

University of Memphis

University of Memphis Digital Commons

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

5-1-2015

Culturally Responsive School Leadership: Exploring the Characteristics for Urban School Leaders

Cynthia Alexander Mitchell

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.memphis.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Mitchell, Cynthia Alexander, "Culturally Responsive School Leadership: Exploring the Characteristics for Urban School Leaders" (2015). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 1162.

<https://digitalcommons.memphis.edu/etd/1162>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by University of Memphis Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of University of Memphis Digital Commons. For more information, please contact khhgerty@memphis.edu.

CULTURALLY RESPONSIVE SCHOOL LEADERSHIP: EXPLORING THE
CHARACTERISTICS FOR URBAN SCHOOL LEADERS

by

Cynthia Alexander Mitchell

A Dissertation

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education

Major: Instruction and Curriculum Leadership

University of Memphis

May 2015

Copyright©2015 Cynthia Alexander Mitchell

All rights reserved.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this study to my mother, Maxcine Hanner Alexander (Smiling from Heaven) and my father, James Lee Alexander for instilling in me that everything is possible. To my grandmother, Sarah Alexander, for always reminding me, “With God you can do anything.” To my brothers, James D. and Reginald D., who have been and will be there. To my other mother, Sandra Alexander, who is one of my biggest cheerleaders. Special thanks to my supportive husband, LaVant. I extend gratitude to my family, and everyone that supported and encouraged me to keep going. To my colleagues, who supported and motivated me. Finally, to every teacher that told me that I could. Finally to my elementary school teachers who taught us that “If you try hard enough, you can do anything (Alcy Elementary School, Memphis, TN).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am sincerely grateful to the many persons who offered me support during the dissertation process, knowing that without their help it would not have been possible. My sincere appreciation goes to my mentor Dr. Beverly Cross for encouragement, and unwavering support facilitating this research project. Special appreciation is also expressed to my committee members for their time and expertise shared during this process. To everyone that helped me through this process, I am grateful for their firm support and for encouragement

Abstract

Alexander Mitchell, Cynthia. Ed.D. The University of Memphis. May 2015. Culturally Responsive School Leadership: Exploring the Characteristics for Urban School Leaders. Major Professor: Dr. Beverly Cross

School leaders are confronted with the needs and perspectives that students from diverse cultural backgrounds bring to the school within urban and suburban communities (Moll, 1992). Educators face challenges assisting children who come from diverse groups and how to navigate school versus home life (Banks, 2001). Culture, cultural competence, and proficiency are essential to understanding school (Bustamante, Nelson, & Onwuegbuzie, 2009). With increasing diversity in schools, innovative approaches are essential for leaders to have culturally responsive characteristics and capacities (Madhlangobe & Gordon, 2012).

The purpose of this quantitative study was to identify characteristics and establish them as key characteristics that influence leadership behavior for culturally responsive leadership. This identification clarified and attempted to offer a distinction between culturally responsive school leaders and teachers which considered synonymous. This study's aim was to offer a clear distinction between the roles of culturally responsive teachers versus school leaders (i.e. Principals, Assistant Principals, Guidance Counselors, and Central Office Leadership).

Participants shared their academic experiences through a three round Delphi Method to identify qualities that establish the key characteristics that influence leadership behavior for culturally responsive leadership in the roles of urban school leaders. The participant leaders chosen for this study possessed seven or more years of leadership experience. Additionally, they understood the expectations and challenges of leadership

working with populations that reflect cultural diversity among students served within the United States.

The findings in this study suggest that each of the participants' responses were a reflection of their separate and shared views. The fundamental agreement among participants is the fact that there were particular characteristics essential for urban school leader to be successful in culturally diverse situations. Urban school leaders who identify and participate in professional practices that improve learning is communicated could lead to genuine transformation of student outcome and understanding of cultural responsiveness.

Finally, readers of this study should be able to see that there are six characteristics that describe culturally responsive leaders. The culturally responsive leader is inclusive, culturally aware, shared leadership, visionary, instructional leadership, and equitable. Lastly, when these conditions are present, culturally responsive leaders have the opportunity to restructure teaching and learning and shape the total community.

Table of Contents

	Page
Chapter 1 Introduction.....	13
Background	14
Statement of the Problem.....	15
Research Question.....	16
Purpose of Study.....	16
Significance of the Study.....	18
Theoretical Basis of Study.....	19
Definition of Terms.....	20
Summary	22
Chapter 2 Review of Literature.....	23
Foundational Overview of Literature.....	23
Balancing Educational Priorities in a Diverse Society.....	23
Evolutionary Significance of Leadership.....	26
Traditional Leadership.....	26
Contemporary Leadership.....	27
School Leaders in Urban Contexts.....	28
Culture	30
Reflection of Cultural Experience and Expectation.....	32
Cultural Misconceptions and Disconnections.....	33
Early Evolution of Multiculturalism.....	34
Shifts in Multicultural Paradigms.....	36

Challenges with Multiculturalism.....	38
Culturally Responsive Teaching: Teach me to reach me!.....	39
Goal of Responsive Teaching.....	44
Strategies and Established Tenants for Teaching.....	45
Challenges of Culturally Responsive Teaching.....	48
Evolution of Cultural Leaders.....	49
Urgency of Culturally Responsive Leadership (CRL).....	50
Conclusion.....	51
Chapter 3 Methodology.....	52
Method and Methodology.....	52
Methodological Theoretical Approach.....	53
Participant Section and Recruitment.....	56
Confidentiality.....	59
Data Collection & Procedures.....	60
Data Analysis.....	60
Exploring Personal Reflect on CLR (Round1).....	60
Thematic Analysis of CLR (Round 2).....	61
Analysis of Conformed Themes (Round 3).....	62
Verification of Analysis of Process Overview.....	62
Internal Validity.....	63
External Validity.....	64
Reliability.....	64
Consent.....	65

Subjectivity Statement.....	65
Summary.....	66
Chapter 4 Findings.....	69
Round 1 Delphi Response: Open Ended Identification of CRL.....	69
Round 1 Delphi Response Round Survey Question 1: Open Ended Questions....	71
Key Themes for Delphi Round 1 Round Survey Question.....	72
Delphi Round 1 Round Survey Question 1 Conclusions.....	74
Delphi Round 1 Round Survey Question 1 Outliers.....	74
Delphi Round 1 Round Survey Question 2.....	75
Key Themes for Delphi Round 1 Round Survey Question 2.....	77
Delphi Round 1 Round Survey Question 2 Conclusions.....	78
Delphi Round 1 Round Survey Question 2 Outliers.....	79
Round 1 Delphi Response Round Survey Question 3.....	79
Key Themes for Delphi Round 1 Round Survey Question 3.....	81
Delphi Round 1 Round Survey Question 3 Conclusion.....	82
Delphi Round 1 Round Survey Question 3 Outliers.....	82
Delphi Survey Round 1 Survey Question4.....	83
Delphi Round 1 Round Survey Question 4 Conclusions.....	84
Delphi Round 1 Round Survey Question 4 Outliers.....	85
Round 1 Discussion of Emerged Leadership Categories.....	85
Round 1 Conclusion of Discussion on Emerged Leadership Categories..	87
Delphi Round 2: Ranking of Themes of Culturally Responsive Leadership.....	88
Delphi Round 2 Key Findings.....	94

Delphi Round 2: Ranking of Themes Initial Conclusions.....	94
Round Three: Consensus of Conformed Themes.....	94
Round 3 Ranking of Characteristics to Reach Consensus.....	96
Promoters' Vs. Detractors'	97
Promoters' Vs. Detractors' Conclusive Findings.....	100
Ranking Score vs. Promoters Score= Consensus.....	101
Summary.....	103
Chapter 5 Discussion.....	106
Summary of Study.....	106
Major Contributions.....	107
Hear no Evil: Acknowledging the Complexities.....	107
See no Evil: Embracing a Vision of Societal Diversity	108
Do no Harm: Exploring Innovative Approaches	109
Theoretical Application.....	110
Leadership Analysis.....	111
Implications.....	114
Higher Education and Leadership Development	114
Urban School Principals.....	115
Urban Teachers.....	116
Urban Student Achievement.....	117
Recommendations for Future Research Studies.....	118
Conclusions.....	119
References.....	121

Appendices.....	154
A. IRB Approval.....	154
B. Informed Consent.....	156
C. Invitation Letter.....	160
D. Round 1 Survey Letter.....	161
E. Round 2 Survey Letter.....	162
F. Round 3 Survey Letter.....	163
G. Delphi Round 1 Survey.....	164
H. Delphi Round 2 Survey.....	166
I. Delphi Round 3 Survey.....	168

List of Tables

Table	Page
1. Delphi Round 1 Survey Question 1.....	71
2. Delphi Round 1 Survey Question 2.....	75
3. Delphi Round 1 Survey Question 3.....	80
4. Delphi Round 1 Survey Question 4.....	84
5. Round 1 Discussion of Emerged Leadership Categories.....	86
6. Delphi Round 2: Ranking of Themes.....	88
7. Delphi Round 3: Consensus of Conformed Themes.....	95
8. Round Three Ranking of Promoters vs. Detractors.....	97
9. Ranking Score vs. Promoters Score = Consensus.....	102
10. Leadership Analysis.....	112
11. Leadership Comparisons.....	119

Chapter 1

Introduction

Urban School leadership and decisions made by leaders are critical for urban schools to experience success in society, as we know it. Research suggests that diversity is more linguistically, culturally, religiously, ethnically, and racially diverse than ever before in America. Compounding this fact, there is an obviously increased demographic diversity occurring within a political and social context. This is reflected in racial, cultural and economic inequities (Kozol, 2005; Orfield, Frankenberg, & Lee, 2002, & Rebell, 2005). Leadership must display a balance between being effective while being culturally sensitive to the diverse needs of stakeholders.

School leaders are confronted with the needs and perspectives that students from diverse cultural backgrounds bring to the school within both urban and suburban communities (Mol, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992). Yet students from different cultural, religious, and ethnic backgrounds sometimes come to school socialized in ways that are divergent from the school culture (Banks, 2001). Educators, therefore, face challenges of how to assist children who come from diverse groups to translate the expectations of school verses home (Banks, 2001).

The increased significance and need for defined culturally relevant and responsive leadership in schools, is explained by the variance of increases in the number and percentages of students representing the diversity within the United States. While the U.S. Census Bureau projects a 188% increase among the Hispanic population, there is projected to be an increase of 213% among Asians, and 71% among Black, however, only a 7% increase in the White population by 2050. In essence, the majority will

become the minority groups. Furthermore, this demographic and cultural divide between students and educators in the United States presents unique challenges for school leaders (Milner, 2007). Additionally, making the right decisions, planning for inclusivity, and eliminating potential barriers and bias are all part of the daily challenges and expectations of urban school leaders.

The idea of culture is essential to understanding school culture, cultural competence, and proficiency (Bustamante, Nelson, & Onwuegbuzie, 2009). Educational leadership theorists such as Banks, Cambron-McCabe, Dantley and Tilman, believe that investigation of school culture and organizational structures improves school leadership awareness (Bustamante et al., 2009). Fullan (2001) states that educational leadership needs to focus on leadership with a clear understanding of school culture. Uniquely, both sets of scholars point out the critical obligation to a focus on school culture and cultural competence.

Yet, with underlying norms and unspoken cultural influences, school leaders struggle with identifying and promoting inclusive practices in school. This is most challenging when there are cultural assumptions that reinforce inequitable practices (Bustamante, Nelson, & Onwuegbuzie, 2009). Additional pressure validates a need to establish a clear set of expectations for school leaders.

Background

While the field of teacher education has developed and extended research on multicultural education and the importance of culture in learning, a full understanding of the research and resources for a leader who seeks to be culturally responsive is limited.

With the introduction of culturally relevant pedagogy by Ladson-Billings in 1992, followed by culturally responsive pedagogy by Gay in 2000, many scholars have attempted to apply these theories to school leadership; however, the results tend to drift towards transformative leadership or leadership for social justice (Cooper, 2009). This gives birth to the point that centers on a clear understanding of who culturally responsive leaders are and what characteristics define them. When we talk about culturally responsive leadership, we are acknowledging the requisite for educational leaders to recognize that students bring a wealth of prior knowledge about their world from which educators create meaningful learning experiences (Dillard, 1995).

Statement of the Problem

Grounded in purpose, leadership possesses the power to help those being led to sense what is important and valuable (Sergiovanni, 1999). Beyond power that is automatically given to the leader, there are also undeniable responsibilities that accompany the role of leadership. Burnes (1979) contends that leadership is grounded in the conscious choice to lead. Furthermore, recent accountability movements mandate changes in the instructional program that call for those who lead to also be instructional leaders (Green, 2010). Instructional leaders, who lead on purpose and understand the many facets of leadership, are prone to build upon and rely on inner strength to repel the inducement to conform to societal oppression that challenges leadership (Dantley, 2003a; 2003b; 2003c). Clarity about the definition of culturally responsive leadership distracts leaders from becoming culturally competent and hinders that development as an essential leadership function.

Despite the vast knowledge base of effective and culturally responsive teaching practices, it appears that school leaders either lack the background; they have not been exposed to professional growth opportunities, relevant practices, or culturally responsive leadership practices (Bustamante et al., 2009). The increasing diversity in schools calls for new methods in which leaders exhibit culturally responsive organizational practices, behaviors, and abilities (Madhlangobe & Gordon, 2012). If there is not a clear definition or specific indicators of what cultural responsiveness looks like for leaders, there is a superficial or assumed set of standards that leaders follow that may or may not distinguish them as culturally responsive leaders.

Research Question

Decades of research guides the culturally responsive teacher, inclusive of tenants and characteristics as well as training; however there is a limited amount of guidance for culturally responsive urban school leaders. Based on the information presented in the background, I have been led to study the following question: What are the key characteristics that define culturally responsive leaders?

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this quantitative study is to identify characteristics that establish the key characteristics that influence leadership behavior for culturally responsive leadership in the role of urban school leaders. After reviewing literature from numerous areas and studies, the current research defines characteristics of culturally responsive school leaders and teachers synonymously. This is problematic because there should be a clear distinction between the roles of culturally responsive teachers versus school leaders (i.e., Principals, Assistant Principals, Guidance Counselors, and Central Office

Leadership). A diagnostic framework for the review of culturally responsive teaching reveals that the majority of principals and teachers of culturally diverse students do not come from the same cultural backgrounds (Villegas & Lucas, 2002). Additionally, according to Villegas and Lucas, this causes a lack of congruence between the students' cultures and the norms, values, beliefs, and practices of schools. In a previous study on school leadership, Ladson-Billings (2001) concludes there is little guidance for school leaders on how they should support teachers working with learners with cultural variances.

Since the role of the school leader is more than just attaining resources, there is a necessity to understand how motivating and leading in a culturally sensitive manner will positively impact student achievement (Adams & Griffin, 2007). Therefore, the leader must influence student achievement and what is most essential to learning (Datnow & Castellano, 2001). School efficacy and school improvement are regarded as the ultimate goal of leadership (Bruggencate, Lefuyten, Scheerens, & Slegers, 2012).

Understanding that leadership with efficacy is the goal, leading is more about helping people understand the problems, and helping them manage these difficulties (Sergiovanni, 2005). Further, community building is a good example of how the leader supports schools as centers of harmony that contain what is important and shared to stabilize the learning environment. Additionally, the community is a mosaic and comprised of many different elements held together by a common frame and glue (Etzioni, 1997). By understanding this, leaders are able to maintain constancy, even in the face of barriers.

Ironically, emerging challenges tend to occur within leaders who do not possess knowledge of strategies to navigate culturally diverse settings. To that end, cultural responsiveness can be seen as a strategy that can catapult schools into the multicultural age, giving leaders the tools to comprehend and appreciate the students' culture while inspiring the school and classroom environments (Madhlangobe & Gordon, 2012).

Significance of the Study

After reviewing literature from numerous areas and studies, the current research defines characteristics of culturally responsive school leaders and teachers synonymously. This is problematic because there should be a clear distinction between the roles of culturally responsive teachers vs. school leaders (i.e., Principals, Guidance Counselors, and Central Office Leadership). This attempt to define the characteristics for schools leaders will help to clarify practices while affirming students' home cultures, parent and community involvement in culturally diverse settings.

An analytical framework for the reanalysis of culturally responsive teaching reveals the majority of principals and teachers of culturally diverse students do not come from the same cultural backgrounds (Villegas & Lucas, 2002). Additionally, according to Villegas and Lucas, this causes lack of congruence between the students' cultures and the norms, values, expectations, and practices of schools. However, further clarified, by Ladson-Billings Saifer and Barton, there is little guidance for school leaders on how they should help teachers work with students with cultural differences.

Since the role of the school leader is more than just acquiring resources, there is a need to understand how motivating and leading in a culturally sensitive manner will positively impact student achievement (Adams & Kirst, 1999). The leader must

influence student achievement and what matters most (Datnow & Castellano, 2001). School effectiveness and school improvement are regarded as the ultimate goal of leadership (Bruggencate et al., 2012).

Understanding that leadership is difficult, leading is more about helping people understand the problems they face and helping them manage those problems (Sergiovanni, 2005). Moreover, what an individual believes, the attitudes, values and behaviors of school leaders contribute greatly to the behaviors of the leader (Green, 2010). By understanding this leaders are able to maintain stability, even in the face of barriers.

Ironically, emerging challenges tend to occur within schools leaders that do not possess cultural knowledge of strategies to navigate cultural diverse settings. Additionally, cultural responsiveness that influences leadership behavior can be seen as an approach that gives leaders the tools to comprehend and appreciate student culture while enriching the classroom environment (Madhlangobe & Gordon, 2012).

Theoretical Basis of Study: Transformational Leadership Theory

The theory that best supports the goal of this study is the theory of transformational leadership. Transformational leadership theory is frequently used to support other leadership theories (Judge & Bono, 2000). This theory results in both positive and desirable impacts on culturally diverse groups, despite the leadership settings (Judge & Piccolo, 2004). Further, transformational leadership appeals to the social values of the followers, while promoting collaboration (Burns, 1978). Transformational leadership also promotes the ability of leaders to challenge the norm and inspire groups to think beyond their usual scope (Burns, 1978). Transformational leadership includes (a) ideal

influence, (b) inspirational motivation, (c) intellectual stimulus, and (d) personal reflection (Bass & Avolio, 1995, 2004).

Tichy and Devanna (1986) identify transformational leaders as change agents, who are courageous and believe in individuals, while maintaining a strong set of values. Transformational leadership also motivates, influences, and intellectually stimulates, and respects individual concerns (Bass 1985; Burns 1978). Transformational leadership involves encouraging followers to move beyond their self-interest for the awareness of the group (Shamir, House, & Arthur 1993, p. 579). Thus, transformational leadership is appropriate to the public sector. It is here that transformational leaders see the welfare of the larger community (Wright & Pandey, 2010). Additionally, transformational leaders are lifelong learners, who have the ability to cope with complexity and uncertainty, yet are visionaries (Tichy & Devanna, 1986).

The challenges of this leadership style, rest in the fact that traits associated with transformational leadership are not always a standard for all leaders. There is a caution that some leaders lack the essential skills to provide transformational leadership (Barbuto, 2005). Durham and Klafehn (1990) favored the transformational leadership style and its ability to maintain organizational vision and serve as a first step towards structural position to adaptive change. These challenges and cultural shifts are further defined in the current and following chapters of this proposal.

Definition of Terms

Characteristics are features or qualities that make an individual, thing, or group dissimilar to others of the same or differing groups.

Culture is rooted in symbols and may be indicative of future actions (Kroeber & Kluckhohn, 1952) unconscious influence of culture on shaping individual world view and on interpretation of internal and external reality (Javidan, Dorfman, Luque, & House, 2006).

Culturally Relevant Pedagogy is a method that allows students to see the contradictions and inequities'' (Ladson-Billings 1992, p. 382) that occurs in and outside of the classroom.

Culturally Responsive Teaching is the blend of using the home in congruence with school culture to enrich social, academic, and culture needs of children (Gay & Kirkland, 2003; Phuntsog, 2001).

Delphi technique is defined as a way to measure the judgment of a group of experts, and is a method of generating ideas and consensus among individuals who do not meet and who may be geographically distant (Schell, 2006). It is useful for attaining consensus in areas lacking empirical confirmation (Schell, 2006).

Multiculturalism refers to the mix of dissimilar cultural backgrounds adequately supported by group attributes (Flinders, Gamble, Hay, & Kenny, 2009).

Leadership Behaviors are the method in which the leader responds to an individual, group.

Likert-type scale is a measure to gain feedback from members of the study and offers the participants the option to respond to open-ended statements or questions (Sori & Sprenkle, 2004). The survey results and open-ended discussions produces an alternate perspective of the entire survey population to all participants, allowing them to think

using different perspectives and understanding each other's responses, to attain consensus with every survey the participants complete (Sori & Sprenkle, 2004).

Summary

Chapter 1 establishes that there is an existing gap between cultural expectations of teachers vs. the expectations of school leaders. Much of this discrepancy was traced to inadequate information available to guide school leaders in understanding what the characteristics for school leaders look like. And what the tenants are that guide culturally responsive leaders. Next, a means for researching and verifying these characteristics is proposed by utilizing the Delphi method. I further propose to state the research questions including background information and clarify the roles of the participants in this study. Chapter 2 provides a review of the literature pertaining to culture and the evolution of practices overtime. Chapter 3 describes the methodology.

Chapter 2

Review of the Literature

Foundational Overview of Literature

In this chapter, I will attempt to provide a detailed review of current literature to support an understanding of culturally responsiveness and the role it plays in the success of educational leaders. I have dedicated sections that provide a definition of leader, an outline of culture, an overview of the history of cultural education, culturally responsive teachers, and the evolution of culturally responsive leaders. Additionally, this chapter looks at the perceived benefits of finding commonalities in cultural practices, ideas, and beliefs among successful educators and leaders of schools. Several approaches will appear in this review of literature. These approaches also are inclusive of terms that help to offer clarity. The definitions of culture, cultural assimilation, multicultural practices, culturally relevant practices, culturally responsive practices, and leadership will attempt to clarify the need for understanding culture and the inclusionary benefits that accompany its inclusivity in education from a leadership perspective.

Balancing Educational Priorities in a Diverse Society

According to Urban and Wagoner (2004), countless numbers of religious-based educations rose post slavery with the newly freed slave as the target audience for a new form of education that was dictated by the majority culture. Their intention for school establishment was the Christianizing of students. Consequently, they never intended to fully educate newly freed slaves. The new mission encompasses voyaging south to instill an ignorant population with their Christian values in accordance with New Englanders (Urban & Wagoner, 2004). Establishing a place to educate the freed slaves with a

controlled framework for learning and education required new methods and measures for learning. This new learning framework was supported through legislation and mandates.

Although this is not an exhaustive list of court cases, the following examples highlight key turning points in legislation to support a culturally diverse society. Initially, the Supreme Court, upheld the "separate but equal doctrine", and struck down the Plessy v. Ferguson (1896) decision as unconstitutional in its Brown v. Board of Education I (1954) decision. A ruling that separate educational facilities is inherently unequal, and prohibits racial segregation in the public schools. As Warren points out, it is doubtful that any child may reasonably be expected to experience success in life if the opportunity of an education is denied. As a priority, it is more important to understand that education must be on equal terms in order to generate fair opportunities for sustained success.

In 1955, Brown v. Board of Education (1954) mandates the immediate cessation of all racial segregation in public schools. However, the decision seen as unclear, leaving time lines up to the school districts to desegregate. Unlike Brown v. Board of Education (1954), in the Brown v. Board of Education II (1955) decision, the Supreme Court delegates desegregation to district courts, with orders that it occur immediately. This dismisses the complacency for the previous decisions by making desegregation a priority instead of an obscure goal.

Despite the mandate of Brown V. Board of Education II, a decade passes without significant efforts to integrate the public schools. As a result, Congress mandates the end of racial discrimination in all federally supported programs by passing the Civil

Rights Act of 1964 (NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund, 2008). Following this action, many school districts integrated.

The focus of this new education legislation shifts from the well-being of children to the accountability of the schools. Yell, Drasgow, and Lowery (2005) further emphasizes that educators no longer seem to focus on the welfare of children and the circumstances of their lives that cause them to start off and remain behind. But, instead were on a mission to understand and fulfill the demands of the legislation. Safety nets were infused to ensure students in public schools accomplish important learning goals while being educated in safe classrooms by well-prepared teachers, unfortunately, left out minorities and children in poverty (Yell et al., 2005).

Currently, there is a focus with empirical interest to explore the interactive relationship among all racial and ethnic groups in American society, with a major focus on minority settlement in urban areas. Ironically, these measures provide us with important insights into the relationship between minority and non-minority interactions (Frey & Myers, 2005; Logan, Stults, & Farley 2004). As a result, working classes and racial minorities fought over the right to attend school, not realizing that school alone is insufficient and does not guarantee success in America.

Ethnic or cultural minorities struggle for inclusion and to have equal access to education with the possibility of achieving notable success. There is not a union when it comes to diversity, socioeconomic and ethnic classes in public schools but attentiveness on social capital, and economic disproportion that pollutes the ecosystem of schools (Beach, 2007). During the entire 19th Century, blatant inequalities clearly quantify that not all children were given the same chances (Beach, 2007). Subsequently, for an entire

century minorities were victimized as educational outsiders and by negating equal educational opportunities that could lead to potential success.

Evolutionary Significance of Leadership

Traditional Leadership

In an effort to seek the definition of leadership, the findings conclude that the problems in the workplace during the Industrial Revolution caused inquiries to determine how to create effective organizational cultures (Wren, 2005). As a result, an emersion concept of leadership surfaces out of the quest for supervision of talent (Marion, 2002). Further, leadership makes the effort to find, identify, and cultivate occasions to foster individual growth (Howell & Avolio, 1993; Howell & Hall-Merenda, 1999). Leadership also provides support for development of values, standards, philosophies, and principles that enable the success of an organization's development (Canabou, 2003; Dunn, 2000; Gardner, 1995; Nahavandi, 2006). Therefore, leadership is the ability to unite dissimilar groups of people to support a common vision.

