

Running head: CULTURALLY RESPONSIVE LEADERSHIP

Culturally Responsive Leadership: Graduate Program Egalitarianism

Tod Allen Farmer and J. Russell Higham III

Tarleton State University

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the University Council of Educational Administration

Alexandria, Virginia

November 16, 2007

### Abstract

As American society becomes increasingly diverse, it is paramount that university graduate programs produce culturally responsive leaders capable of synergistically energizing an increasingly heterogeneous work force. Inherent in this charge is the egalitarian approach to graduate program design. Culturally responsive leadership development is premised upon egalitarian principles that transcend individual cultural norms. Graduate programs seeking to enhance culturally responsive leadership development must permeate egalitarianism through the amalgamation of both acquiescence and expectation.

### Culturally Responsive Leadership: Graduate Program Egalitarianism

“The belief that all residents of our land can be socially and economically enhanced through education remains a strong national value” (Shom, 2006, p. 13). This belief is core to culturally responsive leadership. The American Association of State Colleges and Universities (2002) reported, “Over the past decade, public four-year institutions have become more racially and ethnically diverse at the student, faculty, and leadership levels” (p. 3). Great progress has been made in diversifying racial representation at various types of universities. However, Trower (2002) stated, “Despite 30 years of affirmative action, the full-time tenured professoriate, especially at research universities, is comprised almost entirely of white males” (p. 3). This dominant group is in a unique position to shape the graduate program agenda. Caldwell et. al. (2005) noted, “In a pluralistic society, members of the dominant group may be particularly limited in their understanding of other groups” (p. 2).

Cultural influences are an important factor when considering the development of culturally responsive leaders. Young and Snead (2005) shared, “Teachers and students alike are expanding monocultural views of history and everyday happenings including an increase in awareness with regard to heretofore-unconscious prejudices” (p. 2). This view also extends to the leadership ranks. Growe, Schmersahl, Perry, and Henry (2001) stated, “At the acceptance level, administrators acknowledge the origins of their own ethnocentric views and attain impartiality in their perception of other cultures” (p. 7). Personal conditioning and bias, coupled with firmly established institutional traditions, limit the development of culturally responsive leaders. Such factors inevitably impact the climate of an organization. Milem (2001) stated, “The climate of an organization can influence people’s behavior, and thus may be linked to teaching practices” (p. 5). Changing societal demographics will further highlight the need to

identify and modify such ethnocentric views that influence the behavior and teaching of the graduate professoriate.

### Demographic Changes

As international migration to developed nations such as the United States continues to increase, culturally responsive leadership will become increasingly important. According to a United Nations report on international migration (2004), North America surpassed Europe as the destination of choice among international migrants during the period from 1960-2000. More specifically, the report stated, “The United States, whose foreign-born population more than tripled---from 10 million in 1960 to 35 million in 2000---accounted for most of the regional increase” (p. 26). The United States remained the country of choice during this same period. In 1960, the United States had 9.7 million migrants accounting for 12.8 percent of total international migration. By 2000, those numbers had risen to 35 million migrants accounting for 20 percent of total international migrations. Historical data would suggest that the United States will continue becoming increasingly diverse. Decreasing American birth rates coupled with increasing international migration to the United States would further strengthen this position. The United Nations projects that the United States will have the highest migration rates of any nation in the world between 2000 and 2050. Such trends highlight the need for culturally responsive leadership. Effective employment of the skills associated with culturally responsive leadership will increase the likelihood of attaining organizational objectives in the increasingly diverse and complex society of the near future.

### Responsive Graduate Programs

#### *Program Admission*

The process of developing culturally responsive leaders begins with graduate program admission. According to Browne-Ferrigno and Shoho (2002), “the reconceptualization of

