeuvre in-between in order to meet the needs and expectations for schooling in diverse contexts. Culturally responsive leadership discusses how historically repressive structures in education can be addressed at the group level in order to empower students and parents. The theoretical framework of democratic education offers an approach to leadership in diverse settings at the individual level of rights, needs, and participation. These two perspectives reveal a major issue in dealing with diversity, namely the essentialist and the processual approaches. According to Baumann (1999), essentialist approaches understand concepts like culture, religion, and ethnicity as "fixed". In this view, culture is something one has and is a member of, rather than something one makes and reshapes through continual activity. Processual approaches, on the other hand, see culture as "fluid". Essentialists often regard the processual approach as too relativistic and without values while the processual argument is that essentialist approaches create categories that do not fit for living people in "the real world". Both perspectives are important in order to understand and improve educational policies and practices for diversity (Baumann 1999; Castles 2005; Wilkinson 2008).

5.2.1 Culturally Responsive Leadership

Culturally responsive leadership practices are those that incorporate the history, values, and cultural knowledge of students' home communities in the school curriculum, work to develop a critical consciousness among both students and faculty to challenge inequities in the larger society, and empower parents from diverse communities. Ladson-Billings coined the term "culturally relevant pedagogy" in *The Dreamkeepers* (1994), her now classic study of eight exemplary teachers of African American students. This instructional approach arises from previous anthropological work that noted a cultural mismatch between students from culturally diverse backgrounds and their white middle-class teachers, particularly in terms of language and verbal participation structures. In Ladson-Billings' (1995a, b) view, culturally relevant pedagogy rests on three propositions: (a) students must experience academic success; (b) students must develop and/or maintain cultural competence, and (c) students must develop a critical consciousness through which they challenge the status quo of the social order.

While much of the research on culturally responsive practices has been applied to classroom teaching, recent efforts have attempted to apply a culturally responsive framework to school leadership. These studies have identified culturally responsive principals as those who emphasize high expectations for student academic achievement, exhibit an ethic of care or "empowerment through care", and maintain a commitment and connection to the larger community (e.g. Reitzug and Patterson 1998;

Scheurich 1998; Johnson 2006). In her review of the literature on the principal's role in creating inclusive schools, Riehl (2000) also identifies three tasks that determine whether administrators are prepared to respond to diversity and demonstrate multicultural leadership. These include fostering new definitions of diversity; promoting inclusive instructional practices within schools by supporting, facilitating, or being a catalyst for change; and building connections between schools and communities.

5.2.2 Leadership for Democratic Education

Leadership for democratic education arises from research at the intersection of educational leadership, critical theory, and critical multiculturalism. It is rooted in theories of social justice that examine institutions that exist for the common good (i.e. Dewey 1916; Freire 1970). Most definitions of "education for democracy" include themes like: (1) recognizing the basic value and rights of each individual; (2) taking the standpoint of others into consideration; (3) deliberation in making decisions; (4) embracing plurality and difference; and (5) promoting equity and social justice (Møller 2006). This approach also has much in common with the essence of our understanding of *democratic leadership* (i.e. Furman and Shields 2005; Furman and Starratt 2002; Møller 2002, 2006; Woods 2005). Through the educational system, all citizens should be given the opportunity to participate in the development of a free, multicultural, and democratic society (Larson and Murtadha 2002).

Kalantzis and Cope (1999) describe how schools can work for diversity through an understanding of critical multiculturalism. Their perspective is closely related to the way we have framed leadership for democratic education. *Firstly*, they argue that education is a way to give all students opportunities for social mobility in society. This means that basic skills like reading, writing, and calculation ought to be focused on. These are tools students need in order to gain social access. To be able to carry this through as a multicultural project, they stress that one of the core values in this education has to be multiculturalism; with a value-laden understanding that we live in a multicultural society in development, a society objected to constant negotiation and re-negotiations. *Secondly*, they emphasize that if it is a goal to ensure all students social access and opportunities for mobility, the majority's culture and pedagogy have to be explicit. This means that education itself and its objective ought to be explicit, and there ought to be meta-concepts to describe it. Yet this explicitness of the culture of schooling ought not be a means of assimilation. *Thirdly*, Kalantzis and Cope argue that all students ought to be educated in cultural and linguistic diversity. When the goal is equal social access compensatory education should be provided, for instance, NSL (Norwegian as a second language) within a Norwegian context, first language tuition and bilingual content instructions as tools to reach the goal. *Finally*, they stress the role of teachers as authorities and professional educators in schools. Teachers play a key part to ensure students social access later in life. By acting as authorities in education and in their respective subjects and by having high expectations for all students, they can contribute to raise opportunities for all students.

5.3 Methods

The analysis of leadership practice is based on data from ISSPP case studies in the USA (New York State), Norway, and Cyprus. These data have been re-analysed in order to compare how successful leadership for diversity is defined, negotiated, and addressed in culturally diverse schools across the three countries. In addition, selected policy documents are examined to highlight and compare national educational contexts of cultural diversity. In reading, interpreting, and analysing the interviews we have found it helpful to explore Lieblich et al.'s (1998) distinctions between form and content and between making sense of whole stories and dividing them into segments or categories. In addition, in analysing policy documents our approach is inspired by critical discourse analysis which defines a discourse as "a practice not just of representing the world, but of signifying the world, constituting and constructing the world in meaning" (Fairclough 1992, p. 64). In this chapter, we will highlight the principals' role in multicultural education across countries and how their beliefs, attitudes, and focus have an impact on education for diversity. The policy documents will be examined first. The concern is with the language used in these documents. Language is treated as a social practice; a way of doing things. The analysis aims to explore as well as challenge the meanings about diversity embedded in these policy documents.

5.4 Framing the Cross-National Policy Contexts

5.4.1 The Educational Context of Cultural Diversity in Norway

Norwegian education policy was intended to create both equal and equitable life conditions for all social groups, regardless of social background, gender, ethnicity, and geographical location. Equity in elementary Norwegian education has at least three meanings. The first is equal access to the educational system. Fairness is understood as the educational system's ability to distribute financial and economic resources in order to meet the needs of all the users in a way that provides equal opportunities. The second aspect concerns equity at the individual level. This addresses the diversity among students and therefore the necessity for unequal treatment in order to meet individual learning abilities (e.g. greater resources for greater needs). The third aspect concerns equity at the group level. For instance, there is a collective right for minority language students to receive additional language tuition.

More than 95% of Norwegian students are enrolled in ordinary classes in public schools.[1] In terms of socio-economic status, there is a fairly narrow income

[1] The structure of the Norwegian school system is 10 years of compulsory primary and lower secondary education and three years of optional upper secondary education. School starts at age six and 90% of the students stay in school until at least age eighteen.

range between wealthier Norwegian families and those less well off. For instance, in a recently conducted national survey which included perceptions about student background and attainment, Norwegian principals rated 78.1% of their students' socio-economic background as medium (middle class) and noted that 69.5% of their students had a supportive home educational environment. Only 9.1% students were characterized as having a low socio-economic background (Møller et al. 2006).

