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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The demographics in today's American society are much different than they were 20 years ago. In *Changing populations/changing schools*, Flaxman and Passow (1995) state that, "The demographic changes observed over the last two decades are likely to reverberate through much of the next century. America has become a more diverse society in its racial, social, and ethnic make-up." (p. 31) These demographic changes have, and will continue to impact the demographics in institutions of higher education. Pascarella et al. (1996) state that:

> It appears clear that diversity comprises a central aspect of America's future. If the trends projected [by the 1989 Census Bureau] represent the country's future demographic reality, then it is likely that future college graduates will be challenged by a society that is increasingly diverse in terms of race, culture, and values. (p. 174-5)

It is predicted by Flaxman and Passow (1995), that the number of Hispanic children will double, the Asian and African-American population percentage will continue to rise, and therefore, the proportion of white students will decline greatly.

Another consideration is the influx of non-traditional, or new-traditional students. Increasing numbers of people ages 25 and up are enrolling in college. These enrollments may be due to people wanting to earn their first degree and/or switching careers. There are also many more students who are physically and mentally challenged attending colleges and universities. Lastly, there is an
increase in women enrolling in these institutions of higher learning. Perhaps, the most straight-forward way to present these changes is in the summary entitled "Tomorrow's College Students," which was derived from Look Who's Coming to College (1994):

1. By the year 2000, 1 in 5 freshman will be born out of wedlock.
2. By the year 2000, only 40 percent of our freshmen will come from families where their mother and father were together from the time they were born until the time they went away to college.
3. By the year 2000, both spouses will work in 75 percent of all families.
4. By the year 2000, 50 percent of the white children will live with a mother who is divorced.
5. By the year 2000, over 54 percent of the Black children and 33 percent of the Hispanic children will live with a never married mother.
6. Today there are 4 times as many Black and Hispanic children living in poverty as white children.
7. By the year 2000, 50 percent of all the youth in California will be a minority.
8. The overall college going rate for high school graduates since 1974 is holding steady at 50 percent, whites 56 percent, Blacks 39 percent, and Hispanics 45 percent.
9. By the year 2000, as many as 50 percent of our students will be part time.
10. In every year since 1978 women have outnumbered men among first time, first year students.
11. Approximately 10 percent of students enrolled today are students with at least one disability.

These demographic changes in institutions of higher learning lead to the following questions: Do relations between students need be addressed in the academe? Will racism, sexism, ageism, etc. be prevailing issues in these institutions? Pascarella (1996) argued, "It seems reasonable, therefore [due to
changing demographics], to be concerned with identifying the ways in which American postsecondary institutions engender in students a greater openness to racial, cultural, and value diversity." (p. 174-175)

The position that these issues need to be addressed in the academe and that greater openness must be a goal can also be supported by the evidence of diversity tensions and relations as reported by the students. In 1982, Newsweek did an on campus poll about race relations. Students reported the following: the relations between whites and minorities were reported by 55% to be friendly, but not close; 63% versus 33% thought that clubs should be integrated, while 48% vs. 45% thought the dormitories should be integrated; in regard to interracial dating, 17% approved, 30% disapproved, 31% reported it didn't matter, and 22% didn't know; 55% believed they had been taught too little about the civil-rights movement and 44% had been taught the right amount. The poll also stated that in reference to different races not trying hard enough to get to know each other, 20% said it was a serious problem, 37% somewhat of a problem, 21% not too much of a problem, and only 15% said it was no problem at all (Liberal Education, p. 112).

In the same year, Sedlacek and Martinez (1982) reported that students at the University of Maryland had a more negative attitude toward communists, socialists, liberals, and people in favor of gradual desegregation than their counterparts of 1970. In regard to the campus' social climate, Sedlacek and Martinez (1982) found there had been little change in racial attitudes in the last decade. In 1983, Sedlacek and Stovall reported that in a survey of 244 participants,
students reacted most negatively to blind students in academic situations and to students in wheelchairs in social situations. Furthermore, the Situational Attitude Scale uncovered that white students had more negative feelings toward Hispanics and Blacks than toward those whose race was not identified. This seemed especially true if personal contact was involved. (Sedlacek & White, 1987) In 1989, Sedlacek reported that at the University of Maryland, attitudes toward the university's influence to improve social conditions, as well as their attitudes about the recruitment of African-Americans, were more favorable in 1988 than in 1978. Students attitudes towards Arab-Americans in 1994, while more tolerant than those in 1992, still displayed negative attitudes when dealing with them in boarding a plane or getting financial help. (Sedlacek & Miville, 1994).

Stover (1992) stated that, "Hate and prejudice come in some new guises in schools today, but their manifestations are as ugly as ever." The students in college today, were in high school when, according to Stover (1992), the following occurred:

*In Water Valley, Miss., school officials closed early for spring vacation following racial tensions sparked when several white students displayed Confederate flags during a black history program. In protest, black athletes began a boycott of the school's sports teams.  
*Racial tensions between whites and Asian immigrants erupted in a fight last year in front of Fall Church (Va.) High School, a mostly white school in an affluent suburb of Washington, D.C.  
*Hundreds of black and Hispanic students, angry at a white teacher's remarks they deemed racist, walked out of classes at Brooklyn's Eastern District High School, smashing display cabinets and forcing the school to close early. (p. 14)
Only 14% of college students surveyed, according to Astin et al. (1993), feel that racial discrimination is no longer a problem in our nation.

Discrimination not only reveals itself in large urban cities, but in more rural areas. Iowa State University, a land-grant institution with 25,000 students located in Ames, Iowa, has recently seen displays of discrimination and bigotry. The institution’s undergraduate population is composed of 87.2% white students, 5.9% international students, and its largest American minority population is African-American at 2.5%. (Student Profile, 1995) At Iowa State University, there is currently a door policy in the residence halls because residents had been mounting materials, including: nude pictures of women, Confederate flags, racial materials, and "Go Home" signs, that were offensive to other students. Currently, students are only allowed to have pre-printed stickers on their door with their name, permanent residence, classification and major.

There is one other area that exemplifies whether attitudes and the overall campus climate are changing. That is in the academy itself, specifically in the administrators, faculty, curriculum, and the research. There are reports and studies (Rutledge, Sedlacek) that reveal biases- in terms of showing favoritism toward, positive examples and role modeling for, and representation of- straight, white, American males. Included in this list of attributes might be a religion such as Catholicism and others such as abled. Finally, in the literature, Sedlacek & Westbrook (1991) found that while there is a greater concern for students in minority
populations, the labels used to describe them may have only increased the problems of tension and alienation.

In summary, with the changing demographics and the potential for an explosive release of tensions, the government and researchers decided to take steps to increase harmony, improve relations, improve campus climate, and ultimately create "safe environments." One step was demonstrated by the Ford Foundation. The Ford Foundation gave $1.6 million dollars in 1990 to various colleges to help them keep up with the demographic changes. The Ford Foundation's Race Relations and Campus Diversity Program was a response to campus disruption over race, religion, gender, and ethnicity. Its goal was to help campuses improve teaching and curricula to keep pace with the changing populations on and off campus. Cultural diversity in all undergraduate courses was stressed, and program expansion was anticipated. Programs such as these are on the rise, hoping to increase awareness and tolerance. The term often used to refer to programs that stress diversity is multicultural education. (Stover, 1990) This thesis will use the term multiculturalism in education.

Multiculturalism in Education

The definition of multicultural education, or multiculturalism in education, is changing. Multiculturalism in education evolved out of ethnic studies. Banks (1991) suggested that the most important goal of multicultural education is, “to help students view events, concepts, issues, and problems from diverse cultural and
ethnic perspectives." (p. 3) Banks also acknowledges that multicultural curriculum must go beyond the idea of "many cultures." Gollnick & Chinn (1990), when discussing multiculturalism in education, state the following:

Thus, educators today are faced with the overwhelming challenge to prepare students from diverse cultural backgrounds to live in a rapidly changing society and world in which some groups have greater societal benefits than others because of their race, sex, socioeconomic level, religion, lack of disability, or age. (p. 2)

In addition, Beane (1990) states that, "the concept of "cultures" includes ethnicity, race, gender, social class, and handicap diversity." (p. 114) Diversity can also represent differences in looks, beliefs, values, and attitudes. So, for the purpose of this thesis, all of the characteristics listed above are meant to be included in the definition of multicultural in order not to limit the term to mean "many cultures." All of these items will be acknowledged as valued for their diversity. Forms of multiculturalism in education will be discussed further in the literature review.

Purpose of Study

Beane (1990), in the book Affect in the curriculum: Toward democracy, dignity, and diversity, states that it is possible to create openness, awareness, and decrease ignorance through multiculturalism in education. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to determine if an affective curriculum in a course at Iowa State University entitled Dialogues on Diversity is changing students' awareness of
diversity issues.

Dialogues on Diversity is currently the only course that focuses specifically on diversity at Iowa State University. There are, of course, courses in diverse areas, such as women’s studies and African-American studies. Also, a new required diversity curriculum is being structured. However, Dialogues on Diversity was specifically created “to explore diversity within the context of the Iowa State University community.” (Dialogues on Diversity, 1996, p. 5)

The goal of this research is to determine if the course Dialogues on Diversity affectively increases students awareness in four areas: 1) awareness of their own culture; 2) awareness of others’ cultures; 3) awareness of biases and preferences that influence behaviors; and 4) awareness of their preparedness and commitment to action.

Statement of Purpose

The purposes of this study are:

1. to determine if there is a relationship between participation in Dialogues on Diversity and awareness of diversity issues
2. to determine if there is a difference between men and women in their awareness of diversity issues
Variables

Dependent variable

The increase in awareness through moral development is the dependent variable within this study. Awareness will be measured in four areas: 1) awareness of their own culture; 2) awareness of others’ cultures; 3) awareness of biases and preferences that influence behavior, and 4) awareness of preparedness and commitment to action. The Awareness Continuum Scale was used to measure these areas. This scale is a compilation of surveys used in Managing Diversity (Gardenswartz & Rowe, 1993) and the Teacher Race Awareness Survey (Donaldson, 1994). Awareness will also be interpreted from the journal entries of the students. The journal entries are a part of their weekly assignments.