administrator preparation programs requires reconceptualization of selection criteria that ensure graduates [sic] able to meet the challenges and complexities of leading 21<sup>st</sup> century [sic] schools” (p. 17). The Admission Policy Impact Study (1993), conducted by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, found that “predicting student success is not an exact science that may be reached exclusively by using quantifiable data” (p. 10). Traditionally, measures such as grade point averages and standardized test scores have driven the admission process. Admission points are frequently established by using a numeric combination of these and other admission criteria. Micceri (2001) found no difference in what was defined as meaningful student outcomes, retention and graduation rates, for over 97 percent of the students directly above and below these points. Conley, Brownbridge, Dungan, and Hilgersom (1994) developed the Proficiency-based Admission Standards System (PASS) in an effort to improve higher education in Oregon. As part of PASS, prospective students were tested in six content and nine process proficiency areas. The Oregon State System of Higher Education (1996) established the program to “reduce remedial education needs and increase completion rates” (p. 1). An admission system needs to foster a sense of equity and fairness in graduate programs that leads to mutual respect between and among students and ultimately toward the development of culturally responsive leaders. The quality of graduate program outputs is directly impacted by the quality of graduate program inputs.

#### *Program Design and Curriculum Content*

“Honest dialogue about the significance of race in this country must be central to and infused in the coursework required by educational administration candidates” (Davis, 2002, p. 11). Program design and curriculum content are fundamental to the development of graduate programs that produce culturally responsive leaders. Turk (2001) found value in a field-based principal certification program with an inquiry focus centered on the student outcomes of

acquiring knowledge of research and the development of the skills necessary to conduct effective action research. Wilmore (2001) described a principal certification program that fostered collaboration between universities and partner school districts with a “grow-your-own” philosophy aligned with the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and Interstate School Leadership Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards. Klotz and Daniel (1998) addressed principal certification program reform by focusing on four areas:

- (a) a move away from a managerial to a human-centered perspective and from the macro-level of a smooth-running organization to the micro-level of the learning needs of the individual student.[sic], (b) a continued orientation on the importance of a “knowledge base” that is best learned via traditional academic preparation, (c) a strengthening orientation on learning by doing, and finally, (d) a renewed orientation on the importance of personal professional characteristics of the administrator. (p. 10)

A movement toward embedded real world problem solving activities was emphasized in the study.

According to Woodrum (2002), “The model in which most administration students are trained, and intellectual paradigm that grew out of a belief in empiricism, predictability and “scientific” certainty, fails to address the complexity that many interns encounter in schools and communities” (p. 33). Interracial interaction is a key component of program design. Antonio (2000) found, “...Leadership Ability [sic] appears to be enhanced by socializing and studying with students of a different race or ethnicity, but especially so for those students who are the least likely to have close, interracial friendships” (p. 17). Such embedded program elements viewed through the lenses of our culturally rich democratic society will facilitate the development of culturally responsive leaders.

### *Implementation Phase*

Once the program design and curriculum content issues have been resolved, focus can be shifted to the critical stage of implementation. In order to effectively implement a culturally responsive leadership program, both university leadership and teaching faculty have to be committed to the institutional objective. Faculty members must shun the shackles of ethnocentricity if they are to effectively weave the fabric of culturally responsive leadership. “Cultural values are strong predictors of leadership behavior” (Slater et al., 2006, p. 158). Endemic ethnocentric views and seemingly benign prejudices must be identified and purged before they contaminate both the classroom setting and the graduate program culture. Such a cleansing process is central to the implementation phase of a culturally responsive leadership program.

The use of conceptual lenses highlights various cultural perspectives and helps graduate students to move beyond the realm of personal experience. Allen and Estler (2002) found that “readings and subsequent discussion related to the concept of privilege seemed to mark a turning point in both a collective understanding of diversity issues and how they fit into thinking of curriculum and leadership” (p. 19). Such exercises help move students away from the universality mindset of any single ethnocentric cultural bias and toward a comprehension and internalization of the efficacy of various cultural perspectives. This paradigm shift is paramount in the development of culturally responsive leadership.

The effective implementation of a culturally responsive leadership program impacts institutions at the student, faculty and university levels, and can ultimately impact institutional effectiveness. According to a 2005 report by the Institute for Educational Leadership, “Culturally competent leadership develops over time and needs to be supported from preparation through practice” (p. 7). To be highly effective at developing culturally responsive leaders, a

graduate program must facilitate a cognitive disequilibrium during which students identify and question their ethnocentric views, consider the efficacy of other cultural perspectives, and ultimately, modify their leadership behaviors. Developing and implementing a comprehensive culturally responsive leadership program is a continuous process that must be persistently revisited and refined.