Due to recent migration, the student population in Norwegian schools is changing and becoming more multicultural and multilingual. By the end of 2005 the immigrant population constituted approximately 390,000 persons or 8.3% of the total population.[2] Current birth-rates at Norwegian hospitals indicate that one out of five children born today is born with one or two parents born abroad. This immigrant population is not a heterogeneous group, however. Norway has had immigration from 208 different nations, and no national groups constitute more than 7% of the total immigrant population (SSB 2006). Primary reasons for immigration are work, family reunion, or refuge. In primary and lower secondary education, the term "students from language minorities" is used. This term refers to students who need personalized instruction in the Norwegian language for some period of time in order to be able to participate in regular classes. Unlike *Statistics Norway's* definition, it does not include the entire immigrant population.[3]

Knowledge Promotion is the latest reform in compulsory education in Norway which took effect in August 2006. In the *Quality Framework*, a policy document formulated for both elementary and upper secondary education in connection with this reform, democracy and diversity are featured as important concepts:

> A clear foundation in values and a broad understanding of culture are fundamental for an inclusive social community and for a community of learning where diversity is acknowledged and respected. Such a learning environment gives room for cooperation, dialogue and negotiations. The students participate in democratic processes and can thus develop a democratic mind and understanding of active and engaged participation in a diverse society. (Ministry of Education and Research 2006, p. 2)

This underscores that giving equal access to knowledge and education within schools through recognition of differences within the school community is crucial, as is the development and practice of a democratic spirit. Moreover, it is stressed in policy documents that schools ought to reflect the students' cultural background. The content of these aims is a matter of continuous debate: they are subject to debate at the national level and may be interpreted differently from school to school, and again lead to differences in discourses and practises.

[2] *Statistics Norway*, the official Norwegian statistics agency, defines the immigrant population as first generation immigrants and their children.

[3] This definition also excludes the indigenous population of Norway, the Sámi and national minorities such as the Artic Finns (an older West Finnish immigrant group) and the Roma. For the Sámi there is an adapted Sámi Curriculum, and both the Sámi and the Artic Finns have the right to tuition in the Sámi language or in Finnish. The Roma people have no such rights. The Norwegian schools in this chapter are both located in southeastern Norway, which means the Sámi, Artic Finns, and the Roma people are not represented in the student population in the study.

5.4.2 Tensions in Norwegian Key Policy Documents

The Norwegian Education Act in 1998 stipulates that all activity in schools should be carried out in accordance with fundamental democratic, humanistic, and Christian values,[4] and that education should uphold and renew the national cultural heritage to provide perspective and guidance for the future. This policy refers to both the past and the future, and to both essentialist and processual understandings of education (Baumann 1999). This duality becomes further visible in the concretizations of the values in The Education Act, the Core Curriculum (CC), and the Quality Framework (QF) of the National Curriculum. The Core Curriculum is still in effect and was written in connection with the 1994 curriculum reform for upper secondary education and the 1997 curriculum reform for compulsory education. In the Core Curriculum, under the headline "The Spiritual Human Being", the core values for public education in Norway are specified:

> The Christian faith and tradition constitute a deep current in our history—a heritage that unites us as a people across religious persuasions. It has imprinted itself on the norms, worldview, concepts and art of the people. It bonds us to other peoples in the rhythm of the week and in common holidays, but is also an abiding presence in our own national traits: in architecture and music, in style and conventions, in ideas, idioms and identity. (CC 1993, p. 9)

In this excerpt from the Core Curriculum a clear us-them dichotomy is created. This heritage links "the Norwegian people" as an inseparable unit, in contrast to other "people" who implicitly are also described as inseparable units. A further excerpt in this document links democracy to Christian and humanistic values. In this instance the Core Curriculum represents an essentialist understanding of Norwegian national culture that is "fixed". When it comes to the description of individuals within schools, the following is stressed:

> Education should be based on the view that all persons are created equal and that human dignity is inviolable. It should confirm the belief that everyone is unique; that each can nourish his own growth and that individual distinctions enrich and enliven our world. (CC 1993, p. 9 f.)

Here all persons are described as unique and equal, and their human dignity is characterized as inviolable. Hopes of a diverse society that can nurture and value differences among people are stressed. Thus, this excerpt offers a processual understanding of diversity, where culture is fluid.

The Quality Framework uses the term "diverse" consequently and the focus on the national heritage, so strongly emphasized in the Core Curriculum, is lacking. In addition, while democracy is seen in relation to Christian and humanistic values and is implicitly understood in the Core Curriculum, the Quality Framework refers to Human Rights and the processual side of an understanding of democracy. Since both documents are a basis for governance in schools, this can be seen as a tension in the policy documents. The discourses in policy documents are ambiguous, and

[4] This reference to Christianity in the Education Act is heavily debated.

they can be interpreted broadly at every school. As such, the analysis indicates that the central choices concerning values in a diverse society have to be constructed and carried out at the school level.

5.4.3 *The Educational Context of Cultural Diversity in the United States*

A central feature of American public education is that governance and funding are highly decentralized. Despite increasingly high-profile federal legislation, education in the United States is the responsibility of 50 similar, but constitutionally autonomous, state systems. State education departments (SED) delegate considerable power and responsibility to local school districts that, in turn, are overseen by elected school boards. In 2000 there were 14,700 school districts serving 47 million children in the United States from pre-kindergarten through grade 12. New York State, the location of the U.S. ISSPP case studies, has over 700 school districts.

Historically American society has always been culturally diverse, made up of voluntary immigrants (initially from Europe but now increasingly from Latin America and Asia), involuntary immigrants of African and Mexican descent who were incorporated by slavery and conquest, and a Native population representing over 600 federal- and state-recognized tribal groups. At the dawn of the twenty-first century, U.S. schools have never been more linguistically, culturally, religiously, ethnically, and racially diverse (Prewitt 2002). Students of colour (i.e. Black/African American, Hispanic/Latino, Asian American, and Native American) make up 43% of the national public school population. In some states, like California, and in the 20 largest urban school districts across the country, students of colour constitute an overwhelming majority of the school population. Nationwide, 18.4% of school-age youth speak a language other than English at home. In some urban school districts, over 100 different languages are spoken.

Despite the changing face of America, however, students from diverse racial, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds continue to experience unequal educational opportunities in schools. The racial achievement gap between white students and African American and Latino students has remained stagnant. The average 12th-grade low-income student of colour reads at the same level as the average 8th-grade middle-class white student. In terms of high school completion, according to the 2000 census, 88% of white students have graduated from high school, but the rate for Hispanics is just 56%.

Increasing demographic diversity in the USA is occurring within a political and social context of high accountability, resegregation, and fiscal inequities between urban and suburban school districts (see, e.g., Kozol 2005; Rebell 2005, Orfield et al. 2002). Poor urban schools must raise test scores on state-mandated assessments with fewer resources or face reorganization and possible closure. In 2002 the federal "No Child Left Behind" (NCLB) Act required states to administer annual benchmarked proficiency tests in reading and math to all students in grades 3–8.

Schools failing to make adequate yearly progress (AYP) towards 100% proficiency are deemed in need of improvement and continued lack of AYP triggers progressively severe sanctions, including reconstitution, replacement of staff, or designation as a charter school.

Because school funding in the USA is highly dependent on local property values, marked social and economic disparities exist between high-poverty urban districts and their more affluent suburban neighbours. These "savage inequalities" (Kozol 2005) have been exacerbated by accountability mandates that are particularly damaging to the education opportunities of children that remain in high need schools.

5.4.4 Tensions in American Diversity Policies

Policy analyses often date America's response to racial and cultural diversity in the schools from the 1954 Supreme Court decision in *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka* which declared ''separate but equal'' education for African American students as unconstitutional (e.g. Gollnick 1995). Yet recent historical case studies indicate that grass roots efforts to address issues of cultural pluralism began in U.S. urban school districts much earlier in the late 1930s and early 1940s. Known at the time as intercultural or intergroup education, this precursor to multicultural education contrasted America's stated democratic ideals of freedom and equality of opportunity with the historical reality of ongoing prejudice and discrimination in an effort to "make democracy real" for those diverse groups who were disenfranchised and marginalized from the school system (Johnson 2002). This discursive strategy, of holding up the promise of America's democratic principles and foundational documents to highlight those who have been excluded from that vision, has been used effectively by civil rights advocates throughout U.S. history.

In the absence of a national policy framework that promotes cultural pluralism, the context for state and local multicultural policies in the United States has been based on conceptual models described by multicultural theorists such as Sleeter and Grant (2009) and J. A. Banks and C. A. M. Banks (2006). The New York City *Statement of Policy on Multicultural Education and Promotion of Positive Intergroup Relations* developed in the late 1980s (New York Board of Education 1989) is a good example of a local school district policy based on Banks' model.