Independent variable

The independent variable is participation in the course Dialogues on Diversity. All students are welcome to take the course, as is advertised through the school newspaper and fliers posted throughout campus. Participants are those students who will register to take the course in the 2nd half of the 1996 spring term, and agree to be part of the study.

Dialogues on Diversity

The course Dialogues on Diversity began in the fall of the 1993-94 academic year. The idea for the course came from a faculty member from the Department of
Food Science and Human Nutrition. This faculty member was particularly concerned about some racial issues and tensions that were occurring on campus. This personal concern prompted the faculty member to contact two faculty members in the Department of Professional Studies (Higher Education). These three people began to meet and have lengthy discussions about what was going on on campus and what they thought could be done to address those concerns. The faculty members discussed the possibility of a course and, if implemented, what the goals of a course should be.

At this time, three more members were added to this group to help develop the course. The group now consisted of five faculty members and one staff member. The five faculty members came from the following departments: Food Science and Human Nutrition, Animal Science, Philosophy, and two from Professional Studies. The staff member worked in the personnel office. They used the book *Managing Diversity* (Gardenswartz & Rowe, 1993) as a primary resource. From this text and other relevant books and articles, they created a syllabus and student manual.

The course was approved as a University Studies course, meaning, it does not belong to any specific college. It is designed to introduce diversity issues in relation to Iowa State University, to students in an environment that encourages open dialogue. The ultimate goal is to help create a more welcoming environment at Iowa State by increasing students' awareness of diversity issues and awareness of their own and others' behaviors.
Dialogues on Diversity is taught during the later half of each semester. This time of the term was chosen for many reasons. One reason was that it would give students who had either dropped a class and needed another credit, or seniors who needed another credit to graduate, an opportunity to earn that credit. It would also give the facilitators time to advertise the course to get students who were interested in the topic to participate.

There are four facilitators per class. The facilitators are composed of faculty, staff, graduate students, and a couple of undergraduate students. All of the facilitators have a personal interest in the subject matter and volunteer to work with this course. These facilitators are asked to participate in a training course before the beginning of the course and have weekly meetings to discuss how the classes are going.

Limitations

1. There is a limit of 20 people per class, and all were between 9 and 14. This relatively small number limits the ability to generalize.

2. The participants in the course may have needed the credit, and therefore, may not be interested, necessarily, in the material.

3. The participants in the study are self-selected, and thus not generalizable to all students.

4. The class is only in its third year and is still undergoing changes and
evaluations. There is limited information about whether or not the course is meeting its goals.

5. Students may be involved in other programs or have personal experiences that are not accounted for in the study that may contribute to changes in their awareness.

6. There are five sections of the course, and may therefore have very different experiences and discussions due to different members and facilitators.

Assumptions

1. Participants in this study will provide accurate and honest responses to the Awareness Continuum Scale.

2. All participants in Dialogues on Diversity were not forced to take the course, but chose to take it, despite other options.

3. The facilitators will follow the outline for the course and address the topics of each session in relation to Iowa State University.

Statement of Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were used to develop and define the research project:

1. There is no difference in students' awareness of their own culture between the pre-test and post-test.
2. There is no difference in students' awareness of others' cultures between the pre-test and post-test.

3. There is no difference in students' awareness of biases and preferences that influence behavior between the pre-test and post-test.

4. There is no difference in students' preparedness nor commitment to action between pre-test and post-test.

5. There is no difference between men and women in their change in awareness in the four areas.

Significance of the Study

The research on classes or programs such as Dialogues on Diversity is relatively minimal. While there is research on awareness and openness changes due to college life itself, none of it looks at a class whose purpose is to affect students. The only programs receiving this kind of evaluation are in the business place. These programs are known primarily as diversity training programs. However, due to the changing demographics that are impacting higher education institutions and the work place, education programs are on the rise. This increase demonstrates the institutions commitment to creating, not only a safe environment, but a welcoming one.

The research will benefit students by increasing our understanding of how to effectively help students develop in areas of awareness that are related to multiculturalism. Students will identify the areas in which they have grown and the
parts of the course that they found to be least and most beneficial. This student input will aid facilitators and future research in identifying what to include in the curriculum and what to measure in future studies.

The research will also offer implications for specifics relating to the course. This study will identify in which areas of awareness students show development. This will have implications for the curriculum itself. These outcomes will suggest what areas of the curriculum are effective and which are not. In essence, it will identify aspects of the current program that perhaps need to remain, be deleted, or be modified.

Lastly, the outcome of this research will have implications for the institutions in two areas of multiculturalism in education. First, it will help determine if courses, such as Dialogues on Diversity, are meeting their goals of increasing awareness and creating welcoming environments. Secondly, it will have implications that will effect programs such as required diversity curriculums and the inclusion of some aspect of multiculturalism in every class.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Research has been conducted on the relationship between college attendance and awareness and tolerance. However, most of these are based merely on college attendance and not inclusion in a required curriculum or diversity course. "The existing body of evidence... fails to address directly the impact of specific dimensions of the college experience on students' appreciation and acceptance of cultural, racial, and value diversity." (Pascarella et al., 1996, p. 175)

The impact of such a dimension is the focus of this study. The literature review in this chapter will include an overview of studies involving college attendance and openness, characteristics of multiculturalism in education, examples of multiculturalism in education, the ability to affect students through moral development, and the application of the previous information to the course Dialogues on Diversity.

College Attendance and Openness

A study was conducted at the University of Iowa. In this study, the Mines-Jensen Interpersonal Relationship Inventory was used to measure the development of tolerance. In this survey, tolerance was defined as, "an increasing openness and acceptance of diversity which expands one's sensitivities and increases the range of alternative for satisfying exchanged and friendships" (Creamer, 1990, p. 119). Longitudinal studies showed that there was an increase in scores during their first
Taylor (1996) conducted a study at the University of Michigan to determine how college experiences contribute to developing greater tolerance for diversity in college students. The subjects (N=575) included only white, United States citizens. Taylor specifically wanted to study the relationship of: entering characteristics to moral development and tolerance, different moral development patterns to tolerance, and institutional, academic, and peer environmental factors to moral development and tolerance. A pre-test was administered, followed by a post-test two years later.

Taylor found that females enter with a higher level of tolerance, and increase this tolerance by almost three times more than their male counterparts. Taylor also found that the environmental constructs of the instruction, including the perceptions of climate and institutional commitment to multiculturalism, have a positive influence on their attitudes of tolerance. Co-curricular diversity involvement (i.e. MLK Day, Gay Pride Week, etc.), also had a significant influence on tolerance.

Pascarella (1996) conducted a study to:

...determine how openness to diversity and challenge is influenced by four different sets of variables: student background or precollege characteristics, environmental emphases of the institution attended, measures of students' academic experience, and measures of students' social/nonacademic involvement. Second, it sought to determine if the influences on openness to diversity and challenge differed in magnitude for men versus women and white verses nonwhite students. (p. 176)
The sample included first-year students. These students were from various four-year institutions located throughout the nation. (Pascarella, p. 177)

Pascarella (1996) found the following: there are many independent influences that have an impact on students' development of openness to diversity and challenge including, "courses they take, how much they study, where they live, how much they work, their involvements and interactions with peers, and the environment press of the institution they attend." (p. 187) They also found that while living on campus, good study habits, and involvement with peers implied a positive impact on the end-of-first year openness to diversity/challenge, a negative impact was the product of things such as Greek membership and being white (versus non-white). The student's peer group was especially influential in the end-of-first year openness to diversity/challenge according to the degree of interaction with their peers, who their acquaintances were, the topics of conversation, and the information exchanged in the conversations.

..the more students interact with diverse peers and the greater the extent to which such interactions focus on controversial or value-laden issues that may engender a change in perspective or opinion, the greater one's development of openness to diversity and challenge. (p. 188)

They found there was little difference for men and women. There was a significant difference between white and non-white students, particularly for those white students that lived on campus and/or were involved in a racial or cultural workshop.
Astin (1993) also reported that the promotion of racial understanding was positively correlated with attending college away from home, especially if they live in university housing. The strongest correlation, however, occurred with Faculty Diversity Orientation and Institutional Diversity Emphasis. Astin (1993) points out that, as expected, involvement variables associated with the promotion of racial understanding are: "discussing racial or ethnic issues, attending racial or cultural awareness workshops, socializing with people form different racial or ethnic groups, participating in campus demonstrations, and enrolling in ethnic studies courses." (p. 136) Astin (1993) also addresses critics who imply that a focus on diversity hinder student development:

In short, the weight of the empirical evidence shows that the actual effects on student development of emphasizing diversity and of student participation in diversity activities are overwhelmingly positive. Clearly, the dire claims about the detrimental effects of emphasizing diversity are not supported by the data. On the contrary, the findings of this study suggest that there are many developmental benefits that accrue to students when institutions encourage and support an emphasis on multiculturalism and diversity. (p. 230)

Multiculturalism in Education

Researchers and educators state various ways in which the implementation of multiculturalism in education can be accomplished. Beane (1990) discusses two types of instruction, direct and indirect. Direct and indirect instruction are described as follows:
By *direct instruction* I mean the explicit teaching of particular concepts in such a way that distinct time is allotted during which personal and social concerns are given primary attention through curriculum plans specifically designed for that purpose. Examples of the direct approach include the religious lessons found in nineteenth-century schools, the character education lessons that emerged in the earlier part of this century, and the more recent set-aside activities used with values clarification, sensitivity training, human relations and self-esteem programs. By *indirect instruction* I mean the implicit promotion of personal and social development themes through experiences that have some other explicit purpose or in which the affective themes are only one of several purposes. Examples of indirect approach include adding on affective questions to explicit studies of literature, history, and other subjects, and promoting particular attitudes or values through the hidden curriculum found in the institutional features of the school. (Beane, 1990, p. 133)

Beane (1990) also restated six ways in which Grant and Sleeter (1985, pp. 98-99) defined approaches to multicultural education. These six approaches are the following:

1. "Business as Usual with Minimal Compliance to Civil Rights Laws," in which social stratification is maintained and assimilation encouraged through simply missing diverse groups in schools.

