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ABSTRACT

The overall purpose of this study was to identify how school leaders, in particular principals, influenced culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy. The goal was to examine the development of culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy in teachers who perceived themselves as having a high self-efficacy in a pilot study (Bishop, 2018). In this explanatory multiple case study (Yin, 2018), I specifically aimed to understand how a leader influenced culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy in the context of cultural differences between teacher and student. I conducted an iterative, explanation building process, beginning with a deductive coding of theoretical propositions, developed from relevant literature. I then used the emerged themes from the deductive coding to inductively code data to operationalize leader behaviors. Initial theoretical propositions and operationalized actions included leader influences by (a) modeling of culturally responsive behaviors, (b) providing ethical contexts for cultural responsiveness, and (c) promoting transformative learning. Beyond leader influences, I also analyzed data deductively and inductively in an explanation building process to understand other influences to a teacher’s culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy: (a) personal experiences, (b) interactions with others, (c) and challenges to assumptions and beliefs. I concluded the study with implications for educational leadership preparation programs and leadership practices and recommendations for further study. The results could possibly aid in culturally responsive leadership development (reflection, professional development and higher education) and could lead to greater influence of culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy in culturally diverse school settings.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

National teacher demographic data (gender and race) has been disproportionate to student demographic data (gender and race) over the past thirty years (NCES, 2012). According to NCES Fast Facts, in 2015, there were approximately 3.6 million elementary and secondary teachers in the United States, comprised of 76 percent female teachers. Additionally, NCES (2013) reported teacher racial data as 81.9 percent White, 6.8 percent Black, 7.8 percent Hispanic, 1.9 percent Asian/Pacific Islander, 0.1 percent American Indian / Alaska Native, and one percent with two or more races. Conversely, during the same time-period, the student population of elementary and secondary school students was 50 percent White, 16 percent Black, 25 percent Hispanic, five percent Asian/Pacific Islander, one percent American Indian / Alaska Native, and three percent with two or more races with fairly equal distribution of race (NCES, May 2018). Figure 1 below represents the national racial demographic comparison.

![Bar chart](image)

Figure 1.1: Percent of teachers by race in U.S. public schools (2012) compared to percent of students by race in U.S. public schools (2013).
The disproportionate teacher to student ratios existed prior to the past 30 years and is projected to continue through 2025 and beyond (NCES, 2016). Such a difference in teacher and student racial demographics negatively impacts students who are racially different from their teacher (Chamberlain, 2005) and historically has affected school achievement (Gay, 2005).

The achievement gap for non-White, non-native English speaking students has been evidenced nationally on K-12 standardized scores on the National Assessment for Educational Progress (NAEP), national high school graduation and drop-out rates (Balfanz & Legters, 2004; Harris, 2011; Jencks & Phillips, 1998; Lee, 2002; Lewis, Simon, Uzzell, Horwitz, & Casserly, 2010; Thernstrom & Thernstrom, 2003). The achievement gap is also evident in over-representation of non-White, non-native English speaking students in special education services (Coutinho & Oswald, 2005; Field, Jette & Martin, 2006; NCES, 2016) and under-representation in gifted education programs (Artiles & Trent, 1994; Obiakor, 2007; NCES, 2016).

With increased accountability for all students (Valli, Croninger, Chamblis, Graeber, & Buese, 2008), followed by the historical achievement gap (Gay, 2005), educational researchers and leaders are faced with an ever-present, long-lived question: How do we effectively and systemically close the achievement gap for non-White and/or non-native English speaking students? To answer the how question, I asked: Why, despite the accountability measures and historical achievement gap, does the achievement gap for non-White, non-native English speaking students persist? To answer the question, I focused this research on the differences in teacher and student racial demographics.
Therefore, this contribution to the discussion of how researchers and educational leaders might close the achievement gap between non-White, non-native English speaking students and their White counterparts is framed by the historical and projected demographics of students and teachers and an understanding that the perpetual achievement gap may be due to a disconnect between teacher and student, particularly the approaches to teaching students who are culturally different from their teacher (Gay, 2002; Ladson-Billings, 2000a).

**Background**

To frame this study, I first provide an identification of cultural differences, followed by a discussion of the need for cultural responsiveness and the challenges to being culturally responsive in the educational context. Next, I share the statement of the problem and introduce the purpose of this study, the research question, and delimitations. Additionally, I include a discussion of the theoretical propositions guiding my study and the theoretical framework. Lastly, I summarize the research design, limitations, and significance of the study.

**Identification of Cultural Differences in United States Educational Settings**

Although race is not solely indicative of one’s culture, race has an influence on culture. According to Terrell and Lindsey (2009), “culture is a set of practices and beliefs shared by members of a particular group that distinguish that group from other groups” (p. 16). Nieto (2000) added that a culture is formed not only by practices and beliefs but also by traditions, social and political relationships, and worldviews that are shared and bound together by a group of people.
With a predominantly White, female, middle class teaching population, most school cultures reflect the practices, beliefs, traditions, social and political relationships, and worldviews of a White, middle class, female culture. The disparity between the school culture and students with a culture different from their school results in learning situations that do not match the cultures, and therefore the learning needs, of all students. Members of groups who are culturally different from the predominantly White female, middle class teaching population (e.g., Black, Asian, and Hispanic, low income, foreign-born or speak a language other than English at home) share distinct values, beliefs and norms among group members, that oftentimes differ from the values, beliefs and norms of White cultural group members (e.g., White, American, middle class) (Nieto, 2002) and require different strategies or considerations when teaching (Gay, 1994; Ladson-Billings, 1995).

Cultural Responsiveness

In order to respond with different strategies or considerations when teaching culturally different groups, and teacher questioning about ability and equitable learning environments that meet the needs of all students, close attention needs to be paid to cultural responsiveness. Cultural responsiveness includes ways of teaching and learning focused on differences in learning. More specifically, it is a response to students’ cultures and an incorporation of their diverse perspectives. (Darling-Hammond, Austin & Nasir, 2003).

Terms such as cultural responsiveness and cultural relevance are broad concepts used by educators and educational leaders in embracing the complexity of culturally
diverse groups. Since the mid-1990s, terms such as culturally responsive teaching (Gay, 1994) and culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1995) have been used to describe ways teachers need to instruct students who are members of culturally diverse groups (Au, 1993; Nieto, 2000b). The challenges educators and educational leaders face in instructing culturally diverse groups are not merely instructional (e.g., instructional approaches, methods, strategies). Rather, they occur when the students’ cultural values and beliefs differ from the plural societal group (Weisman & Garza, 2002). The clash between cultural values is oftentimes the result of a racial deficit perspective (McLaren, 1994) and/or White-dominated worldview assumptions (Nieto, 2000).

Racial deficit perspectives and White-dominated worldview assumptions may manifest as teachers responding to student needs by adopting culturally relevant pedagogy and culturally responsive “best practices” without fully believing the theoretical and ethical implications of doing so (Hosteller, 2010; Shevalier & McKenzie, 2012). Additionally they may appear as a result of school leaders receiving little guidance on how to help teachers work with students who are culturally different from them (Ladson-Billings, 2002; Saifer & Barton, 2007). The problem with cultural responsiveness and cultural relevance is educators and educational leaders might consciously or even subconsciously subscribe to a racial deficit perspective or a White-dominated worldview assumption.

Educators or leaders with a racial deficit perspective or White-dominated worldview may not recognize or acknowledge the difference between the values, beliefs and cultural norms of their societal groups and those who are culturally different from
them. The cultural differences may cause more of a racial disparity gap than closing the racial disparity gap, resulting in a continued achievement gap for students who are culturally different than the current and projected White, middle class female teaching population.

**Statement of the Problem**

Throughout the history of the United States, much attention has been given to addressing the academic achievement gap and to creating equitable educational opportunities for all students, regardless of race. Racial disparities in education became the nation’s focus with the passing of *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954) and the demand for expedient desegregation in *Brown II* (1955); and has remained the focus as non-White racial groups continually underachieved academically compared to White groups. As early as the 1960s, educators adopted multiethnic education (Sleeter & McClaren, 2000) and later multicultural education (Banks, 2001), as responses to addressing the racial academic achievement gap. Banks (2001) suggested the transition from multiethnic education to the broader multicultural education was to create a bridge between racial and ethnic groups and to broaden the realm from ethnicity to include gender and sexuality. Sleeter and McClaren (2000) suggested the move from ethnic to cultural in the identified terms was political, intending to garner support of a larger audience by decreasing the focus on racially acknowledged social justice issues and instead promoting inclusiveness through celebrating cultural differences.

As the achievement gap continued, researchers focused more specifically on the cultural context of teaching and learning and furthermore suggested inclusiveness
through multiculturalism was not culturally responsive (i.e., relevant, sensitive, contextualized, congruent) for non-White racial groups (Delpit, 1995; Gay, 2000; Irvine, 2003). Scholars in the field of cultural responsiveness observed effective teaching of Black and Hispanic students and concluded effective teachers included an infusion of students’ cultures throughout the educational process (Foster, 1994; Ladson-Billings, 1994; Milner, 2006). Ladson-Billings (1994), along with researchers of culturally relevant pedagogy theory (Au, 1993; Delpit, 1995; Irvine, 2003; Moll & Gonzalez, 2004; Nieto, 2010), postulated that the lack of cultural responsiveness created cultural disparities which did not support the academic achievement of culturally different groups. Gay (2010), acknowledged by Banks (2010) as a progenitor of culturally responsive teaching, defined culturally responsive teaching as “using the cultural knowledge, prior experiences, frames of reference, and performance styles of ethnically diverse students to make learning encounters more relevant to and effective for them” (Gay, 2010, p. 31). Gay further contended culturally responsive teaching “is the behavioral expressions of knowledge, beliefs, and values that recognize the importance of cultural diversity in learning” (Gay, 2010, p. 31).

Since the inception of culturally relevant pedagogy theory and culturally responsive teaching, researchers noted the academic gains of culturally diverse groups in contexts where culturally responsive teaching practices were evidenced (Foster, 1994). Prior to culturally relevant pedagogy theory, researchers identified school leaders who displayed successful precepts of cultural responsiveness (Lindsey, Roberts, Campbell
Jones, 2005; Walker & Dimmock, 2005). Researchers found, though, that the gains had been isolated and lacked long-lasting effects when not sustained (Gay, 2010).

Researchers documented the inconsistent effectiveness of culturally responsive teaching resulting from superficial implementation or adoption of culturally responsive teaching practices (Hosteller, 2010; Shevalier & McKenzie, 2012); ineffective school leadership for the culturally different (Ladson-Billings, 2002; Saifer & Barton, 2007); or unethical treatment of racial groups by avoidance or lack of acknowledgement of student needs by the leader (Van den Akker, Heres, Lasthuizen & Six, 2009).

Researchers narrowed the cause of inconsistent effectiveness of culturally responsive teaching and reasons some culturally diverse groups do not perform well academically to two areas: a deficit perspective of culturally different groups or minimization of the accounts of racism through White-dominated worldview assumptions (McLaren, 1994; Nieto, 2000). Well-intentioned educators might possess a deficit perspective (McLaren, 1994), viewing a culturally different group member’s culture more as an impediment to learning and academic success. Others might minimize accounts of racism and assume the educational school context is equitable (McLaren, 1994). Worldviews and beliefs of the predominantly White teaching culture reflect the behavioral expressions of the dominant White population (Nieto, 2000).

Weisman and Garza (2002) contended teacher development “must address attitudes about difference and develop… an awareness of societal structures that perpetuate inequality” (p. 28). Gay (2010) included Teel and Obidah’s (2008) racial and cultural competencies for culturally responsive behavioral expressions, including value-
and belief-driven verbs such as seeing, creating, being, challenging, mediating, and accepting. The behavioral expressions needed in teaching culturally different groups may be affected by a racial deficit perspective or White-dominated worldview assumptions of the educator, causing ineffective practices in culturally diverse classrooms. The problem, therefore, is understanding how a school leader recognizes and eliminates value- and belief-driven biases that stem from a racial deficit perspective or from White-dominated worldview assumptions.

**Purpose Statement**

To address the individual development of culturally diverse students in an inclusive school environment and to recognize and eliminate value- and belief-driven bias that may be hindering academic success, there is a need for a focus on culturally responsive classroom practices. The purpose of this study is to examine the development of cultural responsiveness in teachers who self-scored as having a high level of culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy, including an examination of the influences a principal has on teachers’ culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy.

**Research Question**

The research question for this study hinges on Gay’s (2010) reference to behavioral expressions in culturally responsive teaching as cited earlier, “the behavioral expressions of knowledge, beliefs, and values that recognize the importance of cultural diversity in learning” (p. 31). Simply developing teachers’ expertise in teaching culturally different groups (i.e., using cultural knowledge, prior experiences, frames of reference, and performance styles (Gay, 2010)) may not serve to change value- and belief-driven
behavioral expressions in teachers. The following section is an explanation of the development of the research question for this study.

Based on the inconsistent effectiveness of culturally responsive teaching, caused by deficit perspectives or White-dominated worldview assumptions, Gay (2010) called for leaders to impact others’ personal assumptions and beliefs about cultural differences. The central factor in widespread and long-lasting effectiveness of culturally responsive effectiveness is leadership. Educational leaders within any given context are responsible for addressing the achievement gap. Educational leaders are also responsible for ensuring students are provided opportunities for equity and excellence (Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), 2015).

To address equity and excellence for all students, many school leaders have given attention to culturally responsive teaching (CRT) and culturally relevant pedagogy (CRP). The implementation of CRT and CRP have produced overall immediate results in improving achievement in those students who are culturally different from the teaching population (Dickson, Chun, & Fernandez, 2016) but do not have long-lasting effectiveness (Gay, 2010). Gay (2010) suggested teaching practices and pedagogy alone would not have the long-lasting effects culturally responsive leadership has in creating an inclusive school environment. Hattie (2010), using various leadership competencies, identified school leadership and the resultant collective teacher efficacy as having the greatest potential to considerably accelerate student achievement.

Lopez (2015) reported “culturally responsive leadership provides a way for educational leaders to theorize their work, develop agency, take action, and build school-
wide capacity on issues of equity, diversity, and social justice” (p. 173). Lopez further delineated the tenets of culturally responsive leadership needed to enact changes such as behavioral expressions changes: self-reflection and a commitment to (a) challenging the status-quo, (b) engaging in new methods of knowing and doing; (c) actively advocating for equity; and (d) staying the course. Proponents of social learning theory (Bandura, 1977, 1986) connected leader behaviors (such as role-modeling, care and concern, trustworthiness, and fair treatment of others) to influences on follower behaviors (Brown & Trevino, 2006). Therefore, based on the conflicting validity of culturally relevant pedagogy theory and the lack of widespread academic effectiveness for culturally diverse groups, I developed the research question: How do principals influence the culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy of teachers?

**Delimitations**

Results from a pilot study conducted in the summer of 2018 (Bishop, 2018) delimit this study contextually and methodologically. The purpose of the pilot study was to examine whether ethical leaders’ modeling had an impact on teachers’ culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy in contexts where cultural differences between teacher and student(s) existed. The research question guiding the pilot study was, “Do ethically consistent levels of principal reported and teacher perceived levels of principal ethical leadership relate to culturally responsive teacher self-efficacy?” The pilot study (Bishop, 2018) was conducted using data collected from voluntary participants in a southeastern educational consortium consisting of 85 schools within 12 school districts, using two surveys, one measuring the leader’s level of ethical leadership (ELQ) and the other
measuring the teacher’s culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy (CRTSE). Results of the pilot study (Bishop, 2018) indicated teachers’ perceptions of ethical behaviors positively correlated to culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy.

One goal of the pilot study was to identify sites and participants for this case study. The CRTSE survey scores from the pilot study (Bishop, 2018) were ranked from highest to lowest to select sites and participants for follow-up interviews based on CRTSE responses. Out of the top 20 scores, the scores from three sites had (a) the highest number of high scores; (b) included at least three teachers who ranked high on the CRTSE survey; and (c) gave permission for further interviews. Other sites did not have a high representation of high CRTSE scores and were not selected for this multiple case study. As a result, I delimited this case study to the three sites and 12 total participants.

A further goal of conducting the pilot study was to conduct a follow-up case study to understand how a leader influences cultural responsiveness in teachers. Yin (2018) indicated three analytical strategies for case study research: theoretical propositions, rival explanations, and case descriptions. Based on the pilot study, I crafted a theoretical proposition and rival theory to guide this study. They are:

1. Initial Theoretical Proposition: The case study will show high culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy is influenced by intentional actions of leaders (i.e., modeling of culturally responsive behaviors; providing ethical contexts for adults; and promoting and enacting transformative learning).
2. Plausible Rival Theory: The case study will show high culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy is not developed by the intentional actions of leaders but by personal experiences and interactions with others (Mezirow, 1991) or challenges to assumptions and beliefs (Oakes, Welner, Yonezawa & Allen, 1998).

The theoretical proposition was developed from a literature review initially conducted for the pilot study, and helped delimit the analysis of this study. In the following section, I expound upon the theoretical proposition and delineate the propositions used to develop the theoretical proposition and rival theory.

**Theoretical Propositions**

Culturally responsive leadership, derived from culturally responsive pedagogy, focuses on an inclusive school environment backed by philosophies, practices, and policies for students and families who are culturally different from the teaching population (Johnson, 2014). It includes practices to empower the parents of diverse, culturally different groups and to create a more multicultural curriculum in the schools (Johnson, 2007). To provide effective culturally responsive leadership, a leader must impact the cultural assumptions and beliefs of others if those beliefs and assumptions stem from a deficit perspective or White-dominated worldview perspective.

Due to the notion that beliefs and assumptions, and the meaning of those beliefs and assumptions “exist within ourselves rather than in external forms such as books, and that the personal meanings that we attribute to our experience are acquired and validated through human interaction and experience” (Mezirow, 1991, xiv), one suggestion for effectively changing the beliefs and assumptions of teachers requires role-modeling, care...
and concern, trustworthiness, and fair treatment of others (Bandura, 1989), but may not be possible without transformative learning experiences (Mezirow, 2000). Role-modeling, care and concern, trustworthiness, fair treatment of others and transformative learning are the basis of the theoretical proposition guiding the directions of this study, as described in the following sections.

**Role-modeling: Modeling of Culturally Responsive Behaviors**

Educational leaders could have an influence on teachers equitably responding to cultural norms of students with similar and dissimilar cultural norms. Such a change could occur through viable leader modeling of behaviors. Modeling is a major tenet of social learning theory (Bandura, 1971) and suggests behaviors are acquired through direct experiences and observation of the behaviors of others. Bandura stated that behaviors are largely influenced by examples as a socialization process, specifically where models selectively reinforce behaviors through the modeling of expected behaviors (Bandura, 1971). Kouzes and Posner (1987) suggested that an essential leader behavior is role modeling.

Blase and Blase (1999), in studying instructional leadership, added modeling as useful in influencing classroom instruction. Not only did teachers report the benefits of principals’ modeling teaching techniques, teachers reported modeling of positive interactions with students impacting teacher motivation and reflective behavior. One factor, therefore, that may influence a teacher’s level of cultural responsiveness is based on the role modeling plays in forming behaviors, in this instance, how the culturally responsive behaviors modeled by the school’s leader forms the beliefs and behaviors of
the leader’s teachers. With the above literature, I developed the first proposition for this study:

*Proposition 1: A teacher’s cultural responsiveness is influenced by the modeling of culturally responsive behaviors by the principal.*

**Care and Concern, Trustworthiness, and Fair Treatment of Others: Providing Ethical Contexts for Adults**

Due to the recurring themes of ethics and social justice embedded in the culturally responsive leadership charges (Gay, 2010; Johnson, 2014; Lopez, 2015), combined with racial deficit perspectives (McLaren, 1994), and White-dominated worldview assumptions (Nieto, 2000a), leaders could influence cultural responsiveness through ethicality. Ethicality is an ethical stance and focus on social justice through actions, relationships, and decisions (Nieto, 2000a). Ethicality is not only a stance of culturally responsive leadership, it is central to being a culturally responsive leader.

In the assertions of cultural responsiveness, the focus is responding to the needs of the culturally different, underserved, and excluded within an inclusive school environment to promote educational equity. To address the individual development of culturally diverse students in an inclusive environment, there is a need for ethical consideration not only for the culturally different but for all groups. This consideration is needed to ensure all groups and all individual students are provided an equitable education. Ethicality in leadership calls for attention to individuals while considering biases, individual needs, and cultural needs as well as ensuring policies, procedures, and practices are upheld with fidelity (Nieto & Bode, 2012) in the most equitable manner.
possible. During a point of ethical deliberation, a school leader need not suppose his or her actions can be technical or rational solutions, but must be undergirded with a moral compass.

The notion of a moral compass comes from Starratt’s (1991) ethical tripartite of ethics, consisting of (a) ethic of justice, (b) ethic of care, and (c) ethic of critique. Starratt’s ethical tripartite paradigm corresponds to Bandura’s (1989) notion of changing beliefs and assumptions through care and concern, trustworthiness, and fair treatment of others. Care and concern relate directly to ethic of care; trustworthiness aligns with ethic of critique; and fair treatment of others corresponds to ethic of justice. Paasche-Orlow (2004) directly called for a focus on three principles: (a) acknowledgement of the importance of culture on people’s lives; (b) respect for cultural differences; and (c) minimization of any negative consequences of cultural differences (p. 347-348). Gardner (1995) further suggested the need for ethical consideration for each child, by “accept[ing] as a universal task the fostering of individual development within a framework of rational and ethical values – at every age, in every significant situation, in every conceivable way” (p. 128). In addressing individual development, Lopez (2015) stated a culturally responsive leader ensures,

students who have traditionally been underserved and excluded (a) have the opportunity to achieve academic excellence; (b) engage in learning that raises their awareness of injustices in society; (c) experiences and ways of knowing are included in the teaching and learning process; and
(d) engage in curricula that disrupt in dominant privilege and power (p. 172).

Culturally responsive leadership, therefore, includes an ethical stance (Johnson, 2014; Lopez, 2015), which is needed to address individual rights and needs regardless of one’s own beliefs (Starratt, 2005). Based on these arguments, I developed proposition two as follows.

Proposition 2: A teacher’s cultural responsiveness is influenced by the ethicality of the principal’s culturally responsive behaviors.

Transformative Learning: Promoting and Enacting Transformative Learning

Mezirow (1997) added that the process of effecting change in a frame of reference in adults occurs through transformative learning. He argued that this occurs by engaging in “critical reflection on the assumptions upon which our interpretations, beliefs, and habits of mind or points of view are based” (p. 7) and further critical-dialectical-discourse about the assumptions with a trusted individual. Modeling alone may not cause an effect on the responsive nature of individuals, which requires a change in a frame of reference. Therefore, another factor that may influence a teacher’s level of cultural responsiveness are the elements of transformative learning, such as critical reflection and critical-dialectical-discourse within a trusted environment. With the above conceptualizations, I added the final proposition for this study:

Proposition 3: A teacher’s cultural responsiveness is influenced by transformative learning guided and enacted by the principal.
The purpose of this study, explicitly, is to examine how a principal influences teachers’ culturally responsive self-efficacy in order to understand (a) whether vicarious experiences and social observations are modeled for a teacher through a principal’s culturally responsive behaviors; (b) what ethical behaviors contributed to a teacher’s culturally responsiveness; and (c) whether past performance, communicative persuasion, and psychological state are enacted through guided critical reflection and critical discourse with the principal. To answer the research question, I concentrated on three areas that may form a teacher’s cultural responsiveness: (a) the teacher and his or her culturally responsive teaching practices; (b) the teacher’s perspectives about teaching in culturally responsive ways; and (c) the perception of culturally responsive teaching at the teacher’s school.

**Theoretical Framework**

To better understand how a leader could influence a teacher’s cultural responsiveness, I researched theories used for adult learning that require changes in assumptions and beliefs. Bandura’s (1977) self-efficacy is a social learning theory that explains how behaviors are acquired and maintained. He stated “self-efficacy beliefs function as an important set of proximal determinants of human motivation, affect, and action” (Bandura, 1989, p. 1175). Self-efficacy is how a person perceives his or her ability to complete or achieve a task while considering the degree of effort the person would need to dedicate to overcoming difficulties in the completion of the task (Bandura, 1994). Teacher self-efficacy refers to teachers’ perceptions of their abilities to perform an instructional activity with a high level of success (Guskey, 1987), and the teachers’
beliefs in their abilities to positively impact student learning (Ruble, Usher & McGrew, 2011). Whereas teacher self-efficacy is a teacher’s belief in his or her abilities to improve student learning and outcomes, culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy is more specifically focused on a teacher’s beliefs in his or her abilities to impact student learning by responding to students’ individual and collective needs in a culturally competent manner.

Bandura (1977) described the development of self-efficacy as being comprised of four components: past performance, vicarious experience and social observation, communicative persuasion, and psychological state. In the theoretical propositions guiding this study, cultural responsiveness may be influenced in teachers through (a) the modeling of vicarious experiences and social observations of the leader; (b) the ethical practices of a leader; and (c) the leader’s guidance in transformative learning experiences, including critical reflection and critical dialectical-discourse. Modeling, ethicality and transformative learning may influence a level of culturally responsive teacher self-efficacy.

**Research Design Summary**

The present explanatory multiple case study (Yin, 2018) builds on current demographic trend data and the results of the pilot study (Bishop, 2018) by qualitatively exploring three teachers and the principal in three different school sites (9 teachers and 3 principals) identified following the pilot study. The three schools with the greatest occurrence of high teacher culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy scores were
chosen as the research sites with each principal’s leadership practices serving as the cases for the multiple case study (Yin, 2003).

An explanation building approach (Yin, 2017) was adopted, beginning with a deductive process, based on an initial theoretical proposition and a plausible rival theory as stated in the theoretical framework, followed by an inductive process, based on gathered data from the cases. The initial theoretical proposition and underlying propositions were used to guide the multiple case study framework, including the semi-structured interview questions, data collection methods, and an outline for the multiple case synthesis. The interview questions were open-ended and broad to provide the teachers opportunities to reveal stories of the development of their perspectives and their perceptions of teaching students who are culturally different from them, including opportunities to share stories of experiences and influences, including and excluding the principals in developing and practicing culturally responsiveness. The guided conversation prompts (i.e., interview protocol) are validated through the corroboration of literature review concepts and sources to guided conversation prompts (Appendix C: Multiple Case Study Protocol).

