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Chapter 1: Introduction

Problem Statement

According to the National Center for Education Statistics (2002), only 20% of teachers in the United States expressed confidence in meeting the needs of limited English proficient or culturally diverse students. Only twenty-seven percent of teachers from schools with more than 50 percent minority enrollment believed they were well prepared to teach students with limited English proficiency or students from diverse backgrounds. Diverse backgrounds are not limited to race, but include factors such as socio-economic status, ethnicity, religion, and varied abilities of children. “Effectively working within the cultural context of a diverse community or with individuals from a diverse cultural or ethnic background is cultural competence” (Campinha-Bacote, 1994, pp.1-2). Cultural competence focuses on the continual acquisition of knowledge, skills, and self-awareness, which can allow one to interact with people from various cultural backgrounds (Diller & Moule, 2005; Howard, 1999; McAlister and Irvine, 2000).

Research demonstrates that educators’ insufficient skills in working with students from diverse backgrounds can negatively impact student learning (Gay, 2003; Ladson-Billings, 2001; Singleton & Linton, 2006). There may be much to gain, then, from studying the levels of cultural competency that educators employ in their interactions with students.

Theoretical Rationale

Much of the existing research examining cultural competence focuses on health care, human services, and counseling and has concluded that increasing levels of cultural
competence among practitioners has a positive impact on patient and client outcomes in health and human services (Bentacourt, Green, Carillio, & Anankeh-Firempong II, 2003; Davis, 1997; Isaacs & Benjamin, 1991). Even though researchers have established the importance of cultural competence in those fields, its significance is just beginning to emerge in the field of education (Diller & Moule, 2005).

In education, limited research has established the importance of cultural competence in educational settings and helped to identify important variables that may be associated with cultural competence (Boyd, 2004; Riehl, 2000; Ryan, 2003). These variables include teachers' levels of education, experiences with other cultures, ethnicities, and levels of training in diversity and multiculturalism. Given that various factors and experiences influence cultural competence, the acquisition of related knowledge and skills is a process which can develop over time (Bennett, 1993).

Several scholars have proposed use of Bennett's Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) as a framework from which to examine cultural competence among educators (Diller & Moule, 2005; Mahon, 2003; Van Hook, 2004). The DMIS is widely used in both educational and corporate settings due to its ability to measure individual levels of cultural competence on a developmental continuum (Jackson, 2006). Bennett's (1993) DMIS is used in this study to examine cultural competence levels of school principals. This model provides a framework for the development of individual self-awareness along a continuum of sensitivity to cultural differences. This sensitivity is referred to as intercultural understanding, and the term intercultural is synonymous to cultural.
The DMIS is based on three assumptions: (a) intercultural awareness is learned and is not innate, (b) people and cultures are not stagnant and are vastly different, and (c) intercultural competence refers to the individual's personal experience, which enables one to obtain a better understanding and interpretation of intercultural interactions (Klak & Martin, 2003). As one's own experience of cultural difference becomes more complex and sophisticated, one's competence in intercultural relations increases. Since the DMIS is developmental, different life experiences may facilitate the movement through the six stages (Bennett, 1993).

The six stages of development range from ethnocentric to ethno-relative (Bennett, 1993). Each of the six stages represents a distinct cultural "worldview" (See Figure 1-1). The DMIS identifies an individual's outlook on the world, specifically how a person organizes and constructs cultural experiences. Changes in attitude or behavior are not described by the DMIS, but changes in cognitive development are described in the six "worldview" stages (Hammer et al. 2003).

The ethnocentric continuum includes three stages (denial, defense, and minimization) in which individuals view cultural differences in relation to their own cultural standards. One's own culture is experienced as central when confronted with cultural difference. This makes it difficult to understand differences in and among other cultures.

Stage one is denial of cultural difference and is described as the inability to see cultural differences. This stage is characterized by the assumption that there are no real differences among people from other cultures. People in this stage have lived in homogenous communities with little or no exposure to people from different cultural
groups (Paige et al., 2003). Denial can be a result of unintentional isolation due to geographical circumstances and living in remote area or intentional separation from other cultural groups to maintain segregation (Hammer et al., 2003).

The second stage, defense of cultural difference, is when one views cultural differences with a negative outlook toward those who are culturally different. In this stage, a person may deem personal culture as superior to others and may be threatened by other cultures. This negativity can lead to criticism other cultures and acceptance of negative stereotypes of different cultures. A sub-stage of defense is reversal, which refers to an individual who has adopted another culture and views this second culture as superior to the original (Paige et al., 2003).

Stage three, minimization of cultural difference, emphasizes the similarity of people and the commonalities inside humanity. This also is known as the “color-blind” stage because differences are minimized and undervalued. Persons in this stage tend to categorize others based on similarities rather than differences. Minimization is the precursor to the ethno-relative continuum and is a transitional stage because one must move beyond the ethnocentric “worldview” to achieve higher levels of cultural competence.

The ethnorelative continuum also includes three stages acceptance, adaptation, and integration). According to Bennett’s (1993) continuum, ethno-relativism is the ability to function at a high level of relational and social involvement in a non-native culture. At this level, individuals understand that cultures can only be viewed in relation to other cultures. Three stages in the ethno-relative continuum constitute stages four, five, and six discussed further below.
Stage four, *acceptance* of cultural difference, is the ability to recognize and appreciate cultural differences. Individuals in this stage do not perceive cultural differences as threatening. There are two major levels to *acceptance*, which include behavioral relativism and value relativism. These sub-stages characterize an *acceptance* of the belief that behaviors and values vary across groups and cultural contexts (Hammer et al., 2003).

*Adaptation* to cultural difference, Bennett’s (1993) stage five, consists of seeing cultural categories as flexible, demonstrated by an improvement in cross-cultural communication. At this stage, an individual is able to apply the knowledge and skills of interacting effectively with people from different backgrounds. The adaptive individual makes a proactive effort to use intercultural skills to communicate and relate in an effective manner. Two sub-stages of *adaptation* include empathy and pluralism. Empathy allows people to shift their frame of reference and include different cultural “worldviews”. Pluralism involves the addition of multiple frames of reference resulting in an expanded “worldview” (Paige et al., 2003).

The sixth and final stage, *integration* of cultural difference, Bennett (1993) defines as an internalization of multiple frames of reference and the maintenance of a heterogeneous identity. In this stage, an individual is able to adapt to two or more cultures without rejecting either one. This orientation is usually found in individuals who have lived in two or more cultures. They are able to make cultural shifts as the need arises.
Denial | Defense | Minimization | Acceptance | Adaptation | Integration

Ethnocentric Stages | Ethnorelative Stages

Experience of Difference

*Bennett's Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity*

Bennett's model also specifies the necessary steps and experiences for movement to higher stages. Knowing the levels of cultural competence among educators can identify readiness and openness to the implementation of multicultural education and diversity programs (Dukes & Ming, 2006; McAllister & Irvine, 2000). A critical piece that is overlooked in the push for multicultural education is the evaluation of educators' levels of readiness to work effectively with students from diverse backgrounds. Levels of readiness can be determined by the levels of cultural competence among educators (Diller & Moule, 2005; Howard, 1999).

In order to make the levels of cultural competence operational, Hammer (1998) developed the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) basing its theoretical foundation on Bennett's DMIS. The IDI measures individual levels of cultural competence along Bennett's six-stage continuum. The IDI will be discussed in further detail in the Methodology section.

The IDI represents one way to measure individual levels of cultural competence to assess the need for strategic responses to current changes in student populations. The assessment of levels of individual cultural competence may be useful in teacher education programs, professional development activities, and the development of teaching standards. According to Hammer et al. (2003, p. 441), higher scores on the IDI can
predict "greater job accomplishment in culturally different environments, lower levels of prejudice and discrimination against culturally different others, and less resistance to diversity initiatives in organizations."

Student populations of public schools in the United States are growing more ethnically and culturally heterogeneous, requiring schools to address students' diverse social, physical, and educational needs. The number of second-language learners, students with disabilities, students of color, and students living in poverty continues to increase (Haycock, 2001). This expanding student diversity challenges the teaching force where significantly less cultural diversity is found (Haycock, 2001; Singleton & Linton, 2006).

As student populations become more diverse, the demographic of school leaders and teachers remains predominantly homogenous. Current national data (NCES, 2002) suggests that only 27% of school principals are Black (non-Hispanic) and Hispanic. At the same time, the number of teachers of color (Black, Hispanic, Asian, and Native American) is declining while White (non-Hispanic) teachers represented 92% of public school teachers and 85% of the graduates of teacher preparation programs in 1999-2000 (NCES, 2002). All educators, regardless of racial background, must be prepared to teach students from a variety of backgrounds.

An academic achievement gap exists between White (non-Hispanic) students and students of color (Black, Hispanic, and Native American). Despite comparable economic backgrounds, students of color score less well on academic achievement tests, compared with their White (non-Hispanic) classmates. By the end of eighth grade, Black (non-Hispanic) students are two years behind their White (non-Hispanic) counterparts, and this
gap widens by the twelfth grade (Haycock, 2001). Upon graduation, Black (non-Hispanic) students' skills match those of eighth grade White (non-Hispanic) students (National Center for Education Statistics, 2002). New York State has the largest achievement gap in the nation, with only 45% of Black (non-Hispanic) students graduating from high school compared to an 81% graduation rate among White (non-Hispanic) students (NCES, 2002). In spite of these discouraging statistics, however, there are some schools that are closing the achievement gap. Williams (2003) identifies three characteristics of schools that have been successful in closing the achievement gap. These characteristics include smaller class sizes, quality teaching, and culturally relevant curriculum.

According to Lindsey, Roberts, and Campbelljones (2005), responses to student diversity can range from cultural destructiveness to cultural proficiency. These responses are on a cultural proficiency continuum representing the highest level of response. Cultural destructiveness represents a negative response that can interfere with student learning in a way that impedes academic success.

Multicultural education is an attempt to address the needs of students of color and to close the achievement gap that exists between students of color and White (non-Hispanic) students (Banks, 2001; Bennett, 2003; Gay, 2003). The goal of multicultural education is to provide educational equality for under-represented groups. Its roots lie in the 1960's civil rights struggle of African Americans seeking social justice during the Civil Rights Movement (Banks, 2002). During the 1970s, other groups such as women and people with disabilities joined the quest for educational reform and equity. In the 1980s, research and scholarship on multicultural education increased in an effort to
provide more depth and understanding of the concept. Several scholars developed various frameworks from which to examine education and underrepresented groups.

Banks (1994) was one of the first to investigate schools in the context of multiculturalism. He emphasized the importance of investigating and potentially changing educational policies, teachers' attitudes, instructional materials, assessment methods, counseling, and teaching styles (Banks, 2002). Teacher education and curriculum integration are two key areas that have been influenced by Banks. His multicultural education framework includes five dimensions that can be used with various types of diversity orientations. These dimensions include (a) content integration, (b) knowledge construction, (c) prejudice reduction, (d) equity pedagogy, and (e) empowering school culture. Banks' (1994) work on multicultural education serves as the theoretical foundation of cultural diversity in education.

Multicultural education is considered "...integral to improving the academic success of students of color and preparing all youths for democratic citizenship in a pluralistic society" (Gay, 2003, p. 30). However, the outcomes of multicultural education programs and initiatives have been inconclusive because they have focused mainly on curricular additions rather than transformative practices (Gay, 2003; Gorski, 1998; Nieto, 2005). Banks (1994) referred to such approaches as additive because they lack the depth and commitment of a more integrated approach. According to Dukes and Ming (2006), educators do not consistently and effectively use the strategies and practices linked to multicultural education because educators lack training and have limited experiences with people from other cultures (Dukes & Ming, 2006). Another barrier to the implementation
of multicultural education has been teacher perceptions and attitudes (Diller & Moule, 2005; Howard, 1999).

Howard discussed the concept of cultural competence as the “inner work” to refer to the personal transformation necessary for diversity programs and multicultural education to be meaningful. Howard (1999) stated that there is a significant lack of preparation in this area, despite the expectation that educators work effectively with diverse populations. Overwhelmingly, research indicates the importance of recognizing cultural backgrounds in teaching students of color since the lack of knowledge and understanding of cultural differences can negatively impact student learning (Gay, 2003; Ladson-Billings, 2001; Singleton & Linton, 2006).

The importance of cultural competence among educators is also emerging in the development of national and state standards. The National Council on the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) recognizes the important role of principals in developing and maintaining cultural competence in the schools as illustrated in its “Leadership Standard 7.4” which states that school leaders must “…promote multicultural awareness, gender sensitivity, and racial and ethnic appreciation” (NCATE, 1995). The National Council on the Accreditation of Teacher Education (1995) expectations for teacher education programs also addresses the need to prepare culturally competent educators.

Some state education departments have begun including cultural competence as one of the performance standards required for teachers and administrators (Smith, 2004). New York State’s “Educational Leadership Assessment Framework for School Building Leaders” identified cultural diversity as a significant component of recognizing effective instruction and collaboration (New York State Education Department, 2006). In 2007,
Oregon became the first state to require teachers and administrators to demonstrate a minimal level of cultural competency to maintain licensure (Catsillo, 2004). Several other states, including Iowa and Minnesota, have begun the process of including cultural competence as an important component of education preparation and practice (Oregon Department of Education, 2004).

A report from the Institute for Educational Leadership claimed that in order to be an effective educational leader, one must be a culturally competent leader (IEL, 2005). This report also identified five themes that are important in the preparation and support of culturally competent school leaders. These themes are: (a) educational leaders are not effective if they are not culturally competent, (b) culturally competent leaders work to diminish patterns of discrimination as well as their own biases, (c) culturally competent leaders consistently build relationships with families and communities, (d) culturally competent leaders need preparation and support, and (e) educational policies must incorporate cultural competence standards. These themes are recurrent in the research on cultural diversity and school leadership.

It is important for school leaders to develop knowledge and skills to help teachers meet the needs of diverse populations of students so that the school environment promotes cultural acceptance as well as sensitivity in order to achieve academic success for all students (Lindsey et al., 1999; Riehl, 2000). There is limited literature on the specific leadership qualities necessary to lead schools during this time of demographic change. Consequently, cultural competence is seen as a common set of tools that can be an important asset for school leaders (Diller & Moule, 2005).
Overall, the changing demographics and the cultural discrepancy between educators and students in urban settings has been the impetus for the current focus on cultural competence in education. The consistent gap in academic achievement between White students and students of color, along with the uneven success of multicultural education efforts, has prompted research on cultural competence and its potential impact on education. This study may contribute to the emerging body of knowledge through examination of the relationship between levels of cultural competence among school principals in an urban community and the organizational cultural competence of the schools they lead.

Significance of the Study

This investigation may contribute to the knowledge base on cultural competence in an educational setting. Exploration of the levels of cultural competence among school principals and their schools may add to the emerging body of knowledge and provide information from which to inform practice, policy, programs, and professional development.

Emerging research on cultural competence has focused primarily on teachers as opposed to school administrators (Boyd, 2004; Riehl, 2000). There is a limited amount of research on school administrators' attitudes toward cultural diversity consisting of interviews with small groups of participants, but these studies provide very little information about levels of cultural competence (Lucas, 1997; McAllister & Irvine, 2000; McCray, Wright & Beachum, 2004; Walker & Dimmock, 2005).

This study's investigation of cultural competence will examine the relationship between the principals' self-reported levels of cultural competence using Hammer's
Intercultural Development Inventory (Hammer, 1998) and the schools’ levels of organizational cultural competence as measured by the Checklist Measure of Organizational Cultural Competence (Darnell & Kuperminc, 2006). The results may establish a baseline of current levels of cultural competence among school principals and the possible congruence between administrators’ characteristics and those of their schools. Additionally, the levels of organizational cultural competence may provide information about the principals’ ability to promote cultural competence and meet the needs of its diverse student populations on an organizational level. This information is critical to establishing professional development needs as well as in examining existing policy and practices associated with cultural diversity efforts.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this proposed study is twofold. The first objective is to examine the levels of cultural competence among 58 principals in the Rochester (New York) City School District (RCSD) as measured by Hammer’s (1998) Intercultural Development Inventory. The RCSD is in the final stages of a diversity initiative; thus, it is important to examine the levels of cultural competence among school leaders given that they are primarily responsible for the implementation of educational programming in their schools.

The RCSD superintendent launched a five-year Diversity Initiative during the 2005-2006 school year. The goal of the plan was to achieve a working environment in the district that was more inclusive, reflective of the student population, and capable of meeting students’ needs more effectively. The elements of the plan included developing
goals to foster diversity and inclusion through hiring practices, instructional initiatives, and professional development.

Examining the levels of cultural competence may provide useful information in the assessment of implementation efforts regarding the diversity initiative. It also may identify necessary steps to support the district in reaching the above-mentioned goals.

The second objective is to study the relationship between the levels of cultural competence among school principals and the respective schools’ level of organizational cultural competence as measured by the Checklist Measure of Organizational Cultural Competence (Darnell & Kuperminc, 2006). Cultural Competence theory and research suggests that there is a positive relationship between the individual cultural competence and organizational cultural competence (Cross, Bazron, Dennis, & Isaacs, 1989; Darnell & Kuperminc, 2006; Lum, 2007; Nybell & Gray, 2004; Yee & Tersi, 2002).