2. "Teaching the Exceptional or Culturally Different," in which social stratification is maintained, but assimilation is more directly addressed through altered instruction and curriculum plans intended to bridge mainstream and nonmainstream cultures.

3. "Human Relations," in which social stratification is maintained and assimilation promoted, but students are encouraged to display tolerance and humane attitudes toward those who are culturally different.

4. "Single Group Studies," in which attempts are made to reduce social stratification and assimilation, and promote social, structural change through teaching about the histories, contributions, and
material conditions of cultural minorities.

5. "Multicultural Education," in which social, structural change is promoted through altered curriculum plans, recognition of language diversity, nontraditional staffing patterns, and sensitivity to diverse learning styles.

6. "Education That is Multicultural and Social Reconstructionist," in which social stratification is directly confronted by a social issues curriculum organization, teaching of political skills, and altering the school as in the multicultural approach.

Another, yet similar, explanation appears in McCarthy's (1991) article that discusses three versions of multiculturalism in education. The first version is cultural understanding (teaching to promote appreciation of and for differences); the second is cultural competence (bilingual education); and the third is cultural emancipation (inclusion of all cultures in the curriculum).

These many versions of the implementation of multiculturalism in education can be summarized by placing them in three categories. The first is what the researcher will term the "all-inclusive" class. In this case, there is one class in which diversity issues, such as those characteristics mentioned in the definition of multicultural are addressed. The goal is to give students a broad base of knowledge on current issues. This class may be a workshop, such as those suggested by Pascarella et al. (1996) The Dialogues on Diversity class at Iowa State University is another example of this type of implementation.

The second category includes curricula programs such as the required diversity curriculum that will soon be implemented at Iowa State University. In this version, students are required to take a set number of credits of classes that have
been determined to be multicultural. It is up to the department or college to recommend classes that they feel are multicultural. It is then up to a central committee to decide if the courses will be included as options in the required diversity curriculum. These courses include not only the women's studies courses and African-American history courses, but literature and architectural courses that study the trends and contributions of people from diverse backgrounds.

The third version is for every course/instructor to incorporate multicultural issues in the curriculum. For some instructors this may mean a week of focused multicultural discovery. For others, it may mean incorporation on a "daily" bases of such issues. Regardless of how the courses/instructors implement multicultural issues, the idea is that each takes responsibility for and ownership of such implementations.

The purposes of implementations such as these are numerous. One purpose is to help students develop cognitively, and develop their critical thinking skills. Also, these versions try to develop skills in resolving social conflict. Another purpose is to increase communication accommodation. By this, it is meant that students become aware of different styles of communication (verbal and non-verbal), and ways in which they can alter/accommodate their communication style to improve understanding with those who communicate differently. Banks (1991) states that, "the key goal of the multicultural curriculum should be to help students develop decision-making and citizen-action skills." (p. 34)
Affecting Students: Morals and Values

Beane (1990), in the book *Affect in the curriculum: Toward democracy, dignity, and diversity*, states that it is possible to have an affect on students. Affective outcomes, as defined by Astin (1993), "refer to the student's attitudes, values, self-concept, aspirations, and everyday behavior." (p. 9) Other definitions of the word include: "to stir the emotions of," (Webster's New World Dictionary, 1984) and "mental aspects [anger, fear, love, and others] of human nature that are differentiated from reason (Oxford English Dictionary, 1961)." (Beane, 1990, p. 3) Beane (1990) does contend, based on the theories of John Dewey, that cognition and affect operate at the same time. Thus, it is important to consider the thinking that takes place in situations, as well as the emotional reactions.

Beane (1990) uses the concepts introduced by two other people to arrive at a definition:

One very useful way of thinking about affect... was developed by Philip Phenix (1977) in an attempt to align it with the area of ethics (concerns about what we "ought" to do). In his view, affect has five levels:

1. *Organic* needs rooted in the search for personal homeostasis
2. *Subjective* feelings or the search for pleasure that characterizes hedonistic ethics
3. *Interests* or aspirations expressed in cognitive values related to the ethics of self-realization
4. *Judgments* by which the individual reflects upon and organizes the first three levels and intersects them with social interests in the community through critical ethics
5. *Idealizations* that are located in the continuing search for creative growth as both and individual and a society expressed through the ethics of progressive norms. (pp. 5-6)

Beane (1990) state that Wight:

...described affect as involving an elaborate set of goals based on self (self-control, self-concept, and self-esteem), others (interpersonal and intercultural relations and responsibilities), and the environment (natural and technological). (p. 5)

Beane (1990) concludes with the following definition of affect:

In sum, then, we may now define affect as an aspect of human thought and behavior that has a number of constitutive elements. It refers to a broad range of dimensions such as emotion, preference, choice, and feeling. These are based on beliefs, aspirations, attitudes, and appreciations regarding what is desired and desirable in personal development and social relationships. Both of these are connected to thinking or cognition, because they are informed by what has been learned from past experiences and they influence purposeful action in terms of values, morals, and ethics. The nature of such influence may range from the barely conscious to the carefully reasoned. Finally, affect is connected to behavior as both an antecedent and a consequence. Thus it is both a constitutive aspect of learning and an appropriate object of educational efforts. While I have been speaking of affect as a noun, it is also used as a verb; for example, "to affect someone." In this sense it refers to the influence of one or more of those dimensions of thought and action included in the definition above. ... I will refer to how we "place affect in the curriculum" as an expression of the deliberate attempt to influence the personal and social development of young people. (p. 6-7)

This attempt to influence the personal and social development of students is parallel to the development of morals and values. The authors of Moral Values in
Higher Education (1991) state that the development students are lacking is in the area of moral values. They contend that the development of moral values is a responsibility of institutions of higher education. One author states that, "... although the universities and colleges do not determine moral values and norms as such, they can, in a variety of ways, take the leading role in transmitting reflexive awareness with respect to moral values." (p. 62) Lapsley (1992) discusses a letter which addresses the transmission of moral values. Specifically, Lapsley supported the following themes of the letter:

(1) Although value pluralism is a pervasive feature of American culture, there does exist, nonetheless, a certain foundational moral "wisdom" that is immutable, unchanging, and impervious to passing fashions and tastes. (2) Moral education, the transmission of moral wisdom, should be deliberate, and not left to happenstance, since not to attend to deliberate moral education is to abdicate our educational (and moral) responsibility toward the next generation, and to leave the "lights" of our society "flickering." (3) Finally, moral wisdom so imparted can be usefully deployed in order to correctly resolve practical moral dilemmas.

The development of morality and moral reasoning is discussed by various authors and researchers. Beane (1990) identifies Kohlberg and Gilligan as influential in works that lend themselves to multiculturalism in education. Specifically, Beane (1990) states that:

[Lawrence] Kohlberg argued that moral reasoning could be described as a series of predictive stages that were related to age, to states of cognitive development, and to increasingly complex concepts of
justice... Further, he suggested ways that teachers might elevate moral reasoning through use of moral dilemmas and described their relation to school structure in what was called a “just community” approach...

In 1977, Carol Gilligan... published a paper claiming that Kohlberg had defined moral reasoning from a distinctly male perspective, thus ignoring the fact that women tended to use “caring” instead of “justice” in such reasoning. (p. 46)

Specifically, Kohlberg’s theory of moral development is divided into three categories. Each category has two stages, for a total of six developmental stages. The three categories are preconventional, conventional, and postconventional.

The preconventional category has the heteronomous morality and the individualism, instrumental purpose and exchange stages. The first stage involves doing what is right simply to avoid punishment. People in this stage regard authorities as having superior power. The second stage involves following rules only when it is to that person’s immediate interest.

The mutual interpersonal expectations: good boy/nice girl stage and the social system and conscience stage belong to the conventional category. The third stage means that a person will do whatever is necessary to be accepted by society. In the fourth stage, the person will do what they have agreed to do, and laws will be followed. In this stage, the person can differentiate between social and interpersonal motives.

The postconventional category has the following two stages: social contract/utility and individual rights stage, and the universal ethical principles stage. The contract/utility and individual rights stage states that the person tolerates
pluralism. They are aware that people have a variety of values and opinions, and that morality is often relative to a particular group. They also acknowledge that rights such as life and liberty, are non-relative. In the universal ethical principles stage, a person will have self-chosen principles and will stand by them. They are rational and exercise universal moral principles.

This development of moral reasoning is termed the "justice voice" of moral reasoning. "The justice voice, ..., is characterized as emphasizing the effects of moral choice on the self or on the other as the self would see it from the other's shoes" (Creamer, 1990, p. 36). Gilligan argues that there are two voices: the justice voice (utilized more by males) and the care voice (utilized more by females). "The care voice may be characterized (Gilligan, 1982; Lyons, 1983) as emphasizing relationships between persons and seeing self and others as embedded in their specific situations (Creamer, 1990, p. 36). Gilligan argues that while people use both voices in making moral decisions, everyone prefers one over another.

The research by Gilligan that pertains to this study in particular is that:

Care-voiced persons seem to prefer dialogue discussions, where students rely on each other and their teacher or facilitator for understanding, comfort, and support (Gilligan, 1986a, p. 50). They prefer collaborative, supportive discussions instead of competitive debates. They prefer an interdependent atmosphere that empowers them to build and evolve relationships with each other and staff members and then to learn from one another by listening to each other. They do not prefer hierarchical classrooms or organizations that are structured around dominance and subordination or autonomous competition (Creamer, 1990, p. 38).
Gilligan also believed that the combination of these two had implications beyond moral development, such as two methods people use for resolving conflict (Creamer, 1990, p. 38). These conflicts could include situations that revolve around moral issues related to diversity. First, however, one must be aware that they are, in fact, dealing with a moral/ethical issue.

