


Systemic and Cultural Barriers to Ethnic Minority Leadership in Education: A Critical Conceptual Analysis

 **Michael Anthony Thomas, MBA**

Department of Business, University of Wales Trinity Saint David, Birmingham Campus, United Kingdom; and Department of Interdisciplinary Studies and Statistics, PENKUP Research Institute, Birmingham, United Kingdom

 **Kennedy Oberhiri Obohjemu, PhD**

Department of Interdisciplinary Studies and Statistics, PENKUP Research Institute, Birmingham, United Kingdom.

 **Fidelis Evwiekpamare Olori, PhD**

Faculty of Business Management, Oxford Brookes University, GBS Partnership, Birmingham, United Kingdom; and Department of Interdisciplinary Research and Statistics, PENKUP Research Institute, Birmingham, United Kingdom.

 **Christian Atabong Nchindia, PhD**

Faculty of Business Management, Global Banking School, University of Suffolk, Manchester Campus, United Kingdom; and Department of Interdisciplinary Research and Statistics, PENKUP Research Institute, Birmingham, United Kingdom.

 **Olusola Sam-Sorongbe, PhD (in progress)**


Department of Business Management, London School of Science and Technology, Birmingham, United Kingdom; and Department of Interdisciplinary Research and Statistics, PENKUP Research Institute, Birmingham, United Kingdom.

 **Jalaleddin Kazemi Fard, MSc**

Department of Business Management, Scholars School System, Leeds Trinity University Partnership, Manchester Campus, United Kingdom.

Oladimeji Philip Akerele, MSc

Aberdeen Business School, Robert Gordon's University, Scotland; and Department of Interdisciplinary Research and Statistics, PENKUP Research Institute, Birmingham, United Kingdom

 **Ei Thu Thu Myint, DBA**

Department of Business Management, Scholars School System, Leeds Trinity University Partnership, Manchester Campus, United Kingdom.

Corresponding Author: Dr. Kennedy Oberhiri Obohjemu, PhD, Department of Multidisciplinary Studies & Statistics, PENKUP Research Institute, Birmingham, United Kingdom. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5175-1179>.

Article received: 11/02/2026, Article Revised: 04/03/2026, Article Accepted: 17/04/2026, Article Published: 21/05/2026

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.55640/tprjsms-v03i05-02>

© 2026 Authors retain the copyright of their manuscripts, and all Open Access articles are disseminated under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 \(CC-BY\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which licenses unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided that the original work is appropriately cited.

ABSTRACT

Persistent underrepresentation of ethnic minority professionals in senior leadership roles within educational institutions remains a pressing concern across the United Kingdom and comparable contexts. Existing research has often emphasised representation gaps, yet limited attention has been given to the structural and cultural mechanisms that sustain these inequalities. This paper develops a critical conceptual analysis of systemic and cultural barriers shaping leadership access and progression. Drawing on organisational theory, critical race perspectives, and empirical insights from previous research, the analysis demonstrates that leadership inequality is not simply the result of individual deficits or pipeline limitations. Instead, it reflects deeply embedded institutional processes, including

biased recruitment pathways, informal sponsorship patterns, and culturally constructed standards of leadership legitimacy. The paper further argues that cultural expectations surrounding authority, communication, and professional identity continue to privilege dominant groups while marginalising alternative leadership expressions. These dynamics operate simultaneously, producing cumulative disadvantage across career trajectories. The contribution of this paper lies in reframing ethnic minority underrepresentation as a structural and cultural phenomenon rooted in institutional design rather than an outcome of insufficient diversity initiatives. The analysis concludes by outlining implications for leadership theory and institutional reform, emphasising the need for systemic transformation that addresses both formal processes and informal norms.

KEYWORDS

Ethnic minority leadership, educational inequality, structural barriers, cultural legitimacy, leadership pathways, higher education

INTRODUCTION

Educational institutions occupy a distinctive position within modern democratic societies. Universities, colleges, and school systems are commonly associated with fairness, meritocracy, and social mobility. Public commitments to equity, diversity, and inclusion have therefore become increasingly visible across educational governance structures in the United Kingdom and internationally. Strategic frameworks, equality charters, race action plans, and institutional diversity statements now form part of mainstream educational administration (Wolbring & Lillywhite, 2021; Champion & Clark, 2022). Despite this heightened policy attention, ethnic minority representation within senior leadership positions remains persistently low across many educational settings. The contradiction between institutional commitments and leadership outcomes has become difficult to ignore.

Recent evidence from Advance HE shows that Black, Asian and minority ethnic staff constituted 19.1% of the UK higher education workforce in 2022/2023, compared with 8.6% two decades earlier (Advance HE, 2024). However, this increase in workforce diversity has not translated proportionately into leadership representation. White academics continue to dominate professorial and executive positions, while Black academics remain significantly underrepresented within the highest institutional ranks. Advance HE data further indicate that only 9.9% of heads of institutions in UK higher education were from Black, Asian and minority ethnic backgrounds in 2022/2023. These disparities persist despite the increasing ethnic diversity of student populations and sustained institutional investment in EDI initiatives.

