Administrator Preparation for Multicultural Leadership:
Inside Four Nationally Accredited Programs

Mary Gardiner, *University of Idaho, Boise*
& Ernestine K. Enomoto, *University of Hawaii at Manoa*

Abstract

As accrediting associations and ISLLC Standards for School Leaders attest, school leaders have a critical role to insure equitable educational opportunities for diverse students. But how are they being prepared for multicultural leadership in administrator preparation programs? This qualitative study examined and contrasted four different university programs to answer this question. Findings reveal consistency among the programs, with a fairly traditional array of course offerings. While diversity was addressed to some extent in each, distinctions were made between certification and master's degree programs. Five recommendations are made to reform what currently exists.

Introduction

Given the increasing diversity among school-aged students, and the need for more adequately trained, culturally aware faculty and staff, school administrators can play a critical role in serving students in culturally pluralistic schools (Riehl, 2000). They can promote better understanding of the issues, experiences and outcomes of diverse groups of students. Administrators can promote inclusive instructional practices and ensure sufficient training and professional development for faculty and staff. They can join with community agencies and organizations to provide services for students and their families. These are some of the multicultural tasks that can be done by administrators in leading American public schools.

Social justice, a broad umbrella for multicultural leadership, has been referred

to as the "new anchor in educational administration" (Murphy, 2003). But what is being done specifically in multicultural leadership in actual preparation programs? How are school leaders being prepared for multicultural leadership tasks? In this study, we examine this question and consider what is being done in administrator preparation programs to foster this kind of leadership. We take an in-depth look at four similar programs in research universities, asking the following questions: Who are the students in such programs? Who teaches them? What is the content of the curriculum? What pedagogy is employed? How do faculty members teach, support, advise, and mentor prospective administrators to succeed in diverse school settings? What follow-up if any is provided? The aim of the study was to assess, using a framework of multicultural education, whether students were receiving the necessary knowledge, skills and dispositions to succeed as leaders of culturally pluralistic schools.

We begin by presenting literature on multicultural education as a framework. Our data sources in this study consist of four administrator preparation programs at research universities across the country, named (a) Land Grant University; (b) Western State University; (c) Flagship University; and (d) Valley State University. Pseudonyms were used for these programs to provide for confidentiality. We contrast the programs in terms of institutional context, college and department organization and aims, students enrolled, faculty, curriculum, pedagogy, and student support. We identify the similarities as well as the differences in the programs used to address diversity issues, and posit what is occurring in these administrator preparation programs with regard to multicultural leadership. In conclusion, we offer five recommendations for reforming the programs.

Multicultural Diversity and Educational Leadership

Historical Context

It could be argued that American public education has always served a culturally diverse student population. Historian Lawrence Cremin (1988) describes the metropolitanization of the American republic that sought to accommodate the country's global expansion from the East Coast into the middle of the Pacific, the waves of immigration from East and West, and rapid urbanization that characterized nineteenth and twentieth centuries. He notes American education has played a central role in defining how this diverse population was Americanized. Public education, devised by the ruling white Protestant elite, was charged to assimilate the heterogeneous masses and create a suitable workforce for a developing American nation (Tyack & Hansot, 1982).

Assimilation, with a "melting pot" metaphor, has remained the dominant strategy in American schools, with mainstream educators setting the curriculum, standards, and assessments for each succeeding generation. According to Ferguson (2001), schools were designed to imprint students with white middle class values.

Those students who resist this assimilation are frequently labeled "at-risk" leading to their marginalization and subsequent failure.

Riehl (2000) argues our current challenge is transforming the educational system to combine multicultural education knowledge with leadership. Riehl argues that inclusive educational practice is needed that is rooted not in assimilation, but in the values of equity and social justice. "It requires administrators to bring their full subjectivities to bear on their practice, and it implicates language as a key mechanism for both oppression and transformation" (Riehl, 2000, p. 55). That is, schools would affirm diversity and provide equity in race, ethnicity, religion, culture, national origin, socio-economic status, gender, ability, language, sexual orientation, physical appearance or other diversities for students, faculty and staff (Lewis & Paik, 2001).

We define multicultural leadership as leadership that is focused on affecting change in schools and society to affirm pluralism. The work of school leaders is centered on addressing the needs of all students, particularly those traditionally marginalized. Multicultural leadership is thus concerned with redefining who we are as Americans to be more inclusive. As Takaki (as cited in Halford 1999) notes, traditional schooling is rooted in inaccuracies:

> The traditional master narratives we've learned in our schools says that this country was founded by Americans of European ancestry and our ideas are rooted in Western civilization. But when we just look around at ourselves, we realize that not all of us came from Europe. Many of us came from Africa and Latin America, and others were already here in North America. And others, like my grandfather, came from a Pacific shore. It is not only more inclusive, but also more accurate to recognize this diversity. The intellectual purpose of multiculturalism is a more accurate understanding of who we are as Americans. (p. 9)