Rest's four-component model is based on the belief that in order to act ethically, the decision that determines the action must be decidedly a moral decision. The processes of this decision and action are explained in the following components:

Component I: Interpreting the situation as a moral one. This component attends the individual's ability to perceive the situation as one that affects the welfare of others. It also refers to the ability to trace the consequences of action in terms of the welfare of all involved. It addresses the question: Does the individual perceive that moral dimensions of the situation exist? When people fail to be aware, several factors may account for the lack of awareness: They misunderstand what is happening in the situation; they differ in their spontaneous sensitivity to the needs and welfare of others; or they have strong emotional reactions to which they respond before they have time to reflect.

Component II: Formulating a moral course of action. This component involves the decision-making process, how one decides which course of action is morally right, fair, or closest to one's moral ideals. This, of course, is where the theories of moral reasoning are applied. In essence, one's stage of moral reasoning acts as a filter influencing how one understands what is moral and how competent one is to integrate the often complicated considerations involved in ethical issues.

Component III: Deciding what to do. This component focuses on deciding what one will actually do and whether the moral judgment made gets carried out in the face of competing values such as the need to advance one's own career or the desire to avoid criticism from
colleagues. In essence, it deals with the motivation to act morally. In reality, of course, the motive to act morally often gets preempted by other considerations.

Component IV: Implementing a plan of action. This component deals with carrying out the moral behavior despite the difficulties it may entail. Old-fashioned words like character, perseverance, and resoluteness are particularly fitting at this point. The psychological concepts of ego strength or self-regulation are alternative ways of explaining factors that influence the actual implementation of the moral behavior. (Creamer, 1990, p. 204)

The processes described above, (determining a decision to be morally/ethically based, applying those moral/ethics to action, deciding what to do, and implementing action), are descriptors of what happens during the dialogues that occur in the class Dialogues on Diversity.

Application to Dialogues on Diversity

The course objectives are listed as follows:

1) To expand understanding of issues in human relations facing a diversity of populations and individuals.

2) To develop skills in evaluating moral arguments and deciding moral issues regarding diversity.

3) To explore the strategic, legal and personal aspects of diversity.

4) To develop the ability to participate in respectful community dialogue.

Developers, five faculty members and a staff member, used what they knew of student development and diversity issues on campus to try to structure the course
to meet these objectives. One of the first requirements was exposure to diversity outside of the class. This was implemented by requiring the students to do interviews of students different from them. This correlates to research conducted previously in this area. The second, was to incorporate multiculturalism in education through direct instruction. The goal was to create an affective curriculum using theories involving moral reasoning and value-laden situations. The last requirement, which is the application of the theoretical and developmental framework, was to take place through discussion and dialogue.

In order to create these discussions, students were given case studies or articles each class period to read and discuss. Some of the examples of case studies from week four used for such discussions were:

**Scenario #10.** Tina and Lisa have been best friends since third grade. They were even accepted to the same college and decided to room together. One night after they had been out drinking, Lisa told Tina she was in love with her. Tina said, "I can't believe you're a dyke. You're going to have to move out. I can't be around you anymore." What would you do? How would you respond if this happened to you?

**Scenario #11.** Your brother announces he is getting married and wants you to meet his fiancee. After talking to her on the phone and hearing so much about her, you are anxious to meet her. When they arrive, you discover that she is in a wheelchair. Funny, he never mentioned this. What do you say to your brother?

**Scenario #13.** A group of Asian-American female students are having a loud conversation in the dorm hallway. A white male student opens his door, and yells, "Don't you water buffalo have anything better to do than disturb the peace? I'm trying to study." How would you respond? (Dialogues on Diversity, 1996, p. 21)
Aside from the questions listed in each of the scenarios, the students are asked to talk about the feelings and desires of each of the people involved. They are also asked to arrive at some possible outcomes, and of those outcomes, which would be the most desirable. Lastly, they are asked what they would do to reach the desired outcome and some of the consequences if it is not reached. The ideas involved in this type of format include: education that is multicultural, exposure, dialogue, direct instruction, development of moral reasoning, and creating awareness.

Summary

The literature suggests that the mere exposure to a college/university setting has an impact on students' awareness of and tolerance for diversity. Participation in cultural and racial workshops and ethnic studies courses also had a positive impact. Most important (Astin, 1993) were the institutions faculty diversity and their commitment to promoting racial understanding.

It was also found that researchers believe it is possible to have affective curriculum. Affective development occurs in conjunction with cognitive development. Affective curriculum is most effective when moral and ethical development are used as the tools to promote awareness. This development takes place by challenging the students, and allowing them to use both their justice and care voices. One method for allowing them to express these voices, especially the care voice, is through dialogue.
The course Dialogues on Diversity attempts to incorporate all of these ideas in order to have an impact on the students. Its primary tool is the dialogue itself that is facilitated by four people who are, themselves, members of the class and participants in the discussion. It is through these means that the course aims to: help the students develop, create a safer campus environment, and prepare the students for the world after higher education.

The purpose of this study is to determine if the course Dialogues on Diversity affectively increases students' awareness in four areas: 1) awareness of their own culture; 2) awareness of others' cultures; 3) awareness of biases and preferences that influence behaviors; and 4) awareness of preparedness and commitment to action.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Sample

The subjects of this research were participants in the Dialogues on Diversity class at Iowa State University. The participants ranged in age from traditional age freshmen to adult learners. Subjects also ranged in ethnicity, major, living environments, and their extracurricular activities.

All students had the opportunity to register for the class which began the week of March 18, 1996. Each of the five sections was limited to 20 people. However, the numbers did not get that high. The researcher attended the first session of each class to ask class members to participate. All of the class members agreed, and filled out the pre-test: consent form, demographic information, and survey. At this time there were 7 in Section I; 11 in Section II; 9 in Section III; 12 in Section IV; 9 in Section V. A total of 13 students added this course later in the term, but were not given the initial survey.

The researcher attended the seventh class to distribute the post-test. Those that did not take the pre-test were asked to participate, and filled out the following: consent form and survey. The following responses were received as compared to the total number of class members in each section respectively: 7 of 10; 9 of 13; 8 of 10; 9 of 14; and 12 of 14. However, given that only 48 took the pre-test, there were only 38 complete pairs of surveys (pre-test and post-test pairs).
Procedures

During the fall term of the 1995-96 academic year, the researcher, aware of the existence of the course and having been asked to be a facilitator of one of the sections, suggested to the organizers that a study be done. This study was meant to determine whether or not the course was meeting its goals and objectives. Specifically, the researcher wanted to know if students’ awareness about diversity issues was increased due to the content of the course.

Upon receiving approval, the researcher began collecting possible sources to be used to compile an awareness scale. One of the two sources chosen was a survey used by an Iowa State faculty member to survey the use of multiculturalism in the classroom by teachers: Teacher Race Awareness Survey (Donaldson, 1994). The second was the book Managing Diversity. (Gardenswartz & Rowe, 1993) In the previous semesters of this course, a seven-item awareness scale had been used that had been taken from this book. The scale has continually shown increases in awareness, but significance, reliability and validity tests have not been done on the data. These items and others were a part of the 35-item survey created by the researcher. The items were presented in accordance with a Likert scale.

On February 27, 1996, a proposal to use the Awareness Continuum Scale was presented to the Iowa State University Human Subjects Review Committee for approval. The proposal also asked that the researcher be allowed to retain examples of the journal entries of the students to support the data retrieved from the survey.
On February 24, 1996, a training session was held by the organizers for the facilitators, specifically those who were new to the position. Facilitators were faculty, staff, graduate students, and a couple of undergraduate students. There were 20 in all, four facilitators for each class. Each facilitator received a preliminary copy of the course manual, including articles and case studies that would be used during the course.

At the beginning of March, fliers were distributed and advisors were contacted, notifying students, faculty, and staff, that the course would begin the week following spring break. The information that was distributed also included the course number, class meeting times and locations, and facilitators names. Registration for the course began immediately.

The week of March 18, 1996, the course began. One section met on Monday, two on Tuesday, and two on Wednesday. The first session is designed primarily to do the following: make introductions, do some team building activities, set ground rules for the dialogues, and do a values clarification exercise. Students continued to meet for two hours each week for eight weeks. Institutional responses/responsibilities in making Iowa State University a welcoming place and the policies in action that aid in this process were discussed during weeks two and three, respectively. The fourth meeting was used to discuss personal responses/responsibilities in relation to epithets and insults. Experiencing being different was the focus of the next week. Societal responses/responsibilities for creating community-shared values were and in relation to disenfranchisement and
democracy were discussed in the sixth and seventh weeks. An action plan for creating a better community at Iowa State University was also discussed the seventh week. The last class was an all-section class. All five sections were brought together to meet and discuss what they had learned and their action plans (see Appendix C).

Throughout this time, facilitators continued to meet to discuss the progress of each class and the goals and activities for the next class. Also, examples of the students' journals were collected and compiled. The researcher attended the seventh meeting of each class to administer the post-test survey.

Instrument

The Awareness Continuum Scale (ACS) was used to determine the students' levels of awareness and tolerance. The scale was a composite of survey questions from Managing Diversity (Gardenswartz & Rowe, 1993), the awareness continuum survey (also derived from the book) used since the beginning of the course in 1993 (see Appendix B), and a survey entitled Teacher Race Awareness Survey I (Donaldson, 1994). The scale measures the students' awareness in four areas: awareness of their own culture, awareness of others' cultures, awareness of biases and preference that influence behavior, and awareness of preparedness and commitment to action.

The book itself is a training manual designed for many people, including, "a facilitator who works with groups to help them identify and solve-diversity related
problems and build individual and group skills." (Gardenswartz & Rowe, 1993, p. 5-6). The questionnaires and surveys included in the text offer no information on validity and reliability. This source was used because it is a foundation text for the course itself. Mean scores have been run on the data from the seven-item scale used since the beginning of the course. The mean scores consistently show increases between pre-test and post-test. However, the significance of these increases has not been determined. Validity and reliability tests are also incomplete.