Existing research has documented these inequalities extensively. Studies examining race and higher education leadership repeatedly identify barriers

associated with progression, recognition, and institutional belonging (Bhopal, 2020; Rollock, 2019). Research also demonstrates that ethnic minority academics are more likely to experience isolation, excessive service responsibilities, limited mentoring opportunities, and exclusion from influential professional networks (Arday, 2018). Yet, much of the public and institutional discussion surrounding leadership inequality continues to frame the issue primarily as a pipeline challenge. This perspective assumes that underrepresentation reflects insufficient progression through educational and professional pathways rather than structural problems embedded within institutions themselves.

Such assumptions have increasingly attracted criticism. Recent studies argue that leadership inequality cannot be explained solely through deficits in aspiration, experience, or preparedness (Bhowmik et al., 2026). Attention has shifted towards the institutional processes and cultural expectations that shape leadership legitimacy. Recruitment systems, promotion frameworks, governance structures, and informal sponsorship networks collectively influence who is recognised as leadership material and who remains marginalised. These mechanisms often appear neutral and merit-based, yet their outcomes reveal persistent racial disparities.

Previous research has identified recurring patterns linking structural arrangements with cultural constructions of authority (Thomas et al., 2026). Recruitment and promotion pathways frequently reward continuity, institutional familiarity, and proximity to existing leadership cultures. Informal endorsement, reputational visibility, and access to influential networks continue to shape progression opportunities in ways that

are not equally accessible to all staff. Ethnic minority professionals therefore encounter barriers that accumulate gradually across career trajectories rather than emerging only at senior appointment stages (Nchindia et al., 2025; Obohjemu et al., 2025a).

Cultural expectations surrounding leadership further intensify these inequalities. Leadership within educational institutions has historically been associated with behavioural norms, communication styles, and professional identities closely aligned with dominant White middle-class organisational cultures (Adesina et al., 2025). These expectations are rarely stated explicitly, yet they influence how competence, authority, and credibility are interpreted. Ethnic minority professionals may therefore encounter additional scrutiny when navigating leadership spaces, particularly where institutional cultures continue to privilege familiarity and sameness (Obohjemu et al., 2025b).

Recent research has also raised concerns about the performative dimensions of institutional diversity work. Equality frameworks and race action plans often generate extensive documentation and visible commitments while leaving underlying power structures largely unchanged (Ahmed, 2012). Nottingham Trent University's recent report on ethnic diversity in higher education leadership similarly concluded that structural and cultural barriers continue to restrict progression despite years of EDI activity. Questions have therefore emerged regarding whether current institutional approaches genuinely address exclusion or simply manage its appearance.

This paper develops a critical conceptual analysis of systemic and cultural barriers shaping ethnic minority leadership within educational institutions. Supported by recent empirical evidence, the analysis argues that leadership inequality is reproduced through the interaction of institutional structures and culturally embedded assumptions about legitimacy, professionalism, and authority. Leadership underrepresentation is therefore examined not as an accidental imbalance or temporary shortfall, but as a predictable outcome of organisational systems that continue to privilege historically dominant groups.

The paper contributes to current debates in three important ways. First, it moves beyond descriptive representation statistics towards a deeper examination of how leadership pathways are organised and maintained. Second, it integrates structural and cultural explanations

rather than treating them as separate phenomena. Third, it reframes leadership inequality as a governance issue requiring institutional transformation rather than isolated diversity interventions. Through this approach, the paper seeks to advance understanding of why leadership disparities persist despite sustained policy attention and growing awareness of racial inequality within education.

STRUCTURAL BARRIERS IN LEADERSHIP PATHWAYS

Leadership progression within educational institutions is frequently presented as a transparent and merit-based process shaped through measurable achievement, professional competence, and institutional contribution. Formal recruitment frameworks, promotion procedures, and performance metrics are commonly portrayed as objective systems designed to reward excellence irrespective of race, ethnicity, or background. Existing evidence, however, suggests that these systems do not operate within socially neutral environments. Leadership pathways are shaped through institutional histories, organisational cultures, and unequal access to opportunity, producing outcomes that continue to disadvantage ethnic minority professionals across higher education and school leadership structures.

Thomas et al. (2026) identified recruitment and promotion processes as central mechanisms through which leadership inequality is reproduced. Ethnic minority academics and educational professionals often encounter barriers long before reaching senior appointment stages. These barriers emerge through restricted access to influential networks, limited sponsorship opportunities, uneven workload distribution, and reduced institutional visibility. Such disadvantages accumulate progressively across careers, constraining leadership trajectories over time rather than through a single point of exclusion (Nchindia, 2020; Obohjemu et al., 2025b).

Recent data from the National Foundation for Educational Research demonstrate that ethnic minority teachers in England remain less likely to progress into senior leadership positions despite increasing workforce diversity (NFER, 2025). Although minority ethnic teachers account for a growing proportion of the teaching workforce, headship and executive leadership roles continue to be disproportionately occupied by White professionals. Similar patterns are visible across higher education. Advance HE (2024a) reported that Black academics represented only 1.2% of professors in UK

universities despite sustained increases in overall academic workforce diversity. These disparities cannot be adequately explained through pipeline arguments alone, particularly given the length of time over which institutional diversity initiatives have operated.