Various sources of school leadership theory (Greenfield, 1981; Sergiovanni, 2000; Smith, 2004) suggested that school leaders influence their organization. Examining individual levels of cultural competence and their organizational levels may provide information regarding the role and potential influence of school principals. Scholars have asserted that the levels of individual and organizational cultural competence are linked and can influence one another (Darnell & Kuperminc, 2006; Nybell & Gray, 2004; Yee & Tersi, 2002). The study proposed here will examine this relationship between principals and the schools they lead.

Chapter 1 identified the problem to be studied, the purpose of the study, the significance of the study, the theoretical rationale, and research questions. Chapter 2 provides a literature review that focuses on the role of the principal, cultural competence,
the developmental nature of cultural competence, and organizational cultural competence. This literature review provides background on the problem of cultural competence in education and the conceptual framework used to address the problem. Chapter 3 details the research methodology used for data collection. Chapter 4 outlines the results of the study based on quantitative analyses including descriptive statistics, correlations, ANOVAs and t-tests. In Chapter 5, the findings of this study are discussed in relation to practice, theory, and research. Recommendations are provided for professional practice and future research.

**Research Questions**

This study is an investigation of the perceived level of cultural competency among 60 urban school principals from the Rochester City School District in Rochester, New York. The following research questions will guide this study:

1. What are the levels of cultural competence among elementary and secondary school principals?
2. What is each school's level of organizational cultural competence?
3. What is the relationship between the levels of cultural competence among school principals, serving two or more years as principal of their school and the respective schools' levels of organizational cultural competence?
Definition of Terms

Achievement Gap: The recognized achievement difference between White and Asian students in comparison to Black (non-Hispanic), Hispanic and Native American students; recognized by a disparity in test scores as well as grades, special education enrollment, vocational educational enrollment, drop-out rates and college enrollment (Haycock, 2001).

Critical mass: The point at which students of color feel comfortable on predominantly White campuses (Green, 1988). This concept has been used in other fields to define adequate representation of staff of color (Ponterotto et al., 1995).

Culture: A lens through which life is perceived. Each culture, through its differences (in language, values, personality and family patterns, world view, sense of time and space, rules of interaction and other considerations that generate a phenomenologically different experience of reality). Thus, the same situation (such as the first day of school in a kindergarten classroom) may be experienced very differently, depending on the cultural backgrounds of individual students and teachers (Diller & Moule, 2005, p. 5). Culture encompasses behavioral patterns, intergenerational passages, and particular group life experiences (Lum, 2007, p. 5).

Cultural competence: For the purposes of this study, the definition developed by the Oregon Department of Education is used due to its comprehensiveness and utility in the educational setting. “Cultural competence is based on commitment to social justice and equity. Cultural competence is a developmental process occurring at individual and system levels that evolves and is sustained over time. It requires that individuals and organizations:
1. Have a defined set of values and principles, demonstrated behaviors, attitudes, policies, and structures that enable them to work effectively in a cross-cultural manner.

2. Demonstrate the capacity to (a) value diversity, (b) engage in self-reflection, (c) facilitate effectively (manage) the dynamics of difference, (d) acquire institutional cultural knowledge, (e) adapt to the diversity and the cultural contexts of the students, families, and communities they serve, and (f) support actions that foster equity of opportunity and services.

3. Institutionalize, incorporate, evaluate, and advocate the above in all aspects of leadership, policy-making, administration, practice, and service delivery while systematically involving staff, students, families, key stakeholders, and communities.” (The Oregon Department of Education (2004) based on a cultural competency summit of 100 education stakeholders, p. 15).

**Diversity:** A variety of cultures and ethnicities, including language, but also may include religion, social class, gender, sexuality, age, and exceptionality.

**Ethnocentrism:** A viewpoint “that one’s own culture is experienced as central to reality in some way” (Hammer & Bennett, 1998, p.12).

**Ethnorelative:** A viewpoint “that one’s own culture is experienced in the context of other cultures” (Hammer & Bennett, 1998, p. 12).

**Intercultural competence:** The ability of individuals to recognize, appreciate, and communicate effectively in cultural contexts different from their own.
Intercultural Sensitivity: Ability of individuals to accommodate cultural differences into their own reality as guided by their worldview, behavior, and attitudes (Bennet, 1993).

Students of color: Students who are non-White; classified by school districts as “minority;” most students of color in urban schools are classified as Hispanic or African American (Orfield & Lee, 2006).
Chapter 2: Review of Literature

This review of related literature presents pertinent research supporting an investigation of the levels of cultural competence among school principals and their respective schools' levels of organizational cultural competence. This review of literature will provide an overview of the role of the school principal and research related to the study of cultural competence at the individual and organizational levels.

The Role of the Principal

The principal is the highest level of leadership in a school setting. As a school leader, the principal has a variety of responsibilities including managing the budget, plant maintenance, scheduling, supervision of personnel, public relations, school safety, and, most importantly, coordinating the instructional program (Lockwood, 1998).

The traditional role of the principal has evolved over time. Principals in the 1950s were viewed as administrators who managed schools. The term “change agent” was introduced between the 1960s and 1970s, along with higher expectations for principals (Lockwood, 1998). The Effective Schools Movement, which began in the early 1980s, identified schools successful in educating all students regardless of their socioeconomic status or family background (Levine & Lezotte, 1990). The Effective Schools research has shown that effective schools were highly correlated with seven school-based factors (leadership, teacher expectations, school climate, and consistent feedback to students, mastery of basic skills, parental and community involvement, and clear school mission). The principal's role evolved into an “instructional leader” working directly with teachers.
to change the instructional environment in order to increase student achievement (Levine & Lezotte, 1990; Lockwood, 1998).

According to Sergiovanni (2000), the principal is the foundation of instructional leadership at the school level. School leadership is second only to the influences of classroom instruction in improving student learning (Leithwood, Seashore-Louis, Anderson & Wahlstrom, 2004). Over the past decade, the role of the school principal has evolved to focus more on instructional leadership and school reform in addition to the traditional managerial role (Buckner, 2007).

A review of research on school leaders in culturally and ethnically diverse school settings reveals that administrators are required to take on the role of a culturally competent principal despite levels of preparation and experiences. Riehl (2000) examined the role of administrators in the implementation of cultural diversity practices over a period of 33 years. She identified three broad administrative tasks exemplifying inclusive administrative practice in diverse schools: (a) fostering new meaning about diversity, (b) promoting inclusive practices within schools, and (c) building connections between schools and communities. It is necessary for school leaders to engage in each task as they work to serve diverse students. Riehl (2000) highlights specific examples of how administrators have accomplished these tasks in ethnically and culturally diverse settings.

Task one, fostering new meanings, refers to the development of open and honest discourse about demographic patterns in schools and the issues of justice or equality. To foster new meanings about diversity, school leaders must be willing to discuss cultural and ethnic differences as understood within the school community. Riehl (2000) acknowledged that this type of discourse is difficult to develop in a school setting, but it
is a prerequisite for creating a new understanding of diversity. This discourse is difficult because schools tend to promote focus on similarities and assimilation rather than focusing on differences between groups (Riehl, 2000). Some theorists have stated that “race” should be specifically addressed (Krovetz & Manny, 2005; Singleton & Linton, 2006).

In the text, *Courageous Conversations about Race*, Singleton & Linton (2006) argued that the discussion of race rather than language, poverty, or disability may lead to more meaningful conversations about equity and closing the racial achievement gap. They further assert that race plays a primary role in the existence of the achievement gap, and dialogue among educators must include the topic of race. They pose the question, “...how will educators who are the racial inverse of the emerging student population arrive at a new and necessary level of cultural proficiency and instructional effectiveness?” (2).

Riehl’s (2000) task two, promoting inclusive practices within schools, requires that leaders also promote inclusive practices within the school (Riehl, 2000). Principals can accomplish this task by creating policies and practices addressing the needs of diverse students. Changing instructional practices to include culturally responsive teaching and providing diversity training to teachers are behaviors demonstrating a principal’s engagement in task two (Riehl, 2000). Research demonstrates the importance of using culturally relevant teaching practices and a culturally responsive curriculum with students of color (Gay, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 1994). These teaching practices not only support student learning, but also help educators develop a deeper understanding and appreciation of students and their communities (Nieto, 2004).
Building relationships with the community is the third task for school leaders. Particularly in communities represented by low socio-economic status, a school may not meet the various needs of students as an isolated entity. According to Riehl (2000), school leaders must garner the various services needed to support their students' needs, including students' health and social-emotional well-being. School leaders also must demonstrate support to the outside community by becoming involved in community initiatives that improve the community in which the school is located. Riehl considers this task the most under-examined and complicated aspect of cultural competence due to a lack of research on school partnerships.

Each of the three tasks discussed above is important for leaders of culturally and ethnically diverse schools. Although these tasks are broad and challenging, they are specific practices in which a leader must engage in to be effective. As identified by Riehl (2000), these practices are consistent with subsequent research on the role of school leaders in culturally and ethnically diverse schools (Gardiner & Enmoto, 2006).

Gardiner and Enmoto (2006) examined the role of urban school principals as multicultural leaders. They used a cross-case analysis to investigate the role of six White urban school principals as multicultural leaders in one school district. Principals were selected by the growth of demographic changes in their student populations as well as their ability to bring leadership experience of three years or more to their workplace. The researchers used interviews, observations, and school-based documents to compose case studies based on the experiences of each principal. Riehl's (2000) three key tasks served as a framework to assess the principals' ability to demonstrate "multicultural leadership." Multicultural leadership was defined as leadership that involved all three key tasks.
Their findings showed that to varying degrees, the six principals engaged in Riehl’s three “multicultural” tasks. The second multicultural leadership task, “promoting inclusive practices” was the least evident among the six principals. The principals acknowledged that they were not able to identify specific ways of demonstrating this task on a consistent basis. Upon further questioning, they indicated that they had little understanding of culturally responsive instruction and multicultural education, but were interested in learning about them (Gardiner & Enmoto, 2006). All principals reported a lack of preparation and training in multicultural educational practices. Their knowledge was developing as they gained more on-the-job experience. The researchers considered the principals’ effectiveness as multicultural leaders to be transitional or emergent and not fully effective because they expressed an inability to support teachers in learning new ways to meet the needs of students from diverse backgrounds. Even though principals may not be prepared for their roles as leaders in diverse school settings, the cultural context of the schools requires that they respond to multicultural issues on a daily basis.

One of the six principals in the Gardiner and Enmoto’s (2006) study expressed disinterest in promoting diversity in school. This finding is consistent with McCray, Wright, and Beachum’s (2004) findings that some school principals do not hold positive views about multicultural education.

McCray et al., (2004) examined perceptions of multicultural education among 126 principals. The principals from smaller rural schools tended to believe that multicultural education was divisive. The results showed a significant difference in the principals’ perceptions relative to the size of their schools (F5, 120 = 2.656, p < .05). The principals from the larger urban and suburban schools expressed more positive views about
multicultural education, a finding consistent with research on principals from urban and suburban schools with larger student populations (Ryan, 1999; Walker & Dimmock, 2005).

Walker and Dimmock (2005) investigated five principals leading culturally and ethnically diverse schools at both the elementary and secondary levels. These principals were selected because they had established a reputation of demonstrating effective leadership of “multi-ethnic” schools. The results showed that although the principals expressed frustration with the challenges of diversity, they were able to engage in proactive practices, believing that they could make a difference. Similar to Gardiner and Enmoto’s (2006) findings, principals were least effective in addressing diversity in classroom and teaching practices.

The research on principals as leaders in ethnically and culturally diverse settings shows that principals address various issues of diversity as part of their daily practice. Even though they are expected to demonstrate this type of leadership, many express a lack of preparation (Barbara & Krovetz, 2005; McCray et al, 2004) as well as frustration with their lack of experience in this area (Ryan, 2004; Walker & Dimmock, 2005). Some principals, nonetheless, feel that they are successful in culturally diverse settings (Walker & Dimmock, 2005). An assessment of the levels of cultural competence will provide information regarding various levels of this phenomenon as well as the type of training and support needed to assist school leaders with this challenge.

Research on Cultural Competence

The history of cultural competence began with social work. Lum, (2007) credits Green (1982) and Pinderghuges (1989) for introducing cultural competence to the field of
social work. In 1980, the American Psychological Association (APA) used cultural competence as one of its key components for describing competent social work practice (Lum, 2007). Cross et al. (1989) established the first comprehensive model in the development of a cultural competence continuum for an organizational system of care (Lum, 2007). Subsequent paradigms have been established based on this model.

In the early 1990s, a framework for culturally competent counseling was developed, and the APA committed to multicultural competence relative to ethnicity, language and culture. Currently, the concept of cultural competence establishes national standards in the academic and professional disciplines of medicine, psychology, social work, and most recently, education.

Measures of cultural competence are complex constructs that have existed for social service, health, and other fields, but have grown to include measures for educators as well (Diller & Moule, 2005). Research on cultural competence has focused primarily on health care, human services, and counseling. Previous research found that increasing levels of cultural competence can have a positive impact on patient and client outcomes (Bentancourt, Green, Carillio, & Anankeh-Firempong II, 2003; Davis, 1997; Isaacs & Benjamin, 1991). In education, research on cultural competence is limited and focused primarily on classroom teachers (Boyd, 2004; Diller & Moule, 2005; Riehl, 2000; Ryan, 2003).

Various frameworks and instruments have been used to examine levels of cultural competence among teachers (McAllister & Irvine, 2000; Van Hook, 2004). Bennett's Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) can be instrumental in preparing and supporting culturally competent teachers (McAllister & Irvine, 2000; Van
McAllister and Irvine (2000) reviewed three different process-oriented models that have been used to describe and measure racial identity and cross-cultural competence and cited Bennett's DMIS (1993) as useful in identifying and assessing stages of cultural competency development. Similarly, Van Hook (2004) emphasized the use of the DMIS and the IDI (Hammer, 1998) with educators as a pre- and post-assessment of training and course content for pre-service teachers. Although limited, there is research using the IDI to assess the cultural competence of teachers (Mahon, 2003).

Mahon (2003) examined the levels of cultural competence among 155 teachers from eight different school districts in Ohio. Mahon used Hammer's IDI (1998) to measure the cultural competency levels of 17 teachers. Mahon found that the majority of teachers fell into the ethnocentric category and tended to minimize cultural differences. Not one teacher obtained scores to place him or her within the ethno-relative stage, the stage indicating an acknowledgement and respect for cultural differences. (See Figure 1.1)

According to Hammer (1998), the ethnocentric stage hosts individuals who do not understand the importance of cultural differences. The ethnocentric stages are characterized by denial, defense, and minimization of cultural differences. This type of perspective can be a barrier to developing relationships with students and families as well as limiting student learning (Ferguson, 2000; Gay, 2003; Lindsey, Robins, & Terrell, 1999). According to Lindsey et al. (1999), acknowledging cultural differences, rather than ignoring them, is the goal of cultural proficiency. Minimization of cultural differences is perceived to be one of the main barriers in implementing culturally relevant
teaching practices (Banks, 1994; Gay, 2003). According to Ferguson (2000), an ethnocentric “worldview” can be detrimental to children and affect their motivation to learn. Not seeing color or race is ignoring someone’s identity, which can interfere with meeting individual student needs (Banks, 1994; Gay, 2003; McAllister and Irvine, 2000). Mahon (2003) recommended improving university preparation and professional development to increase cultural competency among teachers.

Other researchers have found a lack of cultural competence among teachers (Boyd, 2004). Boyd (2004) used the Multicultural Education & Cultural Competency Assessment (MECCA) (Boyd, 2004) to examine multicultural knowledge, skills, attitudes, beliefs, and expectations of 162 pre-service teachers. The majority of the teachers earned low averages as measured by the MECCA in the area of Multicultural Education Knowledge and Skills. Boyd (2004) concluded that teachers were in the developing stages of multicultural competency and were not familiar with multicultural education approaches.

Research highlights the lack of cultural competence among teachers. The limited research on principals, however, suggests varying levels of cultural competence among school leaders (Allen, 2004; Smith, 2004). Studies have been exploratory, investigating specific strategies used by principals to lead in a culturally and ethnically diverse setting. Existing research has not empirically measured the level of cultural competence among school principals.

Smith (2004) studied 11 principals from high-performing and high-poverty schools to identify culturally competent practices by principals to develop a positive school climate and improve student achievement. Smith (2004) identified ten frequently used practices
that were effective in promoting the acceptance of diversity and increasing student achievement. Principals reported that the following strategies had positive affects on student achievement: parent participation, valuing students from diverse backgrounds, a teaching staff skilled at teaching students from diverse backgrounds, and understanding and respecting differences. The practices align with Riehl’s (2000) three multicultural tasks, specifically, (a) fostering new meanings about diversity (addressing race and ethnicity), (b) promoting inclusive school cultures and instructional programs, and (c) building relationships between schools and communities. For example, parent participation reflects the building of relationships between schools and communities. Promoting inclusive school cultures and instructional practices is demonstrated in the assurance of a skilled teaching staff.