Interviews were conducted in the selected sites with teachers who scored highly on the Culturally Responsive Teaching Self-Efficacy Scale (Siwatu, 2005) administered in the pilot study (Bishop, 2018). The reliability of the interview questions was ensured by triangulation among multiple sources (Yin, 2018). These sources included teacher interviews, principal interviews, documents collected from the schools (i.e., teacher handbook/manual, chosen curriculum, professional development materials), and
documents collected from the individual teachers (i.e., email and written correspondence, meeting notes, coaching logs, administrator observation data, administrator reflective questioning, FaceBook and Twitter posts).

The iterative process of explanation building (Yin, 2018) was used to analyze the multiple cases, using the initial theoretical proposition and plausible rival hypothesis presented earlier:

1. Initial Theoretical Proposition: The case studies will show high culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy is influenced by the intentional actions of leaders (i.e., modeling of culturally responsive behaviors; providing ethical contexts for adults; promoting and enacting transformative learning).
   a. Proposition 1: A teacher’s cultural responsiveness is influenced by modeling of a principal’s culturally responsive behaviors.
   b. Proposition 2: A teacher’s cultural responsiveness is influenced by the ethicality of a principal’s culturally responsive behaviors.
   c. Proposition 3: A teacher’s cultural responsiveness is influenced by transformative learning guided and enacted by the principal.

2. Plausible Rival Theory: The case studies will show high culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy is not developed by the intentional actions of leaders but by personal experiences and interactions with others (Mezirow, 1991) or challenges to assumptions and beliefs (Oakes, Welner, Yonezawa & Allen, 1998).

The iterative process I used followed the positivistic explanation building of Yin (2017). This process included (a) comparing the case study data to the initial theoretical
proposition; (b) revising the initial theoretical proposition; (c) comparing the data from the case to the revision; (d) comparing the data from the next case to the revised theoretical proposition and revising if needed; and (e) repeating the process through each case until all are completed. To ensure a high-quality analysis, I followed the four principles of good social research by attending to all the evidence, investigating plausible rival hypotheses, addressing the most important issue defined at the outset of the study, and demonstrating knowledge of the case study topic (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Yin, 2003).

**Limitations**

Cultural responsiveness is well recognized by educational researchers and practitioners as one of the factors necessary for academic success for all students. Successful educational practices stemming from cultural responsiveness rely on educators’ assumptions, beliefs and ensuing practices. Culturally responsive assumptions and beliefs may be influenced innately (e.g., from personal experiences, (Mezirow, 1991)) or may be influenced through extrinsic sources (e.g., challenges to assumptions or beliefs (Oakes, Welner, Yonezawa & Allen, 1998), critical reflection, and/or critical-dialectical-discourse (Mezirow, 2003)). The study of how a person’s culturally responsive beliefs and assumptions are developed is important, but understanding the influence a principal has on culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy is needed to add to the body of literature on developing and influencing culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy. This study is limited to principal’s influences on the culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy of teachers.
This study is also limited to three school sites in the southeastern United States. The schools’ populations consisted of predominately White, middle-class teachers and White, Black, and Hispanic, students from lower-income families and represented two school districts. The stories and accounts portrayed in this research are not generalizable to a broader context but do provide accounts of perceived and self-reported behaviors principals display and the influence the behaviors have on teachers’ culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy.

**Significance of the Study**

Based on the scant empirical research on the influence leaders have on influencing teachers’ culturally responsive practices (Hamm, 2017; Johnson, 2007; Johnson, 2014; Lopez, 2015), the study fills a gap in the literature base related to culturally responsive leadership practices and the effects on teaching self-efficacy in the context of culturally different settings. The research adds to the field of educational leadership by providing leaders a perspective to understand both the difficulties teachers face in implementing culturally responsive practices and the support a school principal can provide to teachers. Furthermore, district leaders and higher education faculty can use the results to better design and implement ethical leadership training for cultural responsiveness.
Organization of the Study

This chapter included a brief overview of cultural diversity, cultural responsiveness and culturally responsive leadership as well as the problem statement, purpose statement and significance of the study. The purpose of this chapter was to introduce a theoretical proposition wherein (a) ethical behaviors and culturally responsive practices are intentionally modeled and (b) transformative learning is encouraged to influence culturally responsive teacher self-efficacy.

The remaining dissertation is organized into five chapters. Chapter 2 reviews relevant literature on cultural diversity, cultural responsiveness and culturally responsive leadership along with components of the conceptual model (providing ethical contexts for adult learning; modeling of ethical behaviors and/or culturally responsive behaviors; and promotion of transformative learning by the principal). Chapter 3 describes the pilot study guiding this research followed by the research design and methods of this study. Chapter 4 includes descriptions of each case, including case members’ (a) personal assumptions and beliefs from personal experiences and interactions with others, (b) challenges to assumptions and beliefs, and (c) principal participation in the development of culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy. Lastly, Chapter 5 provides the cross-case analysis based on propositions embedded in the preliminary theoretical proposition along with Chapter 6 discussion of the study findings and the implications for study.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

This review of literature is divided into three sections. In the first section, I offer a brief history of cultural differences impacting student achievement, followed by a summary of the effects and causes of cultural mismatches in the school setting. Lastly, I include the theoretical framework of the study, including elements of social learning theory and transformative learning.

History of Cultural Differences Impacting Achievement

Racial disparities in education and attempts to equalize racial opportunities have been extensively documented over time. In this section, I provide a brief history of the efforts to rectify racial disparities in education and the implications both have on educational equity in the 21st century. In doing so, I recount the history of educational equity, particularly for non-White school-age children, followed by the accountability measures meant to monitor educational access and equity.

Racial disparities in education in the United States are noted as early as 1865, with the development of the Freedman’s Bureau and the creation of the first Black schools. Landmark events, such as the Civil Rights Act of 1866 and 1875, the 1899 Cumming v. Board of Education of Richmond County, and the 1896 Plessy v. Ferguson, along with the 1909 development of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) are responses to early acknowledgements of racial disparities in education. The NAACP served to fight racial and social injustice through legal action and eventually served to legally attack segregation in the Supreme Court’s hearing of
Brown v. Board of Education (1954), declaring that racial segregation in public schools violated the Equal Protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. The Brown v. Board case was significant because it provided national acknowledgement of the racial disparities in education and laid the groundwork for racial and social justice in the United States.

Despite the acknowledgement of racial disparities in education and Supreme Court rulings, the Brown v. Board ruling was not readily acknowledged by all states, with several southern state legislatures adopting resolutions declaring the Supreme Court’s decision to be “null, void, and of no effect.” Several legislatures in southern states followed the resolutions with laws imposing sanctions on those who implemented desegregation, and developed school plans to suspend public education, including disbursing public funds so parents could send their children to private schools (Aucoin, 1996). The southern states’ legislature’s stalling of integration and Brown II’s (1955) ordering “all deliberate speed” to desegregate served as a catalyst for student protests and resulted in the civil rights movement. Despite the protests and boycotts of the civil rights movements, attempts to end segregation through integration met resistance, with many southern schools either gradually integrating in the 1970s or adopting state level “freedom of choice” plans (Clotfeller, 2004).

Over 20 years later after Brown II (1955), the White House's Office of Management and Budget (OMB) issued Statistical Policy Directive Number 15, “Race and Ethnic Standards for Federal Statistics and Administrative Reporting,” stemming from the federal government’s need to monitor civil rights and voting access, and to more
accurately monitor the changing population dynamics (OMB, 1977). The directives indicated standards for the reporting of race (American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian or Pacific Islander, Black, and White) in federal programs (OMB, 1977), and later included ethnicity standards (non-Hispanic Origin and Hispanic Origin) (OMB, 1997). Final guidance from OMB (2007) allowed individuals (a) the opportunity to self-identify race and ethnicity; (b) expanded reporting options to seven categories (American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black or African American, Hispanic, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, White, and Two or More Races); and (c) provided the option to choose more than one race or ethnicity.

Following the OMB’s initial directive in 1977, the United States Department of Education, along with other federally funded agencies, began collecting aggregated data on race and ethnicity (New Race and Ethnicity Guidance for the Collection of Federal Education Data. (2010). In the late 1980s and early 1990s, several states (e.g., Ohio, Texas, and North Carolina) garnered voter support to develop and implement accountability systems in response to substandard test scores for protected populations such as those reported in the OMB’s Directive 15 (Heubert & Hauser, 1999).

Following the reported success of the states that implemented accountability systems, the United States Congress restructured federal funding and imposed accountability on all states in the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB, 2002) (Ravitch, 2001). The legislation in NCLB included funding statutes for K-12 education programs. It specifically targeted schools with high proportions of low-income families that received funds from Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
(ESEA) (ESEA, 1965) and schools with high proportions of low income families. The NCLB Act further required a state accounting system whereby schools must make adequately yearly progress on student achievement (NCLB, 2002). Achievement gaps based on race, ethnicity and income levels became evident through the NCLB reporting requirements.

With federal funding tied to race, ethnicity, and poverty levels, along with the reporting of each group’s achievement, the United States Department of Education has changed its focus from social-based education to equity-based education. The Department’s mission statement is “The United States Department of Education’s mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access” (https://www2.ed.gov).

To prioritize and address educational needs for realizing educational excellence and equal access as stated in the nation’s mission, the United States Department of Education collects, collates, and analyzes elementary and secondary enrollment data to make projections and address trends and needs. The Department’s National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) collects census data on elementary and secondary school enrollment (i.e., grade levels, state or region, and race/ethnicity), elementary and secondary school teachers (i.e., private v. public school, pupil-teacher ratios, and numbers of new hires), high school graduates (i.e., state or region and race/ethnicity), expenditures for public elementary and secondary education, enrollment in degree-granting postsecondary institutions (i.e., age, gender, race/ethnicity), and postsecondary degrees conferred (i.e., levels conferred and gender) (Hussar, & Bailey, 2011, 2016a,
Similarly, the United States Census Bureau reports demographic enrollment data collected from census respondents (i.e., race and Hispanic origin, nativity, family income, disability status, gender and language spoken in the home) (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011). Based on the most recent published American Community Survey (2011) responses, collected by the U.S. Census Bureau, national race/ethnicity demographics are White, non-Hispanic (57.7%), Black (15.6%), Asian (5.5%) and Hispanic (21.2%), and nationally elementary and secondary public school students come from poverty (12.7%), are foreign-born (7%) and speak a language other than English at home (28%) (American Community Survey, 2011). The United States Census Bureau reported a declining White population in schools from 2000 to 2011 (i.e. non-Hispanic Whites: 2000= 62% of students; 2011= 57.7% of students) (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011) and estimated by 2020, children of color, will represent half of the student population (U.S. Census Bureau, 2013).

Using data beginning with the 1998-99 school year, NCES members projected national enrollment in elementary and secondary public schools will increase two percent from 2013 to 2025 (NCES 2018). Within the two percent increase, though, the racial and ethnic trends and projections varied more significantly, with a projected decrease in White (-4.7%) and Black (-4%) and a projected increase in Hispanic (+3.6%), Asian (+0.9%) and two or more races (+0.6%) (NCES, 2018). Musi-Gillette et al. (2017) reported increasing numbers in high school completion and continuing education participation for all students enrolled, yet found each racial and ethnic group had differing rates of increase, including lower rates of achievement, retention, and behaviors
for non-White, poor, or non-native American. Overall, NCES and the United States Census Bureau consistently examined race and ethnicity, nativity, and poverty status to exemplify the changing demographics and in turn projected needs of schools and teachers (Gillette et al., 2017).

Despite the changing student demographics, teacher demographics remained constant, consisting of predominately White (81.9%) and female (76%) teachers in 2013. U.S. Education Secretary, John B. King, Jr., shared his push for teacher diversity while speaking at Howard University (public address, March 8, 2016). King called for action in addressing the low representation of teachers of color (18%) in the nation’s teacher workforce. Secretary King questioned the crowd, asking “how do we address this quickly and thoughtfully?” King’s call for diversity action addressed the Department of Education’s mission of ensuring equal access by addressing negative stereotypes through diverse role models to students; improving cultural sensitivity through teacher diversity; and closing the achievement gap through improved school experiences; and academic outcomes through high expectations of students of color (U.S. Department of Education). Current trends in teacher preparation programs and teacher retention do not present an immediate change in teacher diversity. Not only are teachers of color underrepresented in the educator workforce, people of color are underrepresented in postsecondary educator programs, leading to further projections of unchanging teacher diversity.

Due to the OMB and United States Department of Education’s demands for reporting race and ethnicity, nativity and poverty, much attention has been given to teaching students based on their identity. With the long-lasting trend of racial and cultural
disparities in public education, combined with the teacher demographics trends, and compounded by federal accountability and reporting measures, educational leaders need to understand why this trend continues and how leaders can influence change for educational equity. This is, it is essential to understand how educational leaders can overcome the demographic differences between teachers and students to ensure equitable learning experience for all students.

**Cultural Differences in the School Setting**

Due to the prevalence of the achievement gap between racially and culturally diverse students, I began with the why question, *Why does the racial and cultural achievement gap continue?* To examine a why question, Straker (2010) recommended an effect to cause reasoning method to anchor a problem in reality, a statement of known effects, to reflect on the hypothetical causes of the effects. Putting the effects first anchors the statement in reality. The reality of an historical achievement gap is an effect and the whys are hypothetical causes for the effect.

The one constant in the history of education in United States is the high prevalence of White, middle-class, female educators and the relatively higher achievement of White students. Since race and gender are components of cultural identity, the White teacher and White student may represent similar cultures. Conversely, a White, middle-class, female teacher and Black, low income, male student may represent different cultures. The effect of this difference may be a disparity in academic achievement among racial groups. Conversely, the similarities in cultures and the responsiveness to the student’s culture (i.e., cultural similarities) may be a cause of the relatively high achievement in White
students compared to non-White students. In the following paragraphs, I further examine empirical studies on the effects of teaching students with cultural differences in education, followed by possible causes of a cultural differences impacting the achievement gap.

**When Two Cultures Collide: Examination of Cultural Differences as an Effect**

In many cases, students perceived oppression in a school setting when cultural differences between teachers and students existed (Alexander, Entwisle, & Thompson 1987; Downey & Pribesh, 2004; Michaels, 1981). The first study below is an example of the effects of cultural differences between teacher and students. The second example extends beyond a teacher to student cultural difference, to a cultural difference among personal and community beliefs, norms, or values.

Charleston, Charleston, and Jackson (2012) researched the cultural barriers felt by African Americans in computing sciences. The researchers grounded their study using Bell’s critique of *Brown* (1954) and found that “racially isolated schools continue(d) and in many ways, the isolation of African American students from racially segregated careers [is] poised to become yet another frontier in the fight of educational parity…” (Charleston, et al., 2014, p. 415). The researchers also concluded that “the factors leading to the pursuit and persistence of the STEM field of computing sciences are largely attributed to culturally responsive practices whereby social construction trumps academic outlook among African Americans” (p. 412).
In an interpretive case study, Larson (1997) examined the merging of a predominantly White high school with bordering cities, which occurred 15 years prior. Although the merging was intended to equalize the opportunities of the minoritized students in surrounding areas, the entering students felt alienated. As the community began to have political issues, racial tensions flared, flowing over to the school setting. During a school talent show, seven African American males marched across the stage and destroyed an American flag replica then unveiled an African National Congress Flag. The males were suspended by the school administrators, causing challenges from the Black community. The school’s administrators were adamant that the males be punished for the unapproved act, sentencing them to a three-day suspension, and claiming that all students must be treated equally, based on institutional fairness. The researchers noted that “social problems such as those fueled by racial stereotypes about minority populations may be every bit as problematic as those of the community they serve” (p. 327).

**When Two Cultures Collide: Causes of Cultural Differences**

Teachers’ assumptions and beliefs influence their actions in the classroom (Gay, 2009, Pohan, 1996). Likewise, teachers’ actions are influenced by the frames administrators invoke (i.e., problems defined by administrators, solutions pursued by administrators) (Tyler, 2015). In this section, I explore beliefs and actions that may hinder cultural responsiveness in schools.

Pajares (1992) argued that educational inquiry must examine teachers’ beliefs, including their explicit and implicit biases, development of attitudes, and personal knowledge. Tyler (2016) suggested teachers’ ideologies related to diversity are
influenced by prior experiences, educational and teacher preparation programs, perceived and idealized racial attitudes, and personal beliefs about society. In a critical discourse analysis of interviews of teachers, principals and assistant principals, along with other school staff in suburban school districts across the United States, Tyler identified two discourses that threaten educational equality: White-dominated worldview or color-muteness and deficit perspective.

White-dominated worldviews may be informed by prevalent prejudices in American culture (Garcia & Guerra, 2004) and mirror racial attitudes of the general population (Tyler, 2016). Critical race theorists espouse racism as a means to meet Whites’ needs and methods to organize society to benefit themselves (Bell, 1987; Garcia & Guerra, 2004; Rogers-Ard, Knaus, Epstein, & Mayfield, 2013; Solórzano & Delgado Bernal, 2001). White-dominated worldviews may cause a sense of colorblindness or color-muteness (i.e., avoidance of racial terminology or discussions of racial inequities) (Hollins & Guzman, 2009). Conversely, an overemphasis of White-dominated worldviews may cause race neutrality (Frankenberg & Orfield, 2012), resulting in no acknowledgement of racial differences.

Several researchers argued teachers enter the teaching profession holding negative views of racial and ethnic, lower socioeconomic, and linguistically diverse students (Hollins & Guzman, 2009; Nelson & Guerra, 2014; Weisman & Garza, 2002). Deficit thinking may stem from beliefs that students from a lower socioeconomic status and different-than-their-own race or ethnicity, lack experiences and supports that would make them successful in school (Cooper, 2009; Garcia & Guerra, 2004; Lewis, 2001; Wainer,
This deficit thinking in practice causes teachers to ‘have little willingness to look for solutions within the educational system itself. ... [and] resist modifying their own practice” (Nelson & Guerra, 2014, p. 71).

Weisman and Garza (2002) examined preservice teachers’ attitudes toward diversity. The researchers assessed 150 preservice teachers’ attitudes toward diversity, before and after the students took a multicultural course. The findings showed the positive effects on attitudes of diversity of most students but concluded that just being a member of a multicultural class did not affect the “knowledge of existence of White privilege and continued to blame students and their parents for academic problems” (Weisman & Garza, 2002, p. 33).

**When Two Cultures Collide: Leadership Opportunities**

Research in the area of inequalities and impediments caused by teacher and student cultural mismatch is plentiful, beginning with the era of *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954), the first true attempt at providing equality for all children through racial desegregation of public schools. Nieto and Bode (2012) contended the inception of both multicultural and bilingual education were direct outgrowths of the civil rights movement, and they developed in response to racism (discrimination based on race), ethnocentrism (discrimination based on ethnicity and national origin), and linguicism (language discrimination) in education. (p. 6)
Amid the following studies, educators or administrators had to make an equity decision in the face of cultural diversity. Furthermore, according to Shapiro and Stefkovich (2005), equity,

deals with difference and takes into consideration the fact that this society has many groups in it who have not always been given equal treatment and/or have not had a level field on which to play. These groups have been frequently made to feel inferior to those in the mainstream and some have even been oppressed (p. 103-104).

Catarro, Shuda, Zander and Marshall (2008), justified unequal treatment of groups, especially groups who have historically been disadvantaged or oppressed. For many leaders, the paradox of providing unequal treatment to be equitable may cause dilemmas because the mainstream or community ideals may not align with community decision-making and policies (Shapiro & Gross, 2008). The struggle of opposing community ideals and beliefs, or more specifically, the struggle of opposing personal beliefs when making decisions for underprivileged and oppressed groups, calls for moral agency (Shapiro & Gross, 2008). Moral agency is a social process that is co-constructed with the community (Cherkowski, Walker & Kutsyuruba, 2015). Moral agency involves making moral judgments on behalf of others, and involves being held accountable for those actions (Angus, 2003). Gay (2010) argued,

if educators (or educational leaders) continue to be ignorant of, ignore, or impugn, and silence the cultural orientations, values and performance styles of ethically different students, they will persist in imposing cultural
hegemony, personal denigration, educational inequity, and academic underachievement upon them (p. 27).

The inequities faced by groups identified in the above-cited research and groups identified during *Brown v. Board of Education* and the later civil rights movements “continue to exist, especially for American Indian, Latino, African American, Asian, and multiracial youngsters” (Nieto & Bode, 2012, p. 6). In the cases cited above, affirmation of the diversity of students did not occur and resulted further in dilemmas for a culturally responsive leader. As a result, Nieto and Bode (2012) explained that, affirming language and culture can help students become successful and well-adjusted learners, but unless language and culture issues are viewed critically through the lens of equity and the power structures that impede the goals of social justice, these perspectives are unlikely to have a lasting impact in promoting real change. (p. 5)

Critically viewing language and culture requires moral agency and ethical consideration (Nieto & Bode, 2012).

**Leading the charge.** Doscher and Normore (2008), contended that “during times of national crisis and conflict, leaders in all areas of society, including education, find themselves in a decision-making climate filled with reactive solutions to dilemmas” (p. 9). The decision-making climate is fueled by a need for educators to “challeng[e] racism and other biases as well as the inequitable structures, policies, and practices of schools, and ultimately society itself” (Nieto & Bode, 2012, p. 5). Fullan (2005) suggested school leaders face dilemma-laden systemic change with moral purpose, calling for leaders to be
both agents and beneficiaries of the school change process. He further contended that moral purpose includes value-added components:

- effective [school] cultures establish more and more progressive interactions in which demanding processes produce both good ideas and social cohesion. A sense of moral purpose is fuelled by a focus on value-added high expectations for all, raising capability, pulling together, and an ongoing hunger for improvement (Fullan, 2005, p. 59).

Starratt (2005) built on the value-added level of moral purpose by contending that educational leaders “call on students and teachers to reach beyond self-interest for a higher ideal - something heroic” (p. 130) and indicated that educational leaders must act by “preventing harm to students and teachers, guaranteeing their security and safety, supporting equitable consideration, and fulfilling contractual obligations out of a sense of justice” (p. 131).

Walker, Haiyan, and Shuangye (2007) contended that “having a defined moral purpose, whether it is enacted through a shared vision or in more concrete forms, is about exercising moral leadership” (p. 380). Leadership carries the responsibility not just to be personally moral, but to be a cause of “civic moral education” which leads to both self-knowledge and community awareness (Foster, 1989, p. 284). Tuana (2003) called for the development of leadership moral literacy, comprised of becoming knowledgeable, cultivating moral virtues, and developing moral reasoning skills and further added (2007) ethics sensitivity, ethical reasoning skills, and moral imagination. In essence, school leaders in intercultural settings “need to know, connect to, and be responsive to their
communities, even if values, expectations, and traditions diverge” (Walker, Haiyan & Shuangye, 2007, p. 382). Katranci, Sungu and Saglam (2015) asserted that school leaders must contribute to the organizational effectiveness of the school by creating shared values through a mission, vision, and strategies in an ethical atmosphere.

In conclusion, Stefkovich (2006) stated that,

ethics should guide school leaders’ decision-making, [so] that there can be common ground even in multiculturistic, pluralistic societies, and that, rather than impose their own values on students and teachers, school leaders should strive to reach a higher moral ground in making decisions. (p. 4)

Moral purpose is, therefore necessary, in ethical consideration and in the development of an ethical school context.

**Providing ethical contexts.** In offering guidance to school leaders eager to develop an ethical school, Starratt (2005) identified a multidimensional framework of moral responsibility for educational leaders. The framework included five domains: (a) responsibility as a human being; (b) responsibility as a citizen and public servant; (c) responsibility as an educator; (d) responsibility as an educational administrator; and (e) responsibility as an educational leader. Each of the five domains successively builds upon the domain prior to it leading to a level of moral competence, or moral agency. In the context of a school, and moreover the context of a culturally diverse school, Starratt further contended,

one cannot be a good citizen and violate one’s own and others’ humanity.

Whatever progress the [leader] achieves in its governing must be accomplished
with and for the people it governs, respecting their rights as citizens and as human beings. (Starratt, 2005, p. 131)

During a point of ethical deliberation, a school leader cannot suppose his or her actions can be technical or rational solutions, but must undergird them with a moral compass. Brown, Trevino and Harrison (2005) proposed “leaders become attractive, credible, and legitimate as ethical role models in part by engaging in ongoing behaviors that are evaluated by followers as normatively appropriate” (p. 120). Normatively appropriate behaviors are relative to the context but include “conduct that followers consider to be normatively appropriate (e.g., honesty, trustworthiness, fairness, and care), making the leader a legitimate and credible role model” (p. 120). Starratt’s ethical tripartite paradigm (i.e., (a) ethic of justice, (b) ethic of care, and (c) ethic of critique) corresponds to Brown et al.’s normatively appropriate behaviors of ethical leadership as cited earlier: honesty and trustworthiness align with ethic of critique; fairness aligns with ethic of justice; and care directly corresponds to ethic of care. Paasche-Orlow (2004) further called for an ethic of cultural competence within the ethic of care in the medical field, focusing on three principles: (a) acknowledgement of the importance of culture on people’s lives; (b) respect for cultural differences; and (c) minimization of any negative consequences of cultural differences (pp. 347-348). Cherkowski, Walker, and Kutsyuruba (2015) found that “as public employees, principals often have to walk a difficult line between developing a culture of collaborative decision-making among professionals and adhering to the rules and prescriptions that often characterize a public bureaucracy” (p. 11), often creating a multidimensional framework for school leadership. Ethicality in
leadership for culturally diverse contexts, therefore, includes a combination of technical and rational solutions, and managerial tasks, integrated with the tripartite framework for ethical practice and a level of cultural competence.