Institutional recruitment systems play a significant role in sustaining these inequalities. Leadership appointments often rely heavily on informal criteria that extend beyond published job specifications. Research examining organisational recruitment practices has shown that concepts such as “institutional fit”, “leadership presence”, and “professional credibility” frequently influence decision-making despite lacking clearly defined standards (van den Brink & Benschop, 2014). Such concepts are shaped through socially embedded assumptions regarding who appears suitable for authority and leadership. Existing leadership teams therefore tend to reproduce familiar profiles, particularly within environments where senior decision-making structures remain demographically homogeneous.

Social capital further influences access to leadership progression. Informal mentoring relationships, sponsorship from senior colleagues, and inclusion within influential professional networks remain critical components of leadership development in educational institutions (Ibarra, Carter, & Silva, 2010). Access to these networks is unevenly distributed. Ethnic minority staff often report exclusion from informal leadership spaces where opportunities, strategic information, and institutional endorsements circulate. Rollock’s (2019) study of Black female professors in the United Kingdom found that participants regularly experienced professional isolation and reduced access to senior advocacy despite strong academic performance and institutional commitment.

Workload allocation patterns also contribute to unequal progression outcomes. Research has consistently shown that ethnic minority academics are more likely to undertake pastoral, diversity-related, and student support responsibilities that attract limited institutional recognition within promotion frameworks (Joseph-Salisbury, 2020). These responsibilities are often essential to institutional functioning yet remain undervalued compared with research income generation and externally visible leadership achievements. Consequently, ethnic minority professionals may contribute extensively to institutional life while simultaneously receiving fewer opportunities to

accumulate the forms of capital rewarded within senior leadership selection processes.

Promotion criteria themselves are not immune from structural inequality. Academic promotion systems frequently prioritise research output, grant acquisition, and international visibility. Access to these indicators is shaped through unequal resource distribution, differential mentoring, and varying institutional support structures. Studies examining racial inequalities within academia indicate that ethnic minority academics often encounter additional scrutiny regarding competence and credibility while also receiving less sponsorship for career-enhancing opportunities (Bhopal & Henderson, 2021). Merit therefore operates within contexts already shaped through structural imbalance.

Governance structures further reinforce exclusionary patterns. Senior decision-making bodies across educational institutions remain overwhelmingly White, particularly within executive leadership and governing boards. Recent UK data show that minority ethnic representation remains disproportionately low across vice-chancellor positions and governing councils despite sector-wide diversity commitments (Gbadamosi, 2025). Homogeneity within leadership structures influences not only recruitment outcomes but also institutional understandings of authority, professionalism, and leadership legitimacy.

Transparency represents another significant concern. Leadership pathways within education frequently depend upon unwritten institutional knowledge regarding acceptable career trajectories, strategic networking, and behavioural expectations. Ethnic minority professionals often report uncertainty surrounding how leadership progression operates in practice, particularly where informal endorsement carries substantial influence (Hussain & Findlay, 2025). Formal equality policies may therefore coexist alongside opaque institutional cultures that continue to privilege those already positioned closest to existing centres of power.

Importantly, structural barriers do not necessarily rely upon overt discriminatory intent. Contemporary organisational inequality often operates through routine institutional practices regarded as normal, professional, and procedurally fair. The language of meritocracy can therefore obscure how leadership systems reproduce accumulated advantage across racialised lines. Existing inequalities appear naturalised precisely because

exclusion is embedded within ordinary organisational processes rather than explicit discriminatory acts.

Thomas et al. (2026) suggests that meaningful leadership reform requires more than expanded access to leadership development programmes or mentoring schemes alone. Structural transformation depends upon critical examination of recruitment criteria, workload allocation systems, governance arrangements, and promotion metrics. Institutions that fail to interrogate how leadership pathways are constructed risk reproducing inequality even while publicly committing to diversity and inclusion. Leadership inequality therefore persists not because ethnic minority professionals lack capability or ambition, but because institutional systems continue to reward proximity to historically dominant organisational norms.

CULTURAL CONSTRUCTIONS OF LEADERSHIP LEGITIMACY

Structural inequalities alone cannot fully explain the persistence of ethnic minority underrepresentation within educational leadership. Leadership progression is also shaped through culturally embedded assumptions regarding authority, professionalism, competence, and institutional belonging. These assumptions influence how leadership potential is recognised long before formal appointment processes begin. Leadership within educational institutions is not evaluated in a socially neutral context. Perceptions of credibility and legitimacy are constructed through historically dominant organisational norms that continue to privilege particular identities, behaviours, and modes of self-presentation.

Research has identified cultural expectations surrounding leadership as a major factor sustaining exclusion across educational institutions. Ethnic minority professionals frequently navigate environments in which leadership is implicitly associated with behavioural styles and professional identities aligned with dominant White middle-class organisational cultures. Such expectations are rarely articulated openly, yet they exert considerable influence over recruitment decisions, workplace interactions, and informal evaluations of leadership suitability.