To identify the skills of culturally competent principals, Allen (2004) investigated successful strategies used by middle school principals. She conducted a meta-analysis of 24 research studies to identify characteristics of cultural competence. Twenty-one characteristics of cultural competence were identified and served as the basis of a checklist. Allen asked 77 school superintendents to use the checklist to select principals who they deemed culturally competent. The 62 chosen principals completed a survey regarding the characteristics they considered important in developing positive community relationships with families from diverse cultural backgrounds.

Allen’s (2004) findings identified what principals considered to be important characteristics as well as what they perceived to be the most difficult challenges in building positive connections with communities. The five most important characteristics include displaying respect, communicating, establishing meaningful relationships, demonstrating
“non-judgmentalness” and exhibiting patience. These findings support the need for developing cultural competence; specifically, the characteristics of suspending judgment, communicating, and showing respect are consistent with higher levels of cultural competence.

Allen (2004) also identified two major challenges to the development of cultural competence among school principals. These challenges were limited access to training and lack of accountability for the development of cultural competence among all professional educators. Limited training is a major issue for teachers and administrators. Smith (2004) also discussed the need for accountability among educators to demonstrate culturally competent practices. New standards for education are in development, but the enforcement of these standards has not been clearly defined (Diller & Moule, 2005).

Research on cultural competence among educators is at its beginning stages. Although characteristics of competence have been identified, there has not been an empirical assessment of the levels of cultural competence. In the assessment of cultural competence among individuals, it is important to examine the level of cultural competence of the organization in which individuals work (Darnell & Kuperminc, 2006; Nybell & Gray, 2004). Research in medicine, nursing, and social work demonstrates that experiences and exposure may increase levels of cultural competence indicating its developmental nature and may improve with experiences and exposure to other cultures.

Cultural Competence as Developmental

Bennett’s (1993) DMIS proposes that cultural of cultural competence, and supports Bennett’s model (Carter, Lewis, Shrocco, Tanenbaum et al., 2006; Guy-Walls,
Carter et al. (2006) investigated the effects of cultural competence training among 196 medical students over an 18-months. The researchers used the pre- and post-Cultural Attitudes and Beliefs Scale (CABS) to measure the participants' changes in cultural attitudes and beliefs after participation in a Cultural Proficiency Workshop. The results of the study showed a significant increase from pre- to post-CABS. Factor 1 of the scale, Cultural Beliefs Regarding Medical Treatment showed an increase, (pre-mean = 14.18, standard deviation (SD) = 2.98 vs. post-mean = 15.55, SD = 2.90; p < .05). Factor 2 of the scale, Self-Awareness of Cultural Bias, also showed a statistically significant increase in the score (pre-mean = 8.89 vs. post-mean = 9.56, SD = 1.99; p < 0.05). Although the results indicated changes in cultural attitudes and beliefs, the scores do not indicate how one would apply the attitudes, knowledge, and skills in clinical practice.

In nursing cultural competence is an integral component of professional education, even though faculty under use the teaching strategies and frameworks available to teach cultural content (Chrisman, 1998; Purnell & Paulanka, 2003). Similar to the fields of medicine and education, the majority of the nursing faculty (80%) are White, middle-aged, and of a middle-income socioeconomic standard (Sechrist, 2002). Research in this area also demonstrates the importance of experiences and exposure in increasing levels of cultural competency.

Kardong-Edgren (2007) examined the cultural competence of a convenience sample of 170 randomly selected baccalaureate nursing (BSN) program faculty. They used Campinha-Bacote’s Inventory for Assessing the Process of Cultural Competence
Among Healthcare Professionals-Revised (IAPCC-R) to measure and compare the cultural competence of BSN faculty teaching in states with the most immigrants to those BSN faculty teaching in states with the least immigrants. The results showed a significant difference in the mean cultural competence score as measured by the IAPCC-R. Nursing faculty teaching in states with the most immigrants had significantly higher cultural competence scores than did nursing faculty teaching in states with the least immigrants (t [168] = 2.222; p = 0.028). Baccalaureate school of nursing faculty in the former group scored at the culturally competent level and the BSN faculty from the latter group scored at the culturally aware level. These findings suggest that access to diverse populations may have enhanced the cultural competence scores of the faculty from states with the most immigrants. This may suggest that interactions with people from other cultures can affect cultural competence development.

In the field of social work, the National Association of Social Workers (NASW) has mandated that multicultural content be incorporated throughout the curriculum for social work students preparing them for culturally competent practice (Guy-Walls, 2007). Guy-Walls (2007) investigated the effectiveness of including multicultural content at two universities in the mid-south. A convenience sample of 150 Bachelor of Social Work (BSW) students participated in this study and completed the Multicultural Awareness-Knowledge-Skills Survey (MAKSS) instrument to assess levels of cultural competence. The MAKSS was designed to measure cultural awareness, knowledge, and skill (D’Andrea, Daniels, & Heck, 1991). Guy-Walls (2007) compared senior level BSW students’ scores to those of entry-level BSW students. The results showed a significant difference (t = 4.313, p < .000) between senior BSW students’ and entry-level social
work students' levels of cultural competence. The senior-level students' exposure to the multicultural curricula may have enhanced their scores on the MAKSS and impacted their levels of cultural competence.

Research in the fields of medicine, nursing, and social work demonstrate that the levels of cultural competence may be improved through experience and exposure. These findings support the developmental model of cultural competence, indicating that competence may increase with experience. Establishing a baseline measure is a necessary part of the process when determining outcomes of various programs and curricula. Such information is critical in the development and continuation of culturally competent practice in all fields.

Organizational Cultural Competence

Principals who are able to implement policies and practices that value diverse cultures in a school can create culturally competent schools (Klotz, 2006). Klotz defines a culturally competent school as one that “...honors, respects, and values diversity in theory and in practice and where teaching and learning are made relevant and meaningful to students of various cultures.” Classifying schools as culturally competent requires examination of each school’s level of cultural competence in addition to individual levels of cultural competence among school leaders. Individual levels of cultural competence may influence the organizational levels (Cross, 1989; Lum, 2007; Nybell & Gray, 2004). Research on organizational cultural competence in education is limited (Prasad & Mull, 1997). The research that examines organizational cultural competence has been principally focused in the areas of mental health, social work, and adult development.
The development and examination of individual levels of cultural competence are insufficient without a focus on the organizational level of cultural competence (Nybell & Gray, 2004). If an organization does not support cultural competence, it will be difficult for individuals to develop skills in this area while finding the support and training needed. Nybell and Gray (2004) argued that there are values, beliefs, and attitudes embedded in an organization's policies, structures, and physical setting that can influence an individual's level of cultural competence.

Darnell and Kuperminc (2006) examined the relationships between individual and organizational dimensions of cultural competence in 12 public mental health agencies. They found that public agencies with culturally competent mission statements and training had a significantly more members who perceived the organization as culturally competent. This finding has implications for the role of the school principal who can be instrumental in developing the mission statement and providing training for staff in a school setting. Similarly, Yee and Tursi (2002) concluded that internal leadership and systematic support were key elements to moving an organization toward cultural competence.

Current research has found that achieving organizational cultural competence is a complicated undertaking (Darnell and Kuperminc, 2006; Nybell and Gray, 2004; Yee and Tursi, 2002). In their examination of three social service agencies, Nybell and Gray (2004) found that the perception of cultural competence varied among leadership and staff, which may lead to conflict. They asserted the importance of embracing conflict as a prerequisite to achieving organizational cultural competence. Their data revealed that staff members who were people of color or members of the diverse community expressed
a need to address inequity within the organization before addressing the organization’s interaction with consumers. If staff believe their personal issues of diversity and equity are not addressed within the organization, it will be difficult for the organization to understand the needs of the larger community.

Improving organizational cultural competence requires time, effort, and experience similar to the development of individual cultural competence (Darnell & Kuperminc, 2006). In beginning this journey organizations conduct a baseline evaluations of the levels of their own levels of cultural competency (Yee & Tursi, 2002). It also is important to provide training and monitoring of levels of cultural competency in order to make improvements in both. By focusing on the individual levels and organizational levels, both can develop more successfully.

The research on organizational cultural competence suggests that there is a relationship between individual level of cultural competence and organizational levels of cultural competence. This study seeks to understand this relationship by examining connections between schools and those who lead them.

Summary

The role of school principals continues to evolve over time requiring modern principals to be culturally competent. The expanding and complex diversity of our nation’s population “...demands that school leaders ... be a more diverse and culturally competent community” (Institute for Educational Leadership, 2005, p. 10). Additionally, schools must meet the demands of a growing diverse student population.

As outlined by Riehl (2000), it is inevitable that principals will engage in specific tasks as outlined by Riehl, when working with ethnically and culturally diverse
populations. Improving cultural competence is challenging for principals and teachers due to the lack of training, support, willingness, and accountability (Allen, 2004; Mahon, 2003; Smith, 2004).

Using the IDI (Hammer, 1998) and the CMOCC (Darnell & Kupermine, 2006) to empirically measure individual and organizational cultural competence levels will provide information to examine the relationship between individual and organizational levels. Assessment of preparedness can support development of the much needed training that both teachers and school principals require as they work to improve levels of cultural competence. The current study may add to the existing literature on individual cultural competence and organizational cultural competence in schools.

This chapter presented a review of pertinent literature supporting investigation of the individual levels of cultural competence among school principals and the organizational levels of cultural competence within their schools. The review provided an overview of the role of the principal in ethnically and culturally diverse school settings. Research related to individual cultural competence and organizational cultural competence were also discussed. Chapter 3 will provide an overview of the methodology used in this investigation.
Chapter 3: Methodology

The purpose of this chapter is to outline the methodology used in this study, including the context, participants, procedures, instrumentation, and data analyses. This exploratory, correlational study used the IDI (Hammer, 1998) and the CMOCC (Darnell and Kuperminc, 2006) to examine the relationships among individual RCSD principals’ levels of cultural competence and that of the schools they lead.

Context

The study took place in the RCSD located in Rochester, New York. The RCSD is an urban school district serving approximately 34,000 students in grades pre-kindergarten to twelfth grade. The ethnic makeup of the student population is 64% African American, 20% Hispanic, 14% White and two percent Native American and Asian. There are approximately 5,300 district employees including teachers, administrators, and support personnel. The ethnicity of the teaching staff consists of 69% White, 15% Black, 15% Hispanic, 4% Asian, and 6% American Indian teachers. Forty-nine percent of school administrators are White, 35% are Black, 12% are Hispanic, and the remaining four percent are Asian.

Participants

The target population of this study was 58 RCSD building principals from 39 elementary schools and 19 secondary schools. Non-randomized convenience sampling was used to ensure that all RCSD principals were invited to participate in the study. Cottrell and McKenzie (2005) recommend a sample size greater than 30 for correlational
studies since a larger sample size is more likely to produce significant results. Thirty-nine principals participated in this study resulting in a response rate of 67%.

**Instruments**

Hammer’s (1998) Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) is a 50-item questionnaire constructed to measure individual levels of cultural competence. It also includes ten demographic questions and four, open-ended “contexting” questions. These four questions focus on respondents’ experiences with cultural differences and were not used in this data analysis.

Because online participation was limited, the researcher also used a paper-and-pencil version in follow-up requests. Appendix A lists the scales and dimensions of the IDI and the DMIS. See Appendix B for the demographic questions. The IDI itself is not listed in the appendices reflecting copyright limitations. The researcher received permission to use the IDI after participation in a training seminar (see Appendix C). Contact information for the IDI author is provided in Appendix D.

The theoretical framework for the development of the instrument is based on the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) created by Bennett (1993). The theoretical concepts presented in the DMIS are made operational by the IDI. The IDI measures an individual’s orientation toward cultural differences explained by the stages outlined in DMIS. In measuring an individual’s or a group’s fundamental worldview orientation to cultural difference, the IDI can assess the individual’s or group’s capacity for intercultural competence, herein referred to as cultural competence. The IDI has been “normed” and a score of 100 represents its mean. The score of 100 is in the centrally located within the Minimization scale. A score of 85 represents the lowest end of the
Minimization scale; while a score of 114 represents the highest score in this segment of the scale. The IDI predicts that 68% of people will profile within the Minimization range. Approximately 15.9% will profile on the Denial/Defense scale with a score between 55 and 70. A score of 70 represents the midpoint of the Denial/Defense scale. Fifty-five represents the lowest end of the Denial/Defense scale, and a score of 84 represents highest end. The remaining 15.9% are likely to fall in the Acceptance/Adaptation scale, where a score of 130 represents the midpoint. A score of 115 represents the lowest end of the Acceptance/Adaptation scale, and a score of 145 or higher represents the highest score (Figure 3.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.4%</th>
<th>13.5%</th>
<th>34%</th>
<th>34%</th>
<th>13.5%</th>
<th>2.4%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Denial/Defense  
Minimization  
Acceptance/Adaptation

Figure 3.1. Overall Intercultural Sensitivity Development Profile

To determine the levels of cultural competence among selected RCSD elementary and secondary school principals, the researcher input data from the IDI survey using the IDI CD-ROM (Version 2-3), which requires the use of Microsoft Office Access. The researcher used identification numbers to maintain confidentiality.

The IDI constructed two types of reports, a group report and an individual report for each participant. The group report included demographic data and frequency analysis of each item, cluster, and scale on the IDI (The IDI Software Manual). This report also included means and standard deviations for each item on the scale. The individual report included graphs with numeric scores, demographic data, and the response to each IDI
item. The report included a score for the actual level of cultural competence and a "perceived" level of cultural competence. The actual level of cultural competence indicates how the IDI rates individuals in developmental terms. This score is adjusted to show the effect of ethnocentrism on the development of ethno-relativism. The perceived level of cultural competence indicates how individuals rate themselves in terms of intercultural sensitivity. The perceived level is not adjusted for developmental factors. For the purposes of this study, both the actual level of cultural competence and the perceived level of cultural competence were used.

Using the software provided by the author of the IDI, the IDI data yielded an overall profile score on a continuum running from ethnocentrism to ethno-relativism. Instead of the six stages used in the DMIS, there are five different scales on the IDI: denial/defense (D/D), reversal (R), minimization (M), acceptance/adaptation (A/A) and integration (I). Denial/Defense, R, and M comprise the ethnocentric orientation. The ethno-relative orientation includes the A/A and I scales. The profile score indicates the stage of intercultural development identified on that continuum.

The first scale of the IDI, the D/D scales represent an ethnocentric worldview that simplifies or polarizes cultural differences. This type of thinking can occur in the form of denial, which assumes that there are no real differences between people from different cultures. Defense, represents the second form of simplification and polarization, and is a much more explicit recognition of differences. At this stage, there are overt attempts to become defensive against people from different cultures because they are seen as threatening.
The second stage in the ethnocentric orientation is the R scale. *Reversal* is characterized as the recognition of cultural differences, but is much more polarizing than the previous stages. This worldview is the *reversal* or “mirror image” of the D/D stage and sees people from other cultures as superior, while viewing one’s own culture as inferior.

The third scale, *Minimization* represents the final stage of the ethnocentric orientation and the third scale on the IDI. This worldview attempts to identify the commonality and universal values in all cultures. This stage is transitional from the ethnocentric orientation to the ethno-relative orientation.

The fourth scale of the IDI, *A/A* scale measures a worldview that demonstrates understanding and accommodation of cultural differences. *Acceptance* involves the recognition of cultural differences of one’s own culture as well as others. *Adaptation* is the altering of one’s behavior and perception in relation to the cultural context. Individuals are able to adapt their behavior successfully, according to the cultural situation.

The fifth and final scale is *integration* (I) representing the highest level of the ethno-relative orientation. Integration measures a worldview that includes different cultural perspectives. The worldview incorporating a multicultural identity with confused cultural perspectives is *encapsulated marginality (EM)* and is one form of integration. *Encapsulated marginality* characterizes a person who has experience with several cultures but may experience confusion with cultural identity.

In validating the five dimensions of the DMIS, Hammer, Bennett, and Wiseman (2003) completed confirmatory factor analyses, reliability analyses, and construct validity...
for the following scales: (a) D/D scale (13 items, alpha = .85); (b) R scale (9 items, alpha = .80); (c) M scale (9 items, alpha = .83); (d) A/A scale (14 items, alpha = .84); and (e) E M scale (5 items, alpha = .80). In the current study, the Cronbach Alpha analysis (or reliability coefficients) for N of cases = 39 and N of items = 50 conducted by this researcher revealed a score of 0.717. These coefficients are in the “moderate” to “substantial” range indicating acceptable validity and reliability (Cottrell & McKenzie, 2005).

