Fostering the Multicultural Efficacy of Principal Candidates

Karen D. Jones
ECU, joneskare15@ecu.edu

Fostering the Multicultural Efficacy of Principal Candidates

School leaders have a key role in creating and supporting school climates that address and disrupt racism and xenophobia (Milner, 2020). Between 2000-2016 the number of students attending public K-12 schools in the United States increased, exceeding an enrollment of 50 million (de Bray et al., 2019). With that growth, White students made up less than 50% of the United States school population in 2014-2015 (McFarland et al., 2019). Principals are not always prepared to lead in diverse school environments. Often school leaders believe that being color-blind or color-evasive so that they "don't see color or race" is an adequate response to these demographic changes in their schools (Diem & Welton, 2020). This thinking can lead to surface-level responses of multi-cultural celebrations and isolated professional development sessions which only create an illusion of appreciation with no real change (Gorski, 2019; Welton et al., 2015). Race is constantly present in policy and practice in public schools, whether clandestine or overt (Joseph et al., 2020). Principals need support in developing skills in addressing the needs of diverse students and families.

Principal preparation programs can help preservice school leaders develop a mindset of social justice advocacy (Crawford et al., 2014). This study will examine the multicultural efficacy of pre-service principals. Research demonstrates that increased efficacy can lead to change in future behaviors (Bandura, 1986). Principals who believe they can serve students and families from diverse backgrounds are more likely to be successful. The purpose of the study was to answer the following research question:

How is the multicultural efficacy of principal candidates affected by their participation in diversity seminars with reflection activities during their year-long internship?

Review of Literature

Principal Preparation Programs

The job of the school leader is "not only managing our schools, but also of leading them through an era of profound social change that has required fundamental rethinking of what schools do and how they do it" (Levine, 2005, p. 5). Principals have a significant impact on quality education for all students (Perrone & Tucker, 2018; Leithwood et al., 2010; Robinson et al., 2008). Unfortunately, many university principal preparation programs do not reflect the actual job of a principal (Davis et al., 2016).

It is critical that principal preparation programs utilize coursework and field internships to prepare socially just school leaders (Stone-Johnson et al., 2021). Field experiences are not enough to prepare leaders with a focus on social justice. Many school leaders act from a deficit mindset regarding students from diverse backgrounds (Flessa, 2009; Nelson & Guerra, 2014). Research has shown that principal preparation programs need to add experiences and curriculum for equity-focused leadership (Anderson et al., 2018; Barakat et al., 2019; Stone-Johnson et al., 2021). Barakat et al. (2019) found principal preparation programs provide a positive and statistically significant effect on the candidates' cultural competence. Literature demonstrates that many principal preparation programs provide little focus on social justice leadership (Brown, 2004; Cambron-McCabe & McCarthy, 2005; Stone-Johnson, Gray & Wright, 2021).

School Leadership for Social Justice

Schools in the United States reflect demographic changes leading to a more racially and ethnically diverse student body (Aud et al., 2011; Grothaus et al., 2010; Shrestha, 2006; Wazwaz, 2015). Theoharis (2007) provides the following definition of social justice leadership, "principals make issues of race, class, gender, disability, sexual orientation, and other historically

and currently marginalized conditions in the United States central to their advocacy, leadership, practice and vision" (p. 223). The need for social justice leadership in schools is well documented (Macedo, 2994; Spring, 2007; Zinn, 2003). School leaders must understand the issues that impact students, schools and families (Capper et al., 2006; Jean-Marie et al., 2009; Merchant & Shoho, 2006). Some principal preparation programs focus on traditional ideas of budgeting, scheduling and supervision (Hernandez & Marshall, 2016). To create social justice oriented leaders, preparation programs should focus on curriculum and pedagogy that provides skills required to achieve social justice (Capper et al., 2006).

Preparing social justice leaders for diverse schools is "complex and multidimensional" (Theoharis, 2007, p. 249). Many principal preparation programs provide a deficit focus for candidates by looking at test scores and the achievement gap (Skousen, 2020). The literature shows that programs should move to a model that recognized the assets of diverse school populations (Marshall & Oliva, 2006; Valencia, 2000). Liou and Hermanns (2017) found schools leaders can facilitate change when they focus on the values of diverse learners in a school.