Research examining educational leadership cultures has consistently shown that ideas of professionalism are shaped through historically embedded assumptions regarding speech, communication style, emotional expression, and institutional conduct (Akanji et al., 2020;

Fisher, 2021). Confidence, decisiveness, and authority are often interpreted according to culturally familiar norms. Individuals who diverge from these expectations may therefore encounter additional scrutiny regarding competence or leadership readiness even where their qualifications and experience are equivalent to those of their peers.

Recent studies indicate that ethnic minority professionals frequently experience pressure to adapt aspects of their identity in order to align with prevailing institutional expectations. Celestine (2026) found that minority ethnic leaders within UK educational settings regularly engaged in forms of behavioural self-monitoring to avoid being perceived as either overly assertive or insufficiently authoritative. Such experiences reflect broader organisational dynamics in which professional acceptance depends partly upon proximity to dominant cultural norms.

This process often creates contradictory expectations. Ethnic minority professionals who adapt closely to established leadership cultures may face perceptions of inauthenticity or tokenism. Conversely, those who maintain distinct leadership styles or cultural expressions may be viewed as lacking institutional fit. These tensions generate what several studies describe as “double constraints”, where acceptance becomes conditional upon navigating conflicting organisational expectations (Settles et al., 2019). Leadership legitimacy therefore extends beyond measurable competence into the realm of cultural recognition.

Institutional narratives surrounding leadership success further reinforce exclusionary patterns. Educational leadership frameworks frequently valorise uninterrupted career progression, strategic networking, institutional loyalty, and highly visible professional confidence. These narratives reflect particular forms of career experience more commonly associated with historically dominant groups. Ethnic minority professionals, meanwhile, are more likely to encounter career interruptions, disproportionate pastoral responsibilities, and exclusion from influential networks, all of which may reduce alignment with conventional leadership trajectories (Bhopal, 2022).

Research has also identified the significance of informal organisational spaces in shaping leadership legitimacy. Leadership identities are cultivated not only through formal performance evaluations but also through everyday interactions occurring within committees,

conferences, networking events, and institutional social spaces. Access to these spaces is uneven. Ethnic minority professionals often report reduced inclusion within informal networks where sponsorship relationships, reputational visibility, and strategic alliances are formed (Ogunyemi et al., 2023; Thomas et al., 2026). Exclusion from such environments limits opportunities to acquire the informal recognition that frequently precedes leadership advancement.

Cultural exclusion is reinforced further through organisational silence surrounding race and power. Educational institutions commonly present themselves as inclusive and progressive environments, yet discussions regarding racial inequality often remain constrained or avoided altogether. Research has shown that conversations about racism within higher education are frequently perceived as uncomfortable, divisive, or reputationally risky (Ahmed, 2012). This silence sustains the appearance of neutrality while limiting opportunities for critical examination of how institutional cultures reproduce inequality.

The persistence of colour-blind organisational narratives intensifies these dynamics. Educational institutions often emphasise universal professionalism and meritocracy while minimising the influence of race on organisational outcomes. Such approaches can obscure the lived experiences of ethnic minority professionals and restrict institutional willingness to engage with structural and cultural inequalities directly. Zamora Liu et al. (2025) argue that colour-blind leadership models frequently reinforce exclusion because they detach leadership evaluation from the historical and social realities shaping institutional life.

Media representation and wider societal narratives also influence educational leadership cultures. Leadership authority within Britain has historically been associated with whiteness, elite educational backgrounds, and middle-class professional norms. These broader cultural associations continue to shape institutional understandings of credibility and professionalism, even within formally diverse environments. Leadership expectations developed within historically homogeneous institutions do not disappear automatically following the introduction of diversity policies or representation targets.

Importantly, cultural constructions of leadership legitimacy interact continuously with structural processes. Recruitment systems, promotion frameworks,

and governance structures are interpreted through culturally shaped understandings of authority and institutional fit. Leadership selection therefore reflects not only formal criteria but also deeply embedded assumptions regarding who appears trustworthy, competent, and suitable for institutional representation.

Research suggests that meaningful progress requires educational institutions to interrogate how leadership legitimacy itself is socially constructed. Expanding representation without challenging dominant leadership norms risks incorporating diversity into unchanged institutional cultures rather than transforming them. Leadership reform therefore depends not only upon structural transparency but also upon cultural change capable of recognising multiple forms of authority, communication, and professional identity.

INTERPLAY BETWEEN STRUCTURAL AND CULTURAL BARRIERS

Structural and cultural barriers do not operate as separate or isolated forces within educational institutions. Leadership inequality persists because institutional processes and cultural expectations reinforce one another continuously across professional trajectories. Recruitment systems, promotion criteria, governance arrangements, and informal leadership cultures interact in ways that normalise exclusion while preserving the appearance of meritocracy and procedural fairness. Understanding ethnic minority underrepresentation therefore requires attention to how these dimensions intersect rather than examining them independently.

