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Abstract

The reason why the Trayvon Martin murder trial and similar court cases create a philosophical rift in our nation is due in part to flaws in the delivery of multicultural education. Traditional multicultural instruction does not prepare students for the subtleties and complexities of race relations. This study investigates critical strategies and practices that address multicultural missing gaps. I seek to fill a void in the literature created by a lack of student input. Students (N=337) enrolled at a Midwestern university were asked to rate the efficacy of selected instructional strategies. Utilizing a 9-point Likert Scale, students gave themselves a personal growth rating of 7.15 (SD=1.47). Variables important to predicting personal growth ($R^2 =.56, p<.0005$) were: a six-factor variable known as a non-color blind instructional approach ($t=10.509, p<.0005$); allowing students the opportunity to form their own opinions ($t=4.797, p<.0005$), and; a state law that mandated multicultural training ($t=3.234, p=.001$). Results demonstrated that utilizing a 35% traditional and 65% critical pedagogy mixture when teaching multicultural education helped promote win/win scenarios for education candidates hoping to become difference makers.
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**Introduction**

Teacher education programs across the nation are being called on to prepare their graduates to serve an increasingly diverse student population. Most states have a mandate that requires teacher candidates to take one or more prescribed multicultural courses before certification is granted. Teaching diversity at a college campus can be an exhilarating experience for instructors on the one hand or the source of incredible frustration on the other hand. This is due in part because there are higher levels of emotions, self-esteem issues, opinions, religion differences, definition problems, process and methodology issues, and politics that must be infused along with facts comparative to other fields of study (Banks, 2009; Nieto & Bode, 2012; Stockman, Boult, & Robinson, 2008; Sue & Sue; 2013). Adding to the confusion is the fact that Barack Obama, a black man, was elected in 2008 to the Presidency of the U.S. Many white and conservative students use this as evidence that America no longer has a major race relations problem. African Americans and liberals, on the other hand, use the July, 2013, acquittal of George Zimmerman for the death of Trayvon Martin as evidence that we are far from reaching optimal results.

Navigating the mine-laden field of multicultural instruction can be a tricky endeavor. A sampling of problems an instructor might encounter include dealing with administrators and curriculum specialists who agree to supplement the curriculum without truly transforming it (Freire, 2005; Jay, 2003; Nieto & Bode, 2012); instructors of color being disproportionately assigned to teach diversity course offerings (Ladson-Billings, 2005; Perry, Moore, Edwards, Acosta, & Frey, 2009); deciding which groups to eliminate as a result of definition problems and lack of time (Boyer-Fier & Ramsey, 2005); wading through a plethora of typologies that appear to have little articulation (Castagno, 2009); students who insist on a color-blind curriculum (Gordon, 2005; Richardson & Villenas, 2000); dealing with students who desire a simple recipe
approach as opposed to learning how to problem-solve (DiAngelo & Sensoy, 2010); students having difficulty accepting concepts such as White privilege (Campbell, 2010) and affirmative action (Heriot, 2011); dealing with a range of intense student emotions (Mio & Barker-Hackett, 2003); and adequately explaining the emotional consequences of racism (Sue & Sue; 2013).

One of the ways students express their resistance to multiculturalism is through bringing up counter-arguments and exceptions to the rules (Mio & Barker-Hackett, 2003). An example would be the student who resists comprehending problems that emanate from the abuse of power and privilege by making statements such as, “I treat all people with dignity and respect. All we need is love.” Regarding multicultural instructors, it may very well be that some fall short because they were not properly trained.

“Research findings suggest that the pedagogical skills necessary for the required diversity education classroom are complex, extensive and may be beyond the skills that are modeled in current classrooms or represented in typical instructional training and development programs on campus.” (Perry, et al., 2009, p. 100).

“Faculty members need to employ instructional strategies that empower students, rather than provoke defensiveness” (Anderson, MacPhee, & Govan, 2000, p.39). We need to do a better job of teaching students how to (a) see beyond the surface level of social problems, and (b) release themselves from historic guilt so they can put wasted energy towards creating solutions. The educator’s highest priority should not be discovering things that make our job easier or creating a classroom atmosphere where students feel safe and warm, but rather on maximizing the impact the experience will have on students becoming difference makers.

Despite potential setbacks, the instruction of multicultural education can be rewarding. This study seeks to highlight critical strategies and practices that encourage life-long learning in multicultural education.
Student Input

Current debate regarding effective strategies tends to exclude the views of teacher candidates. Teaching must start from the students’ life experiences, not the teacher’s perspective (Gollnick & Chinn, 2009). “Students are a viable and important (yet neglected) source of information about the impact of multicultural education” (Anderson, et al., 2000, p. 52).

Effective teachers of diversity are not only theoretically sound and challenging; they also find ways to include students as partners (Zeichner, Grant, Gay, Gillette, Valli, & Villegas, 2001).

During the few times when a student voice is offered, it mostly comes from a primary and secondary education perspective. Gollnick and Chinn (2013), for example, offer these findings: Graduating high school students wanted their teachers to (a) be passionate about their work, (b) connect instruction to issues they care about outside of school, (c) give students choices on things that matter, and (d) make learning more than just an academic, cerebral affair. The authors talk about being aware of minority students who emotionally drop out because their voices and experiences are silenced or ignored. This suggestion could easily be applied to students enrolled in a college teacher preparation program.

Studies of students at the college level are few. Rudney and Marxen (2001) surveyed 25 graduates of an elementary teacher education program and identified the following correlates of good multicultural instruction: (a) adequate attention given to learning style differences, (b) an emphasis on cross-cultural communication skills, (c) exposure to a variety of curriculum approaches, (d) the articulation of multicultural goals in all courses, and not just in stand-alone offerings, (e) providing mandatory field placements in diverse settings, and (f) providing additional immersion experiences [e.g., visits to social service agencies, ethnic parades, and church visits].
Anderson, MacPhee, and Govan (2000) surveyed current and former students and summarized the following correlates: (a) dynamic and thought-provoking lectures and discussions, (b) exposure to facts and statistics that help address missing gaps, (c) readings and homework that force students to compare and contrast different theories, (d) reflective exercises and self-exploration, (e) simulation games, (f) collaborative research projects, (g) persuasive guest speakers, and (h) a diverse class composition. Outside of these two (and perhaps a few more) hard-to-find studies, there is little written about the views of college students. My study hopes to fill a portion of that gap.