The conceptual framework developed by Sleeter and Grant (2009) identifies five different approaches that address human diversity—race, ethnicity, gender, social class, disability, and sexual orientation: (1) *teaching the exceptional and culturally different* aims to assimilate students of colour into the cultural mainstream and existing social structure, equipping people of colour with the knowledge and skills to achieve in schools and society; (2) a *human relations approach* aims to promote tolerance and acceptance, reduce stereotyping, and promote students' self-concepts; (3) *single-group studies* focus on the experiences, contributions, and concerns of distinct cultural, ethnic, gender, and social class groups to promote structural equality and recognition of the identified group (e.g. African Americans and women);

(4) *multicultural education* promotes equal opportunity in schools, cultural pluralism, respect for diverse peoples, and support for power equity among groups; and (5) *multicultural social justice education*, which is rooted in social recontructionism, aims to eliminate the oppression of one group by another, involve students in democratic decision making, and teach social action and empowerment skills.

Gollnick's (1995) study found that, with few exceptions, state diversity policies in the United States focused on Sleeter and Grant's first three approaches, with little expectation that societal inequities and existing curriculum and classroom practices should actually be reformed to reflect cultural diversity. The scope of diversity policies has also been limited by the federal courts in the United States, which have defined equity in narrow terms. As Welner (2001) notes, ''equity for these federal courts revolves around issues of race and is limited to prevention (or remedy) of intentional discrimination'' (p. 7).

The 1990s were a time of contradiction and contest in the realm of diversity policies in U.S. schools. The 1983 report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education (*A Nation at Risk*) pronounced that the United States was at risk because of its poor education system. The ensuing emphasis on standards in education resulted in a gradual shift in the discourse on equity. Thus, while the 1994 Amendments to the ESEA contained nine substantial sections addressing diversity and equity, at the state-level campaigns to roll back equity programs such as bilingual education and affirmative action were gaining ground. By the 1990s at least 45 states had at least a minimal multicultural curriculum policy in place. In the United States, policy documents at the state level have generally been limited to guidelines that recommend the inclusion of diverse racial and cultural groups in the curriculum but fail to challenge institutional inequities (Gollnick 1995). The New York State Social Studies Review and Development Committee guidelines were no exception. The six points focused on understanding difference and acknowledging commonalities as an integral part of learning democratic values and building a strong nation (NYSSSRADC 1991).

At the local school district level, as Placier et al. (2000) have noted, efforts to formulate multicultural policy have been reactive and crisis oriented, often arising in response to periods of racial conflict. Highly contentious and fraught with political controversy, efforts to move beyond the policy text to institute practices in schools have often resulted in the ''watering down'' or the abandonment of the original multicultural policy (see, e.g., Agard-Jones 1993; Cornbleth and Waugh 1995; Delpit and Perry 1997). Thus, diversity policies in local U.S. school districts remain more symbol than substance (Johnson 2003).

5.4.5 The Educational Context for Cultural Diversity in Cyprus

Cyprus is an island state in the eastern Mediterranean. It achieved its independence from Britain in 1960, becoming the Republic of Cyprus. The country was divided *de facto* in 1974 after the Turkish invasion of the northern part of the island and a solution is still being sought. At the end of 2006, the estimated population was 867,600

with an ethnic composition of 76.1% Greek Cypriots (including a few Maronites, Armenians, and Latins), 10.2% Turkish Cypriots, and 13.7% immigrants (Statistical Service of the Republic of Cyprus 2007). These figures do not include Turkish settlers and military personnel, estimated at 150,000 and 40,000, respectively, who have moved into the Turkish-occupied areas since the Turkish invasion of Cyprus in 1974. The constitution of Cyprus recognises Greek and Turkish as the official languages of the Republic. As of May 2004, Cyprus has become a full member of the European Union together with 10 other candidate countries.

The Ministry of Education and Culture (MOEC) is responsible for the administration of public education in Cyprus, as well as for the supervision and standardization of services provided by the private sector up to higher education. The public education system in Cyprus is highly centralized, with the MOEC being responsible for the implementation of educational laws and the preparation of new legislation. Public schools are financed from government funds, while private schools raise their funds primarily from tuition and fees along with some government assistance.

In Cyprus, strong democratic and social justice values are emphasized in the aims and objectives of the national educational system:

> The general aim of education in Cyprus is the development of free and democratic citizens…who contribute…to the promotion of cooperation, mutual understanding, respect and love among individuals and people for the prevalence of freedom, justice and peace. (MOEC 2002, p. 17)

The aforementioned aim of education seems to be of paramount importance when one considers the sudden increase in the number of pupils coming from other countries. More specifically, during the last few years, the composition of the population of Cyprus has dramatically changed due to the influx of a significant number of immigrants, mostly coming from the former Soviet Union countries and Asia. The children of these immigrants do not speak Greek as their mother language and are distinguished by the particular cultural features of the ethnic group that they belong to (MOEC 2008a). During the school year 2006–2007, the number of international students has reached 7,775 (MOEC 2008c). These students are distributed across the different levels of education as follows: 660 in pre-primary schools, 3,959 in primary schools, 2,843 in Secondary schools and 313 in Technical schools.

5.4.6 Tensions in Cypriot Key Policy Documents

In light of the demographic changes, the Ministry of Education and Culture (2008b, p. 1) has set the aim of achieving "the smooth integration of all Turkish Cypriot and foreign students to the Cypriot Educational System without any discrimination to any population group". In this context, the MOEC seeks to support the individual characteristics of all pupils instead of assimilating them into the dominant culture (Kanaris 2007; MOEC 2008a). This means that it is vital not only to provide education for learning the Greek language but also to provide the kind of education that supports the language and cultural identity of various groups of pupils. In

response to these demands, the MOEC promotes the implementation of policies and measures that will enhance the smooth integration of pupils from different cultural backgrounds (Kanaris 2007; MOEC 2008a, b). Overall, the approach to diversity by the MOEC may be reflected in the following quote as expressed in the most recent annual report for 2006–2007:

> Developing multicultural awareness, providing information among the pupil population of the way of life, patterns of thought and attitudes of people who differ from us, attempting to understand these differences and communicating with those people are important features of schools. (MOEC 2008a, p. 276)

The ultimate goal is to provide all school members with equal opportunities for learning and thus integrate them successfully into the Cypriot society (Kanaris 2007; Kleanthous 2007).

However, it must be pointed out that until recently the aforementioned declarations of intent were not incorporated into a comprehensive policy framework. For this reason, the MOEC has proceeded to design an institutional framework which addresses the education needs of all students in a holistic way (MOEC 2008b). According to the *Policy Document of the Ministry of Education and Culture on Intercultural Education*, the intercultural approach is adopted as a primary dimension of the Ministry's educational policy. This stance stems from the Ministry's acknowledgement that the intercultural approach is "the most effective educational strategy which can contribute to the acceptance of each other, the cultivation of a climate of trust and the elimination of negative stereotypes and prejudice among students" (MOEC 2008b, p. 1). The philosophy pervading this policy rests upon two main reform-oriented objectives:

1. The creation of a democratic school which integrates but does not exclude.
2. A school system which shows respect for diversity, pluralism (cultural, linguistic, and religious) and multiple intelligences.

Within this policy context, the MOEC promotes the introduction of specific measures in order to speed up the integration of minority students in the school system and society in general:

1. The introduction of parallel classes of accelerated learning of the Greek language.
2. The enhancement of professional development activities for teachers.
3. The development and implementation of an Induction Guide for minority students.
4. Future planning which includes the incorporation of intercultural elements in the curricula and textbooks as well as the production of appropriate educational and training material.