### *Program Evaluation*

Both objective and subjective feedback must be attained in an effort to thoroughly evaluate the effectiveness of the culturally responsive leadership program. Early feedback provides critical information that can be utilized to keep minimal problems from becoming more significant. Furthermore, providing early feedback opportunities increases stakeholder input and ownership in the program and thereby increases the likelihood of successful implementation. According to The Center for Comprehensive School Reform and Improvement (2006), “The results obtained from an evaluation can suggest ways to modify the implementation of a practice or uncover a need for more professional development to support its implementation” (p. 2). Both internal and external graduate program reviews provide useful information that can be used to refine both structural and delivery programmatic issues.

### Discussion and Implications

An open exchange of information and ideas is both a hallmark of a democratic society and a prerequisite of an informed citizenry. Dewey wrote in *Democracy and Education*:

A society which makes provision for participation in its good of all its members on equal terms and which secures flexible readjustment of its institutions through interaction of different forms of associated life is in so far democratic. Such a society must have the type of education which gives individuals a personal interest in social relationships and



control, and the habits of mind which secure social changes without introducing disorder.  
(p. 99)

The changing demographics of our culturally rich democratic society necessitate the readjustment of our institutions of higher learning in an effort to enhance the development of culturally responsive leadership. Shom (1993) stated, “Higher educational leaders have, with some justification, pleaded that the colleges and universities of our nation should not be held solely accountable for achieving the economic and social equity to which all Americans aspire” (p. 8). That being said, no one is in a better position to prepare culturally responsive leaders than American institutions of higher learning.

“In fall 2000, students from racial/ethnic minority groups constituted 22.3 percent of the total graduate enrollment at public four-year institutions, an increase of approximately 8 percentage points over 1990 levels” (American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 2002, p. 4). Educational administration program faculty continue to face an on-going conundrum relative to keeping their respective programs quantitatively solvent, pertaining to maintaining and building upon the number of students making application to and subsequent matriculation through these programs in light of intra- as well as inter-institutional competition, versus the purposive perpetuation of the quality performances of these students relative to assuaging mastery of essential professional competencies, improving out-of-school professional learning opportunities, and extending personal participation in the arts and culture (Fry, O’Neill, & Bottoms, 2006).

It has been readily acknowledged that postsecondary education has become a basic educational requirement for most occupations in the modern economy, particularly occupations presently involved in stimulating on-going economic growth, those occupations resulting in personal, individual economic success, and those occupations deemed by many to be the most

noteworthy contributors to the future development of an improved, learned society (Wieman, n.d.). Additionally, “a larger, more diverse population is seeking postsecondary education than in the past, and thus a system is needed that can deliver a high quality education to that large diverse population” (Current Model, para. 4). Within the premise of this aforementioned concept of increased accessibility of postsecondary educational opportunities for diverse populations, educational administration preparation program faculty have been continually encouraged to holistically consider the varied backgrounds, interests, previous academic and professional performances, and projected professional goals and talents of graduate student candidates who have made application to their respective graduate programs, relative to the potential professional contributions that these individuals can make in their respective school(s) and district(s). In this regard, a quantitative assessment of future program participants becomes a viable consideration for educational administration program faculty that pertains to the input side of systems thinking relative to perpetuating program growth.

Conversely, from a qualitative perspective relative to the on-going assessment of educational administration preparation program growth and development, Levine (2005) has contended that a dearth of educational administration programs presently deal with “the competition for prospective graduate students by lowering admission and subsequent graduation standards, watered down coursework, and subsequently offering faster and less demanding degrees” (p. B16). Furthermore, other researchers have purported that many educational administration programs do not effectively, or efficiently, work with their students toward the acquisition of essential professional competencies that include the use of various forms of data, research, and technology, skill development in the technical understanding of personnel hiring (fit) and termination, and the data-based evaluation of (teaching) personnel (Fry, O’Neill, & Bottoms, 2006). These researchers, as well as others, have recommended that educational

administration preparation programs become more purposeful in addressing quality as it relates to student admission, effectiveness in developing future school principals who understand the problems and needs of their respective schools and can effectively address these based upon their talents and the solicitation of stakeholder efforts who possess a commonly shared mission/vision, as well as the development of future school principals who work effectively and tirelessly to improve student learning and achievement according to a variety of measurable perspectives.