Leadership is defined as a personality in charge of a group that guides others to gain a common response (Bass, 1990). Furthermore, traditional leadership descriptions vies that a personality that carries out psychological stimuli on others to condition certain levels of collective responses is the identified leader (Bass, 1990a). Additionally, leadership is the ability to influence others to follow preset expectations, while inspiring those being lead to show respect, loyalty, and collaboration (Moore, 1927). Leadership is both ambiguous and biased according to delineation of the role (Yukl, 1989). Further establishing an expectation that clarifies the ability of leaders is to challenge the norm, while motivating groups to think beyond their standard range is

inclusive of the assignment of the leader (Burns, 1978). The word or concept of leadership has become tied to the exercise of authority by subjecting one group to be subject to another group (Gronn, 2003). The concept of leadership is woven through several centuries in public, political and religious frameworks, according to Bell.

Additionally, leadership is a copied concept from the business setting (Bell, 1991). Significantly, the most critical component that determines the success or failure of an organization is leadership (Bass, 1990a). Leadership provides support for developing beliefs that enable the success of organizations through values, norms, and organizational culture (Canabou, 2003; Dunn, 2000; Gardner & Nahavandi, 2006). Additionally, traditionally defining leadership is a method of boosting others to do what is preferred by the leader (Bundel, 1930). Unfortunately, such acceptance allows limited contribution from group being lead and functions as a top down leadership model with clear supremacy (Kemmelmeyer, 2003). Consequently, the leaders must also shoulder full liability for their choices, victories and calamities (Burns, 1979).

Contemporary Leadership

While there are more standard definitions of leaders in the recent or contemporary definition, leadership is at the center of group processes and leads to decisions that are influenced by perceptions (Glickman, 2007; Hersey, 1997; Hofstede, 2001).

Contemporary leadership is also a process of expressing the direction of groups from an educational, symbolic and cultural standpoint to perform leadership planning, define the organizational arrangement, and harmonizing activities to ensure organizational efficiency (Sergiovanni, 2007). This trending paradigm is also present within the schools organizational structures as well.

Contemporary leaders also believe that culture has a significant influence on leadership and the school as an organization, through collaboration, teaching and learning. Therefore, Sergiovanni (2007) also believes leadership is a practice outlined by the unique contexts of each school. As a result, leadership is a practice that is followed and is not limited to an individual personality.

Individual who have the charge of influencing a group to achieve a common goal serves in the role known as leadership (Northouse, 2001). Further, this role contains the essential ideas around processes, inspiration of the group, and suggests that leadership impacts both leaders and followers in a particular setting (Hughes, Ginnett, & Curphy, 2006). Additional, leadership includes personalities, conditions, procedural functions, emotions, and exchanges, where inspiration influences how a leader moves groups (Northouse, 2001).

Moreover, four leadership functions emerge from the contemporary definitions of leadership. This is inclusive of the leader's ability to define and maintain the group's structure, and establish the vision and goals of the organization to serve as a guide for the group. The leader also arbitrates conflicts both inside the organization as well as externally, while assisting members with defining and clarifying objectives and path ways to achieve them. Therefore, the duty of the leader is to assist effective messaging and group collaboration with a goal of reaching group unity (Gordon, 2004; Kayser, 1994).

School Leaders in Urban Contexts

Much like contemporary leadership, school leadership establishes a context that connects current leadership expectations to schools. According to The Institute for

Educational Leadership's Task Force on School District Leadership, during the first half of the 20th century, district management could be expected to manage Bonds, Budgets, Buses, and Buildings. Further, leaders focus transitions to Race, Resources, Relationships, and Rules as urgent needs for the 1970s according to the task force.

Following this decade, a shift during the 1980s trends to contemporary school reform movement gained traction. Currently, the focus for leaders today is centered on Academic standards, Accountability, Autonomy, and Ambiguity in conjunction with Collaboration, Communication, Connection, Child advocacy, and Community building. The Institute for Educational Leadership's Task Force on School District Leadership (2001) further articulates the changes by emphasizing that district leaders are working in an environment of evolving priorities and stakeholders.

School leadership that includes parents, students and educators, moves from routine and produces inimitable and successful schools (Sergiovanni, 2007). It is here that each member in the school understands the vision and goals for achievement of leadership from a singular perspective (Hord & Hall, 2006; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007). According to Burns, leadership functions willingly in the decision to lead.

School leaders are entrusted with the expectancy that decisions will be made to find solutions (Gini, 2004). Gini (2004) believes leadership assumes both the negative and the positive with the understanding they do not have the opportunity to ignore or evade conflict. School leadership is not an easy assignment, but it is vital that the leader understands when it is time to make changes, transitions or even shift in their leadership role. It is here the opportunity for educators to become more culturally aware and

responsive to higher levels of cultural sensitivity and competence needed to lead in diverse settings.

Effective school leadership is a prerequisite for all other learning. However, there is an absence of necessary cultural guidelines or tenants that guide sustainable success. Success for leaders involves becoming competent decoders of cultural complexities. Hence, this study will attempt to clarify the need for culturally responsive leaders.

Culture

Over time, there have been many accepted definitions of culture Javidan, Dorfman, Luque, and House (2004) have asserted that there is a model of reality that credits culture as a shaper of an individual's worldview. Parsons (1958) defines culture as the influencing of human behavior and the relics produced through the behaviors. The transmission of created content, patterns, values, ideas and other symbolic-meaningful systems are factors as well (Parsons, 1958). While an alternate view sees culture as a part of the environment that is constructed by humans (Triandis, 1994). Paralleling previous definitions of culture, it can easily be determined that culture is inclusive of shared knowledge and of meaning. Thus culture is explained best by the interpretation of those represented within the local context.

Therefore, in my research, I conclude that the defining of culture is complicated. There are numerous elements of culture, such as material culture, subjective culture, and social culture inclusive of sharing rules of social behavior and ideals (Chiu & Hong, 2006). While defining is complex and complicated, culture includes beliefs, knowledge, customs, morals, laws, and any other habits acquired as reflective of member of a society (Tylor, 1871). Alternately, many anthropologists define culture as a set of both implicit

and explicit values. Culture also reflects ideas, concepts, and rules of behavior that allow a communal group to function and thrive. Furthermore, culture is a systematic frame of understandings obvious in art and artifacts that reflect tradition of a human group (Redfield, 1940). Culture understands the dynamic and progressing socially based constructs of reality that exists in the social group members.

From another perspective, psychologists understand culture as the concentrated focus on geographic or ethnic variation. Additionally, individualism and collectivism are commonly a way of illuminating any discernible cultural differences (Hu & Yee, 1994). Psychological definitions focus on correction or problem solving. Emphasis is placed on essential definitions of culture that consider patterns, organizations and traditions with respect to the norms and artifacts of those reflected within a group (Oyserman, 2002). Culture is a displayed reflection of a set of experiences that is interpreted through the actions words and expressions of a particular group. Also, culture is an organized system of meanings transmitted from generation to generation through oral, written and transference of norms (Rohner, 1984).

For this study, I will focus on a definition which says culture is inclusive of ideas, knowledge, and values shared by group members through structures of communication that includes group survival in adaptive situations (Banks, 2001). Beyond understanding the definition of culture and the social science perspectives, there is a need for cultural competence. Cultural competence is defined as a congruent set of attitudes, actions, and procedures that enable a person or group of people to work effectively in cross-cultural situations, according to the National Association of Social Workers.

Cultural competence is made up of multiple perspectives which articulate cultural competence as cultural responsiveness, cultural effectiveness, cultural sensitivity, and cultural self-effacement (Betancourt, 2003). Cultural competence is a system that responds to cultures, languages, classes, races, ethnic backgrounds, religions, and other diversity factors both reverentially and successfully. Furthermore, there is affirmation that values the worth of individuals, families, and communities (National Association of Social Workers, 2001).

Reflection of Cultural Experience and Expectation

Principles, values, and expectations are all components of culture and are prescribed as norms in a given setting. These are considered systems of meaning and these meanings are imparted from childhood of a particular culture (Hofstede, 1980; 2001; Nisbett, 2003). The primary socialization affects the values of individuals, while influencing cultural systems and norms (Smith & Peterson, 2005). Consequently, the cultural expectations of a given group are defined by that group over time.

These cultural expectations are a response to social, political, economic and environmental factors, and have given birth to the idea that the cultural values, norms and behaviors of individuals are unavoidable societal inclusions (Cohen, 2001). This lends itself to an adaptive method for establishing survival strategies of a culture that is defined by the groups shared strategies (Triandis, 1995). These strategies influence over individuals' ways of thinking are connected to the natural framework of a given culture (Berry, 1993). Berry also considers population density, natural resources and patterns of settlement shape the thought patterns of members of different cultural groups. Noting

this, the social patterns are seen as variables that intersect with ways of thinking with respect to culture (Nimkoff & Middleton, 1960; Zebian & Denny, 2001).

Cultural Misconceptions and Disconnections

Unfortunately, this challenge leads to cultural disconnects that often result in negative academic outcomes and behavioral disruptions and distractions. Sadly enough, teachers with limited familiarity with students' diverse backgrounds have a tendency to misidentify cultural differences as misbehavior issues (Osher, Cartledge, Oswald, Artiles, & Coutinho, 2004). Regrettably, values and the cultural underpinning of schools in the United States are largely compatible with middle-class. What's more, it is aligned with European American systems and expectations, causing schools to have the inclinations to diminish the impacts of diverse students and community influences and contributions (Boykins, 1994).

The sober realization is that the vast majority of teachers are middle class, and dominantly English speaking whose lives differ profoundly and whose cultures are vastly different from the students that they teach. Moreover, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (2010) reports that 83.1% of teachers are white, 7.0% are African American, 1.2% are Asian, 0.2% are Pacific Islander, 0.5% are Native American and 0.9% are listed as two or more other races other than the above listed.

Although, finding strategies is helpful, the challenge comes when information is provided and teachers are expected to interpret it (Villegas & Lucas, 2007). They must have sociocultural awareness and be openly affirming of diversity in order to make productive instructional use of this information (Nieto, 1996). Teachers have to be willing to open themselves up to the culture and customs of the students they teach.

The need for both understanding and tolerance, culturally and linguistically responsive teaching is grounded in constructivist views of learning (National Research Council, 2000). A vital capacity of the culturally and linguistically responsive teacher is to bridge the gap between what the learner knows and needs to learn (Villegas & Lucas, 2007). At a minimum, teachers must understand the impact of race; religion, gender, and ability, as academic and social achievement are affected (Grant & Gillette, 2006; Irvine, 2003; Nieto, 2003). This can be remedied by providing a clear definition of cultural relevance and viewing it as a means of creating significant relationships.

Early Evolution of Multiculturalism

In an attempt to build a democracy that is inclusive of all people, there is an historical attempt to adopt the concept of cultural assimilation. Assimilation occurs when the minority population accepts the idea, and adjusts accordingly to the behavioral standards of the majority population (Kurokawa, 1970). This results in the provoking of the reaction of the minority culture's response which is ultimately assimilation as a minority (Kurokawa, 1970). Cultural assimilation according to Munch and Cavan encompasses the adoption of the total value system of American society. Further, Munch and Cavan distinguished the tenacity among culturally adapted groups of certain ethnic qualities. Eisenstadt clarified Cultural assimilation does not demand the total destruction of the ethnic culture but requires conformity to the dominant culture in his study of immigration. Therefore, shifts and modifications required to function in the dominant culture are the responsibility of the minority groups.

The studies of racial and cultural minorities are very notable when exploring concepts of assimilation. The earliest reference to assimilation is credited to Wilhelm

Wundt in 1892. Assimilation involves a process by which an individual assumes the attitudes, habits, language, characteristics and behaviors of another group (Park, 1914). The fascination with cultural integration leads to many studies that attempt to shift the role from acquisition to respect and understanding of others.

The manifested attempt towards understanding and respect is noted in the evolution of multiculturalism. Focusing on assimilation by esteeming culture causes a sense of urgency and establishes a need to offer a response to an increasingly diverse population (Banks, 2010a,b; Gay, 2000; Martin, 1998). A proactive stand on the practice of social justice and shared power coupled with contemplations of race, diversity, culture and identity establishes an undeniable existence in American society (Adams, Bell, & Griffin, 2007; Kahn, 2008; Lea, 2007; Schoorman & Bogotch, 2010).

Multicultural education began to be used in the early 1970s (Payne & Welsh, 2000). Multicultural education describes programs focused on the equity in education (Banks & Banks, 1999). Multicultural education is seen as a method of rejecting racism and discrimination in schools while at the same time inspiring school reform and basic education (Nieto, 2000). Other challenges that are reflective in the community also include religious economic status and gender as well (Nieto, 2000). The underlying theme of equity and the rejection of discrimination has community implications and expectations.

Beyond the community implications, multicultural education seeks to provide culturally connected relationships that helped students to be equipped to connect with and function in a diverse world (Banks, 1993). This approach seeks to dismantle the cultural assumptions that even students hold for themselves (Banks, 1993). This implication

infers that equality and justice in practice are the desires of multicultural education (Banks, 1993). These practices include achievement approaches, inter-group education and curriculum reform as the three primary efforts in multicultural education. These concentrations must be included if there is a chance for the goals of multicultural education to be achieved (Banks, 1993). Multicultural education could potentially lead to major societal challenges.

Beyond the foci, the reduction of prejudice and discrimination in society can potentially lead to a more equal distribution of power. The vision for supporters of multicultural education includes expanding and meeting the needs of a variety of individuals and groups more frequently (Banks & Banks, 1999). Thus, this visioning results in a focus on equity that goes beyond simply giving attention to race, but shifts and gives credence to the inclusion of socio-economic status, language, and gender as well (Banks & Banks, 1999). Hence, in meeting equality standards, one must look at social systems and see the need to be equitable and approach this from multiple angles (Banks & Banks, 1999). Knowing these steps beyond simple personnel changes, we can see real diversity in education.

Shifts in Multicultural Paradigms

Focusing on the essence of multicultural education, there is a need to spotlight the connection between theory and practice. Banks (1995) points out that there is little connection between theories to practice in multicultural education. Subsequently, multicultural education is criticized for not having a robust theoretical base. But, it is given credit for its attention to social values, and efforts to create equality (Garcia, 1994). Banks (1995) sees challenges with its ability to be seen as pervasive and significant.

Further, the majority of multicultural education efforts overlook the unavoidably significant role of pedagogy (Garcia, 1994). Leaving multicultural education in a position that avoids underlying problems of discrimination, underachievement and segregation that continue to give birth to educational inequality (Garcia, 1994). Therefore, there are noticeable gaps in multicultural education that present a need to focus on cultural shifts.

Giving attention to these shifts, the idea of difference rather than a push for a common definition through a majority culture shifts occur. The minority cultures explain the fact that multiculturalism in education rose in stark contrast to traditional social and educational theories (Banks, 1993; 2010a; Gay, 2000; Martin, 1998). With rapid changes in socio-economically stratified and structurally pluralistic societies, the purpose of multicultural education attempts to equip individuals as these changes take place (Washburn, 1995).

Multicultural education operates with the desire to educate children to become social change agents who are able to understand and navigate the cultural pluralism and ethnic diversity in the United States. Results are inclusive of acquiring the knowledge into practice in a society that is growing increasingly more global and diverse (Banks, 2010b; Gay, 2000; Sleeter & Grant, 2009). Social changes and attention to global diversity influences the acquisition of knowledge.

Along with the changes needed, there are many disparities in respect to the complexity and span of multicultural education. Several scholars of multicultural education are noted for developing multiple descriptions that outline the various levels and ways of thinking when it comes to the definition of multicultural education and the

disagreements surrounding how it is defined (Banks, 1995; Bennett, 2001; Nieto, 2000; Sleeter & Grant, 1988). The range of definitions prescribed to multicultural education varies from a limited pedagogy of addressing tolerance to restructuring all aspects of the institution of schooling using a critical social justice model (Banks, 1995; Bennett, 2001; Nieto, 2000; Sleeter & Grant, 1988). Despite the many definitions and the wide range of multicultural education principles, the inclusion of social justice tests the fortitude of multicultural education.

Soberly considering multicultural education, there is a need to boldly address holistic inclusivity. By observation, Grant's explanation of multiculturalism serves all students, incorporates issues of social justice, and is inclusive of those who are marginalized. Grant says when social justice for students is included in the formula; students are more likely to acquire the knowledge, skills, power, and positive self-identity to pursue their life goals. "The elimination of obstacles that prevent achievement is among the greatest benefit of inclusion of social inclusion" (Grant & Tate, 1995, p. 147). A structural reform of the practices that promotes student advocacy and equity is the essence of multicultural education.

Challenges with Multiculturalism

Beyond the benefits of obtaining information, there is a need to create equitable school systems, which is a respected and honorable goal. According to Dixon and Rousseau (2005), multicultural education's view of equality tends to distract educators in order to reflect their practices. This produces uneven results and does not inevitably alternate practices that produce necessary improvements for students (Dixon & Rousseau, 2005). Furthermore, multicultural education only manages to superficially represent the

culture with minimal importance in the lives of students (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Sleeter & Grant 1993; White-Clark, 2005). Therefore, multicultural education has limitations as it seeks to meet both the demands of educating students and understanding cultural influences.

Changing societal systems, justifies a need for a system that is more culturally responsive. The multicultural education objectives of unity and diversity are problematic because they are not realistic societal standards (Ladson-Billings, 1992). Additionally, Ladson-Billings conceives that multicultural education cannot serve the dual demands of changing societal systems while educating multicultural students.

Culturally Responsive Teaching: Teach me to reach me!

Shifting from thinking multiculturally, there is an emphasis on the need to fully understand the vital of role culture in education. As previously shared, with such limited research on the role of culturally responsive leaders, the present research heavily focuses on culturally responsive teachers. This will establish a foundation to attempt to create bridge between teachers and leaders expectations.

According to Ladson-Billings (2001), the dual goals of opposition and empowerment are confronted. Beyond affirming cultural identity, educators must provide an awareness of the world around them and be able to connect within it. Further, Ladson-Billings suggests raising not only the academic achievement level of students. In fact, issues of race and culture places them at the forefront and actively works with students to develop cultural competence (Ladson-Billings, 2001).

Besides competence, teachers in a culturally responsive environment possess some understanding with respect to the cultural identity of the learner (Huber, 1991).

Beyond respect, the introduction of culturally relevant teaching by Dr. Gloria Ladson-Billings set out with a goal to improve academic success through embracing the cultural heritage of students. Ladson-Billings also includes the home cultures as well as community cultures in the learning environment. Moreover, culturally responsive teaching involves the use from cultural knowledge, prior experiences and frames of reference of ethnically diverse students to make learning encounters more relevant to and effective for them according to Gay (2000). Gay further states that culturally responsive teaching focuses on the strengths of students while using culturally responsive teaching to instruct to those strengths. Specifically, teachers who work in these settings have both a respect for the culture and environment in which they are working.

The needs of culturally and linguistically diverse students and their families constantly experience shifts and must be formally addressed if there is to be definable success. This is addressed in what is often referred to as culturally responsive teaching or culturally relevant teaching. This way of teaching requires teachers to recognize and understand the cultures in addition to the realities and identities of students (Gay, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 1994; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). This is the source of teachable knowledge that connects the teacher with the students' culture. However for this study, I will focus on culturally responsiveness.

First, culturally responsive pedagogy or teaching positions itself in a way that recognizes knowledge as well as the skills that diverse students bring to schools according to Terry and Howard. Secondly, culturally responsive teaching attempts to grow dynamic teaching practices while nurturing students' academic, social, and emotional health (Howard & Terry, 2011). Next, culturally teaching also has the potential

to improve student cooperation which in turn inspires a greater understanding of the educational agenda. Then, increases in academics in the school, classroom, and curriculum are reflective variables (Brown, 2004). Finally, culturally responsive teaching empowers, authenticates, and celebrates cultural identities through instruction.

It is vital that the teachers are amenable to the cultural needs of the students. Consequently, culturally responsive teachers resist the insufficiency paradigm and decontextualized learning according to Taylor and Sobel, devaluing and disengaging from the culture of students. Ironically, by incorporating the student's home language, sociocultural diagrams, artistic expression, and life experiences and more meaningful activities are established by the educators to support cultural learning (Taylor & Sobel, 2011). Learning is more relevant when cultural knowledge, prior experiences, frame of reference, and performance styles of ethnically diverse students are considered (Gay, 2002). Through these experiences, there is a greater understanding and connection with culture and learning.

Gay (2000) defined culturally responsive teaching is founded on the idea that the lives and experiences embody the knowledge and skills of students. Thus, the use of cultural components serves as a channel for ethnically diverse students. Coupled with instructional process is the need to include perspectives of ethnically diverse students that include cultural characteristics and experiences that serve as conduits for teaching while outlining the meaning of culturally responsive teaching. Therefore, when learners are educated in ways that respect their own culture, the academic success of ethnically diverse students shows increases or gains (Au & Kawakami, 1994; Ladson-Billings, 1994, 1995). Exploring both the academic and psychosocial capabilities of the students

as a means for releasing the potential of ethnically diverse students describes culturally responsive teaching (Gay, 2000). Educators and future educators should be intentional and learn how to teach in a culturally responsive manner to the diverse populations in our nation's schools (Feiman-Nemser, 1996). Culturally responsive teaching, while different outlines culturally inclusionary benefits.

The negative effect of the dominant culture occurs when students suppress their own culture for the prevailing culture (Ladson-Billings, 1992). Knowing this obligates teachers to learn and establish an understanding of the meaning of culture in their own context (Ladson-Billings, 2001). Yet, when teachers choose to be color blind; the beliefs, experiences or understanding that children bring with them to school tend to be unsupported (Irvine, 1990). According to Ladson-Billings (2001), there are indicators of cultural competence that teachers should express.

Instruction that is congruent with the cultural value systems of a dissimilar learning population is vital. Teachers who are equipped with the knowledge of the way in which students construct and process information will be more capable of detecting and focusing on students' strengths in order to endorse their academic success (Delpit, 1995; Guion, 2005). Teacher education students confronting skills development in this area should begin the genesis (Gay, 2001). Therefore, planning for teaching educators how to incorporate cultural competencies is essential. Additionally, revisions of instructional strategies are determined by cultural characteristics of ethnically diverse students.

Cultural values, traditions, communication, and learning styles, are among these ethnic characteristics and contributions (Gay, 2001). Understanding the cultural characteristics and contributions of different ethnic groups represents a fraction of this

awareness for educators (Hollins, King, & Hayman, 1994; King, Hollins, & Hayman, 1997; Pai, 1990; Smith, 1998). As culture encompasses a broad inclusion of concepts, it is important for teachers to be acquainted with the implications for teaching and learning.

A clear understanding of cultural and appreciation of cultural implications can impact or impede the success of schools. Thoughtful attention of the cultural background of students can support teachers who are attempting to make meaningful educational experiences for students (Hilliard, 2001; Wilson, 1991). Valid experiences of educators provide opportunities for teachers to become comfortable with cultural and academic content while solidifying teacher confidence in engaging students (Wilson, 1991). This emphasis further displays a need to operate with cultural confidence and understanding.

Beyond cultural understanding, one must look through the lenses of cultural accountability to pinpoint and highlight the influences of culture, language, ethnicity, race, gender, religion, exceptionality, socioeconomic level, and home environment (Huber, 1991). Cultural gaps in understanding the ethnic customs and school traditions also exist and persist here (Huber, 1991). Hilliard (2001) suggests that teachers must understand their own cultural identities and the role that culture plays in the educational process. This is done by examining the influence that culture has on goals and instructive beliefs (Hilliard, 2001). Therefore, understanding is an unavoidable requirement.

There is an attempt to delineate this requirement. If cultural understanding takes place, then authentic and meaningful experiences will produce increased academic achievement (Osborne, 1997; Wilson, 1991). Noting the above statements, there is also an assumption that attempts to prove that if schools and educators make an attempt to

ensure that classroom instruction for students from culturally diverse backgrounds is a priority, there will be improvement in achievement.

While academic improvement is an aim, caring allows the educator to see and empathize with others. This partnership establishes a basis of respect, honor, integrity, and resource sharing (Gay, 2000). Seen as a pedagogical necessity, caring is a moral imperative, combined with a social responsibility for teachers. Knowledge and strategic thinking serve as the moral compass that decides how to act in the best interests of others. It further connects individuals to the whole society, specific communities, and to each other interchangeably (Webb, Wilson, Corbett, & Mordecai, 1993). Caring, culturally responsive education is equally as important as knowledge of the culture.

There are several benefits of attaining and infusing cultural alertness. The knowledge of ethnically diverse groups along with strategic thinking of cultural knowledge is used to redesign culturally responsive teaching (Gay, 2001). Further, strengthening of student connectedness with schools as well as fewer behavioral infractions and enhanced learning occur through culturally responsive teaching (Klyanpur, 2003). Thus, cultural thoughtfulness has the capacity to be transformative, and translate into culturally experiences and expectations.

Goal of Responsive Teaching

The goal of connecting the curriculum and content that is appropriately relevant and attempts to meet the needs of students from diverse backgrounds while addressing the limitations in previous practices. Studies completed by Hale (1982), Ladson-Billings (1994), Banks (1995) and Gay (2000) attempts to connect the curriculum and content that is appropriate and reflective of our current society. Culturally responsible, culture

compatible, culturally appropriate, culturally congruent, culturally relevant, and multicultural education are among many terms used to describe culturally responsive pedagogy or teaching (Irvine & Armento, 2001). With each term or definition, the ultimate goal is to address the current needs and not to address prior studies and limitations.

In 1982, Hale offers an explanation that challenges educators to support pedagogy for educating the oppressed. This style of teaching in a culturally inclusive schooling environment has the capacity to build obvious bridges. Even more, Hale vies there is a need to address and reflect both a dually defined purpose to mirror the culture of both the home and community.