**Best Practices**

The literature is replete with macro suggestions of what makes for good multicultural education. Most of it is from a theory, program, or political point of view, however. Conversely, there is not enough in the literature that addresses (a) missing gaps, (b) the art of multicultural curriculum delivery, and (c) how to deal with learner resistance. Even less attention has been given to best practices as identified by students.

James Banks (2009) offers the following foundational perspectives and teacher training suggestions:

1. A person’s cultural identity can and should be defined by more than just racial and ethnic factors (pp. 15-16);
2. Because of our country’s history with racism, the study of race and ethnicity deserves to have its own day in the sun without being watered down (pp. 72-73);
3. While it is important to discuss global education, it should not be confused with multicultural education. While the former deals with interrelationships between nations, the latter deals with the interaction of groups within a nation (pp. 23-25);
4. The purpose of multicultural education is not to diminish the accomplishments of European culture, but rather to highlight the contributions of non-western and indigenous peoples. The accomplishments of ALL ethnic groups, Whites included, should be celebrated (pp. 69, 231);

5. Sometimes it is better to teach multiculturalism from a theme base, as opposed to a specific event. For example, teaching about discrimination while using examples of slavery, the Trail of Tears, and the Holocaust sends a stronger universal message than highlighting only one of those topics (pp. 92-94);

6. We must learn to investigate an event from multiple angles. The causes of WWI, for example, may be viewed quite differently by Europeans, as compared to that of populations from the Mideast. We should teach a wide range of perspectives, then allow students an opportunity to make up their own minds (pp. 23-24);

7. Ethnic studies must be conducted from an interdisciplinary perspective. A study of multiculturalism utilizing only traditional inputs such as history, literature, music, and politics will leave out important pieces of information that could help students see a bigger and more complete picture (pp. 33-38);

8. Teachers must understand the various levels of curriculum delivery. For example, the contributions approach focuses on low-level learning such as heroes and holidays. The additive approach adds to the curriculum without changing its structure. The transformative approach identifies missing pieces, while also creating new ways of viewing and defining truth. The social action approach helps students learn how to evaluate, assess, and solve problems. Unfortunately, too many instructors teach at the two lower levels without promoting higher-order thinking skills (pp. 18-22);
9. The ethnic experience cannot fully be understood apart from a nation’s struggle for power. The abuse of power and privilege has as much to do with explaining racism as does skin color, customs, and culture (pp. 78-80);

10. The teaching of race identity development theory greatly enhances minority self-awareness, as well as that of majority teachers who struggle with understanding why minority students sometime resist their instructional efforts (pp. 62-65); and

11. It is not enough to arm students with knowledge. Educators must provide opportunities for social action aimed at bettering society (p. 105).

Sonia Nieto and Patty Bode (2012) suggest a critical pedagogy approach to multicultural education – curriculum that seeks to reinvent the rules of how we live. The importance of not watering down racism, elevating the study of multicultural education to the level of other academic subjects, and infusion into all courses taught is highly recommended. Effective multicultural education is seen as instruction that emphasizes (a) instruction that leads to social justice, (b) student reflection, (c) an equal mix of content and process, and (d) the acquisition of communication and problem-solving skills.

Sleeter and Grant (2009) describe five approaches that curriculum specialists and school officials rely on when setting up a program of study: (a) teaching the culturally different, (b) human relations approach (c) single studies, (d) multicultural education, and (e) social justice education. Each approach has its strengths and weaknesses, but any of the choices is better than the business-as-usual paradigm that is still popular in some circles. Sleeter and Grant prefer social justice education over other options because of its emphasis on transforming the traditional literary canon, as well as providing an impetus for changing the rules of how we live.

Although John Farley (2010) writes from a sociological perspective, educators can learn a lot from his analysis of the role that ego defense mechanisms play in resisting multicultural
messages. For example, some individuals have chosen to hate Jews as a way of displacing their own personal and business failures. Other unconscious mental games that people play with themselves and others include the following (paraphrased) Farley examples:

1. If I can prove that I am a good person on the individual-to-individual level, then that gives me permission to ignore disparities that exist at the group level. Furthermore, if one of the “good minorities” made it out of the ghetto but others failed, I can safely assume that it is because they didn’t apply themselves (p. 17-18).

2. If Koreans and Japanese come over to America and succeed despite the odds stacked against them and Mexicans and African Americans don’t, it’s because the latter groups are lazy [i.e., a general problem of not understanding the differences between colonized and immigrant minority groups] (p. 141-145).

The many connections between multicultural resistance and ego defense mechanisms constitute a fascinating field of study that is often overlooked by multicultural instructors.

Farley (2010) also offers the following as macro characteristics of effective multicultural training programs: (a) there is a need for diversity among trainers, (b) begin with an assessment of needs instead of making assumptions, (c) do not push problems under the carpet – deal with them upfront and have a viable system of reporting, (d) use case studies and scenarios during training sessions that grant employees an opportunity to practice and apply knowledge gained, (e) establish written goals and objectives that are clearly articulated and have the support of the administration, and (f) have diversity be a part of the annual evaluation of employees.

A Call for Dispositions

The term dispositions has been used in so many different contexts that finding a working definition is hard to come by (Borko, Liston, & Whitcomb, 2007). For purposes of this study, the following Gollnick and Chinn (2013) definition of dispositions will be used: “Values,
commitments, and professional ethics that influence teaching and interactions with students, families, colleagues, and communities” (p. 379).