Research has demonstrated that structural arrangements within educational institutions are interpreted and enacted through culturally embedded assumptions regarding professionalism, competence, and institutional legitimacy. Formal recruitment criteria may appear objective, yet assessments of “leadership potential”, “strategic fit”, or “institutional presence” are shaped through subjective cultural interpretations. Decision-makers often rely upon implicit understandings of credibility informed through historically dominant organisational norms. As a result, structural systems that appear neutral on paper may produce highly unequal outcomes in practice.

Research examining leadership selection processes supports this interpretation. van den Brink and Benschop (2014) found that recruitment panels within higher education frequently reproduced existing leadership

profiles through informal evaluations of similarity, familiarity, and perceived compatibility. Such processes rarely involve explicit racial exclusion. Instead, organisational actors often interpret leadership suitability through tacit cultural expectations developed within historically homogeneous environments. Structural procedures therefore become mechanisms through which cultural preferences are institutionalised.

The interaction between structure and culture is particularly visible in the operation of professional networks. Informal sponsorship and institutional advocacy remain central to leadership progression across educational settings. Access to these networks depends not only upon organisational position but also upon social inclusion and cultural recognition. Ethnic minority professionals may therefore encounter simultaneous structural exclusion from influential spaces and cultural marginalisation within those environments. Reduced visibility within leadership networks subsequently affects opportunities for strategic appointments, committee participation, and career-enhancing projects.

Research has identified cumulative disadvantage as a defining feature of these interactions. Early-career exclusion from mentoring relationships or institutional sponsorship often limits opportunities for professional visibility. Reduced visibility subsequently affects performance evaluations, promotion outcomes, and leadership readiness assessments. Over time, these processes create leadership pathways that reward those already positioned closest to dominant institutional cultures. Inequality therefore emerges incrementally through repeated interactions between structural arrangements and cultural expectations rather than through singular acts of discrimination.

Workload allocation provides another illustration of this relationship. Ethnic minority academics and educational professionals are frequently expected to undertake diversity-related labour, pastoral responsibilities, and student support work because of assumptions regarding representation and accessibility (Joseph-Salisbury, 2020). These expectations are culturally shaped yet structurally embedded within institutional practice. Such responsibilities often consume time and emotional labour while attracting comparatively limited recognition within promotion systems. Structural evaluation criteria therefore disadvantage professionals carrying culturally assigned institutional burdens.

Leadership development initiatives also reveal the limitations of addressing structural or cultural barriers in isolation. Educational institutions increasingly implement mentoring schemes, leadership programmes, and diversity training aimed at improving representation. Although such interventions may provide valuable support, their impact remains constrained where broader organisational cultures and institutional structures remain unchanged. Studies examining diversity interventions within higher education indicate that programmes focused solely on individual development rarely produce sustained organisational transformation (Bhopal & Pitkin, 2020). Ethnic minority professionals may acquire additional qualifications, training, and leadership experience while still encountering unchanged institutional norms governing legitimacy and belonging.

The persistence of meritocratic narratives further strengthens the interaction between structural and cultural inequality. Educational institutions frequently frame leadership outcomes as the product of talent, effort, and professional achievement. Such narratives obscure how structural advantages and cultural familiarity shape access to opportunity. Ahmed (2012) argues that institutional commitments to equality can coexist comfortably with exclusion precisely because organisations interpret inequality through individual rather than systemic explanations. Leadership disparities therefore become attributed to confidence gaps, aspiration deficits, or pipeline shortages rather than institutional design.

Recent research examining race and organisational culture within higher education highlights how diversity initiatives may unintentionally reinforce this dynamic. Institutions often celebrate diversity rhetorically while preserving existing power structures and leadership norms (Arday et al., 2021). Symbolic inclusion may increase visibility without altering the structural and cultural conditions shaping progression. Consequently, educational institutions may appear increasingly diverse at surface level while leadership authority remains concentrated within historically dominant groups.

Research suggests that the durability of leadership inequality lies precisely within this interaction between institutional systems and cultural legitimacy. Structural reform without cultural change risks reproducing exclusion through altered procedures interpreted according to unchanged assumptions. Cultural

awareness initiatives without structural accountability similarly fail to address how opportunity and authority are distributed organisationally. Meaningful transformation therefore requires simultaneous engagement with both dimensions.

Educational institutions seeking to address leadership inequality must critically examine how formal processes and informal cultures reinforce one another. Recruitment frameworks, promotion systems, governance arrangements, workload allocation practices, and leadership development programmes cannot be evaluated independently from the cultural assumptions shaping their operation. Leadership diversity is unlikely to improve substantially where institutions continue to privilege organisational familiarity, inherited professional norms, and historically dominant understandings of authority.

This interactional perspective also carries important implications for leadership theory. Conventional leadership models often separate organisational systems from cultural identity, treating leadership competence as universally measurable and socially neutral. Thomas et al. (2026) challenges such assumptions by demonstrating that leadership recognition itself is culturally mediated and structurally regulated. Leadership inequality therefore reflects not merely unequal participation but unequal institutional valuation of professional identity and authority.