The main tensions that arise from this policy document relate to the operation of the accelerated learning classes. Firstly, the specific measure is only applicable in schools which have a significant number of ethnic minority students and are therefore granted sufficient teaching time over and above what is required in the normal curriculum. This means that the schools with a lower percentage of ethnic minority students are being excluded. However, such a provision is not in congruence with

the document's philosophy of creating democratic schools which do not exclude. In addition, schools are provided with the flexibility to utilize the time in the curriculum of auxiliary subjects (such as Religious Instruction, History, Geography, Physical Education, Music) in order to enhance the accelerated learning schedule. Nevertheless, in this case the students will be deprived of the opportunity to express their cultural identity in subjects which may be considered of lesser value for the majority, such as History and Geography, but which are in fact essential in promoting cultural diversity in the mainstream curriculum. In other words, this dilemma relates to the difficulty in achieving a balance between the promotion of student performance and the adoption of a culturally diverse pedagogy.

5.5 Comparisons Across the Three Policy Contexts

In the USA students do not constitute a homogeneous single language and ethnic population which has become more diverse through increased immigration as in Norway and Cyprus. Instead, particularly in urban schools, students of colour (i.e. African American, Hispanic, Native American, and Asian American) now represent the majority of students in American public schools. This was true in the ISSPP case study schools as well. Diversity policy in the United States has been largely race-based, with students identified by race on census data as opposed to identified by language (as in the Norwegian case). In practice, diversity issues have largely been decided through litigation, not through legislation. There has also been a long history of legalized segregation in the United States that has been addressed through the courts (e.g. *Brown vs. Board of Education*), but de facto segregation is on the rise in the twenty-first century. This reliance on the courts has recently resulted in equity and diversity initiatives losing ground. For instance, recent Supreme Court cases such *Parents Involved in Community Schools vs. Seattle School District No. 1* (Supreme Court of the United States 2007) have greatly limited the options by which individual school districts can racially integrate their school populations.

Norway has a national policy that addresses cultural and language diversity. Examples from other countries with national policies, such as Canada, indicate that national policies make a difference in the advocacy of and attention to diversity issues (Joshee and Johnson 2005). The United States must rely on state and local diversity policies that are still on the books but had their heyday in the 1980s and early 1990s. Although some local school districts in New York State have written diversity policies, most teachers and administrators are unaware of them.

Another tension in the policy documents, which is evident in both the Norwegian and Cypriot examples, is the focus on the integration of "those who differ from us". However, this notion is juxtaposed to other statements in the policy documents that support cultural, linguistic, and religious pluralism. As such, contradictions both within and across different policy documents can be identified. An "us-them" dichotomy may assume a national culture that is mainly homogeneous, and one in which immigrant students and families are expected to "fit in".

5.6 Examining School Practices Across Three Countries

5.6.1 Norway: Successful School Leadership for Diversity?

The Norwegian ISSPP case studies included schools appointed as "good practice schools" by the Ministry of Education. In this chapter we focus on two of these schools in which approximately 20% of the students were language minorities. *Brage School* is a combined primary and a lower secondary school with about 400 students. The enrolment area includes students from both high and low socio-economic status groups. The staff at Brage School is a heterogeneous group and includes both younger and more experienced teachers, some staff from minority backgrounds, and nearly as many men as women. The principal at Brage is male and was appointed when the school was established 7 years ago. He understands the school's tasks as providing its students with the best possible platform for living in Norway where fluency in the Norwegian language as a communicative tool is key and the school's number one priority. **Skog School** is a primary school with about 350 students. The enrolment area mainly includes students from the average socio-economic status group. The staff at Skog School is mainly a homogenous group made up of female teachers in their fifties. Most of them have worked at the school for a long period of time. The principal at Skog is male and was appointed 7 years ago. He puts focus on the students' history and family background. By explaining and understanding students with reference to their cultural differences and not through a focus on teaching and learning has led some teachers in the school to focus upon students' deficits in relation to the majority culture.

The data from two of the Norwegian ISSPP case study schools was re-analysed through the combination of two complementary theoretical lenses for understanding leadership in diverse schools. These were "culturally responsive leadership" and "leadership for democratic education". An earlier analysis of these two schools (Vedoy and Moller 2007) demonstrated how the deployment of different discourses of diversity, when applied to a study of formal leadership within schools with ethnically diverse populations, can have very different effects in terms of theory and leadership practices. Practices and discourses from the two schools were initially analysed through the lenses of democratic leadership and critical multiculturalism. In particular, the two principals' discourses were compared. In addition, these discourses were viewed in relation to how the whole staff related to each other and students and families from ethnic minority groups within their respective schools. It was argued that the principal played a pivotal role for including all stakeholders in work for democratic schooling (Vedøy and Møller 2007).

At Brage school "respect" was the key term used to describe meetings between majority and minority, or more specifically between people in general. It was shown that the principal, through an explicit discourse of critical multiculturalism based on respect, opened up democratic processes to the development of diversity in his school. This was done through the formulation of shared educational goals and

explicit pedagogy. Moreover, he used language which described ethnic minorities as equals, hired a diverse staff, contributed in the development of a school culture where staff felt free to disagree, expected all teachers to take responsibility for the education of minority students, and expected the whole school to be responsible for the common good and the development of a diverse society.

At Skog school "care" was the key term to describe how the school leaders interacted with minority students and their parents. It was revealed that the principal, through an implicit discourse of pluralism where power relations were taken for granted in favour of the majority and harmony in the staff was stressed, suppressed democratic processes in the development of diversity in his school. This resulted in staff backing off from responsibility concerning minority students, static descriptions of minority groups, and the silencing of teachers who were critical. The concept of "care", in an environment where power relations in general were not disputed, resulted in practices where a focus upon deficits and the preservation of status quo were accepted.

Using the lenses of culturally responsive leadership, it is apparent that the principal at Brage was reluctant when it came to incorporating the history, values, and cultural knowledge of student's home communities in the school curriculum without justification about the pedagogical relevance in each case. His argument was that of respect and individuality, and each student's right to have a say in whether they wanted their home cultures exposed in public or not. In contradiction, the principal at Skog was very much in favour of such a practice; his argument was that such a practice was overall caring and inclusive. The tension between these two attitudes can be explained in the particular situation for minority students in these Norwegian schools. The heterogeneity in the group labelled as minority students is large. At both schools 20% of the student population can be characterized as belonging to ethnic minority groups in a Norwegian context, but these students belong to a number of different language groups and nationalities. The representation of each language group or nationality in the schools is shifting.

The case of developing a critical consciousness among students and staff and empowering parents from diverse communities was genuinely addressed at Brage. This was sought through the use of democratic processes where the distribution of voice and both respect and self-respect was important and through all teachers working to empower minority parents at the individual level by giving extensive information and listening to parents' opinions. At Skog the staff's focus upon the status quo and the present situation seemed to limit the development of a critical consciousness. Work was carried out to help minority parents to adapt to the school's expectations at the individual level but not necessarily to empower them.

In the Norwegian cases the lenses of democratic leadership offered a way to describe and understand whole school practices in the development of a diverse society through respect for processes and individuals. The lenses of culturally responsive leadership, on the other hand, raised the unsettling question of who decides in the matter of incorporating student's home cultures in the school curriculum. Is the matter highly personal for each student or can these practices be generalized in the contexts described?

5.6.2 New York State: Rethinking Successful School Leadership in Challenging U.S. Schools

The U.S. ISSPP case studies involved seven schools in New York State that were selected because they had shown improved student performance since the arrival of the current principal. All but one were high-need schools, reflected in the high percentage of students eligible for free or reduced-fee lunch. The initial study profiled three principals who turned around failing schools serving high-poverty communities in Western New York (Jacobson et al. 2005; Jacobson et al. 2007). These three case studies eventually grew to seven schools which were analysed through Leithwood and Riehl's (2005) conceptual framework derived from three core leadership practices: setting directions, developing people, and redesigning the organization, as well as the enabling principles of accountability, caring, and learning (Giles et al. 2005).