The ACS has 35 questions asking the students to respond about behaviors, comfortableness around people different from themselves, and knowledge of their own and others’ cultures. The student is asked to respond on a five point Likert scale, ranging from Strongly Disagree = 1 to Strongly Disagree = 5. A lower ACS score indicates lack of awareness. A higher ACS score indicates increased awareness.

All of the students were asked to participate in the study by completing a consent form and filling out the ACS. The consent form also stated that their journal may also be used in the study (see Appendix A). The students were informed verbally that the survey would be readministered at the end of the course and that they may withdraw from the study at any time by contacting a facilitator or the researcher.
Data Analysis

Data collected from the ACS were coded for statistical analysis. The first section of the Awareness Continuum Survey was used to acquire demographic information. The demographic information included the following items: gender, age, classification, major, ethnicity, residence at university, and extracurricular activities. Also included were the section the student was in and their reasons for taking the course (see Appendix A).

Paired t-tests run on Statview (1995) were used to examine the relationships between the pre-test and post-test scores of the 35 statements. Differences between male-female scores were also analyzed. A .05 level of significance was used throughout the test to determine a high level of significance.

The statements of the ACS have a positive correlation to awareness toward diversity issues. Each item received a 1-5 rating. A "1" represented strong disagreement, and a "5" represented strong agreement. The statements fall into four categories. The first is awareness of the student's own cultural background. Corresponding questions in the survey were numbers 6, 8, 9, 22, and 23. The second is awareness of others' cultural backgrounds. Questions 1, 7, 20, 21, 24, and 25. Awareness of biases and preferences that influence behavior questions were represented in 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 19, 26, 27, 28, 31, 32, 33, and 34. The last category is awareness of preparedness for and commitment to action. Questions 15, 16, 17, 18, 29, 30, and 35 were used to measure this area of awareness.
Journal entries made weekly by the students were collected by the researcher. They were read and studied to support any findings in the survey. The journal entries ranged from assignments given to the students to issues they felt a need to present to the facilitators. The last assignment was used specifically to determine attitudes about the course.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine the affective curriculum outcomes of Dialogues on Diversity on students' awareness of diversity issues. Also, to determine if there is a difference between the development of males and females.

Areas of Awareness

The Awareness Continuum Scale was used to determine affect in four areas: awareness of student's own culture, awareness of others' cultures, awareness of biases and preferences that influence behavior, and awareness of preparedness for and commitment to action. This scale was a compilation of research by Donaldson and the course Dialogues on Diversity. Each item was scored on a Likert scale ranging from 1 to 5.

Awareness of own culture

Of the five questions relating to awareness of students' own culture, all increased, but only one showed a significant increase between the pretest and post-test (see Table 1). This was question #9, stating that the student had experienced discriminatory behaviors in their lifetime. It predicted an increase of .474 with \( p = .0122 \). This increase may be attributed to the courses' broad definition of diversity
Table 1. Awareness of one's own culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>.9272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>.7675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.474</td>
<td>.0122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.237</td>
<td>.0831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>.5806</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

which allowed for attributes such as weight, height, hair color, etc. to be used.

In the homework for week three, the assignment was to interview three people who were different and had been injured or insulted because of some personal characteristic. The examples of these injuries and insults ranged from being picked last for every team due to lack of coordination, to names that are used to insult Greeks and non-Greeks on Iowa State's campus, to racial slurs. One student stated in their journal,

Because of today's standards [regarding looks] that society seems to set, no one has a chance to truly become and individual. Is it just our human nature to point out qualities of other people that we ourselves are maybe jealous of? Or is our society so wrapped up in looks, that we really are so cruel to make fun of others whom we see to be "less fortunate" than ourselves... Having looked at diversity this way, I was not surprised to find that all of the people I interviewed had felt discriminated against.
Another student wrote that their personal example of discrimination is not limited to race, color, or gender. The student went on to discuss a personal characteristic which they were uncomfortable with and were often teased about. The student decided to have surgery to correct, what they perceived to be, the problem. Realizations such as these may have lent themselves to the increase in the student's own experiences with discrimination.

Students were never asked to write in the journal about their own heritage or growth experiences. However, some entries that dealt with this area of awareness were:

Everyday I am consciously aware of trying to discover myself and on concentrating on being the person that I want to be. I am confident in myself and proud of the way that I have shaped my life thus far. I fell that I have learned a great deal about myself by reading autobiographies and by trying to understand the way these authors perceive the world and why.

In conclusion, [this assignment], once again made me realize what a lucky person I am. I was blessed with the chance to grow up in and environment that was "sound." I had parents that were still married, educated, and that served as positive role models for me.

I noticed that most of the people I know and grew up with are a lot like me- Caucasian, from the Midwest, middle class, similar ideas and values, etc.

In the comparison of men and women, men scored higher on two of the questions (one of which is significant), but their scores decreased in two other areas. On question 9, experiencing discriminatory acts, the men scored a mean
difference of .619, p = .0086 and the women were at .294, p = .3513. Question 22, asking about interest in one's own culture, revealed the same results. The men scored a mean difference of .333, p = .0896 and women = .118, p = .5434. Although the scores for males actually decreased on two others, the other questions all proved to be insignificant.

Awareness of others' cultures

All six questions in this area showed increase, but again, only one was significant (see Table 2). Question #1 calculated an increase of 1.053, p < .0001. It stated that the person was knowledgeable about cultural norms of different groups on campus. The other questions (#s 7, 20, 21, 24, 25) inquired about the students' interest in becoming aware of others cultures and the importance of educating students about various cultures.

Table 2. Awareness of others' cultures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.053</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.395</td>
<td>.1002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.158</td>
<td>.5706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>.2535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>.7503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.263</td>
<td>.2692</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The reason for the lack of significant increases is unknown. It could be speculated, for question #1, that the amount of interviews increased their general knowledge of cultural norms. It is also possible that their interest in learning about other cultures did not change. Question #24 asked if others' cultures has always been an interest. It was not expected that this would change over the two month period (.53, p = .7503). Question #25 asked if others' cultures is a recent interest. The data gives the difference as .263, p = .2692.

Students did verbally and through action express their desire to learn more about other people and their cultures. One student stated that, "I did not take this class solely for an extra credit- I REALLY would like to learn more about diversity. This class seemed like the perfect opportunity." Another student said, "Diversity gives everyone a chance to learn about other cultures rather than our own, which is great." Other examples appeared in journals. Students attended guest speakers, diversity programs, and activities on campus that they wrote about in their journals. Some of these included MLK Day, activities for Black History Month, rallies involving a racial tension on campus, speakers such as Ice T and a former model that discussed discrimination and pressure in her field. While such participation was encouraged, it was not required. The students did this on their own initiative.

Another example of willingness and initiative to learn about others appeared in two types of the written assignments. The first assignment was one in which students were asked to interview people different from themselves. Some used people they knew and had known for a while. "I liked this assignment and learned
something "new" from my three friends. Scenarios they had mentioned in the past briefly, I was now asking for more details and their after-thoughts." Others expressed that they had had an interest in getting to know someone on their floor or building and this gave them the perfect opportunity. Most of them, whether they had previously known the person or not, expressed that they had learned something that had surprised them. One student wanted to know the impacts of the difference in family composition. They wrote, "I interviewed a girl who grew up as a single child, I however was a middle child of three sisters. So, I thought it would be interesting to see how a single child was brought up in comparison to me, being a part of a multi-children family." The student was surprised to discover how similar their lives were. Another student was surprise that they had so many similar values to a Chinese student even though their lives were so different.

The second assignment was to write about the ability to walk in someone else's shoes. Secondly, if they could walk in another person's shoes, who would they want to be. While many students said that you could never truly walk in someone else's shoes, most of them had someone they wanted to be. These ranged from walking in the shoes of parents to professionals in their field. One student wanted to walk in the shoes of a handicapped person.

If I could walk in somebody else's shoes I would want to be someone who is physically handicapped. I would want to know what it felt like, how those people have to face all those everyday challenges. I want to be able to relate to those people, know what it's like to not have everything so simple. I would try to maneuver a wheel chair around,
use leg or arm braces, or try to work without an arm or leg.

One student wrote about his effort to be minority on campus for a day. This student wrote that since they couldn't actually be a minority, the following would be an alternative: "I would spend a day with a minority. Sort of like job shadowing. I would follow the individual around,... and listen to the environment of the individual."

There were also students who watched movies or read books to learn about cultures or experiences within a culture that they did not understand. Some of the movies watched were, "The Color Purple," "Schindler's List," "School Ties," and "Higher Learning." Another student, who watched, "The Color Purple," wrote,

In reality my life does not even compare to the pain and suffering the main character encountered through her life time. I know that I can never really experience the feelings this person felt, but for a split second I could be there, looking through her eyes, and take a short walk in her shoes.

One of the students who watched "Schindler's List" wrote,

This movie opened my eyes to things I never knew even happened. I always believed in the Holocaust, but I never knew the extent to which it was so evil and humanly wrong. It saddened me so much as I watched it that by the end I was an emotional mess. It also sparked my interest so much that I am reading some books on it.

Many of the students read articles in the school paper about Carry Chapman Catt (an alumni accused of being a racist and xenophobe), the Greek versus non-Greek
debate, and editorials involving perspectives on religion and cultural issues on campus. Again, this was not asked of the students (except for one assignment to respond to an article of their choice), they did this on their own initiative.

When broken down into male and female counterparts, we find the male mean difference is -.333, p = .0896, and females mean difference = 1.0, p = .0271. This would indicate that there is indeed a significant difference in females interest of others' cultures. The same thing happened with #24, although the numbers are not significant. In #1, males mean difference was 1.143, p < .0001 and females mean difference was .941, p = .0051.