IMPLICATIONS FOR LEADERSHIP THEORY AND INSTITUTIONAL PRACTICE

The persistence of ethnic minority underrepresentation within educational leadership raises important theoretical and practical questions regarding how leadership itself is conceptualised, evaluated, and reproduced. Existing leadership research has traditionally concentrated on individual characteristics such as competence, emotional intelligence, strategic capability, and transformational capacity. These approaches have generated valuable insights into leadership behaviour and organisational effectiveness. However, they provide limited explanatory power when addressing enduring patterns of racial inequality within leadership systems. Leadership does not emerge within socially neutral environments. Organisational structures, institutional cultures, and historically embedded power relations shape whose leadership is recognised, legitimised, and rewarded.

Research suggests that conventional leadership frameworks frequently overlook the role of institutional power in shaping leadership outcomes. Leadership theories grounded primarily in individual performance and behavioural effectiveness often assume that progression depends largely upon merit, capability, and aspiration. Such assumptions risk obscuring how opportunity itself is distributed unevenly within educational organisations. Ethnic minority professionals may possess equivalent qualifications, experience, and leadership capacity while still encountering structural barriers and cultural exclusion that restrict progression into senior roles.

Recent studies have increasingly challenged universalist leadership assumptions. Research examining race and educational leadership demonstrates that dominant leadership models are frequently shaped through historically White organisational norms that remain insufficiently interrogated within mainstream leadership theory (Santamaría & Santamaría, 2016). Expectations surrounding professionalism, authority, and institutional credibility continue to reflect culturally specific understandings of leadership behaviour. Leadership theories that fail to engage critically with race therefore risk reproducing the exclusions they seek to explain.

Research also highlights the need for greater attention to institutional context within leadership analysis. Educational leadership is often discussed through abstract frameworks detached from the organisational environments in which leadership operates. Recruitment systems, governance structures, workload allocation practices, and informal professional networks all shape leadership trajectories in ways that cannot be reduced to individual capability alone. Leadership inequality therefore reflects organisational conditions as much as personal achievement.

Critical race perspectives offer important contributions in this regard. Such approaches shift attention from individual deficits towards institutional arrangements and power structures shaping organisational life. Research using critical race frameworks has demonstrated how racial inequality persists through apparently ordinary institutional practices regarded as neutral, professional, and merit-based (Gillborn, 2008). Applying these perspectives to educational leadership allows greater understanding of how exclusion becomes embedded within everyday organisational processes rather than relying solely upon explicit discrimination.

Research further suggests that leadership legitimacy should be treated as a socially constructed phenomenon rather than an objective organisational reality. Leadership recognition depends partly upon cultural familiarity and institutional acceptance. Educational institutions often reward forms of communication, self-presentation, and authority aligned with historically dominant organisational cultures. Leadership theories that present authority as universally recognisable fail to account for how race shapes perceptions of competence and professionalism within institutional settings.

Methodologically, the analysis points towards the importance of interpretive and qualitative approaches in leadership research. Quantitative representation data remain essential for identifying disparities, yet numerical indicators alone cannot capture the everyday experiences through which leadership inequality is sustained. Ethnographic research, narrative inquiry, and critical institutional analysis offer valuable insights into how informal interactions, organisational silences, and cultural expectations shape leadership progression. Such approaches enable examination not only of who becomes a leader, but also how leadership itself is socially recognised and institutionally authorised.

The implications for institutional practice are equally significant. Diversity initiatives focused primarily on representation targets or leadership development programmes are unlikely to produce substantial change where underlying organisational structures remain intact. Educational institutions must move beyond symbolic commitments towards structural accountability. Recruitment and promotion systems require greater transparency, particularly regarding informal decision-making processes and criteria related to institutional fit or leadership potential.

Governance reform also represents an important priority. Senior leadership teams and governing bodies continue to shape institutional culture through both formal authority and symbolic influence. Diverse representation within governance structures is therefore not merely a matter of visibility but one of organisational legitimacy and decision-making capacity. Research suggests that institutions with more inclusive governance arrangements are better positioned to identify structural barriers and challenge exclusionary organisational norms (Ely et al., 2012).

Workload distribution and recognition systems require critical examination as well. Ethnic minority

professionals frequently undertake disproportionate levels of pastoral care, mentoring, and diversity-related labour that remain undervalued within conventional promotion frameworks. Institutions committed to leadership equity must therefore reconsider how professional contribution is recognised and rewarded organisationally.

Cultural transformation remains equally essential. Educational institutions often avoid sustained engagement with discussions surrounding race, privilege, and institutional power because such conversations are perceived as uncomfortable or reputationally sensitive. The wider research indicates, however, that organisational silence reinforces exclusion by preserving the illusion of neutrality. Institutions serious about leadership reform must create environments capable of engaging critically with racial inequality rather than managing its appearance through performative diversity discourse.

Importantly, the implications extend beyond race alone. Structural and cultural mechanisms shaping ethnic minority exclusion frequently intersect with gender, class, disability, and migration status. Leadership systems therefore reproduce multiple forms of inequality simultaneously. Institutional reform grounded in transparency, accountability, and inclusive organisational culture may consequently contribute towards broader forms of educational equity.

Research ultimately suggests that leadership inequality cannot be resolved through incremental adjustments alone. Educational institutions must critically interrogate how leadership authority is constructed, distributed, and legitimised organisationally. Without such engagement, leadership diversity initiatives risk producing symbolic change while preserving deeply unequal institutional systems beneath the surface.