**Being a Culturally Responsive Leader.** The scant empirical research on effective leadership for culturally diverse contexts focuses on the qualities and observed practices of cultural responsiveness. Culturally responsive leadership, according to Johnson (2014), is “derived from the concept of culturally responsive pedagogy, [and] incorporates those leadership philosophies, practices and policies that create inclusive school environments for students and families from ethnically and culturally diverse backgrounds” (p. 145) and include the practices involved “that help to empower diverse groups of parents and make the school curriculum more multicultural” (Johnson, 2007, p. 50).

In order to be a culturally responsive leader, Lopez (2015) suggested there must be attention given to students who have been underrepresented by ensuring they

(a) have the opportunity to achieve academic excellence;
(b) engage in learning that raises their awareness of injustices in society;
(c) experiences and ways of knowing are included in the teaching and learning process; and
(d) engage in curricula that disrupt dominant privilege and power (p. 172).

Due to the potentially dilemmatic events that could arise in confronting injustices and examining dominant privilege and power, a culturally responsive leader must be an ethical leader while maintaining a responsiveness to the needs of individuals.
**Being responsive.** Cultural responsiveness cannot be relegated to mere practices or a set of activities teachers use in their classrooms. The verb “responsive” designates the term as an action, and in this case, an action that reacts to individuals who might be culturally different from the predominant cultural group or more profoundly, opposes the cultural beliefs of the group. Since culturally responsive efforts have not had widespread or long-lasting effects on national academic achievement of cultural minority groups thus far, one must examine the leadership practices needed to effect systemic change.

Due to the sensitive nature of culturally responsive teaching, it is important to note the changes needing to be made are not surface level changes, but are deeper, personalized changes in the individual thoughts and actions of teachers. To impact the changes needed, a leader might convey culturally responsive actions through modeling of behaviors and through critical dialectical-discourse and critical reflection with the teachers. Modeling and critical dialectical-discourse or critical reflection may occur in isolated situations, but to have broad, long-lasting, systemic change, the educational leader needs to act ethically. Ethicality must be modeled for the teachers to ensure equity and access for each student, and must also be modeled to build trust and openness for critical dialectical-discourse and critical reflection.

**Promoting change.** Social learning theory is a theory explaining beliefs and actions of individuals are influenced by social interactions with others. Rotter (1954) first suggested social learning theory as a predictive model for understanding personality and one’s ability to accomplish goals. Rotter identified seven assumptions of social learning theory and the development of personality and behaviors, including personal experiences,
directionality of behaviors (e.g., goal setting), and expectancy that goals will (or will not) be reached. Bandura (1971), adding to the conceptions of social learning theory, suggested role processes, whether vicarious, symbolic, or regulatory, contribute to the development of behaviors. Bandura stated “most of the behaviors that people display are learned, either deliberately or inadvertently, through the influence of example” (p. 5). He posited “psychological functioning [of man] is best understood in terms of continuous reciprocal interaction between behavior and its controlling condition” (p. 2). This means behaviors are influenced by direct experiences and also vicariously, where both behaviors and consequences are observed and result in either in development or extinction of similar behaviors.

Bandura (1977) worked to narrow Rotter’s views and suggested there are two factors that contribute to the personality and behavior of individuals: self-efficacy and outcome-expectancy beliefs. Kattari (2015), referring to self-efficacy and outcome-expectancy beliefs as ableism, added “social learning theory is an excellent model that may be able to help people…recognize their able-bodied perspective and understand how their actions maintain ableism” (p. 377). Kattari concluded that the framework of social learning theory could be used to develop interventions for individuals to promote social change by meeting individuals where they are (Thyer & Myers, 1998).

One such intervention for meeting individuals where they are is based on transformative learning theory (Mezirow, 2000). Transformative learning, according to Mezirow (1996) is the process where a person uses prior meaning or interpretation to revise meaning and to guide further action. Mezirow (2003) stated “transformative
learning is learning that transforms problematic frames of reference—sets of fixed assumptions and expectations (habits of mind, meaning perspectives, mindsets)—to make them more inclusive, discriminating, open, reflective, and emotionally able to change” (p. 58). Frames of reference, according to Mezirow (2000) are mindsets, oftentimes fixed, based on interpretations and assumptions of prior meanings which were based on contextual beliefs, values and feelings (e.g., political, cultural, relational).

For adults, and in this case educators, frames of reference are based on meanings that may or may not have been challenged. Transformative learning includes challenging the frames of reference that do not have absolute, definitive meaning through critical reflection and critical dialectical-discourse with others (Mezirow, 2000, 2003). Mezirow (1991) framed the processes of critical reflection and critical dialectical-discourse using Habermas’ (1984) multi-dimensional communication process theory of communicative action.

Mezirow and Associates (1990) emphasized the social nature of transformative learning and highlighted the need for interaction with others: providing alternative perspectives; providing emotional support; analyzing differing points of view; identifying dilemmas as shared and negotiable; and providing models for new meaning-making. Ideally, the social, multi-dimensional communication process includes mutual trust and the following characteristics of both communicators: intelligibility, truth, trustworthiness, and legitimacy” (Habermas, 1984). In the absence of ideal circumstances, Habermas (1984, 1987) identified the necessity of discourses (i.e., explicative discourse based on intelligibility of a notion; theoretical discourse based on questioning of claims of truths;
and practical discourse questioning legitimacy) and the trustworthiness of the other communicator to question interpretations, develop assertions and explanations, and arrive at justifications for beliefs or actions (Habermas, 1984, p. 110).

Mezirow (2003), focusing on adult learning, suggested fostering the development of skills, insights and dispositions for critical reflection and critical dialectical-discourse to promote democratic citizenship. In order to impact adult learning, Mezirow warned the one educating the adult learner, in this case the leader leading the teacher(s), must also become critically reflective of the values, norms, and assumptions of his or her own beliefs as well as the beliefs of others. Mezirow contended that the role of the leader is “facilitator of reasoning in a learning situation and a cultural activist fostering the social, economic, and political conditions required for fuller, freer participation in critical reflection and discourse by all adults in a democratic society” (p. 63). Being a facilitator of reasoning and a cultural activist while maintaining mutual trust, intelligibility, truth, trustworthiness, and legitimacy calls for ethical sensitivity and ethical leadership qualities and trustworthiness (Den Hartog, et al., 1999; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991; Kouzes & Postner, 1993; Posner & Schmidt, 1992).

Beyond Modeling and Critical Reflection and Critical Dialectical-Discourse:

Focusing on Ethical Leadership and Ethical Sensitivity

The social aspect of social learning theory and transformative learning in adults problematizes cultural responsiveness for school leaders. School leaders are faced with influencing the personal values, beliefs, and norms of others in order to change frames of reference through actions such as modeling, critical reflection and critical dialectical-
discourse. Researchers further suggested the effectiveness of a leader depends on the perception of a leader’s behaviors, particularly honesty, integrity and trustworthiness (Den Hartog, et al., 1999; Dirks & Ferrin, 2002; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991; Kouzes & Postner, 1993; McAllister, 1995; Posner & Schmidt, 1992). Brown and Trevino (2006) substantiated the need for an ethical dimension of leadership to influence follower outcomes (e.g., follower ethical decision-making; prosocial behavior; productive behavior; follower satisfaction, motivation and commitment). Due to the possibility of ethical dilemmas in cultural responsiveness (e.g., meeting the needs of students who have controversially perceived values, beliefs or norms; raising awareness of injustices in society; teaching to disrupt dominant privilege and power), and the need to intervene and impact teacher values, norms, and beliefs, a leader must be perceived as ethical. In the following section, I explain the dimensions of ethical leadership and the nature of developing ethical sensitivity for handling dilemmas.

Ethical leadership extends beyond technical and rational solutions and ethical paradigms to the responsibility for the ethical development of others, organizations, and societies (Johnson, 2004). Starratt (1991) suggested “educational leaders must develop and articulate a greater awareness of their significance of their actions and decisions” (p. 187). Furthermore, Mayer, et al. (2008) added “ethical leadership… highlights not only the traits (e.g. integrity, concern for others, just, trustworthy) of ethical leaders, but also draws on social learning theory” (p. 1). Mayer, et al. (2008) contended that in the business world, top management provides the role modeling of ethical values and is more
readily able to dole out rewards and punishments According to research by Brown et al. (2005),

if leaders are to be seen as ethical leaders who can influence employee ethical conduct, they must be legitimate and credible ethical role models because employees may be cynical about ethical pronouncements coming from some organizational leaders, especially in a scandalous business climate. (p. 120)

In a study using exploratory and factor analysis, Brown, Trevino and Harrison (2005) conducted seven separate but interlocking studies to develop an ethical leadership construct and to create an instrument to measure ethical leadership for studying organizational behavior. Brown et al. proposed using Bandura’s social learning theory as a framework to examine the influence leader ethical modeling had on followers’ behaviors. Brown et al. purported, “in order to be an ethical leader who can influence employee outcomes, the leader must be viewed as an attractive, credible, and legitimate role model who engages in normatively appropriate behavior and makes the ethics message salient” (p. 130). The perception of normatively appropriate ethical conduct is created through role modeling and two-way communication (Brown et al., 2005).

Langlois, Lapointe, Valois and de Leeuw (2014) revealed that Brown et al.’s definition of ethical leadership considered moral reasoning and ethical leadership separately and further expounded upon Brown et al.’s definition of ethical leadership to include “a social practice by which professional judgment is autonomously exercised...[and] constitutes a resource rooted in three ethical dimensions – critique, care, and justice – as well as a powerful capacity to act in a responsible and acceptable
manner” (p. 312). To understand the link between the social practices of professional
guidance (i.e., ethical sensitivity, Langlois & Lapointe, 2007, 2009, 2010) and the ethical
dimensions of ethical leadership (i.e., ethics of critique, care, justice, Starratt, 1991) in
education, and to add empirical research to ethical leadership studies, Langlois et al.
(2014) constructed and validated the Ethical Leadership Questionnaire (ELQ) to be used in
educational contexts.

Langlois et al. (2014) developed the ELQ from prior qualitative studies (Langlois,
presented participants with a definition of an ethical dilemma and asked the participants
to reflect on a time when they faced a conflict between values that were equally
important. Langlois included interviews with participants to describe how they resolved
the dilemma, including any obstacles faced during the process. Langlois et al. conducted
thematic analysis using Starratt’s (1991) ethical framework of critique, care, and justice
and conclusively designed a typology of moral behaviors: nine related to critique, 13
related to care, and eight related to justice. Langlois et al. used the 30 moral behaviors of
ethical leadership to create the ELQ and added three Likert-scaled prompts to link the
dimensions of critique, care, and justice to ethical sensitivity in the participants:

1. For me, a situation that produces inequality presents an ethical dilemma.

2. For me, a situation which involves power-tripping creates an ethical dilemma.

3. For me, situations that are hurtful to people create ethical dilemmas. (p. 316)

Langlois et al. tested the ELQ by collecting data from 668 North American educational
leaders and randomly divided the samples into four subgroups to conduct four different
data analyses: 1.) item response theory to verify psychometric properties of the questionnaire; 2.) confirmatory factor analysis to test the three factors of the questionnaire; 3.) differential item functioning to examine differences in gender; and 4.) measure prediction of ethical sensitivity using the questionnaire.

Results of the ELQ indicated the presence of all three dimensions of Starratt’s (1991) conceptual framework in resolving ethical dilemmas in educational contexts. Ethic of critique and ethical sensitivity were most closely aligned. Langlois et al. (2014) attributed the alignment of ethic of critique and ethical sensitivity to the nature of the ethic of critique being closely aligned with social justice and preserving equity in schools. Langlois et al. emphasized the need for educational organizations to pay closer attention to the ethic of critique in educational leaders “as it appears to play a significant role in the development of ethical sensitivity, the ability to discern injustice, and privilege being a sign that one’s consciousness and perception of ethical issues is awakened” (p. 326). Langlois et al. noted an ancillary observation: leaders who examined and reflected on the questions in the ELQ became aware of strengths and weaknesses which prompted them to engage in a transformative cycle of improving ethical sensitivity in each dimension.

Intrigued by the transformative nature of learning prompted by the reflective self-assessment of using the ELQ, I, under the guidance of a university research mentor, delved deeper into Starratt’s (1991) ethical leadership framework and conducted a scholarly personal narrative on an identified ethical dilemma (Bishop, 2016). Based on the clashes of district-level, systemic reform mandates, and building-level administrative goals, I found myself in a values conflict as a district-level instructional coach. The
values conflict became the focus of my scholarly personal narrative as I sought to not only understand and comprehend the ethics of critique, care, and justice, but to extend myself to a higher level of analysis and synthesis of the dimensions of ethical leadership. The values conflict was personal and initially caused feelings of inferiority and inadequateness. Ackerman and Maslin-Ostrowski (2004) documented the emotional cost and scarring, as well as growth opportunities, arising from leaders’ wounding, often as a result of values conflicts. I found myself unable to make a decision and fell into the temptation of not causing conflict and dismissing my personal values and beliefs. I was validated by a statement in Langlois, Lapointe, Valois and Leeuw (2014), acknowledging “conflict prevents… her from making a decision” (p. 315). Langlois et al. continued with a quote from Hatcher (1998):

In resolving a moral dilemma, we can do better than to evaluate carefully the various elements of the interaction, to determine the predominant principles, and then to act accordingly. We will not always succeed, even when trying our best, nor will we always have the time to engage in extensive reflection before acting. (p. 121)

Hatcher’s quote provided me with the plan to resolve my dilemma by evaluating all elements, to determine the principles, and to act accordingly, but in this scenario, I intended to engage in extensive reflection before documenting an ethical decision-making process.

Buskey and Pitts (2009, 2013) identified a framework for minimizing scarring, through the use of an ethical decision-making process which, when applied, helps
individuals navigate conflict, in part by engaging in calculated resistance. Building on Buskey and Pitts’ model, I synthesized research aligned to Starratt’s (1991) tripartite ethical dimensions model and created questions to use in a reflective process for ethical decision-making (Appendix D: Synthesized Ethical Decision-Making Model). During the process of journaling and reflecting, I met with my university mentor, Dr. Frederick Buskey, who engaged in critical dialectical-discourse and critical reflection with me. Little did I realize I was participating in transformative learning through his open-ended and thought-provoking questions.

High-level learning and behavioral expression changes needed in cultural responsiveness are high-risk ventures (Gay, 2010). Attempts to change deficit thinking (i.e., color muteness, and colorblindness) (McLaren, 1994) or challenging dominant White worldviews (Nieto, 2000) in others is an even greater risk as a leader. Gay (2010) contended “to pursue [high-risk venture of behavioral expression changes] with conviction, and eventual competence requires… some degree of mastery as well as personal confidence and courage” (p. 26). Due to the sensitive nature of ethical dilemmas derived from possible values conflicts in being culturally responsive, personal confidence and courage is needed in leading for behavioral expression changes.

**Theoretical Framework**

Bandura (1988) provided guidelines in social learning theory to “equip people with the competencies, self-regulatory capabilities, and a resilient sense of efficacy that enables them to enhance their psychological well-being and personal accomplishments” (p. 299). The sense of efficacy is defined by Bandura (1977) as, “beliefs in one’s
capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments” (p. 3). The self-efficacy construct is based on beliefs that combined knowledge, skills, and competencies are mediated by a person's belief in using the acquired skills. (Bandura, 1977, 1988). Bandura (1988) suggested teachers with a high level of self-efficacy are more willing and more optimistic in teaching culturally different students and “focus their attention on mastering tasks” (p. 280).

Teacher self-efficacy is “intimately tied to the curriculum for students of such diverse groups as learning disabled and English Language Learners” (Sleeter, 2005, p.14). Tucker et al. (2005) added teachers oftentimes feel inadequate in teaching students with different cultural backgrounds than their own. Teachers oftentimes find “themselves in high-risk situations and barely coping” (Henderson & Milstein, 2003, p. 34)

Based on Bandura’s social learning theory, Gibson and Dembo (1984) contended that if Bandura’s theory is applied to the “construct of teacher efficacy, outcome expectancy would essentially reflect the degree to which teachers believed the environment could be controlled, that is, the extent to which students can be taught…” (p. 570). Gibson and Dembo’s research focused on creating a Teacher Efficacy Scale, based on a factor analysis of the proposed scale and added classroom observations. Gibson and Dembo suggested that “teacher efficacy is multidimensional, consisting of at least two dimensions that correspond to Bandura’s two component model of self-efficacy” (p. 579).

Siwatu (2007) developed and administered a scale to measure culturally responsive teacher self-efficacy along with outcome expectancy beliefs. Siwatu based his
research on social learning theory with the purpose of (a) examining the culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy and outcome expectancy beliefs of preservice teachers; (b) providing the data needed for factor structures and reliability measures of the *Culturally Responsive Teaching Self-Efficacy* and *Culturally Responsive Teaching Outcome Expectancy* scales; and (c) examining preservice teachers’ self-efficacy and outcome expectancy beliefs as a relational measure. The researchers found that the surveyed preservice teachers had higher self-efficacy when helping students feel like they are important members of the classroom and developing positive student relationships. However, they self-efficacy scores were not as high in terms of speaking with English language learners.

The researchers also concluded that preservice teachers’ outcome expectancy beliefs were high in the areas of building trust, but were lower in the outcomes of encouraging native language use. The researchers also found a positive correlation between teacher self-efficacy and outcome expectancy beliefs. Siwatu suggested, in light of this possible relationship. Bandura posits that self-efficacy and outcome expectancy beliefs can form four distinctive patterns (i.e., high/high, high/low, low/high, and low/low). Each of these patterns can produce different behavioral (e.g. high engagement, withdrawal) and affective (e.g., self-assurance, self-devaluation) responses. (p. 1096)

Siwatu described several limitations of the study:
1. The high correlation between self-efficacy and outcome expectancy beliefs should be taken with caution. Since only preservice teachers were surveyed, the results may change as development and experience increases.

2. This study surveyed a large percentage of White Americans, thereby not representing the national population and not generalizable to the population.

3. The scales do not contain an exhaustive list of skills of culturally responsive practices.

Implications from the research suggest that there is a need for cultural responsiveness training for preservice and in-service teachers. Siwatu recommended his prior research on *Culturally Responsive Teaching Practices*. Further research is suggested on the following questions:

- What is the relationship between teacher background variables and their CRTSE and CRTOE beliefs?
- What factors predict preservice teachers’ CRTSE and CRTOE?
- What is the relationship between different CRTSE and CRTOE belief patterns of preservice teachers and the number of courses taken addressing cultural diversity in the classroom and the number of practicum requirements completed? (Siwatu, 2007, p. 1097)

The direct interpretations of the relationship between CRTSE and CRTOE are represented in the graphic in Figure 2.1.
Chu (2011) further conducted a pilot study examining teacher efficacy beliefs in the service of culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) students. Chu examined 90 in-service special education teachers who taught English language learners in Pre-K through 12 schools. Chu used the scales used in Siwatu (2007) but selected the questions that focused specifically on culturally and linguistically diverse special education students. The scales focused around four themes: curriculum and instruction, classroom management, student assessment, and cultural enrichment (p. 395). Each scale was analyzed and Chu found that (a) “in-service special education teachers perceived the highest of their ability in creating a caring, supportive, and warm learning environment for their students from CLD backgrounds” (p. 398) and (b) “in-service special education teachers had the highest of certainty in using prior knowledge and culturally relevant
examples motivates students’ learning” (p. 399). Chu acknowledged several limitations of using a survey: (a) does not make a causal conclusion; (b) respondents were localized and therefore cannot be generalized to other regions; (c) vagueness in the term race; and (d) self-perceptions may be inaccurate. Despite the limitations, Chu drew several hypotheses from this study:

- A teacher’s culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy is positively related to her or his culturally responsive teaching outcome expectancy;
- There is a nonsignificant relationship between culturally responsive teaching efficacy beliefs and perceived effectiveness of teacher education programs in addressing diversity of in-service special education teachers;
- There is nonsignificant relationship between culturally responsive teaching efficacy beliefs and perceived effectiveness of professional development training in addressing diversity by in-service special education teachers;
- Several contextual variables could predict special education teachers’ culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy and culturally responsive outcome expectancy beliefs;
- A teacher’s collective teacher efficacy is positively related to her or his culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy as well as outcome expectancy beliefs (pp. 402, 404-405).
Summary

As described in this chapter, there is both an evident gap in research and a need among practitioners to understand how leaders influence culturally responsive behaviors in educational contexts where there are cultural differences between teachers and students. My review of the literature on effects and causes of cultural differences in the classroom led me to a number of conclusions. While there have been efforts to identify effective culturally responsive teaching practices, there has been relatively little effort to study culturally responsive leadership practices (Hamm, 2017; Johnson, 2007; Johnson, 2014; Lopez, 2015) and the influences in a teacher’s culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy. My intentions are to reduce the observed knowledge gap and to increase the knowledge of leadership practices important to school leaders who are working to influence culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy. Through research of effects and causes of cultural differences, methods to influence negative cultural assumptions and beliefs (i.e., color-blindness or color-muteness, racial-deficit perspectives, White-dominated worldviews) may include Bandura’s social learning theory and the act of modeling along with Mezirow’s transformative learning theory through critical reflection and critical dialectical-discourse.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

The question I posed for this research study is *How do principals influence the culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy of teachers?* I developed the question following a review of literature on cultural responsiveness, desiring to understand the prevalent achievement gap between culturally diverse groups and how a school leader could influence. I further examined the causes and effects of cultural differences between students and teachers, and developed a theoretical proposition to examine principals’ influences on teachers’ culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy, suggesting a principal might influence a teacher’s self-efficacy through modeling, ethical behaviors and elements of transformative learning.

In this chapter, I described the methodology, including details from a pilot study that delimited this study. I devoted the greater portion of this chapter to detailing the multiple case study protocol used, and further describing how the case study protocol enhanced the quality of the study. I concluded this chapter with a description of my positionality and how it aligns with this research study.

**Methodology**

In this research study, I began with a pilot study based on the collection of quantitative survey data (ELQ and CRTSE) from principals and their respective teachers within a southeastern educational consortium to assess whether teachers’ culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy related to the principal’s level of ethical leadership.
A Spearman’s correlation was run to measure the relationship between a teacher’s perception of his principal’s ethical leadership and the teacher’s level of culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy using a sample of 84 teacher participants. There was a positive correlation between teachers’ perceptions of their principals’ ethical leadership and the teachers’ levels of culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy, which was statistically significant ($r_s=.3470$, $p=.0012$). In modeling ethical decision-making and the effects of culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy, the principals’ reported levels of ethical leadership did not correlate with culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy ($r_s=.3470$, $p=.0023$).

With overall conflicting correlations between the impact of culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy and teachers’ perceptions of principal ethical leadership, along with the impact of culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy, and self-reported principal ethical leadership, the question of how a leader influences culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy remained. Using the survey responses to identify teachers with high culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy, I identified three schools with teachers who scored highly in terms of culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy compared to others in the sample. I then examined the question *How do principals influence teachers’ culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy?* in a multiple site explanatory case study.

**Delimitations**

In this study, I sought to understand how a principal influences culturally responsive practices and behaviors. I began with a quantitative pilot study to examine self-reported and teacher-perceived levels of principal ethical leadership and examined
teachers’ culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy beliefs. Following the pilot study (Bishop, 2018), and maintaining my positivistic theoretical perspective, I developed several theoretical propositions to explain how a principal might influence culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy, including ethical leadership behaviors (Starratt, 1991), leader modeling (Bandura, 1971, 1977) and leader guidance of teacher critical reflection and critical dialectical-discourse (Mezirow, 1997, 2006).

To address the overarching purpose of this study, examining how leaders influence culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy, quantitative or qualitative research alone would not provide sufficient data. Whereas quantitative research allows for generalizability; qualitative research provides meaning to personal stories (Creswell, 2007). Building on a quantitative pilot study (Bishop, 2018), I identified three principals within a southeastern educational consortium who displayed varying levels of self-reported and perceived principal ethical leadership behaviors along with three teachers at each school who scored themselves as having high culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy. Narrowing the study to three sites further delimited this research.

**Pilot Study**

In the pilot study preceding this research study (Bishop, 2018), I examined the question *Do ethnically consistent levels of principal reported and teacher perceived levels of principal ethical leadership relate to culturally responsive teacher self-efficacy?*

**Participants.** The data for the pilot study (Bishop 2018) were drawn from districts in the rural south that met the following criteria: (1) diverse population of students, based on race, gender, ethnicity, socioeconomic status and/or language; and (2)
teaching staff which was predominately different from the diverse population of students, in terms of race, gender, ethnicity, socioeconomic status and/or language. The schools were situated within a 12-district educational consortium. All 85 schools within the consortium were invited to participate, ensuring representation from all levels of PK-12: primary, elementary, middle, high school and career centers or alternative schools.

Teacher participants in the pilot study (N=82) were predominately White (N=73) and nine were not (e.g., Asian, Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino), female (N=75), and all primarily spoke English. Seventy-two percent of the teachers had earned at least a Master’s degree. The sample consisted of a representation of primary, elementary, middle, and high schools. Of the nine principals, six were female, six were White (one Black male and one Black female), and all spoke English as a primary language. Educational degrees varied from Master’s degrees (N=4), Educational Specialists (N=4), and Doctor of Philosophy (N=1). A majority of principal participants have been a principal for 10 or less years and all have served in his current school 10 or less years.

To ensure data were gathered from a teaching staff who were predominately different than the students, an added open-ended question was added to the survey, “Ethnicity (List or describe any social group(s) such as culture, religion, language, etc. that defines your personal identity.” Responses from teacher participants included Christian (N=27), religious affiliation (e.g., ARP, Baptist, Catholic, Latter Day Saints, Methodist, Protestant, Presbyterian, Reformed Baptist, Southern Baptist), race or
nationality (e.g., African American, Cherokee, European descent, White), English or English-speaking, and athletic, conservative and community volunteer.
Table 3.1: Summary of Teacher Demographic Background and Academic Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teacher Participants (N=82)</th>
<th>Principal Participants (N=9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Specialist</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor of Philosophy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Years as Teacher or Principal/ Years at Current School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5 years</td>
<td>16/49</td>
<td>4/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>13/12</td>
<td>2/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>24/12</td>
<td>1/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16+ years</td>
<td>29/9</td>
<td>1/0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Collection.** In the pilot study (Bishop, 2018), data were collected from voluntary participants in approved schools. Participants were emailed a link to a survey which included questions about the perception of the current principal’s ethical leadership (ELQ) along with questions about the teacher participant’s beliefs about his or her culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy (CRTSE).