Checklist Measure of Organizational Cultural Competence

Darnell and Kuperminc (2006) measured organizational cultural competence using a checklist based on six “markers” (Dana, Behn, & Gonwa, 1992; Garcia-Caban, 2001; Ponterotto, Alexander, & Grieger, 1995). These “markers” are (a) mission statement, (b) staff of color in leadership positions, (c) existence of a diversity committee, (d) mandatory diversity training, (e) the percentage of staff of color (critical mass), and (f) the ratio of staff of color to the client population (Darnell & Kuperminc, 2006). One marker was modified by this researcher to include the measure “critical mass” which further provided a definitive measure of “staff diversity”. The term, “critical mass” is used to refer to an adequate representation of staff of color. Green (1988) defined “critical mass” of 30% staff of color, as the point at which students of color feel comfortable on predominantly White college campuses. This concept has been subsequently used in other fields to define adequate representation of staff of color (Ponterotto et al., 1995).

Each “marker” was posed as a “yes” or “no” question and each answer received a score of one for “no,” and two for “yes.” The total score provided an overall measure of the school’s level of organizational cultural competence which was used in correlational
analysis with the scores from the IDI. For instance, a higher score (7-8) reflected a higher level of organizational cultural competence while a low score (1-2) reflected a lower level.

The researcher used each school’s current School Improvement Plan (SIP) (See Appendix E) and demographic data from the RCSD Human Resources Office to obtain information used to measure the “markers” of organizational cultural competence. Some of the items were assessed quickly using school data. For example, the mission statement, staff of color in leadership positions, percentage of staff of color (30% or more), and ratio of staff of color to student population were found using the school improvement plan and data from the RCSD Human Resources Office. The remaining items, existence of a diversity committee and mandatory diversity training, were not readily assessable from the School Improvement Plan (SIP). If this information was not present on the SIP, the researcher contacted a school administrator seeking this and any other information required to complete the checklist.

According to Darnell and Kuperminc (2006), checklist measures of cultural competence show strong evidence of reliability, validity, internal consistency, inter-rater reliability, and criterion-related validity. The above markers were chosen based on a review of literature pertaining to organizational cultural competence. The markers focus on the cultural competency themes of vision, training, and representation of diverse cultures. Three items focus on diverse representation, a competency measure used in the assessment of cultural competence (Darnell & Kuperminc, 2006; Ponterotto, Alexander, & Grieger, 1995).

The markers can be accurately measured with a simple “yes” or “no” response. In their study, two independent raters coded responses to the checklist items and obtained an
inter-rater reliability for each checklist item. The kappa coefficients of inter-rater reliability ranged from .81 to 1.0 indicating high reliability (Darnell & Kuperminc, 2006). Key informants were asked to complete the CMOCC in Darnell & Kuperminc’s (2006) study. In the current study, the researcher used the SIP and school administrators to obtain the information needed to complete the checklist (See Appendix F).

The School Improvement Plan

Each school within RCSD is required to develop a comprehensive SIP annually. School improvement planning addresses district student performance targets and goals as established by the Board of Education. SIP steering committees in each school are charged with developing these plans, which are based on a standardized SIP template. The process requires each school to collect and analyze specific data to determine improvement priorities, make decisions about goals, and continuously measure progress toward achievement of those goals.

The SIP provides information about each school’s mission and vision as well as school goals for the academic year. In order to measure markers a, c, and d, the researcher obtained copies of each school’s SIP. The following markers were measured using each school’s individual SIP as it details this type of information:
(a) Does the mission statement explicitly address diversity or cultural competence? (c) Is there a diversity committee, task force, or dedicated staff position?, and (d) Does the organization (school) require cultural competence training for all staff?

Demographic Information

The remaining markers included b, c, and f: (b) Is there staff of color in leadership positions (administrative)?, (e) Is there racial/ethnic diversity among the staff
that meets critical mass?, and (f) Does ethnic/cultural diversity of the consumer population match the staff population? Responses were obtained from obtaining this information from the RCSD’s Department of Human Resources (HR).

Procedure

This research required the approval of the RSCD’s Department of Research, Evaluation and Testing (DRET). An overview of the research process and how the study addressed the RCSD “Diversity Initiative” was shared with the DRET through the submission of an application requesting approval of the research study. The DRET reviewed the application and approved the research request. The researcher was notified of approval in writing (Appendix G). Upon receipt of RCSD approval, the researcher submitted an application to St. John Fisher College’s Institutional Review Board (IRB). After due consideration, the researcher received written approval to conduct the proposed research study from IRB (Appendix H).

In March 2008, the researcher contacted the Chief of Diversity and Professional Development and the Chief of Elementary Schools to request assistance in notifying principals about this study. The Chiefs of Elementary Schools and Secondary Schools agreed to notify principals of the study during their monthly meetings.

In April, the researcher sent individual letters (Appendix I) to 58 RCSD principals using district e-mail accounts. The letter briefly explained the purpose of the study and invited principals to participate in the study by completing an online version of the IDI. The e-mail included instructions for completing the instrument. Each principal was provided with individualized login names, passwords, and the link to the online IDI survey. Participants were asked to contact the researcher if they experienced any
difficulty accessing the website or completing the survey. The researcher suggested a
two-week deadline to participants. The e-mail request was accompanied by an attachment
which provided a more detailed letter of introduction (Appendix J).

Participants were assured their responses would be held in strict confidence and
not associated with them or their schools, in addition, participants were extended the
option of removing themselves from the research study at any time without negative
consequences. Participants were assigned an ID number and their schools were given a
corresponding ID letter. Personal names were not used on the IDI or the CMOCC.
Additionally, all data and the master participant list, which links the participants’ names
with their ID numbers, were stored in a locked cabinet in a college office. To ensure
anonymity and confidentiality, the researcher completed the CMOCC prior to the
administration of the IDI. A research assistant subsequently matched the codes on the
CMOCC and IDI to permit unbiased analysis of data.

In late April, the Chief of Elementary Schools briefly explained the study at a
meeting and invited principals to participate in the study. She also explained that the
principals should have received an email requesting their participation. After the meeting,
the elementary and secondary school Chiefs recommended resending the email request to
all principals. This second email request was sent on April 24th. After one week, 12
principals had completed the survey.

On May 1st a third e-mail was sent to all principals requesting their participation
in the survey. One week later, a total of 19 surveys were completed. As a reminder, a
fourth request was sent via email on May 5th. By the following week, a total of 23
principals had completed the on-line survey.
In order to increase response rates, the researcher spoke with the two Chiefs of secondary and elementary schools asking them to request that principals participate in the study. The Chiefs sent another email to principals encouraging them to complete the survey on-line. Three principals responded that they wanted to participate, but they were experiencing difficulty accessing the website. The researcher asked the principals if they would be willing to complete a paper-and-pencil version of the survey and all were. The researcher obtained permission from the dissertation committee to send a fifth request to principals along with the paper-and-pencil version of the survey. Using RCSD inter-office mail, the researcher sent surveys to 30 principals who had not responded. These 30 principals received an introduction letter, a copy of the survey, and a self-addressed stamped envelope to return the survey. All surveys were coded prior to mailing allowing them to be tracked by school code. By late May an additional 13 surveys were returned via U.S. mail resulting in a total of 36 completed surveys. Five additional surveys arrived in the mail during the month of June for a total of 41. Two of the surveys were incomplete; therefore, 39 surveys were used in the final data analysis. The researcher collected these surveys from the research assistant.

Data Analysis Plan

Based on the proposed research questions and the design of the study, the researcher applied descriptive statistics, Pearson correlation coefficient, and analysis of variance procedures. This information provided responses to the research questions:

1. What are the levels of cultural competence among elementary and secondary school principals?
Descriptive statistics were used to examine the group means and standard deviation.

2. What is each school’s level of organizational cultural competence?
Descriptive statistics were used to examine the group mean and standard deviation.

3. What is the relationship between the levels of cultural competence among school principals, serving two or more years as principal of their school and their respective schools’ levels of organizational cultural competence?

The Pearson product-moment correlation was used to determine the relationship between the participants’ scores on the IDI and the respective school’s level of organizational cultural competence as measured by the Checklist Measure of Organizational Cultural Competence (Darnell & Kupermine, 2006).

The Pearson correlation reflects the degree of linear relationship between the two scores. A correlation of +1.0 represents a perfect positive linear relationship between individual cultural competence and organizational cultural competence. Based on the statistical significance of correlations, subsequent data analyses included F tests (ANOVA) and t tests.

Summary

This section addressed the context, participants, instruments, procedures, and data analyses used in this study. A survey approach examined the relationship between the levels of cultural competence among principals and the levels of organizational cultural competence of the schools they lead. Analysis of the data provided information responsive to the proposed research questions.
Chapter 4: Results

Overview

The research questions for this study centered on the relationship between individual cultural competence and organizational cultural competence. Levels of individual cultural competence were measured using Hammer's (1998) Intercultural Developmental Inventory (IDI). Levels of organizational cultural competence were measured using Darnell & Kuperminc's (2006) Checklist Measure of Organizational Cultural Competence (CMOCC).

This chapter is organized according to the three research questions that guided this study, namely:

1. What are the levels of cultural competence among elementary and secondary school principals?
2. What is each school's level of organizational cultural competence?
3. What is the relationship between the levels of cultural competence among school principals, serving two or more years as principal of their school and their respective schools' levels of organizational cultural competence?

Data analysis included descriptive statistics, Pearson correlation coefficient, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), and t-tests. Demographics of the participants are reported followed by levels of individual cultural competence and levels of organizational cultural competence. Frequencies were used to evaluate the number of checklist items for various components of organizational cultural competence. The frequencies of the total CMOCC
scores and the individual checklist items were analyzed. Relationships between individual levels of cultural competence and organizational cultural competence were examined using the Pearson correlation coefficient, ANOVA and t-tests were used to compare means of various groups.

Survey Response Rates

An e-mail request was sent by e-mail to 58 principals in the RCSD requesting their participation in the completion of the IDI on-line survey. Of the 58 participants solicited for this purpose 30 responded. Twenty-six completed the survey on-line, and four principals declined participation.

Three additional requests for participation were sent to the remaining 26 principals via e-mail and a fifth request was mailed using the school district inter-office mail. The requests included a letter of introduction; the survey; and a self-addressed, stamped envelope. Thirteen respondents completed paper-and-pencil surveys were returned by mail. In total, 41 surveys were returned resulting in a 67% response rate. Thirty-nine of the surveys were completed and used in the data analysis. Two respondents submitted incomplete surveys, which could not be used.

Results

In this study the participants (n = 39) were predominantly female (66.7%) and within the age range of 51-60 (48.7%). The sample was composed of White (51.3%), Black (41%), and Latino (7.7%) principals. Additional demographics of the participants are listed in Table 4.1.
Table 4.1

Demographics of 39 Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity/Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian/White/Euro-American</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African-American</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Months/Years Living in Another Culture</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never lived in another culture</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 3 months</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-6 months</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11 months</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than ten years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(completed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College graduate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA degree or equivalent</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD degree or equivalent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary (K-6)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary (7-12)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 39.
The number of months and years living in another culture were slightly varied, though the majority of respondents indicated a lack of experience living dissimilar culture. Fifty-six percent of participants in the study had no experience living in another culture. Another 17.9% spent less than one year in another culture, 5.1% had spent between three and six months living in another culture, and 2.6% spent three to five years in another culture. The remaining 17.1% reported having spent 10 years or more living in a culture different from their own.

The IOI also asked respondents to state the world region in which they lived up to the age of 18. Ninety-five percent of the participants stated that they spent those formative years in North America, when given the following choices: North America, Central America, South American, Middle East, Africa, Australia, Asia Pacific, Western Europe, Eastern Europe, and “other”. The remaining five percent indicated Asia Pacific and “other” as the region in which they spent their formative years (one participant selected each category).

Research Question One: Individual Levels of Cultural Competence

The IDI has a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 15 with possible scores ranging from 55 (full intercultural denial/defense) to 145 (full intercultural acceptance/adaptation) (Hammer, 1998). The IDI measures the primary worldview of individuals and groups using a set of one-dimensional scales. Each score corresponds to a dimension measured by the IDI representing the primary orientation identified in the theoretical model, the DMIS (Bennett, 1993). The IDI creates both Perceived and Developmental Intercultural Sensitivity Profiles on a developmental continuum from
ethnocentrism to ethnorelativism. Each score corresponds with a dimension on the IDI developmental continuum.

Research question one posed the query, “What are the levels of cultural competence among 58 RCSD elementary and secondary school principals as measured by Hammer’s (1998) Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI)?”

The average score of participants (N = 39) on the IDI Overall Developmental Intercultural Sensitivity scale was 100.28 (SD = 14.61, range = 69.92 - 125.00). The group average suggests that the respondents have a Minimization “worldview.” This finding indicates that the levels of intercultural sensitivity (cultural competence levels) of RCSD principals were average, placing the group in the Minimization dimension and on the Minimization scale. The Minimization scale is represented by the scores 85 to 114. As the IDI is a “normed” instrument, the principals’ scores when computed using this instrument distributed themselves normally.

Figure 4.1 displays the distribution of IDI data.
The levels of intercultural sensitivity (cultural competence) were varied though most (43%) of the respondents scored in the Minimization dimension (Table 4.2). The Minimization worldview posits that all people are similar. People with this particular ethnocentric worldview tend to experience and explain cultural difference from their own cultural perspective. In accordance with its name persons falling in the Minimization dimension “minimize” cultural differences often focusing on human similarities and attempting to find commonalities. This dimension and further interpretation of the scores are explained in chapter five.

Thirty-one percent of the principals scored in the Acceptance dimension, representing an ethnorelative competence level, which is above the average score of 100.
The *Acceptance* worldview acknowledges cultural differences and believes that different behaviors and values exist within dissimilar cultures. These scores are not consistent with the predictive normative distribution which indicated that 15.8% of the population would reflect an *Acceptance/Adaptation* worldview.

Twenty-three percent of principals scored in the "Defense dimension," with the remaining five percent scoring in the "Reversal dimension." These categories are similar because both characterize a form of *Defense*. In the *Denial/Defense* dimension, one’s own culture is viewed as superior to other cultures, and a polarized “us/them” distinction is created. This distinction also exists in *Reversal*, although in this case one’s own culture is denigrated and other cultures are viewed as superior. Only two of the 39 respondents scored in this range, indicating that most respondents have developed beyond the *Defensive* dimension.

None of the respondents scored in the dimensions of *Adaptation* and *Encapsulated Marginality*. *Adaptation*, therefore, represents the next likely stage of development for most of the participants in this study.

Overall, the levels of cultural competence were slightly varied, with most respondents scored in the average range, which is the "Minimization dimension." Sixty-eight percent of respondents scoring in the ethnocentric range, and 31% scored in the ethnorelative range. This suggests that most of the RCSD principals had an ethnocentric worldview and a large percentage were approaching ethnorelativism. Table 4.2 outlines the various dimensions found and the number of participants in each dimension. As seen in previous IDI research most participants are in the *Minimization* dimension (Ayas, 2006; Bray, 2004; Mahon, 2003).
Table 4.2

Number and Percentage of Participants per Dimension on the IDI for the Total Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage of N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Denial</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Defense</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Minimization</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Acceptance</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Adaptation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Encapsulated Marginality</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perceived and Developmental Gap

The IDI produces a score for both the Developmental Intercultural Sensitivity and the Perceived Intercultural Sensitivity. The Developmental score represents the actual score while the Perceived score represents the group’s perception of themselves. The results of a paired sample t-test showed a relatively large gap between the developmental IDI score (M = 100.28) and the perceived IDI score (M = 123.55), which was 22.216 (SD = 9.925, range = 5.33 to 114.61). This result was significant: t (1, 38) = 13.4 (p < 0.01) (Table 4.3). This significant difference suggests a gap between the principal’s perception of their levels of cultural competence and the actual levels of cultural competence.
Table 4.3

*Intercultural Sensitivity Gap*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Sample</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Significance (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PDS Gap</td>
<td>13.430</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.00000000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 39 participating principals of the RCSD overestimated their developmental intercultural sensitivity. Hammer (1998) stated that any “gap score” greater than one standard deviation was substantial. Such a “gap” indicates that the respondents see themselves as culturally competent and may overestimate their ability to be successful in addressing cultural differences. All participants lead schools where the students are predominantly African American and Hispanic. Principals may view the success experienced in their position as leaders in a diverse schools setting as successful and thus misperceive their true ability interact with people from various cultures.

*Subscales of the IDI*

It is important to interpret the IDI by examining all scale scores which determine the group’s or individual’s developmental areas in regard to the understanding of cultural difference. Table 4.4 provides the number and percentages of participants for each subscale of the IDI.
Table 4.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage of N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Denial/Defense or Reversal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Minimization</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Acceptance/Adaptation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Encapsulated Marginality</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of the participants' scores placed them in the Minimization range of the scale (66%) which aligns with the overall group score of 100. Again, this finding supports previous research suggesting that most people score in the Minimization range (Ayas, 2006; Bray, 2004; Mahon, 2003). It also supports the predicted normative distribution associated with the IDI (Hammer, 1998).