CONCLUSION

This paper has examined the systemic and cultural barriers shaping ethnic minority underrepresentation within educational leadership. The analysis has shown that leadership inequality cannot be understood solely through representation gaps, pipeline explanations, or assumptions about individual capability. Structural arrangements and culturally embedded expectations continue to shape who accesses leadership opportunities, whose authority is recognised, and which professional

identities are considered legitimate within educational institutions.

Recruitment systems, promotion frameworks, governance structures, and informal sponsorship networks remain central to the reproduction of inequality. These mechanisms frequently operate beneath the language of meritocracy and professionalism, making exclusion appear routine and institutionally acceptable. Leadership pathways often reward organisational familiarity, visibility within influential networks, and alignment with dominant institutional cultures. Ethnic minority professionals therefore encounter barriers extending beyond qualifications or experience.

Cultural expectations surrounding leadership legitimacy further reinforce these inequalities. Educational institutions continue to associate authority and professionalism with historically dominant organisational norms. Such assumptions influence how competence and leadership potential are interpreted, even where formal equality policies exist. Ethnic minority professionals frequently navigate conflicting expectations regarding authenticity, conformity, and institutional belonging while operating within environments that remain shaped through historically homogeneous leadership cultures.

The paper has also demonstrated that structural and cultural barriers operate simultaneously. Recruitment criteria are interpreted through culturally embedded understandings of credibility and institutional fit, while cultural exclusion affects access to opportunities necessary for career progression. Leadership inequality therefore persists through cumulative organisational processes rather than isolated incidents of overt discrimination.

Meaningful progress requires more than symbolic diversity commitments or compliance-driven initiatives. Educational institutions must engage critically with recruitment systems, promotion practices, governance arrangements, and organisational culture. Leadership equity depends upon structural accountability, transparency, and willingness to challenge long-standing assumptions about authority and professionalism. Institutions capable of confronting these issues are more likely to develop leadership environments that genuinely reflect the diversity and complexity of contemporary education.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

All authors contributed meaningfully to the development of this study and the preparation of the manuscript. The study was conceptualised and designed by M.A.T. F.E.O. and K.O.O. prepared the initial manuscript draft. Co-authors strengthened the analysis, offered detailed revisions and enhanced the clarity and coherence of the final document. All authors collaborated in drafting, revising, and approving the final manuscript.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

FUNDING

This research did not receive any grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors would like to acknowledge the management and technical staff of PENKUP Research Institute, Birmingham, United Kingdom for their excellent assistance and for providing manuscript writing/editorial support in accordance with Good Publication Practice (GPP3) guidelines.

REFERENCES

1. Adesina, I., Joham, A. E., Hamad, N., Pincha Baduge, M. S. D. S., Garth, B., Nguyen, T. V., & Boyle, J. (2025). Intersectionality in healthcare leadership: a scoping review on the career experiences of racially and ethnically minoritised women health professionals. *International Journal for Equity in Health*, 24(1), 245.
2. Advance HE. (2024a). *Equality in higher education: Staff statistical report 2024*. Available at: <https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/news-and-views/equality-higher-education-staff-statistical-report-2024>, [Accessed: 7 January 2026]
3. Ahmed, S. (2012). *On Being Included: Racism and Diversity in Institutional Life*. Duke University Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1131d2g>
4. Akanji, B., Mordi, C., Ituma, A., Adisa, T. A., & Ajonbadi, H. (2020). The influence of organisational culture on leadership style in higher education institutions. *Personnel review*, 49(3), 709-732.
5. Arday, J. (2018). Understanding race and educational leadership in higher education: Exploring the Black and ethnic minority (BME)