The sum of the male/female comparison can be interpreted a couple of ways. The first is that there is no real difference between males and females, which would support the work of Pascarella (1996). Another conclusion could be that the data is inconclusive. The third is that given the care voice of women, they became more interested throughout the course, and although both genders reported that their knowledge of cultural norms increased, women's increased more.

**Awareness of biases and preferences that influence behavior**

Of the 17 questions that were included in this area of awareness, only two showed a significant increase (see Table 3). They were #3 and #34. #3 stated that the student felt equally comfortable around people from diverse backgrounds. The mean difference for this question was .368, p = .0416. A question that was similar
Table 3. Awareness of biases and preferences that influence behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.158</td>
<td>.3496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td>.0416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.237</td>
<td>.1731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>.8948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>.7437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.316</td>
<td>.0632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>-0.053</td>
<td>.7621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>.5343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.158</td>
<td>.2949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>-0.053</td>
<td>.7621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>.1860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>.2216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>.2535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>.4184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>.5930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.526</td>
<td>.0008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

to this was #28 stating that the student felt at ease with people from diverse backgrounds. The mean difference was .211, p = .2216, obviously not demonstrating the same growth as #3. Number 34 stated that the student was aware of how others’ cultural backgrounds influence their behavior. It scored a mean difference of .526, p = .0008. A similar question, #11 stating that students understood the cultural influences that were at the root of behaviors they observed
had a mean difference of .316. \( p = .0632 \). These four observations seem to demonstrate an increase of comfortableness with diverse people and an increase in the understanding of others' behaviors based on cultural influences.

These do, however, only represent 4 out of 17 questions. This again can be explained in a few different ways. One explanation is that students sincerely thought they knew a lot about their own biases and preferences that lend themselves to behavior at the beginning of the class. They discovered later that they did not, but in taking the post-test, rated themselves where they had begun. Another possibility is that they were not honest, and replied to the survey with what they thought the researcher wanted to discover. Yet another possibility is that the students do not develop in terms of their awareness about biases and preferences that influence behavior.

There were not journal entries that related to this specifically. Students did seem to have a lot of questions in various entries about why some people treat others unjustly. They also expressed concern on what is appropriate to share about yourself, given biases and preferences of both parties. A student wrote,

Our class discussed this issue last week and I have been thinking about it a lot ever since. If someone knows something about someone else or themselves and he or she know it is big difference, should it be mentioned on purpose or "hidden" until it is discovered?

This student used examples such as: one roommate is an atheist and the other is a devout Catholic, a family member brings home their gay lover without telling the
family the partner is of the same sex, and a final example of a male college student getting their ears pierced or a tattoo, even though they know their parents won't approve.

Overall, students seem to struggle with the underlying causes of behaviors. They did learn some new information, but some expressed that they discovered that had much more to learn about why people act the way they do. The students who wanted to follow a minority for a day said there would be barriers to experiencing everything. An example that was used was if they went to a store the minority may be treated differently if the salesperson thought that this person was with them. The students question why it should make a difference in the employee's behavior.

Another student wrote about attending a speaker who was at Iowa State to speak against violence and things that attribute to violence. The student described the speaker as a "walking contradiction." Not only did the speaker talk about how much he loved violence, but he was especially rude and demeaning about women's issues. Specifically, the student said,

He is beyond a doubt encouraging the oppression of women. It seemed as if he did everything he could to downgrade females and what is worse is that he seemed to show no mercy... He even tried to pawn his demeaning statements off as being part of male sexuality... He also said at one point, "f**k what the white people think." He saw nothing wrong with what he was doing and the audience only seemed to encourage his behavior by cheering and laughing when oppressive statements were made.

The speaker's actions upset the student, but the behavior of the students was found to be even more upsetting. The student wondered why no one confronted the
speaker or walked out. She also wondered why they would bring a speaker such as this, whose message is supposed to be against violence. The student questioned the behavior of everyone involved. A follow up letter was submitted by this same student in which the lack of understanding and frustration was still present.

Several students wrote about people's general ability to be cruel for no particular reason. They questioned what it is in the various culture that causes this cruelty, or was it just human nature. They wrote about superiority and inferiority complexes lending themselves to this behavior, and determined that both could be antecedents of the cruel behavior depending on the circumstances.

When comparing males and females, there are some evident differences. In #3, males' mean difference score was .095, p = .7049, while females were at .706, p = .0060. This would imply that females explain the majority of the mean difference in the total score for this question. The same pattern occurs in #28. While neither is significant (as with the total), men scored a mean difference of .095, p = .6657, and women .353, p = .2102. On questions number 11 and 34 the scores were the following, respectively: M = -143, p = .4803 and W = .882, p = .0006; and M = .381, p = .0571; W = .706, p = .0060. This, again, suggests much more affective development has occurred among the females.

**Awareness of preparedness and commitment to action**

There were seven questions in this area. Of these, five demonstrated a significant increase in awareness of preparedness and commitment to action, and
the other two, while not significant at .05, support the other five (see Table 4). The questions that had significant increases were #s 16, 17, 29, 30, and 35.

Questions 16 and 17 address the students' ability to confront situations in which they feel uneasy or a derogatory comment is made. The mean differences for these questions were .421, \(p = .0274\) and .447, \(p = .0331\). Question 18 also addresses an issue of confrontation, dealing specifically with racial tension and discrimination. The mean difference for this question was .342, \(p = .0793\).

Question 29 dealt with tolerance of racial, ethnic, and gender jokes, implying action or reaction. Question 15 addressed the student's own use of jokes based on race, gender, or sexual orientation. The mean differences were .553, \(p = .0017\) and .368.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td>0.0946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>0.0274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.447</td>
<td>0.0331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.342</td>
<td>0.0793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.553</td>
<td>0.0017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td>0.0248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.378</td>
<td>0.0416</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
p = .0946. Question 30 asked about the students ability to resolve conflicts with diverse individuals. The mean difference was .368, p = .0248. Lastly, #35 asked the student if they actively seek out relationships with people who are different. .378 was the mean difference between pre-test and post-test with p = .0416.

The increase in preparedness and commitment to action is most likely attributable to the many case studies discussed throughout the course. In each of these, feelings, outcomes, reactions, and plans of action are discussed. Some classes have role-played these confrontations so that students become "comfortable" with such situations. This exposure and practice may be the reason they feel more prepared and committed to act.

The comparison of men and women seem to be inconclusive. In the first grouping, with the inclusion of resolving conflict (#30), men scored higher on two and women on the other two. Women do score significantly higher in lack of tolerance for and telling of jokes/slurs. They also score higher in actively seeking out relationships with people of different backgrounds.

Overall, this seems to be the area in which the most affective education is taking place. This is, however, the area that is the most questionable. The other areas deal more with attitudes and values. This area is a self-reported commitment to act. It does not inquire if the students have actually acted by confronting situations or have them give examples of when they have sought out a relationship with someone who is different. A student made this very same observation:
Last week after class I really started to think about what was going on in class. One of the interesting parts for me was when we discussed the scenario involving the gay man always talking about his boyfriend. It kind of surprised me to see that many people seem pretty open about the whole thing, that is in class... I hope these same people whom are open about these kinds of issues in this group situation will be the same way out there in the real world, where it really counts.

There were some other journal entries that, while they did not address these specific questions, did suggest some critical thinking about diversity and development on the part of the students.

In the case study that we read for class, about the president from Rutgers University making racial comments, I am not sure exactly where I stand on the issue... the clubs and organizations that he set up were good, but the part where it said that the housing arrangements were set up to house minorities.. was bad. That, I feel, is just another way of segregation. If we are ever going to get rid of racism we all have to learn to live together, and stop trying to keep everyone separated into their little groups.

This class,... and my own need to change, open up and allow others to know me has made quite an experience. Since first arriving here, I have noticed that I can see a personality more readily and not a skin color. I used to see a skin color first and then a person.

The article that I read surrounded the debate set off by the fact that Hawaii is going to legalize same-sex marriages. The person in this article was saying how it was so wrong and goes against all of the good family values and good Christian values. He gives no good-apparent reason why it should not happen... If these people are so religious then they would realize what a sin they are committing because of the hate they for gays and the way they throw it around.

Overall diversity cannot be achieved by merely implementing affirmative action programs or programs that limit segregation. These
types of programs are currently in place at Iowa State, yet there are obvious divisions in the campus population with respect to race, culture, gender. The most detailed plan to ensure diversity and promote tolerance cannot succeed without individual efforts. Each student at Iowa State must make a conscious effort to be more tolerant to ideas from different cultures and groups. Since most college students think they are tolerant enough or do not have a reason to do this, something must be done across the board to improve communication. The only obvious solution to this problem has been discussed as a solution several times in the past. A class, mandatory for all incoming Iowa State students must be offered such as this one. In this setting, students of different backgrounds could interact on a closer, more personal level. Even if great obstacles are not overcome, students will be excused to new ideas and intercultural friendships are bound to form. These friendships alone could drastically improve the attitudes on this campus. Students would remember their classmates from this class and cross racial and ethnic boundaries by merely socializing more frequently with one another.

This was a hard assignment because I had to try and explain the term values. That was difficult, to back away from the homework question and define the term for myself as well.

I was extremely moved by her speech/slide presentation [concerning modeling and female exploitation]. Sure, I see ads every day where women are exploited; however, she opened a whole new avenue of thought about this problem for me. I walked away from the union last night with an incredible amount of anger and tension bound in myself.

If decision makers, leaders, managers or other persons of authority set a cheery and positive atmosphere, everyone will follow with that mode or tone in their behavior. One person sets the tone, and all the others will follow. If these people of high authority act responsibly and fairly, I feel everyone else will be more cooperative in the effort for creating a comfortably diverse community.

The ignorance that is in the world today drives me crazy. Sure, I live in my Iowa State world and want people to enjoy the diversity of others, but to fire someone because they are the "wrong color" is absurd. The firing is an excuse for other underlying issues that the manager might have, or is more likely a first class case of discrimination.
Final journal entries

The first question the students were asked was what they learned in this class. Many expressed that they felt they learned more about diversity in general. Some said they realized that everyone is different, and differences range from obvious attributes such as race/color to values and morals. Others stated that they felt they could make a difference if they stood by what they believed to be fair, just, and equal. Many stated the course has helped them to become more open-minded.