Moreover, there is recognition that students may be different in terms of more than the sociological typologies of class, race, and gender (Kozol, 1991). Consideration should be given to an individual's national origin, native language, sexual orientation, physical and mental ability as well as other differences. Further, these categories are viewed as social constructs, varying with time (e.g., differences over generations), terminology (e.g., refers to Afro-American versus African-American), location (e.g., rural Midwestern versus upper Manhattan), and group affiliation (e.g., recent Laotian immigrant as contrasted with third generation Arab American). Group cohesiveness appears to be less definitive and more difficult to subscribe (Marshall, 1993). Thus, educators are challenged because of diversity and a demand for greater knowledge and awareness, rather than simply assimilating student differences (Sleeter, 2001; Wallace, 2000).

Conceptual Framework

The literature on multicultural education provides a direction and scope for the

kind of social-cultural inclusiveness that is demanded. While there are different approaches to multicultural education, we draw from Bennett's (2001) categorization and identification of four key principles in the research literature. The first principle affirms every child's home culture. In a democratic society, there is respect for human dignity through cultural pluralism. Each ethnic group can retain its own heritage through language and culture, without segregation or suppression of minorities. Every child's home culture "must be affirmed and respected and opportunities must be provided for all children to reach their fullest potential" (Bennett, 2001, p. 173). The work of Asante (1991) on "centricity" and Nieto (2000) is critical here. The metaphor for schools and society is that of a rich "salad bowl" of diverse contributors who create a more interesting whole.

The second principle seeks to eliminate institutional racism and structural inequities related to diversities such as race, ethnic identities, class, and gender. According to Banks (2001), the emerging consensus of scholars in this field is that public education, if it is to be multicultural, should aim "to reform the school and other educational institutions so that students from diverse racial, ethnic, and social-class groups will experience educational equality" (p. 3). Thus, scholars and practitioners need to address, for instance, the high rate of dropouts, suspensions and expulsions of students of color and low-income students.

The third principle recognizes the importance of culture in teaching and learning. Teaching at any level needs to be multi-culturally competent (Alvarado, Derman-Sparks & Ramsey, 1999; Hollins, 1996a, 1996b; Hollins, King & Hayman, 1994; Ladson-Billings, 1995). Student attributes, such as one's race, cultural background, ethnicity, etc., are not viewed as discrete, separate categories. Rather, these attributes are "inseparably interrelated" and must be understood and applied when designing curriculum, teaching, administering, and conducting assessments (Gay, 2000, p. 14). All teachers are urged to become "culturally proficient instructors" (Robins, Lindsey, Lindsey & Terrell, 2002).

The fourth principle advocates reform and a change agenda by linking academic excellence with equity (Sleeter 2001). Not to be confused with equal treatment or identical experiences, "equity in education means equal opportunities for all students to reach their fullest potential" (Bennett, 2001, p. 174). All students are deemed capable of learning at high levels and should be provided opportunities to be academically successful. These four principles provide the foundation for multicultural education.

With multicultural education principles in mind, leadership can be transformed and guided by a social justice agenda to overcome race, social class, gender, and other socially constructed barriers to educational success. The work of school administrators is directed toward promoting actions to change the social, cultural and structural conditions that are disadvantageous to students (Alvardo, Derman-Sparks & Ramsey, 1999; Banks, 2001, 1997; Capper, 1993; Gay, 2000; Nieto, 2000; Paccione, 2000; Riehl 2000). The leadership that is necessary must address how

culture and language impact student learning (Ladson-Billings, 1995) and promote social justice through an ethic of care (Beck, 1994; Noddings, 1992, 2000). Finally, if educating for multicultural education, then leadership preparation would include an awareness of eco-justice and the development of moral leaders who are concerned about the integral needs of the student, school, district, state, and nation, as viewed within an environment of a shared humankind (Bowers 2000).

Examining the practice of educational administration, Riehl (2000) identifies three specific tasks to consider in determining whether administrators would be adequately prepared to practice multicultural leadership. These three tasks are: (a) fostering new meanings about diversity (e.g., sufficiently knowledgeable about issues, experiences, and outcomes for diverse groups of students to institute change); (b) promoting inclusive instructional practices within schools by supporting, facilitating, or being a catalyst for improved student outcomes; and (c) building connections between schools and communities (e.g., networking with community members to provide services for students and their families). These tasks are grounded in the values of multicultural education that seeks to advocate for cultural pluralism and honor difference, while ensuring social justice and equity for all students.

Data Sources and Analysis

Data for this study were drawn from four administrative preparation programs at different state institutions. Based in colleges of education within similar research universities, each program was of comparable size and scope, serving approximately 100-160 graduate students with five to eight full time faculty members. Most of the colleges of education were responsible for the preparation of teachers, administrators, school counselors, and other educational personnel within their state. Baccalaureate as well as master's and doctoral degrees were granted in all four institutions. Table 1 represents a comparison of program mission descriptions and characteristics of the programs.