- experience. *Management in Education*, 32(4), 192-200.
6. Arday, J., Belluigi, D., & Thomas, D. (2021). Attempting to break the chain: Reimagining inclusive pedagogy and decolonising the curriculum within the academy. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 54(3), 298–313. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2020.1773257>
7. Bhopal, K. (2020). *White privilege: The myth of a post-racial society*. Policy Press.
8. Bhopal, K. (2022). Academics of colour in elite universities in the UK and the USA: The “unspoken system” of exclusion. *Studies in Higher Education*, 47(10), 2127–2137. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2021.1948894>
9. Bhopal, K., & Henderson, H. (2021). Competing inequalities: Gender versus race in higher education institutions in the UK. *Educational Review*, 73(2), 153–169. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2019.1642305>
10. Bhopal, K., & Pitkin, C. (2020). ‘Same old story, just a different policy’: Race and policy making in higher education in the UK. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 23(4), 530–547. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2020.1718082>
11. Bhowmik, M., Chen, Y., Kennedy, K. J., & Gube, J. (2026). Higher education leadership for equity, diversity and inclusion: A systematic review of literature from 2000 to 2024. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 17411432261432494.
12. Champion, K., & Clark, K. (2022). Revitalising race equality policy? Assessing the impact of the Race Equality Charter mark for British universities. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 25(1), 18-37.
13. Celestine, S. (2026). Exploring How Leadership and Managerial Practices Shape the Workplace Experiences and Careers of Black Professional Women in the UK and the USA. University of Lincoln. Thesis. <https://doi.org/10.24385/lincoln.32167536.v1>
14. Ely, R. J., Ibarra, H., & Kolb, D. M. (2012). Taking gender into account: Theory and design for women’s leadership development programmes. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 10(3), 474–493. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2010.0046>
15. Fisher, D. (2021). Educational leadership and the impact of societal culture on effective practices. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 20(2), 134-153.
16. Gbadamosi, G. G. (2025). Unequal Academy: The Struggle and Challenges of Token Black Academics in the United Kingdom. “*Unequal Academy: The Struggle and Challenges of Token Black Academics in the UK*”.
17. Gillborn, D. (2008). *Racism and education: Coincidence or conspiracy?* Routledge.
18. Hussain, Y., & Findlay, K. (2025, March). Understanding the power dynamics affecting black and minority ethnic females in leadership roles. In *Women's Studies International Forum* (Vol. 109, p. 103066). Pergamon.
19. Ibarra, H., Carter, N. M., & Silva, C. (2010). Why men still get more promotions than women. *Harvard Business Review*, 88(9), 80–85.
20. Joseph-Salisbury, R. (2020). Institutionalised whiteness, racial microaggressions and black bodies out of place in higher education. *Whiteness and Education*, 5(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23793406.2019.1620629>
21. National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER). (2025). *Ethnic disparities in entry to teacher training, teacher retention and progression to leadership*. Available at: <https://www.nfer.ac.uk/publications/ethnic-disparities-in-entry-to-teacher-training-teacher-retention-and-progression-to-leadership/>, [Accessed: 01 January 2026]
22. Nchindia, C. A. (2020). Black and ethnic minority academics’ perspectives on intercultural interaction in UK universities: Beyond racialization. *International Journal of Education*, 12(4), 49-72.
23. Nchindia, C. A., Obohjemu, O. K., Kachitsa, C. L., Tayo, O., Sahoo, S. S., & Osinubi, O. (2025). Lost in the Metrics: The Human Cost of Performance Culture in UK Alternative Higher

- Education. *International Research in Education*, [online], 13(2), 88-88.
24. Obohjemu, K. O., Christian, N. A., Oluwadamilola, T., Charles, K. L., Supriya, S. S., & Olusunmola, O. (2025). Systematic Review of the Experiences and Mental Health Outcomes of Ethnic Minority (BAME) Academics in Non-Traditional Higher Education. *Nypubhouse Library for European International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Management Studies*, 5(11), 22-47.
25. Obohjemu, K., Nchindia, C., Kachitsa, C., Sahoo, S., & Tayo, O. (2025). Protocol for a systematic review of the experiences and mental health outcomes of BAME academics in non-traditional higher education. *The American Journal of Social Science and Education Innovations*, 7(2), 16-24.
26. Ogunyemi, D., Bhopal, K., & Henderson, H. (2023). Race, leadership and higher education: Black and minority ethnic experiences of career progression in UK universities. *British Educational Research Journal*, 49(4), 742–759. <https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3860>
27. Rollock, N. (2019). *Staying power: The career experiences and strategies of UK Black female professors*. Project Report. UCU, London.
28. Santamaría, L. J., & Santamaría, A. P. (2016). *Culturally responsive leadership in higher education: Promoting access, equity, and improvement*. Routledge.
29. Settles, I. H., Buchanan, N. T., & Dotson, K. (2019). Scrutinized but not recognized: (In)visibility and hypervisibility experiences of faculty of colour. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 113, Article 103–115. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2018.06.003>
30. Thomas, M. A., Obohjemu, K. O., Ekwuluo, C. E., Akinmade, O. V., Haruna, D. O., Danladi, S. S., ... & Nuka-Nwikpasi, K. (2026). Structural and Cultural Barriers to Ethnic Minority Leadership in UK and Canadian Educational Institutions. *European Index Library of European International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Management Studies*, 6(02), 8-17.
31. van den Brink, M., & Benschop, Y. (2014). Gender in academic networking: The role of gatekeepers in professorial recruitment. *Journal of Management Studies*, 51(3), 460–492. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12060>
32. van den Brink, M., & Benschop, Y. (2014). Gender in academic networking: The role of gatekeepers in professorial recruitment. *Journal of Management Studies*, 51(3), 460–492. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12060>
33. Wilkins, C., & Lall, M. (2024). Race, identity and educational leadership in England: Negotiating professionalism and belonging. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 52(1), 84–101. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17411432221141256>
34. Wolbring, G., & Lillywhite, A. (2021). Equity/equality, diversity, and inclusion (EDI) in universities: the case of disabled people. *Societies*, 11(2), 49.
35. Zamora Liu, R., Terrell Shockley, E., Curry, D. G., & Conley, C. M. (2025). Educational equity through a critical race perspective of antiracism and intersectionality: Disrupting colour-blind ideologies in school leaders' praxis. *The Urban Review*, 57(4), 1071–1096. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-025-00737-9>