The practice of assessing the dispositions of pre-service educators has gained increasing attention among institutions of higher learning. I agree with the National Accreditation of Teacher Education’s (NCATE) assessment (2008) that the training of teacher candidates in the areas of skill and knowledge without the added inclusion of exploring mindsets that enhance student learning results in incomplete teacher preparation. Teacher dispositions strongly influence the impact educators have on student development (Collinson, Killeavy, & Stephenson, 1999; Notar & Taylor, 2009; Thompson, 2013). Teacher preparation programs must help candidates develop the necessary dispositions to be effective educators (Rike, 2008). From this perspective, the usage of dispositions becomes a best practice that I include in my teaching.

Training for greater multicultural awareness is an often-overlooked part of teacher preparation (Gay, 2003; Tozer, Senese, & Vilas, 2006). The movement toward greater professionalization of teaching through assessment-based accreditation was spearheaded by NCATE as a way to determine whether a person was the right match for the classroom, thus the reinforcement of dispositions. Unless teachers are willing to explore beyond the familiar comfort zone of the majority culture, the education of students of color will be shortchanged (Dee & Henkin, 2002).

NCATE highlights a need for both overall professional dispositions [Standard 1] and a requirement that teachers become proficient in diversity issues [Standard 4] (NCATE, 2008). Dispositions as formulated by the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) - an agency that collaborates with state teacher licensing departments - provide another portion of the theoretical framework for this research. The following eight multicultural dispositions are gleaned from a broader set of 43 recommendations teachers should embrace in
order to better serve our children (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2011, pp. 13-18).

Effective teachers:

1. Believe that all children can learn and persist in helping each learner reach his/her potential;
2. Realize that content knowledge is not a fixed body of facts but is complex, culturally situated, and ever-evolving;
3. Recognize the potential of bias in their representation of the discipline and seek to appropriately address problems of bias;
4. Constantly explore how to use disciplinary knowledge as a lens to address local and global issues;
5. Respect learners’ diverse strengths and needs and are committed to using this information to plan effective instruction;
6. Are committed to deepening awareness and understanding the strengths and needs of diverse learners when planning and adjusting instruction;
7. Value the variety of ways people communicate and encourage learners to develop and use multiple forms of communication;
8. Are committed to deepening an understanding of their frames of reference, the potential for biases in these frames, and their impact on expectations for and relationships with learners and their families.

Not all writers agree that dispositions can or should be assessed. Damon (2007), for example, argues that (a) dispositions in teacher education risk becoming poorly-defined constructs that are interpreted in open-ended ways to suit the subjective biases of the evaluator, and that (b) while the traditional scientific discussion of a disposition emphasizes a birth-until-now process that impacts personality development, the NCATE definition focuses only on the
candidate’s here-and-now, value-driven conduct. This can cause a misalignment of purpose between established research and current practice. There is also concern that loosely defined standards of dispositions can lead to the elimination of people who do not pass a political litmus test, which could potentially lead to intimidation and fear of being eliminated from teacher preparation programs (Damon, 2007; Dee & Henkin, 2002).

Despite reservations, Damon (2007) believes that students deserve to be instructed by teachers who are ethics-driven, but only if educators can find ways to address the problems of assessment. Even writers who are conflicted about dispositions agree that if done correctly, students can benefit from instruction that encourages an educator code of ethics that can be assessed (Burant, Chubbuck, & Whipp, 2007; Diez, 2007). Borko, Liston, and Whitcomb (2007) and Duplass and Cruz (2010) believe that despite the lack of metrically sound assessment measures, we must find creative ways to provide on-going constructive feedback for teacher candidates in dispositions.

Some writers (Dee & Henkin, 2002; Gollnick & Chinn, 2013; Thompson, 2013) call for a closer marriage between multicultural education and the dispositions movement. Aside from NCATE and InTASC standards, multicultural dispositions are less defined in the literature compared to broader professional dispositions. If pursued, this marriage must be more than just a symbolic exercise. Thompson’s (2009; 2013) work on multicultural dispositions allows students an opportunity to expand on NCATE and InTASC recommendations in a way that helps them to better understand the missing links of race and human relations. He also provides a viable method by which to assess multicultural dispositions.

**Non-Color Blind Curriculum**

In addition to the review of literature, this study will also pull from the 35 years of experience I have with teaching multicultural education. Over the years, I have developed a
macro perspective called non-color blind curriculum (NCBC). It is defined as a style of teaching that attempts to go beyond the feel-good, “I treat everybody like I would want to be treated” approach to instruction. NCBC builds on a collaborative, synthesis approach to teaching and learning.

Although NCBC borrows elements from the critical race theory, critical pedagogy, and critical theory schools of thought, it does not totally abandon the underlying principles of the Western traditions of rational inquiry. The principles of NCBC agree with Max Horkheimer and the Frankfurt School that learning must accomplish more than just the promotion of knowledge – that we must use education to liberate ourselves (Ray, 2003). NCBC also believes that established legal and constitutional methods have the potential to bring about meaningful change. Likewise, it agrees with Delgado and Stefanic (2012) that the phenomenon of white privilege is greatly understated in current discussions and that many civil rights advances made on the behalf of African Americans coincided with the self-interest of the white elite. Still, NCBC is hesitant to embrace those critical race theorists who call for such things as reparations and separatism.

The principles of NCBC also agree with the views of Joan Wink (2010) and other leading critical pedagogists that teachers must redistribute classroom power so that students take more responsibility for their own education. While it is true that sharing power encourages intellectual character and discourages the promotion of simple mimicry of the professional style, it is also true that many twenty-year-olds require deeper levels of knowledge and guidance before they are able to make critical decisions about topics such as race, power, and privilege. A fourth of the respondents in this study, for example, did not know the difference between a liberal and a conservative. Gaps like that cannot be remediated by self-exploration and dialogue alone. NCBC acknowledges the need for a delicate balance between mentoring students and utilizing
traditional teaching methods on the one hand, while empowering learners to critically think, self-explore, and reinvent truth on the other hand.