In a subsequent study, data from three of the original U.S. ISSPP schools were reanalysed with a particular focus on home–school relationships (Johnson 2007). The leadership practices in these case study schools are described in this chapter through the lenses of "culturally responsive leadership" and "leadership for democratic education".

Costello Elementary is housed in a modern building in a city neighbourhood surrounded by empty lots and derelict buildings. The student population is racially diverse, with 30% of the students White, 56% African American, 6% Asian American, 5% Hispanic, and 3% Native American. Just over 80% of students at the school are eligible for free and reduced lunch (the primary indicator of poverty status in the United States), a level of economic need that far exceeds the district average (54%).

When the new principal arrived at the school eight years ago, it was her second position as a building-level administrator in this urban district in upstate New York. An African American woman who was raised in the nearby housing projects, she quickly earned a reputation among teachers, support staff and parents in the school as a strong and demanding principal. In her very first "town hall" meetings with staff and students, she established her high expectations that all students "can and will learn".

The second school, *Fraser Academy*, was characterized 10 years ago by high transiency (47.8%), poor attendance, discipline problems, and a school building covered with graffiti and in disrepair. The student population is predominately African American (99%) and largely poor—over 90% of the students qualify for free and reduced lunches. Prior to the arrival of the new principal, the school had great difficulty connecting with and encouraging parents to support the school in its work with students. The dearth of parents at parent meetings, the reluctance of parents to collect report cards, and the sometimes contentious relationships between parents and teachers meant that parents did not feel comfortable and welcome in the school. As one of the veteran teachers noted, "Before [the new principal] got here, we didn't have parents in the school."

The new principal, recruited from a large school district in the Midwest through a partnership with a regional bank, is an African American woman who has a Mas-

ters degree in guidance and counselling and a doctorate in educational administration. Since the beginning of the principal's tenure, the school has risen from being one of the lowest performing schools in its district to one of the highest. In 2001, the school was recognized as one of the most improved schools in New York State for student performance in eighth-grade math, as well as being the most improved school in math that year in the county.

The third school, *Colman Elementary*, is located in a first-ring suburb just outside a large urban district in Western New York. Like many first-ring suburbs adjacent to U.S. cities, the district has become more racially, socially, and economically diverse in recent years, and longtime teachers from Colman note changing family structures in the school as well, with an increase in single-parent families. The school population remains predominately White (94%) and middle class, but the percentage of students receiving free and reduced lunches has increased to 16%. The teaching faculty of Colman is entirely white and female, and many have spent the majority of their teaching careers at the school.

When she arrived at this suburban school 7 years ago, this White principal was a veteran administrator in her fifties with 9 years of experience in high-poverty schools in the nearby city school system. She worked at creating a more trusting and supportive environment for both teachers and parents at the school by creating an "open door policy" to make parents feel welcome and facilitate communication between parents and teachers. Colman's principal maintains a core belief that parents should be integrated throughout the school and that both teachers and parents must have a sense of belonging.

Each of the three women principals in these U.S. case study schools—two African American and one White—worked to create a trusting environment in their school where parents and community members could feel welcome and comfortable. At Fraser Elementary School the newly appointed African American principal transformed the school's relationship with parents through an ethic of care and the use of "open door" strategies. In this school, the discourse of "care" could be described as empowering, for the principal made hiring a diverse faculty a priority. These new teachers, along with the principal, identified with parents and held high expectations for student achievement. At Colman Elementary, a predominately white middle-class school with a changing student body, the principal emphasized a sense of belonging and the importance of personal connection with parents. Because racially diverse Costello Elementary had a previous reputation for low student achievement and inconsistent student discipline, the new African American principal's goal was to create a safe and nurturing child-centered learning environment that focused on addressing students' basic social and emotional needs. As one of the parents put it:

> You see (the principal) telling children "You're important. We're glad you're here." ….all the children feel that this school is for them, that they are important here.

All three U.S. principals held high expectations for student achievement. For the two African American women leaders, this "no excuses" approach maps onto a long

historical tradition of high expectations for African American students within the Black community and Black women leaders who are often viewed as community "othermothers" to the children in their schools (Collins 1991). The White suburban principal's approach regarding inclusiveness in home–school relationships seemed related to her moral stance to "serve children and families first". Yet there was little evidence from data collected about their instructional programs that these leaders incorporated students' home cultures or community "funds of knowledge" in the day-to-day curriculum of their schools. Fraser Elementary probably comes the closest to this, with multicultural assemblies, occasional staff development workshops for teachers, and multicultural literature prevalent in the school library.

Through the lenses of leadership for democratic education and critical multiculturalism, the leaders of these three schools represent a continuum of efforts to transform whole school practices in the development of a democratic and diverse society and distribute leadership throughout the organization. Although the United States does not have a comparable tradition of democratic leadership as Norway, each of these principals made efforts to include culturally diverse parents and community members in the life of the school, with Fraser being the most inclusive and Costello being the least inclusive. Faced with safety issues in the surrounding neighbourhood at Fraser Elementary, the principal brought together parents, teachers, and the block club to form an "action group" to pressure city officials and established a "parent patrol" to disrupt the drug dealing in the city park near the school. By modelling agency, Fraser's principal enabled parents to become successful advocates and lobbyists in accessing and mobilizing community resources needed for their neighbourhood. In their words, "from the beginning she's (the principal) included the parents in every decision that's being made around here".

Although Colman's principal initiated workshops for parents and enlisted them as full members of the site-based decision-making team, it is the personal relationships and her advocacy for parents that have made the difference in school–community relationships. As one of the parents described her approach:

> She will listen to you as a parent…she will speak to the teachers on your behalf and get you the support you need. She will get you the help you need, and that's something that's been helpful, kind of a go-between between parents (and teachers).

At Costello Elementary, recognizing that her hard-hitting style could be intimidating to some of the parents, the principal hired a parent liaison and utilized the guidance counsellor in the school to help enlist parents as volunteers and coordinate parent workshops. But there is little evidence that parents were involved in decision making in this school. Of the three U.S. case study schools, none of them involved students in the democratic life of the school.

In the face of high-stakes testing and accountability mandates in U.S. schools, this reanalysis of the ISSPP case study data raises questions about how successful principals in culturally diverse schools might maintain high standards for student success and upward mobility without producing a narrow and standardized curriculum (see, e.g., Sleeter 2006).

5.6.3 Cyprus: Successfully Leading Diversified Rural Schools

The Cyprus findings have emerged through the secondary analysis of the ISSPP data as well as through additional data collected from complementary interviews with the principals of the schools. The selection of the two rural school cases to be examined was based on the existence of a significant percentage of ethnic minority students in the schools as well as evidence from the previous analysis that their principals were indeed successful.

School Cape is one of two primary schools in a village located within the rural areas of the capital of Cyprus. The once small village has experienced shifting demographics on several occasions. After the Turkish invasion of Cyprus more than 30 years ago, a government refugee settlement was established that changed the character of the village. In later years, due to its proximity to the capital, the village attracted many affluent residents. Recently, the industrial area of the village has attracted many immigrant workers. Consequently, most children of the school are Cypriot while 6% of children are from immigrant families.

The principal of the school is male and in his early fifties. He has completed 3 years as a principal at this school and was a teacher for 30 years. The principal viewed school leadership as a challenge which he wanted to achieve and obtained a Master's degree in Educational Leadership to prepare himself for the principalship. This principal coped with the challenges of the school through a combination of his own personal strengths and the experience he gained throughout his career and his education.

School Daphne is located in a small village located within the rural areas of the capital of Cyprus. The moderate SES and the homogeneity of the village population have begun to change due to the recent arrival of immigrant workers. Up until a few years ago, School Daphne served only local children from the local village. Later on, the school was made into a district school and began to accept children from a nearby village as well. More recently, the school has also been accepting immigrant children who currently comprise 16% of the student population.