Along these same lines, Gloria Ladson-Billings is credited with making major strides on the expansion of culturally relevant pedagogies purpose and definition. Ladson-Billings' pedagogy (1992), was one that dealt with oppression in a way that is specifically committed to collective empowerment of a group, not just individuals. Much like Hale, Ladson Billings' pedagogy or way of approaching teaching focuses on the marginalized from a culturally inclusive perspective.

Strategies and Established Tenants for Culturally Relevant Teaching

With a decrease in competitiveness and individual focus, there is clear intentionality of educator focus on the presence of culturally responsive practices. Additionally, there is consideration to the promotion of practices that produce results when the intentional effort is on becoming pedagogically relevant (Hale, 1982). The effective use of body language, Standard English, equal amounts of teacher and student talk time, encouragement of group learning, a variety of learning activities are approaches

that should be incorporated when teaching African American students (Hale,1982)

Highlighting this model of educating ethnically diverse students includes comprehensive relevance and higher expectations.

There is a common thread that is woven through the research that centers on the cultural inclusivity and practices. Ladson-Billings (1992) create a bridge between theory and practice by contributing and responding to a new move toward addressing diversity. Although, previous research magnifies and evaluates results, it then designs approaches to ensure cultural equivalence (Gay, 2002). This congruence should be observed in symbolic and societal curriculum noticeable in classroom practice, and noted in formal lessons (Gay, 2002). Each approach extends results of findings based on prior research.

Within this research lies the significance of the role of the educator. An unavoidable focus for educators is that culturally appropriate classrooms rest in the role of the educator and the designing curriculum (Gay, 2002). Further, research continues other findings that the teacher's role of influence within the classroom is a major focus and supports students' ethnic identity development over time (Gay, 2005). From this perspective, there should be direct reflection in classroom practice. This is verified through analyzing and designing curriculum to ensure cultural congruence (Gay, 2002). Meaning, there are greater opportunities for successful academic outcomes for ethnically diverse students in the dominant society.

Thus, the theory of cultural responsiveness, teaching, learning, and curriculum, are enhanced instructional processes (Gay, 2000). Moreover, there is a resolve that teachers are equipped at a minimum with a focus on cultural competence, academic achievement, and sociopolitical consciousness to the classroom in order to impact their

students (Ladson-Billings, 2001). From this vantage point, the dual goal of opposition and empowerment challenge the reform efforts of centers of learning.

Many factors define the connection with culture and learning that may shape teachers' beliefs. Understanding and acceptance occurs when teachers are exposed early to cultural diversity (Dee & Henkin, 2002). Additionally, through informal interaction or through learning opportunities, teachers who often interact with a range of cultural diversity are challenged to become more unbiased and support and support social exchanges. Dee and Henkin (2002), suggest the challenging counter argument that tendencies to avoid social contact with others who are culturally different are limiting factors in professional practice. The connection of teachers' beliefs and culture are necessary to marry successful intersection of educators with the culture of the learning environment.

Culturally appropriate teaching has the capacity to affirm the student's cultural identity, recognizes cultural background, and is capable of building on the student's experiences (Ladson-Billings, 1994). However, when teachers do not affirm the cultural needs of their students, ' academic and social advancement suffer (Nieto, 1999). Further damage occurs when practitioners seek to reduce culturally responsive teaching to a simple act and fail to recognize its true potential to positively influence educational outcomes.

When the positive aspects of educational outcomes and practices intersect, this potentially liberation releases teachers from social constraints and frees educators to teach. Accordance to Freire (1980), culturally responsive instruction has been made possible through redemptive practices. Liberating pedagogy sees the significance and

necessity for the education of African American student's (Hale, 1982; Ladson-Billings, 1994). Additionally, Hale further states that there is a purposeful duality in that there is both a struggle in education and education for survival coupled with educating the oppressed (Hale, 1982).

Through emancipating teaching, educators can break through the common expectation of limiting teaching. It is not merely a way of teaching, or a set of practices. Nor is it simplified to an act, but culturally responsive pedagogy or teaching is culturally responsive and embodies a set of professional, political, cultural, ethical, and ideological disposition that openly resist typical teaching (Howard & Terry, 2011). Culturally responsive teaching recognizes that changing the structure of the classroom interactions and activities that reflects cultural connectivity promotes classroom learning (Martin, 1997). Additionally, culturally responsive teaching believes within the context of teaching and learning, students and communities possess an unyielding commitment to see student success as a reality (Howard & Terry, 2011). Freedom comes when teaching shifts away from tradition and sees the possibilities without boundaries.

Challenges of Culturally Responsive Teaching

However, even without the hindrances of boundaries, there is still a gap. Efforts to develop culturally responsive practices in different populations are documented. Culturally responsive pedagogy or teaching as an extension of multicultural education according to Nieto, meets that need. Ironically, there is an assumption that academic outcomes are the same between observed populations, academic individualities differ (Osborne, 1996). Establishing a need for an innovative approach to educational pedagogy for diverse learners is an unavoidable necessity.

Adjustments of classroom instruction are required to respond positively to the home culture of students and recognized as sociocultural consciousness. This is the awareness that a person's worldview is profoundly subjective to life experiences, by race, ethnicity, gender, and social class (Villegas & Lucas, 2007). A lack of familiarity about the theory, practice, and implementation of culturally relevant pedagogy has led to unsuccessful efforts and great jeopardy in meeting the needs of students (White-Clark, 2005). Sadly, teachers who lack sociocultural consciousness are prone to rely on their own personal experience which leads to miscommunication.

Evolution of Cultural Leaders

A significant role in establishing multicultural school policies and procedures lies with administrators. Knowing this, administrators possess the skills to cultivate an ability to comprehend and respect cross-cultural values (Anderson & Ottesen, 2011; Lumby & Fosket, 2009). Cross-cultural competence embraces sensitivity to cultural differences and strong verbal and written communication (Bush & Molot, 2009; Lumby & Fosket, 2009; Ines, 2010). Therefore, advancing individual and organizational cultural knowledge, adapting to the growing diverse needs of the people, an individual, or group can establish an obligation to practice (Crow, Lumby, & Pashiardis, 2009; Lumby & Fosket, 2009; Pratas, 2010). Leaders who do not effectively address the concerns of cultural and ethnic diversity in their schools have a disjointed school culture and create an atmosphere of isolation and a consistent lack of support (Cowdery, 2010).

The level or degree in which administrators and educators are culturally aware and sensitive determines the cultural span of multicultural school policies and procedures. Finally, creating strong, safe and inclusive school communities that also exhibit cultural

proficiencies are essential (Pica-Smith, 2009). There is a need for administrators and educators to be culturally aware while connecting theory and practice.

Urgency of Culturally Responsive Leadership

Leadership requires the leader to possess the ability to make sound decisions that reflect the best leadership of schools; which can serve as a key to the success or demise of schools without personal bias. Making intentional decisions for all stakeholders does this. According to Burns, leadership is grounded in the conscious choice to lead (1979). When trusted with responsibility, leaders must be challenged and decisions made to find solutions (Gini, 2004). Leaders must shoulder full accountability for their choices and commitments, successes and failures (Burns, 1979). Leadership is not an easy assignment; it is imperative that the leader understands when it is time to make changes, transitions or even shift their leadership role and view.

Effective leaders do not have tunnel vision, instead they see the big picture and connect that image with their organization, school and district. Fullen (2003) argues that leaders are able to effectively connect the dots in a way that is coherent. Leaders know that reducing the performance gap across all schools is the key to social cohesion in society, health, well-being and the economic performance of citizens (Fullen, 2003).

The leader understands that the betterment of humankind is not an abstract goal for ethical and transcendent leadership for a higher purpose (Fullen, 2003). Leadership has the capability to influence and enhance the community beyond the school building. A prevalent admission is to understand that change is necessary and leadership is critical in times of change and transformation, at both the school and system levels (Fullen, 2003). Therefore, improving the overall system will not happen just by endorsing the

vision of a strong public school system. Principals must be cognizant that changing their schools and the system is a simultaneous proposition.

Strengthening the heartbeat of schools requires that we rethink what leadership is, how it works, and its relationship to learning. According to Sergiovanni, leaders strengthen the heartbeat, their schools become stronger and more resilient (2005). These qualities help leaders to share the burdens of leadership with others, creating collaborative cultures, while becoming continuous learners. Change in leadership is certain and it involves new leaning. Change begins with leadership through the heart, head, and hands that drive leadership practice (Sergiovanni, 2005).

Conclusion

It is vitally important that teachers who serve students, whose dominant culture differs from their own, must understand that there are cultural encryptions that are both spoken and unspoken. The intellectual thought of students from different ethnic groups is culturally encoded (Cazden, John, & Hymes, 1985). In order to teach students, and reflect ethnic diversity, educators need to be able to decipher these communication barriers (Cazden et al., 1985). Many years of diligent research has provided a map to direct the paths of learners. This is done through knowing, acknowledging and developing a functional level of cultural capability that is both relevant and responsive to the needs of those entrusted to our educational system.

Chapter 3

Method and Methodology

The purpose of this study, using a Delphi technique, was to attempt to identify the characteristics that define and clarify the roles and responsibilities for urban school leaders from a cultural perspective. Further, this study proposed to address the question, “What are the key characteristics for Urban School Leaders?”

With the intention of gaining an understanding of the connection between cultural understanding and urban school leadership, I used a quantitative methodology informed by symbolic interactionism producing interpretive research to understand if the role of cultural competence was significantly related to the success of urban school leaders. Bearing this in mind, I attempted to explore common characteristics found in urban educational leaders. I also attempted to find a general consensus among these experts regarding the use of theories, practices, and perspectives of school leaders in a culturally responsive environment. Ironically, this proposed research study was significant because it addressed a gap in the literature as described in the previous chapter (Argote & Ingram, 2000; Busch, 2006, 2008; Hartmann et al., 2004). Components of this chapter included the research design, instrument, data collection, and the data analysis of the results relevant to the substantiate findings of this study.

This chapter also provided details of the study design, research population, method, approach, data gathering procedures, and data analysis of the overall data associated with the study. In addition, discussion of the research questions, research design, and instrumentation of the methods in this Delphi research study were also included. Also, to ensure fidelity was maintained for participants of the study, informed

consent procedures were also provided as a statement of confidentiality. Finally, it is anticipated that one outcome of this proposed study is to provide leaders with an outline to gauge successful leadership in urban settings.

Methodological Theoretical Approach

For this study, I used Transformational leadership theory which is frequently used to support leadership theories (Judge & Bono, 2000). This theory resulted in both positive and desirable impacts on culturally diverse groups, despite the leadership settings (Judge & Piccolo, 2004). Further, transformational leadership appealed to the social values of the follower and promoted collaboration (Burns, 1978). Further promoted was the ability of leaders to challenge the norm, inspiring groups to think beyond their usual scope (Burns, 1978). Transformational leadership included (a) ideal influence, (b) inspirational motivation, (c) intellectual stimulus, and (d) intellectual stimulation (Bass & Avolio, 1995, 2000, 2004).

Additionally, transformational leaders were change agents, who were courageous and had high ethical standards (Tichy & Devanna, 1986). Transformational leaders motivated, influenced, and intellectually stimulated, yet respected individualized concerns (Bass 1985; Burns 1978). This style of leadership involved encouraging followers to move beyond their personal interests to that of the group (Shamir, House, & Arthur 1993). It was here that transformational leaders saw the welfare of the larger community (Wright & Pandey, 2010). Additionally, transformational leaders are committed to being lifelong learners, who can manage convolution and uncertainty (Tichy & Devanna, 1986).

The challenges of this leadership shift were not always a standard for all leaders. There was a caution that some leaders lack the essential skills to deliver transformational leadership (Barbuto, 2005). Durham and Klafehn (1990) favored the transformational leadership style and its aptitude to support organizational vision and the first step towards organizational position to adaptive change. My goal was inclusive of exploring these challenges and cultural shifts defined in the current and following chapters of this proposal.

For this study, I used the Delphi method, which typically included a three-round technique of surveying a target expert panel, where the end resulted in consensus for my research. The experts had the opportunity to communicate responses to items based on their opinions, thoughts, and relevant experiences regarding the issues in each round (Greatorix & Dexter, 2000; Kennedy, 2004).

The Delphi method has been widely used and accepted practice for achieving convergence of opinion of experts within certain areas regarding collective knowledge from experts (Hsu & Sandford, 2007). The Delphi study's aim was to develop a set of themes, needs, directions, or predictions about a topic, while providing a communication structure between the participants and researcher that was interactive (Gatewood & Gatewood, 1983). The objective of the Delphi process was to systematically facilitate communication of information through several stages of the questions posed by the researcher, undertaking analysis, providing feedback, and asking further questions (Dalkey & Helmer, 1996). Embedded within this Delphi method was an assumption that valuable information would evolve (Dalkey & Helmer, 1966). Equally important, within

the Delphi research design, the researcher facilitates the study, with the goal of arriving at a consensus that strengthens the validity of the results (Dalkey & Helmer, 1966).

Founded on their ability to review results provided by the other Delphi panelists, the outcomes of previous studies regarding specific statements of individual panel members were open to change in later restatements of facts (Hsu & Sandford, 2007). When summarized, the responses were shared with the participants, and the experts were given the opportunity to offer additional feedback about the results (Grunenwald & Ackerman, 1986). Additionally, the feedback allowed and encouraged the selected Delphi participants to reevaluate their initial judgments about the information provided in previous surveys. Linstone and Turoff (1975) explain, when all practitioners agreed with the conclusion, the Delphi technique achieved consensus.

I communicated consensus with the goal of sharing findings in a systematic way that helped to limit issues. Summarized feedback was then shared with the participants, and they were given the opportunity to offer additional feedback about the results (Grunenwald & Ackerman, 1986). Most changes occurred during the transition from the first to the second round, while up to four rounds should be adequate to reach consensus (Effermeyer, 1986). The Delphi Method called for the expert panelists to independently write brief statements or respond to the initial open ended question asked about their expert insight and experience. Then the investigator gathered clarifying statements from the expert panelists. Next, the investigator re-questioned the expert panelists, and combined the panelists' responses into meaningful and unified responses.

The culmination of the research, led to use of the Delphi Technique. This was to determine consensus of the common characteristics for culturally responsive leaders in

this research study. By gathering data from education leaders across the United States, this Delphi Study compiled a consensus of common characteristics present in culturally responsive school leaders.

Using this Delphi study approach, qualified participants were asked to serve as experts. These selected experts completed three sequential questionnaire rounds inclusive of a preliminary set of open-ended questions. Next, a second survey round occurred consisting of scaled questionnaire items evaluating the importance of the characteristics gathered from participants' responses to the first-round of questions. Then, the responses were sent to the panel to rank and establish importance. In the third-round, classification of the characteristics recommended from the responses to items in the second round was conducted. With the goal of reaching consensus among the sets of responses from an expert panel, three rounds were considered a typical Delphi study (Sizer, 2007; Skulmoski, 2007).

The goal of the final round was to evaluate the relationship between responses of participants to those of the leadership tenants and exploring possible differences among the panel's participant responses. This investigation identified comparisons with regard to their respective subdomains. The final analytical step was meant to determine if the identification with a particular subdomain served as a basis for successful leadership as well. The differences found, could be useful in future expansion and reinforcing of leadership tenants proposed within the realm of urban educational systems.

Participant Section and Recruitment

This study attempted to understand the role of cultural competence and its significance to the success of Urban School Leaders by surveying a minimum of 10 of

the 30 past participants in the National Institute for School Improvement (NUI SI) LEADScape. This group of 30 was comprised of a national constructed group of principals, Associate Superintendents, Superintendents, as well as other district leadership that directly supported the role of leaders serving as principals. NUI SI LEADScape, a five-year initiative, sought to develop a powerful network of principals that embraced and implemented evidence-based, systemic school improvement approaches for inclusive practices as sited in the Year 4 Quarter 3 Report. From 2006-2011, NUI SI LEADScape maintained a goal of developing sustained networks of principals that embraced and implemented evidence-based, systemic school improvement approaches for inclusive practices. The initiative goals included (a) continuous improvement structures for classrooms, schools, and school systems; (b) ongoing participatory inquiry and development to apprise and improve outcomes for all students; (c) inclusive, culturally responsive professional learning that resulted in improved outcomes for all students; and (d) networking and dissemination that extends beyond the reach of this project and impacts practice nationally (Year 4 Quarter 3 Report, 2010).

The intent of the current study was to collect information from the selected experts in the field of educational leadership that specifically represented urban educational settings. A population or an assembly was defined as a group of individuals who had the same characteristics (Creswell, 2005). The suggested community for this study was a selected panel of urban school leaders who met the study criteria. The study involved working with a panel of urban school leaders, who served as field experts representing three subdomains of leadership: Principalship, District Level Administration, and University Leadership, who directly worked with or influenced

leaders in urban education. For this quantitative study, the panel of experts included 12 who were both willing to participate in the study and who met the criteria for participation.

The criteria that was used to determine which panelists were chosen as expert panel members include: (1) Leaders who were currently serving in a leadership role in education, who understood the expectations and challenges of leadership; (2) Leaders who worked with populations that reflected cultural diversity among the students served within the United States, who possessed a working knowledge of cultural respect and appreciation; and (3) Leaders who possessed advanced degrees in education, with at least seven years of experience in a culturally diverse population, ensuring an advanced level of experience significant to this study.

There were the 30 members of NUISI who met the criteria to be invited to participate in study. As a past participant, only 29 neutral participants were eligible. Educators currently serving, as leaders in education were considered to form a possible group and the primary method of contact was through electronic mail. For those persons who met the established criteria, a personal cover letter was sent electronically via e-mail, formally inviting them to participate. As a member of NUISI LEADScape, I had access to the email directory of participants that was used to contact the potential participants. All contact with participants remained confidential and did not include any added incentives for the 12 educators participating in this proposed study.

The use of a Delphi method, a quantitative research design was appropriate for this study. Within this method, the key leadership characteristics developed by a group of expert urban educational leaders representing principals, Associate Superintendents,

Superintendents, and University Level Educators who work directly with school leaders was explored. The data collection and generated results were used to identify and group leadership characteristics appropriate to leadership success for urban leaders in educational settings. Finally, the results of the study had the potential to provide a basis for future leadership efforts (Sizer, 2007; Skulmoski, 2007).

With this in mind, up to three sequential questionnaire rounds served as the outline or design of this study. This design included an initial set of open-ended questions. Secondly, a set of structured, scaled questionnaire items evaluating the importance of participants' responses to the first-round questions followed the initial round. Finally, a third-round ranking of the recommendations from the responses to items in the second round shaped the results to be shared. Typically, reaching consensus or agreement among an expert panel encompasses the three-round Delphi study (Sizer, 2007; Skulmoski, 2007).

Confidentiality

According to Creswell, an ethical practice to preserve the confidentiality of research participants was necessary. Confidentiality offers concealment and privacy to individuals who participated in research studies (Creswell, 2005). Since there was no link between study participants' names or positions and the participants' responses, confidentiality and anonymity were main features of the Delphi technique (De Villiers et al., 2005). Therefore, the identity of the study participants remained confidential.

The study's questionnaire results were available for the panelists review during the three rounds of questions. Neither the panelists nor any other individual outside of the study were allowed to review the raw input data. Further, the current research study

abided by principles of moral and ethical practices based on mutual respect, non-coercion, and non-manipulation (Creswell, 2005).

Using SurveyMonkey for data collection, it ensured the confidentiality of all data. Additionally, SurveyMonkey used the security features to protect the researcher's account, participants' identities and data collected. As an extra layer of security, the data was temporarily stored on an external drive and will be shredded three years after the data collection. Finally, upon request, Survey Monkey deleted system users' personal data as well as the research data from their database.

Data Collection & Procedures

While several methods were considered for this study, such as observation, focus groups, and theme identification, the use of a quantitative Delphi was proposed for this study. A panel of experts serving in leadership roles in urban educational settings was recruited from the three educational subdomains completed during the first part of this study using a Delphi research design. Educators were better able to connect and efficaciously develop trends, needs, or other factors relative to a particular area of education (Stitt-Gohdes & Crews, 2004). With this in mind, the proposed experts had an opportunity, without bias, to compile expertise and best practices with the aim of gaining consensus among survey responses.

Data Analysis

Exploring Personal Reflect on Culturally Responsive Leadership (Round 1)

Study participants were asked to review leadership concepts associated with their role in educational leadership and then respond to open-ended questions regarding leadership subject matter. The goal was to determine essential aspects of leadership that

could be formalized as standards in leadership. Next, responses to the open-ended questionnaire items were compiled and content analyzed. The researcher then reviewed the content and identified thematic commonalities emergent from the open-ended question responses. The themes that did not receive consensus reviewer were listed separately as outliers. Once these responses were compiled, the content of the responses were provided as feedback to the panel.

The duration of the first Delphi round was set at one calendar week from the point of notification and the SurveyMonkey link giving participants access to the open-ended questionnaire items. Where there were no responses by midweek, the researcher sent a follow-up reminder via e-mail, encouraging them to participate and once again provided the SurveyMonkey link with directions for access. Upon expiration of the week period, the first-round open-ended questionnaire expired on the SurveyMonkey site.

All 12 panel participants responded within the time frame of the first round and no one was excluded from further participation in the study. A two-day period between the closure of the first Delphi round and the initiation of Round 2 was scheduled for the researcher to compile the quantitative analysis of the open-ended questionnaire response data. After the completion of Round 1 and prior to Round 2, compiled responses clarified the findings from survey results of round one, and created a second survey.

Thematic Analysis of Culturally Responsive Leadership (Round 2)

The second round involved a questionnaire where the panel was charged to rank the key characteristics of a culturally responsive school identified on a Likert Scale of 1-3 (1 = Not important, 2 = Somewhat Important, or 3 = Extremely Important). The second-round questionnaire was developed based upon the quantitative analysis of the open-

ended responses to the research questions presented to the panel in the first Delphi round. For the second Delphi round, the researcher sent out an e-mail to panel members containing the compiled questionnaire from the first Delphi round open-ended questions.

The second-round invitation to continue on the panel and complete the developed Round 2 questionnaire with the Likert type items were sent that contained a new link to the Round 2 questions. The time frame for response to the second-round survey was 1 week, with a reminder again being sent out to panel members if there was no response by the end of the third day to complete the questionnaire. As with Round 1, those panel members who failed to complete the rating instrument within the time frames established were excluded from the study. Only one person was excluded from this study in round to due to lack of participation.

Analysis of Conformed Themes (Round 3)

For the third round, a summary of the panel members' responses to the Likert-scaled items associated with each leadership dimension from the second round were shared with the participants. The goal was forming a consensus. The final list of recommended characteristics were compiled based on the responses, and included the results of Round 2. The process was not repeated in a fourth round as consensus or agreement among the participants was reached after Round 3.

Verification of Analysis of Process Overview

Successful use of the Delphi methodology was connected to the writing of the questions in the different questionnaires. These questions were clear, concise, and correctly interpreted by the experts (MacCarthy & Atthirawong, 2003). The current

study using a Delphi methodology, were administered to the participants consisting of open-ended questions followed by a Likert-type survey.

The themes were formed from the first round of open-ended responses. These responses or newly formed themes were articulated into scaled items representing leadership dimensions along the Likert 5-point scale. This procedure used to quantify the themes developed as measures of each leadership dimension along an ordinal rating format designed to capture participants' ratings of importance in relationship to each of the identified dimensions (Likert, 1932). In the second round of the Delphi method, the expert panelists reviewed the responses from the first round and rated the various ideas, concept evolution, and views represented from the quantitative analysis. In the third round, the expert panelists were asked to evaluate the rated responses from the second round and then prioritized those retained based on average ratings of 3 or above.

Internal Validity

For this study, internal validity was established by ensuring that expert panel participants met selection criteria as outlined. The procedures for the Delphi method were followed. Proper selection of the educational experts contributed to the validity of this study. High levels of internal validity meant very few errors and low levels of internal validity reflected errors appeared and were identified (Crestwell, 2008).

Impediments to internal validity were possible errors or alternative explanations of results despite attempts to institute control (Neuman, 2003). Again, threats to internal validity were problems that threaten our ability to draw correct cause-and-effect inferences that arise because of the experimental procedures or the experiences of participants (Creswell, 2008). Common threats to internal validity were selection bias,

history, instrumentation, mortality, statistical regression, and experimenter expectancy (Neuman, 2003). These threats were minimized by strictly following the expectations outlined in this study.

External Validity

External validity made it possible to generalize outcomes and findings from a specific setting. This was inclusive of a small group, a comprehensive setting and large group of individuals (Neuman, 2003). External validity made connections from past situations, future situations, and present situations using sample data (Creswell, 2008).

There were two types of external validity. When the results applied only to a very specific setting where the research study at issue was actually conducted, there was low external validity; whereas high external validity meant that the results could be generalized to an expansive scope. In a strict methodological sense, the Delphi study raised issues for external validity (Neuman, 2003). Yet, experts meeting set criteria for participation of the Delphi-round results were intended as a means of assessing possible differences among groups.

Reliability

While it was essential to achieving significant outcome in research, I emphasized that validity as well as reliability was essential. Reliability meant that individual scores derived from the administration of an instrument were stable on repeated administrations as well as internally consistent. Consequently, the results were free from systematic sources of measurement error (Urbina, 2004). The reliability of the Delphi technique related primarily to the administration of the steps of the process (Linstone & Turoff, 2002). Along with reliability, the credibility of a study was truthful, appropriate,

consistent, and conformable (Hasson, 2000). I ensured reliability by rigorously following the stated steps outlined in this study.

Consent

The current research study consisted of panelists who were 18 years of age and older. I utilized a consent form to obtain participants' permission before asking the research questions (Creswell, 2005). The study was conducted via the Internet; therefore obtaining a physically signed consent form was not possible. Although, I emailed the invitation, participants received a web-based welcome letter which explained the purpose of the study. The internet served as a neutral and confidential location to conduct research for this study. Therefore, the e-mail platform allowed the participants to freely and openly share their opinions. All surveys will be stored on the secured account on a specific Survey Monkey data base and deleted within five years following the study.

Subjectivity Statement

Serving as a point of disclosure and identifying my subjectivity gives the reader a better understanding of the role of researcher study's findings and implications. While the National Institute of Urban School Improvement (NUISU) LEADScape was inclusive of 30 nationally selected school leaders; I was selected as one of the participants in this project.