In addition to the generalized description given above, the following is a more detailed listing of strategies and perspectives utilized by the NCBC approach:

1. A politically correct (i.e., color-blind) approach is viewed as insufficient. Its ultimate goal appears to make students feel good without adequately healing them or addressing hurting people in our communities. It also does little to properly address the phenomenon of low self-esteem among disenfranchised populations;

2. Multicultural education should never be an awareness-only exercise. The attainment of cross-cultural and communication skills, greater levels of insight, self-efficacy, and change agency are preferred goals;

3. Controversy should not be shunned, but rather embraced. Good learning happens when instructors face problems head on and skillfully address, not avoid, controversy;

4. Even though anti-racism remains the central theme of multicultural education, its study must now include other forms of oppression;

5. Once traditional indices are accounted for, additional attention must be given to power and privilege issues and the abuses that often flow from them;

6. Successful instruction must pay attention to both content and process;

7. In order for life-long learning to take place, instruction must simultaneously be aimed at the head (academic), gut (feeling), and heart (social change) levels;

8. Effective multicultural education is greatly enhanced by engaging in interactive learning experiences;

9. Multicultural education must take an interdisciplinary approach. It should include
a synthesis of information gathered from many fields of study. It should not only investigate people, places, and events, but also pay attention to psychological forces that explain multicultural rejection and ego defense mechanisms that encourage resistance;

10. The instructor must become adept at releasing majority group students from historical guilt, while at the same time recruiting them to become change agents;

11. Effective multicultural education is enhanced when instruction highlights the pain and suffering of human relations, as well as testimonials about how obstacles were overcome. A delicate balance between messages of pain and triumph is needed for the successful training of education candidates;

12. Because it is impossible to cover all groups in a seventeen-week course, students will need to learn basic social justice principles from a sampling of diversity populations, then apply the general themes and principles learned to all groups;

13. Partisan political pandering is viewed as counter-productive to the ultimate goals of a diverse society. Common ground can be found. Eclectic collaboration between political groups and competing ideologies is highly encouraged;

14. Student reflection and on-going self-assessment make for a better professional;

and

15. Educators who adopt a well-conceived dispositional mindset will have a greater opportunity to bring about meaningful social change compared to those who are dispositional critics.

To a large degree, this research investigates the efficacy of the overall curriculum that I use. But it also seeks to highlight those strategies that students identify as being helpful to their personal and professional development.
Research Questions and Hypotheses

This study addressed the following research questions:

1. How do students respond to a non-color blind, critical and questioning brand of multicultural instruction?
2. What teaching strategies are identified by students as being ones that heighten awareness and encourage life-long learning in the area of multicultural education?
3. Are the results of this analysis affected by certain demographic characteristics such as race, gender, age, and political allegiance?

Going into the study, I rejected the null hypothesis for question three. I especially believed that factors such as race and political allegiance would have an impact. Because questions one and two were deemed exploratory in nature, no predictions were made.

Method

Participants

Participants who comprised a convenience sample for this study were teacher and counselor candidates (N=337) who attended a Midwestern metropolitan university situated in an urban setting of 800,000 people. One hundred twenty-one students (36%) said that they had received no prior multicultural education. One hundred sixty-six respondents (50%) had taken 1-3 prior classes, while 45 persons (14%) had taken four or more classes. Eighty eight (26%) of the individuals surveyed were male and 249 (74%) were female. Three hundred persons (89%) were Caucasian, while 37 (11%) were students of color. Of those 37, 15 were Hispanic, 13 were African American, and 9 were of Asian descent. A low percentage of race minority students applying to become an educator has been a long-standing issue for this and many other communities.

There were 206 persons (61%) who fell in the 18-22 age range, 67 persons (20%) within the 23-30 age range, and 62 individuals (19%) who were 31 to 58 years old. Two hundred thirty one
persons (69%) possessed only a high school degree, while 82 persons (24%) had obtained an
associate’s or a bachelor’s degree, and 23 individuals (7%) had a post-bachelor’s degree. Two
hundred twenty respondents (66%) were undergraduate education majors, while 59 (18%) were
graduates studying to be counselors (35 school and 24 agency candidates). Fifty two persons (16%)
were non-education majors who took the class as an elective.

Politically speaking, 65 individuals (20%) classified themselves as being conservative, 70
persons (21%) as moderate, 36 (10%) as liberal, and 84 people (25%) said they were eclectic in
their thinking. Seventy-seven (23%) were politically undecided, and three people (1%) refused to
answer the question. The rationale for including political affiliation on the survey was to test the
popular stereotype (accurate or not) that conservatives do not value the study of multicultural
education. We will investigate the stereotype from the narrow perspective of education majors.

The Survey Instrument

A copy of the survey is enclosed as Appendix B. The primary assessment was the overall
impact of the treatment plan (i.e., instruction based on the review of literature and NCBC
principles) on the personal and professional growth of students. The first two survey items
accomplish this. The remaining 13 items deal with related structure and process questions.
Additional items that solicit demographic information round out the survey. The assessment was
administered at the end of the semester. It was administered in addition to the college level end-
of-semester evaluation, and it was cleared by the university’s institutional review board.

Data Analysis

Utilizing the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) computer program, the
following statistical analyses were conducted:

1. A summarization of descriptive findings;

2. Several ANOVA analyses to estimate relationships between selected survey
responses and demographic attribute variables;

3. A factor analysis to help clarify the delineation between instructional and environmental impacts, and to ascertain which constructs pass statistical scrutiny for inclusion in a predictive model; and

4. A multiple regression analysis to determine which of the instructional variables help to predict personal and professional growth.