The qualitative methods employed in this study relied on a cross-case analysis (Creswell, 1998; Merriam, 1998) that involved four stages. Case studies were written on each program in the first stage of the process. Data were obtained from faculty, administrators, staff, and students in personal interviews and email. In addition, syllabi; department, college, and university websites; institutional self-reports for NCATE accreditation; college, department, and program catalogues, brochures, and program requirements were obtained. The detailed case studies that were written were contextually rich. The second stage involved the process of seeking answers to the questions we had regarding institutional context, college and department organization and aims, students enrolled, faculty, curriculum, pedagogy, and student support. As a third stage, we used each of the three tasks from Riehl's (2000) multicultural education framework outline above, and examined the data from the separate case studies in a to-and-fro process between data and theory.

Table 1
Comparative Case Studies of Educational Administration Preparation Programs

Univer-sities	#1 Land Grant	#2 Western State	#3 Flagship	#4 Valley State
Mission of program	"To prepare educational leaders who function as scholar/ practitioners. The work of schools is scholarship, the work takes place in complex organizations, and these organizations are embedded in a complex, diverse, technological society."	"To promote the acquisition of leadership skills in instruction and management. [The program] emphasizes human, technical and conceptual skills considered necessary for leadership."	"To prepare discipline-based, reflective school leaders to serve the educational needs of a pluralistic society."	"To prepare educational administrators and supervisors for a broad range of education related administrative positions."
Accred-itation	NCATE* accredited	NCATE accredited	NCATE accredited	NCATE accredited
Stan-dards	ISLLC** standards	State standards based on ISLLC	ISLLC standards	ISLLC standards
Students per sem.	160	120	100	85-100
Faculty	8 (4 academic, 4 clinical) plus adjunct faculty	7 faculty (no differentiation) plus adjunct	7 (6 acad., 1 clinical) plus adjunct	5 faculty (all academic) plus adjunct faculty
Credit hours	35 for M.Ed., 12 for superinten.	34 for M.Ed.; 30 for superinten.	39 for M.Ed.	36 for M.Ed.; 21 for certif.
Intern-ship	2 semesters (3 credits) for principal; 4 semesters (3 credits) for superinten.	3 semesters (3 credits) for principal and superintendent	6 credits of field experience and practicum	3 credit internship or practicum in school setting

*National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)

**Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC)

After categorizing the data according to these tasks, the fourth stage was to write about the analysis in narrative form, drawing out the similarities and differences in the programs with regard to multicultural leadership. At each stage in the process, some participants in programs were asked to comment on both the case studies and the written analysis for feedback, which was then incorporated into the final analysis and report.

Our concern was whether prospective administrators were being prepared to become agents of inclusive education. Particularly, we focused on the three tasks identified by Riehl (2000) in assessing administrator preparation for responding to diversity. For example, we asked whether the course content included inquiry into issues of diversity. Were students in administration encouraged in coursework or experiences to be facilitators of inclusive education? Did they have the knowledge, skills, and disposition to promote connections with families and communities? Where was the evidence of multicultural education being included in program objectives, curriculum offerings, or course content? Courses, activities, and experiences in each program were examined to determine the extent to which these tasks were addressed.

Findings

Institutional Context

All four administrator preparation programs were housed within Colleges of Education in state institutions that held Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching classification as either first or second tier research universities. Three of the programs identified certain faculty members as academic scholars in contrast with "professors of practice" or clinical professors. This distinction was a way to deal with the emphasis on research productivity and scholarship at these research universities, while still delivering administrator preparation programs considered relevant to practitioners. Another alternative was to have certain courses taught by adjunct faculty with more school administration experience. This was the case at Flagship and Western State, which featured prominent school leaders among their adjunct faculty.

All institutions were in states with diverse population issues. In the state that Land Grant University serves, the K-12 student population, especially the minority student population, was rapidly increasing. But there was a gap between the number of minority teachers and administrators, and their students. While there was some population growth in metropolitan areas at Valley State and Western State, these institutions also faced educational challenges in rural areas of their respective states. In these "pockets of poverty," there were challenges such as lack of gainful employment, migrant farm workers including some illegal immigrants, and minority enclaves due to religious, cultural, and language differences. Each university indicated that diversity was important to its mission, with goals such as to enrich

education through diversity. Western State's student body of 11,000 included students from all 50 states and 78 countries. Land Grant University's publications for 2002 noted that students of color were 13 percent of its campus student body, a growth from only 2.6 percent over a 34-year period.

Organizationally, each university was part of a larger higher education network of institutions serving the state. Included in these networks were community colleges as well as first tier research institutions, with comparisons made between the different tiers. For example, Flagship University was the foremost institution in that state's higher education system and its campus was located in the same city as the university system office. By contrast, Land Grant University had originally been founded as an agricultural college at the turn of the twentieth century. Despite its first tier ranking among the 50 top public American universities, it was often compared with the premier institution of that state's higher education system.