**Measures.** Two research-based surveys were used to conduct the pilot study: the *Ethical Leadership Questionnaire* (ELQ) and the *Culturally Responsive Teaching Self-Efficacy Scale* (CRTSE).
**Ethical Leadership Questionnaire.** Langlois, Lapointe, Valois and de Leeuw’s (2013) *Ethical Leadership Questionnaire* (ELQ) was used to measure a level of ethical leadership, based on Starratt’s (1991) ethical paradigms of the ethics of critique, care, and justice. Although there are more recent introductions of ethical paradigms (e.g., ethic of profession, ethic of community, etc.) (Kutsyuruba & Walker, 2013), Langlois and Lapointe (2010) contended that the interdependent ethics of justice, critique, and care are needed to exercise moral judgement needed in ethical leadership, as posited in Starratt’s ethics of justice, critique and care. The ELQ, along with support from prior qualitative research (Langlois, 1997; Langlois and Lapointe, 2007, 2010), validated Starratt’s model and confirmed the presence of the three ethics in resolving moral dilemmas.

The ELQ is a 23-item, 6-point Likert scale survey which is prefaced with a definition of ethical dilemma, and divided into three sections: (a) When I reflect on the way I act at work, I can see that…; (b) When I have to resolve an ethical dilemma…; and (c) My decision in the resolution of an ethical dilemma is based on… The ethics of justice, critique, and care are reflected upon by the principal in random order, as prompts for each are embedded throughout the questionnaire, and scored from a level of 1 (Never) to a level of 6 (Always). The following section includes the breakdown of the questions in relation to each ethical paradigm.

**Ethic of justice.** Protection of human dignity within the community is central to the ethic of justice. The following items reflect the ethic of justice in the ELQ:

- When I reflect on the way I act at work, I can see that…
- I follow procedures and rules.
- When I have to resolve an ethical dilemma…
- I check the legal and regulatory clauses that might apply.
I check my organization’s unwritten rules.
I conduct an investigation.
I sanction mistakes in proportion to their seriousness.
My decision in the resolution of an ethical dilemma is based on…
the statutory and legal framework.

_Ethic of critique._ Injustice is primary to the ethic of critique. The following items reflect the ethic of critique in the ELQ:

When I reflect on the way I act at work, I can see that…
I don’t tolerate arrogance.
I try to make people aware that some situations disproportionately privilege some groups.
I speak out against unfair practices.
I speak out against injustice.
When I have to resolve an ethical dilemma…
I try to oppose injustice.
My decision in the resolution of an ethical dilemma is based on…
gerreater social justice.

_Ethic of care._ Human and interpersonal relations along with absolute respect are the major tenets of the ethic of care. The following items reflect the ethic of care in the ELQ:

When I reflect on the way I act at work, I can see that…
I establish trust in my relationships with others.
I try to ensure harmony in the organization.
I try to preserve everyone’s safety and well-being.
I seek to protect each individual’s dignity.
I expect people to make mistakes (it’s human nature).
When I have to resolve an ethical dilemma…
I take time to listen to the people involved in a situation.
I seek to preserve bonds and harmony within the organization.
I avoid hurting people’s feelings by maintaining their dignity.
I pay attention to individuals.
I promote dialogue about contentious issues.

Arar, Haj, Abramovitz and Oplatka (2016) examined the relationship between Israeli Arabian school leaders’ ethical dimensions (ethic of care, critique, and justice) and
ethical decision-making. Arar et al. issued the 23-item ELQ along with 17 additional items scoring ethical decision-making, culture and ethical sensitivity. The authors found the three dimensions of ethical leadership (Starratt, 1991) were linked to the leadership work of identifying ethical dilemmas and making decisions once ethical dilemmas occurred.

**Ethical Consistency.** In order to present a more in-depth account of principals’ levels of ethical leadership, the ELQ was administered to teachers of each principal to ascertain teachers’ perceptions of each principal’s ethical leadership qualities. The pronoun “I” was changed on each item on the ELQ to query the behaviors perceived of the principal (e.g., “When the principal reflects on the way he/she acts at work, I can see that he/she…” and “When the principal has to resolve an ethical dilemma, he/she…”). As a result of the added use of the ELQ compared to principal reporting of ethical leadership, ethical consistency was measured (Paine, 1994; Van de Akker, Heres. Lastuizen & Six, 2009).

**Culturally Responsive Teaching Self-Efficacy.** The CRTSE (Siwatu, 2007) was developed from Siwatu’s (2006) *Culturally Responsive Teaching Competencies* and Bandura’s (1977) self-efficacy construct. Siwatu’s (2006) proposed competencies included skills and knowledge of culturally responsive teachers, including cultural sensitivity, equity, and responsive teaching practices in each of the four domains: curriculum and instruction, classroom management, assessments and culture enrichment, as shown in Table 2. The CRTSE is a 40-item scale in which participants rate their confidence in their ability to engage in culturally responsive teaching practices (Siwatu,
2007). Each statement is scored by the participant on a 0-100 scale, providing a psychometrically stronger scale with greater discrimination than a traditional 4- or 5-point Likert scale (Bandura, 1977; Pajares, 2001). Participants rated each statement (e.g. “I am able to adapt instruction to meet the needs of students” based on the degree of confidence in doing so, ranging from a confidence of 0 (no confidence at all) to 100 (completely confident). A higher score on the survey demonstrated a higher level of confidence in abilities compared to those with a lower score.

**Qualitative Research Methodology**

I used the results from the pilot study (Bishop, 2018) to conduct this explanatory multiple case study (Yin, 2018) from a positivistic theoretical perspective (Crotty, 2015). Multiple case study evidence from a positivistic perspective is more compelling and robust than single case study designs (Herriott & Firestone, 1983). Pivotal to a positivistic multiple case study is case selection and replication design (Yin, 2018). I followed the multiple case-study literal replication logic outlined by Yin (2018): define and design the study, including developing a theory then selecting cases and designing data collection protocols; prepare, collect and analyze data by conducting each study and writing an individualized case report; and analyze and conclude by drawing cross-case conclusions, modifying the theory, developing policy implications and writing a cross-case report. The cases chosen for this explanatory multiple case study are conducive to literal replications due to the high survey scores on the culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy scale administered during the pilot study (Bishop, 2018).
Case Study Protocol

Yin (2018) outlined the steps to creating a case study protocol to increase reliability in a multiple case study. The steps are to include a case study overview, procedures for collecting data, protocol questions, and a case study outline (Yin, 2018). I created a case study protocol to guide my data collection across multiple cases in a systematic method, and to guide my inquiry (Yin, 2018). In the following sections I elaborate on the case study protocol sections to provide the steps for replicability.

Overview of the case study. Throughout the history of public education in the United States, non-White students have underperformed academically compared to their White peers, in a predominately White, female teaching population. Underlying the difference in race is the notion that race, along with other factors such as gender, ethnicity, and social identity (i.e., beliefs, religion, language, socio-economic status) identifies a person as belonging to a cultural group. The culture of the predominately White teaching population presents many students with a cultural mismatch for their personal and learning needs. The cultural identity of individuals is evidenced in the way people think, act, and do, and manifests itself in behaviors and beliefs typically indicative of one’s culture. The cultural mismatch is, therefore, a factor to be considered when analyzing the racial and cultural disparity in academic achievement throughout the history of United States public education.

Based on the tenet of cultural differences between students and teachers contributing to academic achievement disparity, along with my literature review and pilot study (Bishop, 2018), a prevalent question is How do principals influence cultural
Cultural responsiveness is a behavior needed by educators in educating students who represent a culture different from their own.

Bandura (1977) proposed that behaviors are acquired and maintained following social learning theory. Undergirding social learning theory is the notion of self-efficacy. Self-efficacy is how a person perceives his or her ability to complete a task while considering the amount of effort the person requires to overcome difficulties in the completion of the task (Bandura, 1997). One caveat of Bandura’s (1988) self-efficacy model is that one’s self-beliefs are built not only on modeled skills but also on the self-assurance the observer has in conveying the skills observed. Self-assurance is built through a social comparison process (Bandura, 1988), where seeing success in others’ sustained efforts raises the observer’s self-efficacy beliefs. Therefore, my goal for conducting this multiple case study was to document not only stories of the development of teachers’ culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy but also the influences a principal may or may not have on the teachers’ self-efficacy development, by answering the research question How do principals influence teachers’ culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy?

Propositions. In an explanatory case study, researchers seek the answer to a how and why question. The research question I posit, How do principals influence teachers’ culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy? is the how question I seek to understand. The overall theoretical proposition is The case studies will show high culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy is influenced by the intentional actions of leaders. The rival theoretical proposition is The case studies will show high culturally responsive teaching
self-efficacy is not developed by the intentional actions of leaders but by personal experiences and interactions with others (Mezirow, 1991) or challenges to assumptions and beliefs (Oakes, Welner, Yonezawa & Allen, 1998).

Instrumental to a positivistic perspective in explanatory case study designs is the deductive approach of developing propositions (Rowley, 2002). Cultural responsiveness is not merely a set of best practices. Cultural responsiveness is the acknowledgement of cultural differences and responding to others who are culturally different. Adult responses are based upon individual assumptions and beliefs developed by individual experiences and interactions with others (Mezirow, 1991). In becoming culturally responsive, a person may have to confront his assumptions and beliefs about a culture that he does not respect or value in order to truly be culturally responsive. As a school leader, the one who leads the vision and mission of the school and ensures each and every child has an equitable learning experience, the principal may effect change by challenging assumptions and belief systems. Challenges to assumptions and beliefs may create resistance but are necessary to reconceptualize assumptions and beliefs to promote equitable learning environments (Oakes, Welner, Yonezawa & Allen, 1998). I propose three roles a principal may play to effect changes in teacher assumptions and beliefs about cultural differences: role modeling (Bandura, 1989); ethicality (Bandura, 1989; Starratt, 1991); and transformative learning (i.e., critical self-reflection and critical dialectical-discourse) (Mezirow, 2000). The three roles are proposed as propositions to how a principal influences culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy:
Proposition 1: A teacher’s cultural responsiveness is influenced by modeling of a principal’s culturally responsive behaviors.

Proposition 2: A teacher’s cultural responsiveness is influenced by the ethicality of a principal’s culturally responsive behaviors.

Proposition 3: A teacher’s cultural responsiveness is influenced by transformative learning guided and enacted by the principal.

With all three propositions defined, the complete theoretical proposition is:

The case study will show high culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy is influenced by the intentional actions of leaders (e.g., modeling of ethical behaviors, providing ethical contexts for adult learning, and promoting critical-dialectical-discourse and critical reflection).

Based on the theory of self-efficacy development, consisting of personal assumptions and beliefs from personal experiences and interactions with others (Mezirow, 1991), and challenges to assumptions and beliefs (Oakes, Welner, Yonezawa & Allen, 1998), the plausible rival hypothesis for this study is

The case study will show high culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy is not influenced by the intentional actions of leaders but through personal experiences, interactions with others and challenges to personal assumptions and beliefs.

Rationale for selecting the cases. Bandura (1988) suggested modeling promotes a social comparison process that enhances or undermines an observer’s judgments of personal capabilities. The focus of this research is centered on the principals’ leadership practices and the influence they have on teachers’ culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy; therefore, the culturally responsive leadership practices of the principal in his
school, is the case. Principals were chosen for the study based on survey data from the pilot study (Bishop, 2018), where teachers self-scored as having high culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy.

**Data collection procedures.** Culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy scores from the pilot study (Bishop, 2018) were ranked from highest to lowest. Out of the top 20 scores, the scores from the following sites had (a) the greatest occurrence of high scores; (b) included at least three teachers who ranked high on the CRTSE survey; and (c) gave permission for further interviews: City Middle School, Country Primary, and Country Elementary/Middle. Based on these results, the participants were chosen for this multiple case study.

The qualitative case study consists of semi-structured interviews of both teachers and their respective leaders using open-ended questions. All participants were given a pseudonym to protect identities and all interview data and documents were saved in a password protected database. I recorded and transcribed the interviews using a transcription service (Rev.com) and later reviewed the transcriptions to verify their accuracy. During the interview process, I recorded anecdotal notes of expressions and body language to add richness to the interview transcriptions. The intent of the interviews was to allow the voices of the participants to be heard and to add depth to the questions. Gay (2012) contended “stories are powerful means to establish bridges across other factors that separate them (such as race, culture, gender, and social class), penetrate barriers to understanding and create feelings of kindedness” (p.3). Rosaldo (1989) further asserted stories “shape, rather than simply reflect, human conduct… because they
embody compelling motives, strong feelings, vague aspirations, clear intentions, or well-defined goals” (p. 129). By adding the stories of the development of teachers’ culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy, I will be able to describe the lived experiences of the participants in their own voices, and "explain the presumed causal links in real-life interventions for the survey" (Yin, 2018, p. 19).

Multiple sources of data were gathered to “corroborate and augment evidence from other sources” (Yin, 2018). I collected documents from individuals (i.e., email and written correspondence, meeting notes, coaching logs, administrator observation data, administrator reflective questioning, FaceBook, and Twitter posts) and from schools (i.e., teacher handbook/manual, chosen curriculum, professional development materials) during interviews and additional searches of school and teacher websites and social media to triangulate the findings.

**Interview questions.** The purpose of the interview questions was to guide the lines of inquiry (Yin, 2018) and to provide external validity to the research design (Rowley, 2002). Yin (2018) recommended crafting conversations for interviews but focusing on inquiry questions about each case. To not confuse the data collection source (teachers) with the unit of analysis (leadership practices), I separated the two levels of questions on the multiple case study protocol. I crafted level one questions to be articulated to the interviewee and divided them into teacher questions and principal questions. I delineated level two inquiry questions to include the concept being operationalized, the data to collect, and evidence to cite. I crafted level two questions to focus on the individual and the context. I included level two questions for the individual
to provide the reader additional information about the development of culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy and for future research on the topic. I used level two questions to operationalize the intentional actions of principals to influence cultural responsiveness (i.e., supporting practices, setting and articulating expectations, influencing beliefs and assumptions by challenging or confirming beliefs) in the school context.

Multiple case study outline. Three analytical strategies are necessary in a positivistic multiple case study: a theoretical proposition, a plausible rival theory and rich case descriptions (Yin, 2018). Rich case descriptions follow the format of level two inquiry questions and will be written for each case, operationalizing the intentional actions of principals’ influence on cultural responsiveness in the school context (Appendix C: Multiple Case Study Protocol). The multiple case study report consists of a cross-case synthesis using pattern-matching to theoretical propositions (Yin, 2018). The outline of the multiple case study includes seven foci centered around the three propositions: (a) ethical contexts for adult learning (ethic of critique, ethic of justice, and ethic of care); (b) modeling of culturally responsive behaviors (vicarious experiences and modeling); and (c) promotion of transformative learning (critical dialectical-discourse and critical self-reflection).

Participants

Each participant was given a pseudonym to provide anonymity. Culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy scores from the pilot study (Bishop, 2018) were collected from schools in a rural, southeastern educational consortium in the United
States. Although the pilot study consisted of survey data from 12 districts within the educational consortium, this study focuses on three schools within two of the districts. Both districts portrayed a cultural mismatch between the teaching staff and student population according to the South Carolina Department of Education website (retrieved 12/13/2018): District G1 (Country Primary) consisted of 61 teachers (83% female; 17% male, 97% White; 2% Black or African American; 1% Hispanic) and 951 students (47% female; 53% male; 15% Black or African American; .4% Asian; .5% Hispanic or Latina; 4% two or more races) in a poverty index of 72.7%; District L5 (City Middle and Country Elementary Middle) consisted of 368 teachers (81% female; 19% male, 84% White; 11% Black or African American; 2% Asian; 3% Hispanic) and 5786 students (48% female; 52% male; 30% Black or African American; .2% Asian; 12% Hispanic or Latina; 3% two or more races) in a poverty index of 70.8%. Median teacher income was above the poverty index in both school districts.

The teaching population in the three schools was predominately White, middle level socio-economic status females and the student population was a mixture of White, Black and Hispanic, lower-income students.

Data Analysis

I analyzed the data for all cases using an iterative, deductive approach (Yin, 2018) comparing evidence to the identified propositions (Rowley, 2002). During the deductive process, I examined the data for evidence of Level One and Level Two questions, as outlined in the case study protocol. My intent was explanation building by corroboration of the propositions. Data were analyzed using NVivo software, following a codebook
created from the seven foci of the theoretical propositions. I compiled each piece of evidence substantiating the proposition foci and synthesized the data according to the foci, either supporting or refuting the proposition foci. Following the deductive analysis, I analyzed the data using an iterative, inductive approach using evidence to explain the influences to the development of culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy. During each iteration, I read through the data collected for each proposition, allowing themes to emerge. As themes emerged, I revised the propositions to match the themes, resulting in a revised theoretical proposition.

Quality of the Research Design

Four criteria exist for judging the quality of empirical social research designs: construct validity, internal validity, external validity and reliability (Yin, 2018). I have intentionally considered all factors of quality research during the design process.

Construct validity. Construct validity is ensured through the collection of multiple sources of evidence. Sources of evidence are interviews from principals, with corroboration of teacher interviews, individuals’ documents (i.e., email and written correspondence, meeting notes, coaching logs, administrator observation data, administrator reflective questioning, FaceBook, and Twitter posts), and school-level documents (i.e., teacher handbook/manual, chosen curriculum, professional development materials). Documentation of the sources are evidenced in the data collection procedures of the case study protocol (Appendix C: Multiple Case Study Protocol).

Internal validity. Internal validity is evidenced in the data analysis section through explanation building (Yin, 2018). By deductively matching the data to theoretical
propositions, my goal was to explain how a leader influences cultural responsiveness. Inferences made as to how or why culturally responsive self-efficacy were developed and based on prior literature reviews and were plausible theories for changing cultural beliefs and assumptions.

**External validity.** The generalizability of the findings of this multiple case study was evidenced in the replication logic of the research design (Yin, 2018). The logic linking data to the propositions is promoted by the positivistic research design explicated in this methodology section.

**Reliability.** The goal of reliability is to ensure the research can be repeated to guarantee consistent results (Yin, 2018). I employed three tactics to provide reliability in this study: using an explicit case study protocol; developing and maintaining a case study database; and maintaining a chain of evidence (Rowley, 2002).

**Implications**

With the final analyses of data from the pilot study (Bishop, 2018), three schools were identified for this qualitative study. The data gathered from this qualitative phase revealed stories of how teachers perceived principals’ modeling of culturally responsive behaviors or ethicality, and how principals used critical-dialectical-discourse and reflective discourse to promote culturally responsive behavioral changes in culturally sensitive educational contexts. I used the data to provide rich descriptions of the principals’ influences on teachers’ culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy. In the qualitative phase, I extended responses on ELQ and CRTSE survey data and are of importance to principals for individualized development and to higher education.
instructors and personnel in principal preparation programs. Additionally, the results might be useful to district level personnel and superintendents in developing ongoing professional development opportunities for principals and aspiring leaders within the district.

**Limitations**

One possible weakness of this study was the sampling methods used and limiting of data as a result of the pilot study (Bishop, 2018). All conclusions were restricted to the location, limited sample size, and voluntary participation of teachers within districts where both the superintendent and principal agreed to participate. Additionally, due to the contextual nature of cultural responsiveness, the results are not generalizable to other contexts. Nevertheless, they provide examples of observations and perceptions of leadership behaviors in relation to cultural responsiveness.

**Positionality**

Driving the intentions of the research are my worldview and assumptions (Creswell, 2014) and the nature of cultural responsiveness. My worldview and assumptions stem from a naturalist perspective, believing that people act from social meanings. Social and cultural meanings, according to Hammersley and Atkinson (2007), are “intentions, motives, beliefs, rules, discourses and values” (p. 7). Survey data alone will not uncover the social and cultural meanings of teachers but will only display results for the questions asked. The social and cultural meanings of teachers and the development of culturally responsive beliefs are further understood through qualitative data. Three selected schools from the initial pilot study were sampled in a qualitative
multiple case study to offer examples of how principals influence culturally responsive self-efficacy beliefs. The intent was not for a generalizable maxim but for an understanding of an example of social processes (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007). Therefore, to address the research questions and remain true to my beliefs, the overarching focus was on finding evidence of social and cultural meanings using exemplar schools discovered during the quantitative portion of the study (Creswell, 2007).

**Summary**

As described previously, there is both an evident gap in research and a need among practitioners for ethical leadership in culturally responsive dilemmatic spaces. The best method to impart behavioral expression changes is through Bandura’s social cognitive theory (modeling), and Mezirow’s transformative learning theory (critical dialectical-discourse and reflective discourse). In this chapter, I presented the methodology to examine principals’ influences on teachers’ culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy. I included details of the case study protocol to add to the quality and replicability of this research study. I concluded this chapter with limitations and my positionality to provide transparency.
CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS

The purpose of this multiple case study was to understand how school leaders influenced teachers’ culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy. I centered the cases for this study around the context of the culturally responsive leadership practices of the principals and teachers who scored high on the Culturally Responsive Teaching Self-Efficacy survey (Siwatu, 2005). In this chapter, I presented the contexts for each case, beginning with a brief summary of the school’s vision and demographics, followed by an examination of culturally responsive teaching expectations, supports, and influences. I gathered the details of the cases using level two teacher questions as outlined in my case study protocol. I reported the collected evidence from level two teacher questions among three areas: (a) supporting culturally responsive teaching practices; (b) setting and articulating expectations for teaching students in culturally responsive ways; and (c) influencing culturally responsive teaching practices and self-efficacy.

City Middle

The vision of City Middle School was to be a learning community where students are empowered for success. The school was situated in the heart of District L5, just five miles from the school’s rival in sports, Rival City Middle School. City Middle School had 452 students (33% Black or African American; 18% Hispanic or Latino; 3.8% two or more races; 45% White) in grades six through eight and was structured to house a traditional classroom setting (328 students: 40% Black or African American; 21% Hispanic or Latino; 4% two or more races; 34% White) and a Montessori setting (124
students: 15% Black or African American; 10% Hispanic or Latino; 2% two or more races; 73% White). Traditional classes (26 teachers: 86% White; 7% Black; 7% Hispanic) were divided by grade level and rotated as heterogeneously grouped classes; Montessori classes (4 teachers: 100% White) consisted of multiple grade levels, also heterogeneously grouped, who rotated among content-area classes as groups (See Table 4.1).

Table 4.1: City Middle School Demographics Comparison by Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Black / African American (%)</th>
<th>Hispanic / Latino (%)</th>
<th>2 or More Races (%)</th>
<th>White (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Demographics</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Demographics</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Demographics</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montessori Demographics</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AnneMarie Brewster was in her second year as the principal at City Middle School. On the ELQ (Langlois, Lapointe, Valois, & de Leeuw, 2014) during the pilot study (Bishop, 2018), Mrs. Brewster received an high score on ethical consistency (average of self-reported and teacher reported score greater than 5.5 on a 6.0 scale where 5 is rated as very often and 6 is rated as always) on the following items: I try to preserve everyone’s safety and well-being (5.81); and I follow procedures and rules (5.78). Items where she also scored high with ethical consistency (average of self-reported and teacher
reported score between 5.0 and 5.5 on a 6.0 scale where 5 is rated as *very often* and 6 is rated as *always*) were:

- I check the legal and regulatory clauses that might apply (5.33);
- my decision is based on increased equity in the workplace (5.22);
- I establish trust in my relationships with others (5.22);
- I try to ensure harmony in the organization (5.19);
- I know people can make mistakes – it is human nature (5.19);
- I take into consideration the related facts
- I pay attention to individuals (5.125);
- I try to rectify injustice (5.09); and
- I avoid hurting people’s feelings by maintaining their dignity (5.03).

The overall average of Mrs. Brewster’s self-reported and teacher perception scoring of ethical leadership was a 5.01 (5=very often; 6=always).

**Supporting Culturally Responsive Teaching Practices**

Support for using culturally responsive teaching practices at City Middle School fell into two categories: support from the principal and support from others. Dianne spent a considerable amount of time talking about the lack of support she received from the principal at Rival Middle School compared to the support she received at City Middle School. Dianne’s experience at Rival Middle School was a negative experience where she felt unsupported. She stated,

The principal at Rival City threw me under the bus multiple times but it was due to the similarities between my students and me. At Rival City I
had a high failure rate. I admit that my failure rate was due to a… I guess a “disjunct” between me and my students. I can’t remember the term the principal [used]. Oh the principal said it was a “disconnect” between me and my students and [also] there was the students’ expectation to come in and socialize and do whatever they wanted to do (DM Interview, January 18, 2019).

Dianne compared her experiences at Rival Middle School to the support she received from the Instructional Coach at City Middle.

At City Middle the Instructional Coach gave us tools… I tried to do as much as I could. I guess I cared more at City Middle because I had a larger Hispanic population at City Middle than I did at Rival City Middle and I was better supported at City Middle — what I did there mattered. I was just another teacher babysitting at Rival City Middle — that’s how I felt with no support from the administration. (DM Interview, January 15, 2019)

Dianne added,

I appreciate [the instructional coach] for everything that she taught us [and] all the tools that she gave us. Talking to her really help[ed]. She gave me insight on things and after talking to her I felt like I was armed and ready to go back to Rival City Middle. (DM Interview, January 15, 2019)
Dianne concluded, “Learning was more welcome at City Middle. [The instructional coach] was very understanding and willing to help and was accessible at City Middle and I could take the information I gained from her back to Rival City” (DM Interview, January 18, 2019).