Results

Descriptive Analysis

Table 1 provides the descriptive results of how students rated the various instructional and non-instructional variables on their multicultural growth. On a scale of one to nine with one being the lowest and nine being the highest, respondents rated their personal growth with a mean score of 7.15 and a professional growth score of 7.44. These are high multicultural marks for a predominantly white population from a mostly conservative part of the nation. Students rated all of the instructional strategies higher than the average (i.e., mid-point) score of five. The two highest influences were (a) the class allowed me to form my own opinion independent of the instructor’s perspective [7.97], and (b) the instructor’s non-color blind teaching approach positively impacted me [7.76]. The two lowest influences were I was impacted by (a) information gained from the textbook and other readings [5.87], and (b) guest speakers who shared stories about personal trials and triumphs [6.97]. Even these lower set of scores represent solid multicultural acceptance.

Prior education, parents, religious training, and the individual’s personal sense of “personal goodness” were important factors in forming the multicultural worldview of students, but not as much as the impact of NCBC factors (see Table 1). Of special note is the fact that prior education was the lowest score (5.39) of the environmental influences. Surprisingly, the
highest score (8.07) on the post-survey was given for support of a multicultural state mandate. Contrary to popular myth, education candidates support the role of an intervening governmental body on behalf of multicultural education if it is explained and executed well. In addition, students did not want the instructor to exchange his critical questioning, experimental style for a safer, more standard teaching approach (2.53). [Insert Table 1 here?]

**One-Way ANOVA Analyses**

The hypothesis that significant differences would be found as a result of disaggregating the data by selected demographic variables had to be mostly rejected. By and large, scores were relatively independent of race, gender, class, and age. When looking at political allegiance, however, there were a few significant findings. For example, conservatives were more likely to have [a] a lower mean score (6.71, SD=1.66) compared to moderates (7.40, SD=1.38) when looking at personal growth, \( (F(4, 327)=2.74, p=.029) \); [b] a lower mean score (7.72, SD=1.67) compared to liberals (8.50, SD=0.74) when looking at the impact of a state mandate \( (F(4, 317)=3.44, p=.009) \), and; [c] a lower mean score (5.49, SD=1.96) compared to liberals (6.61, SD=1.68) when judging the textbook’s impact on learning \( (F(4, 326)=2.47, p=.045) \). Effect size scores were .45 (small), .65 (medium), and .62 (medium) respectively.

Students who did not know what their political allegiances were had the hardest time adjusting to the experimental teaching style. People who were politically undecided were more likely to have higher mean scores (4.13, SD=2.12) compared to liberals (2.92, SD=2.02) and eclectic thinkers (3.23, SD=1.91) when it came to believing the instructor should have experimented less \( (F(4, 325)=3.17, p=.014) \). Effect size scores were .58 (medium) and .46 (small) respectively. [Insert Table 2 here?]

**Factor Analysis**
The results of the factor analysis indicate that two dimensions were being measured (see Table 2). The first construct was labeled *instructional correlates*. It consists of the following six teaching techniques: (a) a non-color blind, critical style of teaching, (b) a message that is aimed simultaneously at both the head and the heart, (c) the promotion of open dialogue that addresses tough questions, (d) the usage of videos that highlight human relations missing links (e) guest speakers who share persuasive stories about human relations trials and triumphs, and (f) the impact of the textbook and other reading materials used for the course. The reader will note that Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient for all six variables was above the 0.70 acceptability rule, meaning the construct was reliable. This is the construct identified in the abstract of this paper as the six-factor variable. Although each strategy stands on its own, it is more accurate to account for variances shared between variables. Therefore, it is included in the multiple regression model as a six dimensional construct.

A second construct was tabbed *environmental influences*. It consists of the following four correlates: The influence of (a) prior education, (b) parents and family upbringing, (c) religious beliefs, and (d) the “naturally good person in me.” Unlike the first construct, the coefficients for these four variables did not meet the 0.70 rule for establishing reliability. Kachigan (1991) argues that results in the .40 to .69 range should not be totally ignored because of the potential to understand important part influences. Because a .50 cut-off is only a guideline, however, each researcher must make his/her own judgment call. I decided to reject the environmental influences coefficients as not being reliable enough to be used in my predictor model. [Insert Table 3 here?]

**Multiple Regression Analysis**

The results of the multiple regression analyses are found in Table 3. Although important in understanding overall student development, environmental factors (i.e., prior education,
parents, religious training, and the individual’s personal sense of personal goodness), had no influence when it came to predicting growth of students. Variables important to predicting student personal growth were a six-factor instructional variable known as non-color blind, critical instruction (t=10.509, p<.0005), allowing students the opportunity to form their own opinions independent of those of the instructor (t=4.797, p<.0005), and a state law mandating multicultural education (t=3.234, p=.001). The linear equation for the three predictor model is Personal Growth = -1.139 + .714 (Critical Teaching) + .248 (Independent Thinking) + .161 (State Mandate), R Square =.56, p <.0005. The effect sizes were .17 (medium), .03 (small), and 0.1 (less than small) respectively for critical teaching, independent thinking, and state mandate.

Factors important to predicting students’ professional growth include the same variables as above but with a lesser impact, namely non-color blind instruction (t=9.485, p<.0005), allowing students the opportunity to form their own opinions (t=3.493, p=.001), and a state mandate (t=2.947, p=.003). The linear equation for the three predictor model is Personal Growth = -1.44 + .647 (Critical Teaching) + .181 (Independent Thinking) + .147 (State Mandate), R Square =.49, p <.0005. The effect sizes were .16 (medium), .02 (small), and 0.1 (less than small) for critical teaching, independent thinking, and state mandate, respectively. It is important to note that regression analysis does not establish causation, but rather primarily speaks to predictive correlations.

[Insert Table 4 here?]

**Discussion**

Regarding the first research question, students responded very positively to a non-color blind, critical and questioning brand of multicultural instruction. On a scale of one to nine with nine representing the most positive experience, students (N=337) rated their personal growth at 7.15 and their professional growth at 7.44 (see Table 1). These are high scores taking into
account the level of emotion and controversy inherent in teaching diversity, as well as the fact that students are enrolled in a state mandated course. A non-color blind curriculum (NCBC) style of teaching helped to mediate potential interference points for multicultural rejection.

