School Leadership Review

2009

Ethical Development and Diversity Training for Educational Leaders

Ilene L. Ingram
Oakland University

Shannon Flumerfelt
Oakland University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.sfasu.edu/slr

 Part of the Disability and Equity in Education Commons, Educational Administration and Supervision Commons, and the Educational Leadership Commons

Tell us how this article helped you.

Ethical Development and Diversity Training for Educational Leaders

Ilene L. Ingram, Oakland University
Shannon Flumerfelt, Oakland University

In the 21st century schools must meet the challenges of current and anticipated increases in racial and ethnic student populations. In turn, school principals must be prepared to lead diverse student populations to high levels of achievement. To facilitate adequate leadership preparation, therefore, the diversity training of educational leaders in given settings must be reworked so that the achievement gap between non-white and white students can be closed. Furthermore, restructuring of principal training is best accomplished through consensus within the profession, based on the tenets of the democratic values of respect, acceptance, and appreciation of diversity.

The purpose of this paper is to add to the body of knowledge in educational leadership degree and certification programs in regard to diversity standards and social justice relevance. This paper provides an overview of a social justice agenda that includes five key elements. The first is a discussion of the term diversity and American demography. The second element is a summary of the sociopolitical context of social justice. The third element is an examination of multicultural education. The fourth element is an overview of educational administration programs. The last element is a review of the moral and ethical leadership standards for educational administrators.

Diversity and American Demography

An analysis of American demography is useful in understanding the diversity picture in the country. Such an analysis provides for the variety and specificity of indigenous, migrant, and imported populations; the particular scale and regional uniqueness of demographic configurations and patterns of settlement; and the historically embedded

55

56

characteristics of dominant cultures and the history of their interaction with minority

groups. The current state of diversity and American demography in the Consensus 2000

report outlines unprecedented diversity (Prewitt, 2003-2004). Hence, the data indicate a

variation towards more diversity and demographic shifts. This degree of transformation

greatly impacts the practice of school leaders as facilitators of social justice and diversity

issues.

Sociopolitical Context of Social Justice

Current educational reform proposals are deeply rooted in attitudes, values, and

beliefs about diversity. There are a variety of interpretations of what diversity and social

justice mean. Moreover, there are political implications embedded in the term diversity,

when linked to social justice. Those interpretations represent a wide polarization of

political agendas, including what the national agenda for education should be. When one

attempts to understand what it means to implement effective politically-motivated school

policies, the complexity of the sociopolitical context of social justice is confounding.

Hence, to understand the term diversity, the sociopolitical inflection of social justice must

be considered next.

Social justice has a particular interpretation in the U.S. when conservative groups

describe it. The conservative view tends to emphasize rights, laws and the legal system

based on the belief that the taxonomy of social justice begins with a shared view of

diversity. In turn, this foundation is essential in establishing a commonly held goal of

unity of thought. A detractor to this ideology is the belief in diversity of thought.

Diversity of thought is viewed as contrary to the establishment of one society, the

"melting pot" concept. Hence, diversity is held in opposition to the implications for

assimilation in the "melting pot" and threatens the conservative view of the essential notion of unity of thought for a successful society (Schlesinger, 1991; Wills, 1994). This view is justified by the experiences of earlier immigrants who readily embraced *one American* society and developed unity by participating in the "melting pot" dynamics (Gibson & Follo, 1998). This formula for assimilation is one that is readily applied to the role of education whereby conservatives argue that one important role of education is to accomplish the same results for diverse groups. One shortcoming of this view is the difficulty in determining which one ideology to rally society around. Thus, when schools contribute to the making of *one American* society via this way of thinking, this approach privileges the Western ideologies of the prevailing White, Christian Eurocentric view, as it has historically. In addition, English is the preferred language to this pedagogy. Furthermore, since this ideology is not claimed as representative of various constituents in American society, it is easy for non-white groups to become disenfranchised with this perspective.

While conservatives focus on the word "justice," conversely, liberals consider more broadly the word "social" in the term social justice. Liberals and growing numbers of educators are concerned about the historical record of underachievement of non-white students. In this view, there is criticism of the analytical, rational "justice" paradigm advocated by conservatives. Since this conservative paradigm reinforces the favoritism inherit in a system that allows a dominant group to both make and benefit from the laws of the land, the need to mend the "torn social fabric," a term Darling-Hammond (2005) coined to describe the racial and ethnic divide in the U.S., emerges as a call to action from the liberal camp. Hence, an examination of cultural issues of "social" justice

58

emerges from this platform of unequal institutional norms and social structures in schools. Typically, such an examination results in dissonance. This dissonance reverberates as dissatisfaction with the notion of schools serving society as meritocracies whereby the inequitable practices of society are embedded in education systems that lead to inequitable outcomes. Kozol's work (2005) brings forth the "in use" shortcomings of the educational system to serve all children. He vehemently describes the shortcomings of the 50 year-old moral victory of *Brown v. Board of Education* when the evidence of social justice is sorely lacking in educational systems and the schools continue to fail the most vulnerable groups of children in our society who are poor and largely African American.

Multicultural and Multicultural Education

In order to understand diversity, the terms *multicultural* and *multicultural education* must be defined. Nieto (2004) does this well, providing the explanation that the term *multicultural* means *inclusive* because it includes *all* people. *Multicultural education* is in reference to studying the histories, cultures, and stories of *all* people who populate the world. Following the civil rights movement in the 1950s and 1960s, the case to reframe the racially and culturally biased school curriculum was made by Banks (1994) and other multicultural scholars. These multiculturalists and education scholars provided an historical analysis of how those who have political and economic power have held preeminence regarding how knowledge is constructed (Gay, 2004; Gollnick & Chinn, 2001; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Nieto, 1997; Sleeter, 1996). They argued that a curriculum constructed from the White supremacy paradigm was not relevant to

garnering a better understanding of multiculturalism and appreciation of diversity in a pluralistic society like the U.S.

Interpretations of conservative and liberal views of multiculturism and multicultural education produce different results in schools (Nieto, 1997). Gibson and Follo (1998) stated the proponents of *one American* culture, conservatives, believe that multicultural education should not receive merited consideration in the curriculum or, if at all, only " . . . where there is ethnic diversity or a predominant non-white population" (p. 17). On the other hand, multicultural advocates, liberals, argue that the study of multicultural and multiethnic groups has a *legitimate* place in the curriculum. According to Gay (2004):

As a concept, idea, or philosophy, multicultural education is a set of

beliefs and explanations that recognize and value the importance of ethnic

and cultural diversity in shaping lifestyles; social experiences; personal

identities; and educational opportunities of individuals, groups, and

nations. Consequently, it has both descriptive and prescriptive

dimensions. (p. 33)

Gay furthers this thinking as an advocate for multicultural education. As multicultural education grows and more explicitly defines its domains and goals to include descriptive, prescriptive and critical types of theorizing, such as delineating the differences in views of social justice, these dimensions will be more evident and overtly presented in curriculum content.

60

Educational Administration Programs

In terms of school leadership development, Gay (*2004)* describes the importance of including multicultural education theory and its meaning for school administration. Levine (2005) has been critical of university leadership programs in this regard because they generally lack content needed for educating a population undergoing dramatic demographic and diversity change. Levine points out the increasing racial, ethnic, cultural, and socioeconomic diversity in the student body as negatively correlated to the recent rise in segregated schooling by race and income. Training educational leaders for multiculturism and multicultural education is one way to influence educational policy and change the educational landscape to create positive school outcomes. He laments that leadership preparation programs appear to be unaware of this phenomenon and the potential for school improvement and better education outcomes in addressing it.

Nieto (2004) made a strong argument in her book, *Affirming Diversity: The Sociopolitical Context of Multicultural Education*, and stated that educational systems that prepare school leaders do have a history of racism, exclusion, and debilitating ideology. Furthermore, she contested that school leaders in general do not understand how to make equity and social justice actionable. Understanding concepts of cultural, ethnic, and racial diversity and their implications is difficult and such complexity lends to pedagogy for minority student populations bound in low expectations, under achievement, and marginalization. Subsequently, the dynamics for all students to learn are missing when diversity and multiculturism is not embraced. This condition is in great contrast to the desired outcome of administrators actively engaging the tenets of social justice in schools.

In an important paper entitled, *Reculturing the Profession of Educational Leadership: New Blueprints*, Murphy (2002) argued that a new construct for educational leadership must have a social justice focus. Unfortunately, the current educational administration knowledge base does not do this well. It compromises efforts to prepare principals to value diversity and social justice since the existing body of knowledge in the field is predominantly positivist or functionalist (Scheurich, 1995). According to Murphy (2002), "The default to positivism and our fascination with building the academic infrastructure of school administration has produced some serious distortions in what is primarily an applied field" (p. 69). Furthermore, theories of knowledge in the field privilege a White male perspective. Feminist theory and critique, and the voices of "critical" others, are conspicuously absent in the knowledge discourse. Expressing concerns about the knowledge base, Brown and Irby (2006) concluded, ". . . such a knowledge base is inadequate as a conceptual foundation for understanding and informing practice in organizations, as well as for advancing diversity and social justice" (p. 7).

Beyond educational leadership programming, criticism of university programs in a broader sense has been put forth by the late Ernest Boyer (1996). He was highly critical of a lack of focus by schools and universities to contribute to solutions embedded in social justice. He felt that the higher education community should readily provide multiple venues for community-based dialogue. In essence, Boyer called on schools and higher education to stop abrogating their moral mission. Mallory and Thomas (2003) reinforced this view and posited that a vital mission of ". . . colleges and universities is to serve as sites of open inquiry, leading to a deeper understanding of contemporary social

62

challenges" (p. 2). They go on to say that while the need for sustained forms of inclusive dialogues related to paramount ethical and social issues facing our broader society is critical, ". . . there seem to be few examples in higher education of such conversations" (p. 2).

If higher education was aligned with the mission of social justice, it is possible that leadership programs would also be more closely aligned with it. Certainly, because our democratic way of life requires a concern for equity, the moral and ethical dimensions of school agency are vitally important. Furman and Starratt (2002) describe this well,

> Since democratic leadership is moral, leadership practices proceed from
>
> this moral sense. It is intentional leadership aimed at enacting the values
>
> of democratic community; sociality for its own sake, open inquiry in
>
> pursuit of the common good; a deep respect for individuals; celebrating
>
> differences; and a sense of interdependence with all life. (p. 124)

Moral and Ethical Leadership Standards for Educational Leaders

Ciulla (2004) describes ethics as being the heart of leadership. Changing historical and incomplete understandings of what it means to lead diverse schools, along with the need for principals to be presently concerned about all children, compels school leaders to be aware of their own moral and ethical platforms and praxis. Leadership programs do have a moral responsibility to train principals to apply moral reasoning and ethical principles to all kinds of situations, problems, and ethical dilemmas encountered on the job (Brown, 2006; Fullan, 2003; Johnson, 2005; Kallio, 1999; Rebore, 2001; Starratt, 2004). Hence, for leadership development programs, the moral and ethical development

of leaders depends on providing learning opportunities to do so. In turn, the standards for practicing and aspiring leaders must adequately address their development needs for diversity, social justice, and multiculturism.

Educational leadership programs may rely on the work of John Dewey (1916), who first taught that a key element to making democracy work is the moral and ethical agency of educators. In this sense, his appeal to democratic education suggested that the educational system and democracy are co-dependent for sustainability. Beckner (1994) and Shapiro and Stefkovice (2001) develop this concept further and indicate that ethical training of leaders must be deliberate. They challenge institutions to make ethical education a necessary inclusion in the training of educational leaders by including ethical training as a program standard and by providing the processes, protocols and structures to accommodate the development of knowledge, values and applications of social justice.

In spite of the complexities of today's era, it is possible, and is, in fact, necessary to develop a shared vision of leadership in regard to diversity and social justice. The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation and call for accountability, although challenging forces for change, do create positive conditions for school improvement and the alignment of standards for leadership preparation. Brown (2006) states, "Making it possible for all students, regardless of their social, cultural, and economic backgrounds, to achieve high academic standards requires greater leadership skills on the part of the principal than ever before" (p. 525). The Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards honor that reality through the comprehensive *Standards for School Leaders*. Many leadership programs across the country have adopted the ISLLC standards. The ISLLC standards' taxonomy for leadership development includes the

64

learning behaviors of knowledge, performance, and dispositions indicators. The series of standards each begins with a lead phrase regarding the work of a school administrator as one promoting student success through the behavior descriptions in the standards. When taken as a whole, the ISLLC standards support the belief that leadership programs must more broadly focus on the dynamic, complex and diverse schools that await program graduates. Furthermore, ISLLC Standard 5 addresses the issue of ethical and diversity development.