The school principal is a woman in her fifties who has been a teacher for 33 years, all of which were spent at village schools. This is her first principalship and she has just completed the third year. One of the major challenges faced by the principal has been the racism expressed towards the immigrant students. She considers the main obstacle in the integration of the children in the school to be the resistance of the local community towards immigrant families.

First, the practices and discourses of the two school principals were analysed through the lens of "culturally responsive leadership". At School Cape, the principal seemed to exhibit respect towards all of the children, irrespective of their ethnicity, language, and religion. The principal was committed to the value of human beings in general as well as their right to live among each other without any prejudice. In this way, he aimed at creating an inclusive environment where social inequities would be challenged. This strong will of the principal was realized through the creation of a positive atmosphere in the school where all children would intermingle for various activities.

The principal of School Cape also made an effort to incorporate cultural "funds of knowledge" in the curriculum. For example, all children were invited to display elements of their home culture in religious and cultural school events. Furthermore, immigrant members of the community were invited to talk to the children about the difficulties they encountered upon their arrival in Cyprus. Through these actions, the principal utilized the social capital of the community in order to create an empowering environment for all students and their families. According to the principal:

> What we want to do is to pay attention to the children at all levels of the actions of the school unit without making any attempt to assimilate them, that is make them forget what they used to do. This is important.

To this effect, a multicultural approach was also promoted in the classroom. For example, during religious instruction all children were encouraged to talk about their own experiences concerning religion. The aim was to create an inclusive instructional environment whereby students' home cultures would serve as a vehicle for learning.

With regard to the principal of School Daphne, an "ethic of care" towards the individuality of all children was demonstrated by promoting an inclusive, child-centered learning environment. For instance, ethnic minority students could express themselves in their mother language, sing their own local songs, and bring their own folk tales to class. Furthermore, during the Week of Intercultural Dialogue an exhibition was organized during which the children displayed objects featuring their home culture including books, clothes, and photographs.

Both principals also launched attempts to build stronger connections between the school and the diverse community. In the case of School Cape, the principal kept an "open door policy" regarding parents while he managed to gain the support (both moral and financial) of the parents' association. In addition, he set clear boundaries regarding the interventions of those parents who were in favour of streaming. In this way, he clearly demonstrated his strong advocacy for the more disadvantaged community.

The principal of School Daphne also acknowledged that the local community exhibits great resistance towards the integration of immigrant families. As a result, the principal instigated teachers to subtly promote acceptance of the immigrant children during their interactions with the parents. The principal herself communicated the school goals regarding cultural diversity to the parents' association. However, her approach for empowering the ethnic minority students and parents was not as strong as the advocacy observed in the case of principal Cape.

Comparing the practices of the two principals, it is evident that the principal of School Cape moved a step further than the principal of School Daphne in order to develop a stronger culture of socio-political consciousness within the school. The curriculum adjustments he made were more innovative and he seemed to be more willing to challenge the status quo in order to empower the diverse community of the school, and thus he seemed to be more involved in the creation of a sense of social justice with regards to minorities in his school.

The leadership practices of the principals of both schools were also examined through the lens of "leadership for democratic education". In School Cape, teachers were invited to become actively involved in the process of the development of a diverse society. A shared pedagogy with clear expectations was formed in collaboration with the teaching staff. In addition, the principal utilized the expertise of a teacher who had a Master's degree in Intercultural Education by assigning her the responsibility of coordinating a range of activities aimed at the integration of minority students. Thus, leadership was not centralized in the principal's role but distributed to the rest of the staff as well.

The principal of School Cape also employed democratic processes in order to empower the ethnic minority students in school decision making through participation in the students' council. In one particular situation, the regulations were modified so that a specific child who was very close to be elected could be positioned as an additional representative in the council.

The principal of School Cape could also be distinguished by his willingness to build arenas for collaboration and negotiation with the wider community. More specifically, the ethnic minority parents were often contacted by the principal in order to discuss and resolve any problems which had emerged during the school year. In this way, he provided space for their voices to be heard in a democratic process of decision making. However, not all parents were in a position to help in an effective way, due to language constraints and their long hours of work.

The transformation of organizational structures through the utilization of compensatory education tools has been a priority of the principal of School Cape. To this end, an induction class was created to teach minority students the Greek language, even though the use of induction classes is not officially foreseen. This tool was intended to speed up the achievement of the goal of equal social access by complementing the practices of incorporating the students' home cultures.

With regard to School Daphne, the principal also attempted to build the foundations for collaborative action. In successfully handling the issue of diversity, the principal formed together with the teaching staff a shared vision and set clear expectations for the inclusion of ethnic minority children. To this effect, the principal created committees of teachers who were responsible for forming relevant action plans. Thus, distributed leadership was employed in that teachers took a leading role for the development of a diverse society within the school.

Finally, the principal of school Daphne established frequent and direct communication with the parents of ethnic minority children. For example, in the case of conflicts among students, translated letters were sent to the parents or phone calls made in order to explain the school policy and the school expectations with regards to their children. Some efforts were also made to engage them in the parents association but their response was negative due to their tight working schedules.

Through the lens of "leadership for democratic education" it seems that both principals engaged themselves in the mobilization of school stakeholders towards the creation of a democratic society. However, the principal of school Cape showed greater creativity in managing organizational and cultural structures in his effort to empower the diverse community of the school. In fact, actions such as the formation of induction classes constituted a challenge to the established rules of the Ministry.

5.7 Similarities and Differences Across National Contexts

Cross-national comparisons remind us that theory and practice in educational leadership and management is socially constructed and contextually bound. The difference is even greater when the countries compared do not share a common political and cultural heritage (cf. Johnson et al. 2008). Also, the selection of schools in the ISSPP study allowed for national variety, and as such it is complicated to conduct a robust cross-country analysis (Leithwood 2005). For instance, the three U.S. cases were all defined as "high need" schools located in challenging environments. Accordingly, the principals at these schools had to cope with specific challenges related to poverty, discipline problems, and high-stakes testing. The selection of the rural schools in Cyprus was based on the existence of a significant percentage of ethnic minority students in the schools and evidence of successful principalship, while the Norwegian schools were recognized as "good practice schools" by the Ministry and selected to represent the full range of compulsory schools based on a distinctive background variable. Therefore, our cross-national comparison of efforts to lead for diversity in multiethnic schools will highlight and uncover different challenges for school leaders depending on the context. These challenges include tensions connected to the role of school leaders as catalysts for change, and tensions that may occur between honouring home cultures and promoting student outcomes. Issues about how leadership practices which contribute to the empowerment of all stakeholders should be defined and provided are closely related.

5.7.1 School Leaders as Catalysts for Change

In many studies school leadership is highlighted as the determining variable for whether schools are successful or not with their students, and in particular this is the case for students from diverse backgrounds. These are schools which have the power to move beyond the celebration of diversity in order to transform the school from an organization into a community where all members are respected. The most successful schools have principals that also allow participation of teachers in the work of leadership, use inquiry-based information to inform decision and practice, establish responsibilities that reflect involvement and collaboration, and focus upon and generate high student achievement (Leithwood and Riehl 2005; Reyes and Wagstaff 2005).

Our case studies about leadership for diversity across all three contexts have provided examples of how school leaders are perceived as or expected to be catalysts for change. In all three countries, it is expected that principals apply a highly visible leadership style and have a strong focus on student learning. Strong leadership is needed in order to change schools to become learning organizations.

In a country like the USA with high accountability measures, student performance on external tests of literacy and numeracy has become a key measure of school success. In challenging, high-poverty schools, like the case schools we have

highlighted in this chapter, this often determines whether the school will remain open and the principal will retain his or her job. Nevertheless, the school leaders in our American case study schools managed to take social relationships into account in spite of high-stakes accountability.