The dimensions of the six-factor NCBC variable include (1) a questioning, deep-seeking, exploratory, and critical brand of instruction, (2) a message that is simultaneously aimed at both the head and the heart, (3) instruction that promotes open and honest student-to-student, and student-to-instructor dialogue, (4) the usage of outside speakers who are adept at highlighting both challenges and ways to overcome their obstacles, (5) the usage of videos that help make a head-to-heart connection about the struggle of disempowered people, and (6) written material and textbook readings that inspire reflection and enhance multicultural awareness. Respondents also placed a high value on the importance of an instructor who encourages people to think about how we think, as well as the importance of thinking for ourselves and not just swallowing whole the views and perspectives of teachers, parents, and friends. The promotion of independent thinking was one of the best received interventions. In addition, respondents concluded that even though they were not initially excited about the idea of having to take the class because the government ordered it so, they probably would not have voluntarily taken the course had there not been a state mandate in place.

These findings corroborate curriculum suggestions found in the literature. For example, they agree with Gordon (2005) that color-blind curriculum is insufficient; with Freire (2005) about the importance of dialogue; with Nieto and Bode (2012) that content alone is not enough – that the process of multicultural education is just as important; with Banks (2009) that it is important for teachers to critically teach many perspectives, and then trust students to form their own opinions, and; with Anderson et al., (2000) that including guest speakers who have a permeating story to tell helps give the message of diversity staying power. In that sense the
findings of this study are not new. Yes, they validate literature recommendations but more importantly, they encourage the coupling of valuable correlates in new ways that are seldom realized in the typical classroom.

When given a chance to state that they wish the instructor had taken a more standard and safer approach to instruction, students responded with a mean score of 2.53 representing a dissenting view. To help the reader obtain a clearer distinction between the two approaches, Appendix A is included. It is important to note that the goals of a traditional approach are not bad at all – they are just incomplete. Still, the non-color blind curriculum approach attempts to include important principles that the traditional approach embraces, while also extending the conversation into areas that are often overlooked or minimized. I propose that multicultural education that has a 35% traditional and 65% critical analysis mix yields the best results of encouraging social change and life-long multicultural awareness.

High respondent scores also aligned themselves with anecdotal commentary provided in the optional portion of the survey. A few student samples include the following comments:

“To be totally honest, I was dreading this class. Turns out I learned a lot about life and about myself.”

“Thank you for teaching more than just me. Every time I learned something new in your class I shared it with my husband and the rest of my family.”

“You have provided me with so much education. You have stretched my brain to think beyond the ‘Pollyanna’ ways in which I normally think.”

To be sure, not all students were happy. Listed below is an example of a negative review:

“I leave this class more confused than when I first entered it. Before this class I believed in treating everyone equal. Now, I feel guilty for being white.”

The null hypothesis regarding the impact of selected demographic influences was mostly
accepted. By and large, scores were relatively independent of race, gender, and age. When looking at political allegiance, however, there were a few significant findings, but none of them were surprising. For example, respondents who did not know what their political allegiances were had the hardest time adjusting to the experimental instructional style. People who were politically unaware or undecided were more likely to have higher mean scores compared to liberals and eclectic thinkers when it came to believing the instructor should have experimented less. Likewise, conservatives were more likely to have (1) a lower mean score compared to moderates when looking at personal growth, (2) a lower mean score compared to liberals when looking at the impact of a state mandate, and (3) a lower mean score compared to liberals when judging the impact of written material on learning. Although the views of liberals and moderates were somewhat more pro-multicultural education than that of conservatives and undecided persons, those differences were small and not statistically significant. By and large, all groups were benefitted by the NCBC brand of multicultural instruction. Whether or not this conclusion remains true outside of the field of education remains to be seen. In light of the absence of an environmental impact, I conclude that it was the strength of teaching strategies that accounted for the growth that students experienced.

This study is not without limitations. First, we are all aware of great curriculum designs that are poorly articulated by marginal teachers. It is quite possible then that poor designs can yield better-than-expected results because of the professional and personal qualities of master teachers. Above and beyond teaching strategies and techniques, more research needs to be conducted regarding the characteristics of instructors themselves. What personal and professional qualities do master teachers possess that inspire student learning? Second, even though an MR of .56 is considered high for the social sciences, there may be other factors not accounted for (i.e., student self-analysis, simulation games, self-disclosure, use of humor, etc.) that might be able to further improve the prediction. Third, the study is also limited by the fact
that until it is replicated, the results cannot be generalized to a larger population. Duplication of this work is sorely needed and welcomed.

Despite these limitations, the results of this study are important because they highlight two separate, but related gaps in the literature: (1) a set of user-friendly, critical oriented multicultural instructional strategies that work, and (2) a need for including more of a student voice to help create multicultural education that has a lasting impact. Respondents showed that they were not intimidated by a critical brand of multicultural education that forced them to think in a deeper manner. Study results demonstrate that education majors do not have to be afraid of navigating controversial subject matter and that a state mandate does not have to become a hindrance if the instructor knows how to refocus the attention of the class on the benefits of them.

**Implications for Educators**

It goes without saying that permeating instruction makes a difference in student learning. Curriculum approaches that were formed during the 1960s and 1970s provide a solid foundation for multicultural education, but changing times dictate that methods of teaching be further adapted to reflect a changing world. Since that era, a true global society has emerged, and the definition of multicultural education has broadened. Misinformed folks will try to make a claim that the election of Barack Obama as President of the U.S. was a signal that class and socioeconomic factors have replaced race, racism, and gender related issues as the main concerns of human relations. From my point of view, those individuals appear to be about 50 years too soon. It is no longer acceptable to teach about personal possibilities without also investigating the roadblocks that keep us from reaching our full potential collectively.

While educators should not ignore the power of love and the wisdom of treating others like we want to be treated (i.e., a traditional multicultural approach), it is also imperative that we
investigate the deeper more subtle factors that keep good people divided. The outcome of the recent Trayvon Martin murder trial is a good example of how well-meaning people on both sides operate from vastly different perspectives. In that case, conservative pundits failed to see how issues of power and privilege blocked Florida jurors from understanding how disempowered people communicate and react with each other and to authority figures. I believe that a 35% traditional and 65% critical curriculum mix taught in our schools could help create more opportunities for win/win results in cases like these.