Each subscale score identifies areas of strengths and areas needing developmental growth. On each of the five subscales (Denial/Defense, Reversal, Minimization, Acceptance/Adaptation, and Encapsulated Marginality), the scores range on a continuum from 1 to 5 consisting of three developmental areas including “unresolved,” “in transition,” and “resolved.” The phrase “unresolved” is defined as a state of being in which few developmental challenges prevent growth toward ethnorelativism. The term “in transition” is defined as a state in which there are a few developmental challenges preventing growth toward ethnorelativism. The term “resolved” suggests resolution of developmental challenges and growth toward ethnorelativism. Figure 4.2 displays each area and score on the subscales.
Table 4.5

*Mean Scores of the Total Sample on the Subscales of the IDI*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Std. E.</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defense/Denial</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.426</td>
<td>0.3589</td>
<td>0.05747</td>
<td>0.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reversal</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.0690</td>
<td>0.8300</td>
<td>0.10800</td>
<td>0.689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimization</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.48185</td>
<td>0.67444</td>
<td>0.10800</td>
<td>0.455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance/Adaptation</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.3831</td>
<td>0.66748</td>
<td>0.10688</td>
<td>0.446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encapsulated Marginality</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.5110</td>
<td>0.68141</td>
<td>0.10911</td>
<td>0.464</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the subscale continuum a score of five represents the highest score and indicating that issues in that stage are largely resolved. The term “issues” refers to the idea of cognitive frameworks or beliefs that present difficulty for individuals as they move beyond a certain stage toward ethnorelativism (Hammer, 1998). A score of one indicates that an individual or group has developmental issues in a particular stage and should engage in specific developmental tasks to resolve those issues before moving to the next stage.
Figure 4.2. Mean Subscale Scores

Figure 4.2 displays the mean for each subscale. This bar graph demonstrates the variation and similarity between the subscale scores. A score above 3.66 indicates a "resolved" area or subscale. The principals were "resolved" in all areas except Minimization.

On the Subscale of Denial/Defense, the study population on average scored within the resolved range (M = 4.53; Figure 4.2). This indicates that as a group the participants have resolved most issues related to Denial/Defense or Reversal. The strength of individuals in this subscale is their ability to adhere to traditional values, tasks, and support groups having a similar mind set. In order to reach resolution the developmental task is to begin
to recognize that cultural differences exist even though the individual may not notice them (Hammer, 1998).

The groups’ average score of 4.1203, on the Reversal subscale was also in the resolved range (Figure 4.2). A profile in the “resolved” range indicates that issues impeding development toward enthnorelativism have been successfully overcome. This score (4.1203) suggests that the group could demonstrate concern with global and domestic inequity, be self-critical, and maintain a positive attitude toward other cultures. The developmental task includes displaying more understanding toward one’s own culture and accepting the positive and negative aspects of that culture as well as other cultures.

On the Subscale of Minimization, the average score of 2.4814 was in the “in transition” range (Figure 4.2), suggesting issues surrounding human commonality as a way to view cultural differences. The principals received the lowest score on this subscale, suggesting a focus on similarities among cultures.

The groups’ strength is the ability to recognize humanity in others and display tolerance toward others. The developmental task is obtaining more knowledge about one’s own culture and avoiding using personal culture to analyze others. The score on this particular subscale indicates this is the area in which the group may need the greatest development. This score has implications for the professional development of the majority of principals participating in this area of need.

An Acceptance and Adaptation subscale average of 3.3514 suggests that participants view cultural difference as acceptable (Figure 4.2). This score is in the “in-transition” range and may indicate that the group has issues with Acceptance and
Adaptation. This score may indicate a resistance to changing perspective or behavior when faced with different cultural contexts (Hammer, 1998). Acceptance and Adaptation is another area needing developmental growth, though this score is approaching “resolved” with a score near the 3.6 range. This information can provide a focus for professional development for study participants.

This group was able to recognize and value cultural differences between their personal cultures and others. Their developmental task is to connect their ability to appreciate the value in other cultures to shifting perspectives, while maintaining a commitment to their own values. Two aspects of Adaptation are the ability to shift behavior and cognitive frames. Individuals at this stage are able to change their behavior in culturally appropriate ways and take on the perspective of one or more other cultures (Hammer, 2007).

The mean score of 4.5423 indicated that the group has resolved most issues in the area of Encapsulated Marginality (Figure 4.2). The group can behave and communicate in a variety of settings without losing their own cultural identity.

An Encapsulated Marginality profile in the “resolved” area indicates that the group may not experience cultural identity issues at all, or that they have transformed their experiences into a more constructive form. This profile suggested that the group is not experiencing difficulties with cultural identification or, perhaps, that they are comfortable with a multicultural identity and the movement among different cultural identities (Hammer, 1998).
Correlations between IDI and Demographic Variables

An analysis of the relationship between the IDI and demographic variables showed that most variables were not related to the IDI. A negative correlation was found between the actual IDI score and the amount of time spent living in another culture, \( r = -0.371, p = 0.049 \). A higher score on the IDI was associated with a shorter amount of time living in another culture. This finding did not support research investigating the relationship between experiences with other cultures and levels of cultural competence. Previous research suggested that experiences with other cultures could increase levels of cultural competence (Kardong-Edgren, 2007). In accordance with Bennett’s DMIS (1993), individuals can increase their development through meaningful experiences with other cultures.

An examination of the relationship between the IDI subscales and demographic variables revealed a significant correlation between the Acceptance/Adaptation scale and three demographic variables: age, months, and years living in another culture and race/ethnicity. Table 4.6 displays the correlations for these variables and the Acceptance/Adaptation subscale. There was an inverse relationship with Acceptance/Adaptation \( r = -0.389, p = 0.014 \). As the age of the participant increased, the score on the Acceptance/Adaptation scale was lower, thus suggesting that older participants scored lower on the Acceptance/Adaptation scale. The two remaining variables were positively related to Acceptance/Adaptation. As the months and years of experience living in another culture increased, the score on the Acceptance/Adaptation scale increased \( r = 0.407, p = 0.010 \). This finding suggests that experience living in another culture is likely to yield an Acceptance/Adaptation worldview.
There was also a positive relationship between Acceptance/Adaptation and race/ethnicity ($r = .325, p = .044$). Black participants obtained higher scores on the Acceptance/Adaptation subscale.

Table 4.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Age of participant</th>
<th>Month, years of experience living in another culture</th>
<th>Race/ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance/Adaptation</td>
<td>-.389*</td>
<td>.407*</td>
<td>.325*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

An ANOVA was conducted to compare the mean Acceptance/Adaptation scores of Black, White, and Hispanic respondents. The results showed a difference that was approaching statistical significance between Black ($n = 16$), Hispanic ($n = 3$), and White ($n = 20$) respondents’ mean scores on the Acceptance/Adaptation scale. The mean for Black participants was 3.6425 (SE = .143), the mean for Hispanic participants was 3.5700 (SE = .151), and the mean for White participants was 3.1475 (SE = .158). This difference was approaching significance, $F(1, 38) = 2.818$, $p = .073$.

Table 4.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Among Groups</td>
<td>2.292</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.146</td>
<td>2.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>14.638</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.407</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16.930</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tukey’s HSD (Honestly Significant Difference) Post-hoc test was completed to determine which groups differed from one another. The results revealed a difference between the Black respondents and White respondents approached significance at the .05 level (p = .067). The low number of Hispanic respondents may have contributed to the lack of significant differences between this group and Whites and Blacks.

There was a negative relationship between the Minimization subscale and age of participant (r = -.327, p = .042). As the age of the participant increased, the score on the Minimization subscale decreased. This relationship suggests that older respondents have lower scores on the Minimization subscale, and younger respondents tend to higher scores on the Minimization subscale.

Summary Description of Intercultural Sensitivity

Participants scored in the Minimization dimension and Minimization scale on the IDI. Demographics of the participants found that many presented similar backgrounds (e.g., age, educational level, nationality, experience living in another culture). This lack of variability of backgrounds could account for this similarity in scores.

Research Question Two: Checklist Measure of Organizational Cultural Competence (CMOCC)

Descriptive statistics addressed the second research question which asked, “What is each school’s level of organizational cultural competence as determined by Darnell & Kupermine’s (2006) Checklist Measure of Organizational Cultural Competence (CMOCC)?”

Darnell and Kupermine (2006) measured organizational cultural competence using a checklist based on six “markers” (Dana, Behn, & Gonwa, 1992; Garcia-Caban, 2001;
Ponterotto, Alexander, & Grieger, 1995). These “markers” were (a) mission statement, (b) staff of color in leadership positions, (c) existence of a diversity committee, (d) mandatory diversity training, (e) the percentage of staff of color (critical mass), and (f) the ratio of staff of color to the client population (Darnell & Kuperminc, 2006). Each “marker” was posed as a “yes” or “no” question and each answer received a score of 1 for “no,” and 2 for “yes.” The total score provided an overall measure of the school’s level of organizational cultural competence, which was used in the correlational analysis with scores from the IDI. For instance, a high score (9-12) reflected a higher level of organizational cultural competence, and a low score (1-4) reflected a lower level. The researcher used each school’s current School Improvement Plan document and demographic data from the RCSD Human Resources Office to obtain the information used to measure the “markers” of organizational cultural competence.

In the first phase of the study, a Checklist Measure of Organizational Cultural Competence (CMOCC) score was obtained for each of the schools (n = 58). The mean was 7.33 (SD = .965). The maximum score was twelve and the minimum score was six. Most of the schools scored a seven (33.3%) or an eight (35%) on the CMOCC, indicating a moderate range of organizational cultural competence. Eighteen percent of the schools scored a nine, five percent scored a ten, and the remaining five percent scored a six. Table 4.8 displays the total scores, frequency, and percentages for the group (n = 58).
Table 4.8

*Checklist Measure of Organizational Cultural Competence scores*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The CMOCC was analyzed to obtain the frequency of yes/no responses among the 58 schools. Forty-three percent of schools had a (a) mission statement that specifically addressed cultural diversity, (b) twenty-four percent of schools had a principal or assistant principal of color, (c) twenty-seven percent of schools had a diversity committee, (d) seventeen percent of schools had mandatory diversity training, (e) nineteen percent had a percentage of teachers of color that met the “critical mass” of 30% (Black, Hispanic, Asian, and Native American), of the schools had a ratio of staff of color that matches the client population (Table 4.9). Table 4.9 displays the percentage of schools having each CMOCC item present. Aside from having a mission statement that specifically addressed diversity, a majority of schools (over 50%) did not have the remaining five markers on the CMOCC measure.
Table 4.9

Frequency of CMOCC items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CMOCC item measure</th>
<th>Percentage of schools with CMOCC item measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission Statement that specifically addresses diversity</td>
<td>56.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person of Color in Leadership</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity Committee Formed</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory Diversity Training</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Mass of Teachers of Color (30%)</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match between ratio of Students of Color to Teachers of Color</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlations between the CMOCC and Demographic Variables

The Pearson product-moment correlation was used to determine the relationship between the total score on the CMOCC and various demographic factors (i.e., race/ethnicity, age, gender, experience living in another culture, years as principal of the school, and school type).

Ethnicity. There was a correlation of .395 between the total score on the CMOCC and ethnicity ($p = .002$). Those participants who were Black or Hispanic scored higher on
the CMOCC than those participants who were White. Further analysis of the CMOCC items showed that Black and Hispanic respondents scored higher on two items.

First, there was a significant positive correlation between ethnicity and the mission statement \( (r = .269, p = .041) \). A greater number of Black and Hispanic principals had a mission statement that specifically focused on cultural diversity.

Secondly, there was a moderately significant positive relationship between critical mass and ethnicity \( (r = .266, p = .044) \). Schools with Black and Hispanic principals were found to have more teachers of color in staff positions at their schools than did schools with White principals.

These correlations represent a possible relationship between ethnicity and the total score on the CMOCC. Black and Hispanic principals in this study met more criteria on the CMOCC checklist than the White principals, which accounts for the higher overall score on the CMOCC.

**Age.** There was no significant correlation between age of participant and the total score on the CMOCC \( (r = .122, p = .363) \).

**Gender.** The results failed to demonstrate a significant relationship between gender and the total score on the CMOCC \( (r = .206, p = .125) \). There was, however, a significant positive relationship between the establishment of a diversity committee and gender \( (r = .295, p = .029) \). There was a greater likelihood that female principals had a diversity committee in their building.

**Experience living in another culture.** The study failed to find a significant relationship between time spent living in another culture and the total score on the CMOCC \( (r = .056, p = .679) \).
Level of the school. The results failed to demonstrate a significant relationship between school level (elementary vs. secondary) and the total score on the CMOCC ($r = .110, p = .415$). Nonetheless there was a moderate significant negative relationship between school level and the establishment of a diversity committee ($r = -.431, p = .001$). Participants at the elementary level were more likely to have a diversity committee in their building.

Years as Principal of the school. The results failed to demonstrate a significant relationship between years as principal of the school and the total score on the CMOCC ($r = .062, p = .645$).

Summary of demographic factors. The low sample size may have contributed to the lack of significant correlations obtained. Ethnicity was the only factor that demonstrated a significant relationship with the total scores on the CMOCC. This result suggests that Black respondents attained a higher score on the CMOCC than White respondents.

An ANOVA was used to compare the mean CMOCC scores of Black, White, and Hispanic respondents. The results showed a significant difference among the means scores of Black ($n = 16$), Hispanic ($n = 3$), and White ($n = 20$) respondents’ on the CMOCC. The mean for Black participants was 8.19 (SE = .294), for Hispanic participants was 8.33 (SE = .294), and for White participants was 7.35 (SE = .543). This difference was significant at the established level, $F (1, 38) = 4.731, p = .015$. 
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Table 4.10

Differences among Black, Hispanic, and White Respondents' Scores on the CMOCC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differences</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Among Groups</td>
<td>8.655</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.328</td>
<td>5.380</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>44.241</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>.804</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52.897</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tukey's HSD Post-hoc test determined which groups differed from others on the CMOCC. The results revealed a significant difference between the Black respondents and White respondents (p = .019). The low number of Hispanic respondents may have contributed to the lack of significant difference for this group.

The remaining demographic factors failed to demonstrate significant relationships with the score on the CMOCC, although gender appears to be approaching significance (r = .206, p = .125). This will be discussed in further in Chapter 5.

Other analyses were used including the Pearson Correlation to examine the relationship among the specific items on the CMOCC (such as mission statement, diversity among leadership, mandatory diversity training, diversity committee, and critical mass) and demographic variables (i.e., age, years as principal, experience living in another culture, race, gender, and school level). Table 4.11 presents the derived correlations among these variables. The variable, population match, was excluded as all schools obtained the same score for this variable. None of the schools were able to meet the criteria for this checklist item and they all received a score of one.
Table 4.11

Correlations between Demographic Variables and CMOCC Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Years as principal</th>
<th>Experience living in another culture</th>
<th>School level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission Statement</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.269**</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>-.145</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>-.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of Color in Leadership Positions</td>
<td>-.156</td>
<td>.360**</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>-.107</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.287*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity Committee</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>-.131</td>
<td>.295*</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>-.431**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory Training</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>.340**</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>-.221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Mass</td>
<td>-.161</td>
<td>.266*</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>-.108</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ** p < .01, * p < .05.

Research Question Three: The Relationship Between Organizational Cultural Competence and Individual Cultural Competence

Research question three inquired, “What is the relationship between the levels of cultural competence among school principals, serving two or more years as principal of their school, as measured by the IDI (Hammer, 1998) and their respective schools’ levels of organizational cultural competence as measured by the CMOCC (Darnell & Kupermine, 2006)?” The Pearson correlation coefficient reflected the degree of linear
relationship between participants' scores on the IDI and the respective school's level of organizational cultural competence as measured by the Checklist Measure of Organizational Cultural Competence (Darnell & Kuperminc, 2006).

The correlation between the total score on the CMOCC and developmental cultural sensitivity as measured by the IDI indicated no relationship between individual levels of cultural competence and organizational cultural competence ($r = -0.112$, $p = 0.542$). Additionally, the results indicated no relationship between the total score on the CMOCC and perceived cultural sensitivity ($r = -0.031$, $p = 0.865$). The lack of relationship between the total score on the CMOCC and perceived cultural sensitivity may be attributed to non-random sampling as well as other unknown factors.

**Correlations between the IDI Subscales and CMOCC Items**

To determine the relationship between the IDI Subscales and the CMOCC, Pearson Correlation Coefficient was used to analyze data. One significant correlation detected between the total CMOCC score and an IDI subscale. There also was one significant correlation between an IDI subscale and an item from the CMOCC.

**Correlation total CMOCC score and Defense/Denial subscale.** A significant relationship existed between the total score on the CMOCC and the Defense/Denial Subscale of the IDI ($r = -0.453$, $p = 0.004$). There was a negative relationship between these two variables. As the score on the CMOCC increased, the score on the Defense/Denial subscale decreased. This relationship does not align with the interpretation of the Defense/Denial subscale. Individuals who score high on Defense/Denial are characterized as displaying a tendency to simplify or polarize cultural differences and demonstrate a disinterest in cultural differences (Hammer, 1998). This
examination of differences is in opposition to the characterization of individuals who score on the Denial/Defense dimension. Individuals with this particular worldview are either in denial of cultural differences or are defensive about cultural differences, suggesting that they are not aware of the value of diversity. This negative relationship, therefore, does not support the premise of the IDI and the CMOCC. This is an unanticipated finding which is further discussed in chapter five.