College and Department Context

All four programs were in NCATE accredited Colleges of Education responsible for the preparation of teachers. Accreditation may have factored into the emphasis placed on diversity. For instance, Valley State's College of Education had developed its mission statement in preparation for NCATE review. Its mission was "to prepare educators to contribute to the advancement of a diverse humanity in realizing a just, democratic society." The College identified two themes particularly relevant to promoting multicultural education, collaboration, and inclusivity. Collaboration refers to working cooperatively with all educational stakeholders. Inclusivity considers how prospective educators might respect multiple perspectives and honor democratic principles. These two themes were evident in Valley State's administrator preparation program, as noted in coursework, class projects, assignments, and linkages to field work.

A specifically designated department or subgroup within a larger department handled school administrator preparation at each university. At Valley State, one department was in charge of the preparation of K-12 and post secondary level administrators to serve the larger geographic region as well as the state. In the three other programs, departments included other specializations. For example, at Land Grant, the same department that prepared administrators also prepared counselors. At Flagship, in addition to K-12 and higher education leadership, graduates might qualify to be policy analysts and staff specialists as well as academic faculty.

Specific to the preparation of K-12 administrators in the state, each program provided coursework toward certification as a school administrator. Land Grant University was seen to be the premier institution preparing educational leaders in its state. It was estimated that currently two thirds of new superintendent vacancies were filled by Land Grant graduates. Both Western State and Valley State held exclusive domain over public administrator preparation, although private schools provided some competition. Western State University provided administrator preparation,

while another university in the state focused on teacher preparation. Valley State was designated through legislative statute and school board policy to provide the coursework for all administrators in K12 public schools. It had an established partnership with the state government to prepare school administrators as well as teachers, counselors, and other educational specialists for the public sector.

Students

Typically, the students in these four administrator preparation programs were working professionals. Among the requirements for administrator certification were three to five years of teaching experience, either at elementary or secondary grade levels. Therefore, those seeking administrator certification were mainly teachers, but some students in the program were counselors or other educational staff. While the majority of students were in public education, some were from the private education sector. A minority of students were transfers from other institutions, attending for a short period of time often because of military transfers. These students usually planned to return to their home states, and sought master's degrees in educational administration to apply for credentials at home. A few international students were also enrolled in the administrator preparation programs to gain credentials and return to their home countries.

Faculty Members

Core faculty in each of the four administrator preparation programs consisted of five to eight full time faculty members. However, there were differentiated roles for academic faculty and clinical faculty in three programs. For example, at Land Grant University, all students in the administrator credential program were served in field-based principal or superintendent programs completed at the student's workplace. All instructors for those programs were clinical faculty, usually retired K-12 school administrators. Academic faculty members who conducted research and published were responsible for master's and doctoral degree students. By contrast, at Valley State, all five were academic faculty who taught courses in the program. Three were designated for K-12 administrator preparation, and the two other faculty members were in the Higher Education stream.

All four programs employed adjunct professors to varying extent. Land Grant, Western, and Flagship employed adjuncts with extensive administrative experience who were superintendents or school level administrators with doctorates in administration. Valley State utilized visiting faculty who were contracted to teach summer courses to round out the schedule of offerings in the program.

In terms of gender, the majority of faculty at Flagship and Valley State were female, a change from five years ago when there was a majority of male faculty members. In terms of race-ethnicity, all but one faculty member was Caucasian.

Curriculum Offerings and Content

In the four programs, total credit hour requirements for a master's degree with principal certification ranged from 34 credits at Western State to 39 credits at Flagship. All programs included (a) an introductory course, (b) one to three research methods courses, (c) an administrative "core" consisting of curriculum supervision, law, finance, personnel, (and in three of the programs school-community relations), and (d) an internship or practicum. Some programs offered an option of writing a master's thesis or conducting an empirical study as a culminating project. At Valley State, it was possible to obtain administrator certification by taking a program of 21 credits; no distinction was made in terms of pay scale in the school system between certification and master's degree administrators.

In developing a student's multicultural leadership with content dealing with diversity issues, each program had different approaches to meeting this requirement. Land Grant required a one-credit "diversity" course to meet principal certification. However, the requirement could be waived depending on the student's background or prior experience. For example, a student with a background in bilingual education might be exempt from taking the diversity course. Allowing this waiver presumed that multicultural issues were sufficiently covered by addressing issues specific to bilingual education, and ignoring those issues of socioeconomic status, race, ethnicity, national origin, sexual orientation, and so on. For those pursuing master's or doctoral degrees, courses in social foundations, philosophy, or ethics were more likely to address issues of multiculturalism. Unfortunately, certification students might not enroll in these courses.