Deficit thinking blames the student for their failure and does not examine the systems within the school institution (Stone-Johnson et al., 2021). School leaders lack motivation to engage in school reform or alter their own behaviors if the blame is on the individual student (Garcia & Guerra, 2004; Nelson & Guerra, 2014). Many educators do not realize they act from a deficit perspective because the ideas are embedded in the systems of schools (Weiner, 2006). Seventy-two percent of educators in a study looking at two states exhibited deficit thinking regarding diverse student populations (Nelson & Guerra, 2014). Research is needed to find how principal preparation programs can work to rectify deficit beliefs (Stone-Johnson, Gray & Wright, 2021).

There is no agreement in the literature of what a principal preparation program should do to prepare leaders with a social justice mindset (Capper et al., 2006; Carpenter, 2012; Furman, 2012; McKenzie et al., 2008; Stone-Johnson & Wright, 2019). Critical self-reflection embedded in coursework develop principal candidates' dispositional thinking (Jacobson et al., 2015; Waterson, 2015). Critical reflection can impact the dispositions of principal candidates in a positive manner (Allen et al., 2017). An inside-out approach, centering on the individual, encourages reflection on their own beliefs (Lindsey et al., 2009). Jones and Ringler (2017) found using an inside-out approach with a structured study of diversity in schools provided principal candidates the opportunity to explore their own biases.

Description of the Monthly Diversity Seminars

The principal preparation program in this study consists of two years of study offered in a cohort model. The second year of the principal preparation program includes a 1000-hour internship. This internship consists of field experiences in a K-12 school, while being supervised and coached by practicing school principal and university supervisors. Interns reflect weekly and monthly on their experiences, tying them to relevant state and national standards for school leaders. One part of the reflection focuses on the learnings from the monthly diversity seminars.

The monthly diversity seminars focus on school leaders' roles in providing safe, welcoming learning spaces for students, staff and community. The topics discussed in the seminars included: micro aggressions and implicit bias, race, socioeconomic status, language diversity, sexual orientation and gender identity, and religion. Each month interns are provided with current research to review prior to the online synchronous seminar meeting. During the seminar, community members serve as speakers discussing their experiences in K-12 schools as a member of a diverse community. Principal interns are able to learn best practices from

examples of school leaders in these communities and also learn from the community members what could have been done differently if they felt unsafe or unwelcomed at school.

Interns then go back to their school site and reflect on their learnings from that month in their particular context. They then reflect on what they learned from the research, seminar speakers, and school site. Looking through the lens of the monthly diversity topic, they can examine attitudes, practices and policies in their school and district. For example, when discussing racial diversity in schools, interns are encouraged to review their school and district data in areas of discipline, special education and honors course enrollment. They are also asked to listen to language of faculty and staff when discussing different racial groups of students and their families. The interns then apply what they learned to create a plan they would implement when they reach a school leadership position. This plan may include professional development activities for staff or community events for example. The purpose of these events is to build a space of inclusion for diverse families and students.

Self-Efficacy

Bandura's (1986) cognitive theory posits that thought mediates knowledge into action. Individuals reflect on their own experiences, and then their beliefs are a way to understand new experiences and generate future behaviors (Abelson, 1979; Dewey, 1933; Pajares, 1992). Future behaviors are adjusted based on an individual's beliefs and their previous behavior outcomes (Pajares, 1996). According to Bandura (1996), self-efficacy is "beliefs in one's capabilities to organize and execute the course of action required to manage prospective situations" (p. 2). Efficacy determines the amount of effort one will apply to a task and how long they will persist when faced with obstacles (James, 1885/1975). Self-efficacy can be measured because it is situation oriented. Bandura's (1986) research demonstrates that an individual's proficiency can

be matched to specific results to predict future behaviors. Guyton & Wesche's (2005) Multicultural Efficacy Scale was used in this study.

The Study

Sample

To address this study question, the Multicultural Efficacy Scale (MES) (Guyton & Wesche, 2005) was given to 42 principal interns before and after participating in monthly diversity seminars. This group of 42 principal candidates was a convenience sample of students participating in principal internship courses. Twenty-five (60%) of the interns were White and 17 (40%) were Black or African American. Forty (95%) principal interns identified as Heterosexual and two (5%) chose not to disclose their sexual orientation. Thirty-nine (93%) of the interns identified as Christian and three (7%) stated they had no religious affiliation.