Further analysis included partial Pearson Correlation Coefficient controlling for the variables of gender, race/ethnicity, years of experience, and age. The $r$ value is moderately significant even when controlling for these variables were controlled (Table 4.12).

Table 4.12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Controlled variable</th>
<th>Denial subscale $r$ value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>-.451**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.449**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>-.444**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years as Principal</td>
<td>-.432**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.419**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary/Secondary</td>
<td>-.450**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Months/Years Living in Another Culture</td>
<td>-.451**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$.
Correlation: Presence of Diverse Leadership and Acceptance/Adaptation Subscale

A significant positive relationship existed between diverse leadership and the Acceptance/Adaptation subscale \( r = .353, p = .028 \). The presence of diverse leadership (a person of color in administrative positions) is related to increased scores on the Acceptance/Adaptation subscale of the IDI. Principals from schools with a person of color in leadership had higher scores on the Acceptance/Adaptation scale. Individuals in the Acceptance/Adaptation dimension are able to adapt and accept cultural differences.

There were no other significant relationships between the IDI subscales and the CMOCC. There were, however, two relationships that were approaching significance: that between Defense/Denial and presence of a diversity committee, and the relationship between Defense/Denial and the presence of mandatory diversity training.

Correlation: Defense/Denial and Presence of a Diversity Committee

The relationship between the IDI subscale of Defense/Denial and the Presence of a Diversity Committee was approaching significance \( r = -.309, p = .056 \). The presence of a diversity committee may be related to a lower score on the Defense/Denial subscale of the IDI. A larger sample size might yield more significant results. The possibility of a negative relationship would not support the premise of the IDI and the CMOCC. Based on the definition of the Defense/Denial dimension, those who demonstrate characteristics of Defense/Denial would not likely establish a diversity committee.

Correlation: Defense/Denial and Presence of Mandatory Diversity Training

The relationship between the IDI subscale of Defense/Denial and the presence of mandatory diversity training was approaching significance \( r = -.309, p = .056 \). The presence of mandatory diversity training may be related to a lower score on the
Defense/Denial subscale of the IDI. Although the correlation is approaching significance, a larger sample size would be more sensitive to differences. Possibility of a negative relationship is an unanticipated finding and would not support the IDI Defense/Denial subscale measurement. This finding is discussed in more detail in Chapter 5.

Table 4.13
Correlations between Defense/Denial and CMOCC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>D/D</th>
<th>CMOCC</th>
<th>Diversity Committee</th>
<th>Mandatory diversity training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.451**</td>
<td>-.309*</td>
<td>-.309*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ** Significant at p < .01. * Significant at p < .05. D/D = Defense/Denial

Summary

This study used descriptive statistics, frequencies, correlations, ANOVAs and t-tests to answer three research questions related to individual cultural competence and organizational cultural competence. The major findings of this study suggest that the overall levels of cultural competence among 39 RCSD principals were average. The group scored 100 on the IDI, placing them in the ethnocentric range of the IDI continuum. There was, however, a significant gap between perceived levels of cultural competence and actual levels of cultural competence.

The levels of organizational cultural competence were in the average range. The results also showed that there was not a significant relationship between individual levels of cultural competence and organizational levels of cultural competence.

There were several findings identified by this study which focus on demographic variables that are related to organizational and individual levels of cultural competence.
Ethnicity was related to the overall score on the CMOCC and diversity-related mission statement, critical mass, and diverse leadership.

There was a negative significant relationship between the IDI and experience living in another culture. No other variables demonstrated a significant relationship to the IDI.

The small sample size may have contributed to the lack of significant relationships between the IDI and the CMOCC. There were no significant relationships between the IDI and demographic variables such as, race/ethnicity, gender, age, school level, educational level, and experience living in another culture. The findings are discussed in greater detail in Chapter 5.
Chapter 5: Discussion

Introduction

This chapter presents a summary of the major findings and related implications. The findings and implications are outlined according to each research question and discussed relative to theory, research, and practice. The strengths and limitations of the study as well as recommendations for professional development and future research are considered. A concluding statement summarizes the major elements of the dissertation.

The central research problem of this study focused on individual and organizational cultural competence among urban principals and their schools. Urban schools face the challenge of a growing population of students from diverse cultural backgrounds and low rates of academic achievement among them as evidenced by the persistent achievement gap. Barbara & Krovetz, 2005; Lindsey et al., 1999; Riehl, 2000; and Singleton & Linton, 2006 found that students from such backgrounds need school environments promoting cultural acceptance as well as sensitivity in order to achieve academic success. This study was designed to examine the problem of individual and organizational cultural competence in the context of the following research questions:

1. What are the levels of individual cultural competence among elementary and secondary school principals in the Rochester City School District?

2. What is each school’s level of organizational cultural competence?
3. What is the relationship between levels of individual cultural competence among school principals, serving two or more years as principal in their school, and the levels of organizational cultural competence of their respective schools?

Implications of Findings

Research Question One

Research question one asked, “What are the levels of individual cultural competence among elementary and secondary school principals in the Rochester City School District?” The four major findings related to this research question included: (a) levels of cultural competence among RCSD principals were average as measured by the IDI (M = 100.28; SD = 14.61), (b) a substantial gap existed between perceived levels of cultural competence and actual levels of cultural competence (t (1, 38) = 13.4 (p < 0.01)), (c) significant correlations existed between the subscales Minimization and Acceptance/Adaptation (r = -.327, p = .042; r = .407, p = .010) and specific demographic variables (i.e., race, gender, years/months living in another culture), and (d) the overall IDI scores were not associated with demographics such as age, race, gender, nationality, and years/months living in another culture.

Overall the average score for the principals in the area of cultural competence was 100.55 (SD = 14.61). This score was within the average range of the IDI and placed the principals’ group level of cultural competence within the Minimization dimension of the ethnocentric continuum. Although the scores clustered in the ethnocentric range, there was a great deal of variability with scores ranging from 69.92 to 125.00. This unevenness of scores consisted of 43% of principals scoring in the Minimization stage, 31% scoring above average in the Acceptance stage, 5% scoring below average at the Reversal stage,
and 23% scoring far below average at the Reversal stage. Overall, the average score
obtained on this instrument does not accurately represent the levels of cultural
competence among RCSD principals. The variability among the scores appears to
demonstrate strengths as well as areas requiring improvement to move from the
ethnocentric realm toward the ethnorelative side of the continuum where cultural
differences are acknowledged, accepted and respected.

Although the IDI yields a group score and individual scores, it is important to
interpret the group score with caution. As a group, RCSD principals' obtained an average
score of 100. Upon closer examination, this average is based on a wide range of scores
from 69 to 125. This broad range suggests interpretation of a group measure of central
tendency should be done with caution. It may be more appropriate to consider individual
scores on the IDI when designing professional development for principals. For example,
a principal scoring below average in the Denial/Defense dimension may have quite a
different view of cultural differences than principals scoring above average in the
Acceptance dimension. Carefully considering such individual differences provides the
opportunity to differentiate support and meet individual needs more effectively.

Sixty-six percent of the RCSD principals in this study demonstrated average
levels of cultural competence. In spite of these average levels RCSD principals are
currently leading urban schools that are culturally and ethnically diverse. Although the
levels of cultural competence are not below average, these average levels can be
problematic. The finding of average levels of cultural competence raises concern about
the type of leadership required for ethnically and culturally diverse schools. According to
previous research, higher levels of cultural competence are necessary to provide effective
leadership, particularly in schools as diverse as those studied in the current analysis (Allen, 2004; Lindsey et al., 1999; Smith, 2004). Increasing levels of cultural competence may positively influence leadership practices among principals.

The findings regarding levels of cultural competence are consistent with the findings elsewhere on school leaders in culturally and ethnically diverse schools (Gardiner & Enmoto, 2006; McCray et al., 2004; Ryan, 2004; Walker & Dimmock, 2005). Gardiner and Enmoto (2006) found that the six principals in their qualitative study were in the transitional or emergent stage of effectiveness as multicultural school leaders. Although the principals in their study were leading culturally and ethnically diverse schools, their stages of effectiveness were not at optimal levels. Transitional and emergent stages suggest that the principals were at the beginning and middle stages in their development as multicultural leaders. In the current study the identified stages of intercultural development may provide guidance in the type of characteristics individuals exhibit in an organization.

One implication of the finding related to the range of scores (69.92 to 125.00) is that none of the principals in the study obtained scores for placement in higher stages of intercultural competence. These data suggest that none of the principals in this study demonstrated a level of cultural competence in the Adaptation stage which would benefit students, teachers, and parents in a culturally diverse school environment. The higher stage of Adaptation is the point at which the individual is able to take on perspectives of other cultures. Additionally, these individuals encourage other members of the organization to develop cultural competence and provide opportunities for such growth. It
may be difficult, therefore, for these principals to consistently support curricular
diversification while accurately represent a broad range of cultural perspectives.

Another implication of the average scores on the IDI centers on principals' leadership capacity to provide adequate support of their staff in the area of cultural competence. Boyd (2004) and Mahon (2003) found most teachers are able to demonstrate average levels of cultural competence but require support in order to move beyond this level. Leaders must be able to support the cultural needs of staff, even when their own levels of cultural competence are not high. Previous research among principals indicated that principals were frustrated with their lack of preparedness in this realm (Allen, 2004; Gardiner & Enmoto 2006; Riehl, 2000; Smith, 2004; Walker & Dimmock, 2005). Administrators admitted that although they are required to evaluate teachers’ abilities to provide culturally proficient instruction, they themselves did not have a firm personal grasp on the concept (Gardiner & Enmoto, 2006). Having knowledge of culturally competent concepts also may have limited value when attempting to apply these concepts. The principals in Smith’s (2004) study were able to identify the characteristics of “intercultural competence” but had difficulty putting those characteristics into practice.

Results revealed a correlation between age and Minimization suggesting that older respondents had lower scores on the Minimization subscale. Younger respondents scored higher on the Minimization scale suggesting that they may have “resolved” issues related to minimizing cultural differences. In support of this finding, the Acceptance/Adaptation subscale also demonstrated a negative relationship with age. These findings indicated that older respondents scored lower on both the Adaptation/Acceptance scale and Minimization scale suggesting that they are not “resolved” on either of these dimensions.
and may have developmental "issues" in areas of intercultural development. Differences in age are not predicted by the IDI and may not be generalizable beyond this population. Findings in this area appear inconsistent with the premise that older participants have more years of experience and more opportunities to work with people from diverse cultural backgrounds. It is plausible that younger participants have received more exposure to cultural diversity training and initiatives as a result of demographic trends or may reflect changes in social views. Findings related to age differences deserve further investigation.

Acceptance/Adaptation also was found related to race and ethnicity. Black RCSD principals scored higher than Whites on the Acceptance/Adaptation subscale. This finding suggests that Black RCSD principals were more inclined to beliefs related to the acceptance of cultural differences. McIntyre (1997), Ladson-Billings (1994, 2001), assert that White educators may be more challenged in developing cultural awareness and its impact on the behavior and attitudes of others. These theories align with Hammer’s (2007) explanation regarding cultural differences in development. An individual’s race and cultural background may influence the types of difficulties one encounters in achieving cultural competence. Specifically, Hammer explains that individuals from the dominant racial group (Whites) tend to lack an awareness of their social privilege and assume more commonalities between cultures that may not be present. This disconnection and focus on commonalities may prevent or delay movement to the next stage of Acceptance. In contrast, non-dominant members, which include Blacks, experience Minimization differently, and consciously use it as a strategy to assimilate to the dominant culture (Hammer, 2007). It may be that Black participants experience fewer
difficulties at the Minimization stage and are, therefore, better able to move toward the next stage. For example, people of color may have fewer challenges in the area of self-image as part of a racial group, whereas Whites may have difficulty with this particular concept (Howard, 1999; Irizarry, 2007; Irvine, 2003; Nieto, 1999). This particular finding regarding race supports earlier results indicating variability among the IDI scores and suggesting that participants may experience different issues related to their levels of cultural development. Although individuals have similar scores or fall within the same stage, they may experience vastly different challenges in moving to higher levels of cultural competence.

Finally, the results indicate that those who have more experience living in another culture earned higher scores on the Acceptance/Adaptation scale. This finding is consistent with Bennett’s (1993) theoretical framework, the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS), which advances the notion that cultural experiences increase an individual’s level of cultural competence. According to Bennett it is important that these experiences provide meaningful interactions.

Findings related to experiences living in another culture also support research in the areas of medicine, nursing, and social work indicating that experiences and exposure may increase levels of cultural competence in these fields (Carter, Lewis, Sbrocco, Tanenbaum et al, 2006; Guy-Walls, 2007; Kardong-Edgren, 2007). For example, BSN faculty from states with greater numbers of immigrants scored significantly higher on measures of cultural competence (Kardong-Edgren, 2007). Similarly, social workers’ levels of cultural competence increased significantly after exposure to multicultural
content (Guy-Walls, 2007). These findings demonstrate the potential value of such experiences and likely have implications for education.

In the current study, those who spent more time living in other cultures may have acquired skills and knowledge allowing them to be more accepting of cultural differences. This suggests that personal cultural experiences are important to the development of cultural competence and may differ from professional experiences with culture. For example, working in a diverse school environment may not present an effective way to develop cultural competence. Mere presence in an environment with diverse cultural populations may not ensure the experiences needed to improve levels of cultural competence. It appears that a different set of experiences is required to move beyond the level of Minimization. Although experience in a diverse school setting provides an opportunity for interaction with those from other cultures, it does not preclude the need for more meaningful interactions with those from culturally different backgrounds. It also may be that the nature of instructional cultures like schools tends to emphasize teacher-to-student and administrator-to-student communications and, as such, require minimal reception of cultural learning. That is, in the schooling environment, teachers and administrators are “giving” information in far greater quantity than they receive from students. Even though some cultural information is “learned” by school officials coincidental to their work with students, such learning is secondary to the school’s role as dispenser of cultural information. Meaningful interactions may include developing relationships with students and families beyond the typical school day or inviting families to share their experiences and culture.
There was a significant gap between the actual IDI score and the perceived IDI score. The perceived score indicates how individuals rate themselves in terms of cultural competence. The actual IDI score indicates how the IDI rates individuals in developmental terms. Any gap greater than one standard deviation is considered substantial (Hammer, 1998). The 23-point gap yielded by the findings indicates that the respondents in this study overestimated their levels of cultural competence by 2.33 standard deviations (SD = 9.93).

The discrepancy between the perceived score and the actual score may become problematic when school leaders are presented with new information or asked to participate in additional training related to cultural competence. The overestimation of competence also may interfere with principals requesting additional support from the district. Principals may believe they are demonstrating high levels of cultural competence and conclude, therefore, that additional training is not necessary. Also, an inflated sense of cultural competence may lead to insensitivity to ethnic, race, class, or gender privilege (Bennett, 2003). It is, therefore, important to assist leaders in accurately assessing their areas of cultural competence.

There were insignificant differences in scores associated with demographic variables such as race, gender, age, school level, months and years living in another culture, and education level. This may be attributable to the similarity of the sample on several demographic variables (e.g., 95% of the participants were from North America, 85% had the same level of education, and most fell within the same age range). Additionally, the small sample size might not have been sensitive to differences.
**Research Question Two**

The second research question inquired: "What is each school’s level of organizational cultural competence?" There were five major findings related to this research question. The findings included: (a) schools generally obtained low average scores on the CMOCC (M=7.33), (b) schools with Black principals scored higher on the CMOCC than schools with White principals \( (r = .395, p = .002) \), (c) schools with Black principals were more likely to meet the critical mass checklist criteria than schools with White principals \( (r = .266, p = .044) \), (d) schools with Black principals were more likely to have a mission statement focused on cultural diversity than schools with White principals \( (r = .269, p = .041) \), (e) schools with female RCSD principals were more likely to establish a diversity committee than schools with male principals \( (r = .295, p = .029) \), and (f) RCSD elementary schools were more likely to establish a diversity committee than secondary schools in the same district \( (r = -.431, p = .001) \).

The average score on the CMOCC was 7.33 on a 12-point scale. The mean score indicates that the majority (56.1%) of the schools met at least half of the items on the checklist. These three items in order of frequency included mission statement (the mission statement developed by the school), having a person of color in a leadership position (person of color as a principal or assistant principal), and the establishment of a diversity committee (a committee focused on cultural diversity within the school). Two of the remaining three items were (a) mandatory diversity training and (b) less than 30% of schools were able to meet critical mass (30% teachers of color). None of the schools met the third criterion of a ratio of staff of color matching the student population. Overall, the levels of organizational cultural competence appear to require improvement.
In this study, only half of the schools met half of the criteria for organizational cultural competence, despite hosting an urban, culturally complex student population. This poor showing may be due to an absence of awareness, lack of commitment, or staff resistance. Some of the checklist items may present more of a challenge than others. For example, achieving critical mass of staff of color requires principals' involvement in recruiting and hiring teachers of color when principals may not have direct control over recruitment or hiring. Walker and Dimmock's (2005) research indicated that although principals were attempting to hire teachers from diverse cultural backgrounds, they expressed frustration with the process and stated they did not have control over the recruitment and hiring. Principals in the RCSD rarely control advertising, collection of applications, or preliminary screening of job applicants; however, they have some latitude in the development and implementation of the interviewing and screening processes for their building. These processes present a limited opportunity for principals to increase the diversity of their teaching and administrative staffs (Ragans, 2008). Extending this control to building principals and their teams may support building-level efforts to increase staff of color. The RCSD has recently implemented a diversity hiring initiative. It is important for the district to examine the results of this initiative, comparing results at the school level to similar effort by the district. Gains in the number of staff of color on the district level are not always easily observed by the building-level personnel. There may be specific schools with low representation of staff of color that would benefit from targeted efforts to increase employment of staff of color.