The non-color blind curriculum (NCBC) approach asserts that there is more useful truth located somewhere along a critical spectrum, as opposed to what we typically find at the fringes of the political left or right. Criticism will undoubtedly emanate from both sides. Traditionalists and conservatives will hail the suggested approach as the end of a national unity. Critical pedagogists and education liberals will say it doesn’t go far enough – that hegemony and the abuses of the powerful and privileged will remain protected for the elite. One thing is clear: There is no argument that something different must be done. I believe reform is better than revolution (although there are exceptions). In the meantime, there is a war being waged against children and many of them fall through the cracks of society while pundits continue the debate.

This research is significant because students from a typically conservative part of the country were positively impacted by a synthesis approach that 20 years ago would have been labeled as radical or over-the-top. The difference between now and then is threefold. First, students of all colors and backgrounds today want a more meaningful education that lines up with the everyday experiences they live outside of the classroom. Second, putting greater emphasis on the process and not just highlighting multicultural content is a key factor to success. Third, the adoption of a critical pedagogy which infuses discussions of power and privilege into
the traditional conversation helps students better understand interference points that account for
the missing gaps in our human relations efforts.

The art of managing social polemics is never an easy road to traverse. The critical
middle is a hard place to find. We as a people appear to be forever enslaved by a day/night,
either/or, black/white, up/down, devil/angel existence. This is especially true with regards to
race and human relations. But, there is a remnant of young people that appear poised on the
horizon to one day crash the familiar party. They sing an old song with a sacred chorus, but with
new vigor and interpretation: “Yes, we are truly free at last!” The results of this study
demonstrate that meaningful human relations do not occur by happenstance, but rather by the
purposeful, critical, and creative efforts of educators to properly instruct and inform students.
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Table 1

*Student ratings of the impact selected strategies had on their personal and professional growth:*

*Utilizing a Likert Scale of 1 to 9, with 1 being the lowest and 9 being the highest impact.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Posttest Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Post-semester student rating of educational experience:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Student rating for personal growth.</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Student rating for professional growth.</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Instructional strategies that influence multicultural learning:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The teacher encouraged me to form my own opinions.</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A non-color blind, critical, questioning style of teaching.</td>
<td>7.76</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A message that is aimed at both intellect and emotions.</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The usage of open dialogue to address tough questions.</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Usage of critical videos that help highlight missing links.</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Guess speakers who share stories of trials and triumphs.</td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Textbook and written material that encourage reflection.</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Other school influences impacting my education:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I wish the teacher would have experimented less.</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I am glad the government imposed a state mandate.</td>
<td>8.07</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Potential environmental influences on my learning:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Influence of parents on my multicultural (MC) awareness.</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Influence of my religious beliefs on my MC awareness.</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Influence of the “good person in me” on my awareness.</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Influence of my prior education on my MC awareness.</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2

**One-Way ANOVA: Significant relationships between survey items and political allegiance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Demographic Variables</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Personal growth score:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Allegiance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conservatives</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(compared to)</td>
<td>Moderates</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Impact of state mandate:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Allegiance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conservatives</td>
<td>7.72</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(compared to)</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Impact of text materials:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Allegiance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conservatives</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(compared to)</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Please experiment less:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Allegiance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undecided Persons</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(compared to)</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(compared to)</td>
<td>Eclectic Thinkers</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Alpha = .01
Table 3

Factor Analysis Results: Post-Semester Survey Items with Factor Loadings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Factor Loading-1</th>
<th>Factor Loading-2</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Impactful Instructional Correlates:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. A non-color blind, critical, questioning</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brand of teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A message that is aimed at both the</td>
<td>.802</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intellect and the emotions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The usage of open dialogue to address</td>
<td>.702</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tough questions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The usage of videos that help highlight</td>
<td>.700</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>human relations missing links.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Guest speakers who share their stories.</td>
<td>.525</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Textbook and other written materials</td>
<td>.536</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. Environmental Influences on Awareness:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Influence of my parents.</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.606</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Influence of religious training &amp; beliefs.</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.538</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Influence of the “good person” in me.</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>.372</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Influence of prior education.</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.600</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

*Multiple Regression Analysis of the Influence of Instructional Strategies on Student Personal and Professional Multicultural Growth*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>( N )</th>
<th>Adjusted ( R^2 )</th>
<th>( F^{change \ in \ R^2} )</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>( t ) Score</th>
<th>( p )</th>
<th>( F^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Growth</td>
<td></td>
<td>329</td>
<td>.560</td>
<td>140.38</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>&lt;.0005</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NCBC Instruction</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>.521</td>
<td>10.509</td>
<td>&lt;.0005</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent Thinking</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>4.797</td>
<td>&lt;.0005</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Mandate</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>3.234</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Growth</td>
<td></td>
<td>329</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td>104.17</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>&lt;.0005</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NCBC Instruction</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>.509</td>
<td>9.485</td>
<td>&lt;.0005</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent Thinking</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>3.493</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Mandate</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>2.947</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probability of ( F = )</td>
<td>Entry .05 and Removal .10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A