From the 42 participating interns, 12 volunteered to participate in virtual focus groups. The demographic makeup of the focus groups was 83% (10 participants) Black or African American and 17% (2 participants) were White. The 12 participants were grouped into two focus groups of six interns in each. They were grouped based on convenience of scheduling the virtual focus group sessions.

Data Collection

Guyton & Wesche (2005) created the Multicultural Efficacy Scale (MES) to examine a teacher's efficacy in a multicultural setting. Their scale includes 35 items across subsections: experience, knowledge, efficacy, and attitude. Each factor is ranked using a Likert scale. A benefit of the scale is that it measures not just a teacher's attitudes, but the teacher's efficacy in multicultural settings (Guyton & Wesche, 2005). Teachers' efficacy in their abilities positively relates to the teacher's ability to create a secure, accepting classroom climate. Ashton & Webb

(1986) found that teacher efficacy is related to better teaching practices with low-achieving students. A caution is that a single scale, such as MES, must be used with other measures to determine a person's complete multicultural perspective.

The MES is a valid and reliable instrument with a Cronbach's alpha level of 0.89. According to Guyton & Wesche (2005), the MES should not be used in isolation as the only measure of multicultural efficacy. For that reason, focus group interviews were also completed with a voluntary group of 12 participants.

The focus groups were recorded and transcribed. Thematic analysis of the participants' responses in the focus groups was conducted using the process developed by Braun & Clarke (2006). Thematic analysis is a method for recognizing and analyzing patterns within qualitative data. Braun & Clarke (2006) describe six phases of thematic analysis: 1) familiarize yourself with the data; 2) generate initial codes; 3) search for themes; 4) review themes; 5) define and name themes; and 6) produce the report. This approach of thematic analysis was developed in the field of psychology and can be used in a variety of epistemologies and research questions (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Member checks were completed after the thematic analysis to attempt to validate the themes discovered by the researcher.

Data Analysis

Principal preparation student interns completed the MES prior to the first diversity seminar (pre-test) and again after the internship and final seminar (post-test). For clarity, the survey provided the following statement at the beginning, "The terms 'diversity' and 'people different from me' used throughout the survey are meant to include people of different races, ethnic groups, cultures, religions, socio-economic classes, sexual orientations, and physical abilities." As shown in Tables 1-3, principal candidates indicated a positive shift in their attitudes

and efficacy after the year-long diversity seminars. There was little to no change in the Experience section of the MES (Table 1) from the pre-test to the post-test. This was expected as the Experience section asks questions about childhood and past experiences which remained stagnant.

In the Attitude section of the survey (Table 2), the greatest change was seen with question 10, *Discussing ethnic traditions and beliefs in school leads to disunity and arguments between students from different cultures.* In the pre-test, three (7.1%) students "Agreed Somewhat" with that statement and in the post test, none (0.0%) of the students "Agreed Somewhat" with that statement. Also, in the pre-test, none (0.0%) of the interns "Disagreed Strongly" with the item, that is compared to six (14.3%) interns in the post test.

The Efficacy section of the survey showed the greatest changes from the pre- to post-tests (Table 3). In question 16, *I can adapt instructional methods to meet the needs of learners from diverse groups,* two (4.8%) interns chose "I am quite confident that this would be easy for me to do" in the pre-test. In the post test, 17 (40.1%) principal interns chose that response. Question 18, *I can develop instructional methods that dispel myths about diverse groups,* also showed a large change. Two (4.8%) interns selected "I am quite confident that this would be easy for me to do" in the pre-test. After the diversity seminars, 12 (28.6%) chose that answer. In the pre-test 6 (14.3%) interns said "I am quite confident that this would be easy for me to do" for question 19, *I can analyze instructional materials for potential stereotypical and/or prejudicial content.* In the post-test, that number rose to 30 (71.4%) of principal interns. Question 25, *I can identify cultural biases in commercial materials used in teaching,* had six (14.3%) interns choose "I am quite confident that this would be easy for me to do" before participating in the diversity seminars. In the post test, 39 (92.9%) agreed with that statement. In the pre-test, 12 (28.6%) interns chose "I

am quite confident that this would be easy for me to do" for question 28, *I can identify school practices that may harm diverse students.* In the post test that number increased to 27 (64.3%). For question 33, *I can help diverse students view history and current events from diverse perspectives,* the pre-test revealed 12 (28.6%) agree with "I am quite confident that this would be easy for me to do." In the post test, 39 (92.9%) interns agreed with that statement. The final question of the MES is around participants' beliefs about teaching.

Question 35 of the MES (Table 4) presents five statements that participants were asked to choose from that most closely reflected their beliefs about teaching. The statements were:

1) If every individual learned to accept and work with every other person, then there would be no intercultural problems.

2) If all groups could be helped to contribute to the general good and not seek special recognition, we could create a unified America.

3) All cultural groups are entitled to maintain their own identity.

4) All cultural groups should be recognized for their strengths and contributions.

5) Some groups need to be helped to achieve equal treatment before we can reach the goals of a democratic society.

The largest changes occurred with statement 3 and statement 5 between the pre-test and post-test. For statement 3, 10 individuals (23.8%) chose it during the pre-test and no individuals chose it for their post-test response. Statement 5 was selected by 9 individuals (21.4%) in the pre-test and by 23 individuals (54.8%) in the post-test. The quantitative data collected through the MES was supplemented with qualitative data collected through focus groups.

The focus group response data revealed the themes of positive change of attitude and increased efficacy of participants. Interns' attitudes around their own perceptions and attitudes of

student and family diversity shifted from the beginning to the end of the study. This is evidenced through statements including:

> *"I didn't realize that I was biased against some students and families."*
>
> *"Before [the diversity seminars] I thought I was treating all students fairly."*
>
> *"I see now that I was treating students equally but not equitably."*
>
> *"I was only including views of groups like me. I didn't think of all the different kinds of groups that make up my school."*

The second theme that emerged from the qualitative data was a positive change in intern participants' efficacy to work with diverse students and families. Some quotations that demonstrate this finding are:

> *"I now have the knowledge to make changes in my class."*
>
> *"As a principal, I can provide PD to help my teachers understand their own biases and the impacts on students."*
>
> *"My lens for looking at discipline data and special education data has changed. I can make a difference as a leader by not letting my biases impact student achievement."*
>
> *"I see the problems with some of our classroom materials not representing different groups. I can find more different things for the school that show our families."*
>
> *"Some of them [instructional materials] don't show all groups in a fair light. Now I see that and can choose a variety of views."*

Discussion

Shifting demographics in United States K-12 schools requires school leaders to embrace a social justice mindset (Macedo, 2994; Spring, 2007; Zinn, 2003). They cannot work from a

deficit perspective to advocate and support diverse students and families. Efficacy is a measure of an individual's perceptions and predictor of future actions (Abelson, 1979; Bandura, 1986; Dewey, 1933; Pajares, 1992). Increasing principal candidates' efficacy around multicultural issues will likely improve their social justice advocacy and leaders and principals. Data from this study indicates that examining diversity through seminars during a principal preparation internship increases positive attitudes and efficacy.

Interns in this study were all practicing teachers or other school practitioners, such as instructional coaches. The principal preparation program in this study is designed for working professionals with evening classes. There is concern that the multicultural efficacy in the pre test was low. This implies that teachers in schools in this study did not have strong feelings of multicultural efficacy. There is wondering what this means for students and families they worked with in their role as teachers and teacher leaders. Further study could examine the impacts of poor multicultural efficacy on the work of teachers and their impacts on students.

A follow-up study could be completed with the participants from this study to see what social justice-oriented actions they actually take as school leaders and principals. This would help determine if the change in attitudes and increase in efficacy actually leads to new behaviors in the area of multiculturalism and social justice. Future studies could replicate the diversity seminars and reflection model to see if similar results are found. Since this study was completed at one University in the southeastern United States, setting the study in diverse geographic locations to measure results would also be helpful.

In a study such as this, it is not possible to definitively say that the diversity seminars alone directly led to a shift in attitudes and behaviors. The participants did reference the seminars and reflection activities in their focus group responses. Interns are operating in complex systems

of school, work and social activities. Any of these could affect attitude and efficacy, or they could work in combination to make changes in an individual. That being said, this study presents a promising opportunity for principal preparation programs to foster the multicultural efficacy of their interns through a diversity seminar series.

References

Anderson, E. et al (2018). Examining university leadership preparation: An analysis of program attributes and practices. *Journal of research on leadership education*, 13(4), 375-397.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Barakat, M., Reames, E. & Kensler, L.A. (2019). Leadership preparation programs: Preparing culturally competent educational leaders. *Journal of research on leadership education,* 14(3), 212-235.

Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101.

Cameron-McCabe, N. & McCarthy, M.M. (2005). Educating school leaders for social justice. *Educational policy,* 19(1), 201-222.

Crawford, E.R., Arnold, N.W. & Brown, A. (2014). From preservice leaders to advocacy leaders: exploring intersections in standards for advocacy in educational leadership and school counseling*. International Journal of Leadership in Education, 17*(4), 481-502.

deBray, C., Musu, L., McFarland, J., Wilkinson-Flicker, S., Diliberti, M., Zhang, A., Branstetter, C. & Wang, X. (2019). *Status and trends in the education of racial and ethnic groups 2018.* (NCES 2019-038). U.S. Department of Education .Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch

Dewey, J. (1933). How we think: A restatement of the relation of reflective thinking to the educational process*. Health*, 35(64), 690-698.

Diem, S., Welton, A.D., Franderberg, E. & Holme, J.J. (2016). Racial diversity in the suburbs: How race-neutral responses to demographic change perpetuate inequity in suburban

school districts. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 19*(4), 731-762.

Diem, S. & Welton, A.D. (2020). *Anti-Racist Educational Leadership and Policy: Addressing Racism in Public Education.* Taylor & Francis Group.

Flessa, J. (2009). Urban school principals, deficit frameworks, and implications for leadership. *Journal of school leadership,* 19(3), 334-373.

Furman, G. (2012). Social justice leadership as praxis: Developing capacities through preparation programs. *Educational administration quarterly*, 48(2), 191-229.

Garcia, S.B. & Guerra, P.L. (2004). Deconstructing deficit thinking: Working with educators to create more equitable learning environments. *Education and urban society,* 36(2), 150-168.

Gorski, P. (2019). Avoiding racial equity detours. *Educational Leadership, 76*(7), 56-61.

Jacobson, S., McCarthy, M. & Pounder, D. (2015). What makes a leadership preparation program exemplary? *Journal of research on leadership education,* 10(1), 63-76.

James, W. (1975). *Pragmatism*. Cambridge, MS: Harvard University Press. (Original work published 1885).

Joseph, A.A., Wilcox, S.M., Hnilica, R.J. & Hansen, M.C. (2020). Keeping race at the center of school discipline practices and trauma-informed care: An interprofessional framework. *Children & Schools, 42*(3), 161-170.

McFarland, J., Hussar, B., Zhang, J., Wang, X., Wang, K., Hein, S., Diliberti, M., Forrest Cataldi, E., Bullock Mann, F. & Barmer, A. (2019). *The Condition of Education 2019.* (NCES 2019-144). U.S. Department of Eductaion. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2019144

Milner, H.R. (2020). Foreward in Anti-Racist Educational Leadership and Policy: Addressing Racism in Public Education. Taylor & Francis Group. (Sarah Diem and Anjale D. Welton, eds)

Nelson, S.W. & Guerra, P.L. (2014). Educator beliefs and cultural knowledge: Implications for school improvement efforts. *Educational administration quarterly,* 50(1), 67-95.

Pajares, F. (1996). Self-efficacy beliefs in academic settings. *Review of Educational Research,* 66(4), 543-578.

Stone-Johnson, C. & Wright, C. (2019). Leadership preparation for social justice in educational administration. In R. Wright (Ed.) Leadership Preparation for Social Justice in Educational Administration. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer Publishing.

Stone-Johnson, C., Gray, C. & Wright, C. (2021). Learning to lead socially just schools: An exploration of candidate readiness for equity-focused principal preparation in the United States. *Professional development in education*, 47(1), 36-49.

Theoharis, G. (2007). Social justice educational leaders and resistance: Toward a theory of social justice leadership. *Educational administration quarterly*, 43(2), 221-258.

Waterson, B. (2015). Environmental scan: Principal preparation programs. Available at https://www.aitsl.edu.au/docs/default-source/default-document-library/environmental-scan-principal-preparation-programs-(screen).pdf?sfvrsn=ecaaec3c_0 (accessed 28 January 2022).

Weiner, L. (2006). Challenging deficit thinking. *Educational leadership,* 64(1), 42.

Welton, A.D., Diem, S. & Holme, J.J. (2015). Color conscious, cultural blindness: Suburban school districts and demographic change. *Education and Urban Society, 47*(6), 695-722.