Fifty-six percent of schools had a mission statement that specifically addressed diversity. Principals can exhibit more direct control in the creation of mission statements.
One component of the school improvement planning process used by the RCSD, requires schools to develop such mission and vision statements. Mission statements can reflect an organization’s commitment to diversity, as well as identify the purpose of the organization (Michael, 2007). Although mission statements are only one aspect of organizational culture, they can clarify an organization’s values and goals. This particular checklist item may have been more prevalent because it is developed within the school building and is under the control of local school authorities.

Few schools in this study reported providing mandatory diversity training, although this is an area within the control of principals and schools. According to Lindsey et al. (1999), it is the role of the building-level administrator or principal to manage the dynamics of difference by providing training and support systems for conflict resolution related to cultural differences. The near absence of training aligns with the IDI data in that individuals in the Minimization and Acceptance stages would not likely provide training on the topics of cultural competence and cultural diversity (Hammer, 2007). One challenge at this stage is making school leaders aware of their own placement on the scale and the necessity of moving forward toward ethnorelativism. The provision of training by the RCSD also could make this step more achievable.

There appeared to be a positive correlation between the total score on the CMOCC and race and ethnicity. Further data analysis (ANOVA) revealed that schools with Black participants scored higher on the CMOCC than did schools with White principals, indicating that they met more criteria on the CMOCC checklist than White participants.
According to Diller & Moule (2005), Howard (1999), and McAllister and Irvine (2000), White teachers in urban settings may need more support to improve levels of cultural competence and meet the needs of students of color than Black teachers. Race and ethnicity also were related to the checklist measure and critical mass as defined by Green (1988) (i.e., at least 30% of teaching staff are people of color). There may be a variety of explanations for this finding. Many teachers are assigned by seniority, making it difficult to determine why critical mass was achieved by schools with Black principals as opposed to schools with White principals. Teachers of color may prefer to work with principals from a diverse background due to perceived similarities based on race and ethnicity. The impact of race and ethnicity is very complicated and requires further study to determine if it has a significant role in a school’s level of organizational cultural competence.

Race also was related to the presence of a mission statement focused on diversity. Schools with Black principals were more likely to have a mission statements focusing on diversity than were schools headed by White principals. As noted previously, Black principals may be more sensitive to diversity and thus may be attuned to the inclusion of culturally sensitive language when developing the mission statement for their school. Since this represents the third variable associated with race; further research is suggested to examine the potential role of race in organizational cultural competence.

Gender also may have a role in a school’s level of cultural competence. A correlation was found between gender and the establishment of a diversity committee. Schools with female principals were more likely to establish diversity committees than those headed by males. As part of a historically underrepresented group, female
principals may be more sensitive to the need for such committees. This idea of gender is
merely speculation at this point since this study found no significant gender differences on
overall scores of individual and organizational levels of cultural competence. The IDI
does not predict differences in gender. The findings of this study suggest that this
particular demographic variable deserves further study.

A negative correlation was found between school level and the establishment of a
diversity committee. Elementary schools were more likely to have diversity committees
than were their secondary counterparts. Sixty-four percent of the elementary principals
were females which may account for the greater number of diversity committees. There
were no other significant differences between elementary and secondary schools when
examining individual or organizational levels of cultural competence.

Overall, a school’s performance on the CMOCC can provide useful information
for schools and their sponsoring districts. The findings of this study are consistent with
previous research that found measuring levels of organizational cultural competence
provides an opportunity for improvement and discussion rather than a determination of
whether or not an organization has achieved organizational cultural competence.

Research Question Three

Research question three asked, “What is the relationship between the levels of
individual cultural competence among school principals, serving two or more years as
principal in their school, and the levels of organizational cultural competence of their
respective schools?” There were two major findings related to this research question.
These findings included: (a) a lack of a significant relationship between individual and
organizational levels of cultural competence ($r = -.112$, $p = .542$), and (b) significant
correlations between the Denial/Defense subscale and the total CMOCC score, as well as the checklist items, establishment of a diversity committee and mandatory diversity training \( (r = .453, p = .004; r = -.309, p = .056; r = -.309, p = .056) \). These findings and their implications are further explained below.

The finding of a null relationship between individual levels of cultural competence and organizational levels of cultural competence is unexpected given the literature in this area. Research that specifically examines both organizational and individual cultural competence simultaneously remains sparse; however, Cross et al. (1989), Lum (2007) and Sue et al. (1998) assert that individual levels of cultural competence may influence the organizational levels or, alternatively, they may influence one another. Few studies have attempted to establish an empirical connection between these concepts due to the complexity of each. These concepts, individual cultural competence and organizational cultural competence, are beginning to generate interest in the field of education. As education further defines individual cultural competence and organizational cultural competence in an institutional context, the measurement of these constructs may become more accurate. Future research investigating this relationship also may reveal more information about their interconnectedness.

Despite the result of no direct correlation between the two instruments, there were three correlations between the Denial/Defense subscale scores of the IDI and checklist items on the CMOCC, suggesting that there was some level of connection between these two instruments. The results revealed a negative relationship between the total CMOCC score and the Denial/Defense Subscale. Those participants with higher CMOCC scores had lower Denial/Defense scores. The relationships between low Denial/Defense scores
and the presence of a diversity committee and the presence of mandatory diversity training were approaching significance. These results are contrary to the premise of the Denial/Defense category. According to Bennett's DMIS model and the premise of the IDI an individual with a Denial/Defense worldview would not likely establish a diversity committee or have mandatory diversity training for staff. Also, such an individual would be expected to meet fewer criteria on the CMOCC.

Bennett's DMIS (1993) was used as the theoretical framework in this study. Since the DMIS describes an individual's world outlook and how one organizes cultural experiences, it can serve as a framework in understanding why certain individuals engage in specific activities and others do not. Bennett (1993) explains each stage and the types of behaviors demonstrated by individuals in specific stages. Contrary to the model, those individuals who had not "resolved" issues in the Denial/Defense stage scored higher on the CMOCC than those further from the "resolved" range. This finding appears contradictory since the Denial/Defense stage is characterized by a disinterest in cultural difference which does not align with the absence of the items on the CMOCC. Again, these relationships do not appear to support the DMIS model's characterization of the Denial/Defense stage of intercultural development.

Further analysis of the data revealed that Denial/Defense scores were relatively high in nature, ranging from 3.77 to 5.00, with 5.00 representing the highest score. All participants had achieved a score that placed them in the "resolved" range of the Denial/Defense stage (resolved = minimum score of 3.66). Based on the data presented previously, only 23% of the participants scored at the Denial/Defense range overall. It is important, therefore, to interpret these findings cautiously, knowing that most of the
participants were resolved in this area. In the Denial/Defense stage, “resolved” individuals are described as seeking interaction with culturally different people after a period of denying cultural differences. Establishing a diversity committee and mandatory training in cultural diversity may represent the way in which they seek this interaction reconciling their earlier stage of denial. In light of this finding the stage of Denial/Defense could present as a critical stage of development at least within the field of education. It may be important to engage those principals with an eye to further enhancing positive development and understanding of their cognitive framework at this stage.

Recommendations for Professional Practice

The following section provides recommendations for professional practice. These recommendations emanate from the study and its theoretical framework, the DMIS. This study has implications for understanding how school principals are trained and supported to be successful in culturally diverse school settings.

Most graduate administrative programs require at least one course in diversity or multiculturalism. This training, however, appears insufficient and rarely equips school administrators to support teachers in an effective manner (Gardiner & Enmoto, 2006). Administrators admit they are required to evaluate teachers’ ability to provide culturally proficient instruction, without having an adequate grasp of this concept themselves (Gardiner & Enmoto, 2006). Ongoing training, professional development, and self-reflection in the area of diversity are key elements for school principals who lead multicultural schools (Gardner & Enmoto, 2006; Lindsey et al., 1999; Riehl, 2000; Singleton & Linton, 2006). School administration programs should address cultural
competence reflective of changing demographics and a persistent achievement gap between White students and students of color. It is not only important to address cultural diversity within schools, but school leaders must begin to examine their individual levels of cultural competence and receive training in how to create culturally competent organizations.

According to Allen (2004) cultural competence can be described, taught, and learned. Since school leaders play such a critical role in promoting cultural competence, the development of their personal cultural competence commands support. Allen (2004) found that principals who were deemed “effective” in leading culturally diverse schools viewed themselves as lacking in training and perceived leadership in such schools as a consistent challenge. Principals may require additional support in the area of professional development. Research on principals of multi-ethnic schools indicates that continuous learning is an integral component of successfully leading schools with diverse student populations (Ryan, 2004; Walker & Dimmock, 2005). On-going professional development in cultural competence should be a key component in supporting school principals.

Researchers have discussed the importance of school leaders reflecting on personal levels of cultural competence (Manning & Barouth, 1996; Singleton & Linton, 2006; Troutman 1997/1998; Van Hook, 2004). Similarly, research in higher education contends that cultural competence begins with leaders' individual reflections. Becoming aware of one's own personal values regarding cultural differences and cultural diversity helps individuals evaluate personal commitments to these ideas. Organizations demonstrating success with diversity initiatives have leaders who are deeply committed
to diversity and willing to challenge traditional values (Kezar, 2007). This commitment may best begin with personal reflection. Leaders should consider reflective analysis in order to understand and communicate the meaning of diversity for their organizations (AASCU/NASULGC, 2005). This reflection may be critical given the educational inequities and challenges facing students of color both nationwide and within the RCSD.

School administrator programs should examine how prepared school leaders are in the area of cultural competence, particularly those individuals in urban areas. The conceptual framework of the DMIS and the empirical nature of the IDI may prove useful to those who design professional development for school administrators and teachers. For example, if educators (teachers and administrators) are aware of the developmental stages outlined in the DMIS framework, it may provide a foundation for individual growth in the area of cultural competence. Many educators are likely unaware of their need for such development.

It is important to establish a baseline measure or gather general information about the overall levels of cultural competence among principals. In the RCSD, a Diversity Initiative was launched in 2005. Principals were asked to lead this initiative in their schools. Knowing the levels of cultural competence among school leaders could guide the district in providing appropriate support to principals that is maximally effective in assisting in the implementation of diversity initiatives.

Based on previous research, principals demonstrate average levels of cultural competence just as teachers do. It is important, therefore, to ensure that when principals lead an initiative they have support and additional professional development much the
same as teachers. The RCSD should consider providing more training and professional
development opportunities for both school administrators and teachers.

In addition to training, accountability is needed. If cultural competence is
important to the RCSD, principals, teachers and other school personnel must be held
accountable for participating in training and implementing culturally competent practices.
For this to occur, the importance of cultural competence must be made clear by the
RCSD. Additionally, culturally appropriate behavior should be more assertively
incorporated in performance appraisals. The current teacher and school administrator
evaluation criteria includes “multicultural awareness” as a component in the formal
assessment process. This component is not clearly defined and possibly varies from
school to school. Support by the superintendent is required in seeking a common
definition and an assertive statement of the importance of cultural competence within
RCSD schools.

Rochester City School District principals scored in the stages of Minimization and
Acceptance, indicating a lack of focus on the role of race, particularly in the educational
setting. Singleton & Linton (2006) refer to conversations about race in the school setting
as “Courageous Conversations.” They are considered courageous because they openly
focus on the topics of race and racism, concepts that can be difficult to discuss. It is
important for the district to provide more opportunities for these conversations to occur.
For example, principals scoring higher on the individual level of cultural competence
might be invited to share their experiences with those scoring at the lower levels of
cultural competence. Sharing practices and experiences may provide insight and practical
information to those who have limited understanding of how to improve levels of cultural competence.

Along with discussions about race, the district should consider providing opportunities for examining racial identity development among staff and students. Racial identity development may influence individuals' perspective on diversity and cultural interactions. Examining racial identity development among staff and students could also provide information regarding personal views on race and culture. This type of information may support self-awareness among staff and students.

Individual schools and school districts should identify potential organizational barriers to achieving cultural competence. Such barriers are not limited to, but may include, lack of funding, lack of resources, lack of leadership commitment, lack of training opportunities and lack of staff resistance. Once specific barriers are identified, targeted support should be provided and building- and district-level leaders.

Districts and schools committing to the improvement of cultural competence should complete a needs assessment. Needs assessment strategies could include collection of data from student, parent and teacher surveys, focus groups, interviews with school leaders, and consultation with local experts. Identifying the cultural needs of the district and school should include a consideration of specific cultural values and norms, language differences, and assimilation issues. Cultural needs and values may vary according to the cultural background of students.

**Strengths of the Study**

The examination of individual and organizational levels of cultural competence among school principals may contribute to the literature on educational administration.
and school-based cultural competence. The participants in this study represent a group underrepresented in the literature. Most research has examined cultural competence among pre-service teachers, classroom teachers, and those in human service fields (Boyd, 2004; Mahon, 2003).

Some studies have investigated the cultural competence of school administrators using qualitative methods (Allen, 2004; Smith, 2004). This study is among only a few attempting to quantify levels of cultural competence among school leaders. The IDI and the CMOCC provide measures of the varying levels of cultural competence on both individual and organizational levels. Theorists assert that it is important to study cultural competence at both levels as they are equally necessary in meeting the needs of diverse populations (Darnell & Kuperminc, 2006; Sue et al., 1998). As the concept of cultural competence continues to extend into the field of education, this study may contribute to that growing knowledge base.

This study adds to information available regarding both the IDI and the CMOCC, by examining the relationship between these measures. While the present study did not find a direct correlation between the two instruments, it demonstrated relationships between the two measures when considering the subscales of the IDI and specific checklist items on the CMOCC.

This research may support efforts by the RCSD’s Diversity Initiative and related efforts to create culturally competent schools through the provision of baseline data on levels of cultural competence. In addition, this study may serve as a source for information about school leaders and their roles in delivering professional development concerned with cultural competence.
A notable outcome of this study is the opportunity provided to principals to reflect on cultural competence individually and organizationally. Reflection on this topic may increase personal awareness levels among principals. Awareness is a critical first step in the development of individual and organizational cultural competence.

Limitations of the Study

The primary limitation of this study was the use of a convenience sample. Interpretation of the findings is limited by a lack of comparison with other groups of school principals outside the RCSD. Although the research represented by this study is an innovative concept, the absence of comparative data is not unexpected given this study's resource limitations.

Using self-report measures may present limitations regarding truthfulness and accuracy of responses (Gall, Gall & Borg, 2003). Study analysis assumed that responses on the IDI and CMOCC were truthful based on the reported validity and reliability of those instruments. Self-report measures represent a potential threat to validity and should be seen with that caveat in mind when reading this study.

There is a dearth of quantitative research examining school administrators and their levels of cultural competence. In this study, the researcher elected to focus on school principals in the RCSD due to the district's “Diversity Initiative.” This study, therefore, was delimited to the population of school principals in the RCSD and is not generalizable beyond those who participated.

Additionally, it should be noted that the RCSD is in its fourth year of a five-year “Diversity Initiative.” This effort has led to an increased number of professional development opportunities related to diversity which may influence the findings of this
study. Given the limitations specified above, the present study may have limited implications for similar urban school districts striving to meet the needs of diverse students while committed to closing the achievement gap. This evaluation of individual and organizational cultural competence may be used as a foundation from which to develop and implement cultural diversity initiatives, evaluate school leaders, and improve education for multi-ethnic urban students.

Recommendations for Future Research

The present study suggests a variety of recommendations for future research. These recommendations are based on the findings and the fact that little research has explored cultural competence among school principals.

In light of demographic and academic achievement imperatives, it is important to continue examining individual levels of cultural competence among school leaders. Future research should look at individuals (teachers, support staff, students, and administrators) in particular schools to obtain overall measures of organizational cultural competence. Furthermore, each individual in a school building should be encouraged to examine their own levels of cultural competence and reflect on beliefs about cultural differences. This reflection could guide subsequent training for all school personnel.

A post-measure, with this convenience sample, may yield information about changes in the levels of cultural competence over time. Measuring changes over time could serve as a post-study measure following cultural competence training with RCSD principals.

Replication of this study with a different population using true pre- and post-assessment may provide more information about measures of cultural competence. The
influence of variables such as training, experiences with other cultures, and "courageous conversations" could be measured to investigate their influence on levels of cultural competence. For example, a measure of pre- and post-cultural competence following professional development may provide data regarding the influence of training. Establishing both experimental and control groups would add to the validity of such a study.