Nicholas also directly mentioned the support from the same Instructional Coach,

The instructional coach did realize that I would use materials and I would try new strategies and new approaches so the instructional coach offered and delivered a lot of manipulatives, a lot of materials for the classroom and asked me to use things that I hadn't even thought of at the same time. I was asked by the instructional coach to bring in more reading in support of social studies and since I had the students feeling more comfortable we feel like that the literacy was increased as well in my classroom, so yes a lot of support. (NC Interview, January 29, 2019)

Many of the comments about principal support of culturally responsive practices focused on the administrative qualities of the principal. LeeAnn remarked about a hands-off approach as trust, stating “They show up to my IEP meetings and never say anything negative to me, and since they do not constantly monitor how I run my classroom or the inclusion ,shows they trust me” (LF Interview, January 30, 2019). Nicholas concurred, adding, “There are only a select few in the school in leadership roles that understand the need for [culturally responsive practices]” (NC Interview, January 29, 2019) and further added, “In our particular school, the instructional coach drives those [expectations] and I
have to say that's probably the only person in a leadership role that does drive those expectations” (NC Interview, January 29, 2019).

**Setting and Articulating Expectations for Teaching in Culturally Responsive Ways**

The expectations for teachers at City Middle were conveyed to teachers through a teacher handbook, list of essentials, and goals set by Mrs. Brewster. The goals were: (a) Use available data to support all students to reach and exceed learning goals in all areas; (b) Continue to focus on building genuine and caring relationships among teachers, students, parents and the community; and (c) Continue to make safety and security a priority, working daily to follow procedures and always looking for ways to make improvements. Mrs. Brewster prioritized her top ten expectations in her list of City Middle Essentials:

1. We will keep student needs at the heart of all our decisions.
2. We will use instructional time efficiently and effectively, understanding that it cannot be recovered.
3. We will respect our students, colleagues, parents and the mission of our school through professional actions, words, and judgments.
4. We will collectively and individually commit to improvement through data-driven learning communities.
5. We will commit to building relationships with our students, and follow policies and procedures consistently each day.
6. We will model the behavior we wish to see our students to exhibit.
7. We will have the collective responsibility to actively supervise students throughout the building and grounds.

8. We will promote encouragement, empowerment, and excellence in every classroom.

9. We will support each other across grade levels, subject areas and programs.

10. We will commit to communicating with parents/guardians on a regular basis in multiple ways for the best interest of student achievement.

**Principal reported expectations.** According to Mrs. Brewster, the overarching expectations for teaching students in culturally responsive ways were (a) to begin with understanding the students and their backgrounds (i.e., race, sex, demographics, poverty level, cultural norms, clothes they wear), (b) to seek guidance when frustrated with an individual or needing help designing a lesson, and (c) to confront personal bias (AB Interview, January 10, 2019).

To understand students and their background(s), Mrs. Brewster began the school year examining student data with her faculty. She stated that they begin by, “reviewing things like making sure we understand who we are teaching and then the expectation is that you continue to meet the needs and respond to what comes through the door” (AB Interview, January 10, 2019). She identified poverty as the greatest concern in her school and shared the following with her faculty and staff at the first-of-the-year faculty meeting:

I’m a 38 year old white woman who is from middle class and went to college. I did not have to pay off any loans and I don’t know what it’s like
to be in poverty. You have to make sure that you are really upfront with your bias ... be honest with yourself and who you are and how you interact with your students so that when you have a situation how you are presenting your content or how you are responding to personal situations or socioemotional, question yourself, “Are you responding the way that your parents would have responded or how this child’s parents respond to them?” And then “How do we balance that?” (AB Interview, January 10, 2019)

Mrs. Brewster pointed out that the faculty at City Middle School is not culturally diverse, although she was working to diversify the staff as she hired new personnel. She said, “We actively seek and try to diversify our faculty because in order for us to be able to respond to the needs of our students, we need to have lots of different types of people on our staff” (AB Interview, January 10, 2019). Furthermore, during her interview, Mrs. Brewster said she relied on the background and diversity of others to problem-solve:

We are really open here and I let [the teachers] know that if they don’t know how to do something they need to ask me. If I don’t know the answer, I’m going to ask somebody else. I also am really clear with them that we’re human, but we don’t bash people for their differences. We try to establish what it is we need to do to help them and we all get frustrated sometimes. We all have differences. We all have things that we are used to and things we are not used to. And so I think just having a different perspective sometimes, even if I don’t know the right answer or my
assistant principal doesn’t know the right answer or my guidance
counselor doesn’t know the right answer, I can go to the mental health
counselor. I can go to somebody at the district office. I think it is a matter
of having just an open door, an open area of communication where there is
a discussion about it so there is not a fear of discussion about it. (AB
Interview, January 10, 2019).

Mrs. Brewster shared an example of working with a teacher whom she observed
presenting a racially sensitive lesson to a racially diverse classroom. At the point in his
career, the teacher was a novice educator, in his mid-thirties, who had just joined the
teaching profession through an alternate certification program. Mrs. Brewster identified
him as a White male who was able to build great connections with students, but during
this observation noted his students were disengaged. She noted parts of his lessons
included analogies that were not modern-day and remarked that the students were not
able to connect to the lesson. She took the opportunity to help him brainstorm analogies
by questioning him. Her account of the conversation was as follows:

What would be a better analogy, one that is more responsive to the kids in
your room? When I look at the kids in your room, and you have x amount
of Hispanic students, x amount of African American students, x amount of
White students, and maybe a couple of interracial students. What is a
better way that you can get this population to understand what you are
talking about and this population to understand? (AB Interview, January
10, 2019).
She concluded her account of the conversation by asking the teacher, “How are you responding to all of the needs in your room not just this overall analogy to something kind of random when you are talking about something really specific? (AB Interview, January 10, 2019).

Mrs. Brewster reported she used the coaching and questioning of the teacher for the topic of a future professional development session, adding she used those types of scenarios to “point to them” what she expects, but also to show what could be a bias. She added that she shares her expectations by challenging biases of her teachers. One situation Mrs. Brewster shared included a conversation she had with a teacher about a child the teacher thought had Tourette’s syndrome. Mrs. Brewster stated that she challenged the teacher by saying, “You can’t do that, you’re not a medical doctor.” Mrs. Brewster also added a comment about her reaction, sharing that the teacher’s comment was “not necessarily a cultural thing but it’s a difference. It’s a difference and so we have to make sure our conversations and what I expect our conversations to be to be much more constructive [when] talking about students” (AB Interview, January 10, 2019).

**Teacher perceived expectations.** From the teachers interviewed at City Middle School, two themes emerged about the perceived expectations for teaching in culturally responsive ways: using standards and data along with understanding students and their backgrounds. Conversely, all three teachers interviewed concluded expectations for teaching in culturally responsive ways were not communicated formally. Mrs. Brewster confirmed the teacher conclusions in her interview:
I don’t think I have formally told them so much as we address it when we talk about who we serve and why we do this job. We have City Middle essentials, when we look at our data, we look at our evidence. We break it down by population but we also understand that we serve all the students of City Middle School and so I think it is a constant awareness of that (AB Interview, January 10, 2019).

LeeAnn Franklin, a special education resource teacher who had worked at City Middle School for five years, spoke critically of the culturally responsive expectations, stating:

I don’t know if there are expectations except to just be empathetic or try to be empathetic. Try to put yourself in that position and just feel. There was one time the principal loaded all the teachers on the bus to see where the kids lived but as far as changing lessons or adapting it, it’s the standards, it’s the standards. There’s really no culture behind it and no cultural awareness. It’s really “Teach the standards, here’s the data” (LF Interview, January 30, 2019).

Dianne Martin, a related arts teacher who divided her time between two schools, commented on her time at a different school, stating “We did things just to check off a box at Rival City so if we were ever audited, then, well, we did this, that, and the other so we could move on to the next thing…” (DM Interview, January 18, 2019). Yet, in relation to cultural responsiveness at City Middle, she stated, “As far as strategies and as
far as cultures, it is more ‘treat everybody the same.’ There is a focus on data and what
the data says” (DM Interview, January 15, 2019)

Nicholas Compton, the social studies teacher referred to by Mrs. Brewster in the
analogy example above, added to the expectation of using data. He reported, “There's still
an emphasis on just meeting standardized testing and more of the traditional approach in
classrooms, like being quiet. It's okay to be in rows, etc. So, well, you really, you don't
know the expectations because, again, they are not really defined in the words” (NC
Interview, January 29, 2019).

Mr. Compton best summarized the expectations of knowing students at City
Middle when he said, “I think that there still a lack of understanding overall in
diversity…that you can't just bring your perspective in when teaching students. That you
must understand who your audience is, just like as a speaker you have to understand your
audience” (NC Interview, January 29, 2019). He then added “I'm saying that expectations
are high for recognizing diversity and bringing in student backgrounds when teaching”
(NC Interview, January 29, 2019). LeeAnn’s remarks added to Nicholas’ statement:
“Every expectation I have is based on my personal beliefs and desires for being a
teacher” (LF Interview, January 30, 2019). Yet, she said, “I don’t know if there are
expectations except to just be empathetic or try to be empathetic. Try to put yourself in
that position and just feel” (LF Interview, January 30, 2019).

**Influencing Culturally Responsive Teaching Practices and Self-Efficacy**

The principal and teacher participants were directly asked about the influences on
the teachers’ culturally responsive teaching practices and self-efficacy. Of the responses,
few remarks were made as to the principal’s influence. Mrs. Brewster identified her influence by asking questions, conducting follow-up observations, and modeling of expectations. Teachers, summatively, identified influences of the principal as not being scrutinized or observed, due to trust in abilities or low rate of discipline referrals.

**Case Summary**

Teachers at City Middle School identified Mrs. Brewster, an assistant principal, and an instructional coach as people who support culturally responsive teaching practices. According to the teachers, Mrs. Brewster provided a hands-off approach that was perceived as trust. By not observing teachers and not micromanaging, teachers perceived Mrs. Brewster’s actions as being trusting. Two teachers also identified an instructional coach who was supportive of their culturally responsive teaching practices. The instructional coach was willing to help, was readily accessible, provided materials needed and pushing the teachers to do more than they were currently doing. Explicit expectations, as evidenced by Principal Brewster’s interview responses and documents collected, were for teachers to (a) use data to meet the needs of students, (b) build relationships, (c) focus on safety and security, and (d) seek ways to improve. Teachers perceived the expectations as (a) understanding and knowing individual students, (b) seeking guidance when frustrated or when one does not know the answers, (c) challenging biases, and (d) being empathetic. Principal Brewster reported her influences on teachers’ culturally responsive teaching practices and self-efficacy through asking questions, follow-up observations, and modeling expectations; conversely, teachers
reported the main influence on their teaching practices and self-efficacy as not being scrutinized or observed.

**Country Elementary Middle School**

The vision of Country Elementary Middle School was to be a school of excellence and equity in educational practices for each learner. The mission of Country Elementary Middle School was to create a community of learners who are responsible and productive citizens. The school was situated in a rural area on the outskirts of District L5. Country Elementary Middle School had 691 students (8% Black or African American; .1 % American Indian; .4% Asian; 4% Hispanic or Latino; 2.9% two or more races; 84% White) in grades kindergarten through eight and was a traditional school setting (See Table 4.2).

Table 4.2: Country Elementary Middle School Demographics Comparison by Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Black / African American (%)</th>
<th>Hispanic / Latino (%)</th>
<th>2 or More Races (%)</th>
<th>White (%)</th>
<th>Black / African American (%)</th>
<th>Hispanic / Latino (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Demographics</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Demographics</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tracy Freeman, the principal at Country Elementary Middle School, was in her third year as a principal and was in her thirteenth year in administration. On the ELQ (Langlois, Lapointe, Valois, & de Leeuw, 2014) during the pilot study (Bishop, 2018), Mrs. Freeman received a high score in ethical consistency (average of self-reported and teacher reported score greater than 5.5 on a 6.0 scale where 5 is rated as *very often* and 6
is rated as always) on the following items: (a) I follow procedures and rules (5.75); (b) I check the legal and regulatory clauses that might apply; and I try to preserve everyone’s safety and well-being (5.5625). Items on which she also scored high with ethical consistency (average of self-reported and teacher reported score between 5.0 and 5.5 on a 6.0 scale where 5 is rated as very often and 6 is rated as always) were:

- I seek to protect each individual’s identity (5.5);
- I know people can make mistakes – it is human nature (5.375);
- I take time to listen to the people involved in a situation (5.1875);
- I establish trust in my relationships with others (5.0625);
- I try to ensure harmony in the organization (5.0635);
- I speak out against unfair practices (5.0625);
- I seek to preserve bonds and harmony within the organization (5.0); and
- I pay attention to individuals.

The overall average of Mrs. Freeman’s self-reported and teacher perception scoring of ethical leadership was a 5.01 (5=very often; 6=always).

Supporting Culturally Responsive Teaching Practices

Support for using culturally responsive teaching practices at Country Elementary Middle School also fell into two categories: support from the principal and support of others. Support of the principal at Country Elementary Middle School consisted of (a) praise, (b) listening to and being supportive of ideas and thoughts, and (c) getting needed materials for teaching. Kelly stated, “I’ve pretty much gotten what I’ve asked for as far as needs…I think the principal does a good job of knowing where the children are within
their culture, and trying to understand the cultural needs of students” (KO Interview, January 16, 2019). Supplying for the needs of the children was also evidenced in multiple emails from Mrs. Freeman, asking teachers to identify needs for materials in the classroom.

LeeAnn Franks, the special education resource teacher who also works at City Middle School, commented on the support given by one of the assistant principals. LeeAnn highlighted several presentations the assistant principal developed and presented to the faculty at Country Elementary Middle School, including Chinese New Year, Mexican heritage, Black history, as well as suicide prevention and combatting depression. LeeAnn enthusiastically shared a recent lesson the assistant principal created that she and others used in their classrooms. LeeAnn stated, “He made a PowerPoint, included talking points and engagement activities for the students – and they loved it!” (LF Interview, January 30, 2019).

James recalled a personalized professional development opportunity he participated in at a previous school, reporting,

An instructional coach delivered multiple professional development sessions that were focused on the importance of culturally responsive best practices. At that school, I was given opportunities to discuss situations with my instructional coach who never would tell me what to do but would ask me questions to make me really think about the situation. She always allowed me to come up with my own conclusions and then supported me as I delivered the lessons and disciplinary means under her
guidance. The conversations we had really pushed me to grow as an individual. (JW Interview, February 19, 2019)

Setting and Articulating Expectations for Teaching in Culturally Responsive Ways

Principal reported expectations. Mrs. Freeman reported the main expectation articulated to teachers was to build relationships with the children and understand the children. Mrs. Freeman’s expectations for teaching students in culturally responsive ways was to focus on two points:

1. Put everything aside and build the relationship on the likes and dislikes of the child, not based on race, not based on socioeconomic status, not based on anything, but just figure out how you can get to that child.

2. Have a base knowledge of what you want to teach [the students] and then build that relationship with that child, so you can work through whatever the child needs. (TF Interview, January 31, 2019)

Mrs. Freeman stated that she had shared her expectations with the faculty through evidence-based presentations and had given teachers books or articles, asking them to reference a certain page number or chapter. Mrs. Freeman emphasized to her faculty the research-based facts, stating "I'm not just saying this. This is what research says about it" (TF Interview, January 31, 2019). Mrs. Freeman reported that she believed giving them the evidence and research-based information was what teachers needed to then ask themselves the question, “What does this look like at Country Elementary Middle School?”
**Teacher Perceived Expectations.** James Wham, a teacher of only two years, was most able to articulate the perceived expectations at Country Elementary Middle School. James highlighted two areas of expectations that he described as encouragements: collaborative activities in the classroom and reaching the needs of all the students in the classroom. He said, “Each and every day is a welcoming challenge as I strive to teach students of various diverse backgrounds.” James further revealed that, “Each day has new challenges, however when the tone is set for collaboration in the classroom, welcoming all cultures and backgrounds on day one, it always works out for the benefit of all students” (JW Interview, February 19, 2019). James also added, “My principal encourages us to make our instruction meaningful to the backgrounds in the class to ensure that each student is gaining areas of understanding from our teaching” (JW Interview, February 19, 2019).

Kelly Owings, a third grade teacher who taught in the same physical classroom for 15 years, delineated content expectations that had been encouraged by Mrs. Freeman, such as units of study. For example, she stated, “Our second graders do a big unit on the local government. That's part of the culture of our town” (KO Interview, January 16, 2019). Expectations as perceived by Kelly included, “Teaching [culturally based lessons], holding teachers responsible for implementing lessons, and bringing in the culture of different students when you have certain lessons” (KO Interview, January 16, 2019). Mary Davis, a special education resource teacher of 23 years, added “I know we teach what is required by [state] law, like Black history facts” (MD Interview, February 14, 2019). Information about expectations, according to Mary, are shared in emails.
Influencing Culturally Responsive Teaching Practices and Self-Efficacy

Mrs. Freeman responded to the question of how she influences culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy by sharing a management framework she created when she became principal at Country Elementary Middle School. She stated, “It was the simple things that I had to take back to basics in order to do that. I put aside pedagogy, I put aside standards, I put aside instruction, I put aside everything for management” (TF Interview, January 31, 2019). The framework Mrs. Freeman created consisted of three rules: (1) Expect the unexpected; (2) Always take it outside; and (3) Always be nice. Mrs. Freeman shared an experience with each rule and added,

With those three rules governing my school you can't go wrong culturally or any other way, because you're always expecting what you know shouldn't be. You're always taking it to the side and not in front of everybody and you're always being nice… that's technically the way—teacher and administrators watch you do that and yet they still see hold them accountable. Then they begin to operate under the same mechanism or the same way. (TF Interview, January 31, 2019)

The teachers who were interviewed at Country Elementary Middle School did not expound upon school level influences of culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy beyond the influences of the instructional coach. For instance, one teacher reported, “The expectations were instilled in myself during my first few years of teaching” (JW interview, February 19, 2019).
Although Principal Freeman felt her main influence on culturally responsive teaching practices was her management framework, this was not corroborated by the teachers. The teachers expressed during the interviews that the influences came through the materials Principal Freeman provided. The influences identified were from an assistant principal and instructional coach in the forms of presentations and PowerPoint presentations.

**Case Summary**

Teachers at Country Elementary Middle School identified Principal Freeman, an assistant principal and a previous instructional coach as people who supported their culturally responsive teaching practices. Teachers reported Principal Freeman provided support to teachers by (a) offering praise, (b) listening to them and (c) being supportive of ideas and thoughts, and (d) getting needed materials for their classrooms. Additionally, one teacher acknowledged the support provided from an assistant principal who created a lesson for the teachers to use, and two of the teachers identified an instructional coach at a different school who provided personalized professional developments. Explicit expectations, as evidenced by the principal interview and document analysis, were to build relationships and understand the children, but implicitly, teachers perceived the expectations were to use collaborative activities, reach the needs of all students, and teach culturally-based lessons. Principal Freeman reported her greatest influence on culturally responsive teaching practices and self-efficacy was through her management framework; yet teachers described influences as emanating from the materials provided and the influences of others’ presentations and PowerPoints.
Country Primary School

The mission of Country Primary School was to create a safe learning environment and to instill in its students a growth mindset to motivate them to be successful, independent learners with a clear vision for their future. The school was situated in the middle of three counties, approximately 15 miles from City Middle School and Country Elementary Middle School. Country Primary School had 420 students (15% Black or African American; .2% Asian; 6% Hispanic or Latino; 3.2% two or more races; 74% White) in grades prekindergarten through fourth and was structured as a traditional school setting (See Table 4.3).

Table 4.3: City Middle School Demographics Comparison by Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Black / African American (%)</th>
<th>Hispanic / Latino (%)</th>
<th>2 or More Races (%)</th>
<th>White (%)</th>
<th>Black / African American (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Demographics</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Demographics</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diana Burns was the principal at Country Primary School, also in her second year. On the ELQ (Langlois, Lapointe, Valois & De leeuw, 2014) during the pilot study (Bishop, 2018), Mrs. Burns received a high score with ethical consistency (average of self-reported and teacher reported score greater than 5.5 on a 6.0 scale where 5 is rated as very often and 6 is rated as always) on the following items:

- I try to preserve everyone’s safety and well-being (5.9);
- I know people can make mistakes – it’s human nature (5.875);
• I check the legal and regulatory clauses that might apply (5.8);
• I make decisions on the statutory and legal framework (5.8);
• I take into consideration the related facts (5.775);
• I follow rules and procedures (5.75);
• I establish trust in my relationships with others (5.725);
• I establish relationships with others (5.725);
• I sanction mistakes in proportion to their seriousness (5.725);
• I avoid hurting people’s feelings by maintaining their dignity (5.7);
• I try to ensure harmony in the organization (5.7);
• I seek to preserve bonds and harmony within the organization (5.675); and
• I make decisions based on increased equity in the workplace (5.65).

Items in which she also scored high with ethical consistency (average of self-reported and teacher reported score between 5.0 and 5.5 on a 6.0 scale where 5 is rated as *very often* and 6 is rated as *always*) were:

• I take time to listen to the people involved in a situation (5.275);
• I try to rectify injustice (5.2);
• I seek to protect each individual’s identity (5.25);
• I check my organization’s unwritten rules (5.2);
• I speak out against injustice (5.175);
• I pay attention to individuals (5.175);
• I am concerned when individuals or groups have advantages compared to others (5.125); and

• I promote dialogue about contentious issues (5.15).

The overall average of Mrs. Burns’ self-reported and teacher perception scoring of ethical leadership was a 5.43 (5=very often; 6=always), the highest of all principals surveyed within the pilot study.

Supporting Culturally Responsive Teaching Practices

According to Mrs. Burns, she influenced teachers’ culturally responsive teaching practices by going into classrooms and modeling what to do. An example Mrs. Burns shared was when she explicitly modeled in a first grade where the teacher was having troubles with three different children. To model for the teacher, Mrs. Burns stated, “I didn't need to model teaching practices per se, but I needed to model how to respond to a child's behavior” (DB Interview, January 10, 2019). Mrs. Burns and the second year teacher, had already “brainstormed and had some reflection exercises that she's participated in that have not been as beneficial because she is resisting the changes.” The modeling experience had been preplanned and involved bringing another teacher into the classroom along with Mrs. Burns when a call for assistance was made by the teacher. The additional teacher was to assume the role of the teacher in the lesson and the teacher who called for assistance was to observe Mrs. Burns as she modeled how to de-escalate the child who was misbehaving. During the incident Mrs. Burns shared, the plan was executed and the teacher observed the modeled behaviors. As a result, the teacher
explained how she was able to use the modeled actions to de-escalate the child during a later behavior episode in the classroom.

Michelle Banks, a veteran third grade teacher, shared a supportive experience she had with Mrs. Burns:

I was having troubles with a student. Mrs. Burns and I brainstormed what was happening and we saw a pattern that it was happening when he came back [from a visit to his birth family], we just knew that that was going to be the cause... When we figured out that that was the common thread, that was the reason that he was setting off on Mondays, typically, or after a break, we would try to prevent by just giving him some positive attention and having him check in with another adult that he trusts and giving him that encouragement and that support that he needed to make it through those first few days back. (MB Interview, February 14, 2019)

Carrie identified several ways she perceived Mrs. Burns provided support to the faculty and staff: willingness to sit and talk about concerns; receptive to ideas; gives constructive and realistic approach to new challenges; and is sympathetic to the needs of the children. Samantha added to the notion of providing support through sympathy, highlighting experiences Mrs. Burns had shared about being a foster parent and raising special needs children.

The final area of support of culturally responsive teaching practices by Mrs. Burns was through providing resources (i.e., equipment, classroom supplies, and opportunities). One example of supplying resources noted by Michelle was Mrs. Burns
working with local businesses to provide all school supplies for each student, including book bags. Michelle shared Mrs. Burns’ reasoning behind providing all school supplies for students, noting the high level of poverty in the school and the need for each child to have the items needed for school.

**Setting and Articulating Expectations for Teaching in Culturally Responsive Ways**

Principal reported expectations. Mrs. Burns developed an extensive faculty handbook with explicit expectations for school and classroom experiences, including but not limited to behavioral expectations, classroom management, daily procedures, schoolwide expectations, instructional guidelines, interventions, and parent communication. Embedded in each section listed above were specifics for addressing needs of students, including culture, language, poverty, trauma, social-emotional and developmental details. Mrs. Burns indicated she had shared the expectations and referred to portions of the handbook often. She said, “The handbook is a working document. We use it as a collaborative space and update portions as new needs arise or unique situations arise” (DB Interview, January 10, 2019). According to Mrs. Burns, the expectation was for teachers to build relationships with students so each student could be given the opportunity to succeed, emotionally, academically, behaviorally and socially. Mrs. Burns stated that she underscored this expectation by addressing the function of behaviors or unmet needs instead of addressing the behavior or inadequacy that was displayed, and that she expected her teachers to do the same. Mrs. Burns shared multiple examples of faculty meetings focused on the individual child and providing “ambitiously appropriate” educational experiences for each student.
Teacher perceived expectations. Samantha Nixon, a second-career teacher in second grade, summed up her perception of Mrs. Burns’ expectations,

I would think that the first expectation is that you treat each child as an individual, however that does not include a particular bias against them because of who they are or their family or their cultural background. I think we are encouraged to teach with a mind of cultural diversity and consider what their background is and what we do teach or a maybe an assignment… consider if that would be suitable for certain situations. (DB Interview, January 17, 2019)

Carrie Lawson, a physical education teacher of 14 years, added, “I think each teacher is supposed to teach every student to the best of their ability” (CL Interview, January 17, 2019). According to Carrie, the expectations were shared at faculty meetings and were written in the handbook. Carrie emphasized, “if she does not see those expectations being met, she will address it with the teachers.” Ms. Lawson added that she had witnessed Mrs. Burns “meeting with a grade level meeting or with them personally sitting down and talking with that teacher and then taking them and showing them what she wants them to do” (DB Interview, January 17, 2019).