Through this study, I desired to allow the opinions of peers who participated in this study to help us glean clarity as to the potential roles of cultural leaders in urban educational settings. The results challenged the researcher personally to evaluate and refine her own personal leadership practices. Additionally, it was also the ethical

responsibility of the researcher to refrain from including personal judgments so as not to influence the results of the study.

Summary

In my past role as an Instructional Leadership Director, I was charged with coaching, supporting, and evaluating Urban School Leaders. It was my desire that this study offered additional insight for school leaders who are charged with successfully navigating the many cultures and cultural influences, woven into the tapestry of what we call school. While there were attempts to formalize what culturally responsiveness looks like for teachers, I feel it would be most beneficial to Urban School Leaders if they had a guide to help to unlock the mystery of sustainable success for Urban School. The Delphi Method allowed an investigation to take place to find that which does not currently exist on this proposed form. Additionally, the information collected from the experts' responses to the rounds of the questionnaire in this Delphi study yielded a consensus from experts for common characteristics found among leaders in education that were consistently found in leaders who are considered culturally responsive. It was a method for structuring a group communication process to facilitate group problem solving and to structure models (Linstone & Turloff, 1975).

Finally, the Delphi method was well suited to rigorously capture quantitative data. This data collection attempted to clarify the common characteristics or tenants that were constantly present in the 10 Urban School leaders. This chapter of the quantitative research outlined methods and procedures that were used for this research study. My goal was to present and analyze the results of this Delphi study. Consisting of three

Delphi rounds, the study addressed the research question: What are the key characteristics that define culturally responsive leaders?

In the first round, a panel of experts responded to an open-ended questionnaire focusing on the key characteristics of effective school leaders versus the key characteristics of effective culturally responsive school leaders. The difference between a traditional school leader and culturally responsive leader was also addressed. Furthermore, the ranking the factors of a Culturally Responsive Leader previously identified by the panel was also completed. The responses to this series of four open ended questions from the first survey shaped the 14 characteristics used in the second survey.

This second survey was designed to clarify the ranking of the emerged characteristics. For the second round, panelists were asked to evaluate each of 14 key characteristics identified in round one according to a 3-point Likert scale. The panelists were asked to identify each, according to a 3-point Likert scale. The scale consisted of extremely important, somewhat important and not important.

The second round was followed by a third round where the participants were given the option to rule out any characteristics that were seen as nonessential. It was here that three of the 14 were declared nonessential. The panel was also asked to rank the 11 remaining characteristics in order of importance. An analysis of the data revealed that panelists had reached consensus on six characteristics they identified as essential to the success of Culturally Responsive Leaders. These six included: inclusion, culturally aware, shared leadership, visionary, instructional leadership, and equitable. The

outcomes and findings were interpreted in the next chapter immediately followed data collection and analysis of results as referenced below.

Chapter 4

Findings

During this Delphi Study, selected experts completed three sequential questionnaire or survey rounds inclusive of a preliminary set of open-ended questions. Throughout this process, I set a goal to determine essential aspects of leadership that could be formalized as key characteristics present in Culturally Responsive Leaders. The initial responses that I received to the open-ended questionnaire items were compiled and results were analyzed. When reviewing the results, I was able to identify thematic commonalities emergent from the open-ended responses. Once these responses were compiled, a summary of the results were provided as feedback to the panel. The duration of the first through the third Delphi rounds were set at one calendar week.

By doing this, each participant had access to each of the three rounds of surveyed items, with multiple times to answer and reflect on the thoughtful responses. To fully explain, for each of the three rounds and the findings, I have provided in the following sections charts, quotes and summaries of the results. These results were produced by analyzing the results of the four initial open ended questions. This aggregated data produced a deeper understating of the prioritized reflections of study participants.

Round 1 Delphi Response: Open Ended Identification of Culturally Responsive Leadership (CLR)

The first round contained the initial set of four open-ended questions. It is here that I sought to elicit expert panel member opinions regarding roles of leadership within urban education. Additionally, I ensured that the questions in round one were aligned with the research question used to guide this study, by verifying that each open ended

question was reflective of the means to the end results. These results were ultimately to answer the following research question: What are the key characteristics that define culturally responsive leaders?

From the original research question, four open ended questions were created and used in the first survey round.

1. What do you see as the key characteristics of effective school leaders?
2. What do you see as the key characteristics of an effective culturally responsive school leader?
3. What distinguishes a traditional school leader from a culturally responsive leader?
4. In order of importance, rank the factors of a culturally responsive school leader identified in Question 2 on a scale of 1 - 3 (1 = Not important, 2 = Somewhat Important, or 3 = Essential).

Round 1 Delphi Response Round Survey Question 1

Through my attempt to interpret the results of the findings from the participants for question one of the first rounds of surveys concerning the key characteristics of effective leaders, I have found that the outcomes yielded clear conclusions. The effective leaders were self-reflective, made decisions based on data, and they had a vision for leadership. The responses below were analyzed to shape the conclusions for Delphi Round 1 Round Survey Question 1 (see Table 1).

Delphi Round 1 Round Survey Question 1: What do you see as the key characteristics of effective school leaders?

Table 1

Delphi Round 1 Survey Question 1

Respondent	Open Ended Response
1	One who is able to cast the vision and others buy into the vision, resulting in improved performance of an organization.
2	I believe there are MANY different ways school leaders can be effective, which means there are lots of different characteristics. Perhaps the most important (at least, in my opinion) include 1) an ability to recognize their own areas of strength and weakness, so as to build an effective team around him/her, 2) a deep and comprehensive understanding of "effective teaching" and 3) an ability to understand the culture of a school as well as to impact the culture of a school in order to reach positive ends for students
3	Effective school leaders: Can clearly explain their vision - select the best teachers -provide teachers feedback - provide teachers with professional development customized to their strengths and weaknesses -help teachers to collaborate with each other.-give leadership roles to their top teachers -Know how to measure success.
4	Student driven- Organized and responsive to changing needs Collaborative/team oriented and Knowledgeable of CCS.
5	Effective leaders are able to efficiently use data to inform decision making. Effective leaders are capable of navigating through change by demonstrating proficiency in the following: Observation and feedback, shared mission and vision driving, and creating and maintaining a positive school culture which is perceived as a great place to work and grow.
6	1.) Having a strong vision 2.) Developing Teachers 3.) Managing Teachers 4.) Analyzing Data 5.) Being able to motivate people 6.) Listening to others 7.) Reflecting on leadership practices
7	An effective school leader is one who: Understands how learners construct knowledge, Is approachable, Is fair, and institutes philosophy practices that create inclusive schooling. Has high expectations for all students to achieve.

Table 1

Delphi Round 1 Survey Question 1

Respondent	Open Ended Response
8	I believe a culturally responsive leader is transparent, open-minded, collegial, and fair, committed, ethically-sound, progressive, honest. And one who can lead others in accepting differences in fellow stakeholders.
9	Effective Leaders have strong instructional expertise and vision for all components of the school. This vision should encompass instructional leadership, cultural diversity, collaboration and high expectations among adults, parents and students.
10	Having a clear vision, sharing leadership, being charismatic & Intelligence
11	I believe these include: clear vision, shared leadership, charismatic, intelligence & flexibility.

Key Themes for Delphi Round 1 Round Survey Question 1

In the direct reflection of a participant in this study, “there are MANY different ways school leaders can be effective, which means there are lots of different characteristics. Perhaps the most important, in my opinion include 1) an ability to recognize their own areas of strength and weakness, so as to build an effective team around him/her, 2) a deep and comprehensive understanding of "effective teaching", and 3) an ability to understand the culture of a school as well as to impact the culture of a school in order to reach positive ends for students.” It was here that I observed that the participants also saw the inclusion of the role of the teacher and the impact of culture was both affirmative and impactful within this scope of effective leadership.

Effective leaders were described or identified as an individual who is self-reflective and possess cultural understanding. I was able to draw this conclusion based

on the participants' acknowledgements that effective leaders should also have vision. And leaders were able to develop teachers while remaining student focused. Additionally, from the conclusions and responses of the study participants, I was led to believe that student success was the ultimate aim of the effective leader.

Further embedded in the results of this research, I observed decisions of effective leaders based on data. This observation was directly reflected and verified in their responses. According to participants, "Effective leaders are able to efficiently use data to inform decision making. Effective leaders are capable of navigating through change by demonstrating proficiency in the following: observation and feedback create and maintain a positive school culture which is perceived as a great place to work and grow." I understood this to mean, a leader was better equipped to offer valued feedback, and maintained a focus on goals and mission driven learning environments. This leader accomplished this with the use of fact based information guided by data.

Moreover, these leaders were seen as having the ability to effectively use data and to make decisions. I have found that this group was also credited with the ability, according to collected responses, to self-assess and adjust practices as identified. I further concluded that they offer formal and informal feedback with the goal of creating a great place to work and learn for all stakeholders.

"Effective school leaders: Can clearly explain their vision, select the best teachers, provide teachers feedback, and provide teachers with professional development customized to their strengths and weaknesses and help teachers to collaborate with each other. They are able assign leadership roles to their top teachers. They know how to measure success." The effective leader was also "One who is able to cast the vision and

others buy into the vision, resulting in improved performance of an organization.”

Lastly, these leaders share the responsibility of the mission and vision of the organization and these leaders were equipped to a cast vision that results in the potential to improve the performance of the organization.

Delphi Round 1 Round Survey Question 1 Conclusions

According to the results from the responses for question 1, I found that effective leaders are inclusive and focus on growth of the whole school which includes all stakeholders. “This leader is inclusive of all stakeholders and insists upon the development of a school environment that has exceptional evidence of a culturally responsive atmosphere, tone, professional learning, policies and protocols.” The effective leader is also able to adapt to the changing needs of the team through self-reflection, data based decisions, and an established vision for leadership.

Seemingly, this leaders’ ability to be truthful, unbiased, liberal and motivate others was also identified as a key for maintaining positive momentum. According to the panel experts, these ethically sound, yet focused instructional leaders likewise have high expectations and shared leadership expressed in a charismatic way. It is here that I saw the manifestation of characteristics. They were identified as moral qualities and described as ethical, honest and sound judgment.

Delphi Round 1 Round Survey Question 1 Outliers

While most responses during this round did reflect or address the question asked, there were responses that were seen as outliers that deviated from the question.

Therefore, in isolated occurrences, points were not in alignment with the characteristics of effective leaders. For example, there was no connection between “collaborative/team

oriented and Knowledgeable of CCS,” as it related to this study. Although these responses were supplied, they did not disrupt my interpretation of this question, or the progress of this study.

Round 1 Delphi Response Round Survey Question 2

For Question 2, I attempted to interpret the results of the findings from the participants of the Round 1 Delphi Response Round Survey Question 2. According to the responses of the participants, “A culturally responsive leader is transparent, open-minded, collegial, fair, committed, ethically-sound, progressive, honest and one who can lead others in accepting differences in fellow stakeholders.”

With this in mind, I found that culturally responsive leaders had an impact on the culture and climate. The culturally responsive leader also understood the importance of personal and professional development. There was an understanding of positionality, whiteness and inclusive practices. Therefore, the below responses were analyzed to shape the conclusions for Delphi Round 1 Round Survey Question 2 (see Table 2).

Delphi Round 1 Round Survey Question 2: What do you see as the key characteristics of an effective culturally responsive school leader?

Table 2

Delphi Round 1 Survey Question 2

Respondent	Open ended Responses
1	Someone who is able to assess and understand the dynamics of the school culture and identify solutions and resources for the needs of the school.
2	Address the needs of culturally, linguistically diverse and students with disabilities -Avoid tracking to lower level classes -Set high

Table 2 (Continued)

Delphi Round 1 Survey Question 2

Respondent	Open ended Responses
2	expectations -Provide a scaffold of support -Ensure students know which courses to take and the importance of tests -Reduce class sizes in prek-3 -Provide teachers with professional development on best practices which would include creating assignments that require group interaction, increasing wait time, being sensitive of cultural shifts as students move between home and school and discipline.
3	On top of the previous characteristics, I think culturally responsive school leaders should have a deep understanding of what it means to be culturally responsive. In other words, they understand positionality, whiteness, inclusive practices, and culturally responsive teaching strategies. These school leaders are widely read and can also help others (namely, their teachers) further understand CRP.
4	Same as previous with emphasis on equity Disaggregate data Listens for/notices and responds to privilege amongst stakeholders. Honestly, most of these should have been listed in the 1st question too.
5	It is important that an effective school leader is capable of influencing others through his/her awareness of factors which can impact a school's climate and culture. Responsiveness is an important trait for a leader to demonstrate. This should be connected to being a proactive visionary.
6	Being able to reflect on leadership practices
7	An effective culturally responsive school leader is one who: Understands how cultural disconnects result in poor learning Creates environments for students and families from ethnically and culturally diverse backgrounds Has high expectations for all students
8	The most effective culturally responsive leader must understand the difference between and be committed to equity and equality among various stakeholders.
9	This leader is inclusive of all stakeholders and insists upon the development of a school environment that has exceptional evidence of a culturally responsive atmosphere, tone, professional learning in regard to policies and protocols.
10	Being sensitive, good listener, & awareness.
11	Sensitivity, Awareness, Commitment, supportive.

Key Themes for Delphi Round 1 Round Survey Question 2

Effective culturally responsive leaders are aware and focus on entities that impact the schools' culture and climate. "It is important that an effective school leader is capable of influencing others through his/her awareness of factors which can impact a school's climate and culture. Responsiveness is an important trait for a leader to demonstrate." This led me to believe that culturally responsive leaders demonstrated that they value those being lead and were able to adjust to the needs of the population served.

Moreover, there was also an awareness of cultural implications among the culturally responsive leaders as described by the panel. Thus, the experts further stated that these groups of sensitive leaders are also connected and culturally aware. These leaders are committed to equity. I reflected on the results of the panel, and interpreted this awareness of cultural implication as essential and this should be connected to the culturally responsive leader's ability to be a proactive visionary.

Likewise, there was a focus on personal and professional development for these culturally responsive leaders. I concluded that there was an intentional focus on seeking growth opportunities to further development. These culturally responsive leaders were also credited with establishing and maintaining high expectations for self and others as noted by the panel. "The most effective culturally responsive leader must understand the difference between and be committed to equity and equality among various stakeholders." According to my findings, this visionary leader was student focused and labeled as tolerant and equitable. Additionally, this panel expressed the persons' reflection of diversity both culturally and linguistically.

Culturally responsive leaders also understood, “positionality, whiteness, inclusive practices, and culturally responsive teaching strategies.” Therefore, I concluded that the panel suggested that an understanding of cultural leadership was necessary to clarify expectations. And navigate the major culture in a way that benefited and advocated for teacher and students irrespective of race or culture. Through my personal observation and from collective results, the leader’s knowledge of culture was essential to understanding the process of planning, development and training needed for self and others. “An effective culturally responsive school leader is one who: Understands how cultural disconnects result in poor learning. And creates environments for students and families from ethnically and culturally diverse backgrounds has high expectations for all students”. Conversely, I interpreted this as the culturally responsive leader was also able to identify cultural disconnects that would prove to be problematic.

Delphi Round 1 Round Survey Question 2 Conclusions

Culturally responsive leaders were described as those who were able to navigate differences between commitments and equity verses equality. “Being sensitive, a good listener, aware, committed, and supportive” was found to be important. This leader was seen as sensitive and supportive with the ability to embrace diversity. This round also clarified, that the culturally responsive leader impacted school culture and climate and understood its cultural implications. The culturally responsive leader understood the significance of personal and professional development. There was also an understanding of positionality, whiteness and inclusive practices. Finally, the leader was “able to reflect on leadership practices,” and make adjustments as needed.

Delphi Round 1 Round Survey Question 2 Outliers

Through my analysis of data collected, several responses did not fit or the question asked. For example, “Address the needs of students with disabilities”. While important, this singled out response did not help us clarify the intent of the study. Similarly, “Avoid tracking to lower level classes,” was irrelevant to this study. Further, “Provide a scaffold of support,” could not connect to a specific key characteristic as defined by the goals of this study. “Ensure students know which courses to take and the importance of tests,” and “Address class sizes, wait time in teaching, outlining educational and instructional strategy support.” Some responses addressed issues that dealt with classroom instruction and distracted results away from the anticipated purpose. I also found that reduction of pre K-3 class sizes lacked a connection to the research question. As with the previous question, the outlying responses did not distract from this study.

Round 1 Delphi Response Round Survey Question 3

For Question 3, I attempted to understand the outcomes of the collected results from the participants of the Round 1 Delphi Response Round Survey Question 3. According to the responses of the participants, there was a distinction between traditional leaders and culturally responsive leaders. The traditional leader and the culturally responsive leader are distinguished in the proceeding chart. It was here that the characteristics of both types of leaders were compared by the survey panel (see Table 3)

Round 1 Survey Question 3: What distinguishes a traditional school leader from a culturally responsive leader?

Table 3

Delphi Round 1 Survey Question 3

Respondent	Open Ended Response
1	Someone who leads a school for improvement vs. someone who leads a school improvement for ALL students.
2	Culturally responsive leaders -have a vision that address the needs of all students -have completed a self-assessment to determine if they are tolerate or part of the problem -believe diversity and inclusion are goals that can be attained -manage and facilitate conflict -review policies, procedures and practices -are willing to have tough conversations when needed -provide professional development that change teachers beliefs/ stereotypes. Focus on equity.
3	A focus on inclusivity, an understanding of disproportionality, recognition of the role of race/ethnicity (and other cultural identifiers) all plays in disparate educational outcomes for students from historically marginalized populations.
4	Traditional leader goes through the motion; may not have strong values or beliefs, and does not take on issues in conflicts with such; does not "feel it" on a personal level; notices inequities but does little to address.
5	Proactive visionary
6	Traditional school leaders manage buildings. Culturally responsive leaders ensure that students are learning. They make sure that teachers are aware of all the critical needs of students. Culturally responsive leaders believe in creating an environment that is conducive to learning. They also believe in the concept of inclusion.
7	A culturally responsive leader understands that a person's worldview is influenced by life experiences including race, ethnicity, gender, and social class. A traditional school leader views teaching and learning from their personal perspective.
8	A traditional school leader may not be as forward-thinking as a culturally responsive leader. A traditional leader may focus more so on what is equal rather than what is equitable.
9	The typical traditional leader is highly focused on management and operational procedures and decision making. A Culturally responsive leader is interested in the vision setting that is composed of input from stakeholders.
10	Sensitivity and commitment
11	Being sensitive and always aware of the cultural aspects of students.

Key Themes for Delphi Round 1 Round Survey Question 3

When comparing the traditional leader to the culturally responsive leader, there were distinct differences outlined. The traditional leader was seen as managerial and procedural. Contrarily, the culturally responsive leader was inclusive and focused on students. These differing leaders and delineating characteristics were outlined below to offer further clarity.

The traditional leader was seen as managers who were operationally and procedurally focused and were known for following routines. This was seen as potentially ritualistic and conflict focused instead of solution oriented. Ultimately, the traditional leader is seen as, “someone who leads a school for improvement vs. someone who leads a school improvement for ALL students.”

I gathered that these procedural leaders were guided by policies and rules and focused on positional power. According to panel responses, a traditional school leader may not be as forward-thinking as a culturally responsive leader. Consequently, I observed this traditional leader was not seen as progressive, but more response driven. Traditional leaders related to being equal vs. being equitable in leadership and decision making. Teaching and learning was noted as being guided by established practices and left little room for new practices.

Conversely, culturally responsive leaders were seen as inclusive. “A focus on inclusivity, an understanding of disproportionality, recognition of the role race/ethnicity (and other cultural identifiers) all plays in disparate educational outcomes for students from historically marginalized populations.” The culturally responsive leaders not only

were attentive to the cultural individualities, but the discriminatory practices that resulted in disproportionality among those assigned to diverse backgrounds. These assignments were viewed as incongruent educational outcomes for students from generally marginalized cultures. Furthermore, “a culturally responsive leader understands that a person's worldview is influenced by life experiences including race, ethnicity, gender, and social class.”

Culturally responsive leaders also kept a pulse on the needs of all students. Culturally responsive leaders ensure that students are learning and they make sure that teachers are aware of all the critical needs of students. Culturally responsive leaders believe in creating an environment that is conducive to learning. This culturally responsive leader included stakeholders input when making decisions, and they were credited with having a clear focus on teaching and learning.

Delphi Round 1 Round Survey Question 3 Conclusion

In summation, when comparing the traditional leader to the culturally responsive leader, there were individual differences. The traditional leader was understood to be more managerial and ritualistic, whereas, the culturally responsive leaders were seen as inclusive and focused on students. Thus, the added responses from the panel implied that culturally responsive leaders created an environment that was conducive to learning. Culturally responsive leaders were labeled as those who were responsive to and responsible for inclusion of stakeholder voice with sensitivity and cultural awareness.

Delphi Round 1 Round Survey Question 3 Outliers

Much like the preceding questions, responses to this question that did not clearly answer the question asked, nor did it appropriately connect to the study. Although, this

response shined light on the difference between two leaders, “Someone who leads a school for improvement vs. someone who leads a school improvement for ALL students,” it does not identify which leader was being addressed. The response, “a focus on inclusivity, an understanding of disproportionality, recognition of the role race/ethnicity (and other cultural identifiers) all plays in disparate educational outcomes for students from historically marginalized populations,” lacks proper identification of which leader was addressed in the response. Finally, “sensitivity and commitment”, and “always aware of the cultural aspects of students,” were important, the assignment of these responses were not possible due to lack of further identification of the targeted leader.

Delphi Survey Round 1 Survey Question 4

In Question 4, I attempted to interpret the collected results from the participants of the Round 1 Delphi Response Round Survey Question 4. It was here that the panel ranked in order of importance the key characteristics of a culturally responsive school leader. These responses were individually identified by the panel participants in question 2, based on their own priorities (see Table 4).

Delphi Survey Round 1 Survey Question 4: In order of importance, rank the factors of a culturally responsive school leader identified in question 2, on a scale of 1 - 3 (1 = Not important, 2 = Somewhat Important, or 3 = Essential)

Table 4

Delphi Round 1 Survey Question 4

Respondent	Ranking Question
1	3 Essential
2	1-Address the needs of culturally, linguistically diverse and students with disabilities 3-Avoid tracking to lower level classes -Set high expectations -Provide a scaffold of support -Ensure students know which courses to take and the importance of tests -Reduce class sizes in prek-3 2-Provide teachers with professional development on best practices which would include creating assignments that require group interaction, increasing wait time, being sensitive of cultural shifts as students move between home and school and discipline.
3	Not sure I understand this question.
4	N/A
5	1. Being conducive to students 2. Believing in the concept of inclusion 3. .
6	All are essential.
7	Acting in a manner that is fair and equitable is 3 essential for the success of a culturally responsible leader.
8	Essential
9	3 Essential

Delphi Round 1 Round Survey Question Conclusions

After reviewing the characteristics shared by the panel via open ended responses, of the priorities identified, responses included the culturally responsive leader must be fair and aware of cultural shifts. By “believing in the concept of inclusion,” and “creating an environment that is aware of the student needs,” I recognized that the culturally responsive leader was also student centered. Further, these leaders “address the needs of culturally, linguistically diverse and students with disabilities.” “Being conducive to students,” created an environment that was aware of the student needs. Furthermore, I

interpreted that culturally responsive leaders were sensitive, lead improvement and were committed to all students. Also, “being sensitive of cultural shifts as students move between home and school,” these leaders are characterized as equitable.

Additionally, there were responses from nine of the 12 participants who answered this question. Of the nine participants who responded, three declared all characteristics were essential. For example, the participants felt that all characteristics were a priority and ranked equally. There was no established hierarchy or priority for these identified characteristics. Clarity was gained during the second round survey, adding richer meaning to the results produced in this study.

Delphi Round 1 Round Survey Question 4 Outliers

As with previous questions, several responses did not fit the current question asked. While “high expectations,” were seen as important, “avoid tracking to lower level classes and provide a scaffold of support to ensure students know which courses to take and the importance of tests,” was not directly related to the question asked. Finally, the statements “Reduce class sizes in pre K-3” and “Provide teachers with professional development on best practices which would include creating assignments that require group interaction”, and “increasing wait time,” were seen as priority by participants.

Round 1 Discussion of Emerged Leadership Categories

During Round 1, I encouraged the panel participants to freely, yet comprehensively answer each question. As a result, I experienced exposure to a wealth of information that lends to a deeper discussion of the findings from Round 1. Further analysis of content responses served as a basis for the development of themes in leadership. I concluded that the emerging themes outlined leadership categories that

frame distinctions among Influential Leaders, Symbolic Leadership, Moral Leadership and Cultural Leaders (see Table 5).

Table 5

Round 1 Discussion of Emerged Leadership Categories

Influential	Symbolic	Moral	Culturally Cognizant
Aware	High Expectations	Honest	Visionary
Connected	Positional	Charismatic	Student Focused
Inclusive	Personal Development	Motivator	Tolerant
	Professional Development	Ethical	Sensitive
	Data Driven		Equitable
			Inclusive
			Diverse

Based on my interpretation of the results, Influential Leaders are open to group interaction and are sensitive to the cultural shifts that occur between school and home. I also found that these leaders understand the connection between cultural connections and learning acquisition among learners. Also, inclusion is cited as playing a critical role in leveling the plane for historically marginalized populations. Finally, I find that the influential leader is effective as noted by his or her capacity to influence the awareness of the factors that impact the culture and climate of schools.

The emergent theme of symbolic leadership reveals that leaders have high expectations, yet they are positional. There was a level of rank or importance given to this leader by virtue of title and authority that accompanies this position. This leader was

credited with seeking opportunities for both personal and professional development. This leader relies on data to guide or verify decisions. I concluded that this type of leader had high expectations and understood what was required for leadership, but there was little flexibility or inclusion of others in the leadership process. As inferred by the responses, this leader was very traditional and there was clear order within their organization.