Future research might involve a larger representative sample of respondents. Replication of this study with school principals across various districts, both urban and suburban, may increase the validity of the study and provide more data that is generalizable.

Future research might include more qualitative components, such as interviews with principals, teachers, parents and students to assess perceptions of organizational cultural competence. Such interviews may focus on specific tasks, behaviors, and roles related to cultural competence. This information would demonstrate how principals lead their schools, while permitting researchers to further examine the relationship between individual and organizational cultural competence. More extensive measures of organizational cultural competence that include interviews of members of the organization might be used in future research. This information could help identify and categorize specific components of organizational cultural competence in urban and other school setting.

Perhaps naturalistic observations of principals working with staff, students, and parents along with informal conversations could elicit more qualitative data for subsequent comparison with quantitative findings. Such data also may provide more
accurate assessments of cultural competence, or at least, more contexts for understanding data similar to that generated in this study.

In the study reported here, the CMOCC was used to measure organizational cultural competence. Future research should consider modifications of the checklist to capture other aspects of organizational cultural competence. For example, some checklists might include items focusing on providing language translation and a physical environment promoting diversity (e.g., posters, magazines, and art). Specifically, checklist measures of organizational cultural competence might include a component inquiring about physical environments that reflect display of multicultural art, posters and literature. Such measures can complex to evaluate, but may provide additional information for the overall assessment of organizational cultural competence.

The purpose of increasing levels of cultural competence is improvement of student outcomes and academic success (Banks, 1994; Diller & Moule, 2005; Lindsey et al., 1999). It is important, therefore, for future research to investigate the relationship between schools' levels of cultural competence and student academic success.

In light of the finding that principals in this study overestimated their levels of cultural competence, obtaining the perceptions of those with whom principals work may add to an understanding of cultural competence. The perspective of students, staff, and parents might be included in future studies both for their own insights as well as their potential for counterbalancing overestimation of competence by principals.

Summary

The results of this study may help to identify possible strengths and areas requiring improvement among RCSD principals and the schools they lead. This
information may support initiatives to improve levels of cultural competence. As state and national standards focus on the need to prepare leaders who are ready to meet the needs of culturally and linguistically diverse students, the need to become culturally competent is likely to increase in importance. Improving levels of cultural competence may result in higher levels of achievement among linguistically and culturally diverse students while advancing the process of closing the achievement gap.

Conclusion

This study was designed to answer three research questions on the levels of cultural competence among school principals and the organizational cultural competence of their schools. This conclusion provides a brief review of each chapter of the dissertation as well as how each chapter addresses the development and completion of the present study.

Chapter 1 provided background information and a theoretical framework for this study. The problem statement focused on the demographic imperative growing from increasing percentages of students from diverse cultural backgrounds. This student population requires teachers who can provide instruction effectively in light of students’ diverse cultural backgrounds. Teachers and administrators need to work with students from diverse cultural backgrounds. The lack of such skills demonstrates the need to explore levels of cultural competence in education. Bennett’s Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) was recommended as a model from which to examine levels of cultural competence among educators and was used as the theoretical framework for this study. The study posed three research questions regarding levels of
cultural competence among principals and the organizational cultural competence of their schools.

Chapter 2 provided a review of related literature which included a discussion of the role of the school principal and research on cultural competence at the individual and organizational levels. In addition to the numerous responsibilities placed on school principals, changing demographics and the documented low achievement among students of color provide a rationale for becoming culturally competent in leadership. Research and theory on school leadership suggested that principals influence their organizations because their individual worldviews may impact their schools (Bolman & Deal, 1997; Brown, 2007; Klotz, 2006; Nelson & Bustamante, 2008; Sergiovanni, 2000).

Research on individual cultural competence among teachers and principals indicated that most demonstrate median levels of cultural competence. Based on research in the areas of medicine, nursing and social work, levels of cultural competence may be influenced by cultural experiences. Research on experiences and exposure to other cultures supported the premise of Bennett’s developmental continuum.

The development and examination of individual cultural competence levels are insufficient without a focus on the organizational level of cultural competence (Nybell & Gray, 2004). Darnell and Kuperminc’s (2006) examination of relationships between individual and organizational dimensions of cultural competence in public mental health agencies along with Yee and Tursi’s (2002) investigation of elder care services, concluded internal leadership and systematic support were key elements to moving organizations toward cultural competence.
Chapter 3 described the methodology to be used in collecting quantitative data based on the IDI and the CMOCC. The sample population was identified using convenience sampling and focusing on 58 principals in the RCSD. This section addressed the context, participants, instruments, procedures, and data analyses used in the study. Examined was the relationship between the levels of cultural competence among principals and the levels of organizational cultural competence of the schools they lead. Descriptive and correlation analyses of the data provided information relative to the proposed research questions.

Chapter 4 outlined the results of the study based on analyses using descriptive statistics, correlations, ANOVAs and t-tests to answer three research questions related to individual and organizational cultural competence. The levels of individual cultural competence were in the average range for the 39 participants. The levels of organizational cultural competence were in the low average range. The results also found no significant relationship between individual levels of cultural competence and organizational levels of cultural competence. There were, however, relationships between subscales of the IDI and checklist items from the CMOCC, suggesting that there is potential connection between these measures.

In Chapter 5 the major findings and their implications have been presented. The discussion centered on the average levels of individual cultural competence among the 39 participants and the implications of this finding. Levels of cultural competence at the Minimization and Acceptance stages of the IDI and DMIS, can pose challenges for principals in schools serving ethnically and culturally diverse students. The low-average levels of organizational cultural competence indicated the absence of specific checklist
items for a majority of the participants. An unanticipated finding indicated three checklist items were related to the Denial/Defense scale suggesting a potential relationship between the certain individual and organizational levels of cultural competence. The chapter concluded with recommendations for professional practice and future research.

Concluding Remarks

Lindsey et al. (2005) reminds us that “as a leader, making a commitment to align your practice with culturally proficient behavior and working to engage others in making similar commitments requires that you begin where you are—individually and organizationally” (p. 53). Individual and organizational cultural competence begins with the self. School leaders must begin to examine themselves and their organizations as cultural entities and seek to understand how cultural competence may impact students, teachers, and parents. This investigation represents a snapshot of 39 participants and their schools in a journey to increase the academic achievement of students. The development of cultural competence is a process that requires ongoing support in the form of training, assessment and accountability. Understanding the role of cultural competence in education may help to improve outcomes for students from diverse cultural backgrounds and advance efforts at closing the achievement gap found for many children of color.
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Appendix A

Scales and Dimensions of the IDI and the DMIS
### Scales and Dimensions of the IDI and the DMIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnocentric Stages and Sub-stages</th>
<th>Ethnocentric Scales</th>
<th>Denial Stage:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Isolation</td>
<td>Denial Scale</td>
<td>• Includes both sub-stages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Separation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Defense Stage:                     |                     | Defense Scale: |
| • Denigration                     |                     | • Denigration and Superiory joined under single scale |
| • Superiority                     |                     | • Reversal not used |
| • Reversal                        |                     |               |

| Minimization Stage:                |                     | Minimization: |
| • Physical Universalism           |                     | • Includes both sub-stages |
| • Transcendent Universalism       |                     |               |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnorelative Stages and Sub-stages</th>
<th>Ethnorelative Scales</th>
<th>Acceptance Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Respect for Behavioral Differences</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Includes both sub-stages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Respect for Value Differences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Adaptation Stages (Becomes two separate scales) | Cognitive Adaptation Scale |
| • Empathy (Cognitive Adaptation)               | Behavioral Adaptation Scale |
| • Pluralism (Behavioral Adaptation)            |                             |

| Integration Stage                      | Integration: Not Used     |
| • Contextual Evaluation                |                             |
| • Constructive Marginality             |                             |

---
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Appendix B

IDI Demographic Questions
IDI Demographic Questions

1. (Optional) Name and/or Identification Number: ____________________________

2. Gender: ___ Male ___ Female

3. Age Category: ___17 and under ___18-21 ___22-30 ___31-40 ___41-50 ___51-60 ___61 and over

4. Amount of previous experience living in another culture:
   ___ Never lived in another culture ___1-2 years
   ___ Less than 3 months ___3-5 years
   ___ 3-6 months ___6-10 years
   ___ 7-11 months ___Over 10 years

5. Educational level (completed):
   ___ Did not complete High School
   ___ M.A. degree or equivalent graduate degree
   ___ High School graduate ___ Ph.D. degree or equivalent level graduate degree
   ___ College graduate ___ Other (Please specify)

6. Nationality and ethnic background: _______________________________________

7. In what world region did you primarily live during your formative years to age 18
   (please select one):
   ___ North America ___ Central America
   ___ South America ___ Middle East ___ Africa
   ___ Australia ___ Asia Pacific ___ Western Europe
   ___ Eastern Europe ___ Other
Appendix C

Copy of IDI Certification
This is to certify that

**Diantha Watts**

has completed the Qualifying Seminar for administration and interpretation of the Intercultural Development Inventory.

June, 2007  Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA

[Signature]

*This is a certificate.*
Appendix D

Contact Information for the Author of the IDI
Contact Information for the Author of the IDI

Mitchell R. Hammer, Ph. D.
The Intercultural Communication Institute
8835 S.W. Canyon Lane, Suite 238
Portland, OR 97225, U.S.A.
Phone: 503-297-4622
Fax: 503-297-4695
Email: ici@intercultural.org
Appendix E

Rochester City School District-School Improvement Plan Template
School Name:                     School Number:                
Grades:                        Total Enrollment:            Poverty %:        
Comprehensive School Reform Model: Number of Years:  
   School Status:               
   In Good Standing:            SINI YR 1:   SINI YR 2:   Requiring Academic Progress:   
   Corrective Action:           Restructuring:  SURR:  
   AREA CITED:                  ELA: MATH:  

Indicate activities to be implemented to promote effective labor management practices:
# SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
**PART I, II, III, IV**

School Name:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PART I: School Vision</th>
<th>PART II: School Mission</th>
<th>PART III: School Beliefs &amp; Practices</th>
<th>PART VI: School Customers &amp; Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Based on the District's Four Key Result Areas (Standards and Assessments, Learning Environments, High Performance Management, and Parent Participation, Public Engagement & Community Support), use of this template will assist your team to define the current and desired state of your school in the areas of academic achievement, climate, and standards, curriculum and instruction. Your team members will collect and analyze data related to the six improvement areas, identify the possible root causes of their findings and formulate action plans to bridge each achievement gap.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Citation/ Academic Focus Areas</th>
<th>SUMMARY OF BASELINE DATA</th>
<th>CAUSES/REASONS</th>
<th>AREAS REQUIRING SUPPORT AND DEVELOPMENT</th>
<th>PRIMARY STRATEGIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Achievement, Curriculum, Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Assessments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local District Assessments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Specific Assessments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMMARY OF BASELINE DATA</td>
<td>CAUSES/REASONS</td>
<td>AREAS REQUIRING SUPPORT AND DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>PRIMARY STRATEGIES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Climate Measures:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY RESULT AREAS</td>
<td>SCHOOL MEASURES</td>
<td>SCHOOL OBJECTIVES</td>
<td>TIMELINE</td>
<td>RESPONSIBILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1 Improving Student Performance through Monitoring Standards and Assessments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2 Improving Student Performance through our Learning Environments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3 Improving our Student's and Employee's Performance through Quality, Service, Effectiveness and High Performance Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment [JLM1]: Students' 
Comment [JLM2]: Employees
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY RESULT AREAS</th>
<th>SCHOOL MEASURES</th>
<th>SCHOOL OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>TIMELINE</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY</th>
<th>OUTCOMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#4 Improving Student Performance through Parent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation, Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement and Community Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment [JLM3]: The font size is larger (12pt) than above (10pt).
Appendix F

Checklist Measure of Organizational Cultural Competence
# Checklist Measure of Organizational Cultural Competence

(Darnell & Kuperminc, 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Does the mission statement explicitly address diversity or cultural competence?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Is there staff of color in leadership positions (administrative, lead teachers)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Is there a diversity committee, task force, or dedicated staff position?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Does the organization (school) require cultural competence training for all staff?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Is there racial/ethnic diversity among the staff?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Does ethnic/cultural diversity of the consumer population match the staff population?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Rochester City School District Letter of Approval
February 8, 2008

Diantha Watts
32 Goldfinch Drive
Rochester, New York 14606

Dear Ms. Watts:

This letter serves as formal Rochester City School District approval for your proposed project, *A Study of the Relationship Between Objectively Defined Levels of Cultural Competence Among School Principals and the Levels of Organizational Cultural Competence of Their Schools*. Please feel free to forward this formal approval to your Research Subjects Review Board and any other appropriate organization.

With nearly 200 outside research, survey and intervention requests per year, a number of specific criteria must be met in order to gain District approval for a proposal. Among them, it must tangibly benefit students, their parents, staff, or schools or departments. It must be supportable by the schools or departments impacted. Alignment with District goals is highly preferred. Your proposal meets all of these criteria. Your proposal is as ambitious as it is complex. Many of the salient features of the execution of your proposal will require carefully thought-out logistics. We appreciate that your project will require the express approval of RCSD. We are happy to provide this. Please note that principal participation is strictly optional. So, although your proposal is complex, in no way does this diminish its worthiness or our stated support.

Please continue to work with Andrew MacGowan and Dr. Gloria Sullivan of the Department of Research, Evaluation and Testing, my designees as liaison for your project. We will be most interested in meeting with you once your findings are completed.

We wish you every success in your most worthy project.

Very truly yours,

Jana L. Carlisle

C: Andrew MacGowan

Gloria Sullivan
Appendix H

St. John Fisher College Institutional Review Board Approval
April 2, 2008

Appendix I

Drumita Watts
32 Goldfish Drive
West Heronetta, NY 14586

Dear Ms. Watts:

Thank you for submitting your research proposal to the Institutional Review Board.

I am pleased to inform you that the Board has approved your Expedited Review project, "The relationship between objectively determined levels of cultural competence among school principals and the organizational level of cultural competence of the schools they lead."

Following federal guidelines, research related records should be maintained in a secure area for three years following the completion of the project at which time they may be destroyed.

Should you have any questions about this process or your responsibilities, please contact me at 355-8262 or by e-mail to emmerich@sf.edu, or if unable to reach me, please contact the Administrative Assistant to the IRB, Jamie Mosco, at 355-8318, e-mail jmosco@sf.edu.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Eileen M. Emmerich, Ph.D.
Chair, Institutional Review Board

EM, FRM

Cp: 0000000
Ref: 0000000

ST JOHN FISHER COLLEGE
Appendix I

Survey Request (Email)
Dear School Principal:

My name is Diantha Watts and I am a doctoral candidate at St. John Fisher College. I am conducting research on intercultural sensitivity (cultural competence) as part of the requirements for my dissertation, and I am requesting your assistance. If you decide to participate, please complete the Online Intercultural Development Inventory as part of this study. Please complete the online survey as soon as possible and before May 5th, 2008, by following these steps:

1. When you have 20 minutes, go to www.idiassessment.com
2. Enter your username (0205-PRNC08-58) and password (amM7kaPd). The username and password are case sensitive.
3. After reading the directions carefully, complete the survey. Please submit it at the end.

Your results will be confidential. Only the IDI Institute will have access to your individual responses, but they are not able to link them to you by name, e-mail address, or school.

I have attached a more detailed letter of introduction for your information. Do let me know if you have any questions. Thank you for your contribution.

Best regards,

Diantha Watts
Assistant Principal
Theodore Roosevelt School No. 43
585-458-4200 Ext. 1283
Appendix J

Letter of Introduction to the Participants
Dear Participant:

I am a doctoral candidate in the Ed.D. Program in Executive Leadership, at St. John Fisher College. The Institutional Review Board at the College has reviewed and approved this study. I am conducting research on intercultural sensitivity (cultural competence) as part of the requirements for my dissertation, and I request your assistance. If you decide to participate, you will be asked to complete a 50-item survey on-line. The questionnaire will take approximately 20 minutes of your time. I will also use information from your School Improvement Plan to complete a checklist measure of organizational cultural competence.

The goal of this project is to gain an accurate understanding of how intercultural sensitivity (cultural competence) is related to your school’s level of organizational cultural competence. This information may be used to improve personnel preparation and professional development here at the Rochester City School District and may add to our knowledge of cultural competence in the field of school administration.

All responses will be held in confidence. Participants may view the results of their questionnaire at any time should they desire. Taking part in this project is entirely voluntary, and there will be no penalty should you decide not to participate. You also may withdraw at any time after you begin the process.

If you want to know more about this study, please call me at 585-458-4200. The project has been approved by St. John Fisher College and RCSD. If you have questions about St. John Fisher College’s rules for research, please contact Jamie Mosca (Institutional Review Board) at 585-385-8000. A copy of this consent form will be provided to you.

Thank you for considering participation in this important study.

Sincerely,

Diantha Watts
Doctoral Candidate

CONSENT STATEMENT
I agree to take part in this project. I know what I will have to do and that I can stop at any time.

_________________________________________  __________________________
Signature                                      Date