June 2017

Advancing the Dialogue on Multicultural Instructional Approaches

Franklin Titus Thompson
University of Nebraska - Omaha, fthompson@unomaha.edu

University of Nebraska Omaha

ADVANCING THE DIALOGUE ON MULTICULTURAL INSTRUCTIONAL APPROACHES

Franklin Thompson

University of Nebraska-Omaha

Abstract: Most teacher preparation programs and the state governments they answer to agree that education majors should receive training in multicultural education before being granted certification to teach. Agreement begins to break down, however, over the details of that instruction Results of this study show that teachers of tomorrow want multicultural education that is more sophisticated than the typical "blame-game" or "feel-good" paradigms of yesteryear's efforts. It also shows that students are not fragile and prefer an eclectic instructional approach that has a critical pedagogy piece as its flagship.

While all six proposed theoretical instructional approaches were accepted by respondents (N=368) as having legitimacy for the teaching of multicultural education, each met a different need and two in particular made the most impact. Significant pretest-to-posttest changes in mean score rankings were found for a critical pedagogy style of instruction (t(361)=6.243, p<.0005), as well as an instructional style built upon a belief that the world needs more love and trust (t(361)=-5.732, p<.0005). In the beginning stages the need for more love and trust – although highly valued – was slightly overrated, and the need to investigate power and privilege and be critical thinkers was underrated and under-appreciated by students. This research is important because it augments the discourse on multicultural foundations with the introduction of a new classification that helps educators better understand (1) why we teach the way we do, and (2) elements students identify as being important to their lifelong learning of multicultural education.

Key words: Multicultural instructional approaches, eclectic instruction, lifelong learning, multicultural best practices.

A White student walks into class the first day of a typical college semester and proclaims that twice our nation has elected a Black person to the presidency and uses that as proof that racism is no longer a major issue in America, and that its citizens should concentrate on the things we have in common with each other. An eager Hispanic student of liberal political persuasion encourages that student to not overlook cultural differences, and to celebrate diversity and not fear it. An irritated African American responds, "Electing Barack Obama is evidence of a positive step, but I still want the 40 acres and a mule my ancestors earned but never received!" A well-meaning conservative and religious student attempts to broker the situation by saying, "I believe that love and forgiveness can bring us together." A well-read White student sporting a dreadlock hairstyle steps up to the plate and announces that until we stop playing games with issues of power and privilege, America will continue to chase its tail in a circle like a lovable yet confused pet. He then challenges the instructor to not candy-coat the subject matter that will be addressed this semester. Finally, an inquisitive classmate from a rural town turns to the instructor and asks, "Will you be able to give me some skills I can use with inner-city kids once I get to the student teaching phase of my program?" The instructor takes a sip of super charged caffeinated soda pop, glances at his/her low paycheck, and cautiously responds, "I, myself, may not have received the type of training to address all of your needs, but I am a dedicated practitioner and I will give you my best shot."

Welcome to the task of teaching about diversity in the land of plenty. The above scenario plays itself on college campuses every day with alarming regularity, and yet the typical administrative response is a political one: Let the newly hired minority instructor teach the one class that satisfies the state mandate and gives us that mystical, magical feeling that our teacher candidates will graduate with cultural proficiency. Each one of the students mentioned above remained sincere and convinced that their paradigm and set of beliefs is the ultimate prescription for what ails our nation. Question: How does the instructor respond to the multiple perspectives of her opinionated students? What foundational principles will the teacher invoke to meet their needs? How will the teacher prioritize those needs? What will be his/her tools, and how will the educational process unfold?

If in fact going beyond the "feel-good" and "guilt-and-blame" brands of multicultural education is a worthy goal, educators will have to engage in a great deal of wisdom, research, and focus. There are far too many students who view multicultural education as a course they can get an easy "A" in. Meanwhile, colleagues wonder why you put yourself through this agony each semester. One colleague once chided me for "being too smart of a guy to teach that unscientific, emotional stuff." The need to provide more science to the study of diversity provides a rationale for this study. Another rationale comes from the National Accreditation of Teacher Education (2008) and the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (2011). Both agencies recommend that teacher preparation programs include the instruction of meaningful multicultural training. In addition, most state governments mandate a multicultural requirement for teacher certification. If the training of teacher candidates is that important, then it behooves us to provide the best scientific and researched product possible.

Before launching into any systematic effort of training teacher candidates how to be culturally competent, it is a good idea to establish an instructional foundation upon which to build a program of study. "No educational approach is politically neutral . . . all educators make decisions about the goals they are working toward and the type of community they inspire. Recognizing this and arming ourselves with knowledge about competing approaches . . . is a necessary first step towards providing better schooling to our nation's youth" (Castagno, 2009, p. 48). The purpose of this research is help educators better understand that important first step.

Review of Literature

The literature on multicultural instructional approaches is divided into three different camps: Prominent scholars who specially address a system of classification, well-known writers who don't propose formal classifications per se but add to the larger conversation, and lesser-known writers who make important contributions via research that utilizes convenience sample populations. There is not enough room in this paper to address all of the research, but I will attempt to address the best examples of each area.

A framework of multicultural instructional approaches was first offered by Margaret Gibson (1976). She describes a pre-stage where proponents of a deficit model (i.e., various ethnic cultures lack certain cultural staples) push for early intervention programs such as the Head Start. She rejects that school of thought as elitist and describes a healthier first stage referred to as Benevolent Multi-Culturalism. In this approach educators seek to decrease the amount of incompatibility between the culture of the school and that of disadvantaged children's homes. If minority students see more positive representations of themselves in the curriculum, they will be more apt to buy into the educational experience. Gibson's second approach, Education about Cultural Difference is different from the first in that it doesn't target just minority students, but rather it seeks to educate all students about the contributions of ethnic peoples and their culture, as well as the pitfalls of racism and social injustice. The knock against this approach is that it relies on the dominant power structure to reform itself. What often results is forced assimilation and token representation.

A third option, Cultural Pluralism, is different from the first two approaches in that it rejects both assimilation and separatism as acceptable goals, but rather it seeks to educate both young and old learners about an important overlooked truth: Our nation is greatly strengthened when everyone embraces and celebrates cultural differences. Pluralism makes us all more qualified and humane. A fourth approach, Bi-Cultural Education, emphasizes the need to train students how to successfully operate in two cultures. All students need this, but it is especially important for race minorities who face social ostracism if they become too assimilated on one hand, yet they are required to master the knowledge and skills of the dominant culture in order survive school and excel in the job market on the other hand.

These four approaches are derived from discussions about what formal schooling should and should not do. A fifth approach, Multi-Cultural Education as the Normal Human Experience (the author's preference), relies on a broader anthropological definition of education – one that acknowledges that the total community impacts the worldview of young people. This approach is not a big proponent of ethnic schools (although it acknowledges that good can come from them), but rather integration is seen as a key variable. It also rejects the belief that culture, ethnicity, and race are static. There are people of different races, for example, who embrace the Muslim culture. And last but not least, it tries to down-play dichotomies that say "all whites must act this way, and all blacks must act or speak another way." The Human Experience approach promotes a wholesome and fluid definition of multiculturalism. With the Gibson (1976) treatise serving as the initial foundational impetus, other writers proceeded to weigh in on the matter.

One of the more popular and influential models in the field of education is a typology offered by James Banks (2009). He views most teaching efforts by multicultural instructors as emanating from one of four levels: (a) The contributions approach, where the focus is on the curriculum, highlights heroes, holidays and discrete cultural elements. (b) The additive approach where cultural concepts, themes, and perspectives are added to the curriculum without making any significant change to the dominant-group literary canon. (c) The transformative approach where the core structure of the curriculum is changed to view both history and current events from multiple perspectives. (d) The social action approach where students make decisions on important social issues and problems, and then follow up with action to help solve them. The Banks model is used in many teacher in-service programs and often quoted by presenters at national race relations conferences.

Another popular classification of instructional approaches is provided by Sleeter and Grant (2009). The authors summarize how programs tend to fall into one of 5 categories. First is the Teaching the Culturally Different paradigm. With this approach well-meaning educators take on the task of improving learning for disadvantaged students, but they do so from a cultural deficit framework. Minority students are viewed as lacking the values, skills, and abilities to function in mainstream society. The school's job then becomes one of correcting deficiencies through the method of forced assimilation, albeit it is often viewed as benevolence by insiders. While the approach has the potential to produce positive results concerning skill building, job readiness, and national unity, it fails on measures of addressing cultural exchange, cultural pride, self-esteem, closing inequity gaps, and effectively dealing with at-risk issues.

Next is the Human Relations approach. Borrowing heavily from the fields of counseling and social psychology, instructors of this persuasion attempt to expose conscious and unconscious motivators behind acts of hatred and discrimination. Motivators can be triggered from a variety of sources such as dysfunctional childhood rearing, sensationalized media, reference others, poor self-concept, faulty learning, and cognitive underdevelopment at both the individual or group level. Much like how a medical doctor would use a prescription, reeducation and skill-building become the cures for social dysfunction. In particular, the rooting out of self-defeating ego defense mechanisms and the promotion of better communication skills is heavily relied upon to fix a struggling nation and its people.

Proponents of the Single Studies approach believe the supposed neutrality of education is a myth. Rather, the ruling class uses education to promote a dominant set of values and norms which in turn benefit the ruling class socially and monetarily. Counter truths, ethnic histories, and personal perspectives must be told in order to build a more balanced picture of reality. It is especially important to let underrepresented groups tell their own story. Truth is viewed as colorless, and it is OK for many different truths to simultaneously exist. Oppressed groups do not lack culture or capability, rather those in power define what counts as good and often cast marginal groups in a negative light. The single studies approach does an excellent job of explaining why things such as achievement gaps and wage inequality exist.

Proponents of the Multicultural Education approach push for a pluralistic world where many cultures are blended and appreciated. The approach has the potential to end up promoting forced assimilation where minority groups adopt the norms and values of the dominant group. If left to operate properly, however, the approach has the potential to result in "modified cultural pluralism" where each group is unique and distinctive from one another, while at the same time displaying a clear and obvious collective identity. With this approach, difference is not feared but celebrated within the confines of a shared national identity. While the dominant canon is not discarded, alternative paradigms are allowed to co-exist equally as a way of describing a more accurate and balanced picture of history. There is much critique on how minorities are misrepresented in the media and how unfair the status quo is. Expanding the literary canon and embracing choice are central themes for problem solving.

Finally, proponents of the Social Justice approach believe that it is not enough to just teach students how to be more humane, civil, and literate. The struggle for such things as power, privilege, land, goods, and resources are seen as the root of social dysfunction. The more scarce the resources, the more intense the struggle. Most Social Justice Advocates are reconstructivists who borrow heavily from the teachings of Karl Marx (Rockmore, 2002) and Paulo Freire (2005). Establishing collective goals and practicing collaborative decision making are the building blocks of producing a better world. Participatory education is a key correlate. Collective resistance is a liberating agent. Social rebels are not viewed as angry or damaged individuals, but rather as persons who possess the courage to seek self-actualization and better mental health, albeit their choices may not always be wise or peaceful. If students are truly provided an opportunity to challenge dominant group norms and change rules, a society free of oppression can be realized.

While research about multicultural instructional approaches is not hard to find, there is still a need to describe the various writers within a larger context. Angelina Castagno (2009) provides one of the better meta-analyses of the literature that exists to date. Although the paper deserves its own separate read, a brief summary of

her findings is presented here. She posits that there are six multicultural instructional approaches offered by the leading writers (pp. 47-48):

1. Educating for Assimilation – seven of the leading experts on the subject (Gibson, 1976; Banks, 2009; Sleeter & Grant, 2009; McLaren, 1997; Cornbleth & Waugh, 1995; Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997; King, 2004) identify a perspective that helps poor and minority children gain the necessary knowledge, skills, and mindset to successfully navigate a white, middle class existence. Helping disadvantaged kids join the dominant culture [i.e., a cultural deficit model] is seen as good practice and a great investment of time and money.

2. Educating for Amalgamation – five experts (Gibson, 1976; Sleeter & Grant, 2009; McLaren, 1997; Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997; Nieto; 2004) identify a school of thought that promotes national unity by emphasizing the things we share in common. It highlights areas in which the various ethnic groups have the potential to "melt" their culture and join a greater cause.

3. Educating for Pluralism – eight experts (Gibson, 1976; Banks, 2009; Sleeter & Grant, 2009; McLaren, 1997; Cornbleth & Waugh, 1995; Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997; King, 2004; Nieto, 2004) identify an approach where cultural differences are not feared, but rather they are celebrated. All cultures, including eurocentrism, being equally acknowledged and celebrated is viewed as historically accurate and socio-emotionally balanced and healthy for children.

4. Educating for Cross-Cultural Competence – two experts (Gibson, 1976; Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997) promote a pragmatic type of education that emphasizes the need for race minority individuals and other out-group members to become bi-cultural. Whites in America can go through a lifetime of having to only know the norms of their dominant group; still it would be best if they could branch out. Race and ethnic minorities, however, have no choice but to become bi-cultural by successfully navigating their world, plus that of the dominant group.

5. Educating for Critical Awareness – eight experts (Banks, 2009; Sleeter & Grant, 2009; McLaren, 1997; Cornbleth & Waugh, 1995; Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997; King, 2004; Nieto, 2004; Delpit, 1995) include an approach that questions the status quo, investigates the relation of power between groups, and highlights a need to think in new ways that may go against the rules of the dominant group.

6. Educating for Social Action – 4 experts (Banks, 2009; Sleeter & Grant, 2009; Ladson-Billings, 1994; Nieto, 2004) write about the need to go beyond the cognitive awareness stage and delve into getting involved in making structural changes that make society more equitable.

Castagno concludes her treatise by saying that each of the approaches are valid depending on the identified need, and that her curriculum suggestions apply not only to multicultural education, but to all of education.

Other well-known multicultural writers don't specifically address instructional typologies per se, yet they offer advice and strategies that are important to note. For example, Geneva Gay (2004) says that the best multicultural instruction teaches about the atrocities minorities endured, as well as the strength and dignified lives various groups lived while facing their oppression. In addition, she sates that, "Multicultural education is much more than a few lessons about ethnically diverse individuals and events or a component that operates on the periphery of the education enterprise" (Gay, 2004, p.33). Rather, it must become an articulated and integrated part of the total curriculum throughout the whole school year.

Gloria Ladson-Billings (2005) highlights three important gaps in our collective multicultural efforts: (a) We do a decent job of recruiting white women into the field of education, but that effort is not matched when it comes to recruiting candidates of color, (b) Too many educators use rhetoric to require multicultural skills and dispositions of students that they themselves don't possess – in some cases their instructional practices have become a politically correct word game, and (c) We sometimes adopt too much of an updated 1960's version of the cultural deficit paradigm (i.e., we will highlight students' tough environmental backgrounds and the academic and career tools they lack without putting sufficient attention towards their potential and inner strength, as well as the need to empower them to overcome obstacles).

A recent example in my own classroom highlights this last point. A student of Sudanese parents rose to give a student presentation on how teachers can better serve Black students. At first it was clear that he did not have the confidence, the eye contact, the verbal volume, nor the vocabulary to match the prior results of his White counterparts. As he spoke about the history portion of his presentation, I began to write down notes that reflected a grade of a C- student. And then he kicked in with the second part of his presentation: The part about his personal journey and what teachers did for him that helped him not become derailed in life. Despite the fact that the delivery was still lacking, content and emotional impact-wise it was one of the best speeches I had ever heard in terms of describing how we must stand in the gap for poor and minority kids who hurt. I took notes and learned a few new

things. Afterwards, I counseled him on the need to take speech classes, increase his vocabulary, and work on his confidence, but if I continue to shape and mold this kid – he is going to be a master urban-setting educator someday. No, the student wasn't deficient. He/she was underexposed! Teacher disposition has as much to do with student success and failure as do knowledge, skills, and environmental impact (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2011).

Writers who are not so nationally known, such as Zahorik and Novak (1996) have engaged in efforts to combine findings from the literature with results from interviews of local educators. He revealed four types of multicultural teaching that takes place at a designated middle school:

(1) Cultural Adjustment – poor and minority students are taught the standard curriculum at a slower pace and with reduced expectations and a system of rewards in place. No special emphasis on multicultural curriculum is infused.

(2) Cultural Embellishment – multicultural education is treated as an add-on to the standard curriculum. Multicultural content is usually about important people, holidays, celebrations, foods, entertainment, and other cultural topics.

(3) Cultural Integration – multicultural topics are infused into the regular curriculum all year long. The overall goal is usually to promote pluralism.

(4) Cultural Analysis – these teachers go a step further by helping students understand the whys of injustice and oppression. An additional emphasis is put on developing problem solving skill and the promotion of social action.

Augmenting the Current Discourse

Diversity instructors clamor for greater clarity. It is the purpose of this research to fill the gap in the literature by introducing a new model that will help augment the current discourse. I agree with Paulo Freire (2005) that (a) researchers, authorities, and pundits don't possess 100% of the knowledge that exists in the world, and that (b) engaging in a process known as "Praxis" – the synchronization of knowledge from both the street and the academy levels – is the best way to address social problems. Freire notes that one of the biggest areas of improvement for schools is to allow students to have more input in the learning they will be engaged in. This is the original definition of critical pedagogy.

Similar to the Zahorik and Novak (1996) effort, I wanted to identify an authentic, grassroots classification model that grew out of local identified needs. The model proposed here is unique in that it takes into account the goals and desires of students identified at the beginning of a class, things that enhanced a desire to continue in lifelong learning as identified by students at the end of class, and input from colleagues who teach multicultural education – all of this from a pilot study that was done over a 3 year period before the principal study was conducted. In addition, during the semester students were asked to identify multicultural missing gaps in their prior education. Listed below are examples of student comments gathered during the pilot study phase:

A sampling of student multicultural concerns and/or missing gaps include:

1. "I grew up in an all-white school and didn't have much interaction with colored people. I have a willingness to learn, but my past schooling didn't teach me much."
2. "Nobody ever explains to me why some minorities appear to be so angry."
3. "It seems like we make race relations more complicated than it really is. Why can't we just all get along?"
4. "Are we going to truly keep it real this semester, or will this be just another politically-correct exercise so we can check the government box?"
5. "Why don't teachers ever talk about reverse-racism?"
6. "How come Blacks get to say certain words and phrase, but Whites can't? Is there a double standard that exists?"
7. "Why are White people so resistant to the concept of white power and privilege? Are they reading the same history books that I read?"

A sampling of goals and aspirations students hope to glean from multicultural education:

1. "I want to learn more about cross-cultural communication."
2. "I hope we highlight the good things as much or more than the not-so-good."
3. "If Reagan and Bush had the nerve to give Japanese Americans reparations, where is my check for being a descendant of slaves?"
4. "If we follow the golden rule and listen to the words of people like MLK Jr., then we wouldn't

have all these problems."

5. "I want to learn how to embrace and celebrate our differences. Teach us how to be more tolerant."

6. "Can we take the agendas and the politics out of multicultural education and instead concentrate on those things that are best for our kids? Can we do less blaming and finger pointing, and instead do more problem solving?"

7. "I hope we go deep into the subject so that we can uncover things that are missing in our conversation. Let's not keep regurgitating the things we know. Let's dig deeper for those things we still need to learn more about!"

In addition to considering authentic student input, I also took into consideration what the literature had identified plus general race relations conversations one can easily glean by listening to local conversations and daily newscasts. Again, I strongly believe in Paulo Freire's (2005) concept that our problems are best solved when we combine formal knowledge with the wisdom of everyday people.

Listed below is a classification system based upon information that I gathered during a 3-year pilot study of student needs, as well as informal interviews of high school teachers, college instructors, and political colleagues of mine regarding the multicultural worldviews they embraced. The reader will note many similarities between my proposed model and what is already in the literature, as well as a few "folk pearls of wisdom" that the literature may have omitted. Actual titles used to describe sub-categories are offered by me which may or may not endure, but at least they provide a solid starting point:

1. **Reparations Approach:** A philosophical foundation that highlights wrongs that have been done to certain groups, the consequences of those wrongs, and what needs to happen in order to fix hurting people and the broken system they live in. It is a pragmatic approach aimed not at utilizing blame and guilt, but rather discovering what it will take to bring about healing and true equity. Proponents have strong allegiances to affirmative action and other social engineering efforts to level the playing field. Money is not the only form of reparations that can be given.

2. **Cultural Similarities Approach:** A philosophical foundation that highlights all the things that make us similar, while deemphasizing (or ignoring) those things that make us different. An instructor of this persuasion will probably not put much stock in studying the past or going into much detail about psychological consequences of poverty and racism. Neither will there be much of an emphasis on questioning the status quo. Rather, more attention is paid to creating harmony, national unity, and patriotism, as well as the potential for new opportunities. Proponents say to put our energy towards things that we can control.

3. **Cultural Differences Approach:** A philosophical perspective that highlights the need to accept and celebrate our differences instead of fearing them. Difference is not seen as good or bad, but rather only as different. Pluralism is held in high esteem. Color-blind philosophies are viewed as politically correct distractions.

4. **The Golden Rule, Love, and Trust-Building Approach:** A philosophical foundation that says if left unchecked, the dark side of humans will prevail no matter what group you represent. Hatred is a force to be reckoned with, but it is not as strong as light, truth, love, and forgiveness. It doesn't happen magically, however. The aims and goals of this approach must be actively and purposely worked on. Education, integration, collaboration, psychological insight, and religion are seen as key mediators. National and international heroes are role models. Music, art, sports, interactive workshops, and retreats are conduits for social change.

5. **Human Relations Approach:** A philosophical foundation that highlights three main tenets: (a) We must become more aware of unconscious motives and drives (i.e., greed and selfishness) that cause us to be separated from one another, (b) The way to create a better nation is to encourage its citizens one-by-one in the process of becoming better people, and (c) classroom lecturing and head knowledge is not enough. We need to help people gain skills that help them navigate tricky social terrain. The ultimate goal of this approach is to create role models who then go out and inspire others to greatness.

6. **The Critical Multicultural Imperative:** This is the one classification that relied the most on bringing together a synthesis of cross-disciplinary literature findings. It is a paradigm that highlights the following four tenets: (a) In order to successfully navigate race, gender, and human relations, an interdisciplinary approach must be taken. The investigation of psychology and ego defense mechanisms, for example, is just as important as the study of history. (b) Finger pointing, blaming, and the usage of guilt are counter-productive. Being fragile and easily insulted is enabling. Partisan politics and grenade throwing are crippling. Collaboration and finding a

critical middle of our collective perspectives is doable. Helping students to understand how people think, and especially how we think about the process thinking and problem solving is liberating. (c) Lessons that highlight political correctness and language policing at the exclusion of more rigorous investigation often fail to provide meaningful long-term social change. Neo-Freudian tenets provide greater awareness. Uncovering deep roots, peeling back complicated layers, and searching for social dysfunction instigators is far superior than feeling good and creating safe spaces. Controversy should be embraced as a teaching skill and not feared. (d) Of particular interest are the often overlooked power and privilege issues that that keep us from realizing the nation's pluralist goals.

In an attempt to provide the reader with examples of lessons and instructional strategies that highlight each of the curriculum approaches, Appendix A is offered. It is important to understand that this new classification is not intended to replace, but rather only to supplement the various paradigms and classifications that already exist. It provides a grassroots way of showcasing how common folk view race relations and social justice issues.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

This study attempts to compare and contrast student-inspired multicultural classification systems with the traditional findings that are captured in the literature. This effort also seeks to identify potential missing gaps and new revelations that might add to the larger discourse surrounding effective multicultural instruction as it relates to various instructional approaches. Specifically, this study addressed the following research questions:

1. How will respondents rank the 6 instructional approaches described in this paper that make up my proposed classification of training teacher candidates to be multiculturally competent?
2. How will teacher candidates respond to various curriculum approaches that urge students to probe beyond the surface and go deeper than typical "feel good" paradigms require?
3. After receiving the treatment (i.e., a cross-section of teaching styles), will there be meaningful pretest-to-posttest gains in mean rankings?
4. Will the results of the curriculum rankings be impacted by the following demographic attribute variables: race, gender, age, prior multicultural education, educational attainment, SES, and political persuasion?
5. Given a chance to eliminate and/or discard a curriculum approach based on an argument that it has little or no educational value, which one(s), if any, would be chosen?

I hypothesized that the treatment plan (i.e., eclectic multicultural instruction) would help students gain a greater appreciation for a curriculum paradigm that requires deeper levels of investigation and understanding. Secondly, I hypothesized that despite final rankings, students would find educational value in all 6 of the curriculum paradigms. Thirdly, I hypothesized that certain demographic attribute variables (namely race, gender, and political affiliation) would make a difference in how respondents ranked the paradigms. Fourthly, I hypothesized that there would be significant pretest-to-posttest growth in appreciation on at least half of the proposed curriculum paradigms. Because the question of how will respondents rank the curriculum approaches is mostly informational, I did not offer a hypothesis on that point.

Method

Participants

Participants who comprised a convenience sample for this study were teacher and counselor candidates who attended a Midwestern metropolitan university situated in an urban setting of 800,000 people. Survey respondents (N=368) represent a subset drawn from a larger data set *(N=1335)* aimed at identifying various correlates of effective multicultural instruction. One hundred eight students (31%) said that they had received no prior multicultural education. Seventy eight respondents (22.5%) had taken 1 prior class, while 161 persons (43.5%) had taken three or more classes. Fifty four students (15.5%) said they had progressed through their educational experience and never once experienced a teacher who showed a passion for human relations, race relations, or social justice issues. Sixty seven students (19.5%) remembered having only one teacher who did, while one hundred seventeen (34%) had two or three social justice related instructors, and 107 students (31%) had 4 or more of those passionate teachers.

Eighty (23%) of the individuals surveyed were male and 267 (77%) were female. Three hundred and three persons (87%) were Caucasian, while 44 (13%) were students of color. Of those forty-four students, 16 were Hispanic, 14 were African American, 12 were Asian, and 2 were of Middle Eastern descent. A low percentage of race minority students applying to become an educator is a long-standing issue for this and many other urban communities.

There were 116 persons (31.5%) who fell in the 17-19 age range, 144 persons (39%) within the 20-22 age range, 74 persons (20%) within the 23-30 age range, and 34 individuals (10%) who were 31 to 64 years old. Two hundred eighty persons (76%) possessed only a high school degree, while 80 persons (22%) had obtained an associate's or a bachelor's degree, and 7 individuals (2%) had a post-bachelor's degree. Two hundred sixty-four respondents (76%) voiced a desire to become a classroom teacher, while 13 (4%) saw themselves going into the counseling field. Forty three persons (12%) were non-education majors who took the class as an elective.

Politically speaking, 43 individuals (12%) classified themselves as being conservative, 200 persons (55.5%) as moderate or eclectic, and 51 (14%) as liberal. Fifty individuals (14%) said they were politically undecided, and sixteen people (4%) decided to pass on the political allegiance question for privacy reasons. The rationale for including political affiliation on the survey was to test the popular stereotype (accurate or not) that conservatives do not value certain aspects of multicultural education. I will investigate that stereotype from the narrow perspective of education majors.

Study Design

The design of the study is a pre and post survey of the perceptions of education majors. After receiving a multi-faceted curriculum (i.e., the treatment plan), respondents were asked to rank the viability and overall impact of each approach. Instruction included 5 lessons that highlighted each of the proposed six new approaches over a 16-week course. Brief examples of specific lessons that were utilized are listed in Appendix A.

Survey Instrument

A copy of the survey is enclosed as Appendix B. The survey consists of a pre and a post semester student ranking of 6 selected multicultural paradigms from which most multicultural instruction is drawn. Students were made aware that there is a measure of overlap between the instructional approaches, and yet each paradigm has its own unique characteristics. A thorough description of each was provided at the beginning of the semester. The survey also includes two questions measuring student personal and professional growth, a question gauging whether or not the instructor encouraged independent thinking, and an additional question judging the efficacy of learning how to disagree. The additional questions are included so the reader can gain a better understanding of student acceptance or rejection of the eclectic curriculum approach. Lastly, seven demographic measures round out the survey.

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. A paired-sample t-test to determine pre-test-to-post-test mean score differences;
3. A nonparametric [i.e., Mann-Whitney] analysis to ascertain potential relationships between respondent rankings and two-grouping demographic attribute variables (race, gender) ; and
4. A nonparametric [i.e., Kruskal-Wallis] analysis to ascertain potential relationships between respondent rankings and multiple-grouping demographic attribute variables (age, prior education, degree earned, SES).

Cohen's *d* (population mean divided by the standard deviation) will be used to report effect size for paired-sample t-test results. Although the procedure to calculate nonparametric estimators is still up for debate, I used the following formula suggested by Grissom and Kim (2012): the U statistic divided by the product of the two sample sizes.

Results

Descriptive Analysis

Table 1 provides descriptive results for the "quality control" variables in my study. On a nine-point scale (with 9 being exceptionally high and 1 being a very low rating) students rated their professional growth an 8.20 score and their personal growth a 7.96. These are high scores considering the course is state mandated, and the racial make-up is 87% Caucasian from a part of the country that is generally considered to be conservative.

Students gave a very strong rating [8.19] to the instructional effort that encourages them to become independent thinkers, and not just a clone of the instructor. Respondents also gave strong backing [8.64] for a concept that says education majors must know more than multicultural content; they must also master the skill of knowing how to disagree without being disagreeable (i.e., a Human Relations indicator). Respondents also appreciated the idea of an instructor teaching many truths, even when they are opposites, and then having faith in students that they will arrive at a well-informed conclusion of their own [score of 8.44]. Finally, regarding the issue of the legitimacy of teaching about white privilege (i.e., a CMI indicator), respondents gave a score of 7.20.

Table 1
Post-survey descriptive results of "quality control" questions.

Dispositional Question (1-9 Likert scale; refer to Appendix B)	Mean	*SD*	*N*
How I rate my professional growth as a result of this class	8.20	1.20	369
How I rate my personal growth as a result of this class	7.96	1.39	369
The instructor encouraged me to be an independent thinker and not just a clone of himself.	8.19	1.36	368
I must learn how to disagree without being disagreeable	8.64	0.81	304
It is good for multicultural instructors to teach about many truths, and then have faith in their students to make an informed decision about what to believe.	8.44	0.96	304

Table 2 provides descriptive results of how students ranked the six instructional approaches. During the pre-test phase, respondents ranked the curriculum paradigms from most-to-least impactful in the following order: Teach Human Relations Skills (*M*=2.67, *SD*=1.46); Promote More Love and Build Trust (*M*=3.02, *SD*=1.63); Critical Multicultural Imperative (*M*=3.12, *SD*=1.66); Highlight Cultural Similarities (*M*=3.45, *SD*=1.50); Highlight Cultural Differences (*M*=3.61, *SD*=1.48), and; Don't Ignore Reparations (*M*=5.11, *SD*=1.37).

Table 2
Pre-test ranking of the most-to-least impactful multicultural curriculum approaches that make an impact on multicultural learning.

Disposition	Pre Ranking	Mean	*SD*	*N*
Critical Multicultural Imperative	3rd	3.12	1.58	367
Human Relations Approach	1st	2.67	1.46	367
Cultural Similarities Approach	4th	3.45	1.50	367
Trust Building Approach	2nd	3.02	1.63	368
Cultural Differences Approach	5th	3.61	1.48	367
Reparations Approach	6th	5.11	1.37	368

The hypothesis that eclectic multicultural instruction would help students gain a better appreciation for curriculum designs that required deeper levels of investigation was supported. Post-treatment rankings from most-to-least impactful are as follows (see Table 3): Critical Multicultural Imperative (M=2.48, SD=1.58); Human Relations (M=2.51, SD=1.51); Cultural Similarities (M=3.62, SD=1.35); Love and Build Trust (M=3.67, SD=1.62); Cultural Differences (M=3.78, SD=1.41), and; Reparations (M=4.93, SD=1.45).

The results of which curriculum paradigm students would eliminate and which ones they retained are also found in Table 3. My hypothesis that students would find educational value in all 6 of the curriculum paradigms was supported. When given a chance to eliminate one of the curriculum approaches due to potential lack of impact on learning, respondents (N=369) chose unanimously keep the four highest ranked paradigms. Only 4 respondents (1%) said to eliminate the Cultural Differences approach, and only 15 (4%) did not care for the Reparations style of instruction.

Table 3
Post-test ranking of: (a) Most-to-least impactful multicultural curriculum approaches that make an impact on multicultural learning, and (b) Curriculum approaches that should be discarded.

Disposition	Post Ranking	Mean	*SD*	Ranking *N*	Retain *N*	Discard *N*
Critical Multicultural Imperative	1st	2.47	1.58	369	369	0
Human Relations Approach	2nd	2.51	1.51	369	369	0
Cultural Similarities Approach	3rd	3.62	1.35	369	369	0
Trust Building Approach	4th	3.67	1.62	369	369	0
Cultural Differences Approach	5th	3.78	1.41	369	365	4
Reparations Approach	6th	4.94	1.45	369	354	15

Paired-Sample t-test Analysis

The results of the paired-sample T-test can be found in Table 4. Results indicate that there is a statistically significant difference in scores when comparing the rankings of the CMI pre-test scores (mean=3.12, standard deviation=1.66) with those of the post-test (mean=2.45, standard deviation=1.60) phase of the study ($t(361)$=6.243, $p<.0005$). In addition, there was a statistically significant difference when looking at pre-test Trust Building scores (mean=3.02, standard deviation=1.63) with the scores of the post-test (mean=3.67, standard deviation=1.63) phase ($t(361)$=-5.732, $p<.0005$). The calculated effect size statistic is .40 for CMI and .40 for Trust, which is considered small.

Table 4

Paired-Sample t-test Results: Pretest-to-posttest differences in mean scores for rankings of curriculum preferences.

Disposition	Pre *M*	*SD*	Post *M*	*SD*	*df*	*t*-score	*p*	*d*
Critical Multicultural Imperative	3.12	1.66	2.48	1.58	361	6.243	>.0005	0.4
More Love & Build Trust Approach	3.02	1.63	3.67	1.62	361	5.732	>.0005	0.4

Nonparametric Analyses of Mean Rankings

The results of the Mann-Whitney and Kruskal-Wallis analyses for nonparametric significance indicate that the hypothesis for significant findings for race and social class had to be fully rejected. However, the null hypothesis for age, gender, degree, prior education, and political allegiance, however, was only partially rejected. Eleven demographic relationships were found to be statistically significant but because effect sizes were less-than-small, I decided to report the findings in Table 5 without additional narrative. Readers interested in a more detailed explanation of those findings may contact me for that information.

Table 5

Nonparametric Analysis of Mean Rankings: Kruskal-Wallis (KW) and Mann-Whitney (MW) tests of relationships between curriculum rankings and demographic attribute variables.

Curriculum Approach	Demographic Variable	X^2	*df*	KW *p*	*U*	MW *p*	*d*
1. Human Relations							
pre-test ranking	Gender	-----	-----	-----	9714.000	.019	.07
post-test ranking	Gender	-----	-----	-----	10255.000	.034	.08
2. CMI							
post-test ranking	Gender	-----	-----	-----	10330.000	.040	.08
3. CMI	Age	10.92	3	.012	-----	-----	-----
pre-test ranking	23-30 vs. 17-19 year olds	-----	-----	-----	3238.000	.017	.02
pre-test ranking	23-30 vs. 20-22 year olds	-----	-----	-----	3937.500	.005	.03
4. CMI	Degree Earned	6.607	2	.037	-----	-----	-----
pre-test ranking	HS vs. College degree	-----	-----	-----	9225.500	.042	.07

5. Reparations	Political Affiliation	9.598	3	.022	-----	-----	-----
pre-test ranking	Moderates vs. Undecided	-----	-----	-----	4879.000	.005	.04
6. Love & Trust Building	Prior Multicultural Courses Taken	6.671	2	.036	-----	-----	-----
pre-test ranking	No Prior Classes vs. 2 or More Classes	-----	-----	-----	6780.000	.011	.05
7. CMI	Degree Earned	14.917	2	.001	-----	-----	-----
post-test ranking	HS vs. College degree	-----	-----	-----	8231.000	>.0005	.06
8. CMI	Age	8.171	3	.043	-----	-----	-----
post-test ranking	23-30 vs. 17-19 year olds	-----	-----	-----	3487.000	.024	.03
post-test ranking	23-30 vs. 20-22 year olds	-----	-----	-----	4450.000	.038	.03
9. CMI	Political Affiliation	10.094	3	.018	-----	-----	-----
post-test ranking	Moderates vs. Conservatives	-----	-----	-----	3227.000	.007	.02
10. Human Relations	Degree Earned	10.176	2	.006	-----	-----	-----
post-test ranking	HS vs. College degree	-----	-----	-----	8708.000	.002	.06
11. Reparations	Prior Multicultural Courses Taken	9.304	2	.010	-----	-----	-----
post-test ranking	No Prior Classes vs. 2 or More Classes	-----	-----	-----	5109.000	.010	.04
post-test ranking	1 Prior Class vs. 2 or More Classes	-----	-----	-----	7255.000	.011	.06

Discussion

The overall goals of this research were threefold. First, the review of literature was included to help the reader better understand the various multicultural instructional approaches that are available to educators. These approaches are time-tested and provide instructors with a solid foundation upon which to structure a course of study. Second, a bottom-up, student-influenced approach – one that also incorporates research findings – is offered as an alternative to help instructors better handle various authentic questions (such as "Why can't we just all do what Martin Luther King Jr. instructed us to do?") that are often voiced by students, but are not necessarily addressed by the traditional approaches.

Most students make decisions about race and human relations not solely by what scholars say, but rather by home training and what they relate to everyday practical living. While top-down models of instruction identified in the literature do an outstanding job of providing direction for educators, sometimes an additional curriculum supplement helps to address a youth culture of today who value the concept of "keeping-it-real." The proposed classification system takes those authentic needs into consideration. The goal is not to replace what is contained in

the literature, but rather to augment that which is already established. It provides another option for curriculum delivery. The proposed classification system came about as a result of student input, borrowing elements from the literature, borrowing elements from Paulo Freire (2005) and the field of critical pedagogy, and personal observations and notes I gathered as a result of teaching race relations in one form or another over a 39 year time span. In that sense, it is a hybrid of original and established research. Thirdly, this paper also addresses the wisdom of utilizing an eclectic instructional approach. Borrowing from the best of the paradigms and synthesizing a critical, cross-discipline approach seemed to work best for this convenience sample of education majors.

A limitation of this study and others like it is that it provides a big picture without providing instructional detail. Unfortunately, the nuances of effective multicultural instruction cannot be fully captured in a space-limited publication. Ultimately, a textbook on the subject will need to be written. At the very least, I plan to write a follow-up journal article detailing some of the teaching strategies that help account for high respondent ratings found in this paper. In the meantime, I provide examples of instructional strategies in Appendix A. Another limitation is that although the change in pretest-to-posttest difference in mean scores was statistically significant, the effect sizes were small-medium. This is understandable in light of the fact that final scores only reflected a simple ranking, and that any change in thought is still worthy of reporting. One might also argue that until a similar study is replicated elsewhere that the magnitude and transferability of the findings are limited.

Despite these limitations the findings from this study are, nonetheless, important. First and foremost, it helps to fill a gap in the literature. The traditional classifications do a good job of providing direction, but more is needed to help practitioners connect theory to everyday life. This study also shows that it is not enough to simply rely on history and politics to arrive at human relations problem solving strategies. The integration of inputs from the fields of psychology, sociology, communications, music, religion, critical pedagogy, polemics, etc. can enhance the multicultural learning experience of teacher candidates. No, this study does not solve all problems inherent with teaching multicultural education, but it does provide a framework from which a new generation of instructors can help multicultural education evolve and adapt in the post-Barack Obama era.

In particular, this study demonstrates that the axiom that says "know thyself" must not be applied only to students, but also to instructors as they prepare multicultural curriculum. Having greater awareness of what you do, why you do it, and how you do it will make you a better educator. It is also important to know how and why colleagues approach multicultural education differently than you do. It is hoped that the proposed classification offered here will help generate healthy debate, with the end goal of establishing better articulation of multicultural goals and aims.

All of the proposed curriculum approaches proved to be valuable; this was corroborated by study respondents who said the instructor should retain all six approaches for teaching future students (see Table 3). Significant pretest-to-posttest changes in mean score rankings were found for two of the paradigms: A critical pedagogy style of instruction $(t(361)=6.243, p<.0005)$ referred to here as CMI instruction, and a style of teaching built upon a belief that the world needs more love and trust $(t(361)=-5.732, p<.0005)$. Although both styles were deemed important for the overall instruction of teacher candidates, students initially preferred the latter paradigm over the former. During the post-test period, however, those preferences were reversed. In the beginning stages the need for more love and trust – although highly valued – was slightly overrated, and the need to investigate power and privilege and be critical thinkers was underrated and under-appreciated.

The approaches don't all meet the same need. Some have more of an overall awareness value, some are designed to enhance a feeling of nation-building, others are more geared towards improving interpersonal skills, while a few have the potential to help learners solve problems at a deeper level. The CMI approach (and other critical race theory and critical pedagogy orientated paradigms) does an outstanding job of helping students understand power and privilege issues at a level that often escapes our conscious awareness. It also highlights the subtle games people play with themselves and others that block social advancement. Likewise, the Human Relations approach can help students understand how poor communication skills can negatively impact cross-cultural communication. In particular, the concept of learning how to disagree without being disagreeable is a skill that can be learned but only after skillful classroom preparation. Showing how various groups are similar is wise; it focuses everyone on a collective national identity. Still, showing how we are different keeps citizens grounded in how the real world works beyond the theoretical, and what improvement still needs to be done. It also encourages us to celebrate, and not fear our differences.

Although the Reparations approach was ranked last during both the pre and post stages of the study, respondents were still able to see a need for a paradigm that helps in making people whole before we demand production and patriotism out of them. Contrary to popular opinion, Reparations is not always about demanding money from the government. It can sometimes refer to stopping a certain thing to keep a community from hemorrhaging. Tip-toeing around the damage that lead poisoning can do to the minds of young learners is just one

example of how the lack of a focus on reparations can cause new problems and further damages to a group of people.

Implications for Educators

When designing multicultural curriculum preparation for teacher education students, we must be careful not to trivialize our efforts with "feel-good" approaches. This study shows that teacher candidates are not fragile, and that they have a desire to engage in dialogue that is at a deeper level. Conversely, it is OK to talk about controversial topics without digressing into a guilt and blame mode. Meaningful discussions on topics such as white privilege and how to work with non-standard English speakers are just a few examples of controversial lessons than yield student benefits. The embracement of controversy can be a valuable teaching tool when handled properly.

Teacher preparation programs must also make a concerted effort to include instructional strategies and activities that highlight the layered effect of race and human relations. If we truly aim to help high school gang members increase their self-esteem, take school more seriously, and choose a different path, we might need more than "can't we just all get along?" rhetoric. While it is true that promoting more love, building trust, and providing safe places for children provides us with an admirable target to shoot for, those paradigms in and of themselves do not solve problems; they only provide hope—most of the time without answers. This study shows that in addition to love, trust, and celebrating similarities, teacher candidates want to learn more about perspectives and skills that are rooted in the CMI, Human Relations, and Reparations approaches.

Of course, we must be age appropriate in our remediation efforts. Because this study suggests that the CMI approach is better understood and received by an older crowd (see Table 5 analysis), it might be wise for teachers at the secondary level to lead off with the Human Relations and Cultural Differences approaches, while also introducing elements of CMI. At the elementary school level, it's probably smart to lead off with the Love/Trust Building and Cultural Similarities approaches, while supplementing with the others. In-service training for classroom teachers, however, should be at the widest and deepest levels.

It goes without saying that permeating instruction makes a difference in student learning. Curriculum approaches that were formulated during the 1960s, 70s, and 80s provide us with a solid foundation for multicultural instruction, but new paradigms dictate that methods of teaching be adapted to reflect a rapidly changing world. Since the 1960s, a true global society has emerged, and the definition of multicultural education has broadened. Today's multicultural education must not be so broad that it covers too broad a spectrum on one hand, yet it must also not be confining and shortsighted on the other hand.

On-going, lifelong multicultural learning is best encouraged by using an eclectic instructional approach. Today's students prefer that we give them truth from multiple angles, and then trust them to make an informed decision. Teach all the positions of a debate and trust students to make an informed decision. Multicultural education should do more of this and less of the older-school proselytizing approach. It is also appropriate, however, to let students know whether or not they are a good fit to work with other people's children. We cannot legally force students to change their college major, but we must counsel misaligned educators how to look for a better career fit.

Multicultural education can no longer afford to be the product of a "guilt-based" paradigm on one hand, nor a "feel-good" paradigm on the other hand. It must be an experience that everyone can identify with, while also retaining the capacity to stretch the awareness level of all learners, while also empowering disenfranchised students. The art of managing social polemics is never an easy road to traverse. The critical middle is a hard place to find, but it can be done. I agree with the respondents in this study that an eclectic instructional approach that reaches across multiple academic disciplines is one of the better weapons we have in our toolbox. The results of this study demonstrate that meaningful human relations and multicultural education do not occur by happenstance, but rather by the purposeful, critical, and creative efforts of educators to properly instruct and inform students.

References

Banks, J. A. (2009). *Teaching strategies for ethnic studies* (8th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Castagno, A. E. (2009). Making sense of multicultural education: A synthesis of the various typologies found in the literature. *Multicultural Perspectives, 11*(1), 43-48.

Cornbleth, C. and Waugh, D. 1995. *The great speckled bird: Multicultural politics and education policymaking*, New York: St. Martin's Press.

Council of Chief State School Officers. (2011, April). *Interstate teacher assessment and support consortium (InTASC) Model core teaching standards: A resource for state dialogue*. Washington, DC: Author.

Delpit, L. 1995. *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*, New York: The New Press.

Freire, P. (2005). *Education for critical consciousness* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Continuum.

Gay, G. (2004). The importance of multicultural education. *Educational Leadership, 61*(4), 30-35.

Gibson, M. A. (1976). Approaches to multicultural education in the United States: Some concepts and assumptions. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 7*(4), 7-18.

Grissom, R. J., & Kim, J. J. (2012). Effect sizes for research. Univariate and multivariate applications (2nd ed). New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.

Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (2011). InTASC model core teaching standards: A resource for state dialogue. Retrieved from http://www.ccsso.org/Resources/Publications/InTASC_Model_Core_Teaching_Standards_A_Resource_for_State_Dialogue_(April_2011).html

Kincheloe, J. and Steinberg, S. 1997. *Changing multiculturalism*, Philadelphia: Open University Press.

King, J. 2004. "Culture-centered knowledge: Black studies, curriculum transformation, and social action". In Banks, J. and Banks, C. (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education*, 2nd Edition, 349–378. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ladson-Billings, G. J. (2005). Is the team alright? Diversity and teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 56*(3), 229-234.

McLaren, P. 1997. *Revolutionary multiculturalism: Pedagogies of dissent for the new millennium*, Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education [NCATE]. (2008, February). *Professional standards for the accreditation of teacher preparation institutions*. Washington, DC.

Nieto, S. 2004. *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education*, 4th Edition. Boston: Pearson.

Rockmore, T. (2002). *Marx after Marxism: The philosophy of Karl Marx*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley and Sons.

Sleeter, C. E., & Grant, C. A. (2009). *Making choices for multicultural education: Five approaches to race, class, and gender*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons.

Zahorik, J. A., & Novak, R. (1996). Multiculturalism: The range of teacher approaches. *The Clearing House, 70*(2), 85-89.

Appendix A
Brief descriptions of lessons and activities that help delineate differences between the various multicultural approaches utilized for instruction.

Human Relations Approach
- Exercises aimed at the need for educators and help-professionals to develop thicker skin and a wider perspective.   - Exercises aimed at teaching students how to disagree without being disagreeable.   - Cross-cultural communication skill training.   - Things that make you go "hmm" exercises – exposing Ego Defense Games people play with themselves and others.   - Student reflective homework and on-going, life-long self-assessment activities.
Cultural Similarities Approach
- A beginning or end of semester ice breaker: "We are More Alike than we are Different."   "A Day with Aunt Millie" and other simulation exercises.   "No Irish Need Apply" film and other examples of how true racism has no one color.   - The history of how poor antebellum Blacks & Whites were pitted against one another.   - Group presentations aimed at fostering collaboration and cross-cultural understanding.
Trust Building Approach
- Various exercises that emphasize the power of and the need for forgiveness.   - A global look at power, privilege, and oppression: No one group has a corner on hatred and oppression.   - Don't ignore European American cultural inclusions: A cultural and family tree project.   - Cultural immersion activities such as ethnic visitations and community services projects.   - Various exercises and lessons aimed at preparing teachers to "help kids who hurt."
Cultural Differences Approach
- A comparison of western and non-western views of things such as time, competition, child rearing, etc.   - Exposing various historical myths and falsehoods (e.g. the Asian Model Minority Myth).   - Videos that expose contemporary examples of hidden acts of hatred caught on film.   - Statistical differences in homicides rates, incarceration, achievement gaps, etc. Why?   - A critical look at holidays, festival, and cultural norms vs. a show-and-tell approach.
Reparations Approach
- Investigating how post-Civil War "40 Acres and a Mule" was unwisely rejected.   - Discussing Reagan reparations for Asian American WWII internees, but no other group.   - The Nation of Islam (Black Muslims) call for a separate, independent Black country.   - Native American tribes take land, burial, and fishing claims to court and sometimes win.   - Govt. efforts to reduce lead in older parts of town which house poor people of all colors.
Critical Multicultural Imperative (CMI)
- Understanding how power and privilege intersect with race, gender, religion, class, etc.   - Understanding the differences between a colonized and an immigrant minority.   - Gaining a better understanding of Race Identity Development literature and research.   - Racism can make a person sick: Use lessons and activities that investigate the psychological wear and tear of racism (i.e., Asians getting eye surgery).   - Image Theater, Forum Theater, and other Pedagogy of the Oppressed exercises.