Moral leadership was exhibited through leaders seen as transparent, open-minded, fair, committed and ethically-sound. This leader operates from the clear position of what is right and wrong. I further concluded that moral leaders were seen as honest and possessed the ability to lead others in accepting differences, especially in a nonjudgmental manner. It was noted that possessed an ability to motivate others for the good of all.

Finally, cultural cognizant leaders were viewed as proactive visionaries who are intentional about being sensitive to needs of all students and stakeholders. Tolerance is outlined as strength of this leader and was expressed through understanding of others outside one's self. They are sensitive and thoughtfully considerate to those being served. These leaders are labeled equitable and diverse. In my opinion, this group, most closely aligned to culturally responsive leaders.

Round 1 Conclusion of Discussion on Emerged Leadership Categories

I concluded that the information above lends itself to a deeper discussion of the findings from Round 1. I concluded that the outlined emerging leadership themes, grouped the leaders in a manner that allowed me to see the differences between traditional and culturally aware leaders. While influential leaders, symbolic leadership, moral leadership and cultural cognizant leaders proved to be essential information, I

needed to further disaggregate the data to reach the outlined goals established for this study.

Delphi Round 2: Ranking of Themes of Culturally Responsive Leadership

Round 2 focused on the characteristics identified in round one of the Delphi Survey. The panel was charged, in round one to answer open ended questions by reflecting their own experiences. For the second round, the panel was charged to rank the key characteristics of a culturally responsive school leader identified on a Likert Scale of 1 - 3 (1 = Not important, 2 = Somewhat Important, or 3= Extremely Important). The following conclusions transpired as a result, the key characteristics that emerged from Round 2 analyzed results were self- reflective, vision, tolerance, diversity, inclusion, cultural awareness, and sensitivity, equitable, committed, motivated, ethical, charismatic, instructional and shared leadership. The below narrative outlined the findings and implications from the second round of the three round of this Delphi Study (see Table 6).

Table 6

Delphi Round 2: Ranking of Themes

Characteristic	Extremely Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total #of Responses	Weighted Average
Self-Reflective	80% (8)	10% (1)	10% (1)	10	2.7
Vision	100% (11)	-	-	11	3.0
Tolerance	90% (9)	10% (1)	-	11	2.9
Diversity	60% (6)	10% (1)	30% (3)	10	2.3

Table 6 (Continued)

Delphi Round 2: Ranking of Themes

Characteristic	Extremely Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Total #of Responses	Weighted Average
Inclusive	90.91% (10)	9.09% (1)	-	11	2.91
Cultural Awareness	100% 11	-	-	11	3.0
Sensitivity	72.73% (8)	27.27% (3)	-	11	2.73
Equitable	100% (11)	-	-	11	3.0
Committed	80% (8)	-	20% (2)	10	2.6
Motivated	63.67% (7)	9.09% (1)	27.27% (3)	11	2.36
Ethical	90.91% (10)	9.09% (1)	-	11	2.91
Charisma	9.09% (1)	63.64% (7)	27.27% (3)	11	1.82
Instructional Leader	72.73% (8)	27.27% (3)	-	11	2.73
Shared Leadership	72.73% (8)	27.27% (3)	-	11	2.73

Delphi Round 2 Key Findings

For this round of the Delphi survey, I reviewed the key characteristics that were listed or identified as extremely important, somewhat important, or not important. From a

very high level view, the key characteristics of vision, cultural awareness, equitable were listed as extremely important by 100% of the surveyed participants. The key characteristics identified as inclusive and ethical were both listed as extremely important by 90.91% of the surveyed participants. Tolerance was listed as extremely important by 90% of the surveyed participants. Self-reflective and committed were listed and seen as extremely important by 80% of the surveyed participants. Shared leadership, Instructional Leadership, and sensitivity each received score of 72.73% by those who considered these key characteristics as extremely important by 80%. Finally, motivation with 63.67% and diversity with 60% were seen as the least favorable key characteristics as listed as extremely important. While a third survey occurred, I observed trends that outlined a preliminary ranking of key characteristics, later identified in this study.

To gain further insight it was necessary for me to look at each individual key characteristic in greater detail. I found it valuable to look at the response rate to determine the frequency rate of each characteristic. Following this, I determined the response rate for the key characteristics that were seen as extremely important, somewhat important and finally those that were seen as not important. The weighted average or means in which each item being averaged was multiplied by a number based on the item's importance. Further, the results were tallied and the total was divided by the sum of the established weight, producing a weighted average for each key characteristic. The following results were clear and exact.

The first identified key characteristic listed as self-reflective had a total of 10 of the 11 total responses recorded. This was perceived as extremely important by 80% or 8 of the 10 responders. One response equaling 10% of total responses thought that this

characteristic was somewhat important. While 10% or one respondent identified this characteristic was not important at all. The overall weighted average was 2.7 out of a possible 3.0.

The second recognized key characteristic was vision, with a total of 11 out of 11 total responses recorded. This was seen as extremely important by 100% or 11 out of 11 responders. This gave the characteristic a weighted average was 3.0 out of a possible 3.0. This ranking unanimously listed vision as extremely important and helped me to begin ranking the characteristics by priority according to response and ranking score.

The third acknowledged key characteristic tolerance had a total of 10 out of 11 total responses recorded. Here, tolerance was seen as extremely important by 90% or 9 out of 11 responders. One response equaling 10% of total responses thought that this characteristic was somewhat important. Thus, the overall weighted average was 2.9 out of a possible 3.0.

Next, diversity was identified as a key characteristic and had a total of 10 out of 11 total responses recorded. This was seen as extremely important by 60% or 6 out of 10 responders. One response equaling 10% of total responses thought that this characteristic was somewhat important. While 30% or three respondents identified this characteristic was not important at all. The overall weighted average was 2.3 out of a possible 3.0.

The identified key characteristic inclusion had a total of 11 out of 11 total responses recorded. This was seen as extremely important by 90.91% or 10 out of 11 responders. One response equaling 9.09% of total responses thought that this characteristic was somewhat important. The overall weighted average was 2.91 out of a possible 3.0.

Cultural awareness had a total of 11 out of 11 total responses recorded. This was seen as extremely important by 100% or 11 out of 10 responders. The overall weighted average was 3.0 out of a possible 3.0. Much like vision, my observation was that cultural awareness also ranked unanimously among the highest scoring characteristics.

The next emerged key characteristic, sensitivity, had a total of out of 11 total responses recorded. This was seen as extremely important by 72.73% or 8 out of 10 responders. Three response equaling 27.27% of total responses thought that this characteristic was somewhat important. The overall weighted average was 2.73 out of a possible 3.0.

The key characteristic equitable had a total of 11 of the 11 total responses recorded. This was seen as extremely important by 100% or 11 of the 10 responders. The overall weighted average was 3.0 out of a possible 3.0.

Following equitable, the key characteristic committed had a total of 10 of the 11 total responses recorded. This was seen as extremely important by 80% or 8 out of 10 responders. None of the responders or 0% thought that this characteristic was somewhat important. While 20% or two respondents identified this characteristic was not important at all. The overall weighted average was 2.7 out of a possible 3.0.

The recognized characteristic motivated had a total of 11 of the 11 total responses recorded. This was seen as extremely important by 63.67% or 7 out of 11 responders. One response equaling 9.09% of total responses thought that this characteristic was somewhat important. While 27.27% or three respondents identified this characteristic was not important at all. The overall weighted average was 2.36 out of a possible 3.0.

Ethical had a total of 11 out of 11 total responses recorded. This was seen as extremely important by 90.91% or 10 out of 11 responders. One response equaling 9.09% of total responses thought that this characteristic was somewhat important. The overall weighted average was 2.91 out of a possible 3.0.

The panel agreed that charismatic, which had a total of 11 out of 11 total responses recorded was also a key characteristic. This was seen as extremely important by 9.09% or one of the 11 responders. One response equaling 63.64% or seven of total responses thought that this characteristic was somewhat important. Although, 27.27% or three respondents identified this characteristic, it was not important. The overall weighted average was 1.82 out of a possible 3.0.

Finally, the instructional leader had a total of 11 out of 11 total responses recorded was also among the key characteristics. This was seen as extremely important by 72.73% or 8 of the 11 responders. One response equaling 27.27% or three total responses thought that this characteristic was somewhat important. One respondent identified this characteristic as not important at all. The overall weighted average was 2.7 out of a possible 3.0.

Identically to the prior characteristic, shared leader had a total of 11 out of 11 total responses recorded. This was seen as extremely important by 72.73% or 8 out of 11 responders. One response equaling 27.27% or three total responses thought that this characteristic was somewhat important. One respondent, or 10% identified this characteristic as not important. The overall weighted average was 2.7 out of a possible 3.0.

Delphi Round 2: Ranking of Themes Initial Conclusions

It is important to note that there were three characteristics that 100% of all participants in Round 2 identified as extremely important. These characteristics were vision, cultural awareness, and equitable. Each of these equally received the maximum weighted average of 3.0. Furthermore, I conclude that these three key characteristics were dominantly seen as extremely important 100% of the time. They out ranked the remaining 10 key characteristics that received a score less than a weighted average of 3.0.

Round 3: Consensus of Conformed Themes

For Round 3, I established a goal to gain consensus of the key characteristics that influence leadership behavior that ranked as the highest priorities received with the greatest response rate. This rate is directly assigned by Survey Monkey, and was based on the calculations of all responders.

With consensus established as 66.67% for this study, the response rate of the 9 participants' scores equaled 6.06. Outlined below, I have presented an analysis of the received responses from rounds one and two of this survey.

In an effort to find consensus, I discovered that 13 characteristics emerged during this process. For Round 3, I asked participants to both rule out characteristics declared non-essential and rank remaining characteristics based on individual participant's priorities. My intention was to streamline the emerged characteristic and discern the priority responses of the panel (see Table 7).

Table 7

Delphi Round 3: Consensus of Conformed Themes

Characteristic	Frequently Ranked as Priority	Response Rate Score
Inclusive	8	7.89
Vision	8	7.56
Tolerance	3	3.44
Diversity	N/A	N/A
Cultural Awareness	8	7.89
Sensitivity	3	3.0
Equitable	7	7.13
Committed	5	5.29
Motivated	N/A	N/A
Ethical	6	5.89
Charisma	N/A	N/A
Instructional Leader	7	7.22
Shared Leadership	8	7.75

*N/A are the characteristics declared non-essential by the panel of experts

The identified priorities, post rule out and ranking yielded the following results. Due to the precision of the Delphi's results, the statistical results were clear as reflected in the results. The characteristic of inclusion received a response rate of 7.89 and a priority ranking of 8 based on the nine responses. Vision received a response rate of 7.56 and a priority ranking of 8 based on the nine responses. Tolerance received a response rate of 3.44 and a priority ranking of 3 based on the nine responses.

Next, diversity was declared as non-essential, and labeled as N/A based on the nine responses. This served an initial rule of out. Then, cultural awareness received a response rate of 7.89 and a priority ranking of 8 based on the nine responses. Sensitivity received a response rate of 3.0 and a priority ranking of 3 based on the nine responses.

Proceeding with characteristic of equitable leaders, a response rate of 7.13 was captured and a priority ranking of 7 based on the nine responses. The characteristic of committed received a response rate of 5.29. A priority ranking of 5 based on the nine responses was also recorded for commitment.

Based on the nine responses, the characteristic of motivated was declared as non-essential and labeled as N/A. This served an initial rule of out, meaning that motivation is not an essential characteristic. This rule out applies to the characteristic of charisma as well. Charisma was declared as non-essential by the panel as is labeled as N/A based on the nine responses.

Additionally, ethical leadership received a response rate of 5.89 and a priority ranking of 6 based on the nine responses. The characteristic of instructional leader received a response rate of 7.22 and a priority ranking of 7 based on the nine responses. Lastly, the characteristic of shared leadership received a response rate of 7.75 and a priority ranking of 8 based on the nine responses.

Ranking of Characteristics to Reach Consensus

For this analysis, diversity, motivation and charisma, were declared as N/A, or nonessential. This rule out for the third round was intended to eliminate characteristics that emerged as a previous priority, but were not as important as the other identified characteristics. This elimination provoked an opportunity to rank the remaining

characteristics to further prioritize the results. This data established a hierarchical trend among collected responses. It is here in Round 3 where the Ranking of Characteristics helped to Reach Consensus (see Table 8).

Table 8
Round 3 Ranking of Promoters vs. Detractors

Key Characteristic	Prompter's Score (%)	Detractor's Score (%)	Met Consensus
Inclusive	77.78	22.22	yes
Culturally Aware	77.78	22.22	yes
Shared Leadership	77.78	22.22	yes
Instructional Leadership	77.78	22.22	yes
Equitable	77.78	22.22	yes
Vision	66.67	33.33	yes
Ethical	55.56	44.44	no
Committed	33.34	66.66	no
Self-Reflective	22.22	77.78	no
Tolerant	22.22	77.78	no
Sensitive	11.11	88.89	no

Promoters' Vs. Detractors'

When determining consensus, I used the following equation used by Survey Monkey to establish the Promoter Score (Net Participants percent - Detractors percent = Promoters Score). This was determined by subtracting the percent of experts who are

Net Participants equal to 100% of all responders from the percent of experts who are Detractors, or those not in favor of the key characteristic to generate the Promoter Score.

With the result of this equation, I was able to establish preliminary consensus by comparing the Promoter Scores for the remaining 11 key characteristics with the detractors score to establish consensus. This total excluded the three characteristics that were ruled out by panel participants during the initial analysis of data from Round three.

I was then able to verify consensus by determining a benchmarked rate of consensus. This previously established consensus, as outlined from the literature was 66.67%. For this study, the 66.67% promotion rate and above was used, by the statistical design of Survey Monkey's analysis results and literature.

For the third and final round of this Delphi study, for each characteristic, I intentionally included a promoter's score verses a detractor's score. This is used as a clear comparison to determine final consensus. From this analysis, we are able to realize and establish the answer to the research question that guided this study.

As displayed in my interpretations below, leaders' responses were used to identify key characteristics to reflect the leaders' views, philosophies, beliefs, and expertise. The results responded to the following question: What are the key characteristics that define culturally responsive leaders?

Leaders who are inclusive received a promotion rate of 77.78%, equaling seven responders out of nine, or 100 % of total responders. The detractors score was 22.22%, or two responders. With a total rate of 77.78% promoters, this total exceeds that 66.67 rate of established to equate consensus.

Identically, leaders who are inclusive, culturally aware leaders received a promotion rate of 77.78%, equaling seven responders out of nine, or 100 % of total responders. The detractors score was 22.22%, or two responders. With a total rate of 77.78% promoters, this total exceeds that 66.67 rate of established to equate consensus.

Leaders, who were identified as possessing the skill of shared leadership, received a promotion rate of 77.78%, equaling seven responders out of nine, or 10 % of total responders. The detractors score was 22.22%, or two responders. With a total rate of 77.78% promoters, this total exceeds that 66.67 rate of established to equate consensus.

Vision leaders received a promotion rate of 66.67%, equaling six responders out of nine, or 100% of total responders. The detractors score was 33.33% or three responders. With a total rate of 66.67% promoters, this total equals the 66.67 rate of established to equate consensus.

Instructional leadership received a promotion rate of 77.78%, equaling seven responders out of nine, or 100% of total responders. The detractors score was 22.22%, or two responders. With a total rate of 77.78% promoters, this total exceeds that 66.67 rate of established to equate consensus.

Leaders who are equitable received a promotion rate of 77.78 %, equaling seven responders out of nine, or 100% of total responders. The detractors score was 22.22%, or two responders. With a total rate of 77.78% promoters, this total exceeds that 66.67 rate of established to equate consensus.

Ethical leaders received a promotion rate of 55.56%, equaling five responders out of nine, or 100 % of total responders. The detractors score was 44.44% or four

responders. With a total rate of 55.56% promoters, this total did not exceed that 66.67 rate of established to equate consensus.

Committed leaders received a promotion rate of 33.34%, equaling three responders out of nine, or 100% of total responders. The detractors score was 66.6%, or six responders. With a total rate of 33.3 % promoters, this total did not exceed that 66.67 rate of established to equate consensus.

Leaders listed as self-reflective received a promotion rate of 22.22%, equaling two responders out of nine, or 100% of total responders. The detractors score was 77.78 %, or two responders. With a total rate of 22.22% promoters, this total did not exceed that 66.67 rate of established to equate consensus.

Tolerant leaders received a promotion rate of 22.22%, equaling five responders out of nine, or 100% of total responders. The detractors score was 77.78%, or four responders. With a total rate of 22.22% promoters, this total did not exceed that 66.67 rate of established to equate consensus.

Leaders listed as sensitive received a promotion rate of 11.11%, equaling one responder out of nine of total responders. The detractors score was 88.89%, or 8 responders. With a total rate of 11.11% promoters, this total did not exceed that 66.67 rate of established to equate consensus.

Promoters' Vs. Detractors' Conclusive Findings

In conclusion, Leaders who are inclusive, culturally aware, possessed shared leadership, instructional leadership, and equitable all received a promotion rate of 77.78 %. This total exceeded that 66.67 rate of established to equate consensus. With exactly 66.67%, vision received a total the equaled the 66.67 rate of established to equate

consensus. There was a hierarchy on the findings that further either ruled in, or ruled out previous key characteristics.

On the contrary, ethical leaders received a promotion rate of 55.56% and committed leaders received a promotion rate of 33.34%. Next, leaders listed as self-reflective and tolerant received a promotion rate of 22.2 %. Finally, the characteristic listed as sensitive received a promotion rate of 11.1 %. These totals did not exceed that 66.67 rate of established to equate consensus. Therefore, the characteristics listed as ethical, committed, self-reflective, tolerant, and sensitive were eliminated because they did not have a promotion score of at least 66.67%. However, inclusive and culturally aware, shared leadership, instructional leadership, equitable as well as the key characteristic of vision all met or exceeded that 66.67 rate of established to equate consensus.

Ranking Score vs. Promoters Score = Consensus

In an effort to confirm consensus, I looked at a comparison of the promoters score and the ranking score that were assigned by Survey Monkey. The promoter's score represents the net percentage of your customers who are Promoters of the identified characteristics. The pre-built template or question type, Survey Monkey also calculates the score automatically so that the comparison between Promoters and Detractors is easily determined. Further, the ranking score was calculated by using the ranking average for each answer choice to determine which answer choice was most preferred overall by the entire group. The answer choice with the largest ranking average is the most established and the preferred choice and automatically created a score in Survey Monkey (see Table 9).

Table 9

Ranking Score vs. Promoters Score = Consensus

Key Characteristic	Ranked Score	Promoter's Score
Inclusion	8	7.89
Culturally Aware	8	7.89
Shared Leadership	8	7.75
Visionary	8	7.56
Instructional Leadership	8	7.22
Equitable	7	7.13

For this final survey, when looking at both the ranking score and the promoters score the emergence of the prevailing characteristics were clear. Early in the study, consensus was established as 66.67%, or ranked score and promoters score over 6.06. This cut score eliminated five of the 11 characteristics during round three, leaving six that met the criteria established. These six included: inclusion, culturally aware, shared leadership, visionary, instructional leadership, and equitable.

This is verified by the results listed. The characteristics of inclusion and culturally aware rank equally as the top two with a ranked score of 8 and a promoters score of 7.89. The third characteristic was shared leadership with a ranked score of 8 and a promoter's score of 7.75, followed by visionary with a ranked score of 8 and a promoter's score of 7.56. Instructional leadership ranked fifth with a ranked score of 8

and a promoters score of 7.22. Finally, the characteristic identifying culturally responsive leaders as equitable was done with a ranked score of 7 and a promoter's score of 7.13. The above was significant in that of the six verified characteristics, five had a ranked score of 8, leaving equitable with a score of 7. Further, with a promoter's score range of 7.89 through 7.13, there was on a difference of 0.76 in score between the highest score of the key characteristic to the least high score. Therefore, with this secondary verification, the final key characteristics that influence leadership behavior were inclusion, culturally aware, shared leadership, visionary, instructional leadership, and equitable.

Summary

My goal for this data was to analyze and present the results of this Delphi study. Consisting of three Delphi rounds, the study addressed the research question: What are the key characteristics that define culturally responsive leaders? After an examination of the data, it was revealed that the panelists had reached consensus on the six of the original 14 characteristics that were identified as essential to the success of culturally responsive leaders. These six included: inclusion, culturally aware, shared leadership, visionary, instructional leadership, and equitable.

Inclusive leadership was the practice of leadership that intentionally embraced the contributions of all stakeholders in the community or organization. This inclusion means seeing all contributors as valued. This value included an area that provided equal voice at all levels of the organization, according to the National Urban Fellows.

The culturally aware leaders, as defined by The National Center for Cultural Competence (NCCC), was one who was conscious, attentive, and mindful of both

likenesses and variances among and between cultural groups (Goode, 2006). Further, awareness of cultural differences and their impact on behavior is the foundation of intercultural significance. Cultural awareness acknowledged one's own cultural influences. These influences were connected to beliefs, judgments, and values (Winkelman, 2005).

Shared leadership was the practice of leading, not from a singular perspective, but in a manner that involved several key people within and outside of the organization, according to the panels' responses. Shared leadership offered opportunities for teachers, staff members, students, parents, and community members to share in the leadership. This input was key when vital decisions were made.

Visionary leaders had clear ideas about what should happen or be done in the future for the betterment of the organization. This visionary leader was credited as having imagination. This served as a conduit for dreams or visions according to the Glossary of Education Reform by Great School Partnerships.

Instructional leaders operated with the notion that instruction was vitally important for schools. This leader also made developing fellow colleagues a priority. High expectations were clear with a culture of learning continuum for colleagues. Instructional leaders are seen as those who made suggestions, giving feedback, modelling effective instruction. They were open to the opinions of others and, providing professional development opportunities. Instructional leaders also encouraged collaboration (Blase & Blase, 2000).

Equitable referred to the principle of fairness within this study. Equity included a wide range of strategies that may be considered fair. Equality is the outcome or result of

being equal. According to the Glossary of Education Reform by Great School Partnerships, equity reflected the desire to be fair and just. And what was fair in what was applied, allocated, or distributed equally. Ultimately, the goal of equity was to eliminate inequity that occurred when biased programs or practices supported the lack of equality. The implications of these key characteristics will be discussed further in the next chapter.

Chapter 5

Discussion

This chapter is a discussion of the findings that emerged from the data. It includes a summary of the study, major contributions, and an overview of the theoretical application and findings. Chapter 5 also includes suggestions that might represent the key characteristics that influence leadership behavior for culturally responsive leaders. Implications and recommendations for further research studies are included.

Summary of Study

The purpose of this quantitative study was to identify qualities that establish key characteristics for culturally responsive leadership in the role of urban school leaders. For this study, 30 participants were invited to participate in the study and 12 actually participated. These 12 were leaders who currently served in a leadership role in education. They understood the expectations and challenges of leadership and had seven or more years of experience working with populations that reflect cultural diversity among the students served within the United States.

These leaders also had advanced degrees in education, or an advanced level of experience and expertise significant to this study. During this study, data trends and results were analyzed and aggregated to find common themes and meaning. The results of this study have the potential to help guide principal preparation programs, as well as professional development for urban leaders. This study was designed to answer the following question: What are the key characteristics that define culturally responsive leaders?

Major Contributions

Through this quantitative three round Delphi survey, analysis of results revealed six key characteristics that emerged from participants' responses: (a) inclusive, (b) culturally aware, (c) shared leadership, (d) visionary, (e) instructional leadership, and (f) equitable. The analysis of this study revealed three important findings: (1) Urban School Leaders had to understand and acknowledge the complexities of Culturally Responsive Leadership, (2) they embraced a vision of societal diversity through true inclusivity which was the nonnegotiable path to successful culturally responsive leaders, and (3) they had innovative approaches to leadership development that informed and improved culturally responsive leaders beyond past practices.

Hear No Evil: Acknowledging the Complexities of Culturally Responsive Leadership

As a result of the data review, it is apparent that the participants saw the leadership from many vantage points. The leader was seen as one who was sensitive to cultural shifts. This sensitivity enables the leader to be tolerant and accepting of expressed diversity. The data pointed out that leaders were responsive to the needs of students and addressed diversity in an equitable manner.

The culturally responsive leaders were credited with being effective, connected and aware. This leader was compelling and able to appropriately adjust to situational expectations and met the needs of those they were entrusted to lead. Culturally responsive leaders understood a need to cultivate relationships through culturally responsive dialogues and the ongoing modification of practices with all stakeholders.

Leadership with efficacy was the goal. This leader's navigation through was more about helping people understand the changing landscape of urban schools, as well as assisting them in the management of difficulties that accompany unavoidable adjustments. By understanding this, leaders were able to maintain constancy, even when confronted with obstacles.

See No Evil: Embracing a Vision of Societal Diversity

A diagnostic framework for the review of culturally responsive leaders reveals that the majority of educators of culturally diverse students come from dissimilar cultural backgrounds (Villegas & Lucas, 2002). This would be problematic if the leadership operated from a closed perspective. However, the culturally responsive leader in some cases lacked congruence between the students' cultures and the norms, values, beliefs, and practices of schools; they were able to adjust despite this constraint.

Through research or training, little guidance for school leaders was provided specifically on how they should support those working learners with cultural variances. As a result, clear ideas about future changes for the betterment of the organization were seen by the visionary leader. This leader served as a conduit for dreams or visions to develop self and others according to findings in this study.

The culturally responsive leader led the community and helped materialize the diverseness as a common frame and representations of diversity. This mosaic was identified as a societal view or community where urban schools were seen as centers of harmony that stabilize the learning environment.

The findings from this study, call out the areas that must remain clearly visible to the culturally responsive leader. This leader is unable to ignore the needs present in

the fabric of the urban school. The culturally responsive leader is charged to be equitable, in that they are not allowed to be right, but are expected to do what is right. The motivated leader is clear that they are charged to cast a vision that included each student they are entrusted to educate.

According to the findings of this study, in order to understand the societal cultural challenges that students and teachers face, leaders must be the first learners. Parents and other community leaders should discuss successful practices and which need to be revisited within particular student groups. Such sober dialogues enable truthful and transparent opportunities to plan for sincere inclusion.