At Flagship University, the program for master's students included a cluster of courses designed to develop disciplinary and multi-disciplinary perspectives. Students were required to take five three-credit courses in this series. Another requirement encouraged students to take at least nine credits of issue-focused seminars. Both of these clusters of courses might infuse the curriculum with appropriate course electives to promote multiple perspectives and develop critical thinking on issues of diversity.

At Western State, diversity units that were consistent with the state's administrator standards were specified throughout all courses and included in the internship. These state standards were in line with the multicultural knowledge, dispositions, and performances designated by ISLLC. For example, in the School Community Relations course required for the superintendency, students complete a Long Range Public Relations Plan that includes a study of student and community demographics as well as strategies for developing inclusive school communities. Throughout their program, students examine local school district issues and student achievement, considering how to improve administration to advance learning for all children. Table 2 provides a sampling of diversity experiences for students in coursework that were provided for an NCATE report.

Valley State's program also addressed diversity themes of collaboration and

Table 2
Sampling of Diversity Experiences for Students in Courses

Educational Administration	Administering Curriculum	Ethical Leadership & School Law	The Principalship	School Finance
1. Identify ways to enhance organizational culture through inclusion and participation. 2. Deconstruct a problem multicultural scenario and attempt to find the best solution to the problem related to the context of the situation. 3. Create a plan for a high performance school for all students.	1. Create a curriculum and assessment plan for ELL reading groups. 2. Check assessments for bias that might effect performance of diverse groups, *i.e.*, language, cultural context. 3. Study disaggregated data on State achievement tests to determine the performance of diverse groups. 4. Devise strategies to enhance test outcomes for underachieving students	1. Identify diversity issues found in law and district practices. 2. Create a personal leadership vision that balances management rights with individual liberties. 3. Identify and discuss plaintiff positions related to diversity in case law. 4. Defend leadership action in diversity scenarios. 5. Apply Ethical Standards in improving conditions of diverse groups. 6. Identify local legal decisions affecting diversity. 7. Examine impact of laws on diverse groups.	1. Articulate those skills related to the principal in communication, leadership, conflict resolution, decision making, authority, power and influence, organizational culture and school improvement as related to diverse groups. 2. Discuss case study scenarios on diversity issues and the role of the principal.	1. Identify diversity stakeholders and social justice issues in building level finances. 2. Incorporate your vision and philosophy of social justice into financial planning. 3. Apply social justice vision and philosophy in the analysis of district funding plans for schools. 4. Create school-level long range budgetary plans for equitable funding for diverse populations.

inclusivity throughout its courses. Based upon its recent NCATE report, most of the core courses showed evidence of engaging multiple communities, encouraging partnerships either within class activities or in course assignments, and linking field components with coursework. In the course on School Community Relations, students identified the connections among parents, families and communities at their schools. As a final project, students considered how school-community partnerships could be established or promoted.

Pedagogy

All four preparation programs employed teaching strategies in the coursework that included presentations, small and large group discussions, and individual reflective assignments. At Valley State, there were several collaborative group projects in courses with students from both K12 and Higher Education streams engaging cooperatively. This promoted a K16 continuum of education with the possibility of exchanging ideas across the grade levels.

Notably there were projects within school districts, enabling students to connect coursework with real world problems. At Western State, students were connected with local and professional associations, such as the state's school administrators association, to broaden their perspectives.

The internship experience was one means to prepare administrators to serve diverse student bodies. Interns experience classroom instruction, records management, parental conferences, professional development, and administrative assignments related to serving diverse populations. In one school district, 52 different languages are spoken. Interns are expected to study and reflect with their supervising principal on school facilities, achievement data, and staff development. The goal is to learn about problems encountered, approaches that have been tried, and ways to accommodate diversity.

Technology is being utilized in all programs, especially in terms of distance delivery. At Valley State, courses are offered interactively though a closed circuit, television network run by the university system. Several courses are also provided through web-based instruction online. Courses have been designed to meet the needs of students located across the entire state. At Western State, the entire master's degree with principal certification is available online as well as in traditional face-to-face class settings.

Support, Advisement and Mentoring

All four programs offered the standard support for students, but we could find little evidence beyond the requirements in terms of supporting, advising, and mentoring prospective administrators with regard to multicultural leadership. While the degree-seeking students tended to engage more fully with mentors on issues of social justice and ethical deliberation, those students in the certification track had the standard fare of a traditional offering of courses that

emphasized the traditional, technical aspects of leadership, management, and administration.

Discussion of Findings

Our findings show a consistency among the four university programs and the typical educational leadership preparation program as described in the literature (McCarthy 1999). Overall, the four programs appear to be like other administrator preparation programs with a fairly traditional array of course offerings such as management, leadership, curriculum, law, finance, and school-community relations. Despite the use of the term *educational leadership* rather than *educational administration*, course offerings seemed to reflect traditional business management orientation (e.g., planning, finance, management, human factors, and public relations).