Appendix B

Multicultural Survey   4 Digit Code _____
Ranking Instructional Approaches   (Make up a 4 digit number you can remember)

Directions: Use the following Likert Scale to answer the first three questions. It is extremely important that respondents answer the following questions not in a way that pleases the instructor, but rather in a truthful way that helps get at the issue of what really makes for good Multicultural Education. *Your response will remain anonymous.* This is a pass/fail assignment. Your final grade is not impacted by the quality of your answers.

Scale

Strongly   Somewhat Disagree   Somewhat Agree   Clearly Agree
          Very Strongly Agree
Disagree
_____

1   **2**   **3**   **4**   **5**   **6**   **7**   **8**   **9**
_____

Very Low   Low Rating   Moderate Rating   High Rating
                                              Exceptionally High
Rating   Rating

I.   Rate this specific educational experience - Use the scale above to rate your response to the items:

1. _____   How I rate the effect this Human Relations course had on my <u>personal</u> growth and development.

2. _____   How I rate the effect this Human Relations course had on my <u>professional</u> growth and development.

3. _____   Yes, in addition to learning new multicultural content, I must also learn how to disagree without being disagreeable. This skill allows me to be a more effective teacher.

4. _____   Despite my instructor having his/her own views about diversity, he/she encouraged me, nonetheless, to do the following: 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 information I gathered this semester.

II.   Effective Instructional Strategies - Macro Assessment: <u>RANK the following macro teaching approaches</u> in terms of the one that best encourages multicultural learning (ranked as 1st) to the approach that least encourages you to want to learn about diversity and about multicultural education (ranked as 6th). ***Do not use the Likert Scale listed at the top of this survey*.** Read all of the items <u>before</u> ranking them.

1._____   **The Reparations Approach:** Multicultural education that has a strong commitment to make restitution to the groups who have suffered historically. A style of instruction that puts a heavy emphasis on investigating what was taken from minorities and other disempowered groups, and *how the system needs to correct itself and advance true equality and not just espouse empty rhetoric*.

2._____   **The Cultural Differences and Bridge-Building Approach:** Multicultural education that puts a heavy emphasis on investigating the *Cultural Differences* that exist between groups, as well as the *Cross-*

Cultural Communication Skills and Interaction Education needed to better understand each other and bridge cultural differences.

3._____ **The Integration & Cultural Similarities Approach:** Multicultural education that (a) highlights *Opportunities to Collaborate and Work Together*, and (b) emphasize our *Cultural & Ethnic Similarities, Not Our Differences*. Rather than talk about how we are different, put heavy attention on breaking down segregation, and identifying cultural, ethnic, religious, philosophical, political, and experiential factors that various groups within society have in common with one another.

4._____ **The Critical Multicultural Imperative Approach**: An instructional approach that attempts to take the guilt, fear and mystery out of multicultural education. This approach highlights the missing links of race-ethnic-gender-ability-diversity-and human relations. It *Teaches Towards the Missing Gaps* of our knowledge about those subjects. The inclusion of the impact of *Power & Privilege* is one of the main identified missing gaps; there are others. It is an approach that *Embraces Controversy* as a main teaching strategy with the aim of getting students to remove themselves from the center of attention in hopes of being a better servant who is not easily rattled when hard issues arise. It is a strategy that simultaneously appeals to both the intellect and the emotions. It is skill-driven. It teaches students how to *Disagree Without Being Disagreeable*. It pushes students to their developmental edge, and emphasizes the need for skill-building. Heavy emphasis is put on challenging political correctness as a teaching paradigm, as well as pushing students to deeper levels of knowledge and awareness, and highlighting the importance of the *Acceptance of Teacher Dispositions*. While this approach does not ignore etiquette, trust-building, and process issues, it puts far more emphasis on the importance of *Growing Thicker Skin, Gaining Skills, and Becoming a Change Agent*.

5._____ **The Golden Rule, Trust Building, and Love Approach:** Multicultural education that puts a heavy emphasis on making sure educators *Create Trust* among students so that *Classrooms Become Safe Places* where controversial and delicate topics can be discussed with great care. This approach is often used by instructors who feel that change in society can only happen when change is first awakened within individuals. Great care must be taken, however, in making sure people feel safe and respected. Additional factors such as forgiveness, "putting the past in the past and moving on to build a better future, and collaboration" are seen as key ingredients of instructional strategies that make the most impact. This is somewhat similar to the Integration & Similarities Approach, but it is different because the focus there is collaboration and behavioral congruence. The focus here is reciprocal love, etiquette, and trust.

6._____ **The Human Relations Approach**: Includes multicultural strategies and curriculum that seeks to *strengthen the people-to-people skills and acumen of learners*. It emphasizes the acquisition of mindsets and skills geared to make the learner a *positive role model for young people to look up to*. This approach strongly believes that if you teach educators how to be better people, they are then more likely to make better decisions on behalf of their students and their colleagues and peers. Others learn by observing the behaviors you mentor. *The creation of the "world citizen"* is at the core of this approach. This is somewhat similar to the Cultural Differences & Bridge-Building Approach, but it is different because the focus there is on understanding and appreciating differences, whereas the focus here is learning how to role model leadership qualities regardless of race, gender, religion, ideology, poverty, abuse, etc. Overcoming obstacles is another key tenet.

_____

7._____ **Eliminate one of the Paradigms?** Directions: Of the six curriculum approaches listed above, which one should be eliminated on the grounds that the approach serves no useful purpose in the academic study of diversity, race relations, and multicultural education? (Note: If you feel all of the approaches are useful, mark a zero in the blank).

_____

Demographic Information:

8. _____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.

9. Age _____

10. Race/Ethnicity _____ (Note: do not put "human" or "American" for an answer)

11. Gender: Male _____ Female _____

12. Highest Academic Degree Obtained (Check One):

    High School Degree _____   Associate or Bachelor's Degree _____ Post Bachelor's Degree _____

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

14. _____ 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 Open-Ended Comments:

_____

Dr. Franklin Thompson (fthompson@unomaha.edu) is an associate professor at the **University of Nebraska at Omaha, Department of Teacher Education (TED)** in the College of Education. Dr. Thompson is the Team Leader for Human Relations instructors. He also has served 16 years on the Omaha City Council, and is active throughout the community regarding civil rights and social justice issues. His areas of research include, multicultural education, race relations, human relations, at-risk students, urban schools, communication skills, and counseling.