Some of the entries said the following:

The most important thing that I learned was how to be tolerant with others' beliefs.

I learned that it is important to listen to what other people say. Sometimes you can learn more, not by talking, but by sitting back and really listening to people's ideas and how they feel.

I've learned how to look at controversial issues from the opposite perspective. Our discussions have taught me to be tolerant of others' opinions and understand why they have them.

The only way to improve things is to get up and do it ourselves. There is a different side to every situation that is just as logical as your own view, if you consider it.

The most important thing I learned is that even though all people are different, whether it is through cultural background, race, sexual orientation, or whatever, they are still just people, no matter how you slice it. We are all together in this thing, and we all have to make it, somehow. So, instead of putting each other down, we should lift one another up.

The most important thing I've learned from this class is that everyone
thinks differently and that is O.K. Most people have differing opinions on issues and as long as they are not discriminatory against others, these thoughts are not wrong or even necessarily correct. I've always been a stubborn person when it comes to my beliefs. I think this class has taught me to be a little more open-minded with diversity-related issues.

The most important thing that I have learned in class is we are really a diverse population. This does not mean we can not get along with one another. Everyone is different. We may come from the same continent, but we have different values and heritage. I learned about some key issues on debate in Iowa State University today.

The most important thing I have learned in this course would most definitely have to be how to be extremely open-minded. I had to learn how to accept other people's views and hear a lot of things I especially did not agree with- yet sit there and listen.

The only way to improve things is to get up and do it ourselves.

The second question asked the students what they learned most from their out-of-class activities. Students reported that there are issues related to diversity occurring all over campus. Many stated they found that more people had experienced forms of discrimination than they had thought. Some of the entries are quoted below:

I learned how cruel the world really can be. I actually have a whole new perspective on diversity. I realize now how minorities are effected by all the controversy going on in America. I also gained the knowledge of how not just "minorities" are discriminated against. I understand now from reading the varieties of articles that handicapped persons, women or even men, people in different organizations, rich vs. poor, and even relations, political preference, and place in society are all considered diversity topics.

The out-of-class diversity studies gave me a reason to go to the library
or to go catch a guest lecturer when otherwise I might not have gone. These studies made my mind turn in order to relate what I already knew with what I was reading or hearing.

I learned by talking to many students different from myself, that cultural backgrounds significantly influence a person's morals and values.

It takes a lot more time and energy to get to know, or just say hello to someone that is different from you, than it appears.

I learned how really out-of-touch minorities feel at this university. It made me realize that this really is not the most diversified campus. But, I like the fact that we are making strides.

Racism exists at ISU.

I learned that diversity effects everyone.

I feel I have learned a lot more about the opinions of the African-American community.

The third question asked what part of the course was best for the students. Consistently, students responded that the best part was the open dialogue. They said it was refreshing to participate in a class and feel as if their opinions were listened to and valued. The discussions also gave them an opportunity to express some of the things that they saw happening around campus that they didn't feel safe discussing anywhere else. A few of the students commented on the dimension that the out-of-class experiences added. Also, some felt the assignments were the best part.

The one aspect of the course which was best for me would have to be the homework. Sounds crazy, but doing these assignment helped me
to discover my own feelings, try to related to others' feelings, and learn about others in different situations than myself by interviewing them. I guess just taking about an hour of my time each week to just sit an think of all my feelings about the unfairness of the world opened my eyes a lot. By interviewing several people, I realized how lucky I really am and I need not take anything for granted.

The thing I like best about the course was that there was actual interaction with the other students and facilitators.

Listening to the way people feel about gays and lesbians. How they really feel that is, with no holding back.

The open discussions were my favorite part of the class. It taught us to be democratic and respect one another.

I enjoyed being able to come to class and talk. It was fun to hear others views and even more fun for me to get to share mine.

The open dialogue.

The final question was for the students to inform the facilitator about aspects that can be improved. Consistently, students responded that aside from some logistics, the only way to improve the course was to do two things: make it a semester long course and require it. A couple of students suggested that it be a requirement for all incoming students- implying that there needs to be more sections. The logistical comments involved including readings in the packet rather than leaving them at the library and changing some other things that are included in the packet.
Summary

While much of the data from the survey did not prove to be significant, there were signs of some development in areas of awareness. Specifically, the area of preparedness for and commitment to action showed much development. The lack of significant finding could be attributed to many things, including: the students thought they were more aware at the beginning of the course than they actually were, the students responded in accordance with what they thought the researcher wanted to see on the pre-test, eight weeks was not long enough to develop a significant amount- implying that more time is needed, there was no change in development, or that since many of the students took the course by choice they were already aware of diversity issues. The scale found little to no difference between male and female development.

The journal entries suggest that the students did indeed develop thinking skills and grow in their own knowledge of diversity, tolerance, and awareness. Students responded that they felt the class beneficial enough that they would suggest it to others. This supports the idea that growth was taking place, but either not enough time had passed to measure a significant difference, or these students were already very aware. In other words, the students had already acquired knowledge about diversity issues and there was not a lot of room for growth to take place in a basic course such as Dialogues on Diversity.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Chapter V presents a summary of the study, the results of the research, and recommendations for future research in the area.

The study began with 48 students who were enrolled in the Dialogues on Diversity course. These students completed the course eight weeks later. They were given a pre-test and post-test survey entitled the Awareness Continuum Survey. Of the original 48 students enrolled, 38 of them completed both the pre- and post-tests. Journal entries were also collected to support the data of the survey. The final journal assignment was kept to discover students' opinions about the course.

Paired t-tests were run on each of the 35 items included in the survey to determine development in four areas of awareness. Few of the items showed significant differences at the $p < .05$ level for the various areas. However, the journal entries suggest that the students feel they developed in awareness of diversity issues.

There were five hypotheses stated in Chapter one of the study. Each of these will now be discussed in light of the findings. Hypothesis 1 stated that there was no difference in students' awareness of their own culture between pre-test (Week 1) and post-test (Week 7). There was no evidence found to determine that there was a difference. Students' knowledge of their own cultural background remained fairly consistent. Some of the journal entries suggest that some rethinking
or rediscovery occurred, but it appears there was little to no growth in this area.

Hypotheses 2 stated that there was no difference between students' awareness of others' cultures between the pre- and post-tests. There was little change in students' awareness in this area as reported by the data. The journals do suggest the students felt they learned more about other people because of the classes influence.

Hypotheses 3 stated that there was no difference between students' awareness of biases and tolerances that influence behavior between the pre- and post-tests. Again, there was no evidence to support that change occurred. Rather, the journal suggest that understanding behavior is something with which the students struggled.

Hypotheses 4 stated that there was no difference between students' awareness of preparedness or commitment to action between the pre- and post-tests. There was significant evidence, both in the data and the journals, that development occurred in this area. This area showed the only marked increase between the tests.

Hypotheses 5 stated that there was no difference between men's and women's development in awareness. There was little evidence to support a difference between men and women, which supports the findings of Pascarella et al. (1996).
Significance of the Study

The findings of the data suggest that the course is increasing students' awareness, but not significantly. The only area in which significant increases occurred was in the area of preparedness for and commitment to action. The findings of the journal entries suggest that students' feel they are learning and becoming more aware. As a whole, this suggest that the course is a starting place for progress, but needs some modifications such as an increase in the length of the course.

The student responses indicate that, in accordance with Beane (1990) it is possible to have affective curriculum that addresses multiculturalism in education effectively. The journals and the data indicate affective curriculum, (in which students' beliefs, values, and behavior are challenged), impacts students thinking and action surrounding diversity issues. The information gathered in this research suggested that students were thinking more critically. Their ideas began to show additional perspectives, as well as debates going on within themselves about specific topics.

It is also important to note that direct instruction is a positive and beneficial way to address diversity issues. The study suggests students' feel this to be an important topic for a course, supporting Pascarella (1996) Students responded positively to the knowledge that the course was based on campus diversity issues and the topics which they would be discussing. It can be concluded that students respond, not only to direct instruction, but specifically to dialogue. The students'
reported that the most beneficial aspect of the course was that they were allowed to dialogue and express various viewpoints on many topics.

The journal entries support Gilligans' work that dialogue is an important aspect of moral development for these students. Specifically, it was learned that it is possible to challenge students' morals, beliefs, and emotions in order to increase awareness and their ability to make moral decisions. Again, the journals and the survey provided information that allowed it to be determined that they were struggling with some issues. These issues usually revolved around which decision was morally appropriate and how decisions supported or contradicted their own set of morals and values. Finally, their emotions played a role in making those moral decisions.

Another significant contribution from this study is the knowledge that students are more likely to give information that can help educators and developers in their dialogue and items such as journals. The dialogue and journal proved to be a way of collecting information on students’ development that was richer in content and helped facilitators to determine students' true feelings, beliefs, and prejudices. This information was helpful in directing class discussions to help students' explore their feelings further, and hopefully arrive at a resolution. The survey data, while helpful, generated more questions, which were often answered by reflecting on the dialogue and reading the journals.

Lastly, in order to continue to develop students’ awareness, multiculturalism in education, in which dialogue and other formats allow students to express
themselves must become prevalent in institutions of higher education. Mediums such as these allow students the opportunity to learn from each other and dialogue in some form. Should these programs become more prevalent, it seems secondary that tensions would diminish over time and understanding and awareness would increase. It is a fact that the way educators increase students' knowledge on any topic, is by exposing them to the information in various ways. It is logical therefore, to do the same with multiculturalism in education.

Recommendations for Further Research

Research has been done on the effect that attending a college or university has on awareness and tolerance. However, much more needs to be conducted on the impact of the three methods of implementation for multiculturalism in education: the all-inclusive course/workshop, diversity curriculum requirements, and incorporation in every course. Specifically, the following should be considerations in continuing research in this area.

First, it is essential that validity and reliability tests be done on the awareness scale developed for the class as well as for the ACS. There are several terms of surveys completed that would help support the information found in this study. If the surveys are valid and reliable, the lack of significance in this study may be that the time for the course is so limited, the questions are too subjective, or the survey simply needs to be modified.
It is recommended that further research become more qualitative. The journals and actual class discussions would add more to the kinds of development and challenge and support issues the students are experiencing. The dialogue is important because it is the essence of the course, and was reported by students to be the most beneficial. The journals gave students an opportunity to say things they may not have said in class as well as explore issues in more detail. One dimension that should be added to the journal area is the addition of reflective and/or introspective questions for the students. In finding out students own feelings and thoughts in exploring their values and ideas, even more developmental issues may be identified. This would have implications for the curriculum.

The curriculum itself should remain. It was important to the goals of the course to discuss issues that related to Iowa State. However, this means that the syllabus is not always strictly adhered to. Students often came in to class with things that were happening on campus that they wanted to discuss. It is important to give them this opportunity. However, because these "digressions" from the syllabus occur, it is important that these topics are recorded and that the students discussion is noted. This, again, has implications in the curriculum. Due to the possibility of various conversations, due to numerous classes, it is also recommended that each of the classes be observed, again in the qualitative style. The dialogues that occur explain a lot about the progress made in different classes.

There can also be recommendations made about the facilitators. One recommendation is that all facilitators be required to attend the training session,
which should be expanded to sessions. While it is known that with such variety of people, there is difficulty in scheduling, it is important that each facilitator attend as many as possible. These sessions should first give the facilitator an opportunity to explore their own biases, preferences, values, etc. In the dialogues, it is important that each of the facilitators understand themselves so that they can effectively facilitate and express opposing points of view. Secondly, they should train the facilitator to facilitate. It is also important that the facilitators attend weekly meetings. This gives them an opportunity to dialogue about the developmental stages of their class as a whole and issues that are being brought to the attention of the class.

Another essential component that should remain is the mix of facilitators for each class. Faculty, staff, and students all add a different perspective to what is happening in class. The students that serve as facilitators often identify better with the students, or are more aware of students actual feelings about issues because they are in the "trenches." It is also found that the staff person usually adds a very developmental approach to the class. The faculty member is usually thinks more analytically and keeps things on track. Personalities, of course, play a large role in each person's contributions. The point is that with four facilitators, each of these bases is covered. The other aspect that is beneficial is because each of the facilitators volunteered and has a self-interest in the course, each is more knowledgeable about different issues on campus. Therefore, there is usually an "expert" that can better handle students' questions on a specific diversity subject.
This expert usually has a defining characteristic or interest that becomes evident to the students and the other facilitators very early in the course. This characteristic often somehow labels them an expert. For instance, if a facilitator states that they are homosexual, they will often be asked to address questions involving homosexuality. One concern with this label is that many students see them as the representative of their population, and so what they say is true for everyone in their population. The second concern is that the facilitator (more often a student labeled an expert) is going through some very difficult things developmentally, and is not willing to talk about the characteristic that is perceived to define who they are.

The final recommendations involve the subjects. It is recommended that sections of freshmen take this course in their first or second semester. A comparison should then be done between the development of those in the class and those not enrolled. This would have implications for the effects of attending school and being involved in the course. It would also allow for a follow up study to be done with the participants in their sophomore, junior and senior years to see if the non-participant group and participant group developed differently, assuming the initial finding found differences in their development.

While some research has been done in this area, it is evident that there is a lot of unexplored material that will have implications for the future of institutions of higher education and for the work force. In order to solve the potential tensions and oppressions of the future, we must begin to study this areas more in depth today.
APPENDIX A
SURVEY INSTRUMENT
PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

Researcher: Katherine Bolluyt, 263 N. Hyland, 296-0380, katiejo@ia.state.edu

My name is Katherine Bolluyt. I am a graduate student in Professional Studies. For my thesis I will be surveying the participants in the course Dialogues on Diversity (5 sections). The purpose of my research is to discover the implications/impacts of the course on students awareness on various multicultural issues.

As a participant, you will be given a survey at the beginning and end of the course. The information gained from the surveys will be used in my thesis. Information from your class journals will also be used to support the data from the survey. The following are the terms of participating in my research:

1. The information will be used to write my thesis, which will be reviewed and read by three faculty members and submitted to the graduate college.
2. Participant names will not be used during data collection/analysis nor in the thesis, you will be identified during the data analysis by SS# only.
3. The participant has the right to withdraw at any time from the study and for any reason.

If you agree to participate in the research project according to the preceding terms, please sign below.

Participant ___________________________  Date__________________
DIALOGUES ON DIVERSITY
Research Survey
by Katherine Bolluyt

Last 4 digits of SS#__________________________

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION:

Section: ______ Day:_______ Time:___________

Gender: ___ Female ___ Male

Age: ___ 17-22 ___ 23-29 ___ 30-39 ___ 40-49 ___ 50-

Classification: ___ Freshman ___ Sophomore ___ Junior ___ Senior

Major: ________________________________

Ethnicity: ___ European American
___ African American
___ Hispanic
___ Native American
___ Asian American
___ Bi-racial
___ Nationality other than U.S., specify ____________
___ Other

I Live: ___ in the residence halls
___ in a sorority/fraternity house
___ off campus

Extracurricular activities: ___ Not involved outside of class
___ Department Clubs
___ Residence Hall Activities/Leadership
___ Fraternity/Sorority Activities/Leadership
___ Intramurals
___ Academic Clubs/Organizations
___ Social Organizations
___ Collegiate Sport(s) ____________________________
___ Others (please list) ____________________________

Reasons for taking this course (Please check all that apply):
___ personal interest
___ needed the credit
___ recommended to you
___ other ________________________________


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I am knowledgeable about cultural norms of different groups on campus.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I admit that I have opinions about different groups that are based on stereotypes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I feel equally comfortable around people from diverse backgrounds.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I would prefer to work with a group that is diverse than one that is culturally homogeneous.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I prefer to spend time with people who are different from me (different ethnically, religiously, in sexual orientation, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I grew up in a community in which more than one ethnic/cultural group was represented in at least 10% of the population.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I have been involved in at least 3 other programs/courses that dealt specifically with diversity.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. As a child, my family members expressed discriminatory beliefs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. In my life, I have experienced discriminatory behaviors.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I am always patient with people whose first language is not English.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I understand the cultural influences that are at the root of some of the behaviors I see.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I would rather get to know the people I'm working with, as opposed to just concentrating on the task at hand.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I enjoy working with people whose values and backgrounds are different from mine.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I am in favor of welcoming outsiders into the groups with which I associate.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I have not told jokes/made slurs in the last 2 months that were related to race, gender, or sexual orientation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I feel that my education has prepared me to confront situations in which I feel uneasy.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I feel that my education has prepared me to confront people who make derogatory comments.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>I believe I have been prepared to handle situations in which racial tension and/or discrimination is taking place.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>I would feel comfortable in a situation in which I was the only person of my ethnic background, religion, race, or sexual orientation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>I believe that there is more to education than text-book learning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Diversity/multicultural discussions are needed for ALL students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Being aware of my culture and family history has always been important to me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Being aware of my culture and family history has just recently become important to me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Becoming aware of other people and their culture, ideas, and values has always interested me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Becoming aware of other people and their cultures, ideas, and values has just recently interested me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>I am able to disagree with someone religiously or morally and still have respect for them and their right to have those beliefs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>I am aware of my own assumptions and stereotypes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>I am at ease with people of diverse backgrounds.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>I do not tolerate racial, ethnic, or gender related jokes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>I feel able to resolve conflicts with people who are different from me in cultural background, gender, race, and lifestyle.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>I feel comfortable talking about differences in race, culture, gender, and sexual orientation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>I recognize my own biases and prejudices.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>I am aware of how my own cultural background influences my behavior.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>I am aware of how others' cultural backgrounds influence their behavior.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>I seek out relationships and groups in which the people are different from me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SD** | 1 2 3 4 5

**SA** | 1 2 3 4 5
APPENDIX B

CLASS SURVEY
AWARENESS CONTINUUM

Directions: Circle the number that best represents where you fit along the continuum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I am not knowledgeable about the cultural norms of different groups on campus.</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</th>
<th>I am knowledgeable about the cultural norms of different groups on campus.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I do not hold stereotypes about other groups.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>I admit my stereotypes about other groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel partial to, and more comfortable with, some groups than others.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>I feel equally comfortable with all groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I gravitate toward others who are like me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>I gravitate toward others who are different than me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find it more satisfying to participate in a homogenous group.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>I find it more satisfying to participate in a multicultural team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that everyone is the same, with similar values and preferences.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>I feel that everyone is unique, with differing values and preferences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am perplexed by the culturally different values I see.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>I understand the cultural influences that are at the root of some of the behavior I see.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I react with irritation when confronted with someone who does not speak English.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>I show patience and understanding with limited English speakers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am task focused and don't like to waste time chatting.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>I find that more gets done when I spend time on relationships first.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that newcomers to this society should adapt to our rules.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>I feel that both newcomers and the organizations in which they interact need to change to fit together.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C
COURSE OUTLINE
## Course Outline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1--3/18</td>
<td>Introductions/Team Building/Values Clarification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2--3/25</td>
<td>Institutional Responses/Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ISU: a welcoming place?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3--4/1</td>
<td>Institutional Responses/Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policies in Action?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4--4/8</td>
<td>Personal Responses/Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Epithets and Insults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5--4/15</td>
<td>Personal Responses/Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experiencing Being Different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6--4/22</td>
<td>Societal Responses/Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community-Shared Values?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7--4/29</td>
<td>Societal Responses/Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disenganchisement and Democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creating Community at ISU: Making an action plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7--5/3</td>
<td>Ice Cream Social &amp; Wrap-up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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