Do No Harm: Exploring Innovative Approaches to Leadership Development

To that end, cultural responsiveness can be seen as a strategy that can catapult schools into inclusive effectiveness by giving leaders the tools to comprehend and appreciate the students' culture. This leader was able to gain this momentum while inspiring the school and classroom environments. Verifying the fact, that there was a need to understand how motivating and leading in a culturally sensitive manner will positively impact student achievement (Adams & Kirst, 1999).

According to the data, these leaders had to be open to learning and took new approaches on how leading in these diverse settings takes place. Ironically, emerging challenges tend to occur within school leaders who do not possess knowledge of strategies to navigate culturally diverse settings.

Moreover, the culturally responsive leader was inclusive and has the ability to serve as a guide, to define and maintain the group's structure, and establish the vision and goals of the organization. Therefore, the duty of the leader was to assist effective

messaging and group collaborations in adaptive ways to ensure success. The culturally responsive leader's success is measured by the ability to develop personal capacity. The culturally responsive leader must possess develop the teachers' capacity to effectively address the concerns of cultural and ethnic diversity in their school's school culture and create an atmosphere of consistent of support. Within this leadership development is the ability to embrace sensitivity to cultural differences and model perpetual learning.

According to the study results, the culturally responsive leader has to be committed to personal professional development as a leader. This requires honest self-reflection. The honest truth is many leaders have good intentions; however, in order to be successful in our ever changing urban schools, training and development has to occur in identified deficit areas. Modifications in both what and how culturally responsive school leaders are trained and developed has to be revisited.

Theoretical Application

In the review of literature for this study, the theory of transformational leadership was mentioned as the theoretical framework. Among the 12 participants, there was evidence in their responses that they understood that transformational leaders inspire and impact, while intellectually motivating others. Transformational leadership involves encouraging followers to move beyond their self-interest for the awareness of the group (Shamir, House, & Arthur 1993). Transformational leaders are lifelong learners, who have the ability to cope with complexity and uncertainty, yet are visionaries (Tichy & Devanna, 1986).

Previously existing research, on culturally responsive leaders actually outlined the role of the teacher. The theory for this study, argues that the characteristics of culturally

responsive school leaders and school teachers cannot be defined nor seen synonymously. This verifies the need to clarify distinction between the voices and role of the teacher vs. the leader. In fact, this clarification should in no way diminish or minimize either role. This study allowed the disconnection of the two roles through the emergence of a clear set of key characteristics that outline the role of the culturally responsive leader.

Further the data, when examined, supported the revelation that the key characteristics: inclusive, culturally aware, shared leadership, visionary, instructional leadership, and equitable leaders are identified as essential qualities of a culturally responsive leaders' success. While all of the participants are active leaders in urban education, there were commonalities and distinction among their experiences as reflective in their individual responses. The leader's picture of their personal leadership priorities were reflected as well.

These leaders serve as the foundational key to the success of the staff. Their leadership include those they lead, and the students and community that they serve. Thus, transformational leadership is appropriate to the public sector. Transformational leaders see the welfare of the larger community (Wright & Pandey, 2010). This leadership accommodates various approaches and adjustments to leadership.

Leadership Analysis

Leadership is a decision to lead and make choices for the betterment of the entire group that the leader is entrusted to support. Leaders must be challenged and willing to make decisions to find solutions (Gini, 2004). Commitments, successes and failures rest on the leader who assumes the liability for their decisions (Burns, 1979). Leadership is not an easy assignment; therefore an understanding of what leadership should look like is

vital. This perspective establishes the need for leaders to see the global perspective and adjust to the needs of their organization.

Within this study, several noted researcher’s expertise on leadership was cited. Those research conclusions will be compared to the findings of this study. With close examination, there are four researchers and the characteristics associated with their research helps us to see the variations among leadership expectations. These leadership expectations are based on the results of the collective research and leadership analysis of the work of Bass, Sergiovanni, Fullen, in comparison to this study (see Table 10).

Table 10

Leadership Analysis

Bass	Sergiovanni	Fullen	Alexander Mitchell
Idealized Influence	Hope	Self-awareness	Inclusive
Inspirational Motivation	Trust	Self-regulation	Culturally Aware
Intellectual Stimulation	Piety	Motivation	Shared Leadership
Individualized Consideration	Civility	Empathy	Visionary
	Faith	Social skills	Instructional Leadership
			Equitable

According to Bass (1990), there are four categories of leadership. The Idealized leader serves as a role model who is admired for their leadership. Followed by Inspirational motivation or leaders have the ability to inspire and motivate followers. Next, Individualized Consideration expresses genuine concern about the needs and feelings of those being lead. Finally, Intellectual Stimulation challenges followers to be constantly challenged to performance at higher levels.

Secondly, according to Sergiovanni, hope deliberately transforms opportunity into reality (Sergiovanni, 2005). Additionally, faith permits us to see the possibilities of the forthcoming to be then hoped for (Sergiovanni, 2005). Beyond faith is truth. Sergiovanni says that members of a school are inter-reliant and is most obvious when every participant feels safe and supported. Showing devotion, esteem, and affection among group settings, or piety are as essential as hope and faith. Finally, civility is needed to embrace variances and dissimilar groups, while welcoming diversity and tolerance (Sergiovanni, 2005).

Fullen (2003) states that leaders should exhibit self-awareness or the ability to express personal reflection, and is able to follows their instincts. Self-regulation is the ability to maintain control of self and surrounding situations. These leaders are also have balanced restraint for the purpose of reaching goals. They are also able to display empathy and remain aware of the needs and feelings of others. Finally, the exhibition of proper social skills identifies these leaders as one who is capable at inducing desirable responses from others and to others.

For this study, the data revealed that panelists reached consensus on the six characteristics that were identified as essential to the success of culturally responsive

leaders. These six included: inclusive, culturally aware, shared leadership, visionary, instructional leadership, and equitable.

Inclusive leadership was the practice of leadership that intentionally embraced the contributions of all stakeholders in the community or organization. The culturally aware leader is consciousness of cultural differences and their impact on behavior is the foundation of intercultural significance. Additionally, shared leadership offered opportunities for teachers, staff members, students, parents, and community members to share in the leadership.

The visionary leader is one that had clear ideas about what should happen or be done in the future for the betterment of the organization and serves as a channel for dreams and visions. Instructional leadership makes the development of colleagues a priority through giving feedback and modeling effective instruction. Lastly, equity reflects the desire to be fair and just. To that end, urban school leadership takes on many forms, yet a definition of leadership is critical to the success of those expected to lead.

Implications

The finding of this study had several implications that may be seen as significant. This study on the key characteristics of Culturally Responsive Leaders in Urban Schools has the potential to influence literature on Leadership Development and Higher Education, Urban Principals and Culturally Responsive Teachers.

Higher Education and Leadership Development

This study revealed that creating clarity around the key characteristics of culturally responsive leaders helps to improve the urban school leaders' ability to develop an authentic skillset that will ensure that this leader positively connects with the school

communities they will serve. Educational leaders need to learn different strategies for creating and sustaining relationships in schools and within their communities. They must serve to establish a respect and understanding of culturally diverse populations.

Pre-service exposure to the needs of culturally diverse populations should be made available to those who desire to lead urban schools where such relationships exist. Future school leaders need to develop expertise required to identify cultural needs that impact the urban community as well. Leadership preparation programs should help future leaders learn the suggested key characteristics of culturally responsive leaders.

In this study, key characteristics of culturally responsive leaders were identified, including inclusive leaders, culturally aware leaders, shared leadership, visionary leaders, instructional leadership, and equitable leaders. Allowing future leaders to observe exemplary leaders in various settings would create extended partnerships with and among leadership preparation programs and districts where culturally responsive leadership is evident.

Urban School Principals

This study also revealed opportunities for current Principals serving urban schools. As a Principal, who is currently charged with the expectation of operating as a culturally responsive leadership, including all members of the school community is a preliminary step to creating a positive school climate where all students can learn. The burden is then shared and all members of the learning community By proxy, teachers, parents and look to school leaders for answers to difficulties they face on a daily basis. Culturally responsive school leaders must always have a pulse on changing the demographics in their schools and districts. These leaders should proactively set up

school-based development opportunities to ensure that teaching and leadership practices are consistent with the ever evolving demographics of Urban Settings.

Issues related to addressing diversity and culture also require the support of school district officials. School district officials and culturally responsive school leaders are both required, working in tandem, to support leaders in implementing transformational programs. There is an external need for culturally responsive school leaders and school districts to develop partnerships with local universities and community based supports to meet the challenges that accompany these specialized demographics.

Urban Teachers

Culturally responsive teaching acknowledged and validated the cultural heritages of diverse ethnic groups (Gay, 2000). Culturally responsive teaching had the ability to link home and school reverently and in significant ways (Gay, 2000). Learning happens when students' current understandings and their past social interactions intersect. It is here that teachers unite home and school cultures to provide students with learning tools to help them build new models (Vygotsky, 1978). Lastly, culturally responsive teaching recognized that different learning styles required variations of strategies connected to student's needs.

Additionally, culturally responsive teachers have a social awareness and support the reverence of learners from various backgrounds. Culturally responsive teachers are change agents, who assume responsibility for transformation in education and make the necessary adjustments. Culturally responsive teachers accept constructivist views of teaching and learning. Additionally, culturally responsive teachers are identified as

skilled with the ability to stretch learners beyond the familiar by building on students' prior knowledge and beliefs (Villegas & Lucas 2002).

Culturally responsive teachers built trust and are willing to become culturally literate. Further, an extension of culture and its relationship to learning in culturally responsive teaching settings was accomplished by establishing inclusion (Wlodkowski & Ginsberg, 1995). This inclusion through cultural responsive teaching has the potential to help support the improvement of teaching and leadership practices that benefits all students.

Urban Student Achievement

There are an increasing number of students from different cultural, religious, and ethnic backgrounds that come to school socialized in ways that are opposing to the school culture (Banks, 2001). Plans specifically have to be considered to assist children who come from diverse groups to translate the expectations of school. Students occasionally have problems understanding, which causes the teacher to feel overwhelmed. A student-centered approach releases the students from being at a disadvantage due to culturally inherited differences according to the study results.

Like the voice of the leader and teacher, the students have to be allowed to actively participate in their own emancipation. This liberation is free of judgment and guilt relating to being a part of the minority culture. It is the responsibility of the leaders and teachers to develop both the skills and confidence needed to work successfully with diverse groups of students, not the responsibility of the student to adapt.

Students should be included on decisions about what their school should be like. This is reflected in open and honest dialogue with the students so they can see their role

in their education. Finally, improved relationships between students, teachers and school leaders we will see a greater opportunity to be significant and improve student learning.

Recommendations for Future Research Studies

This study attempted to enhance the research literature and address the gap in the research about culturally responsive urban school leaders. However, future research can also benefit this study as well. This study included 12 experienced urban school leaders who participated in a five-year National Program for school leaders specifically working in the areas of culturally responsiveness and inclusion with respect to diversity. During this study, an examination of the shared experiences of the leader through analyses occurred. This analysis of three rounds of responses enabled the participants to reflect on and respond to questions based on their experiences. These leaders, through their responses, offered deeper insight into the need or characteristics should be present if the leader is going to be successful in a culturally diverse setting.

A follow-up study, on the characteristics of culturally responsive leadership would be beneficial for researchers to explore and give more insight into the challenges these leaders may face. A study with a larger sample of urban school leaders with diverse racial backgrounds could prove beneficial to literature with emphasis on culturally responsive leadership. Lastly, a study of culturally responsive leadership in a non-urban setting can also help researchers understand and compare these leaders as well.

Finally, or future studies, exploring tenants for culturally responsive district superintendents and their executive leadership team would bridge the gap between schools and central office. This would yield implication for local school boards as well. This clarity would create opportunities for more systemic infusion of culturally

responsive teaching and culturally responsive leadership. Therefore, eliminating obvious cultural disconnects by making culturally responsive leadership a nonnegotiable for all district operations.

Conclusion

Decades of research guides the culturally responsive teacher, inclusive of tenants and characteristics as well as training. However, there is a limited amount of guidance for culturally responsive urban school leaders. I found that effective school leadership was a prerequisite for all other learning, yet there is an absence of necessary cultural guidelines or characteristics that guide sustainable success. Success for leaders involved becoming competent interpreters of cultural complexities. Hence, this study attempted to clarify the need for culturally knowledgeable and responsive leaders, verses that of the leader who was seen as effective or traditional (see Table 11).

Table 11

Leadership Comparisons

Effective Leaders	Culturally Responsive Leaders	Traditional Leaders
Self-reflective	Strong instructional leaders	Managers
Cultural understanding	Inclusive	Operationally Focused
Vision	Shared leadership	Routine Focused
Develop teachers	Culturally aware	Policy and Rule Driven

Table 11 (Continued)

Leadership Comparisons

Effective Leaders	Culturally Responsive Leaders	Traditional Leaders
Student focused	Equitable	Positional
Data based decisions	Visionary	

The findings in this study, suggest that each of the participants’ responses was a reflection of their individual and collective opinions. The prevailing agreement among participants is the fact that there are specific characteristics necessary for urban school leaders to be successful in a culturally diverse setting. Continuously identifying and participating in professional practices that improve the way we communicate learning , increase understanding of cultural backgrounds; and promote genuine acquisition of new knowledge by diverse students will lead to genuine transformation of student outcomes.

In this study, all leaders were able to share their leadership experience and expertise in the form of survey responses. Further revelations say that culturally responsive leadership can create a positive environment where leaders tailor their leadership approaches in order to understand the cultural problems that students and teachers face. There is also an opportunity for the culturally responsive leaders to engage parent, students and teachers in conversations about practices that are productive and those that need to be dismantled.

School leaders should seek partnerships with experts on cultural responsiveness to identify other forms of knowledge that may help to improve teaching and leadership

practices with diverse students. Finally, readers of this study should be able to see that there are six characteristics, based on an analysis of the data, which identified as essential to the success Culturally Responsive Leaders. The Culturally Responsive Leader is inclusive, culturally aware, shared leadership, visionary, instructional leadership, and equitable.

References

- Abbott, S. (2014). *The glossary of education reform*, Hidden curriculum. Retrieved from Retrieved March 22, 2015. <http://edglossary.org/hidden-curriculum>.
- Adams, J. E., Jr., & Kirst, M. W. (1999). New demands and concepts for educational accountability: Striving for results in an era of excellence. In J. Murphy & K. S. Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of research in educational administration* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Adams, M., Bell, L. A., & Griffin, P. (2007). *Teaching for diversity and social justice*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Adler, M., & Ziglio, E. (1996). *Gazing into the oracle: The Delphi Method and its application to social policy and public health*. London, England: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Alexander, D. C. (2004). A Delphi study of the trends or events that will influence the future of California charter schools. *Digital Abstracts International*, 65(10), 3629. (UMI No. 3150304).
- Alexander, W. F., & Serfass, R. W. (1999). *Futuring tools for strategic quality planning in education*. Milwaukee, WI: American Society For Quality: Quality Press.
- Allemann-Ghionda, C. (2011). Comments on intercultural education in German guidelines and curricula. In C. A. Grant & A. Portera (Eds.). *Intercultural and multicultural education: Enhancing global interconnectedness* (pp. 49-68). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Anantatmula, V. S. P. (2004). Criteria for Measuring Knowledge Management Efforts in Organizations *Digital Abstracts International*, 65(02), 597. (UMI No. 3123064).

- Anderson, F. C., & Ottesen, E. (2011). School leadership and ethnic diversity: Approaching the challenge. *Intercultural Education*, 22(4), 285-299.
- Ashton, R. (1986). Combining the judgments of experts: How many and which ones? *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 38(3), 405 - 415.
- Au, K., & Kawakami, A. (1994). Cultural congruence in instruction. In E. Hollins, J. King, & W. Hayman (Eds.). *Teaching diverse populations: Formulating knowledge base* (pp.5-23). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Ayers, R. W. (1985). Perceptions of the future roles of public school administrators as viewed by selected authors in educational futures, professors of administration and chief school administrative officers: A Delphi study. *Digital Abstracts International*, 46 (08), 2137. (UMI No. 8522642).
- Banks, C. A. M., & Banks, J. A. (1995). Equity pedagogy: An essential component of multicultural education. *Theory Into Practice*, 34, 152-158.
- Banks, G., & Cortes (1992). Guidelines for multicultural education. *Social Education*, 274-294.
- Banks, J. (1994). *An Introduction to multicultural education*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Banks, J. A. (1969). A content analysis of the Black American in textbooks. *Social Education*, 33, 954-958, 963-969
- Banks, J. A. (1991). *Teaching strategies for ethnic studies*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon, Inc.
- Banks, J. A. (1993a). *An introduction to multicultural education*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

- Banks, J. A. (1993b). The Canon Debate, Knowledge Construction, and Multicultural Education. *Educational Researcher*, 22(5), 4-14.
- Banks, J. A. (1995a). Multicultural education and curriculum transformation. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 64 (4), 390-400.
- Banks, J. A. (1995b). Multicultural education: Historical development, dimensions, and practice. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 3-24). New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Banks, J. A. (2001). *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (4th ed.). Toronto, Canada: John Wiley and Sons.
- Banks, J. A. (2010a). Approaches to multicultural curriculum reform. *Approaches to multicultural curriculum reform*. In Banks, J. A., & Banks, C. A. (Eds.), *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (pp. 233-254). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Banks, J. A. (2010b). Multicultural education: Characteristics and goals. In J.A. Banks & C. A. Banks (Eds.) *Multicultural Education* (pp. 3-26). Danvers, MA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Banks, J. A., Cookson, P., Gay, G., Hawley, W. D., Irvine, J. J., & Neito, S. (2001). Diversity within unity: Essential principles for teaching and learning in a multicultural society. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 83, 196-198, 200-203.
- Barbutto, J. E. (2005). Motivation and transactional, charismatic, and transformational leadership: A test of antecedents. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 11(4), 26-41. Retrieved March 30, 2014.
<http://jlo.sagepub.com/content/7/3/18.short>

- Barlett, F. A. (1932). *Remembering: A study in experimental psychology*. Cambridge Press.
- Bass, B., & Avolio, B. J. (2004). *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire: Manual and sampler set (3rd ed.)*. Gallup Leadership Institute: Mind Garden. Retrieved from: <http://www.mindgarden.com>.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, (Winter), 19-31.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1995). *Multifactor leadership questionnaire leader form (5X-short)*. Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden.
- Beach, J. M. (2007). The Ideology of the American Dream: Two Competing Philosophies in Education, 1776-2006. *Educational Studies American Educational Studies Association*, 41(2), 148-164.
- Bennett, C. (2001). Genres of research in multicultural education. *Review of Educational Research*, 71, 171-217.
- Betancourt, J.R., (2003). Cross-cultural Medical Education: Conceptual Approaches and Frameworks for Evaluation. *Academic Medicine*, 78(6), 560-569.
- Billiard, S. (1991). Sorting through the multicultural rhetoric. *Educational Leadership*, 49, 4-7.
- Birdsall, I. A. (2004). It seemed like a good idea at the time: The forces affecting implementation of strategies for an information technology project in the Department of Defense. *Digital Abstracts International*, 65(7), 2756. (UMI No. 3142229).

- Blasé, J., & Blasé, J. (2000). Effective instructional leadership: Teachers' perspectives on how principals promote teaching and learning in schools. *Journal of Educational Administration, 38*(2), 130-141.
- Bolger, F., & Wright, G. (1994). Assessing the quality of expert judgment: Issues and analysis. *Decision Support Systems, 11*(1), 1-24.
- Bono, J. E., & Judge, T. A. (2004). Personality and Transformational and Transactional Leadership: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(5), 901-910.
- Boykin, A. W. (1994). Afrocultural expression and us implications for schooling. In E.R. Hollins, J. E. King, & W. C. Haymen (Eds), *Teaching diverse populations* (pp. 243-256). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Braguglia, K. H. (1994). A national Delphi study of the fashion industry for curriculum development in collegiate programs of fashion merchandising. *Digital Abstracts International, 55*(2), 225.
- Branch, J. W. (2000). Environmental education programming for the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service. *Digital Abstracts International, 61*(12), 4646. (UMI No. 9998660).
- Brancheau, J. C., Janz, B. D., & Wetherbe, J. C. (1996). Key issues in information systems management: 1994-95 SIM Delphi results. *MIS Quarterly, 20*(2), 225-243.
- Brown, D. (2004). Urban teachers' professed classroom management strategies: Reflections of culturally relevant teaching. *Urban Education, 39*(3), 266-289.

- Brown, S. M. (1988). An assessment of ethical dilemmas experienced by university or college counseling center directors: A Delphi study. *Digital Abstracts International*, 49(07), 1700.
- Bruggencate, G., Luyten, H., Scheerens, J., & Slegers, P. (2012). Modeling the influence of school leaders on student achievement: How can school leaders make a difference? *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 48(4), 699-732.
- Brungs, A., & Jamieson, R. (2005). Identification of legal issues for computer forensics. *Information Systems Management*, 22(2), 57-66.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Burnes, J. (1979). *Leadership*. New York, NY: HarperTorchbooks.
- Bush, T., & Molot, K. (2009). Race and racism in leadership development. In J. Lumby, G. Crow, & P. Pashiard (Eds.) *International handbook on the preparation and development of school leaders* (pp. 104-118). New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.
- Bustamante, R. M., Nelson, J. A., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2009). Assessing schoolwide cultural competence: Implications for school leadership preparation. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 45(5), 793-827.
- Cabaniss, K. (2001). Counseling and computer technology in the new millennium: An Internet Delphi study. *Digital Abstracts International*, 62(1), 87. (UMI No.3000284).
- Cambron-McCabe, N., & McCarthy, M. (2005). Educating school leaders for social justice. *Educational Policy*, 19(1), 201-222.

- Carman, W. H. (1999). An application of the Delphi method of forecasting to the future of technology infrastructure in West Virginia high schools. *Digital Abstracts International*, 60(6), 1839. (UMI No.9926681).
- Carson, W. A., III (2005). Successful implementation of enterprise resource planning software: A Delphi study. *Digital Abstracts International*, 66(1), 242. (UMI No. 3161750).
- Carter, K. (1993). The place of story in research on teaching and teacher education. *Educational Researcher*, 22(1), 5-12.
- Cazden, C. B., John, V. P., & Hymes, D. (Eds.). (1985). Functions of language in the classroom. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland.
- Chapman, C. N. (1992). Issues in photography that will confront photography education programs at California State University campuses by the year 2000. *Digital Abstracts International*, 53 (7), 2212. (UMI No. 9235290).
- Christian, L. R. (2003). Essential characteristics of accreditation site visit team members: A Delphi study. *Digital Abstracts International*, 64(3), 1158. (UMI No. 3084176).
- Cohen, D. (2001). Cultural variation: Considerations and implications. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127, 451-471.
- Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1990). Stories of experience and narrative inquiry. *Educational Researcher*, 19(5), 2-14.
- Cooper, C. W. (2009). Performing cultural work in demographically changing schools: Implications for expanding transformative leadership frameworks. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 45, 694-724.

- Costa, C. A. (2000). Future of sport management research: A Delphi study. *Digital Abstracts International*, 61(11), 4332. (UMI No. 9994851).
- Cowdery, J. R. (2010). Immigrants in Appalachia: Educational implications for meeting the needs of all children. *International Journal of Multicultural Education*, 12(1), 1-13.
- Cramer, R. H. (1990). Issues related to the education of gifted children in the United States: A Delphi study. *Digital Abstracts International*, 51(5), 1574. (UMI No. 9028025).
- Creswell, J. (1994). *Research design: Qualitative & quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, USA: Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, USA: Sage Publications.
- Crow, G., Lumby, J., & Pashiardis, P. (Eds.). (2009). *International handbook on the preparation and development of school leaders*. New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.
- Czinkota, M., & Romaine (1997). International business and trade in the next decade: Report from a Delphi study. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 28(4), 827- 844.
- Dahlby, G. K. (2004). Identification of emerging information technology issues of the 21st Century affecting public school board policies. *Digital Abstracts International*, 65(6), 2033. (UMI No. 3136302).
- Dalkey, N. C., & Helmer, O. (1963). An experimental application of the Delphi Method to the use of experts. *Management Science*, 9(3), 458 - 468.

- Dantley, M. (2003a). Purpose-driven leadership: The Spiritual Imperative to Guiding Schools Beyond High -Stakes Testing and Minimum Proficiency. *Education and Urban Society*, 35(X), 1-19.
- Dantley, M. (2003b). Principled, Pragmatic, and Purposive Leadership: Re-imagining Educational Leadership Through Prophetic Spirituality. *Journal of School Leadership*, 13(2), 181-198.
- Dantley, M. (2003c). Critical Spirituality: Enhancing Transformative Leadership through Critical Theory and African American Prophetic Spirituality. *International Journal of Leadership in Education: Theory and Practice*, 6(1), 1-15.
- Dantley, M., & Tillman, L. (2006). Social justice and moral transformative leadership. In C. Marshall & M. Oliva (Eds.), *Leadership for social justice: Making revolutions in education* (pp. 16-30). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Datnow, A., & Castellano, M. E. (2001). Managing and guiding school reform: Leadership in success for all schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 37(2), 249.
- Dee, J. R., & Henkin, A. B. (2002). Assessing dispositions toward cultural diversity among pre-service teachers. *Urban Education*, 37, 22-40.
- Delbecq, A., Van de Ven, A., & Gustafson, D. H. (1975). *Group techniques for program planning: A guide to nominal group and Delphi processes*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Company.
- Delpit, L. (1995). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York, NY: The New Press.