In Norway the accountability issue did not involve high-stakes exams and education for citizenship was put to the forefront to a greater extent. Compared to their colleagues in the American context, there is more talk about understandings of learning that acknowledge the whole person, and to create the conditions under which all children can learn well within a socially just and democratic context. However, the meaning of democracy is ambiguous, and there are disagreements about how democratic leadership is defined and should be provided. While the principal at Brage emphasizes intellectual stimulation and language education as the main way to fulfil this mission, the principal at Skog focused on understanding students with reference to their differences in home culture and directed attention to students' deficits in relation to the majority culture. There is a stronger focus on and more explicit talk about improving student outcomes, but viewed from the perspectives of principals themselves, in spite of different leadership strategies, the focus of Norwegian principals is directed towards doing what they think is best for the students. Although external demands for results-driven curricula and other forms of bureaucratic accountability are increasing in the Scandinavian countries, they are not yet at the same level of intensity as that experienced by their American colleagues (Møller 2009). The principals of the Norwegian case study schools seem to have a rather relaxed attitude towards their superiors, and they do not seem to run any risk by this approach. They still have the "option" of paying little attention to managerial accountability.

The same seems to be the case for the school principals in Cyprus, as demonstrated by the principal at School Cape who set clear boundaries regarding the interventions of those parents who were in favour of streaming and in this way demonstrated his strong advocacy for the more marginalized community and for leadership as a moral endeavour.

5.7.2 Honouring Home Cultures and Promoting Student Outcomes

While diversity in American education is an old phenomenon, it occurs as a relatively new challenge for Norwegian and Cypriot education. But all three countries strive for an equitable pluralism that may break down social barriers between students of different backgrounds. Leadership practices which first and foremost put focus on cultural diversity without simultaneously emphasizing academics and intellectual development may approach diversity from a deficit model. For instance, one of the Norwegian case studies demonstrated how a focus on caring for students by emphasizing the difference in student home culture as a key to comprehending the student population brought forward a deficit model of student difference.

Putting focus on the students' history and family background should not be seen as an oppositional goal to promoting student achievement. On the contrary, understanding cultural diversity should be viewed as a prerequisite for promoting student outcomes. A dichotomy between an emphasis on social justice and academics is inappropriate. Developing self-esteem, cultural awareness, and social skills should be closely related to providing intellectual stimulation in a broad sense. However, too often definitions of intellectual development are tied exclusively to standardized scores on tests that fail to incorporate diverse cultural knowledge. Such a narrow conception of learning legitimizes images of success that privilege certain social groups while marginalizing others (Furman and Shields 2005).

In societies such as Norway and Cyprus that have more recently experienced an influx of immigrants and refugees from several ethnic and language groups, principals who are part of the mainstream are challenged to find ways to make the mainstream curriculum and language explicit while also incorporating students' home cultures. In contrast, in the USA because the two predominately African American schools could face closure under No Child Left Behind (NCLB), these African American principals made raising student achievement on standardized tests a priority.

5.8 Conclusion

This chapter aimed at exploring and comparing how successful leadership for diversity is defined and addressed in Norway, Cyprus, and the United States. The analysis of the differences in the ISSPP case study schools across three national contexts underscores the role of varying ideological orientations and policy contexts on the day-to-day practice of successful principals. Successful school leaders must be highly sensitive to their own local and national contexts.

First, there are differences in policy frameworks. Norway and Cyprus have developed national policies that address cultural and language diversity. However, contradictions within and across different policy documents can be identified. For instance, the major educational policy in Norway emphasizes the importance of both democracy and diversity, and the strong commitment to comprehensive education and social justice is underpinned by social democratic politics for promoting equity. Still within the Norwegian policy documents this notion is juxtaposed to other statements with a focus on the integration of those who differ from the majority and may take for granted that immigrant students are expected to "fit in". In the United States diversity policy has been largely race-based as opposed to identified by language or ethnicity, and there is an absence of a national policy framework that promotes cultural pluralism. Although some local school districts in New York State have written diversity policies, most teachers and administrators are unaware of them. Diversity issues have largely been decided through litigation, not through legislation as in Norway and Cyprus.

Second, there are differences in leadership practices across local schools within the same national context as well as across national contexts. The two Norwegian

school principals both work for a democratic and inclusive schooling for minority students, but they interpret what is best for their students quite differently. The Norwegian cases demonstrated how the concept of care, in an environment where power relations in general were not disputed, could result in practices where a focus upon deficits and the preservation of the status quo were accepted. It reminds us of differences related to more individual qualities of school principals. Also, the advocate role for principals may not be so crucial everywhere, but in economically disadvantaged communities, like the contexts of the U.S. schools and the two Cypriot cases, it seems essential. These cases exemplify how principals may demonstrate strong advocacy for parents and communities who have been marginalized.

Third, we need to examine and interrogate the taken-for-granted constructs that underlie empirical data. This can be done through analysing the concrete implications for practice that flow from one principal's adoption of a caring discourse in regard to students. Leadership for diversity discourses and practices are a set of processes rather than something given, and therefore self-reflexivity is demanded, and in particular in terms of foregrounding notions of power (cf. Wilkinson 2008).

Our analysis of the culturally responsive practices in the ISSPP case studies raises questions about what constitutes successful leadership for diversity across contexts. In the face of different national policy contexts, traditions, and accountability pressures, our case studies have demonstrated how issues regarding leadership practices which contribute to the empowerment of all stakeholders created tensions for culturally diverse schools. Is success about increasing student achievement in the mainstream curriculum? Or should we also consider how schools provide learning experiences that "center" students in the history and culture of their families and home communities and provide all students in the school with a multicultural curriculum? Is the leadership aim to integrate immigrant students and parents into the cultural and linguistic mainstream with the hope of greater social mobility in society? Or do successful school leaders also find ways to challenge inequities in the school district and larger society? It raises dilemmas of sameness versus difference and the responsibility for community versus individual freedom. Finding a balance between honouring student home cultures and emphasizing student learning does not easily lend itself to normative models and quick fixes.

References

Agard-Jones, L. (1993). Going over the rainbow curriculum for multicultural education. *Multicultural Education, 1*(38), 13–15.

Banks, J. A., & Banks, C. A. M. (Eds.). (2006). *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (6th ed.). New York: Wiley.

Baumann, G. (1999). *The multicultural riddle: Rethinking national, ethnic, and religious identities.* New York: Routledge.