A comparison of a traditional versus a non-color blind approach to multicultural instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional Multicultural Approach</th>
<th>Non-Color Blind Curriculum Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Foundational principles</strong></td>
<td>(Note: NCBC incorporates many of the elements found in the traditional curriculum approach, while attempting to extend student awareness into new areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regardless of ethnicity, culture, and family background, all kids can learn.</td>
<td>• It’s better to be color-respective than to be color-blind. Question political correctness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Don’t fear diversity; celebrate it!</td>
<td>• Unless you address the root of a weed, it will continue to sprout back up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A rising tide raises all boats.</td>
<td>• Don’t ignore impact of power &amp; privilege.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Love and education will conquer all problems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. Teacher self-statements</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Poverty and miseducation are the main reasons for continued social problems.</td>
<td>• Greed &amp; uncritical thinking is our enemy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Help poor kids master middle-class values.</td>
<td>• Highlighting the accomplishments of a few while ignoring the problems of the many is neither fair nor wise. Don’t soft-shoe racism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Electing a Black President shows how far we’ve come in race relations.</td>
<td>• Embrace controversy as a teaching tool.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teacher candidates will be positively impacted by greater knowledge, awareness, and skill training.</td>
<td>• Awareness, knowledge, and skills are not enough. The application of dispositions <em>(if done correctly)</em> is a key missing link.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III. Instructional strategies utilized</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Choose lessons that create a safe, caring, and accepting classroom atmosphere.</td>
<td>• Teach towards the gaps. Find the missing pieces. Teach both content and process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Choose lessons that highlight our similarities.</td>
<td>• Investigate power &amp; privilege interference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use lessons that honor heroes and their deeds.</td>
<td>• Investigate ego defense mechanisms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Language policing and practicing how to talk.</td>
<td>• Train teachers to be critical thinkers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use group work and interactive learning.</td>
<td>• Reflection, dialogue, interactive learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use journaling, service learning &amp; portfolios.</td>
<td>• Use a 35/65 traditional-critical educ mix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV. Potential impact on majority teachers</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I am a good person who means well.</td>
<td>• It’s not about me; it’s about the kids!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is a magic recipe that exists. Once I learn it, all my students will be successful.</td>
<td>• It’s not about what I do; but rather, it’s about who I am and the role model I present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V. Potential impact on minority students</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The way to be successful is to either (a) emulate the majority, (b) create a viable alternative, or (c) rely on sports &amp; music.</td>
<td>• I can forgive. I can overcome. I can succeed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I can change my trajectory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• You can’t label me or put me in a box!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Post Semester Evaluation

Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Helpful At All</th>
<th>A Little Helpful</th>
<th>Average Impact</th>
<th>Clearly Helpful</th>
<th>Extremely Helpful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strongly Disagree Somewhat Disagree Somewhat Agree Clearly Agree Strongly Agree

Directions: Use the above scale to register your agreement or disagreement with the following multicultural and human relations teacher strategies. Do not give answers that you think the instructor wants to hear, but rather ones that reflect your true feelings.

I. Human Relations Growth Opportunities - Use the scale above to rate your response:

1. _____ The effect this Human Relations course had on my personal growth.

2. _____ The effect this Human Relations course had on my professional growth.

3. _____ How I rate a teaching style that can be described as a cut-to-the-chase, don’t-worry-about-being-politically-correct approach to delivering the content of diversity education, and its impact on my combined personal and professional human relations growth.

4. _____ How I rate the instructor’s ability to simultaneous appeal to both the cognitive/intellectual and the emotional side of a student when teaching him/her multicultural education, and its impact on my combined personal and professional human relations growth.

5. _____ How I rate the extent to which genuine, open, and frank classroom discussion amongst students themselves, as well as between the instructor and students, had on my combined personal and professional human relations growth.

6. _____ Despite my instructor having his/her own opinions about diversity, he/she encouraged me to become an independent thinker, look at all the various ideological positions, and then arrive at my own conclusions about multicultural and social justice issues based on the formal and informal research I gathered.

7. _____ How I rate the impact the textbook(s) and other written material utilized to instruct the class had on my combined personal and professional human relations growth.

8. _____ How I rate the impact that various films and videos utilized to instruct the class had on my combined personal and professional human relations growth.

9. _____ How I rate the impact outside speakers and special guests had on my combined personal and professional human relations growth.

10. _____ How I rate the extent to which prior teachers and educators prepared me to be open to diversity and multicultural education.
11. _____ How I rate the extent to which my parents, relatives, and family upbringing prepared me to be open to diversity and multicultural education.

12. _____ How I rate the extent to which my religious beliefs prepared me to be open to diversity and multicultural education (note: put N/A, "not applicable", if you are atheist or agnostic).

13. _____ The "good person" in me is the main reason why I grew the way I did in this class. The "good person" in me had more of an impact on how I developed and grew, compared to the curriculum, videos, a certain kind of teaching style, etc. (note: only put N/A if you experienced zero growth).

14. _____ The extent to which I believe a multicultural and human relations State Mandate Requirement Law for certifying classroom teachers and counselors was helpful in impacting my personal growth and professional development.

15. _____ I would have grown more by this class experience if my instructor had experimented less and used a more standard, mainstream approach to teaching multicultural and diversity education.

**Demographic Information:**

16. _____ I considered myself to be a political (only chose one of the following answers): (1) Conservative  (2) Moderate  (3) Liberal  (4) Radical  (5) I am an eclectic thinker - a combination of numbers 1 thru 4  (6) Undecided - I honestly don't know  (7) I'd like to pass on this sensitive question.

17. _____ Which political party do you give most of your ideological allegiance to? (1) Democratic Party (2) Republican Party (3) I am an Independent (4) I don’t know enough about politics to make a proper choice (5) I’d like to pass on this sensitive question.

18. Age __________

19. Race/Ethnicity ________________________________ (Note: do not put “human” or “American” for an answer)

20. Gender: Male _______ Female _______ Transgender _______

21. I am / I want to become a (check one):
   - Pre K-12 Teacher ______ School or Agency Counselor ______ Other Field (List) _____________

22. Highest Academic Degree Obtained (Check One):
   - High School_____ Associate or Bachelor’s Degree _____ Post Bachelor’s Degree _____

23. _______ The number of Human Relations, Diversity, or Multicultural classes or workshops taken prior to this particular course—(Note: include courses taken in high school, in college, in the community, or any job related training. If none, put a zero).

24. _______ Which socioeconomic class/strata do you currently occupy? (1) lower class, (2) middle class, (3) upper class, (4) I’d like to pass on this sensitive question.

Optional Student Comments: