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Introduction

The United States is now comprised of multiple ethnicities with numerous cultural differences. We are seeing the same increase of diversity in the classroom (Stills & Ellison, 1993). However, studies reveal that minority graduation rates are substantially lower than those of the majority. For example, 2009 data indicates that eight percent of African Americans between the ages of 16 and 19 are either not in school or not high school graduates which doubles the four percent of Whites in the same age range (The Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2009). Hispanics (or Latinos) are even at a higher rate at 10 percent and American Indians have the highest rate, 13 percent (The Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2009). This information could be an indication that some minorities are experiencing their education process differently from the majority.

Asante writes, “We have been—in the United States and abroad—trapped in an educational system that has, by estranging us from our own culture and history, prepared us primarily for a subservient role in society” (Asante, 2008). How minorities experience society and education differently can, in part, be based on whether a minority came to the United States voluntarily (“immigrant”) or involuntarily (“non-immigrant”). Their perceptions vary based on their societal and education experiences. Ogbu (2003) discusses how the academic achievement of minority students can vary. First, voluntary immigrants are aware of the distinguishing factors between educational opportunities in the United States versus their native country; non-voluntary immigrants are only familiar with educational opportunities in the States, so, they view these academic liberties as privileges of white people. Second, voluntary and non-voluntary immigrants’ beliefs differ regarding the value of an education. Voluntary minorities see
education as a crucial element to being successful, whereas non-voluntary minorities do not. Instead, they are hesitant in believing that education leads to success. Third is the minorities’ relationship with “the system” (school and school authorities) differs based on voluntary status; this relationship includes three domains; social distance or segregation, conflict and mistrust, and pragmatic trust. Because of their “optimistic, pragmatic attitudes towards education,” voluntary minorities are not as concerned as non-voluntary minorities about social or residential segregation (Ogbu, 2003). Both groups mistrust white Americans but non-voluntary distrust them even more. Voluntary immigrants are more concerned with success and see teachers as “useful experts,” whereas non-voluntary are more concerned with the incorporation of their culture into the curriculum—they want to see themselves reflected in the education they are receiving and to know that the teachers genuinely “care for them” (Ogbu, 2003).

Ogbu’s further discusses how issues of identity, culture, language and ability vary by voluntary status. Voluntary immigrants come to the United States understanding that this is a new country and there will be changes. They are willing to adapt to their educational surroundings and make changes in order to be successful, for their own benefit. Non-voluntary immigrants are not as willing to change. Ogbu writes, “Some fear adopting White or school ways because they think it would mean replacing their own cultural and language identity or that it requires them to give up their cultural and language identities in order to successfully learn the school ways” (Ogbu, 2003).

Finally, Ogbu addresses differences in educational strategies or how the minorities go to school. This deals with mindset. The voluntary immigrant students “pay attention in class, follow rules, and do their schoolwork and homework” (Ogbu, 2003). Their parents and community members hold them accountable for their school performance. They want to be
successful. In contrast, Ogbu (2003) makes this strong point on behalf of non-voluntary immigrant students, “The strategies of non-voluntary minorities are overshadowed by their emphasis on social relations and caring rather than the practical considerations…They are mistrustful of schools and teachers, and feel alienated.” Their behaviors are not “conducive to school success” (Ogbu, 2003). Their parents and community members do not hold them accountable for their school performance; instead, they hold educators responsible.

Ogbu’s (2003) ideas indicate that minority non-voluntary immigrant students encounter a much more negative educational experience then their voluntary immigrant counterparts. These experiences point toward some cultural attitudes that can be difficult for educators to change, but also point toward other, more changeable factors. Specifically, incorporation of a pedagogy that emphasizes multicultural education (ME) could address several of the perspectives and concerns that non-immigrant minority students have regarding their education.

Multicultural education is the concept that all students, regardless of gender, ethnicity, race, culture, language, social class, religion, or exceptionality, are entitled to educational equality (Banks & Banks, 2007). Sleeter (1996) defines multicultural education as “social activism.” This term proposes that ME requires involvement - educators taking action to incorporate the educational needs of minorities.

Recognizing the challenges that educators face in teaching diverse groups, Banks (2007) introduces five dimensions to help with the implementation of ME. The first dimension is content integration which is simply the incorporation of multicultural content. This “deals with the extent to which teachers use examples and content from a variety of cultures and groups to illustrate key concepts, principles, generalizations, and theories in their subject area or discipline” (Banks & Banks, 2007). For example, in English/Literature books, written by
authors from different ethnicities, can introduce students to other cultures, and in Social Studies, students can learn about the multi-ethnic people who contributed to the growth and success of our country.

The second dimension is the knowledge construction process, which Banks states, “relates to the extent to which teachers help students to understand, investigate, and determine how the implicit cultural assumptions, frames of reference, perspectives, and biases within a discipline influence the ways in which knowledge is constructed within it” (Banks & Banks, 2007). An example of this would be to assign students to read a story with a number of diverse characters. Each student would give their perceptions of the story from the view of a particular character. Prejudice reduction is the third dimension, which relies on teachers to find creative ways to help students form “positive attitudes” towards other students that are from different backgrounds. This may be accomplished through lessons, activities, student interaction through group activities, and cultural exposure.

The fourth dimension of ME, an equity pedagogy, is when teachers customize teaching methods to help their diverse groups of students to achieve academic success. Cooperative methods in particular have been suggested as more effective pedagogical practices for helping minority students learn material (Slavin, 2012). An example of an equity pedagogy would be creating a panel of diverse students, working as a governing body with assigned positions, to construct and oversee a book recycling project. An empowering school culture is the final dimension, which requires the involvement of the teachers, the coaches, the principal and any other staff members that are directly involved with the students’ education. The school system must work as a unit, promoting unity and mutual respect among diverse groups. The
empowering educational environment works to ensure that all students, regardless of background, can succeed.

Maslow’s (1954) hierarchy of needs supports the idea that multicultural education is an important component for the education of minority students and as such gives educators a starting point from which to evolve. Maslow’s hierarchy consists of five levels, which include the physiological and emotional needs of humans. Each level must be individually achieved before moving to the next; each acting as a motivational stepping stone to the next. Midlevel in Maslow’s hierarchy of needs is Social Needs, which includes a sense of belonging. Within an educational context, this can include students’ need to feel incorporated into their educational society (Maslow, 1954). At level four, students need to feel value and self-worth, which leads to self-efficacy, which in turn leads to students’ self-motivation to continue to advance academically and in life (Maslow, 1954).

Connection is an important factor when learning. Sigmund Freud (1960) wrote about the significance of positive and negative group solidarity as they associated with identification. His stance is that humans have a basic need for inclusion, to be part of something greater than one’s self (Freud, 1960). The practices of ME takes into consideration the needs of minorities to feel included and may thus enable students to mentally develop skills that will be beneficial to them academically as well as socially. Mead (1951) echoing Freud’s notion of belonging, calls for educators to give constant consideration to cultural differences. Mead explains the existence of the conflict between “the school oriented toward the past” and “the school oriented toward the future.” Successful educator, author, and civil rights activist W.E.B. Du Bois stated the positive results that could come from inclusion as early as 1900, “If now the world of culture bends itself towards giving Negroes and other dark men the largest and broadest opportunity for education
and self-development, then this contact and influence is bound to have a beneficial effect upon
the world and hasten human progress” (Schaefer, 2011). The lack of ME, which likely results in
fewer feelings of inclusion, could hinder overall “human progress.”

Anecdotal reports verify that a sense of exclusion currently exists in our school systems. Asante (2008) writes about the disappointment and the disconnection he felt as a minority student. He wrote that his own school system had been, “a system that made African-Americans and all non-whites an ethnic footnote in American and world history. This is no light matter as one’s identity is often forged through what we learn in school” (Asante, 2008). Further, in his ethnographic study of affluent African-American students, Ogbu (2003) noted students’ frequent remarks about the lower expectations they felt were placed on them. Feeling like a “footnote” and as though others expect less of one does not indicate a full sense of inclusion; ME, by incorporating Minorities’ cultures into the curriculum, might provide the necessary ingredients for that sense of inclusion to blossom.