- Dietz, T. (1987). Methods for analyzing data from Delphi panels: Some evidence from a forecasting study. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 31(1), 79-85.
- Dillard, C.B. (1995), "Leading with her life: an African-American feminist (re)interpretation of leadership for an urban high school principal", *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 31(4), 539-563.
- Dixson, A. D., & Rousseau, C. K. (2005). And we are still not saved: Critical race theory in education ten years later. *Race, Ethnicity, and Education*, 8(1), 7-27.
- Dixson, A. D., & Rousseau, C. K. (2006). Critical race theory in education. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Doke, E. R., & Swanson, N. E. (1995). Decision variables for selecting prototyping in information systems development: A Delphi study of MIS managers. *Information & Management*, 29(4), 173-183.
- Duncan, N. B. (1995). Capturing flexibility of information technology infrastructure: A study of resource characteristics and their measure in elementary and middle grades. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 12(2), 37 - 58.
- Dunham, J., & Klafffen, K. (1990). Transformational leadership and the nurse executive. *Journal of Professional Nursing*, 20, 28-34.
- Eisenstadt, S. N., (1955). *The Absorption of Immigrants*. Glencoe, MN: The Free Press.
- Ely, R., & Meyerson, D. B. (2000). Theories of gender in organizations: A New approach to organizational analysis and change. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 22, 103 – 151.
- Ely, R., & Padavic, I. (2007). A feminist analysis of organizational research on sex differences. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(4), 1121-1143.

- Erickson, F. (1987). Transformation and school success: The politics and culture of educational achievement. *Anthropology & Educational Quarterly*, 18, 335-356.
- Erickson, F. (2001). Culture in society and in educational practices. In J. A. Banks, & C. A. McGee Banks (Eds.), *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (4th ed., pp. 31-58). Toronto, Canada: John Wiley and Sons.
- Erickson, F. (2010). Culture in society and in educational practices. In J.A. Banks & C. A. Banks (Eds.) *Multicultural Education* (pp. 33-53). Danvers, MA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Feiman-Nemser, S., & Remillard, J. (1996). Perspectives on learning to teach. In F. B. Murray (Ed.), *The teacher educator's handbook: Building a knowledge base for the preparation of teachers* (pp. 63-91). San Francisco CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Fink, A., & Kosecoff, J. (1985). *How to conduct surveys: A step-by-step guide*. London, UK, Sage Publications.
- Flinders, M., Gamble, A., Hay, C., & Kenny, M. (2009). *The Oxford handbook of British Politics*. Oxford, London: Oxford University Press. doi:10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199230952.001.000
- Ford, R. T. (1989). A descriptive study of health experts' attitudes about an innovative medical self-care model. *Digital Abstracts International*, 28(1), 120. (UMI No. 1337728).
- Fowler Jr., F. (1993). *Survey research methods*. Thousand Oaks, USA: Sage Publications.
- Fraser, J.W. (1997). Love and history in the work of Paulo Freire. In P. Freire, J.W. Fraser, D. Macedo, T. McKinnon, & W.T. Stokes (Eds), *Mentoring the mentor: A critical dialogue with Paulo Freire* (pp. 175-199). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

- Freire, P. (1980). *Education for critical consciousness*. New York, NY: Continuum Publishing Corporation.
- Friend, J. G. (2001). A Delphi study to identify the essential tasks and functions for ADA coordinators in public higher education. *Digital Abstracts International*, 62(4), 1339. (UMI No. 3012967).
- Frey, W. H., & Myers, D. (2005). Racial segregation in US metropolitan areas and cities, 1990–2000: Patterns, trends, and explanations. *Population studies center research report*, (05-573).
- Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in culture of change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Fullan, M. (2003). *The Moral Imperative of School Leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Gardner, H. (1995). *Leading minds: An anatomy of leadership*. New York, NY: Basic Books, A Division of Harper Collins Publishers.
- Gay, G. (1977). Curriculum design for multicultural education. In Carl A. Grant (Ed.). *Multicultural education: Commitments, issues and applications*. Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Gay, G. (1993). "Ethnic minorities and educational equality." J. A., Banks, & C. A. Banks, (Eds.). *Multicultural education issues and perspectives*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research and practice*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Gay, G., (2002a). *Culturally responsive teaching*. New York: Teachers College Press. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(2), 106-116.

- Gay, G. (2002b). Preparing for culturally relevant teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52(2), 106-116.
- Gay, G. (2010). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Gay, G., & Kirkland, K. (2003). Developing cultural critical consciousness and self-reflection in preservice teacher education. *Theory into Practice*, 42, 181-187.
- Gerdri, N. (2005). An analytical approach on building a technology development envelope (TDE) for road mapping of emerging technologies. *Digital Abstracts International*, 66(3), 1697. (UMI No. 3169411).
- Gini, A. (2004). Moral leadership and business ethics. In J. Ciulla (Ed.), *Ethics, the heart of leadership* (2nd ed.). Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Giroux, H. A. (1992). *Educational leadership and the crisis of democratic culture*. Council for Educational Administration, Report No. ISBN-1-55996-152-X(ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 3660886)
- Giroux, H. A. (2004). Critical pedagogy and the postmodern/morden divide: Towards pedagogy of democratization. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 31(1), 31-47.
- Glass, R. I. (1997). Telling good numbers from bad ones. *IEEE Software*, 14(4), 15 - 19.
- Gollnick, D. M., & Chinn, P. C. (1990). *Multicultural Education in a pluralistic society*. Columbus, OH: Merrill.
- Gomez, M. L., & Tabachnick, B. R. (1992). Telling teaching stories. *Teaching Education*, 4(2), 129-138.

- Good, J. J. (1998). Recommendations for change in physical education: A survey of selected physical education professionals. *Digital Abstracts International*, 59(7), 2417. (UMI No. 9839207).
- Goode, T. (2006). Key definitions. Washington, DC: National Center for Cultural Competence, Georgetown University Center for Child and Human Development.
- Gorski, P. C. (2009). Intercultural education as social justice. *Intercultural Education*, (2),87-90. doi: 10.1080/14675980902922135
- Grant, C., & Sleeter, C. (2006). Turning on learning: Five approaches for multicultural teaching plans for race, class, gender and disability (4th ed). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Jossey-Bass
- Grant, C. A., & Gillette, M. (2006). A candid talk to teacher educators about effectively preparing teachers who teach everyone's children. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 57(3), 292-299.
- Grant, C. A., & Gomez, M. L. (2001). Campus and classroom: Making schooling multicultural (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill-Prentice Hall.
- Grant, C. A., & Tate, W. (1995). Multicultural education through the lens of the multicultural education research literature. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), Handbook of research on multicultural education (pp. 145-166). New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Green, R. L. (2010) The four dimensions of principal leadership: A foundation for leading 21st century schools. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon
- Gustafson, D. H., Shukla, R. K., Delbecq, A., & Walster, G. W. (1973). A comparison study of differences in subjective likelihood estimates made by individuals,

- interacting groups, Delphi groups and nominal groups. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 9(2), 280 - 291.
- Hale-Benson., J. E. (1982). Black children: Their roots, culture, and learning styles (Rev. ed.). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Hannum, W.H. (2001). Web-based training: Advantages and limitations. In B. Khan (Ed.), Web-based training (pp. 13-20). Eaglewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications, Inc.
- Hannum, W.H., Jonassen, D. H., & Tessmer, M. (1999). Task analysis methods for instructional design. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Hartman, F., & Baldwin, A. (1995). Using technology to improve the Delphi method. *Journal of Computing in Civil Engineering*, 9, 244-249.
- Hartman, F., & Jugdev, K. (1998). Leadership undertow: Project manager fears and frustrations. Proceedings of the 29th Annual Project Management Institute Seminars and Symposium, Long Beach, USA.
- Hilliard, A .G. (2001). Race, identity, hegemony and education: What do we need to know now? In W. Watkins, J. H. Lewis, & V. Chou (Eds.), Race and education: The roles of history and society in the education of African American students (pp. 7-33). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related Values (p.143). Beverly Hills, CA. Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Hollins, E. R. (1996). *Culture in school learning: Revealing the deep meaning*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Hollins, E. R., King, J. E., & Hayman, W. C. (Eds.). (1994). *Teaching diverse populations: Formulating a knowledge base*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Holmes, W. M. (2005). Emerging practice in occupational therapy: An exploratory study of its nature and competencies for practice. *Digital Abstracts International*, 66 (11).(UMI No. 31955778).
- Holsapple, C. W., & Joshi, K. D. (2002). Knowledge manipulation activities: Results of a Delphi study. *Information & Management*, 39(6), 477-492.
- House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P., & Gupta, V. (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- House, R. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Sully de Luque, M. (2006). A failure of response to George Graen's critique of GLOBE. *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, 29(4), 102-114.
- Howard, G. R. (1999). *We can't teach what we don't know: White teachers, multiracial schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Howard, T. C. (2001). Telling their side of the story: African-American students' perceptions of culturally relevant teaching. *The Urban Review*, 33, 131-149.
- Huber, T. (1991). *Restructuring to reclaim youth at risk: Culturally responsible pedagogy*. Paper presented at the 13th annual meeting of the Mid-Western

- Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL, October 16-19. (ERIC Document
Reproduction Service No. ED 341655)
- Hughes, R. L., Ginnett, R. C., & Curphy, G. R. (2006). *Organizational Leadership*.
- Irvine, J. J. (2003). *Educating teachers for diversity: Seeing with a cultural eye*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Jackson, F.R. (1994). Seven strategies to support a culturally responsive pedagogy. *Journal of Reading*, 37(4), 298-303.
- Jacob, E., & Jordan, C. (1987). Moving to dialogue. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 18(1), 259-261.
- Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., Sully de Luque, M., & House, R. J. (2006). In the eye of the beholder: Cross cultural lessons in leadership from Project GLOBE. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 20(1), 67-90.
- Judge, T.A., Bono J.E., & Locke E.A. (2000). Personality and job satisfaction: The mediating role of job characteristics. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 237-249.
- Kahn, M. (2008). Multicultural education in the United States: Reflections. *Intercultural Education*, 19(6), 527-536. doi: 10.1080/14675980802568327
- belonging, and psychological adjustment. *Clinical Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 12(1), 29-43. doi: 10.1177/1359104507071052
- Kalyanpur, M. (2003). A challenge to professionals: Developing cultural reciprocity with culturally diverse families. *Focal Point*, 7(1), 1-6
- Keil, M., Tiwana, A., & Bush, A. (2002). Reconciling user and project manager perceptions of IT project risk: A Delphi study. *Information Systems Journal*, 12(2), 103 - 119.

- Kincaid, S. O. (2003). Web-based courses in human services: A comparison of student and faculty perceptions of factors that facilitate or hinder learning. *Digital Abstracts International*, 64(7), 2403. (UMI No. 3098041).
- King, J. E., Hollins, E. R., & Hayman, W. C. (Eds.). (1997). Preparing teachers for cultural diversity. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Kirova, A. (2008). Critical and emerging discourses in multicultural education literature: A review. *Canadian Ethnic Studies Journal*, 40(1), 101-126. doi: 10.1353/ces.0.0065
- Knowles, J. G., & Holt-Reynolds, D. (1991). Shaping pedagogies through personal histories in preservice teacher education. *Teachers College Record*, 95(1), 87-113.
- Koch, T. (1994). Establishing rigor in qualitative research: The decision trail. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 19(11), 5.
- Krahn, J., & Hartman, F. (2004). Important leadership competencies for project managers: The fit between competencies and project characteristics. Proceedings of the 2004 PMI Research Conference, London, UK.
- Kroeber, A.L., & Kluckhohn, C. (1952). Culture: A critical review of concepts and definitions. New York, NY: Random House.
- Kurokawa, M. (1970). Minority Responses. New York, NY: Random House.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1990). Culturally relevant teaching: Effective instruction for black students. *The College Board Review*, 7(15), 20-25.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1992a). Culturally relevant teaching: The key to making multicultural education work. In C. A. Grant (Ed.), *Research and multicultural*

- education: From margins to the mainstream (pp. 106-121). London, England: Falmer Press.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1992b). The multicultural mission: Unity and diversity. *Social Education*, 56(5), 308-311.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). The dream keepers: Successful teachers of African-American children. San Francisco, CA: Jossey- Bass.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995a). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(3), 465–491.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995b). But that’s just good teaching! The case for culturally relevant pedagogy. *Theory Into Practice*, 34(3), 159–165.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2001). Crossing over to Canaan. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Lam, S. S. Y., Petri, K. L., & Smith, A. E. (2000). Prediction and optimization of a ceramic casting process using a hierarchical hybrid system of neural networks and fuzzy logic. *IIE Transactions*, 32(1), 83 - 92.
- Lambert, W. E. (1952). "Comparison of French and American modes of response to the Bogardus So-cial Distance Scale." *Social Forces*, 31, 155-160.
- Lambert, W. E., & Taylor, D. M. (1987) Language minorities in the United States: Conflicts around assimilation and proposed modes of accommodation. In W. A. Van Home & T. V. Tonnesen (Eds.), *Ethnicity and Language* New York, NY: Praeger Publishers.
- .Lambert, W. E., L. Mermigis., & Taylor, D. M. (1986) Greek Canadians' attitudes towards own group and other Canadian ethnic groups: A test of the multiculturalism hypothesis. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science*, 18, 35-51.

- Lang, T. (1998). An overview for four futures methodologies. Retrieved January 06, 2014, from Hawaii Research Center for Futures Studies Web site:
<http://www.futures.hawaii.edu/j7/LANG.html>.
- Latchem, C. (2007). A framework for researching Asian open and distance learning. *Distance Education*, 28(2), 133-47.
- Laxton, R. E. (2002). Quality indicators of effective pupil transportation programs. *Digital Abstracts International*, 63 (11), 3803. (UMI No. 3071361).
- Lea, V. (2010). Empowering preservice teachers, students, and families through critical multiculturalism : Interweaving social foundations of education and community action projects. In S. May & C. E. Sleeter (Eds.). *Critical Multiculturalism Theory and Praxis* (pp. 33-46). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Lecklitner, G. L. (1984). Protecting the rights of mental patients: A view of the future. *Digital Abstracts International*, 46(1), 306. (UMI No. 8504044).
- Levinson, J. M. (2005). To gain consensus on a definition of multicultural children's literature: A Delphi study. *Digital Abstracts International*, 66(8), 2869. (UMI No. 3184291).
- Linstone, H., & Turloff, M. (1975). *The Delphi method: Techniques and applications*. London, England: Addison- Wesley.
- Linstone, H. A., & Turoff, M. (Eds.) (2002). *The Delphi method: Techniques and application*. Retrieved from New Jersey Institute of Technology Information Systems Department. <http://is.njit.edu/pubs/delphibook/>.
- Lipset, M. (1950). Changings social status and prejudice: the race relations theories of a pioneering American Sociologist." *Commentary*, 9, 475-479.

- Lisse, S., Zeitlinger, Moghaddam, F. M., & Taylor, D. M (1987) "The meaning of multiculturalism for visible minority immigrant women." *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 19, 121-136.
- Logan, J. R., Stults, B. J., & Farley, R. (2004). Segregation of minorities in the metropolis: Two decades of change. *Demography*, 41(1), 1-22.
- Ludlow, J. (2002). Delphi inquiries and knowledge utilization. In H. A. Linstone, & M. Turoff (Eds.), *The Delphi method: Techniques and applications* (pp. 97-118). Retrieved from New Jersey Institute of Technology Information Systems Department. Available at: <http://is.njit.edu/academics/graduate/msis/>
- Lunt, B. M., Ekstrom, J. J., Lawson, E., Kamali, R., Miller, J., Gorke, S. et al. (2005). Defining the IT curriculum: The results of the past 3 years. *Issues in Informing Science and Information Technology*, 2, 259-270. Available at: <http://2005papers.iisit.org/I21f61Lunt.pdf>.
- Lyman, S. M. (1968). "The race relations cycle of Robert E. Park." *Pacific Sociological Review*, 2, 16-22. *The Black American in Sociological Thought*. New York, NY: Capricorn Books.
- Madhlangobe, L., & Gordon, S. P. (2012). What makes an effective principal? *Leadership In Focus*, 10, 6-9.
- Martin, B. (1997). *Culturally responsive teaching: A review of research and literature*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 408387).
- Martin, B. (1998). Multiculturalism: Consumerist or Transformational? In Cynthia Willett (Ed.), *Theorizing Multiculturalism: A Guide to the Current Debate* (pp. 121-150). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, Inc.

- Mason, J. (1996). *Qualitative researching*. Thousand Oaks, USA: Sage Publications.
- May, S., & Sleeter, C.E. (Eds.). (2010). *Critical Multiculturalism Theory and Praxis*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- McDiarmid, G. W. (1992). "What to do about differences? A study of multicultural education for teacher trainees in the Los Angeles Unified School District." *Journal of Teacher Education* 43, 83-93.
- McKinley, J. (2010). *Raising Black Students' Achievement Through Culturally Responsive Teaching*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Menix, K. D. (1997). Validation of change management concepts by nurse managers and educators: Baccalaureate curricular implications. *Digital Abstracts International*, 58(10), 5329.
- Milner, H. R. (2007a). African American males in urban schools: No excuses—teach and empower. *Theory Into Practice*, 46(3), 239–246.
- Milner, H. R. (2007b). Race, narrative inquiry, and self-study in curriculum and teacher education. *Education and Urban Society*, 39(4), 584–609.
- Moghaddam, F. M. (1988). Individualistic and collective integration strategies among immigrants: Toward a mobility model of cultural integration. *Ethnic psychology*, 69-71.
- Moghaddam, F.M., Taylor, D. M., & Lalonde, R. N. (1987). Individualistic and collective integration strategies among Iranians in Canada. *International Journal of Psychology*, 22(3), 301-313.

- Moll, L., Amanti, C., Neff, D. and Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory Into Practice*, XXXI (2), 132-141.
- Moore, B. V. (1927) "The May conference on leadership," *Personnel Journal*, 6, 124-128.
- Morrier, M. J., Irving, M. A., & Dandy, E. (2007). Teaching and Learning within and across Cultures: Educator Requirements across the United States. *Multicultural Education*, 14(3), 32-40.
- Mullen, J. A. (1993). Superintendents predict the future of education: A modified Delphi. *Digital Abstracts International*, 32(2), 389. (UMI No. MM82110).
- Nambisan, S., Agarwal, R., & Tanniru, M. (1999). Organizational mechanisms for enhancing user innovation in information technology. *MIS Quarterly*, 23(8), 365 - 395.
- Natriello, G., McDill, E. L., & Pallas, A. M. (1990). *Schooling disadvantaged children: Racing against catastrophe*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Niederman, F., Brancheau, J. C., & Wetherbe, J. C. (1991). Information systems management issues for the 1990s. *MIS Quarterly*, 15(4), 475 - 500.
- Nieto, S. (1996). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of education*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Nieto, S. (1999). *The light in their eyes: Creating multicultural learning communities*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Nieto, S. (2000). *Affirming diversity* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Longman.

- Nieto, S. (2003). Challenging current notions of "highly qualified teachers" through work in teachers' inquiry group. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 54(5), 386-398.
- Nieto, S., & Rolón, C. (1997). Preparation and professional development of teachers: A perspective from two Latinas. In J. J. Irvine (Ed.), *Critical knowledge for diverse teachers and learners* (pp. 89-123). Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.
- Nimkoff, M. F., & Middleton, R. (1960). Types of family and types of economy. *American Journal of Sociology*, 66, 215-225.
- Nisbett, R. E. (2003). *The Geography of Thought*. New York: The Free Press.
- Nolan, L. N. (1994). Forward to the future: A Delphi study of the future of education. *Digital Abstracts International*, 55(7), 1747. (UMI No. 9430911).
- O'Connor, T. (1989). Cultural voice and strategies for multicultural education. *Journal of Education*, 171, 57-74.
- Offermann, L. R. (2004). When followers become toxic. *Harvard Business Review*, 82, 55-60.
- Offermann, L.R., Kennedy, J. K., Jr., & Wirtz, P. W. (1994). Implicit leadership theories: Content, structure, and generalizability. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 5, 43 – 58.
- Offermann, L. R., & Hellman, P. (1997). Culture's consequences for leadership behavior: National values in action. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 28 (3), 342 – 351.
- Offermann, L. R. & Phan, L. U. (2002). Culturally intelligent leadership for a diverse world. In R. E. Riggio, S. E. Murphy, & F. J. Pirozzolo (Eds.). *Multiple intelligences and leadership* (pp. 187–214). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

- Osborne, J. W. (1997). Race and academic disidentification. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 89*, 728-735.
- Parente, F. J., Anderson, J. K., Myers, P., & O'Brien, T. (1994). An examination of factors contributing to Delphi accuracy. *Journal of Forecasting, 3*(1), 173 - 183.
- Peffer, K., & Tuunanen, T. (2005). Planning for IS applications: A practical, information theoretical method and case study in mobile financial services. *Information & Management, 42*(3), 483-492.
- Perez, V. L., & Schueler, R. (1982). The Delphi method as a tool for information requirements specification. *Information & Management, 5*(3), 157-168.
- Phuntsog, N. (2001). Culturally responsive teaching: What do selected United States elementary school teachers think? *Intercultural Education, 12*, 51-64.
- Pieko, E. (2005). Improving the quality of information technology (IT) security audits for federal agencies. *Digital Abstracts International, 61*(9), 3401. (UMI No. 9987367).
- Prescott, P., & Soeken, K. (1989). The potential uses of pilot work. *Nursing Research, 30*, 60-62.
- Prestamo, A. M. (2000). A comprehensive inventory of technology and computer skills for academic reference librarians. *Digital Abstracts International, 61*(9), 3401. (UMI No. 9987367).
- Richards, C. (2004). From old to new learning: Global imperative, exemplary Asian dilemmas and ICT as a key to cultural change in education. *Globalisation Societies and Education, 2*(3), 337-53.

- Richards, J. E. (2000). Public health informatics: A consensus on core competencies. *Digital Abstracts International*, 61(8), 2964. (UMI No. 9983325).
- Roberson, Q. M., Collins, C. J., & Oreg, S. (2005). The effects of recruitment message specificity on applicant attraction to organizations. *Journal of Business & Psychology*, 19(3), 319 - 340.
- Rodgers, B. L., & Cowles, K. V. (1993). The qualitative research audit trail: A complex collection of documentation. *Research in Nursing and Health*, 16, 219 - 226.
- Rorty, A. (1998). *Philosophers on education: New historical perspectives*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Rosenbaum, J. (1985). A College and University Curriculum Designed to Prepare Students for Careers in Non-Broadcast Private Telecommunications: A Delphi Method Survey of Professional Video Communicators. *Digital Abstracts International*, 46(9), 2548. (UMI No. 8525512).
- Rowe, G., & Wright, G. (1999). The Delphi technique as a forecasting tool: Issues and analysis. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 15(4), 353 - 375.
- Sadleowski, M. (1986). The problem of rigor in qualitative research. *Advances in Nursing Science*, 8(3), 27 - 37.
- Sawyer, S. (1997). Share your results and your methods. *IEEE Software*, 10.
- Scheele, S. D. (2002). Reality construction as a product of Delphi interaction. In H. A. Linstone & M. Turoff (Eds.), *The Delphi method: Techniques and applications*. (pp. 35-67). Retrieved from New Jersey Institute of Technology Information Systems Department. <http://is.njit.edu/academics/graduate/msis/>

- Schell, K. (2006). Evidence-based practice: Noninvasive blood pressure measurement in children. *Pediatric Nursing, 32*, 263-267.
- Schmidt, R. (1997). Managing Delphi surveys using nonparametric statistical techniques. *Decision Sciences, 28*(3), 763-774.
- Schmidt, R., Lyytinen, K., Keil, M., & Cule, P. (2001). Identifying software project risks: An international Delphi study. *Journal of Management Information Systems, 17*(4), 5 – 36.
- Schmidt, V. V. (1995). Awakening intuition: A Delphi study. *Digital Abstracts International, 56*(9), 3498. (UMI No. 9543808).
- Schoorman, D., & Bogotch, I. (2010). Moving beyond “diversity” to “social justice”: The challenge to re-conceptualize multicultural education. *Intercultural Education, 21*(1), 79-85. doi: 10.1080/14675980903491916.
- Scott, G. (2000). Critical technology management issues of new product development in high-tech companies. *Journal of Product Innovation Management, 17*(1), 57-77.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (2005). The Virtues of Leadership. *Educational Forum, 69*(2), 112-123.
- Shamir, B., House, R. J., & Arthur, M.B. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept theory. *Organizational Science, 4*(4), 577-594.
- Sharma, S. (2010). Critical multiculturalism and cultural and media studies. In S. May & C.E. Sleeter (Eds.). *Critical Multiculturalism Theory and Praxis* (pp. 113-123). New York, NY: Routledge.

- Shook, S. A. (1994). The identification of key change agents and techniques related to the change from an industrial arts program to a technology education program. *Digital Abstracts International*, 55(10), 3113. (UMI No. 9506289).
- Shuman, D. (2000). Implementation theory and determinants for success: A case study of televised distance learning implementation in an urban university. *Digital Abstracts International*, 61(4), 1371. (UMI No. 9970453).
- Silverman, A. S. (1981). Development of content areas and objectives for a curriculum in death and dying education for junior high school students. *Digital Abstracts International*, 42(5), 1975. (UMI No. 8122977).
- Skulmoski, G., & Hartman, F. (2002). The Delphi method: Researching what does not exist (yet). Proceedings of the International Research Network on Organization by Projects, IRNOP V Conference, Renesse, The Netherlands.
- Sleeter, C., & Grant, C. A. (1987). An analysis of multicultural education in the United States. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57, 412-444.
- Sleeter, C. E., & Bernal, D. D. (2004). Critical pedagogy, critical race theory, and anti-racist education: Implications for multicultural education. In J. A. Banks & C. A. Banks (Eds.). *Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education* (2nd ed., pp. 240-260). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Sleeter, C. E., & Grant C. A. (1988). *Making choices for multicultural education: Five approaches to race, class, and gender*. New York, NY: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Sleeter, C.E., & Grant, C.A. (1993). *Making choices for multicultural education: Approaches to race, class, and gender*. New York, NY: Macmillan.