Table 1

Multicultural Efficacy – Experience Section

Question		Never	Rarely	Occasionally	Frequently
1) As a child, I played with people different from me.	Pre-Test	2 4.8%	10 23.8%	28 66.7%	2 4.8%
	Post Test	2 4.8%	10 23.8%	27 64.3%	3 7.1%
2) I went to school with diverse students as a teenager.	Pre-Test	0 0%	11 26.2%	25 60.0%	6 14.3%
	Post Test	0 0%	11 26.2%	25 60.0%	6 14.3%
3) Diverse people lived in my neighborhood when I was a child growing up.	Pre-Test	4 9.5%	27 64.3%	8 19.0%	3 7.1%
	Post Test	4 9.5%	27 64.3%	8 19.0%	3 7.1%
4) In the past I chose to read books about people different from me.	Pre-Test	0 0%	2 4.8%	33 78.6%	7 16.7%
	Post Test	0 0%	2 4.8%	34 81.0%	6 14.3%
5) A diverse person was one of my role models when I was younger.	Pre-Test	1 2.4%	31 73.8%	9 21.4%	1 2.4%
	Post Test	1 2.4%	31 73.8%	9 21.4%	1 2.4%

6) In the past I chose to watch TV shows and movies about people different than me.	Pre-Test	0 0%	8 19.0%	8 19.0%	18 42.9%
	Post Test	0 0%	8 19.0%	8 19%	18 42.9%
7) As a teenager, I was on the same team and/or club with diverse students.	Pre-Test	1 2.4%	2 4.8%	20 47.6%	19 45.2%
	Post Test	1 2.4%	2 4.8%	20 47.6%	19 45.2%

Table 2

Multicultural Efficacy – Attitude Section

Question		Disagree Strongly	Disagree Somewhat	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly
1) Teachers should adapt lesson plans to reflect the different cultures represented in the classroom.	Pre-Test	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	2 / 4.8%	40 / 95.2%
	Post Test	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	42 / 100%
2) Teachers should provide opportunities for children to share cultural differences in food, dress, family life and beliefs.	Pre-Test	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	42 / 100%
	Post Test	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	42 / 100%
3) Discussing ethnic traditions and beliefs in school leads to disunity and arguments between students from different cultures.	Pre-Test	0 / 0%	39 / 93.0%	3 / 7.1%	0 / 0%
	Post Test	6 / 14.3%	36 / 85.7%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
4) Children should be taught mostly by teachers of their own ethnic and cultural background.	Pre-Test	37 / 88.1%	3 / 7.1%	2 / 4.8%	0 / 0%
	Post Test	38 / 90.5%	2 / 4.8%	2 / 4.8%	0 / 0%
	Pre-Test	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	2 / 4.8%	40 / 95.2%

5) It is essential to include the perspectives of diverse groups while teaching about American history that are common to all Americans.	Post Test	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	42 100.0%
6) Curricula and textbooks should include the contributions of most, if not all, cultural groups in our society.	Pre-Test	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	42 100.0%
	Post Test	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	42 100.0%
7) The classroom library should reflect the racial and cultural differences in the class.	Pre-Test	0 0%	0 0%	2 4.8%	40 95.2%
	Post Test	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	42 100.0%

Table 3

Multicultural Efficacy Scale – Efficacy Section

Question		I do not believe I could do this very well.	I could probably do this if I had to, but it would be difficult for me.	I believe that I could do this reasonably well, if I had time to prepare.	I am quite confident that this would be easy for me to do.
1) I can provide instructional activities to help students develop strategies for dealing with racial confrontations.	Pre-Test	37 88.1%	3 7.1%	2 4.8%	0 0%
	Post Test	28 66.7%	6 14.3%	8 19.0%	0 0%
2) I can adapt instructional methods to meet the needs of learners from diverse groups.	Pre-Test	0	3 7.1%	37 88.1%	2 4.8%
	Post Test	0 0%	0 0%	25 59.5%	17 40.1%
3) I can develop materials appropriate for the multicultural classroom.	Pre-Test	0	2 4.8%	38 90.5%	2 4.8%
	Post Test	0 0%	0 0%	35 88.3%	7 16.7%