Influencing Culturally Responsive Teaching Practices and Self-Efficacy

Mrs. Burns identified her behaviors as the greatest influence on culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy, as follows:

All decisions I make are based on the rules and regulations that are set forth to me through either the state Department of Education or through
the district. After I've looked at the rules and regulations, I try to think what is best way to handle something ethically. When I make a decision on the child or about a child, I address the child based on his or her circumstances at home as well. I always follow due process, which frustrates teachers many times because they are making a decision based on one split second of what they saw, and I make the decision based on all of the facts. (DB Interview, January 10, 2019)

Samantha identified the influences on her culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy as experiences outside of the school (i.e., mission trips, prior job experiences) but also named Mrs. Burns as an influence. Samantha noted, “Mrs. Burns models dealing with individuals as a person. She does an incredible job of getting to know the students and their backgrounds and really leads by example in that manner. I strive to follow her example” (SN Interview, January 17, 2019).

**Case Summary**

Teachers at Country Primary School identified Principal Burns as most influential in supporting teachers’ culturally responsive teaching practices. Teachers stated Principal Burns supported their culturally responsive teaching practices by (a) being present, (b) modeling interactions and behaviors, (c) brainstorming and reflecting with teachers, (d) giving constructive and realistic approaches, and (e) providing resources to teach diverse learners. Principal Burns stated expectations were to (a) address the needs of students, (b) build relationships with students, and (c) provide ambitiously appropriate educational opportunities for all students. Teachers similarly reported expectations as (a) treating
each child as an individual, (b) teaching with a mind of cultural diversity, and (c) considering student backgrounds in teaching and disciplining. Principal Burns reported her influence on teachers’ culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy as following rules and procedures, and making decisions based on the child, including his or her circumstances and all facts. Teachers documented Principal Burns’ influences on teaching practices and self-efficacy through her (a) modeling how to interact with others, (b) knowing students and families, and (c) leading by example.

Summary

In this chapter, I shared each case, including a brief summary of the school’s vision, teacher supports, expectations and influences. I gathered the details of the cases using level two teacher questions as outlined in my case study protocol. I reported the collected evidence from level two teacher questions among three areas: (a) supporting culturally responsive teaching practices; (b) setting and articulating expectations for teaching students in culturally responsive ways; and (c) influencing culturally responsive teaching practices and self-efficacy.
CHAPTER FIVE
CROSS CASE SYNTHESIS AND FINDINGS

My purpose in this chapter was to synthesize the data from the three case studies through an explanation building technique of cross-case analysis (Yin, 2018). My goal for this research study was to explore the influences a principal has on culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy. I approached this study from a positivistic stance, seeking to support either a theoretical proposition or a rival theory,

Theoretical Proposition: The case studies will show high culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy is influenced by the intentional actions of leaders (e.g., modeling of ethical behaviors, providing ethical contexts for adult learning, and promoting critical dialectical-discourse, and critical reflection).

Rival Theory: The case studies will show high culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy is not developed by the intentional actions of leaders but by personal experience and interactions with others (Mezirow, 1991) or challenges to assumptions and beliefs (Oakes, Welner, Yonezawa & Allen, 1998).

As introduced in Chapter Three in the case study protocol, I sought to operationalize the intentional actions of principals to influence cultural responsiveness (i.e., supporting practices, setting and articulating expectations, influencing beliefs and assumptions by challenging or confirming beliefs) in the school context. In Chapter Four, I reported case study data of three principals’ influences on the development of cultural
responsiveness, including (a) supporting culturally responsive teaching practices; (b) setting and articulating expectations for teaching students in culturally responsive ways; and (c) influencing culturally responsive teaching practices and self-efficacy. In this chapter, I continued my case study analysis, including a multiple case analysis using a deductive approach, comparing evidence from all cases to theoretical propositions of principal (a) modeling behaviors; (b) providing ethical contexts; and (c) promoting critical dialectical-discourse and critical self-reflection, followed by inductive coding for emerged themes of each theoretical proposition. I followed the iterative process of explanation building with the rival theory, deductively coding the evidence for personal experiences and interactions with others, and challenges to assumptions and beliefs experienced by the teachers. In the following sections, I shared the findings as revised theoretical propositions and furthermore operationalized the revised theoretical propositions and included evidence supporting the rival theory.

Theoretical Proposition One: Modeling of Behaviors

During the inductive coding process of explanation building across the three cases, I revised the initial proposition of principal modeling of behaviors to include three distinct principal behaviors as perceived by teachers in each case: modeling (i.e., leading by example); demonstrating culturally responsive behaviors (i.e., respecting cultures, responding to backgrounds, being receptive to differences); and sharing expectations (i.e., explaining behaviors, providing evidence, suggesting behaviors). The following is a summary and discussion of the three cases based upon the revised proposition, followed by a comparison of the case study evidence and final theoretical proposition.
Modeling as Leading by Example

Principal Brewster at City Middle School highly regarded herself as a person who led by example. In the principal interview (Interview, January 10, 2019), Principal Brewster reported scenarios where she led by example:

- **Expectations**…come in the way I act. If I treat one student a certain way or I treat this student a different way, my actions speak volumes.

- **If I’m not in the classroom or if I’m not willing to have a student come sit in my office and talk about something and get on the phone with a parent or go to a do a home visit, and we don’t like doing home visit sometimes, but if I’m not willing to send somebody out to a home or I’m not willing to call a parent that somebody else doesn’t want to call, I can’t expect them to do it either.**

- **If I don’t know the answer I’m going to ask somebody else**

Principal Brewster at Country Elementary Middle presented similar examples of leading by example:

- **I called that Hispanic kid in to my office and let assistant principals watch me deal with this particular kid. It was amazing how they began to deal with these same children. Not a screaming match, not a shouting match, but a simple we're going to do it this way.**

- **What I always do with kids in any kind of culture, any kind of situation. I take it outside or take it in my office where they don't have an audience to deal with. I don’t lash out and yell at them in the lunchroom. I'll wait and let them go to class and then I'll get the nurse to call them out of class into my office and deal with**
them that way rather than give them an audience, or embarrass them to death in public.

Principal Burns at Country Primary School shared no examples of leading by example (Interview, January 10, 2019), but all of her teachers acknowledged Principal Burns led by example:

- [Principal Burns] definitely models dealing with individuals as a person. She does an incredible job of getting to know the students and their backgrounds and really leads by example in that manner. (CL Interview, January 17, 2019)

- [Expectations are] shown to us…it’s modeled for us through interactions with parents and students and the learning opportunities she gives us. I think the principal gives us opportunities to grow and in learning how to meet the needs and reach each family. (C.L. Interview, January 17, 2019)

- I am amazed at the calmness Mrs. Burns has in dealing with really tough situations. She is really good handling angry parents. She listens and validates their concerns yet still takes care of the problem. That is difficult when the other person is not right, but Mrs. Burns just listens. (MB Interview, February 14, 2019)

**Modeling by Demonstrating Culturally Responsive Behaviors**

Demonstrating culturally responsive behaviors by the principal was documented at two of the schools. The culturally responsive behaviors were respecting cultural differences, responding to different-than-self backgrounds, and being receptive to differences. Kelly at Country Elementary Middle explicitly remarked “teaching different
cultures, and teaching [the students] to be sensitive to that is... just demonstrated. It’s part of our [school’s] culture” KO Interview, January 16, 2019). Kelly identified the culturally responsive behaviors Principal Freeman modeled as the following:

- respecting student cultures,
- being involved with students and their families, and getting to know them, and how the children are being raised within their families,
- staying up to date [on family structures and living arrangements]
- holding teachers responsible for being sensitive to students’ culture.
- inviting families in, and sharing with them (family nights and different celebrations) (KO Interview, January 16, 2019)

A scenario presented by Principal Burns (in-class modeling of handling behaviors) added to the list of culturally responsive behaviors modeled: addressing behaviors individually and calmly and allowing the child to reintegrate into the class setting. Samantha commented on a similar experience she had with Mrs. Burns, stating “[Mrs. Burns] is very aware of individual circumstances and situations to where she knows...the background of the student to know some techniques...working with significant behaviors” (SN Interview, January 17, 2019).

**Modeling by Sharing Expectations**

Based on teacher interview data and principal interview data, modeling occurred by the principal as sharing expectations in all three cases. Principals Brewster, Burns and Freeman all recounted the expectations for responding to students, including written expectations and modeled expectations. Modeled expectations include talking about and
discussing modeled expectations (AB Interview, January 10, 2019), and explicitly
showing expectations through modeled behaviors (AB Interview; DB Interview; TF
Interview). Principal Brewster explained the modeling of expectations as “trial and error
sometimes” and the fact that the failure may add to a growth mindset.

**Modeling as Operationalized Through this Multiple Case Study**

Modeling as leading by example was evident at all three schools but substantiated
through teacher interviews at Country Primary School. Leading by example included
actions the principals used in (a) treating others fairly and respectfully; (b) not expecting
teachers to do what the principal won’t do; (c) seeking answers when the answer is not
known; and (d) getting to know individuals and backgrounds. Although evident in only
two of the schools, the operationalization of modeling culturally responsive behaviors
included respecting cultural differences, responding to different-than-self backgrounds,
and being receptive to differences. Modeling expectations in all cases included talking
about and discussing modeled expectations and explicitly showing expectations through
modeling behaviors.

The culturally responsive behaviors were used to operationalize the perceived
culturally responsive modeling principals do, collectively as actions requiring the
principal to know the child as an individual with a unique background, culture, family
structure, behavioral expectations and sense of belonging. The teachers perceived the
behaviors modeled by the principals as responsive to the individual. Furthermore,
although the behaviors were responsive to the needs of the child and possibly the needs
of the child’s family, the behaviors cannot be presumed to be culturally responsive and may simply be responsive.

**Theoretical Proposition Two: Providing Ethical Contexts for Cultural Responsiveness**

Initial inductive coding of the theoretical proposition of providing ethical contexts for cultural responsiveness resulted in eight nodes which I narrowed to three (i.e., following procedures and rules; focusing on equity and justice; focusing on the students’ needs). Following the iterative process of inductive coding, I revised the second theoretical proposition to include the emerged themes: (a) following procedures and rules (i.e., legal or law-related, explicit expectations, accountability); (b) focusing on equity and justice (i.e., equity issues, confronting bias); and (c) focusing on student needs (i.e., being empathetic, meeting needs). In the next paragraphs, I summarize the themes and the revised theoretical proposition.

**Ethical Contexts of Following Procedures and Rules**

I discovered three subthemes of following procedures and rules during the inductive coding of providing ethical contexts: following laws, explicitly stated expectations, and accountability measures.

Mrs. Burns was the only principal who discussed laws or regulations she had to follow in the context of influencing culturally responsive practices. Mrs. Burns responded to a question of how she influenced culturally responsive behaviors by stating, “All decisions I make are based on the rules and regulations that are set forth to me through either the state Department of Education or through the district.” (DB Interview, January
17, 2019). Mrs. Burns also referenced the state department of education requiring schools to implement a multi-tiered systems of support (MTSS) to address academic, behavioral and social-emotional needs of each child, requiring teachers to look at each child individually and as a whole child. Mrs. Burns’ expectations stemming from federal Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) was evident in her comment, “My expectations are for each student to be provided an appropriately ambitious education that meets his or her needs wherever they are” (DB Interview, January 17, 2019).

Diana, from City Middle School, referenced a WIDA checklist she was given by her instructional coach when asked about her perception of culturally responsive teaching at her school. Diana stated she still had the checklist and used it in a current leadership position to hold herself and others accountable. Conversely, Diana shared her frustrations at the lack of accountability at Rival Middle School, where she taught a half day. The principal at Rival Middle School (not included in this study) scolded her for using the WIDA checklist and recalled the expectations at Rival, “We did things just to check off a box at Rival City so if we were ever audited then we did this that and the other so we could move on to the next thing…” Diana also added, “there were teachers there not held accountable for… being aware of things” (DM Interview, January 18, 2019).

Expectations were evident in responses of all three principals. Mrs. Brewsters’ expectations were stated in City Middle School Essentials, handbook and principal reflections in the school newsletter. Mrs. Brewster commented about a “constant threading through of expectations” as her method of keeping expectations in the forefront. Mrs. Freeman similarly shared general expectations by embedding the
superintendent’s touchstones in her professional developments. As an example, Mrs. Freeman shared a professional development where she had the faculty read two pages of Gorski’s (2015) *Reaching and Teaching Students in Poverty: Strategies for Erasing the Opportunity Gap* to reinforce the district’s first touchstone, addressing the expectation to understand bias and inequities to be able to understand the relationship between poverty and education. Mrs. Burns provided her faculty and staff a handbook with “explicit directions instructions, procedures, behavioral expectations, classroom management, daily procedures and each of those address the individual” (DB Interview, January 17, 2019).

**Ethicality of Focusing on Equity and Justice**

Equity issues and confronting bias emerged as themes during the inductive coding of providing ethical contexts.

James referred to equity at Country Elementary Middle as he described the influences to his perspectives of teaching in culturally responsive ways. James emphasized, “Administrators and instructional leaders… pushed me to see the importance of helping every student regardless of their background and genuinely realizing that despite a student’s background, they still deserve the right to learn like other students” (JW Interview, February 19, 2019). Jeffrey noted the encouragement of his principal to be more culturally responsive by her pushing for more culturally responsive resources to have the materials to address the needs of each child.

Mary at Country Elementary Middle recalled a situation where she was impacted by an action of Principal Freeman. As students completed projects in the classroom,
Mary displayed the projects in the hallway for all to see. In this class, Mary had only one Black male in her class. Principal Freeman examined the displayed work and questioned why the only Black male’s work was on the bottom row. Mary rationalized she posted the work in the order they were completed and his was last to be completed. Mrs. Freeman responded by telling Mary to move the poster higher among the other students’ work. Mary commented she was somewhat annoyed by the demand but complied with the request. Mary later spoke with Principal Freeman to understand why Principal Freeman made Mary move the poster. Principal Freeman responded that she was examining student work through the lens of equity and social justice, making certain the superintendent, who was scheduled to visit the school, would see evidence of an equitable learning environment.

Principal Burns acknowledged a focus on students as individuals and individualized learning, following the state’s requirement for multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS). This was evident in her interview, as she recounted, “Interventions require [us to] provide students with individualized learning. They still need those needs [met, they] could be academic, behavioral, social, emotional. Each teacher is required to look closely at each student and pay attention to each element” (DB Interview, January 10, 2019).

**Ethicality of Confronting Bias.**

Confronting bias was explicitly identified by Mrs. Brewster, as she stated “So you have to make sure that you are really upfront with your bias” (AB Interview, January 10, 2019). Being upfront with bias, according to Mrs. Brewster, is not just a behavior, it is
also an expectation she has for every teacher at City Middle School. Mrs. Brewster highlighted one example of confronting bias when she challenged a teacher who made a negative comment about a child. Mrs. Brewster overheard a conversation teachers were having about the child, a conversation supposing the child had Tourette’s, and Mrs. Brewster interrupted, saying “What are you doing? Why are you sitting and talking about this?” Mrs. Brewster added, “that’s not necessarily a cultural difference, but it’s a difference… and I expect our conversations to be much more constructive about our students” (AB Interview)

Evidence of confronting bias was also evident at Country Primary School. Dianne Martin, identified an expectation at her school as “standing up for our kids, and not letting them be bullied because of their culture” (DM Interview, January 15, 2019). Dianne identified a child’s culture as their safety blanket, because “that’s what they know.” Dianne elaborated on the expectation, “even if we don’t necessarily agree with [their culture], keeping that safe, and not letting them get… picked on about it… is what [the perception of culturally responsive teaching is at Country Primary School]” (DM Interview, January 15, 2019).

Principal Freeman conveyed her attitude of confronting bias in a scenario she shared about students who matriculate into Country Elementary Middle School at sixth grade. As Principal Freeman was preparing for her initial year at Country Elementary Middle, the peer told Principal Freeman, “You know nothing. You have not met the fishing village of Country. The culture they have is totally apathetic. They care nothing about school” (TF Interview, January 31, 2019). Principal Freeman replied to the
comment by developing an action plan to address the Country fishing village children by “[gathering] evidence… and get[ting] the research about [reaching the apathetic fishing village children] and what we can do to reach this group of people [others] think are not reachable” (TF Interview, January 31, 2019).

**Ethicality as focusing on Student Needs**

Focusing on the individual child and his or her needs was evidenced in Country Elementary Middle and Country Primary as being empathetic to individuals and meeting the needs of individual children. LeeAnn Franks, at Country Middle School, shared an experience where she perceived Principal Freeman expecting teachers to be empathetic. LeeAnn recounted an experience where all teachers were loaded on a bus and driven around the school’s attendance zone, with the intention of showing teachers the homes and living conditions of the students. LeeAnn added her perception of the experience and the intended expectations of Principal Freeman, stating “I don’t know if there are expectations except to just be empathetic or try to be empathetic. Try to put yourself in that position and just feel” (LF Interview, January 30, 2019).

Principal Burns shared, “When I talk to my staff, I focus on the individual and require teachers to address the needs of each individual” (DB Interview, January 10, 2019). The expectation of meeting needs of individuals was confirmed during Carrie Lawson’s interview, as she described her interactions with Principal Burns, she said, “I can bring an idea or something to the table and we can talk about whether how that could be most effective for that student. How it could impact them the most in what ways” (KL Interview, January 17, 2019).
**Operationalization of Ethical Contexts for Cultural Responsiveness**

Ethical contexts for culturally responsive behaviors were operationalized through principal actions: (a) following procedures and rules (i.e., legal or law-related, explicit expectations, accountability); (b) focusing on equity and justice (i.e., equity issues, confronting bias); and (c) focusing on student needs (i.e., being empathetic, meeting needs).

**Theoretical Proposition Three: Promoting and Enacting Transformative Learning**

Three themes related to principal influences of transformative learning emerged during the inductive coding of interviews and documents: (a) principal questioning and teacher brainstorming or problem-solving, (b) principal questioning and teacher reflecting and (c) others questioning. Teacher brainstorming or problem-solving, in the themes revealed, involved making decisions about teaching in culturally responsive ways, whereas teacher reflecting included the teacher confronting beliefs or personal thoughts and considering those beliefs or thoughts in further actions. The three themes were only evidenced at City Middle School and Country Primary School as described in the sections below.

**Promoting and Enacting Transformative Learning through Principal Questioning and Teacher Brainstorming or Problem-Solving**

Principal Brewster was expressive of her expectations for communicating with others, stating she had conversations where she “talk[s] about who we serve and why we do this job” and added “we’re really open here” (AB Interview, January 10, 2019). Mrs. Brewster offered several scenarios of talking and being open, and she also detailed
scenarios of asking questions of teachers to make the teacher come to his or her own conclusions through brainstorming or problem-solving. One scenario, presented in Chapter Four, was a follow-up to an observation, where Principal Brewster noted Nicholas teaching a White perspective of content to a class of Hispanics, African Americans, Whites and interracial students. Mrs. Brewster recounted asking Nicholas, “What is a better way that you can get this population to understand what you are talking about and this population to understand?” and “How are you responding to all of the needs in your room not just this overall analogy to something kind of random when you are talking about something really specific?” (AB Interview, January 10, 2019). In response to a follow-up to the interview question, Principal Brewster added:

His response was exceptionally positive and we just talked through it. I tried to focus on just asking him questions to make him think about what he had done instead of just telling him what to do… He brainstormed ideas and had some much better ideas. (AB Interview, January 10, 2019)

Samantha Nixon identified questions Mrs. Burns had asked as an influence to her development of culturally responsive ways. Samantha recalled questioning by Mrs. Burns as a way to problem-solve for students:

[Mrs. Burns] really encourages us to look at each child individually, … look at their behavior, look at their learning, their learning styles to see exactly why they're behaving the way they are… Not just, oh, well they're trying to get out of doing work. Why are they wanting to get out of doing work? It's just more than just, he just doesn't want to do the work. What
are the underlying reasons? She really wants us to dig deep and get to know that child and get to know, really what they're coming from so we can best try to meet their needs. (SN Interview, January 17, 2019)

Samantha shared an example of questioning for problem-solving in her response below:

Typically we'd begin with the current behavior, seeking a solution to address the current behavior. We'd discuss, so how does his past affect the current behavior, and what could be the answer to that? We know that his behaviors escalate when he visits family that is out of town, which does happen on a somewhat regular basis. And we know that those weekends, on that Monday, we will have escalated behaviors because of his experiences with those family members. When his parents, when he was removed from his parents, two of his siblings went with another family member, and he was taken to live with a great-uncle and great-aunt. And we know when he sees his siblings that his behaviors will escalate the following Monday, and we try to address those behaviors in being proactive, and try to... When he makes the statement that he's going to go see them or when he comes back we kind of check in and check out when those things are coming up so we can try to prevent some of the behaviors. (SN Interview, January 17, 2019)

**Promoting and Enacting Transformative Learning through Principal Questioning and Teacher Reflections**
Principal Burns, in sharing how she influences culturally responsive teaching practices at City Primary School, reflected on her development as an instructional coach:

I believe my greatest influence with culturally responsive teaching practices comes from my coaching background. Before I began coaching I would tell people what to do but through coaching I found that it was best to ask questions that guide the teacher to reflect on his or her beliefs. I have found that a lot of the times teachers and their beliefs have never been challenged so they might have a prejudice that is there that they don’t acknowledge or they may have a personal dislike for an individual or group of individuals. By asking questions the teacher has an opportunity to reflect on what they feel. (DB Interview, January 10, 2019).

One example of Principal Burns’ questioning leading to reflecting was presented in the scenario with Sharon, where Principal Burns questioned the teacher and her thoughts of why the child misbehaved (e.g., “what do you think the child was thinking?” and “Why did the child respond that way?”) and furthermore asked questions to cause the teacher to reflect on her actions (e.g., “What could you have done differently?” “Why did that bother you that the child yelled out?” and “Why did it bother you that the child did some of these things in front of the other teachers?”).

Michelle Banks added to the reflective nature caused by questioning of Mrs. Burns in a scenario she shared. Michelle commented, “[Mrs. Burns] asks questions like What’s going on? What do you see this child doing? What has his mom said, have you asked mom this? Have you asked dad this? Did you ask them about so and so?” Michelle
added, “When she makes us stop and think, have I really done this, and it's not like she’s fussing, it's almost like she’s making us...”, she paused and teared up, “She’s making us question, not because she doesn’t think we're doing our jobs but because she’s trying to make us become better teachers so we can learn our kids more... To in turn give them what they need” (MB Interview, February 14, 2019)

Promoting and Enacting Transformative Learning through Actions of Someone Other Than the Principal.

Dianne Martin concluded her interview with a comment about an instructional coach who influenced her, stating “talking to [the instructional coach] really helped. She gave me insight on things and after talking to her I felt like I was armed and ready to go back to Rival City Middle” (DM Interview, January 15, 2019). Nicholas likewise commented on the impact of an instructional coach, sharing

She questioned us and taught us how to question and brought up the diversity and brought up different angles, like different ways to look at chaos and how the child's world is chaotic and what some of the signals are that they're asking for nonverbally and how to read those. And then sometimes even when they're asking something verbally but they're not expressing it, well we had those examples share with us in those discussions and strategies to help us address those with those individual students. (NC Interview January 29, 2019)

Nicholas shared further some of the activities he participated in with his instructional coach
During our sessions the instructional coach would ask questions, many times those questions were reflective. We did have role-playing at times to help bring out that difference. Sometimes we did role-playing and we role-played it the way we thought that it would be based on our background and then there would be a video clip showing that real event to show how it had really played out and we were able to discuss those differences and where that child may be coming from and what influences in their background caused him to behave or caused him to have the need that you were trying to address as a teacher.

James Wham commented about the influences of a previous instructional coach on his culturally responsive ways, highlighting the following activities:

I was given opportunities to discuss situations with my instructional coach who never would tell me what to do but would ask me questions to make me really think about the situation. She always allowed me to come up with my own conclusions and then supported me as I delivered the lessons and disciplinary means under her guidance. The conversations we had really pushed me to grow as an individual. (JW Interview, February 19, 2019)

James further added,

There was an instructional coach several years back who most influenced my perspectives. She initiated a series of professional developments but allowed us to choose the one we attended. I chose one on Cultural Responsiveness. She
modeled the PD after a book titled *Culturally Responsive Teaching and the Brain* by Zaretta Hammond. One particular session I remember she had us really reflect on our personal beliefs about individual students and I as well as several others had Aha! moments about why students were behaving the way they did, but most importantly I know it changed the way several of us thought about our students.

(JW Interview, February 19, 2019)

**Operationalization of Promoting and Enacting Transformative Learning**

Although promoting and enacting transformative learning through principal behaviors was only evidenced in two of the three cases, the operationalized definitions of promoting and enacting transformative learning included (a) principal questioning and teacher brainstorming or problem-solving, (b) principal questioning and teacher reflecting and (c) others questioning. The distinction between teacher brainstorming or problem-solving and teacher reflecting included the impact on student-based decisions versus teachers’ beliefs and thoughts. Influences of others through questioning, brainstorming or problem-solving, and reflecting were also noted in interviews of three teachers, specifically identifying actions of instructional coaches.

**Rival Theory: Personal Experiences and Interactions with Others or Challenges to Assumptions and Beliefs**

In the following section, I summarized the findings supporting the rival theory into teachers’ personal experiences and interactions with others and challenges to assumptions and beliefs. These experiences identified experiences, interactions, and others challenging teachers’ assumptions and beliefs – all beyond the school.
Personal Experiences and Interactions with Others

Each teacher in each case shared a personal past experience that molded their cultural responsiveness. These experiences included the following experiences and interactions with others that shaped culturally responsive beliefs.