These standards are contrasted with Murphy's (2006) analysis of leadership programs, encumbered with traditional content, largely irrelevant to the issues of social justice and diversity. As society's attention is increasingly focused on schools and the expectation is for all students to achieve at high levels, despite socioeconomic status, cultural and language diversity, educational leadership training programs must increase the pace of diversity training of principals. So, it is timely to examine programming outcomes for content, program design and other pedagogical improvements that will render school administrators equipped and capable of leading with the acumen of social relevance.

<div align="center">The Study</div>

The Aim

The issues of diversity training for educational leaders for this paper draw upon a study conducted at a Midwestern university's graduate educational leadership program. The purpose of the study was to determine if ethical development based on knowledge, dispositions and performance occurred for educational leadership students, either practicing or aspiring school administrators. The study examined significant differences

between practicing and aspiring administrators, graduate students completing an

Educational Specialist degree, in terms of the program's standards for ethical

development of school leaders. The study reported on here was theoretically framed by

Ingram and Flumerfelt (2007) as a discourse on educating multicultural America.

Methodology

The program's standards, the Interstate School Leaders' Consortium Standards

(ISLLC), were self-reported in students' individual professional growth plan statements.

Specifically, the study used mixed methods analysis of student professional growth plans

against ISLLC Standard 5, which states school administrators promote student success

through integrity, fairness and ethics. This examination was done to identify significant

differences between practicing and aspiring administrator-students in order to better

understand student achievement and program effectiveness. ISSLC Standard 5 is further

delineated by behavior descriptors in three categories of Knowledge, with five

explications, Dispositions, with eight explications, and Performances, with 16

explications. In total, 29 descriptions of ethical school leadership behavior were

examined against students' professional growth plans.

The data were categorized by two samples, practicing administrators (n=8,

23.5%) and aspiring administrators (n=26, 76.5%), using qualitative methods. Upon

review, written descriptions of behaviors expressed as knowledge, dispositions or

performance, were categorized as one of 29 descriptions of Standard 5 (Fraenkel &

Wallen, 2003). Once the professional growth plans were examined by the two authors

who are also program coordinators, the results were forwarded to two statisticians for

analysis. There were no missing data in the study.

66

Two statistical tests were used for the quantitative data analysis, the t-test and the cross-tab analysis with a chi-square test. The t-test analysis was conducted with the Knowledge, Dispositions and Performances by examining significant differences in the means of the two samples at an alpha level of .1 to reject the null hypothesis. The cross-tab analysis compared the observed frequency of these distributions with the frequencies expected by chance alone. An alpha level of .1 rejected the null hypothesis that there was no difference between practicing and aspiring administrator-students.

The t-test results showed that there is a significant difference between the self-reported student achievement in ethics in the professional growth plans of the practicing and aspiring administrator-students. Table 1 below presents the mean scores, standard deviations (SD), the degrees of freedom (df), and the probability that differences are not due to chance.

Table 1

Mean Scores of Aspiring and Practicing Administrators on ISLLC Standard 5, Ethics

Group	Mean	SD	t – value	df	Probability*
Aspiring Administrators	11.46	3.47	-6.617	10.54	<.000
Practicing Administrators	21.75	3.96			
*p<.1					

From these results, it can be seen that there were significant differences in the results between aspiring and practicing administrators regarding self-reported ethics development that were not due to chance.

The cross tab analyses also showed differing patterns of evidence for ISLLC Standard 5 by the three areas of growth, Knowledge, Dispositions and Performances. In the Knowledge area, four out of the five behavior descriptors were significantly different. The four behavior descriptors are listed in Table 2 below.

Table 2

Evidence of Individual Behavior Descriptors of ISLLC Standard 5 Ethics/Knowledge

Group	Expected Count	Actual Count	X^2	P
Behavior Descriptor: *Knowledge and understandings of the purpose of education and the role of leadership in modern society*				
Aspiring Administrator Practicing Administrator	6.9 2.1	4 5	6.98	.008
Behavior Descriptor: *Knowledge and understandings of various ethical frameworks and perspectives on ethics*				
Aspiring Administrator Practicing Administrator	9.2 2.8	6 6	7.22	.007
Behavior Descriptor: *Knowledge and understandings of the values of the diverse school community*				
Aspiring Administrator Practicing Administrator	6.9 2.1	4 5	6.98	.008
Behavior Descriptor: *Knowledge and understandings of the philosophy and history of education*				
Aspiring Administrator Practicing Administrator	2.3 .7	1 2	3.40	.085

In the Dispositions area, three out of the eight behavior descriptors were significantly different. The three behaviors descriptors are listed in Table 3 below.

Table 3

Evidence of Individual Behavior Descriptors of ISLLC Standard 5 Ethics/Dispositions

Group	Expected Count	Actual Count	X^2	P
Behavior Descriptor: *Believes in, values and is committed to the ideal of the common good*				
Aspiring Administrator Practicing Administrator	19.9 6.1	18 8	3.22	.073
Behavior Descriptor: *Believes in, values and is committed to accepting the consequences for upholding one's principles and actions*				
Aspiring Administrator Practicing Administrator	14.5 4.5	12 7	4.24	.039
Behavior Descriptor: *Believes in, values and is committed to using the influences of one's office constructively and productively in the service of all students and their families*				
Aspiring Administrator Practicing Administrator	13.0 4.0	11 6	2.62	1.06

68

In the Performances area, 11 out of the 16 behavior descriptors were significantly different.   The 11 behaviors descriptors are listed in Table 4 below.

Table 4

Evidence of Individual Behavior Descriptors of ISLLC Standard 5 Ethics/Performances

Group	Expected Count	Actual Count	X^2	P
Behavior Descriptor: *Facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring values, beliefs and attitudes that inspire others to higher levels of performance*				
Aspiring Administrator Practicing Administrator	19.1 5.9	17 8	3.77	.052
Behavior Descriptor: *Facilitates processes and engages in activities accepting responsibility for school operations*				
Aspiring Administrator Practicing Administrator	13.0 4.0	9 8	10.46	.001
Behavior Descriptor: *Facilitates processes and engages in activities considering the impact of one's administrative practices on others*				
Aspiring Administrator Practicing Administrator	10.7 3.3	6 8	14.95	<.001
Behavior Descriptor: *Facilitates processes and engages in activities using the impact of the office to enhance the educational program rather than for personal gain*				
Aspiring Administrator Practicing Administrator	7.6 2.4	2 8	25.11	<.001
Behavior Descriptor: *Facilitates processes and engages in activities protecting the rights and confidentiality of students and staff*				
Aspiring Administrator Practicing Administrator	12.2 3.8	10 6	3.28	.070
Behavior Descriptor: *Facilitates processes and engages in activities demonstrating appreciation for and sensitivity to the diversity in the school community*				
Aspiring Administrator Practicing Administrator	5.4 1.8	2 8	11.2	.001
Behavior Descriptor: *Facilitates processes and engages in activities recognizing and respecting the legitimate authority of others*				
Aspiring Administrator Practicing Administrator	12.2 3.8	9 7	6.87	.009
Behavior Descriptor: *Facilitates processes and engages in activities examining and considering the prevailing values of the diverse school community*				

Aspiring Administrator	6.1	3		
Practicing Administrator	1.9	5	8.83	.003
Behavior Descriptor: *Facilitates processes and engages in activities expecting others in the school will demonstrate integrity and exercise ethical behavior*				
Aspiring Administrator	10.7	7		
Practicing Administrator	3.3	7	9.27	.002
Behavior Descriptor: *Facilitates processes and engages in activities opening the school to public scrutiny*				
Aspiring Administrator	3.8	0		
Practicing Administrator	1.2	5	19.05	<.001
Behavior Descriptor: *Facilitates processes and engages in activities applying laws and procedures fairly, wisely and considerately*				
Aspiring Administrator	4.6	1		
Practicing Administrator	1.4	5	14.48	<.001

Findings

The results of the study are informative regarding to training school administrators, specifically in understanding the differences in diversity learning results of practicing and pre-service leaders. As indicated in Tables 2, 3 and 4 above, there are significantly different learning outcomes in the area of diversity and social justice between the pre-service and practicing administrators. The findings point to the accumulating effect of such differences in the areas of knowledge, disposition and performances. Upon examining the study results described above individually by behavior descriptors, the reported differences are disturbing, but somewhat predictable, since it is assumed that a practicing administrator might learn more from an educational leadership program than a pre-service administrator would. But, when examining the sum total of differences, the accumulating effect of the results in terms of implementing social justice, the differences become alarming. In other words, an individual and summative evaluation of the results whereby the differences are considered separately is not as informative as a formative evaluation of the results' differences for diversity

training matters for practicing and aspiring administrators. This is important because developing perspectives of social justice are not solely the responsibility of the building administrator, but should involve collaborative work in the school community in fashioning a shared mission, vision and goals. When those perspectives are not shared among formal degree cohort colleagues in a program based on standards that specifically describe learning outcomes as described in Tables 2, 3 and 4, then the concern surfaces that a more dispersed perspective, and possibly a poorly defined one, clearly exists in the schools served by the study's participants.

While the results of the study do not justify generalizations beyond the sample, for those two groups in the sample, there is regional representation of schools. For the schools represented in this region, there are concerns regarding the implementation of social justice tenets. For example, Table 1 highlights the overall analysis of learning results for diversity in this regard. That is, it concludes that there are significant differences in those results for the two sample groups, pre-service and current school leaders. Given the advanced level of responsibility and experience assumed by practicing school administrators, this conclusion is somewhat predictable. What is of concern, however, is that these two sample groups participated in learning cohorts in one graduate leadership degree program, and in the end, describe different learning results. From these findings, it is suggested that the degree program under examination must consider differentiating instruction in order to advance the learning outcomes of the aspiring administrators in diversity development. Or, the alternative is to accept the differentiated results knowing that these program graduates will practice leadership in the areas of diversity and social justice with significantly different developmental abilities overall.

Table 2 highlights the differences in the knowledge development of four behavior descriptors between the two groups. These knowledge differences do impact learning cultures in schools and learning experiences in classrooms. They include differences in knowledge regarding the purpose of schools, the ethical frameworks of diversity, the values of the diverse community and the history and philosophy of schools in terms of diversity. These differences mean that aspiring leaders self-report that they do not understand the purpose of schools in terms of providing equal, equitable and adequate educational experiences for all. They do not have the knowledge needed to understand the impact of diverse perspectives on learning itself and the value of education for different ethnic backgrounds. On a most basic level, they do not have adequate knowledge on the frameworks of education as related to diversity.

Table 3 highlights the differences in the values development of three behavior descriptors between the two groups. These values differences include overt behaviors, behaviors that hold promise for modeling for students' values aligned with the tenets of social justice and diversity, unfortunately. They include behavior differences in demonstrating the value in the common good, upholding one's principles in the face of opposition and using the administrative office appropriately for diversity matters. The absence of these values-based behaviors by aspiring administrators means that school environments are lacking critical advocates for social justice. The absence of learning results in these specific areas means that the formal degree program under study is not providing developmentally appropriate values-development learning experiences for the aspiring administrators. Three of the values that drive effective behavior for social justice and diversity in schools are not developed.

72

Table 4 highlights the differences in performance development of behavior descriptors between the two groups. This list is extensive, including 11 significantly different areas of performance. These areas of difference relate to actions taken with a degree of effectiveness in terms of demonstrating leadership competence in ways that advance the tenets of social justice in schools. Items such as inspiring others, accepting responsibility, influencing the practice of others reflect proficiency in acting in socially responsible manner are missing for the pre-service administrators. Other critical learning outcomes are lacking in the pre-service group, such as using the principal's office for educational gain, protecting rights and confidentiality, considering prevailing values of diversity and demonstrating diversity sensitivity. These learning outcomes are indicative of practices based on an understanding of the power of the administrative office in advancing diversity tenets. Additional learning results are deficient as well and are based on facilitating a respect for legitimate authority, opening the school to public scrutiny and applying the law fairly without bias are indicative of leadership practice grounded in a broad and fair perspective of the school's role in society.