4) I can develop instructional methods that dispel myths about diverse groups.	Pre-Test	2 4.8%	6 14.3%	32 76.2%	2 4.8%
	Post Test	0 0%	4 9.5%	26 62.0%	12 28.6%
5) I can analyze instructional materials for potential stereotypical and/or prejudicial content.	Pre-Test	0 0%	6 14.3%	30 71.4%	6 14.3%
	Post Test	0 0%	0 0%	12 28.6%	30 71.4%
6) I can help students examine their own prejudices.	Pre-Test	3 7.1%	13 31.0%	26 61.9%	0 0%
	Post Test	0 0%	9 21.4%	31 74.0%	2 4.8%
7) I can present diverse groups in our society in a manner that will build mutual respect.	Pre-Test	0 0%	3 7.1%	25 60.0%	4 9.6%
	Post Test	0 0%	0 0%	12 54.5%	22 52.1%
8) I can develop activities that increase the self-confidence of diverse students.	Pre-Test	4 9.5%	30 71.4%	8 19.0%	0 0%
	Post Test	1 2.4%	20 47.6%	20 47.6%	1 2.4%
9) I can provide instruction showing how prejudice affects individuals.	Pre-Test	2 4.8%	22 52.1%	18 42.9%	0 0%
	Post Test	0 0%	15 35.7%	15 35.7%	12 54.5%
10) I can plan instructional activities to reduce prejudice toward diverse groups.	Pre-Test	0 0%	23 54.8%	14 33.3%	5 12.0%

23

	Post	0	11	22	9
	Test	0%	26.2%	52.4%	21.4%
11) I can identify cultural biases in commercial materials used in teaching.	Pre-Test	0	0	36	6
		0%	0%	85.7%	14.3%
	Post Test	0	0	3	39
		0%	0%	7.1%	92.9%
12) I can help students work through problem situations caused by stereotypical and/or prejudicial attitudes.	Pre-Test	4	34	4	0
		9.5%	81.0%	9.5%	0%
	Post Test	2	15	20	5
		4.8%	35.7%	47.6%	11.9%
13) I can get students from diverse groups to work together.	Pre-Test	0	3	3	36
		0%	7.4%	7.4%	85.7%
	Post Test	0	0	4	38
		0%	0%	9.5%	90.5%
14) I can identify school practices that may harm diverse students.	Pre-Test	0	5	25	12
		0%	11.9%	59.5%	28.6%
	Post Test	0	0	15	27
		0%	0%	35.7%	64.3%
15) I can identify solutions to problems that may arise as the result of diversity.	Pre-Test	2	3	35	2
		4.8%	7.4%	83.3%	4.8%
	Post Test	0	0	26	16
		0%	0%	61.9%	38.1%
16) I can identify societal forces which influence opportunities for diverse people.	Pre-Test	0	7	12	23
		0%	16.7%	28.6%	54.8%
	Post Test	0	0	6	36
		0%	0%	14.3%	85.7%

17) I can identify ways in which various groups contribute to our pluralistic society.	Pre-Test	0 0%	0 0%	7 16.7%	35 83.3%
	Post Test	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	42 100%
18) I can help students take on the perspective of ethnic and cultural groups different from their own.	Pre-Test	0 0%	5 11.9%	30 71.4%	7 16.7%
	Post Test	0 0%	0 0%	25 59.5%	17 40.5%
19) I can help diverse students view history and current events from diverse perspectives.	Pre-Test	0 0%	0 0%	30 71.4%	12 28.6%
	Post Test	0 0%	0 0%	3 7.1%	39 92.9%
20) I can involve students in making decisions and clarifying their values regarding multicultural issues.	Pre-Test	4 9.5%	31 73.8%	7 16.7%	0 0%
	Post Test	1 2.4%	17 40.5%	20 47.6%	4 9.5%

Table 4

Multicultural Efficacy Scale – Beliefs Section

Question		If every individual learned to accept and work with every other person, then there would be no intercultural problems.	If all groups could be helped to contribute to the general good and not seek special recognition, we could create a unified America.	All cultural groups are entitled to maintain their own identity.	All cultural groups should be recognized for their strengths and contributions.	Some groups need to be helped to achieve equal treatment before we can reach the goals of a democratic society.
42) Choose the position which most closely reflects your strongest belief about teaching.	Pre-Test	12 28.6%	1 2.4%	10 23.8%	10 23.8%	9 21.4%
	Post Test	11 26.2%	0 0%	0 0%	8 19.0%	23 54.8%