In addressing diversity, programs varied in their approaches. Consistent with earlier studies that reviewed the curriculum in educational administration programs (e.g., Lomotey, 1989; Parker & Shapiro, 1992), we also did not find a focus on social justice or multicultural leadership. Land Grant University had a designated one-credit diversity course that was required. But as noted, the course could be waived. Flagship designed a cluster of courses to develop disciplinary or multi-disciplinary perspectives. Western State had a three-credit required course in Multicultural Diversity. Both Western State and Valley State maintained that diversity issues were infused throughout their programs. One might still question the extent to which topics were covered, and how much variation there was among different instructors for the same course depending on their personal knowledge and commitment to multicultural leadership.

Distinctions were made between certification programs and master's degrees. In some states, certification was sufficient to become a beginning administrator. In this way, state government or professional association initiatives might have directed administrator preparation program parameters, dictating what constituted adequate preparation for certification, or how many credits of which courses were needed. At Land Grant, most students were currently served in the field-based principal certification program, where students attended 16 weekend seminars at various locations and completed a two-year internship. Clinical faculty served this group of students, whereas academic faculty served those students in graduate degree programs.

This study was not designed to compare program content before and after the implementation of ISLLC or NCATE standards. That would have required a different study design. However, we would venture to suggest that the Carnegie Research Extensive status of these institutions, the NCATE accreditation requirements, or standards such as ISLLC, might have influenced the emphasis placed on diversity in master's degree programs within the accredited university, college, and department. If diversity is required in the accreditation or standards and account-

ability processes, then institutions tend to comply with the requirements. Thus, a positive outcome of the standards and accountability movement is a mandated attention to critical areas of educational leadership (e.g., NCATE Standard 4, Diversity; and the six ISLLC standards that incorporate some multicultural under-standings across knowledge, dispositions, and performances). In our view (Gardiner & Enomoto, 2002), while the standards do not go far enough in advocating multicultural leadership, without these standards, we venture to suggest, diversity might have received even less attention.

Recommendations

In reviewing these administrator preparation programs, we are forced to rethink our work and responsibility as faculty members in educating for multicultural leadership. We offer five recommendations to consider in reforming existing programs. These recommendations arise from the multicultural leadership frame-work, and are discussed here as possible approaches for programs, given the scant attention to diversity that we found in the administrator preparation programs that were studied.

Our first recommendation is the hiring and retaining of faculty and staff of color and other diverse groups. One faculty of color out of the 27-core faculty that we studied (3.7%) is inadequate at best. The student-teacher mismatch that occurs at the K-12 level (Digest of Educational Statistics, 1997; Latham, 1999; USA Today, 1997) also should not be replicated at the higher education level. Colleges of Education can model pluralism by ensuring that students are taught in a multicultural environment by diverse faculty.

Second, since issues of equity, excellence, and social justice need to be addressed at the institutional level, it seems appropriate to have consistent rein-forcement from university down to the college and department levels. All programs, not only educational administration, need to be in alignment around these funda-mental principles if our public education system is to serve culturally pluralistic and diverse student bodies. Moreover, academic faculty should not be the only ones concerned about multicultural leadership. Also, the differentiation between certi-fication and academic graduate degrees is problematic. The academic students are focusing on issues of multicultural education and ethical deliberation, while certification students are focusing on day-to-day maintenance of schools and the technical aspects of management and leadership. Management ideologies of structural functionalism and instrumental rationality (the technical core) are surely not opposed to multicultural leadership. However, separating academic and clini-cal faculty can lead to a false notion that ethical issues are for academics only, yet the moral imperative for multicultural leadership can be seen in schools everywhere. Diverse students are being served unequally (Kozol, 1995, 1991), an achievement gap clearly exists along ethnic lines (Fine, 1991, 1997; Johnson, 2002; Kohn, 1995)

and racism exists in schools (Capper, 1993; Donaldson, 1996; Nieto, 2000; Parks, 1999). As Sergiovanni (1991) argues, we need to change theories of practice. Specifically, the guiding vision of these theories needs to be multicultural leadership. We maintain that there needs to be discussion and collaboration between clinical and academic faculty, throughout the various educator preparation programs, and across school-university lines.

Third, we propose the need for multicultural leadership to have required courses of at least three credits, not electives, and that multicultural leadership be infused fully within the preparation programs. If diversity courses are designated as electives, then students can choose to avoid them. With a single course to fulfill the diversity requirement of NCATE, only those faculty members who teach those courses are made responsible for all issues of diversity and equity. Mere compliance with a requirement is inadequate. Students in educational administration programs need to participate in internships and field experiences in contexts that extend their cultural and linguistic proficiency (also see Pounder, Reitzug & Young, 2002, p. 283). They also need to examine issues of diversity across all courses. For example, students might consider how educational law and policy have marginalized certain groups of students. Or in deliberating ethical decisions, they might consider the implications of ruling on the basis of utilitarianism versus caring for individuals. Or in a curriculum and assessment course, students might look at the curriculum of their schools to determine whether there is bias and stereotyping, offering recommendations for reform and revision as a result of their assessment.