Once personal and social needs are met, students can focus on achieving their goals. However, student success also relies on self-efficacy, which is a person’s belief in her/his ability to do things, their drive (Bandura, 2006). Pajares (2002) writes about the effects of what people believe about themselves and their capabilities. He states, “Self-efficacy beliefs provide the foundation for human motivation, well-being, and personal accomplishment.” Differences in self-efficacy could be linked to the higher percentages of minorities that do not graduate from high school. It is possible that, if students feel culturally excluded and educationally unengaged, they begin to lack confidence in their capacity to use appropriate academic skills, even though they may possess them.
Another factor which may contribute to success or failure in the classroom, and which may be impacted by the presence or absence of ME, is cultural identity. Phinney and Ong (2007) explain that identity forms over time and is impacted by what transpires from childhood to adulthood. Erickson (1968) proposed that identity develops through “reflection and observation,” or as others suggest, through exploration which may lead to commitment (Berk, 2010). Unfortunately, some individuals never develop a true sense of identity, making them more volatile and unable to follow through on their commitments. Phinney and Ong (2007) state, “For Erikson, identity refers to a subjective feeling of sameness and continuity that provides individuals with a stable sense of self and serves as a guide to choices in key areas of one’s life.” (p. 274). Students living in a multicultural society face challenges involving adaptation. A classroom lacking ME may not provide information with which students can explore their cultural identities, making this particular dimension of identity more difficult to resolve. Phinney and Ong (2007) make the point that there is a strong correlation between a firm sense of cultural identity (ethnic identity) and academic achievement. They go on to say that, “A well-developed ethnic identity involves an awareness and understanding of one’s cultural heritage and a secure sense of oneself as a member of a particular cultural group,” and that identity development and culture are “inextricably linked” (Phinney & Ong, 2007). So, not only do diverse students need to feel a sense of belonging in the education setting but they need to feel comfortable about who they are culturally in order to succeed academically.

**Research on implementation of ME.**

A review of research about ME practices in the U.S. yields limited information. Some research has examined teachers’ attitudes toward ME and indicates that some educators see ME as “a minority or civil rights issue” and act as if minority inclusion has little or no impact on
students in their classrooms (Garcia & Pugh, 1992). Barry and Lechner (1995) note that research suggests that preservice teachers are ill-prepared to address with the challenges of multicultural education. Barry and Lechner (1995) constructed a survey to obtain information regarding preservice teachers’ attitudes and awareness of ME. Results revealed that the majority of preservice teacher participants are aware of the multiculturally diverse groups they will be teaching and are aware of some of the issues in the implementation of ME. However, they question their preparedness and ability to effectively follow through.

In another study, Vaughan (2004) explores the attitudes and awareness that prospective teachers have toward culturally responsive teaching and learning. Once again, the data concluded that prospective teachers are aware of the need for Multicultural Education. The participants in Vaughn’s (2004) study express confidence in working in diverse settings in the future. However, his study also raises an issue about the trend that is going on in institutions of higher learning and the end results. Prospective teachers attending these institutions are usually required to take only one course in Multicultural Education, yet teachers are being asked to be “culturally responsive” The effects of teachers’ education programs not incorporating more Multicultural Education leads to “a disservice to our prospective teachers” and denies these future teachers the “opportunity to have culturally responsive teachers embracing aspects of culturally responsive pedagogy” (Vaughn, 2004, p. 53).

Preservice teachers are not the only ones feeling discomfort or anxiety over multicultural diverse classrooms. Educators already working in the school systems are feeling the same emotions. Zembylas (2010) discusses the stress that European teachers are feeling because of the diversity in Europe, stating that immigration and multiculturalism have brought “new challenges” for educators in Europe (Zembylas, 2010). In his study, Zembylas asked teachers
how they were dealing with this diversity; discomfort was the overall consensus. However by
not making necessary changes such as cultural inclusion, minority students’ needs are excluded.
Zembylas (2010) notes that, “Awareness of the implications of discomfort in teaching and
teachers’ lives creates openings for alternative pedagogies that may transform the emotional lives
of teachers and their students” (p.715).

**ME and the English classroom.**

Not only do we know little about the integrated practices of ME in the school setting, but
we also lack much information about ME in curriculum-specific settings. Several curricula offer
the opportunity for implementation of some dimensions of ME; however, the English classroom
may be an educational context that provides the richest opportunities for ME implementation.

In the English classroom, at least four of the five dimensions of Bank’s conceptualization
of ME can easily be implemented. For example, educators can easily utilize Bank’s first
dimension, *content integration* through diverse literary materials. There is access to an
abundance of books written by authors from around the world that would allow students insight
into other cultures and the issues they face. Students may be to relate to some of these issues or
may come to a better understanding of the experiences of others. Diversity of reading materials
can also give minority students the opportunity to connect to authors of their own ethnicity and
to works to which they can relate. Minority students can enjoy the works of African authors like
Chinua Achebe from Nigeria, Anna Akhmatova from Russia, the Spanish author Miguel de
Cervantes, and Asian author Amy Tan. Not only does diverse literature expose students from
different cultural backgrounds to other cultures but they can discuss the different views and
perceptions they have about it, as well as the different viewpoints of the characters in the
literature (*knowledge construction*). They can attempt to relate to the foreign characters in the
stories or poems. Literature content can lead to meaningful classroom discussions and with each cultural exposure, possibly reduce prejudice both through discussion of the content as well as through interactions with classmates of varying backgrounds.

English teachers, additionally have the ability to incorporate equity pedagogy that addresses and can mitigate multicultural issues and concerns. For example, they can use an equity pedagogy to demonstrate to all students the importance that English teachers place on the success of their students’ academic achievement in the English classroom.

The purpose of my study, therefore, is to examine the state of practice of ME in the English classroom, and the relationship between ME and students’ cultural identity and self-efficacy. This study contributes to the literature in that it will examine actual classroom practices, rather than preservice teachers’ anticipation of their use of ME practices. Further, those practices will be measured using students’ perceptions, which are arguably more reflective of students’ educational experiences than teachers’ reports of their practices. Finally, this study will examine the use of ME practices within specific curriculum: English Literature.

I predicted that perceptions of ME practices in the high school English setting would have a positive and significant relationship with student self-efficacy as well as a positive and significant relationship with ethnic identity. I also planned to explore racial differences in perceptions of ME, self-efficacy, ethnic identity and their relationships to one another.

Methods

Participants. We recruited 124 freshmen students at a regional mid-sized university. The age range of the sample was 18-19, with a mean of 18.49, and the majority of participants (65%) were female. Of the students who provided information on ethnicity, the majority (72.6%) reported they were Caucasian, 14.5% reported they were Black, 8.1 % reported they
were Hispanic, 1.6% reported Asian and Pacific Islander and 3.2 % reported Biracial. This is proportionally representative of the university population. The majority of the 124 participants (60.5%) reported they attended high school from nearby regions, or immediate surroundings.

**Measures.** The Multicultural Education Scale (MES; Appendix A) was created for this study, consisting of some reframed items used by Barry & Lechner (1995) and others derived specifically for this study, for a total of 23 items that were worded to indicate HS English classroom experiences. For this scale, students were to rate their perceptions of whether HS English teachers engaged in standard ME practices. A 5-point Likert scale was used to measure participant perceptions by choosing a level of agreement. Reliability of the total scale was good, \( \alpha = .93 \).

Items from the MES were rationally divided into four subscales. General Content Integration (7 items, \( \alpha = .91 \)) measured perceptions of whether the teacher integrated multicultural materials into the curriculum. Specific Content Integration (6 items, \( \alpha = .83 \)) requested student perceptions of whether English teachers included multicultural materials specific to the student’s ethnicity. Multicultural Education Process (6 items, \( \alpha = .78 \)) consisted of items that measured perceptions of internal processes, such as teachers’ encouragement of students interaction and student success. Multicultural Pedagogy (4 items, \( \alpha = .77 \)) measured perceptions of teacher’s use of strategies that encourage learning for students of all backgrounds.

The Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure Scale (MEIM; Appendix B) is a six-item measure derived by Phinney and Ong (2007) to specifically measure ethnic exploration and commitment. The MEIM-R scale asks participants to rate their level of agreement on a 5-point Likert scale for items that address identity exploration and identity commitment; higher scores
indicate better resolution of identity. Reliabilities for the MEIM in this study were excellent, $\alpha = .89$.

Using Bandura’s (2006) suggestions for building self-efficacy scales, a 16-item High School Academic Self-Efficacy Scale (Appendix C) was created. The scale asked participants to rate their level of agreement, using a 5-point Likert scale, on items addressing comfort in seeking outside assistance for school work, planning and use of study skills, and perceptions of innate ability during their high school years. ($\alpha = .80$)

Bandura’s suggestions for building self-efficacy scales (2006) were also used to create a five-item Current General Self-Efficacy Scale ($\alpha = .77$; Appendix D). This scale’s items addressed anticipation of success and acceptance of self.

Again, using Bandura’s suggestions for building self-efficacy scales (2006), an eight-item; Current Academic Self-Efficacy Scale ($\alpha = .79$; Appendix E) was constructed. Participants rated the level of confidence they felt they could “do” in a particular subject area along a 10-point scale of confidence.

Two-items of the Current Academic Self-Efficacy Scale were extracted from a series of questions dealing with Literature, Reading and Writing to build the Current English Self-Efficacy Scale. However, because this scale only consisted of two items, reliabilities could not be calculated.

**Procedure.** Participants were recruited voluntarily and anonymously through an electronic recruitment system run by the university’s Department of Psychology. This system lists all currently available studies, from which potential participants can select those of most interest or value to them. Participants who took this study’s electronic survey received credit, which they could apply to any university course they were enrolled in which required or rewarded (through extra credit) participation in human research.

Upon first reading an electronic informed consent, participants were notified that continuing to complete the survey would be taken as consent. Participants at their convenience then electronically completed the demographic questions, followed by the Multicultural Education Scale which included the
Multicultural Education General Content Scale, the Multicultural Education Specific Content Scale, The Multicultural Process Scale, the Multicultural Pedagogy Scale, the Total Multicultural Education Scale, Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure Scale, the High School Academic Self-Efficacy Scale, the Current General Self-Efficacy Scale, and the Current Academic Self-Efficacy Scale, respectively. All procedures and measures were approved by the Institutional Review Board.

Results

Due to recruitment difficulties which led to low numbers of participants in each ethnic group beyond Caucasians, participants were regrouped for analyses into “majority” and “minority” (underrepresented ethnic groups) students. Grouping was based upon Ogbu’s (2003) classification of voluntary and involuntary students. Because Asian students are generally considered “voluntary” minorities, and because their rates of high school success are high (The Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2009), they were grouped with Caucasian students to create the “majority” group (N = 92). African-American, Hispanic/Latino, and Biracial students were grouped together to create the “minority” group (N = 32).

Differences in perceptions of ME practices between racial groups were assessed using t-tests. Results indicate significant racial differences in the perceptions of English teacher multicultural practices for General Content Integration, \( t(122) = 1.98, p<.05 \), Student-Specific Content Integration, \( t(122) = 2.58, p<.01 \), and Total ME, \( t(122) = 2.29, p<.05 \). Examination of the means indicates that, in all cases, the minority group perceived less ME practices than the majority group. (see Table 1).

Racial group comparisons also revealed significant differences for High School Academic Self-Efficacy, \( t(122) = 2.25, p<.05 \), such that it was significantly lower for minorities than the majority group (see Table 1).

Because racial differences in perceptions were noted, regressions among study variables were computed while controlling for race. Table 2 provides regression statistics for study variables. As hypothesized, Multicultural Education significantly and positively predicted Self-Efficacy, such that as Multicultural Education increased, so did Self-Efficacy. In addition, Multicultural Education significantly
and positively predicated Ethnic Identity, such that as Multicultural Education increased, so did Ethnic Identity (see Table 2).

The moderating effects of race on regression outcomes were assessed, and revealed a significant interaction between race and Perceptions of ME for ratings of High School Self-Efficacy ($b_3 = -0.34, t = -2.28, p<.05$). Examination of the conditional effect of Perceptions of ME on ratings of High School Self-Efficacy for each of the racial groupings indicates that, for the majority group, two people who differed one unit in Perceptions of ME were expected to differ .26 units in ratings of High School Self-Efficacy [$t(120) = 3.24, p<.01$], whereas for the minority group, two people who differed one unit in perceptions of ME were expected to differ .60 units in ratings of High School Self-Efficacy [$t(120) = 4.72, p<.01$], a much stronger relationship. See Table 3 for all values.

Moderating effects of race were also explored to examine potential interactions between race and Perceptions of ME for ratings of Ethnic Identity. The interaction effect approached significance, suggesting a trend ($b_3 = -0.41, t = -1.89, p = .06$). Examination of the conditional effect of Perceptions of ME for each of the racial groupings indicates that for the majority group, two people who differed one unit in Perceptions of ME were expected to differ .26 units in Ethnic Identity [$t(120) = 2.27, p = .02$]; however, the relationship was much stronger for the minority group, such that two people who differed one unit in Perceptions of ME were expected to differ .69 units in Ethnic Identity [$t(120) = 3.66, p<.01$]. Both effects are statistically significant, although the effect for the minority group appears to be much stronger. See Table 4 for all values.

Discussion

The results of my study indicate that minority students perceive less ME practices in the classroom than the majority students. There are multiple possible reasons for this difference. One possibility is that the students in the majority group feel the level of ME being taught in their high school classrooms were sufficient enough to more highly endorse those items. At the same time, minorities feel ME practices in their high school English classrooms were insufficient. Minorities may perceive less ME because they had a greater need to feel included and did not feel this need is being met in the classroom.
Whatever the case may be, it is problematic that minorities report less perception of Multicultural Education going on in High School English classrooms. Minorities are the at-risk group and need to feel an improved sense of inclusion.

As hypothesized, I found that perceptions of Multicultural Education practices in the English classroom predict greater self-efficacy and a better sense of ethnic identity. As perceptions of Multicultural Education practices increased so did the Ethnic Identity scores. Likewise, as total Multicultural Education increased so did High School Self-Efficacy. We do not know why they are related yet, but it does appear that Multicultural Education is strongly related to variables which predict success in school. There are several possible explanations for this relationship. For example, self-efficacy may perpetuate superior and inferior feelings, thus affecting perceptions of academic experiences. Perhaps students who have a greater sense of self-efficacy are more open to perceiving ME practices, and those students with low self-efficacy perceive less ME. Alternatively, an unmeasured factor, such as school finances, could explain the relationship between perceived ME practices and self-efficacy/ethnic identity. That is, schools or districts that receive more funding may be better equipped to offer teachers continued training in ME practices, as well as offering students multiple support programs that raise students’ levels of self-efficacy and ethnic identity. Schools that receive less funding would lack such resources.

Of course one other possible explanation for the relationships between perceived ME practices and self-efficacy/ethnic identity could be that minorities may be that ME truly affects students’ self-esteem and ability to better explore and commit to their ethnic identities. This explanation may be viable, because as Maslow (1954) emphasized, students need to feel value and self-worth, which includes feeling comfortable with who they are ethnically. Then, students can obtain self-efficacy, which leads to success in life. Although future research should attempt to answer the question regarding the nature of the ME/self-efficacy and ME/ethnic identity relationships, the possibility that ME affects student outcomes such as these emphasizes the importance of training teachers in how to infuse ME practices within their classes and curricula.
Limitations. Although this study presents interesting and novel information, limitations should be addressed. First, participants were college freshmen, 18 to 19 years of age, rather than currently enrolled high-school students, so they were thinking retrospectively about their high school experiences. Second, the study had small sample sizes, especially for minority representation. Although, the sample proportions are reflective of the proportions in the university population, the numbers are small enough that generalization of the results is difficult.

Further, the use of a college population may limit the variability of self-efficacy ratings. That is, the participants are already attending college and must have developed a certain level of self-effacy that has brought them to this point. Therefore, the full range of low to high self-efficacy was likely not well represented.

Finally, the data for this study was collected in a cross-sectional design. This therefore limits the conclusions regarding predictions and causality that can be drawn based upon the data.

Implications. This study suggests the potential importance of ME to all students, and particularly minority students, providing concrete reasons to support the regular implementation of teacher education programs and workshops. Although we are not yet aware of all the potential impacts of ME, data suggests strong relationships between ME, Self-Efficacy, and Ethnic Identity.

My study supports the continued education of pre-service teachers in ME practices as well as continuing ME education for practicing teachers because of its strong relationship to other positive students outcomes for all students, as well as because of minorities’ perception, compared to majority students, that ME practices are not as frequently employed. My results suggest the possibility that successful implementation of ME can predict better self-efficacy and more positive ethnic identity, perhaps because ME allows nonimmigrant minority students to see that their culture is being incorporated into the classroom and that educators care about the success of all students, not just a particular group. If this is the case, we need to continue to advance educationally by ensuring that cultural interweaving is taking place, particularly in the English classroom. Such practices will likely help minorities better relate to what is being taught in the classroom.
Further, teacher training programs should extend ME education in order to better equip future teachers with knowledge about ME, as well as enhance future teachers’ recognition of the importance of ME to all students. For example, Vaughn (2004) suggests increasing the number of courses in diversity that prospective teachers are required to take, embedding ME into course requirements, and requiring future teachers to spend more of their teaching requirements in diverse settings. Willis and Denicolo (2010) suggest the inclusion of a collective effort to employ and maintain a diverse group of teacher candidates. They also promote training in various educational settings as well as follow-up with the graduates, which should be done in the first few years of their profession. In-service teachers need support, coaching, and retooling (Willis & Denicolo, 2010).

In addition, given my study’s findings of racial discrepancies in how ME practices are perceived, practicing teachers may wish to utilize follow-up procedures with their students on their perceptions of classroom ME experiences. For example, teachers can encourage feedback through class discussions or anonymous brief questionnaires. It is recommended that the feedback process occur regularly, such as twice or more per school year.

My study also suggests many implications for future research. First, a high school population would have likely resulted in more accurate reporting, a longitudinal study of students enrolled in high school is in order. Data collected longitudinally in real time, rather than retrospectively, would allow for more solid and generalizable conclusions.

Second, this study could be additionally replicated in other parts of this country where there are more heterogeneous groups. More research in predominantly Majority and predominantly Minority high schools should also be done. The comparisons between the two should yield some interesting results. Are perceptions of ME, as well as its effects on identity development and self-efficacy, the same in these conditions, or do they differ?

Third, further research could also involve a comparison of school districts, as well as urban areas versus city schools. The research may reveal possible varying gaps in ME practices experienced by students based on location and allow these issues to be addressed.
Finally, since minorities experience Multicultural Education differently from the majority, it is recommended that future studies continue to reflect students’ educational experience versus teachers’ reports of their practices. Anonymous online or paper form surveys could be given to the students to fill out. The surveys could be designed after some of the scales used in this study, thus continuing to explore student perceptions. This may allow us to see potential gaps between what teachers think is happening versus what students are experiencing, which could be informative enough as to encourage better Multicultural Practices.

Mead (1951) explains that it is the responsibility of the school systems to continue to educate teachers to meet the needs of their students and to set a pattern “which will enable the teacher to grow through the years, instead of becoming stunted and distorted, affrighted by the increasing gap between herself and her pupils” (p. 34). The more comfortable teachers become with teaching using Multicultural Education practices, the more they will hopefully incorporate it. Greater frequency in the use of ME practices will thus possibly reduce students’ feelings of exclusion and increase academic success, which for many plays a vital role in leading a successful life in our Western culture. We, as educators, impact the lives of students. Hopefully the more we learn, the more we will help students feel included and be successful.
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Table 1

Means and standard deviations for study scales and subscales by racial grouping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale or Subscale</th>
<th>Majority Participants</th>
<th>Minority Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Content Integration</td>
<td>3.24 (0.71)</td>
<td>2.95 (0.69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Education of Students</td>
<td>3.05 (0.80)</td>
<td>2.62 (0.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Education Pedagogy</td>
<td>3.69 (0.85)</td>
<td>3.51 (0.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Identity</td>
<td>3.44 (0.73)</td>
<td>3.59 (0.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Academic Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>3.70 (0.52)</td>
<td>3.45 (0.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current General Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>4.55 (0.55)</td>
<td>4.29 (0.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Academic Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>7.57 (1.42)</td>
<td>7.30 (1.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Education Total</td>
<td>3.52 (0.63)</td>
<td>3.21 (0.68)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Standard deviations are in parentheses. Majority participants: $N = 92$. Minority participants: $N = 32$. 
Table 2

*Regressions Among Study Variables, Controlling for Race*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Predictor Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME General Content</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME Specific Content</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME Process</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.60**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME Pedagogy</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.35**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total ME</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Identity</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.19*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p < .05, **p < .01
Table 3

*Regressions Estimating High School Self-Efficacy from Perceptions of ME in the English Classroom, Race, and Their Interaction*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$a$: constant</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$b_1$: Perceptions of ME</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$b_2$: Race</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$b_3$: Interaction</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-2.28</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $R = 0.50$, $R^2 = 0.25$, $F(3, 120) = 13.04$, $p<.01$. 
Table 4

*Regressions Estimating Ethnic Identity from Perceptions of ME in the English Classroom, Race, and Their Interaction*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$a$: constant</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$b_1$: Perceptions of ME</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$b_2$: Race</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$b_3$: Interaction</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>-1.89</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $R = 0.38$, $R^2 = 0.14$, $F(3, 120) = 6.56$, $p<.01$. 
Appendix A

Multicultural Education Scale

1. My English teachers talked about my culture in class.
2. My English teachers taught about my ethnicity in class.
3. My English teachers used activities or games where we tried to win.
4. My English teachers seemed to care about our ethnicities.
5. My English teachers encouraged pride in our cultures/ethnicities.
6. My English teachers used different ways to teach us about many cultures.
7. My English teachers seemed to have thought that teaching about diversity is important.
8. My English teachers thought that it is important for us to learn about different cultures.
9. My English teachers thought it was important for us to read stories or learn information about my own race or ethnicity.
10. My English teachers taught about different cultures.
11. My English teachers taught about different ethnic groups.
12. My English teachers used material that was about or was written by people of different cultures.
13. My English teachers made us aware of the differences between cultures.
14. My English teachers helped me understand that there are usually two sides to every story.
15. My English teachers used classroom activities that helped me learn.
16. My English teachers often used group activities.
17. My English teachers assigned us to work together in groups or pairs.
18. My English teachers let us pick materials from our own culture or ethnicity to work on.
19. My English teachers tried to help us be comfortable with each other, no matter what our background is.
20. My English teachers were comfortable talking to us, no matter what our background is.
21. My English teachers seemed to have thought that all of their students could succeed.

22. If I put forth the effort, I should be able to succeed in this school.

23. The school has different ways to help students when they have difficulties.
Appendix B

MEIM-R Scale

1. I have spent time trying to find out more about my ethnic group, such as its history, traditions, and customs
2. I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group
3. I understand pretty well what my ethnic group membership means to me
4. I have often done things that will help me understand my ethnic background better
5. I have often talked to other people in order to learn more about my ethnic group
6. I feel a strong attachment towards my own ethnic group
Appendix C

High School Academic Self-Efficacy Scale

1. I was comfortable asking English teachers to help me when I got stuck on schoolwork in High School
2. I was comfortable asking other students to help me when I got stuck on schoolwork in High School
3. I was comfortable asking my parents to help me with my homework when I was in High School
4. Other students asked me for help when they got stuck on schoolwork
5. I turned in my homework assignments on time in High School
6. I studied regularly in High School
7. I focused on the lessons that were taught in class
8. I did not like to study in High School
9. I always took notes about lessons in my High School classes
10. I motivated myself to do my homework in High School
11. I did my homework so I would not get into trouble with my parents or English teachers
12. I used the library as a resource for information when I was in High School
13. I planned my schoolwork for the day in High School
14. I organized my schoolwork
15. My memory was good when it came to remembering information given in High School classes and from the textbooks.
16. I had a place to study without distractions
Appendix D

Current General Self-Efficacy Scale

1. I live up to what I expect of myself
2. I will graduate college
3. I have what it takes to succeed educationally
4. I have what it takes to succeed in life
5. I like who I am now
Appendix E

Current Academic Self-Efficacy Scale

1. Please rate how certain you are that you can do General Mathematics by selecting one of the numbers from 1 to 10

2. Please rate how certain you are that you can do Probability and Statistics by selecting one of the numbers from 1 to 10

3. Please rate how certain you are that you can do Sciences by selecting one of the numbers from 1 to 10

4. Please rate how certain you are that you can do Reading, Writing, and Language Skills by selecting one of the numbers from 1 to 10

5. Please rate how certain you are that you can do Computers by selecting one of the numbers from 1 to 10

6. Please rate how certain you are that you can do a Foreign Language by selecting one of the numbers from 1 to 10

7. Please rate how certain you are that you can do Sociology by selecting one of the numbers from 1 to 10

8. Please rate how certain you are that you can do Literature by selecting one of the numbers from 1 to 10