- Sori, C. F., & Sprenkle, D. H. (2004). Training family therapists to work with children and families: A modified Delphi study. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 30, 479-495.
- Sparks, W.G. (1994). Culturally responsive pedagogy: A Framework for addressing multicultural issues. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 65(9), 33-36.
- Stitt-Gohdes, W. L., & Crews, T. B. (2004). The Delphi technique: A research strategy for career and technical education. *Journal of Career and Technical Education*, 20(2), 55-68.
- Tate, W. (1995). Returning to the root: A culturally relevant approach to mathematics pedagogy. *Theory into Practice*, 34(3), 166-173.
- Tate, W. (1997). Critical Race Theory and Education: History, theory, and implications. *Review of Research in Education*, 22, 195-247.
- Thomson, B. R. (1985). Appropriate and inappropriate uses of humor in psychotherapy as perceived by certified reality therapists: A Delphi study (Delphi Method). *Digital Abstracts International*, 47(1), 90. (UMI No. 8606095).
- Tichy, N., & Devanna, M. (1986). *The Transformational Leader*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Topper, W. W. (2006). Leadership change in privately controlled businesses: A Delphi study of succession planning best practices. *Digital Abstracts International*, 67(1). (UMI No. 3206379).
- Triandis, H. C. (1989). The self and behavior in different cultural contexts. *Psychological Review*, 96, 506-520.

- Triandis, H. C. (1994). *Culture and social behavior*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism and collectivism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Tsou, H. (2005). An effective food and beverage management internship model in Taiwan. *Digital Abstracts International*, 66(3), 925. (UMI No. 3168543).
- Urban, W., & Wagoner, J. (2004). *American education: A history*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2010). *Teacher Attrition and Mobility: Results from the 2008–09 Teacher Follow-up Survey* (NCES 2010-353).
- Vavrus, M. (2008). Culturally responsive teaching. In T. L. Good (Ed.). *21st Century Education: A Reference Handbook*. (2nd ed., pp. 49-57). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Vazquez-Ramos, R. A. (2003). A Delphi study to assess a potential set of items to evaluate participatory ethics in rehabilitation counseling. *Digital Abstracts International*, 64(4), 1231. (UMI No. 3087663).
- Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (2002). *Educating culturally responsive teachers: A coherent approach*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Visionary. (n.d.). Dictionary.com Unabridged. Retrieved March 22, 2015, from Dictionary.com website: <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/visionary>.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological process*. Cambridge, MA: University Press.
- Walter, H. (1942). Assimilation as Concept and as Process. *Social Forces*, XXI, 35-39. 12 Eisenstadt, op. cit. values in a society.

- Warner, M. (1990). Recreational Foodservice management: A Delphi study of needed competencies. *Digital Abstracts International*, 51(2), 430. (UMI No. 9019144).
- Watson, A. C. (1982). A Delphi Study of Paradox in Therapy. *Digital Abstracts International*, 43(10), 3380. (UMI No. 8304627).
- Webb, J., Wilson, B., Corbett, D., & Mordecai, R. (1993). Understanding caring in context: Negotiating borders and barriers. *Urban Review*, 25(1), 25-45.
- Wei, W. M. (2000). Development of possible cognitive competencies for use in developing a criterion referenced performance test to license kindergarten teachers in Taiwan. *Digital Abstracts International*, 61(09), 3462. (UMI No. 9987282).
- White-Clark, R. (2005). Training teachers to succeed in a multicultural classroom. *Principal*, 84(4), 40-44.
- Whittinghill, W. D. (2000). Identification of the initial curriculum components for the preparation of graduate-level substance abuse counselors. *Digital Abstracts International*, 61(8), 3072. (UMI No. 9984510).
- Wilke, B. J. (1982). The Future of the General Instruction Physical Education Program in Higher Education: A Delphi Study. *Digital Abstracts International*, 43(7), 2278. (UMI No. 8226951).
- Wilson, A. N. (1991). *Awakening the natural genius of black children* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Afrikan World InfoSystems.
- Wlodkowski, R.J., & Ginsberg, M.B. (1995). A framework for culturally responsive teaching. *Educational Leadership*, 53(1), 17-21.

- Wren, D. A. (2005.) *The history of management thought*, (5th ed). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley.
- Wright, B.E., & S.K., Pandey. (2010). "Transformational leadership in the Public Sector: Does Structure Matter?" *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. 20(1): 75-89.
- Wynekoop, J. L., & Walz, D. B. (2000). Investigating traits of top performing software developers. *Information Technology & People*, 13(3), 186-197.
- Yang, Y. N. (1998). Integrating the World Wide Web into art education: Guidelines for designing a Web-based art teacher education curriculum. *Digital Abstracts International*, 60(3), 622. (UMI No.9921650).
- Yell M., Drasgow E., Lowry K. A. (2005). No Child Left Behind and students with autism spectrum disorders. *Focus on Autism and Other Developmental Disorders*, 20(3), 30–39.
- Zaghloul, R., & Hartman, F. (2003). Construction contracts: The cost of mistrust. *International Journal of Project Management*, 21(6), 419-424.
- Zane tell, B. A. (2003). Stakeholder collaboration and discourse: Delphi-generated global and local visions for water resources management. *Digital Abstracts International*, 63(12), 5742. (UMI No. 3075864).
- Zebian, S., & Denny, J. P. (2001). Integrative cognitive style in Middle Eastern and Western groups. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 32(1), 58-75.

Appendix A

IRB Approval

From: Beverly Jacobik (bjacobik) [mailto:bjacobik@memphis.edu] **On Behalf Of**

Institutional Review Board

Sent: Friday, December 19, 2014 11:23 AM

To: CYNTHIA M ALEXANDER; Beverly E Cross (becross)

Subject: IRB Approval 3520

Hello,

The University of Memphis Institutional Review Board, FWA00006815, has reviewed and approved your submission in accordance with all applicable statuses and regulations as well as ethical principles.

PI NAME: Cynthia Alexander

CO-PI:

PROJECT TITLE: Culturally Responsive School Leaderships: Exploring the

Characteristics for Urban School Leaders

FACULTY ADVISOR NAME (if applicable): Beverly Cross

IRB ID: #3520

APPROVAL DATE: 12/12/2014

EXPIRATION DATE: 12/12/2015

LEVEL OF REVIEW: Expedited

Please Note: Modifications do not extend the expiration of the original approval
Approval of this project is given with the following obligations:

1. If this IRB approval has an expiration date, an approved renewal must be in effect to continue the project prior to that date. If approval is not obtained, the

human consent form(s) and recruiting material(s) are no longer valid and any research activities involving human subjects must stop.

2. When the project is finished or terminated, a completion form must be completed and sent to the board.

3. No change may be made in the approved protocol without prior board approval, whether the approved protocol was reviewed at the Exempt, Exedited or Full Board level.

4. Exempt approval is considered to have no expiration date and no further review is necessary unless the protocol needs modification.

Approval of this project is given with the following special obligations:

Thank you,

**James P. Whelan, Ph.D.
Institutional Review Board Chair
The University of Memphis**

Note: Review outcomes will be communicated to the email address on file. This email should be considered an official communication from the UM IRB. Consent Forms are no longer being stamped as well. Please contact the IRB at IRB@memphis.edu if a letter on IRB letterhead is required.

Appendix B



Institutional
Review Board
315 Administration Bldg.
Memphis,
TN 38152-3370
Office:
901.678.2705
Fax:
901.678.2199

Consent to Participate in a Research Study

Culturally Responsive School Leaderships: Exploring the Characteristics for Urban School Leaders

WHY ARE YOU BEING INVITED TO TAKE PART IN THIS RESEARCH?

You are being invited to take part in a research study entitled, “Culturally Responsive School Leaderships: Exploring the Characteristics for Urban School Leaders”. Former NUISI participants are being invited to participate in this study. Invitees are Leaders who are currently serving in a leadership role in education, who work with populations that reflect cultural diversity among the students served within the United States, and hold advanced degrees in education, with at least seven years of experience in a culturally diverse population. If you volunteer to take part in this study, you will be one of up to 30 people to do so.

WHO IS DOING THE STUDY?

The person in charge of this study is Cynthia Alexander Mitchell, a graduate student in the Department of Instruction and Curriculum Leadership at the University of Memphis. I am being guided in this research by Dr. Beverly Cross, Advisor.

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY?

The purpose of this study is to identify characteristics that establish the tenants for culturally responsive leadership from the perspective of urban school leaders. By doing this study, I hope to explore the characteristics of culturally responsive leadership.

ARE THERE REASONS WHY YOU SHOULD NOT TAKE PART IN THIS STUDY?

There are no discomforts or stresses expected while completing your surveys. Questions will be designed to gather common characteristics among urban school leaders, and you

will not be required to answer questions that are uncomfortable to you. I am prepared to allow the option for you to skip any question that causes discomfort. You may choose to not answer an individual question or you may skip any section of the survey. Simply click “Next” at the bottom of the online survey page to move to the next question. You will not be required to respond.

WHERE IS THE STUDY GOING TO TAKE PLACE AND HOW LONG WILL IT LAST?

All surveys for this study will be conducted online.

WHAT WILL YOU BE ASKED TO DO?

If you agree to be part of the research study, you will serve on an expert panel to identify the key characteristics of Culturally Responsive Leaders. This panel of experts will serve on a Delphi panel and will be asked to complete three online surveys to gain consensus of the characteristics based on your experiences as an Urban School Leader. Each survey will be completed online. Each survey will take approximately 30 minutes to complete. The total amount of time that you will be asked to volunteer for this study is three times over a three weeks period totaling a 90 minute period. Your survey will be aggregated and the composite results will be used to create consensus. Your actual name will not be shared from the study. Survey Monkey will be used for data collection to ensure the confidentiality of all data within this study. There will be three rounds of data collection.

- ❖ **Round One: Exploring Personal Reflection on Culturally Responsive Leadership (CRL)** is based on asking open questions about your professional perspectives and experiences of CRL. You will be emailed the initial open ended survey that will take no more than 30 minutes to complete (see Appendix B).
- ❖ **Round Two: Thematic Analysis of Culturally Responsive Leadership** involves a survey using key themes from an analysis of round one result, based on a Likert-type Survey Monkey. You will be asked to rank the results from Round 1 and return it to me.
- ❖ **Round Three: Analysis of Conformed Themes** is a summary of the panel members’ responses to the Likert-scaled items associated with each leadership characteristic from the second round, which will be shared with the participants. In the third round you will complete a second Likert-type Survey Monkey, rating the characteristics of CRL. The final list of recommended characteristics will be compiled based on the responses, and be used to identify the key characteristics of CRL.

WHAT ARE THE POSSIBLE RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS?

To the best of my knowledge, the completion of the electronic survey has a minimal risk of harm. Although questions are designed to gather information about the identifying the key characteristics of culturally responsive leadership from your perspective, you will not be required to answer questions that are uncomfortable to you. Your identity will remain confidential. The study’s survey results will be available for

the panelists review during each of the three rounds of questions. Neither you nor any other individual outside of the study will be allowed to review the raw individual data from the participants or from the study.

WILL YOU BENEFIT FROM TAKING PART IN THIS STUDY?

You will not receive any personal benefit from taking part in this study.

DO YOU HAVE TO TAKE PART IN THE STUDY?

If you decide to participate in this study, you agree to willingly volunteer. No benefits or rights would be lost if you choose not to volunteer. At any time during the study, you can withdraw your participation.

IF YOU DON'T WANT TO TAKE PART IN THE STUDY, ARE THERE OTHER CHOICES?

If you do not choose to be in the study, there are no other choices except not to take part in the study.

WHAT WILL IT COST YOU TO PARTICIPATE?

There are no costs associated with taking part in the study.

WILL YOU RECEIVE ANY REWARDS FOR TAKING PART IN THIS STUDY?

You will not receive payment or a reward for taking part in the study.

WHO WILL SEE THE INFORMATION THAT YOU GIVE?

I will make every effort to keep all research records private that identify you to the extent allowed by law. Your individual information will be combined with other participants taking part in the study. When I write about this study, the information we have gathered will be combined and your individual responses will not be delineated nor specified by your name or other personal identifiers.

During each round, your personal identifiers will not be shared with Delphi panelist. Survey Monkey will be used for data collection for the study and ensures the confidentiality of all data and the protection of all study participants. Survey Monkey ensures that user data is safe, secure, and available only to me. Additionally, Survey Monkey uses the security features to protect my account such as: **User Authentication** where user data on our database is logically segregated by account-based access rules, and has unique usernames and passwords that must be entered each time a user logs on. **Data Encryption** where certain sensitive user data and account passwords, is stored in encrypted format. **User Passwords** are individual and user application passwords that

have complexity requirements. **HIPAA** enhanced security features for HIPAA-enabled accounts are also available. As an extra layer of security, the data will be temporarily stored on an external drive in a locked safety box at my residence and will be shredded five years after the data is collected. Finally, I will request that Survey Monkey delete the file from this study within a year of completion. This request will include all survey related data as well as the research data from their database. All data will be reported in aggregate form. Neither your names nor identifiers will be reported at any time.

All survey results will be held in a locked file cabinet in my home and destroyed within five years following the study. I will also keep private all research records that identify you to the extent allowed by law. An exception to confidentiality involves information causing risk to others which must be reported as required by law or if the researcher is required to provide information by a judge. Research records will be kept in a locked file where only the researcher will have access to the records.

CAN YOUR TAKING PART IN THE STUDY END EARLY?

If you decide to take part in the study you still have the right to decide at any time that you no longer want to continue. You will not be treated differently if you decide to withdraw from any part in the study. If you withdraw or the researcher withdraws you, all info gathered in previous rounds will be used in the study.

WHAT IF YOU HAVE QUESTIONS, SUGGESTIONS, CONCERNS, OR COMPLAINTS?

Please ask any questions that might come to mind now before you decide whether to accept this invitation to take part in the study. Later, if you have questions, suggestions, concerns, or complaints about the study, you can contact the investigator, Cynthia Alexander Mitchell at (901) ###-#### or cmalxndr@memphis.edu. If you have any questions about your rights as a volunteer in this research, contact the Institutional Review Board staff at the University of Memphis at 901-678-2705.

WHAT IF NEW INFORMATION IS LEARNED DURING THE STUDY THAT MIGHT AFFECT YOUR DECISION TO PARTICIPATE?

In the case where the researcher learns of new information in regards to this study and it might change your willingness to stay in this study, the information will be provided to you. If this occurs, you may be asked to sign a new informed consent form.

What happens to my privacy if I am interviewed?

Appendix C

There will be no formal interviews used for this study. All correspondence will occur via emailed surveys and electronic communications.

Invitation Letter

To: [Email]
From: "Cmalxndr@memphis.edu via surveymonkey.com"
<member@surveymonkey.com>
Subject: Please complete this survey for Cynthia
Body: Study Invitational Letter
Dear Urban Education Leader,

You are invited to be in a research study conducted by Cynthia Alexander from the University of Memphis. You are invited because you are a former NUISI participant who is currently serving in a leadership role in education, and you work with populations that reflect cultural diversity among the students served within the United States. In addition, you also hold advanced degrees in education, with at least seven years of experience in a culturally diverse population. The researcher is interested in understanding the common characteristics of Urban School Leaders.

Participation is voluntary and will be greatly appreciated. You are not obligated in any way to participate in this study. If you are interested in participating in this study, please reply with acceptance or rejection to this email. Thank you for your consideration. Finally, upon acceptance, you will receive a link to the first of three surveys.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Alexander Mitchell

Thanks for your participation!
<https://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx>

Please note: If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please click the link below, and you will be automatically removed from our mailing list.
<https://www.surveymonkey.com/optout.aspx>

Appendix D

cmalxndr@memphis.edu via [surveymonkey.com](https://www.surveymonkey.com) <member@surveymonkey.com> wrote:

Round 1 Surveys: Open ended Responses

Dear Expert Panel Participant,

Thank you for your participation in this study. In the first round of the Delphi study, you are asked complete four open-ended questions using a Likert-type scale. Please refer to the original invitation for additional information.

Here is a link to the survey:

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=YNmHjy0IT4I_2b_2b26TaVgYgA_3d_3d

This link is uniquely tied to this survey and your email address. Please do not forward this message.

Thanks for your participation!

Please note: If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please click the link below, and you will be automatically removed from our mailing list.

https://www.surveymonkey.com/optout.aspx?sm=YNmHjy0IT4I_2b_2b26TaVgYgA_3d_3d

Appendix E

Round 2 Surveys: Thematic Analysis of Culturally Responsive Leadership

To: [Email]
From: "cma1xndr@memphis.edu via surveymonkey.com"
<member@surveymonkey.com>
Subject: Round 2!!
Body: Round 2 Surveys: Thematic Analysis of Culturally Responsive Leadership
<https://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx>

Dear Expert Panel Participant,

Thank you for your participation in the first round of the modified Delphi study! Welcome to Round 2! The second round of the study involves rating a series of items developed from the Round 1 open-ended data using a Likert-type scale. Please rate the data from Round 1 as extremely important, somewhat important, or not at all important.

Here is a link to the survey:
<https://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx>

This link is uniquely tied to this survey and your email address. Please do not forward this message.

Thanks for your participation!

Please note: If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please click the link below, and you will be automatically removed from our mailing list.
<https://www.surveymonkey.com/optout.aspx>

Appendix F

Round 3 Surveys: Consensus of Characteristics

To: [Email]
From: "cmalxndr@memphis.edu via surveymonkey.com"
<member@surveymonkey.com>
Subject: Final Question-Round 3

Body:

Thank you for your participation in the first round of the modified Delphi study! Welcome to Round 2! Round Two: Thematic Analysis of Culturally Responsive Leadership involved a survey using key themes from an analysis of round one result, based on a Likert-type Survey Monkey. For Round Three: Analysis of Conformed Themes is a summary of the panel members' responses to the Likert-scaled items associated with each leadership characteristic from the second round, which will be shared with the participants. In the third round you will complete a second Likert-type Survey Monkey, rating the characteristics of CRL. The final list of recommended characteristics will be compiled based on the responses, and be used to identify the key characteristics of CRL.

Here is a link to the survey:

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx>

This link is uniquely tied to this survey and your email address. Please do not forward this message.

Thanks for your participation!

Please note: If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please click the link below, and you will be automatically removed from our mailing list.

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/optout.aspx>

Appendix G

Delphi Survey Round 1

The screenshot displays a mobile survey builder interface. At the top, a status bar shows various icons and the time 2:09 PM. Below the status bar, the survey title "Round One: Exploring Personal Reflection on Culturally Responsive Leadership (CRL)" is visible. The interface is divided into a left sidebar and a main content area.

Left Sidebar (Builder Tools):

- BUILDER**
 - Multiple Choice
 - Dropdown
 - Matrix / Rating Scale
 - Matrix of Dropdown Menus
 - Ranking
 - Net Promoter® Score
 - Single Textbox
 - Multiple Textboxes
 - Comment Box
 - Contact Information
 - Date / Time
 - Text
 - Image
 - Text A/B Test [Upgrade](#)
 - Image A/B Test [Upgrade](#)
 - Intro Page
 - New Page
 - Page Break
- QUESTION BANK**
- LOGIC**
- OPTIONS**
- THEMES**

Main Content Area (Page 2):

Round One: Exploring Personal Reflection on Culturally Responsive Leadership (CRL)

Copy of page: Delphi: Round 1 of 3
Exploring Culturally Responsive School Leadership

Educational literature often defines the characteristics of culturally responsive school leaders and school teachers with the same definition. This is partially due to limited research on culturally responsive school leaders. This is problematic because there should be a clear distinction between the roles of culturally responsive teachers versus school leaders in order to clearly establish the expectations and responsibilities of culturally responsive school leaders. Your experience will assist in exploring the particular characteristics for school leaders. Please respond to the following questions based on your experience, knowledge and ideas about Culturally Responsive Leadership.

2. 1. What do you see as the key characteristics of effective school leaders?

[Prev](#) [Next](#)

Powered by **SurveyMonkey**
Check out our [sample surveys](#) and create your own now!

[+ Add New Page](#)

Main Content Area (Page 3):

Round One: Exploring Personal Reflection on Culturally Responsive Leadership (CRL)

+ Add Page Title

3. 2. What do you see as the key characteristics of an effective culturally responsive school leader?

[Prev](#) [Next](#)

Powered by **SurveyMonkey**

Appendix G (Continued)

Delphi Survey Round 1 (pt.2)

The screenshot displays the SurveyMonkey survey builder interface. At the top, a mobile status bar shows the time as 2:09 PM and battery at 81%. The survey title is "Round One: Exploring Personal Reflection on Culturally Responsive Leadership (CRL)".

Page 4: The question is "4. 3. What distinguishes a traditional school leader from a culturally responsive leader?". It features a single text input field. Navigation buttons for "Prev" and "Next" are visible. The footer includes the SurveyMonkey logo and a promotional message: "Powered by SurveyMonkey. Check out our sample surveys and create your own now!".

Page 5: The question is "4. In order of importance, rank the factors of a culturally responsive school leader (identified by you in question 2) on a scale of 1-3, where: 1 = Not important, 2 = Important, 3 = Essential". It features a single text input field. Navigation buttons for "Prev" and "Done" are visible. The footer includes the SurveyMonkey logo and a promotional message: "Powered by SurveyMonkey. Check out our sample surveys and create your own now!".

The left sidebar contains a "BUILDER" menu with various question types: Multiple Choice, Dropdown, Matrix / Rating Scale, Matrix of Dropdown Menus, Ranking, Net Promoter® Score, Single Textbox, Multiple Textboxes, Comment Box, Contact Information, Date / Time, Text, Image, Text A/B Test (with an Upgrade button), Image A/B Test (with an Upgrade button), Intro Page, New Page, and Page Break. Below the builder menu are sections for QUESTION BANK, LOGIC, OPTIONS, and THEMES.

Appendix H

Delphi Survey Round 2

The screenshot shows a mobile application interface for creating a survey. At the top, there is a status bar with icons for home, back, and search, along with system information: 4G LTE, 79% battery, and 2:19 PM. Below the status bar, the app title is "Round 2: Thematic Analy...", with a "Last saved just now" indicator and buttons for "Upgrade", "Preview & Test", "Print", and "Next".

The main interface is divided into two sections. On the left is a "BUILDER" sidebar with a list of question types: Multiple Choice, Dropdown, Matrix / Rating Scale, Matrix of Dropdown Menus, Ranking, Net Promoter® Score, Single Textbox, Multiple Textboxes, Comment Box, Contact Information, Date / Time, Text, Image, Text A/B Test (with an "Upgrade" button), Image A/B Test (with an "Upgrade" button), Intro Page, New Page, and Page Break. Below this are sections for "QUESTION BANK", "LOGIC", "OPTIONS", and "THEMES".

The main content area is titled "PAGE 2" and "Round 2: Thematic Analysis of Culturally Responsive Leadership". It contains a list of 10 survey questions, each with a 3-point Likert scale. The questions are:

1. How important is "Self Reflection" for Culturally Responsive Leaders?
Extremely Important Somewhat Important Not at all Important
2. How important is "Vision" for Culturally Responsive Leaders?
Extremely Important Somewhat Important Not Important
3. How important is "Tolerance" for Culturally Responsive Leaders?
Extremely Important Somewhat Important Not Important
4. How important is "Inclusiveness" for Culturally Responsive Leaders?
Extremely Important Somewhat Important Not Important
5. How important is "Cultural awareness" for Culturally Responsive Leaders?
Extremely Important Somewhat Important Not Important
6. How important is "Sensitivity" for Culturally Responsive Leaders?
Extremely Important Somewhat Important Not Important
7. How important is "Equity" for Culturally Responsive Leaders?
Extremely Important Somewhat Important Not Important
8. How important is "Committed" for Culturally Responsive Leaders?
Extremely Important Somewhat Important Not Important
9. How important is "Motivation" for Culturally Responsive Leaders?
Extremely Important Somewhat Important Not Important
10. How important is "Diversity" for Culturally Responsive Leaders?
Extremely Important Somewhat Important Not Important

Each question has a horizontal scale with three radio buttons corresponding to the response options.

Appendix H (Continued)

Delphi Survey Round 2 (pt.2)

- Multiple Textboxes
- Comment Box
- Contact Information
- Date / Time
- Text
- Image
- Text A/B Test Upgrade
- Image A/B Test Upgrade
- Intro Page
- New Page
- Page Break

QUESTION BANK ?

LOGIC ?

OPTIONS ?

THEMES ?

11. How important is "Ethics" for Culturally Responsive Leaders?

Extremely Important Somewhat Important Not Important

12. How important is "Shared leadership "for Culturally Responsive Leaders?

Extremely Important Somewhat Important Not Important

13. How important is "Charisma" for Culturally Responsive Leaders?

Extremely Important Somewhat Important Not Important

14. How important is "Instructional Leadership "for Culturally Responsive Leaders?

Extremely Important Somewhat Important Not Important

Prev Done

Powered by [SurveyMonkey](#)
Check out our [sample surveys](#) and create your own now!

Appendix I

Delphi Survey Round 3

The screenshot shows the SurveyMonkey mobile app interface. At the top, the status bar displays various icons and the time 2:21 PM. The browser address bar shows the URL v.surveymonkey.com/. The SurveyMonkey logo and navigation menu are visible at the top of the app. The main content area is titled 'Round Three: Analysis of ...' and includes tabs for 'Summary', 'Design Survey', 'Collect Responses', and 'Analyze Results'. A sidebar on the left contains a 'BUILDER' menu with options like 'QUESTION BANK', 'LOGIC', 'OPTIONS', and 'THEMES'. The 'OPTIONS' menu is expanded, showing settings for Logo, Survey Title, Exit Link, Progress Bar, Page Titles, Page Numbers, Question Numbers, Required Asterisks, Footer, and Language. The main content area displays a survey question: '1. Rank the identified characteristics that met the criteria of consensus based on results of Round 2. If you feel that one of the below is not important, please mark n/a for the characteristic.' Below the question is a list of characteristics with radio buttons for 'N/A' selection: Self Reflective, Visionary, Inclusive, Culturally Aware, Ethical, Shared Leadership, Instructional Leader, Tolerance, Equitable, Sensitive, and Committed. A 'Done' button is located at the bottom of the question area. At the very bottom of the screen, there is a '+ Add New Page' button.