A fourth recommendation acknowledges that each university program serves a unique social community, so graduates of the program need to be aware of the social-cultural milieu in which they live and work. We found strong similarities in curriculum across all states. Surely, an administrator preparation program in one state should not be the same as a program in another because the clientele is different and education should reflect that difference. Educational leadership programs need to recognize the regional, racial-ethnic differences of the students and communities. For instance, it could be expected that administrators in Hawaii learn about the history, culture, and language of the Native Hawaiians and Asian-Pacific Islanders in schools. Administrators in New Mexico or Idaho should be knowledgeable about the Native American tribes in their regions, and learn to speak Spanish to communicate more effectively with their Hispanic populations. If administrators are to promote cultural pluralism, they need to know, understand, and appreciate the diversity present in their own communities.

Finally, to integrate multicultural education principles within one's practice, prospective administrators can be expected to make connections at their school sites. For example, in fostering equity pedagogy, students might be asked to look at their school and classroom cultures and assess whether all students are able to achieve fair educational opportunities. Some of this type of work did occur during internships, but we envisage more links between scholarship and practice in

courses. Discussions might center on policy and practices through a critical examination of data. Are all students able to achieve fair educational opportunities? Is there a hidden curriculum expressed in teacher attitudes and expectations for student learning? For instance, Spencer's (1986) research found white teachers expected less behaviorally and academically of African-American students. Does this still occur today? As Young and Laible (2000) note, these lowered and incorrect expectations are racist, even if the teachers do not consciously intend to harm students (Pounder, Reitzug, & Young, 2002). Are tracking and ability grouping practices the norm, and are diverse students represented equally across all groups? Do ethnic minorities and low-income students tend to be marginalized, labeled and suspended more frequently? Does cultural pluralism have a central place in all school curricula? Is there good communication across all socio-economic status, ethnic, and cultural groups represented in the school population? Do teachers have competence in pedagogy for culturally and linguistically heterogeneous class-rooms? Task forces could be set up to examine these critical issues and make recommendations for a particular school site.

These kinds of assessments foster a specific advocacy agenda and engage students in social action toward equity. Internships and elective courses alone are not enough to provide the opportunity to enable students to examine these kinds of questions relative to their specific school sites. Moreover, a note of caution should be echoed for those whose internship placements are directly related to their employment. Prospective administrators would be less likely to question the practices of their supervising principals. It would be preferable if students were mentored in their university classes to freely critique their school experiences. Using pseudonyms for cases would help avoid possible fear of discrimination or potential job loss.

Preparation in multicultural leadership will not solve all our educational and social ills. Churches, schools, families, workplaces, and other institutions need to begin to engage in multicultural beliefs and practices if inclusiveness is to be attained. However, university preparation programs, interested school systems, and agencies can take action and consider how multicultural leadership can be incor-porated into their own practices. Administrator preparation is much more than technical aspects of organizational management. Multicultural leadership gets to the heart of an ethic of care in schooling by recognizing and valuing the important contributions of all who create the school and community.

Notes

References

Alvarado, C., Derman-Sparks, L., & Ramsey, P. (1999). Reflecting on the work of anti-bias educators. In C. Alvarado et al. (Eds.), *In our own way* (pp. 183-210). St. Paul, MN: Redleaf.

Asante, M. (1991). The Afrocentric idea in education. *Journal of Negro Education, 60* (2), 170-180.

Banks, J. (1997). Multicultural education: Characteristics and goals. In J. Banks, & C. Banks. (Eds.), *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (3rd ed.) (pp. 3-28). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Banks, J. (2001). Multicultural education: Historical development, dimensions, and practice. In J. Banks, & C. Banks, (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 3-24). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Beck, L. (1994). *Reclaiming educational administration as a caring profession.* New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Bennett, C. (2001). Genres of research in multicultural education. *Review of Educational Research, 71* (2), 171-217.

Bowers, C. (2000). *Let them eat data: How computers affect education, cultural diversity, and the prospects of ecological sustainability.* Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.

Capper, C. (1993). *Educational administration in a pluralistic society.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Cremin, L. A. (1988). *American education: The metropolitan experience 1876-1980.* New York: Harper & Row.

Creswell, J. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Digest of Education Statistics. (1997). Estimates of school-age resident population by race and sex. Retrieved March 20, 2003, from http://www.nces.ed.gov/pubs/digest97/d97t016.html

Donaldson, K. (1996). *Through students' eyes: Combating racism in United States schools.* London, UK: Praeger.

Ferguson, A. (2001). *Bad boys: Public schools in the making of black masculinity.* Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.

Fine, M. (1997). *Off white readings on race, power and society.* New York: Routledge.