Overall, these differences in knowledge, values and performance learning outcomes in the two groups represent a noteworthy set of differences in the area of diversity development. The three areas of learning and the 17 behavior areas of difference when considered as a total picture of learning outcomes is alarming. Even if the differences are due to the combination of formal and on-the-job learning practicing administrators have the benefit of drawing upon, the fact that the final self-reported learning outcomes are so divergent indicates that pre-service administrative graduates differentiated learning experiences. If a standard of diversity training for school leaders

is desired, then a common standard of learning outcomes is sensible. In the program under study, the data demonstrate specifically where this did not occur for diversity in the areas of knowledge, dispositions and performances.

Conclusion

Much can be learned from the findings of this study. In particular, specific change strategies regarding diversity training for aspiring and practicing principals can be made. The program under study provided significantly different learning outcome results for social justice and diversity between practicing and aspiring administrators. Hence, recommendations for program improvement include approaches regarding program design, content design, instructional delivery and assessment methods are put forth.

Strategies such as differentiating instruction to provide more experiential and culturally diverse field-based study and internships are given. Additional suggestions, such as individualizing instruction with more specific and formative assessment of learning against the ISLLC standards throughout the tenure of the program are made as well. Using threaded curriculum approaches, whereby diversity and social justice are repeating themes of study through the variety of courses, is essential. Developing additional authentic assessment measures, beyond the methods used for this study, are recommended in order to better triangulate learning outcome data.

The study's findings confirm that educational leaders cannot practice what they do not know or value. In examining the professional growth plans of the two groups, narrative descriptions did uncover matters of understanding, values and actions that distinguished the graduates as individuals. (Combs, Blume, Newman & Wass, 1974) In doing so, individual perspectives on learning outcomes were obtained, but also the two

74

student groups could be compared to identify the critical learning differences that occurred. As the aspiring principals did not develop in several diversity areas, it is concluded that the cultural consciousness of this group lacks the capacity as administrators to implement the mission that all children can learn.

Covey (1992) makes a powerful argument that one's attitudes, beliefs, and values are the foundations for guiding principals at all time, at all places and in all situations. The ISLLC Standard 5 clearly states that aspiring and practicing principals must articulate and share knowledge, dispositions and performances with members of the school community, education's stakeholders and broader society. It is expected, therefore, that in matters of diversity, preparation should be of the highest quality. Leadership graduates must understand, value, and be willing to act in ways that weave diversity into the fabric of American society. Aspiring and practicing school administrators must be challenged to value diversity in the district, school and classroom and must be prepared to advocate for social justice. In this sense, school principals have the potential for serving as powerful change agents in promoting participation for all students in all schools in all of society. There is clearly more work to do in this regard.

References

Banks, J. A. (1994). *An introduction to multicultural education*. Boston: Allyn and
      Bacon.

Beckner, W. (1994). *Ethics for school leaders*. Boston, MA: Pearson.

Boyer, E. (1996). The scholarship of engagement. *Journal of Public Service and
      Outreach, Vol 1, No. 1*.

Brown, P. F. (2006). Preparing principals for today's demands. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 87(7),

525-526.

Brown, G., & Irby, B. J. (2006). Expanding the knowledge base: Socially just theory in

educational leadership programs. In Dembowski, F. L., & Lemasters, L. K. (Eds.),

Unbridled spirit: Best practices in educational administration - The 2006

Yearbook of the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration

(pp. 7-13). Lancaster, PA: Pro Active Publications.

Ciulla, J. B. (2004). Leadership ethics: Mapping the territory. In J. B. Ciulla (Ed.),

Ethics:The heart of leadership (pp. 1-24). Westport, CO: Praeger Publisher.

Combs, A. W., Blume, R. A., Newman, A. J., & Wass, H. L. (1974). *The professional*

education of teachers: A humanistic approach to teacher preparation. Boston:

Allyn & Bacon.