Dianne shared multiple experiences that defined her culturally responsive beliefs, including being a latch-key child of a divorced, single mom. Dianne did not identify solely one experience that contributed to her beliefs—she shared many. Dianne saw her mother killed and had to move from one neighborhood to another to live with her father. Her move was not across town, it was across multiple states to Hawaii. Dianne shared experiences of moving from her mother’s home as a child to her father’s home in Hawaii, but also lauded her travels as a teenager to Europe. Dianne’s recounting if the European tour was as a student ambassador, where she participated in “home stays” with other families. She recalled

I had an opportunity to have home stays in two other countries — in Poland and in Austria — and that’s where I learned that, that there are a lot of things in the United States that we take for granted. [Like] the ability to bathe every day [or] more than once a day. My first home stay was in Coastal Newberg, Austria and they didn’t bathe every day. [Another example was when] one of the children in the household was away at camp — and every time she called home, the family would drop coins in a jar so they could pay their phone bill. Having chewing gum and things like [gum], things that we take for granted in the United States, the children
love that stuff [there] so we were told to pack those types of things in our suitcases so we could give [them] as gifts to our home stay family. (DM Interview, January 18, 2019)

Dianne specifically recounted how her experiences helped her be culturally responsive, “I remembered my experiences in Europe and I tried to be patient and very understanding of my students who were not American” and compassionately stated, “I grew up in the same type neighborhood my students grew up in…” (DM Interview, January 18, 2019).

Nicholas (NC Interview, January 29, 2019) shared an experience that influenced his culturally responsive beliefs

So I have to think about my time with adopt-a-grandparent during college. This was an elderly Black lady who was retired [and I was assigned] to go visit with her and do things for her. So those were experiences that helped me bring things into the classroom, and so whenever there were discussions, it came up, I was able to throw things out for students to ponder and think about… so [it] would open my eyes more when I got their responses.

Kelly shared growing up in a Christian children’s home where she had narrow-thinking from being sheltered from others. Kelly remarked she rarely saw an outside perspective, at least until she went to college. At college, Kelly was amazed at the differences, but still maintained a narrow perspective because she also attended a small private college. The greatest contributing influence to her cultural responsiveness, Kelly
remarked, was due to the reflection she learned to do as a child, “as I have gotten older, and experienced other things, I do a lot of self-reflecting” KO Interview, January 16, 2019). Kelly also added her personal competitiveness, stemming from always having to compete in a group home, “The challenge of changing the way I might be thinking about something, or thinking about a student, or even a co-worker, and so challenging myself to change that thought… then, I try, and challenge that.”

Samantha at Country Primary School shared details of a childhood filled with racism from her grandparents. Her first college practicum was filled with fear because she was assigned a school where first graders were known to carry brass knuckles, much like the children her grandparents referred to when making racist comments. Samantha quickly expressed she now disagreed with those thoughts and attributed her change in beliefs to maturity and being exposed to different cultures.

Mary likewise shared a college experience, but on a different level. She remarked about a graduate class and the professor who challenged her thinking. She reported, “We had a very liberal professor that pushed a very liberal agenda and taught [about] LGBTQ” (Interview February 14, 2019). “The professor,” Mary said, “opened my eyes because I never thought about, well, you do have kids that are going to have the two moms or the two dads... So how does that make them feel?”

**Summary of Personal Experiences and Interactions with Others**

Summarily, teachers shared personal experiences that shaped their culturally responsive beliefs, including (a) childhood experiences; (b) travels beyond the home, including college; and (c) being raised as a latch-key child or in a group home. Teachers
also shared interactions with others as influencing their cultural responsiveness, including
group home families, home stay families abroad, college professors, and family
members.

**Challenges to Assumptions and Beliefs**

Several teachers shared influences of another person challenging their assumptions and beliefs that resulted in changes in their culturally responsive beliefs. These experiences are shared in the following sections.

Dianne at City Middle School shared a series of experiences where her culturally responsive beliefs were challenged by a former principal. Dianne identified herself as a professional, light-skinned African American and identified the former principal as an African American. In recounting her experiences, Dianne commented about her former principal telling her to “take it easy” on the Black students at Rival Middle School. The following was her account of a conversation:

That Principal told me that I needed to relate more to my students [at Rival
Middle School]. I grew up in the same type neighborhood my students
grew up in [poor with high crime and drugs] — the same type
neighborhood the principal grew up — in so I understood. I went through
a tragic event in my life [like many of my students] and this woman told
me I needed to understand my students, [that] I needed to relate to them. I
know what it’s like to eat cereal and cut pet milk, having to cut the pet
milk with water because we didn’t have milk, having to brush my teeth
with baking soda or use baking soda as deodorant. I understand all that —
not having anything else to eat in the house besides corn flakes or frosted flakes. I understood all of that and she told me that someone instilled in me my work ethic…yeah, I did. Cause at the age of 12 I was putting my mother in the ground and at her grave site I told myself that I had to do better I had to get out of this situation. I wasn’t going to use what happened to my mother as a crutch. It propelled me. It fueled me. It’s the reason why I work so hard because I didn’t want to let my mom down and if I fell apart then my two younger sisters wouldn’t have a chance of making it. (DM Interview, January 18, 2019).

LeeAnn from Country Elementary Middle, shared an experience early in her life where her beliefs were challenged by peers, and then confirmed by her mother. She reported,

The one Black kid I was friends with in school made a huge impact on [my beliefs]. I remember coming home one day [from school] and since I was friends with him, other people would make comments. I went home and asked my mom, “What’s wrong with being friends with him?” and she told me there was nothing wrong with him or being friends with him – go ahead and be friends with him.” And then my grandmother would tell me differently. So I grew up in a racist environment and as I got older and got more involved and grew up, I learned there was no difference. I am not ignorant to the fact that people see those differences but I know that I can’t think that way and have no desire to think that way.
LeeAnn expressed the challenges to her beliefs several times throughout the interview, confirming the fact that she learned to question people who were different from her.

**Summary of Challenges to Assumptions and Beliefs**

Although not prevalent among all teachers, two teachers shared experiences that were instrumental to challenging assumptions and beliefs about people from both similar and different cultures. Both experiences related directly to the beliefs of a person and the teacher questioning or opposing the other’s beliefs.

**Summary**

In this chapter, I presented results from a multiple case analysis, deductively coding evidence from all cases to the theoretical proposition, including principal (a) modeling behaviors; (b) providing ethical contexts; and (c) promoting critical dialectical-discourse and critical self-reflection. I followed the deductive coding with inductive coding, uncovering emerged themes of each theoretical proposition to operationalize the principal practices and to develop revised theoretical propositions. I also presented results from deductive coding of the rival theory, including teachers influenced by personal experiences and interactions with others than the current principal, and challenges to assumptions and beliefs. In the following chapter, I discussed the findings as revised theoretical propositions and compared each operationalized term in relation to relevant research.
CHAPTER SIX
DISCUSSION

The findings in this multiple case study were used to answer the following research question: How do principals influence teachers’ culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy? The initial theoretical proposition consisted of three possible means for principals to influence culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy: modeling of culturally responsive behaviors; providing ethical contexts for culturally responsive practices; and promoting and enacting transformative learning. From this multiple case study, I identified themes based on the initial theoretical proposition and identified behaviors of principals that influence culturally responsive practices. The identified themes reflect principals’ influences on culturally responsive practices but also support the rival theory. Therefore, I divided this discussion of the findings into two sections — influences based on the theoretical proposition and influences based on the plausible rival theory.

Influences Identified Supporting the Theoretical Proposition

The initial theoretical proposition included a focus on the intentional actions of the leader, in particular modeling of culturally responsive behaviors, providing ethical contexts for cultural responsiveness, and promoting critical dialectical-discourse and critical reflection. Throughout the multiple case study, the overarching influence perceived by teachers in each case was not based on intentional actions of the principals’ actions but did include principal influences.
Modeling of Ethical and Culturally Responsive Behaviors

Based on the initial theoretical proposition, modeling of culturally responsive behaviors included examples of vicarious experiences reflecting principals’ practices and reports of observations of principals modeling behaviors (Bandura, 1971). During the inductive coding of data, I divided the observed behaviors and the vicarious experiences into two areas: ethical behaviors and culturally responsive behaviors, which confirmed the results from the pilot study (Bishop, 2018). In the conceptual model of the pilot study, I examined culturally responsive leadership behaviors as being embedded within ethical leadership. The findings of this case study included a distinction between ethical behaviors and culturally responsive behaviors. Two principals reported using ethical behaviors as influencing teachers’ culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy, yet there was no corroboration from teachers. Principal Freeman reported experiences where assistant principals should have watched her deal with children and should have noticed examples of trial and error with students (i.e., vicarious experiences); and shared furthermore her expectation for her assistant principals to observe her taking disciplinary actions from in front of an audience (i.e., observation of modeling). Principal Burns touted her expectations were shared through her actions and referred to her not expecting others to do what she won’t do and asking for help when she does not know an answer (i.e., observations of modeling). Principal Burns did not acknowledge any vicarious experiences teachers perceived as ethical but had a teacher remark about Principal Burns’ calmness when dealing with tough situations (i.e., vicarious experiences). Principal Burns also did not acknowledge any modeling of ethical behaviors but two teachers identified
ethical behaviors modeled: principal dealing with individuals (SN Interview) and principal modeling through interactions with parents and students (CL Interview) (i.e., modeling ethical behaviors).

The designation between ethical behaviors and culturally responsive behaviors of principal modeling as an influence on culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy narrowed to an example of a vicarious experience modeled and an example of a teacher observation. Principal Burns documented her awareness of circumstances and backgrounds of students, and using the awareness with student situations; and Kelly noted she observed Principal Freeman requiring teachers to teach about different cultures and teaching to be sensitive to others.

Multiple case study evidence of modeling as vicarious experiences and observations are presented in Table 6.1: Multiple case study evidence of modeling as vicarious experiences and observations.
Table 6.1: Multiple case study evidence of modeling as vicarious experiences and observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vicarious Experiences Reflecting Principal Behaviors</th>
<th>Ethical Behaviors</th>
<th>Culturally Responsive Behaviors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEMS: Assistant principals watched how principal deals with children (TF); trial and error, growth mindset (TF)</td>
<td>CPS: principal is very aware of circumstances and backgrounds and uses that background (SN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPS: calmness dealing with really tough situations (MB)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations of Principal Modeling</td>
<td>CMS: expectations shared through actions; doesn’t expect others to do what she won’t; don’t know an answer then call somebody else (AB)</td>
<td>CEMS: teaching different cultures and teaching to be sensitive is demonstrated (KO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CEMS: Take discipline away from an audience (TF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CPS: models dealing with individuals (SN); expectations modeled through interactions with parents and students (CL)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Case Conclusions: Modeling of Ethical and Culturally Responsive Behaviors**

Based on the findings from the multiple case study, influences were operationalized as (a) modeling or leading by example, (b) demonstrating culturally responsive behaviors by respecting culture, responding to different backgrounds, and being receptive to differences, and (c) sharing expectations by explaining behaviors,
providing evidence and suggesting behaviors. These behaviors were described by
interviewees as positive influences by the principal.

I used the evidence of culturally responsive behaviors to operationalize the
perceived culturally responsive modeling principals do, collectively as actions requiring
the principal to know the child as an individual with a unique background, culture, family
structure, behavioral expectations, and sense of belonging. The principals at CEMS and
CMS perceived the behaviors they modeled as responsive to the individual, regardless of
culture, yet teachers did not report perceptions of the modeled behaviors. One teacher at
CEMS did identify an observation of Principal Freeman’s requirement to teach different
cultures and to be sensitive to different cultures but did not share an observation of
Principal Freeman modeling the identified behaviors. Contrarily, the principal at CPS did
not report modeled behaviors, but teachers perceived her modeling ethical behaviors and
culturally responsive behaviors through vicarious experiences and observations of her
behaviors. The ethical and cultural responsiveness of the principals at CMS and CEMS
differed from the ethical and cultural responsiveness of the principal at CPS because of
the principal reported and teacher perceived behaviors. In the next section, I expounded
upon the ethicality of the reported and perceived ethical behaviors of the principals.

**Providing Ethical Contexts for Cultural Responsiveness**

Based on the initial theoretical proposition, ethical contexts for cultural
responsiveness included

(a) instances where rules or procedures are focused on or followed (e.g.,
legal and regulatory clauses, the organization’s unwritten rules, the

---
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statutory framework), with the intent of protecting or promoting human dignity within the school or larger community (Langlois, Lapointe, Valois & de Leeuw, 2014; Starratt, 1991)

(b) instances focused on social injustice (e.g., not tolerating arrogance, acknowledging disproportionate privilege for some groups, speaking out against unfair practices and/or injustices) (Langlois, Lapointe, Valois & de Leeuw, 2014; Starratt, 1991)

(c) instances focused on human and interpersonal relations along with absolute respect (e.g., trust in relationships, ensuring harmony, preserving everyone’s safety and well-being, promoting each individual’s dignity, listening to and paying attention to individuals, and promoting dialogue about contentious issues) (Langlois, Lapointe, Valois & de Leeuw, 2014; Starratt, 1991)

The three elements of providing ethical contexts for culturally responsive behaviors reflected the tripartite ethical paradigm presented by Starratt (1991). The following sections are a comparison of elements, identified in Starratt’s ethical paradigm, as presented in Bishop’s (2016) synthesis of the ethics of justice, critique and care, in the initial theoretical proposition and the revised theoretical proposition (see Table 6.2: Comparison of Elements of Ethicality in Initial Theoretical Proposition and Revised Theoretical Proposition).

**Ethic of justice.** Principals provided an explication of following rules and procedures, including (a) legal or law-related issues or concerns, (b) having and
maintaining explicit expectations, and (c) accountability measures observed and in place. Two elements reported by interviewees corroborated with relevant research from the initial theoretical proposition: legal and regulatory clauses (i.e., legal or law-related) and the statutory framework (i.e., accountability). Contradictorily, relevant research included the organization’s unwritten rules as a means to protect an individual’s dignity (Starratt, 1991), yet evidence was not prevalent at any of the schools. Teachers identified elements of the ethic of justice through explicit expectations shared by the principal.

**Ethic of critique.** Principals presented behaviors focused on social injustice as a focus on equity and justice (i.e., responding to individuals and confronting bias). These behaviors did not have as strong an action as suggested by Starratt (1991) in ethic of critique. According to Bishop’s (2016) synthesis of ethical decision-making, the ethic of critique contained a more reactionary approach (i.e., not tolerating arrogance, acknowledging disproportionate privilege for groups, and speaking out against unfair practices and/or injustices).

**Ethic of care.** Evidence of the ethic of care was identified by teachers as being empathetic and meeting the needs of students. Ethic of care, according to Bishop (2016), included trust in relationships, ensuring harmony, preserving everyone’s safety and well-being, promoting individuals’ dignity, listening and paying attention to individuals, and promoting dialogue about contentious issues. The evidenced behaviors did not compare to the depths of action listed in Bishop’s (2016) synthesis of the ethical tripartite.
Table 6.2: Comparison of Elements of Ethicality in Initial Theoretical Proposition and Revised Theoretical Proposition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethic of Justice: Rules or procedures are focused on or followed with the intent of protecting or promoting human dignity within the school or larger community</th>
<th>Initial Theoretical Proposition</th>
<th>Revised Theoretical Proposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ethic of Justice: Rules or procedures are focused on or followed with the intent of protecting or promoting human dignity within the school or larger community | • legal and regulatory clauses,  
• the organization’s unwritten rules,  
• the statutory framework | Following Procedures and Rules:  
• legal or law-related (CPS, CMS)  
• explicit expectations (CEMS, CMS, CPS)  
• accountability (CPS) |
| Ethic of Critique: Focused on social injustice | • not tolerating arrogance,  
• acknowledging disproportionate privilege for some groups,  
• speaking out against unfair practices and/or injustices | Focusing on equity and justice:  
• equity issues (CEMS, CPS)  
• confronting bias (CEMS, CMS, CPS) |
| Ethic of Care: Focused on human and interpersonal relations along with absolute respect | • trust in relationships,  
• ensuring harmony,  
• preserving everyone’s safety and well-being,  
• promoting each individual’s dignity,  
• listening to and paying attention to individuals,  
• promoting dialogue about contentious issues | Focusing on student needs:  
• being empathetic (CEMS, CPS)  
• meeting needs (CPS) |

Case Conclusions: Providing Ethical Contexts for Cultural Responsiveness

All three paradigms of Starratt’s ethical tripartite were evidenced in all three cases. City Middle School displayed elements of ethic of justice and care and Country Elementary Middle School and Country Primary School demonstrated all three ethics.
Participants shared influences of principals through modeling culturally responsive behaviors and ethical behaviors, as well as influences through experiences, confirming most behaviors were learned through a “continuous reciprocal interaction” (Bandura, 1971, p. 2) of behaviors and consequences. Except for the modeling of expectations, the principals did not share an intentionality to their modeling. Ethical behaviors observed and modeled portrayed influences in each domain of Starratt’s (1991) ethical paradigm, including examples in justice, critique and care. The highest occurrence of ethical behaviors fell into the domains of ethics of justice and critique.

In relation to the Ethical Leadership Questionnaire (Langlois, Lapoint, Valois & de Leeuw, 2014) scored by principals in the pilot study (Bishop, 2018), the principals self-reported high levels (out of 6.0 Likert-type scale) of ethical leadership (Brewster, 5.0; Burns, 5.43; Freeman, 4.78) and teacher-perceived scores of ethical leadership (Brewster, 5.24; Burns, 5.42; Freeman, 4.5) were not revealed as prevalent in the interviews. Table 6.3: Prevalence of Ethical Behaviors Modeled Compared to Ethical Leadership Scores included details of the prevalence of behaviors revealed. Conclusively, the principal who self-scored and teacher-perceived scored the highest relative to the others, Principal Burns, demonstrated the greatest amount of ethically modeled behaviors.
Table 6.3: Prevalence of Ethical Behaviors Modeled Compared to Ethical Leadership Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Middle School</th>
<th>ELQ Average</th>
<th>Ethic of Critique</th>
<th>Ethic of Care</th>
<th>Ethic of Justice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELQ Average – Principal Self-Reported</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELQ Average – Teacher Perception of Principal</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>5.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Findings</td>
<td></td>
<td>Focusing on equity and justice:</td>
<td>Focusing on student needs:</td>
<td>Following procedures and rules:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• confronting bias</td>
<td>• none</td>
<td>• legal or law related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• explicit expectations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Primary School</th>
<th>ELQ Average</th>
<th>Ethic of Critique</th>
<th>Ethic of Care</th>
<th>Ethic of Justice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELQ Average – Principal Self-Reported</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>5.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELQ Average – Teacher Perception of Principal</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>5.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Findings</td>
<td></td>
<td>Focusing on equity and justice:</td>
<td>Focusing on student needs:</td>
<td>Following procedures and rules:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• equity issues</td>
<td>• being empathetic</td>
<td>• legal or law related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• confronting bias</td>
<td>• meeting needs</td>
<td>• explicit expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Findings</td>
<td>Focusing on equity and justice:</td>
<td>Focusing on student needs:</td>
<td>Following procedures and rules:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• confronting bias</td>
<td>• being empathetic</td>
<td>• explicit expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.3, cont’d: Prevalence of Ethical Behaviors Modeled Compared to Ethical Leadership Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELQ Average – Principal</th>
<th>Self-Reported</th>
<th>5.0</th>
<th>5.5</th>
<th>5.9</th>
<th>5.17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELQ Average – Teacher Perception of Principal</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

143
Evidence of Transformative Learning. Based on the initial theoretical proposition, principal influences to a teacher’s culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy included principal promotion of transformative learning through critical-dialectical-discourse and critical reflection. Transformative learning results in a change in thinking (Mezirow, 1997), creating a shift, often paradigmatic, in beliefs and assumptions. In the case of transformative learning, the learner “moves toward a frame of reference that is more inclusive, discriminating, self-reflective, and integrative of experience” (p. 5). Without a challenge to a person’s beliefs and assumptions, a person’s frame of reference will not change. To challenge beliefs and assumptions in a frame of reference (i.e., habits of mind), one has to think critically about the frame of reference. Mezirow (1997) suggested two means to think critically about a frame of reference: critical reflection and critical dialectical-discourse. Critical dialectical-discourse is communicative actions used to validate and interpret beliefs and assumptions (i.e., frames of reference, habits of mind) instead of accepting social realities as presented by others (Mezirow, 1997).

Critical reflection is “the critical assessment of assumptions [which] leads toward a clearer understanding by tapping collective experience to arrive at a tentative best judgment (Mezirow, 2000, p. 11). Evidence of critical dialectical-discourse and critical reflection are included in the table below, with a distinction between critical discourse and critical reflection as identified in the initial theoretical proposition and discourse and reflection as identified in the revised theoretical proposition (See Table 6.4).
Table 6.4: Evidence of critical dialectical-discourse and critical reflection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical dialectical-discourse</th>
<th>Matching Evidence</th>
<th>Weak Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(communicative actions used to validate and interpret beliefs and assumptions (i.e., frames of reference, habits of mind) instead of accepting social realities as presented by others (Mezirow, 1997))</td>
<td>Questioning to identify beliefs (CPS)</td>
<td>Communication as talking and being open; brainstorming (CMS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical reflection</th>
<th>Questioning as an opportunity to reflect (CPS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(critical assessment of assumptions [which] leads toward a clearer understanding by tapping collective experience to arrive at a tentative best judgment (Mezirow, 2000, p. 11))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What the participants did not conclusively confirm were the depths of critical discourse and critical reflection of transformative learning. Transformative learning is defined by Mezirow (2003) as “learning that transforms problematic frames of reference—sets of fixed assumptions and expectations (habits of mind, meaning perspectives, mindsets)—to make them more inclusive, discriminating, open, reflective, and emotionally able to change” (p. 58). Participants did not share experiences of direct interventions “to foster the development of skills, insights, and especially dispositions essential for critical reflection… on assumptions and effective participation on critical dialectical discourse” (Mezirow, 2003, p. 62). To be more critically reflective and dialectical, the leader must assist the teacher in acquiring skills, sensitivities and assumptions to become more rational and critically reflective of habits of mind,
dispositions and beliefs. The only findings of promoting critical dialectical discourse or critical reflection existed in an instructional coach or principal questioning the teacher to identify beliefs and questioning as an opportunity to drive reflection. Questioning may begin the process of transformative learning but the interviews or collected documents did not reveal the depth of the process as influencing culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy.

**Case Conclusions: Evidence of Transformative Learning.** Evidence of critical dialectical-discourse and critical reflection were presented during interviews with teachers at Country Primary School as principal questioning to identify beliefs and questioning as an opportunity to reflect. One teacher at City Middle School shared an example of critical dialectical-discourse as open communication and brainstorming, but did not provide evidence of the depths of critical dialectical-discourse needed to challenge or change assumptions and beliefs.

**Influences Identified Supporting the Rival Theory**

The plausible rival theory in the case study will show high culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy is not developed by the intentional actions of leaders but by personal experiences and interactions with others (Mezirow, 1991) or challenges to assumptions and beliefs (Oakes, Welner, Yonezawa & Allen, 1998). Themes supporting the plausible rival theory emerged during the writing of the case narratives and the cross-case analysis.

The participants in the cases noted personal experiences and challenges to assumptions and beliefs, but none of the experiences portrayed habits of mind or beliefs
that needed to be changed. The beliefs and assumptions of each teacher participant, therefore, may have been formed from these personal experiences and prior challenges to their assumptions and beliefs.

**Implications and Further Study**

Culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy influences included intentional actions of leaders (i.e., modeling of behaviors, providing ethical contexts for cultural responsiveness, promoting and enacting transformative learning). Yet, they also included personal experiences, interactions with others, and challenges to assumptions or beliefs. Participants in each case confirmed the opportunities principals have to influence a teacher’s culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy, including being ethical models of how to be culturally responsive and engaging others in discourse and reflective practices. Participants also demonstrated personal experiences and challenges to beliefs and assumptions influenced their culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy.

This study was limited to three schools in the southeastern United States, chosen because the teachers scored high on a culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy survey during a pilot study (Bishop, 2018). A second limitation was that, in all cases, there was considerable time between the survey responses and follow-up interviews (up to six months) and consequently the self-efficacy ratings may not have been as relevant. The final limitation is that I did not include observations of principals or teachers practices in natural work settings, instead relying on self-reports.
Implications

Implications from this study include recommendations for leadership preparation and leadership practices. Due to the differences in principals’ reported actions and teachers’ perceptions of those actions, implications also include recommendations for practice in improving culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy. In the following section, I share implications for this study.

Educational leadership preparation programs. Higher education personnel and district or state level preparation leaders must consider several issues as they develop and implement curriculum and training opportunities to ensure principal candidates receive culturally responsive instruction. Opportunities include (a) insuring principals follow racial and cultural competencies, and (b) participation in critical dialectical-discourse and critical reflection.

Leadership preparation programs must ensure that those preparing principals follow tenets of racial and cultural competencies for culturally responsive behavioral expressions (Gay, 2010). According to Bandura’s social learning theory, followers are influenced by leader behaviors (1977, 1986). Therefore, the focus for leadership behaviors must be what the leader needs to display as cultural responsiveness.

Preparation programs must ensure the curriculum and field experiences afford principals opportunities to participate in critical dialectical discourse and critical reflection (Mezirow, 2000). This must be done with the purpose of the principal critically examining his or her values, beliefs, and cultural norms to (a) confront any personal bias
that exists, (b) identify personal bias in others, and (c) promote transformative learning in followers who are biased against those who are culturally different than they are.

**Leadership practices.** Educational leaders must be cognizant of their actions and others’ perceptions of those actions. Leaders must (a) consider perceptions of leadership (i.e., ethicality, equity-based ideals, and culturally responsive leadership practices), (b) promote an inclusive school environment, and (c) influence culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy (i.e., teacher expertise and practices, value- and belief-driven behavioral expressions).

Culturally responsive leadership has not been definitively operationalized through empirical research, but implications from this study include ethicality based on a moral compass (Starratt, 1991), equity-based ideals (Nieto, 2000) and culturally responsive leadership practices (Lopez, 2015).

Culturally responsive leadership behaviors must promote an inclusive school environment through philosophies, practices, and policies, including defining schoolwide and teacher expectations (i.e., curricular, behavioral, inclusivity) and empowering students and families of all groups to be culturally inclusive.