## References

- Allan, E. J., & Estler, S. E. (2002, April). *Difference, disadvantage, privilege and us: Examining meanings of diversity among educational leadership faculty*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- American Association of State Colleges and Universities. (2002, November). *Filling the pipeline: A look at enrollment and employment trends in public higher education*. Washington, DC: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED472500)
- Antonio, A. (2000). *Developing leadership skills for diversity: The role of interracial interaction*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Browne-Ferrigno, T., & Shoho, A. (2002, November). *An exploratory analysis of leadership preparation selection criteria*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Pittsburgh, PA.
- Caldwell, J. Y., Davis, J. D., Du Bois, B., Echo-Hawk, H., Erickson, J. S., Goins, R. T., et al. (2005). Culturally competent research with American Indian and Alaska Natives: Findings and recommendations of the first symposium of the work group on American Indian research and program evaluation methodology. *The Journal of the National Center, 12*(1), 1-21.
- Center for Comprehensive School Reform and Improvement. (2006, June). *Program evaluation for the practitioner: Using evaluation as a school improvement strategy*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Conley, D., Brownbridge, R., Dungan, A., & Hilgersom, K. (1994). *Proficiency based admission standards study (PASS)*. Eugene, OR: Oregon State System of Higher Education.

- Davis, M. D. (2002). Toward democratic education: The importance of culturally responsive leadership in 21<sup>st</sup> Century schools. *Trotter Review*, 14(1), 5-16.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. New York: Macmillan.
- Fry, B., O'Neill, K., & Bottoms, G. (2006, May). *Schools can't wait: Accelerating the redesign of university principal preparation programs*. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board (SREB).
- Growe, R., Schmersahl, K., Perry, R., & Henry, R. (2001). *Diversity education in administrator training: Preparation for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. Lafayette, LA: University of Louisiana at Lafayette. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED457548)
- Institute for Educational Leadership. (2005). *Preparing and supporting diverse, culturally competent leaders: Practice and policy considerations*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Klotz, J., & Daniel, L. (1998, November). *Formatting a proactive principal preparation program in response to the national reform movement in educational administrative preparation*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Levine, A. (2005). *Educating school leaders*. Washington, DC: The Education Schools Project.
- Levine, A. (2005). Educating school leaders. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 51(32), B16.
- Micceri, T. (2001, June). *Facts and fantasies regarding admission standards*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Institutional Research, Long Beach, CA.
- Milem, J. (2001). *Increasing diversity benefits: How campus climate and teaching methods affect student outcomes*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED456202)

- Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education. (1993, September 23). *Admission policy impact study, 1993*. Oklahoma City: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED365368)
- Oregon State System of Higher Education. (1996). *Admission standards: Content & process areas proficiencies and indicators*. Eugene, OR: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED403312)
- Schom, C. (2006, Winter). Minorities and the egalitarian-meritocratic values conflict in American higher education: New answers for an old problem. *Journal of College Admission*, 8-13.
- Slater, C. L., Boone, M., Alvarez, I., Topete, C., Iturbe, E., Base, M., et al. (2006). Ideal images of educational leadership in Mexico City and South Texas. *The Educational Forum*, 70, 154-170.
- Trower, C. (2002, September). *What do we have to hide? Data and diversity*. Paper presented at the annual forum for the Association for Institutional Research, Toronto, Canada.
- Turk, R. (2001, October). *Preparing principals for school improvement: An action research model*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-Western Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.
- United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. (2004). *World economic and social survey 2004: International migration (E/2004/75/Rev.1/Add.1)*. New York: Author.
- Wieman, C. (n.d.) *A new model for post-secondary education, the optimized university*. Retrieved February 28, 2007, from <http://www.campus2020.bc.ca/media/Quality>
- Wilmore, E. (2001, November). *Principal leadership: Applying the new joint ISLLC-*

*NCATE standards*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Cincinnati, OH.

Woodrum, A. (2002, April). *Culture in educational administration: Competing values and expectations*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Young, B., & Snead, D. (2005, January). *Multicultural and diversity issues: Pre-service and in-service teachers' attitudes and knowledge*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED490378)