Covey, S. (1992). *Principal-centered leadership*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2005). Educating the New Educator: Teacher Education and the

Future of democracy. *The New Educator*, 1:1-18.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy in Education*. New York: Macmillan.

Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2003). *How to design and evaluate research in*

education,(5th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Fullan, M. (2003). *The moral imperative of school leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Publications.

Furman, G. C., & Starratt, R. J. (2002). Leadership for democratic community in schools.

In J. Murphy (Ed.), *The educational leadership challenge: Redefining leadership*

for the 21st century. (pp. 105-133). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gay, G. (2004). Curriculum theory and multicultural education. In J. A. Banks & C.A.

76

M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education*. (2nd ed.), pp. 30-49. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Gibson, S. L., & Follo, E. J. (1998). The status of multicultural education in Michigan. *Multicultural Education*, 6(2), pp. 17-22.

Gollnick, D. M., & Chinn, P. C. (2001). *Multicultural education in a pluralist society*. (6th ed.), New York: Prentice-Hall.

Ingram, I. L. & Flumerfelt, S. F. (2007). A diversity training matter for aspiring and practicing principals. In M. A. McMorris & T. J. Manson (Eds.), Hostile Corridors: Advocates and Obstacles to Educating Multicultural America (pp. 349-357). Mason, OH: Thomson.

Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards for School Leaders. (1996). Council of Chief State School Officials. Retrieved January 24, 2006 from http:/www.ccsso.org/content/pdfs/isllcstd.pdf

Johnson, C. (2005). *Meeting the ethical challenges of leadership: Casting light on shadow*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Kallio, B. R. (1999). Ethics education in school administrator preparation programs. In L. T. Fenwick (Ed.), *School leadership: Expanding horizons of the mind and spirit* (pp. 222-230). National Council of Professors of Educational Administration.

Kozol, J. (2005). *The shame of the nation: The restoration of apartheid schooling in America*. New York: Corwin Press.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995, Fall). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 33(3), 465-492.

Levine, A. (2005). *Educating school leaders*. NYC: The Education Schools Project.

Columbia University.

Mallory, B. L., & Thomas, N. L. (2003). When the medium is the message: Promoting

ethical action through democratic dialogue. *Change*, 2-9.

Murphy, J. (2002). Reculturing the profession of educational leadership: New blueprints.

In J. Murphy (Ed.), *The educational leadership challenge: Redefining leadership*

for the 21st century (pp. 65-82). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Murphy, J. E. (2006). Elephants or dinosaurs: A call to action for ed schools. *Phi Delta*

Kappan, 87(7), 529-536.

Nieto, S. (1997). School reform and student achievement: A multicultural perspective. In

J. S. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Multicultural education: Issues and*

perspectives (3rd ed., pp. 385-407). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Nieto, S. (2004). Affirming diversity: *The sociopolitical context of multicultural*

education. (4th ed.). New York: Pearson.

Prewitt, K. (2003-2004). Demography, diversity, and democracy: The 2000 census story.

In J. A. Kromkowski (Ed.), *Race and Ethnic Relations*. (pp. 151-154). Guilford,

CO: McGraw-Hill Dushkin.

Rebore, R. W. (2001). *The ethics of educational leadership*. Upper Saddle River, NJ:

Merrill Prentice Hall.

Scheurich, J. J. (1995). The knowledge base in educational administration: Post positivist

Reflections. In Donmoyer, R. Imber, M., & J. J. Scheurich (Eds.), *The knowledge*

base in educational administration: Multiple perspectives (pp. 17-31). Albany,

NY: State University of New York Press.

Schlesinger, A. (1991). *The disuniting of America: Reflection on a multicultural society*.

78

Knoxville, TN: Whittle Direct Books.

Shapiro, J. P., & Stefkovice, J. A. (2001). *Ethical leadership and decision making in education:Applying theoretical perspectives to complex dilemmas*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Sleeter, C. E. (1996). *Multicultural education as social activism*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Starratt, R. J. (2004). *Ethical leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Wills, G. F. (1994, November). A kind of compulsory chapel: Multiculturalism in a campaign to lower America's moral status. *Newsweek*, p. 84.