Leaders must influence culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy, focusing on teachers’ expertise and practices and value- and belief-driven behaviors. Leaders may influence teachers’ self-efficacy by modeling expected behaviors (Bandura, 1971; Kouzes & Postner, 1987) and following up with critical dialogical discourse and critical reflection with the teacher (Mezirow, 2000).
**Improving culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy.** As evidenced in this multiple case study, principals could have had a stronger influence on teachers’ culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy. There were disparities in actions the principals reported and what the teachers perceived at City Middle School and Country Elementary Middle School. Practical implications are for principals to recognize and understand the complications in influencing values, beliefs, and assumptions. To address the complications, principals need to ensure teachers know the expectations. Teachers need to know and understand the expectations of the principal. In this case study, teachers could have benefited from a survey or feedback instrument assessing the influences of the principal to close the gap between what teachers perceived and principals reported.

Additionally, it is important to note the influences of an instructional coach. Several teachers remarked about the behaviors of an instructional coach and identified behaviors that helped teachers develop culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy. Development and use of an instructional coach may provide opportunities to influence culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy beyond the realm of or instead of principal influences.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

The following recommendations are for further research regarding culturally responsive leadership and developing culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy. The findings of this research suggested the need to further examine culturally responsive leadership practices. Further research could explore how the leader’s culturally
responsive self-efficacy can be developed to further drive leader preparation programs and professional development opportunities.

The findings of this research revealed that a high level of ethicality is needed for leaders modeling culturally responsive behaviors. Along with modeling, ethicality is needed to develop trusting relationships with followers, which is necessary to encourage transformative learning (Merizow, 2003). Further research could explore the influences of ethicality directly on culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy.

The findings of this research highlighted teachers who were responsive to the needs of individuals, not necessarily to individuals who are culturally different from them. Further research could examine the elements of generalized responsiveness in relation to cultural responsiveness to determine whether the responsiveness has to be culturally linked.

The participants in this multiple case study all self-identified as having a high culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy. Further research could examine influences of culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy on individuals who do not self-score highly to further operationalize leader behaviors that influence cultural responsiveness.

Summary

In this chapter, I presented significant interpretations of the influences a leader has on culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy. The summaries of the operationalized theoretical propositions were derived by a cross-case analysis of data. Discussions further displayed the operationalized propositions to relevant literature reviewed in the study. The chapter concluded with implications for educational leadership programs and for
improving leadership practices. I concluded the chapter with recommendations for future research.

My overall purpose of this study was to identify how school leaders, in particular principals, influenced culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy. My goal was to examine the development of culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy in teachers who perceived themselves as having a high self-efficacy in a pilot study (Bishop, 2018). In this explanatory multiple case study (Yin, 2018), I specifically aimed to understand how a leader influences culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy in the context of a cultural mismatch between teacher and student. Through the deductive analysis of a theoretical proposition, developed from relevant literature, I revealed themes that I then inductively coded to operationalize leader behaviors. Leader behaviors included (a) modeling of culturally responsive behaviors, (b) providing ethical contexts for cultural responsiveness, and (c) promoting transformative learning. Beyond leader influences, I suggested a teacher’s culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy is influenced by (a) personal experiences, (b) interactions with others, (c) and challenges to assumptions and beliefs. In the conclusion of the study, I included implications for educational leadership preparation programs and leadership practices and recommendations for further study.
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**Ethical Leadership Questionnaire - 2017**

**Guidelines**
*(Referring to the scale below, circle the number of your choice)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>N/A (not applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### When I reflect on the way I act at work, I can see that…

1. I establish trust in my relationships with others. 1 2 3 4 5 6 X
2. I try to ensure harmony in the organization. 1 2 3 4 5 6 X
3. I don’t tolerate arrogance 1 2 3 4 5 6 X
4. I follow procedure and rules. 1 2 3 4 5 6 X
5. I try to preserve everyone’s safety and well-being. 1 2 3 4 5 6 X
6. I try to make people aware that some situations disproportionately privilege certain groups. 1 2 3 4 5 6 X
7. I speak out against unfair practices. 1 2 3 4 5 6 X
8. I seek to protect each individual’s dignity. 1 2 3 4 5 6 X
9. I know people can make mistakes – it is human nature. 1 2 3 4 5 6 X
10. I speak out against injustice. 1 2 3 4 5 6 X
11. I am concerned when individuals or groups have advantages compared to others. 1 2 3 4 5 6 X

### When I have to resolve an ethical dilemma….

12. I check the legal and regulatory clauses that might apply. 1 2 3 4 5 6 X
13. I check my organisation’s unwritten rules. 1 2 3 4 5 6 X
14. I take into consideration the related facts. 1 2 3 4 5 6 X
15. I sanction mistakes in proportion to their seriousness. 1 2 3 4 5 6 X
16. I try to rectify injustice. 1 2 3 4 5 6 X
17. I take time to listen to the people involved in a situation. 1 2 3 4 5 6 X
18. I seek to preserve bonds and harmony within the organization. 1 2 3 4 5 6 X
19. I avoid hurting people’s feelings by maintaining their dignity. 1 2 3 4 5 6 X
20. I pay attention to individuals. 1 2 3 4 5 6 X
21. I promote dialogue about contentious issues. 1 2 3 4 5 6 X

### My decision in the resolution of an ethical dilemma is based on…

22. The statutory and legal framework. 1 2 3 4 5 6 X
23. Increased equity in the work place. 1 2 3 4 5 6 X
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Culturally Responsive Teaching Self-Efficacy Scale

Rate how confident you are in your ability to successfully accomplish each of the tasks listed below. Each task is related to teaching. Please rate your degree of confidence by recording a number from 0 (no confidence at all) to 100 (completely confident). Remember that you may use any number between 0 and 100.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>100</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Confidence</td>
<td>Moderately Confident</td>
<td>Completely Confident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am able to:

- adapt instruction to meet the needs of my students.
- obtain information about my students’ academic strengths.
- determine whether my students like to work alone or in a group.
- determine whether my students feel comfortable competing with other students.
- identify ways that the school culture (e.g., values, norms, and practices) is different from my students’ home culture.
- implement strategies to minimize the effects of the mismatch between my students’ home culture and the school culture.
- assess student learning using various types of assessments. obtain information about my students’ home life.
- build a sense of trust in my students.
- establish positive home-school relations.
- use a variety of teaching methods.
- develop a community of learners when my class consists of students from diverse backgrounds.
- use my students’ cultural background to help make learning meaningful.
- use my students’ prior knowledge to help them make sense of new information.
- identify ways how students communicate at home may differ from the school norms.
- obtain information about my students’ cultural background.
- teach students about their cultures’ contributions to science.
- greet English Language Learners with a phrase in their native language.
- design a classroom environment using displays that reflects a variety of cultures.
● develop a personal relationship with my students.
● obtain information about my students’ academic weaknesses.
● praise English Language Learners for their accomplishments using a phrase in their native language.
● identify ways that standardized tests may be biased towards linguistically diverse students.
● communicate with parents regarding their child’s educational progress.
● structure parent-teacher conferences so that the meeting is not intimidating for parents.
● help students to develop positive relationships with their classmates.
● revise instructional material to include a better representation of cultural groups.
● critically examine the curriculum to determine whether it reinforces negative cultural stereotypes.
● design a lesson that shows how other cultural groups have made use of mathematics.
● model classroom tasks to enhance English Language Learner’s understanding.
● communicate with the parents of English Language Learners regarding their child’s achievement.
● help students feel like important members of the classroom.
● identify ways that standardized tests may be biased towards culturally diverse students.
● use a learning preference inventory to gather data about how my students like to learn.
● use examples that are familiar to students from diverse cultural backgrounds.
● explain new concepts using examples that are taken from my students’ everyday lives.
● obtain information regarding my students’ academic interests.
● use the interests of my students to make learning meaningful for them.
● implement cooperative learning activities for those students who like to work in groups.
● design instruction that matches my students’ developmental needs.
● teach students about their cultures’ contributions to society.
Overview of the Case Study and Purpose of the Protocol

Research study question: How do principals influence the culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy of teachers?

Propositions:
1. Ethical contexts influence culturally responsiveness
   a. Definition subject to deficit perspective
   b. Definition subject to White-dominated beliefs or Colorblindness
2. Cultural beliefs can be changed
   a. Social Learning Theory – modeling
   b. Transformative Learning

Units of Analysis / its case(s): Context of teachers who self-rate as having high culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy and the teachers’ principal. (12 participants: 3 teachers per principal at 3 different locations)

Logic Linking Data to the Propositions:
1. Explanation building of theoretical propositions
2. Cross-case synthesis

Preliminary Theoretical Propositions:
1. Theory: The case study will show high culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy is influenced by the intentional actions of leaders (e.g., modeling of ethical behaviors, providing ethical contexts for adult learning, and promoting critical-dialectical-discourse and critical reflection).
2. Rival Theory: The case study will show high culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy is not only developed by the intentional actions of leaders leaders but by personal experiences and interactions with others (Mezirow, 1991) or challenges to assumptions and beliefs (Oakes, Welner, Yonezawa & Allen, 1998).
Data Collection Procedures

Site selection:
CRTSE survey scores from the pilot study (Bishop, 2018) were ranked from highest to lowest. Out of the top 20 scores, the scores from the following sites had (a) the highest number of high scores; (b) included at least three teachers who ranked high on the CRTSE survey; and (c) gave permission for further interviews.
1. City Middle 1 – Middle school consisting of grades 6-8 (CRTSE top scores: 100, 100, 95.7, 94.98)
2. Country Elementary – Elementary school consisting of grades K-5 (CRTSE top scores: 100, 98.84, 96.98, 96.98, 96.40, 96.40, 96.05)
3. Country Elementary/Middle – Elementary and middle school consisting of grades K-8 (CRTSE top scores: 100, 98.84, 95.93, 95.58)

Interviewees:
Interviewees chosen based on prior self-ratings on the Culturally Responsive Teaching Self-Efficacy Scale, focusing on survey respondents with high levels of CRTSE in the pilot study (Bishop, 2018) who also agreed to further interviews, along with the teachers’ respective principal. The bolded scores (above) are scores of the teacher participants who will be interviewed.

Data collection methods: Multiple sources of data for triangulation.
1. Interview(s) of individual teachers (Teacher Interview Protocol) – 1 hour each
2. Interview(s) of school’s principal (Principal Interview Protocol) – 30 minutes each
3. Document collection from individuals (i.e., email and written correspondence, meeting notes, coaching logs, administrator observation data, administrator reflective questioning, FaceBook and Twitter posts) – included in interviews and additional searches of school and teacher websites and social media.
4. Document collection from school (i.e., teacher handbook/manual, chosen curriculum, professional development materials) – included in interviews and additional searches of school and teacher websites and social media.

Interviewer Preparation:
1. Review CRTSE scores, noting areas of strengths and weaknesses.
2. Review teacher-perception ELQ scores, noting strengths and weaknesses.
3. Gather materials for interviewing (i.e., audio recorder, iPad, notepad and pencils, interview protocols, introduction and informed consent letters)
Protocol Questions to Guide Conversations

Level 1. Guided Conversations (Teacher) verbalized to teachers

1. First of all, I would like to thank you for taking the Culturally Responsive Teaching Self-Efficacy scale this summer. Your scores were high relative to the others who took the survey. I would like to ask you some open-ended questions that relate to the survey and your responses.
   a. Please tell me a little about yourself as a teacher.
   b. In the survey you took (CRTSE), I asked you to identify your race, gender, ethnicity and to list or describe any social group(s) such as culture, religion, language, etc. that defines your personal identity. You identified yourself as ___________. Would you like to add any details about your background?

2. This next set of questions focuses on you as a teacher and your culturally responsive teaching practices.
   a. How does your background (defined in 1b.) compare to the backgrounds of the students you teach?
   b. How does the similarity/difference impact your teaching?
   c. How effective do you think you are at teaching students with backgrounds other than yours? Please share some examples.
   d. How would your principal describe your ability to teach students with backgrounds other than yours?
   e. In what ways does your principal show support of your efforts teaching students with backgrounds other than yours?

3. This set of questions focuses on your perspectives about teaching students in culturally responsive ways.
   a. Who or what experiences have influenced your perspectives of how you teach students of different backgrounds than yours?
   b. How did (he/she or the experience) influence your perspectives of teaching students of diverse backgrounds? (include non-examples)
   c. Was there a time you thought differently about teaching students of diverse backgrounds? What happened?
   d. Have your perspectives about teaching students of different backgrounds been confirmed/challenged? How?

4. For this last set of questions, I want you to focus on your perception of culturally responsive teaching at your school.
   a. What are the expectations for teaching in culturally responsive ways? (seek evidence: professional development activities, handbook / manual, correspondence)
   b. How do you know the expectations for teaching in culturally responsive ways?
   c. How does your principal influence the expectations of teaching in culturally responsive ways?
Level 1. Guided Conversations (Principal) verbalized to principals
I want you to focus on your perception of your teachers and the school as a whole.

a. What are the expectations for teaching students in culturally responsive ways? (seek evidence: professional development activities, handbook / manual, correspondence)
b. How do you share the expectations for teaching in culturally responsive ways?
c. How do you influence teachers’ use of culturally-responsive teaching practices?
d. Who are the most culturally responsive teachers at your school? In what ways are they culturally responsive?

Level 2. Inquiry questions about each teacher
Operationalize the development of cultural responsiveness contextually (culturally responsive teaching practices; perspectives of cultural responsiveness; perceptions of cultural responsiveness in the school), postulating how the principal influenced the teacher’s cultural responsiveness.
Collect data related to the development of cultural responsiveness, including
- Personal assumptions and beliefs from personal experiences and interactions with others (Mezirow, 1991)
- Challenges to assumptions and beliefs (Oakes, Welner, Yonezawa & Allen, 1998).
- Principal (or other) participation in culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy beliefs (Bandura, 1989)

Cite evidence detailing the development of the teacher’s culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy.

Level 2. Inquiry questions about each context
Operationalize the intentional actions of principals to influence cultural responsiveness (i.e., supporting practices, setting and articulating expectations, influencing beliefs and assumptions by challenging or confirming beliefs) in the school context.
Collect data related to the development of cultural responsiveness, including
- Supporting culturally responsive teaching practices
- Setting and articulating expectations for teaching students in culturally responsive ways
- Influencing culturally responsive teaching practices and self-efficacy

Cite evidence explaining how and why the principal did or did not influence culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy.
Outline of Case Study Report
Deductive Approach Comparing Evidence to Theoretical Propositions

1. Modeling of Culturally Responsive Behaviors
   a. Focus 1: Examples of vicarious experiences reflecting principal ethical behavior and/or culturally responsive practices
   b. Focus 2: Reports of observations of principal modeling ethical behavior and/or culturally responsive practices

2. Ethical Contexts for adult learning
   a. Focus 3: Examples focused on or followed procedures and rules (e.g., legal and regulatory clauses, the organization’s unwritten rules, the statutory framework), with the intention of protecting human dignity within the school or larger community (Langlois, Lapointe, Valois and de Leeuw, 2014; Starratt, 1991)
   b. Focus 4: Examples focused on social injustice (e.g., not tolerating arrogance, acknowledging disproportionate privilege for some groups, speaking out against unfair practices and/or injustices) (Langlois, Lapointe, Valois and de Leeuw, 2014; Starratt, 1991)
   c. Focus 5: Examples focused on human and interpersonal relations along with absolute respect (e.g., trust in relationships, ensuring harmony, preserving everyone’s safety and well-being, protecting each individual’s dignity, listening to and paying attention to individuals, and promoting dialogue about contentious issues) (Langlois, Lapointe, Valois and de Leeuw, 2014; Starratt, 1991)

3. Promotion of Transformative Learning
   a. Focus 6: Evidence of transformative learning through critical-dialectical-discourse
   b. Focus 7: Evidence of transformative learning through critical reflection

Inductive Approach Using Evidence to Explain Development of Culturally Responsive Teaching Self-Efficacy
Guided Conversations Protocol

Guided Conversation Prompt
3a. Who or what experiences have influenced your perspectives of how you teach students with different backgrounds than yours?
3b. How did (he/she or the experience) influence your perspectives of teaching students with different backgrounds than yours? (include non-examples)
3c. Was there a time you thought differently about teaching students with different backgrounds than yours? What happened?
3d. Have your perspectives about teaching students with different backgrounds than yours been confirmed/challenged? How?
4c. How does your principal influence the expectations of teaching in culturally responsive ways?

Guided Conversation Prompt

Concept and Source
“Habits of mind are broad, abstract, orienting, habitual ways of thinking, feeling, and acting influenced by assumptions that constitute a set” codes (Mezirow, 1997, pp. 5-6); habits of mind are expressed as a point of view: “the constellation of belief, value judgment, attitude, and feeling that shapes a particular interpretation” (Mezirow, 1997, p. 6).

Meaning perspectives “mirror the way our culture and those individuals responsible for our socialization happen to have defined various situations” (Mezirow 1991a, p. 131).

Effectively changing the behavioral expressions of teachers requires role-modeling, care and concern, trustworthiness, and fair treatment of others (Bandura, 1989); transformative learning is “becoming critically aware of one’s own tacit assumptions and expectations and those of others and assessing their relevance for making an interpretation” (Taylor & Cranton, 2012, p.4)

“In order to be an ethical leader who can influence employee outcomes, the leader must be viewed as an attractive, credible, and legitimate role model who engages in normatively appropriate behavior and makes the ethics message salient” (Brown, Trevino & Harrison, 2005, p. 130).

In order to respond with different strategies or considerations when teaching culturally diverse subordinate groups, and teacher questioning about ability and equitable learning environments that meet the needs of all students, close attention needs to be paid to cultural responsiveness, which includes ways of teaching and learning focused on differences in learning, but more specifically is a response to students’ cultures and an incorporation of the diverse perspectives. (Darling-Hammond, Austin & Nasir, 2003, p. 109).

2a. How does your background (defined in 1b.) compare to the backgrounds of the students you teach?
2b. How does the similarity/difference impact your teaching?
Bandura suggested “most of the behaviors that people display are learned, either deliberately or inadvertently, through the influence of example” (Bandura, 1971, p. 5) and “psychological functioning (of man) is best understood in terms of continuous reciprocal interaction between behavior and its controlling condition” (Bandura, 1971, p. 2).

“Social learning theory is an excellent model that may be able to help people…recognize their able-bodied perspective and understand how their actions maintain ableism” (Kattari, 2015, p. 377).

A meaning perspective transformation is “a more fully developed (more functional) frame of reference . . . one that is more (a) inclusive, (b) differentiating, (c) permeable, (d) critically reflective, and (e) integrative of experience” (Mezirow, 1996, p. 163).

“Transformative learning is learning that transforms problematic frames of reference—sets of fixed assumptions and expectations (habits of mind, meaning perspectives, mindsets)—to make them more inclusive, discriminating, open, reflective, and emotionally able to change” (p. 58).

Communicative process includes mutual trust, and the following criteria of both communicators: intelligibility, truth, trustworthiness, and legitimacy (Habermas, 1984);
Educational leaders must develop and articulate a greater awareness of their significance of their actions and decisions” (Starratt, 1991, p. 187).

2d. How would your principal describe your ability to teach students with backgrounds other than yours?

Principal 1d. Who are the most culturally responsive teachers at your school? In what ways are they culturally responsive?
Appendix D: Synthesized Ethical Decision-Making Model (Bishop, 2016)

### Ethic of Critique Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions (Buskey &amp; Pitts, 2013, p. 76)</th>
<th>Questions (Starratt, 1991, p. 189) based on critical theory:</th>
<th>Questions (Shapiro &amp; Stefkovich, 2011, p. 15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Does the conflict further the purpose of the organization?</td>
<td>1. Who benefits from these arrangements?</td>
<td>1. Who makes the laws?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is the purpose ethically just?</td>
<td>2. Which group dominates this social arrangement?</td>
<td>2. Who benefits from the law, rule, or policy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Does the conflict address inequalities in the system?</td>
<td>3. Who defines the way things are structured here?</td>
<td>3. Who has the power?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Who defines what is valued and disvalued in this situation?</td>
<td>4. Who are the silenced voices?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Combined Questions for Ethic of Critique**

1. Which group is advantaged within the context? How?
2. Which group is disadvantaged within the context? How?
3. Who defines what is valued/disvalued within the context? How is this evidenced?
4. Who defines the policy? Is it ethically just?
5. Is the policy biased against/for a particular group?
6. Who benefits from the implementation of the (conflict)?
7. Will the outcomes be used to address any inequalities? How?

### Ethic of Justice Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions (Buskey &amp; Pitts, 2013, p. 77)</th>
<th>Questions (Shapiro &amp; Stefkovich, 2011, p. 12)</th>
<th>Questions (Starratt, 1991, p. 191)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What actions will serve the common good?</td>
<td>1. Is there a law, right, or policy that relates to a particular case?</td>
<td>1. How do we govern ourselves while carrying out educating activities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What actions will respect individuals’ rights?</td>
<td>2. If there is a law, right, or policy, should it be enforced?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What actions will promote an ethical community?</td>
<td>3. And if there is not a law, right, or policy, should there be one?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Combined Questions for Ethic of Justice

1. What law, right, or policy relates to the case? If there is not one, should there be?  
2. What are the individuals’ rights? What rights are expected to be supported (by the community, school, individual)?  
3. What actions will deny the person/group’s rights? What actions will support the person/group’s rights?  
4. What are the legal implications of the decision?

## Ethic of Care Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How does the conflict treat each person with intrinsic dignity and worth?</td>
<td>1. Who will benefit from what I decide?</td>
<td>1. Who are the cared-fors?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How is the conflict free of motives to dominate or intimidate others?</td>
<td>2. Who will be hurt by my actions</td>
<td>2. What are the expressed needs of the immediate cared-for?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How does the conflict carry the possibility to nurture and develop others?</td>
<td>3. What are the long-term effects of a decision I make today?</td>
<td>3. What are the likely effects of my decision(s) on the wider web of care? On the caring relation itself?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How does the conflict maintain trust, honesty, and open communication?</td>
<td>4. And if I am helped by someone now, what should I do in the future about giving back to this individual or to society in general?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Also asks individuals to grapple with such values as loyalty and trust” (Shapiro &amp; Stefkovich, p. 18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Combined Questions for Ethic of Care

1. Who are the cared-fors in this context?  
2. Who will benefit from my decision? Who will be hurt by my decision? How?  
3. Does my decision infringe upon anyone’s dignity/worth or trust?  
4. What are the long-term effects of my decision on each cared-for?  
5. Does my decision encroach upon my values of loyalty and trust?
Appendix E: District and School-level Demographics of Students and Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District or School Name</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
<th>Total Teachers</th>
<th>Teacher Gender (%)</th>
<th>Teacher Race (%)</th>
<th>Poverty Level (Index)</th>
<th>Total Students</th>
<th>Student Gender (%)</th>
<th>Student Race</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M  F  W  B  A</td>
<td>H  I  N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M  F</td>
<td>B/A A  AI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District G1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17 83 97 2</td>
<td>0 1 0 0</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>53 47</td>
<td>15 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Primary</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0 100 100 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>82.55</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>54 46</td>
<td>15 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District L5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19 81 84 11</td>
<td>2 3 0 0</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>5787</td>
<td>52 48</td>
<td>30 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Middle</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13 87 80 10</td>
<td>0 10 0 0</td>
<td>71.21</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>51 49</td>
<td>33 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country School</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12 88 93 5</td>
<td>0 2 0 0</td>
<td>67.54</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>53 47</td>
<td>.8 .1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[https://ed.sc.gov/data/information-systems/](https://ed.sc.gov/data/information-systems/): District Headcount by Gender and Ethnicity 2018-19; South Carolina Teachers by Race and Gender 2017-18; 2017-18 Poverty Index
Appendix F: ELQ and CRTSE Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CEM</th>
<th>CM</th>
<th>CP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELQ Average – Principal Self-Reported</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>5.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critique</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELQ Average – Teacher Perception of Principal</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>5.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critique</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>5.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>5.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>5.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRTSE Average</td>
<td>86.89</td>
<td>85.72</td>
<td>90.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culturally Responsive-Specific TSE</td>
<td>79.27</td>
<td>78.27</td>
<td>85.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item-Specific TSE</td>
<td>92.77</td>
<td>91.62</td>
<td>94.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to identify ways that the school culture (e.g. values, norms, and practices) is different from my students’ home culture</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>84.38</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to implement strategies to minimize effects of the mismatch between students’ home culture and the school culture</td>
<td>84.375</td>
<td>80.94</td>
<td>88.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to develop a community of learners when my class consists of students from diverse backgrounds</td>
<td>93.13</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>93.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to use my students’ cultural background to help make learning meaningful.</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>87.81</td>
<td>89.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to identify ways how students communicate at home may differ from the school norms.</td>
<td>91.25</td>
<td>88.75</td>
<td>93.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to obtain information about my students’ cultural background.</td>
<td>83.13</td>
<td>85.31</td>
<td>93.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to teach students about their cultures’ contributions to science.</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>70.625</td>
<td>81.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to greet English Language Learners with a phrase in their native language.</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>66.35</td>
<td>77.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to design a classroom environment using displays that reflects a variety of cultures.</td>
<td>85.00</td>
<td>84.38</td>
<td>87.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to praise English Language Learners for their accomplishments using a phrase in their native language.</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to identify ways that standardized tests may be biased towards linguistically diverse students.</td>
<td>56.875</td>
<td>77.19</td>
<td>78.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to revise instructional material to include a better representation of cultural groups.</td>
<td>91.25</td>
<td>85.94</td>
<td>92.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to critically examine the curriculum to determine</td>
<td>76.17</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>90.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whether it reinforces negative cultural stereotypes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to design a lesson that shows how other cultural</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>64.38</td>
<td>85.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>groups have made use of mathematics.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to model classroom tasks to enhance English</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>83.44</td>
<td>84.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Learner’s understanding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to communicate with the parents of English Language</td>
<td>65.625</td>
<td>54.38</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learners regarding their child’s achievement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to identify ways that standardized tests may be</td>
<td>58.75</td>
<td>79.06</td>
<td>79.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>biased towards culturally diverse students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to use examples that are familiar to students from</td>
<td>93.125</td>
<td>78.06</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diverse cultural backgrounds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to teach students about their cultures’ contributions to society.</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>79.25</td>
<td>89.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revisions\Synthesized Data according to ELQ and CRTSE.xlsx
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