Castles, S. (2005). Migration, citizenship, and education. In J. Banks (Ed.), *Diversity and citizenship education: Global perspectives* (pp. 17–48). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Collins, P. H. (1991). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment.* New York: Routledge.
Cornbleth, C., & Waugh, D. (1995). *The great speckled bird: Education policy-in-the-making.* New York: St. Martin's Press.
Delpit, L., & Perry, T. (Eds.). (1997). The real ebonics debate. *Rethinking Schools, 12*(1). Accessed at: http://www.rethinkingschools.org/archive/12_01/ebintro.shtml.
Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. New York: The Free Press.
Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change.* Cambridge: Polity Press.
Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: The Seabury Press.
Furman, G., & Shields, C. (2005). How can leaders promote and support social justice and democratic community in schools? In W. A. Firestone & C. Riehl (Eds.), *A new agenda for research in educational leadership* (pp. 119–138). New York: Teachers College Press.
Furman, G., & Starratt, R. J. (2002). Leadership for democratic community in schools. In J. Murphy (Ed.), *The educational leadership challenge: Redefining leadership for the 21st century* (pp. 105–134). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
Giles, C., Johnson, L., Brooks, S., & Jacobson, S. (2005). Building bridges, building community: Transformational leadership in a challenging urban context. *Journal of School Leadership, 15*(5), 519–545.
Gollnick, D. M. (1995). National and state initiatives for multicultural education. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 44–64). New York: Macmillan.
Jacobson, S., Johnson, L., Giles, C., & Ylimaki, R. (2005). Successful leadership in U.S. schools: Enabling principles, enabling schools. *Journal of Educational Administration, 43*(6), 607–618.
Jacobson, S., Brooks, S., Giles, C., Johnson, L., & Ylimaki, R. (2007). Successful leadership in three high poverty urban elementary schools. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 6*(4), 291–317.
Johnson, L. (2002). "Making democracy real": Teacher union and community activism to promote diversity in the New York City Schools—1935–1950. *Urban Education, 37,* 566–587.
Johnson, L. (2003). Multicultural policy as social activism: Redefining who counts in multicultural education. *Race, Ethnicity, and Education, 6*(2), 107–121.
Johnson, L. (2006). "Making her community a better place to live": Culturally responsive urban school leadership in historical perspective. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 5*(1), 19–37.
Johnson, L. (2007). Rethinking successful school leadership in challenging U.S. schools: Culturally responsive practices in school-community relationships. *International Studies in Educational Administration, 35*(3), 49–58.
Johnson, L., Møller, J., Jacobson, S., & Wong, K. C. (2008). Cross-national comparisons in the International Successful School Principalship Project (ISSPP): The United States, Norway and China. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 52*(4), 407–422.
Joshee, R., & Johnson, L. (2005). Multicultural education in the United States and Canada: The importance of national policy. In N. Bascia, A. Cumming, A. Datnow, K. Leithwood, & D. Livingstone (Eds.), *International handbook on educational policy* (pp. 53–74). Dordrecht: Kluwer.
Kalantzis, M., & Cope, B. (1999). Multicultural education: Transforming the mainstream. In S. May (Ed.), *Critical multiculturalism: Rethinking multicultural and antiracist education* (pp. 245–276). London: Falmer.
Kanaris, A. (2007). Policy of the Ministry of Education and Culture on intercultural education. www.proodeftiki.info/pdfs/presentation3.ppt (in Greek). Accessed 12 July 2008.
Kleanthous, A. (2007, March). *Address of the Minister of Education and Culture of Cyprus. First educational conference of the Pancyprian association of Greek teachers with the title "Reception of children with immigrant origins: The role of the school".* Larnaca: Cyprus.
Kozol, J. (2005). *The shame of the nation: The restoration of apartheid schooling in America.* New York: Crown.
Ladson-Billings, G. (1995a). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal, 32*(3), 465–491.
Ladson-Billings, G. (1995b). But that's just good teaching! The case for culturally relevant pedagogy. *Theory into Practice, 34*(3), 159–165.

Larson, C., & Murtadha, K. (2002). Leadership for social justice. In J. Murphy (Ed.), *The educational leadership challenge: Redefining leadership for the 21st century; 101st Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (pp. 134–161). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Leithwood, K. (2005). Understanding successful principal leadership: Progress on a broken front. *Journal of Educational Administration, 43*(6), 619–629.

Leithwood, K., & Riehl, C. (2005). What do we already know about educational leadership? In W. A. Firestone & C. Riehl (Eds.), *A new agenda for research in educational leadership* (pp. 12–27). New York: Teachers College Press.

Lieblich, A., Tuval-Mashiach, R., & Zilber, T. (Eds.). (1998). *Narrative research: Reading analysis and interpretation*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Ministry of Education and Culture (MOEC). (2002). *Primary education curriculum.* Nicosia: Curriculum Development Service.

Ministry of Education and Culture (MOEC). (2008a). *Annual report 2007.* www.moec.gov.cy/etisia-ekthesi/pdf/annual_report_2007_en.pdf. Accessed 8 July 2008.

Ministry of Education and Culture (MOEC). (2008b). *Strategic planning for education*. *The comprehensive revision of our educational system.* http://www.moec.gov.cy/stratigikoi_sxediasmoi/pdf/17_1_2008_stratigikos_shediasmos_anatheorimenos.pdf (in Greek). Accessed 21 June 2007.

Ministry of Education and Culture (MOEC). (2008c). *Primary education intercultural education.* www.moec.gov.cy/dde/diapolitismiki.html (in Greek). Accessed 7 July 2008.

Ministry of Education and Research. (2006). *National curriculum for knowledge promotion in primary and secondary education and training*. Oslo: In-house publication.

Møller, J. (2002). Democratic leadership in an age of managerial accountability. *Improving Schools, 5*(2), 11–21.

Møller, J. (2006). Democratic schooling in Norway: Implications for leadership in practice. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 5*(1), 53–69.

Møller, J. (2009). Approaches to school leadership in Scandinavia. *Journal of Educational Administration and History, 41*(2), 165–177.

Møller, J., Sivesind, K., Skedsmo, G., & Aas, M. (2006). Skolelederundersøkelsen 2005. Om arbeidsforhold, evalueringspraksis og ledelse i skolen. [Country Survey of School Principalship 2005] *Acta Didactica, 1*, 53–61.

New York City Board of Education. (1989). *Statement of policy on multicultural education and promotion of positive intergroup relations*. New York: New York City Board of Education.

New York State Social Studies Review and Development Committee. (1991). *One nation, many peoples: A declaration of cultural interdependence*. New York: Author.

Orfield, G., Frankenberg, E., & Lee, C. (2002). The resurgence of school segregation. *Educational Leadership, 60*(4), 16–20.

Placier, M., Hall, P. M., McKendall, S. B., & Cockrell, K. S. (2000). Policy as the transformation of intentions: Making multicultural education policy. *Educational Policy, 14*(2), 259–289.

Prewitt, K. (2002). Demography, diversity, and democracy: The 2000 census story. *The Brookings Review, 20*(1), 6–9.

Rebell, M. (2005). Court-ordered reform of New York State school aid. In L. Johnson, M. E. Finn, & R. Lewis (Eds.), *Urban education with an attitude* (pp. 33–40). Albany: SUNY Press.

Reitzug, U. C., & Patterson, J. (1998) "I'm not going to lose you!" Empowerment through caring in an urban principal's practice with students. *Urban Education, 33*(2), 150–181.

Reyes, P., & Wagstaff, L. (2005). How does leadership promote successful teaching and learning for diverse students? In W. A. Firestone & C. Riehl (Eds.), *A new agenda for research in educational leadership* (pp. 101–118). New York: Teachers College Press.

Riehl, C. (2000). The principal's role in creating inclusive schools for diverse learners: A review of normative, empirical, and critical literature on the practice of educational administration. *Review of Educational Research, 70*(1), 55–81.

Scheurich, J. (1998). Highly successful and loving, public elementary schools populated mainly by low SES children of color: Core beliefs and cultural characteristics. *Urban Education, 33*(4), 451–491.

Sleeter, C. E. (2006). *Un-standardizing curriculum: Multicultural teaching in the standards-based classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Sleeter, C. E., & Grant, C. A. (2009). *Making choices for multicultural education: Five approaches to race, class, & gender* (6th ed.). New York: Wiley.

SSB (2006): *Samfunnsspeilet nr. 4.* Oslo, Statistics Norway.

Statistical Service of the Republic of Cyprus. (2007). *Statistics of education 2005/2006.* http://www.mof.gov.cy/mof/cystat/statistics.nsf/index_gr/index_gr?OpenDocument. Accessed 10 October 2007.

Supreme Court of the United States (2007). *Parents Involved in Community Schools v. Seattle School District No. 1,* (551 U.S. 05908).

Vedøy, G., & Møller, J. (2007): Successful school leadership for diversity? Examining two contrasting examples of working for democracy in Norway. *International Studies in Educational Administration, 35*(3), 58–67.

Welner, K. G. (2001). *Legal rights, local wrongs: When community control collides with educational equity*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Wilkinson, J. (2008). Good intentions are not enough: A critical examination of diversity and educational leadership scholarship. *Journal of Educational Administration and History, 40*(2), 101–112.

Woods, P. (2005). *Democratic leadership in education*. London: Chapman.