Fine, M. (1991). *Framing dropouts: Notes on the politics of an urban public high school.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Gardiner, M., & Enomoto, E. (2002, April). Considerations for an ISLLC rubric for mentoring educational leaders. Presented at the Poster Fair at the Annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (AERA), New Orleans, Louisiana.

Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice.* New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Halford, J. (1999). A different mirror: A conversation with Ronald Takaki. *Educational Leadership, 56* (7), 8-13.

Hollins, E. (1996a). *Transforming curriculum for a culturally diverse society.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hollins, E. (1996b). *Culture in school learning: Revealing the deep meaning.* Mahwah. NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hollins, E., King, J., & Hayman, W. (Eds.). (1994). *Teaching diverse populations: Formulating*

a knowledge base. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Johnson, R. (2002). *Using data to close the achievement gap: How to measure equity in our schools*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Kohn, H. (1995). *I won't learn from you: And other thoughts on creative maladjustment.* New York: New Press.

Kozol, J. (1995). *Amazing grace: The lives of children and the conscience of a nation*. New York: Crown.

Kozol, J. (1991). *Savage inequalities: Children in America's schools*. New York: HarperCollins.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). But that's just good teaching! The case for culturally relevant pedagogy. *Theory into Practice, 34* (3), 159-165.

Latham, A. (1999). The teacher-student mismatch. *Educational Leadership, 56* (7), 84-85.

Lewis, A., & Paik, S. (2001). *Add it up: Using research to improve education for low-income and minority students*. Washington, DC: Poverty and Race Research Action Council.

Lomotey, K. (1989). Cultural diversity in the school: Implications for principals. *NASSP Bulletin, 73* (521), 81-88.

Marshall, C. (1993). The new politics of race and gender. In C. Marshall, (Ed.), *The new politics of race and gender (*pp. 1-6). Washington, DC: Falmer.

McCarthy, M. M. (1999). The evolution of educational leadership preparation programs. In J. Murphy, & K. S. Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of research on educational administration, 2nd ed*. (pp. 119-139). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Murphy, J. (2003, April 21-25). Comments made at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Nieto, S. (2000). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman.

Noddings, N. (1992). *The challenge to care in schools: An alternative approach to education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Noddings, N. (2000). A morally defensible mission for schools in the 21st century. In F. W. Parkay, & G. Hass (Eds.), *Curriculum planning: A contemporary approach* (pp. 9-14). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Paccione, A. (2000). Developing a commitment to multicultural education. *Teachers College Record, 102* (6), 980-1005.

Parker, L., & Shapiro, J. (1992). Where is the discussion of diversity in educational administration programs? Graduate students' voices addressing an omission in their preparation. *Journal of School Leadership, 2* (1), 7-33.

Parks, S. (1999). Reducing the effects of racism in schools. *Educational Leadership, 56* (7), 14-18.

Pounder, D., Reitzug, U., & Young, M. (2002). Preparing school leaders for school improvement, social justice, and community. In J. Murphy (Ed.), *The educational leadership challenge: Redefining leadership for the 21st century* (pp. 261-288). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

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

Robins, K., Lindsey, R., Lindsey, D., & Terrell, R. (2002). *Culturally proficient instruction:*

A guide for people who teach. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Sergiovanni, T. (1991). Constructing and changing theories of practice: The key to preparing school administrators. *Urban Review, 23*, 39-49.

Sleeter, C. (2001). Preparing teachers for culturally diverse schools: Research and the overwhelming presence of whiteness. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *52* (2), 94-106.

Spencer, D. (1986). *Contemporary women teachers: Balancing school and home*. New York: Longman.

Tyack, D., & Hansot, E. (1982). *Managers of virtue*. New York: Basic Books.

USA Today. (1997, 30 September). Disparities persist in minority-teacher mix. p. 7d.

Wallace, B. (2000). A call for change in multicultural training at graduate schools of education: Educating to end oppression and for social justice. *Teachers College Record*, *102* (6), 1086-1111.

Young, M., & Laible, J. (2000). White racism, anti-racism, and school leadership preparation. *Journal of School Leadership, 10* (5), 374-415.

About the Authors

Mary Gardiner is a Professor of Educational Leadership at the University of Idaho. She wrote *School Cultures* (Henry, 1993, Ablex) and *Parent-School Collaboration* (Henry, 1996, SUNY). At the graduate center in Boise, she teaches courses in educational leadership and qualitative research, and supervises administrative interns in the field.

Ernestine Enomoto is an Associate Professor in the Department of Educational Administration at the University of Hawaii Manoa. Her research interests include leadership, organizational systems, culture and contexts especially those serving multiethnic student populations. Her most recent book on educational leaders is entitled *Coloring Outside the Lines: Mentoring Women into School Leadership* (2000, State University of New York). Written with co-authors, Mary Gardiner and Margaret Grogan, the book explores how mentoring can be a transformative activity for those who do not fit the usual stereotypes.