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FOREWORD

. . . Each child requires to be taught as a unique individual, with special attention to his own unique rates of growth and development. And this is what we really mean when we say that human beings are born equal; that is, they are born with equal rights to fulfillment. 'Equal rights' does not mean that every child shall be treated as if he were no different from any other child. Rather, it means that every child has a right to the recognition of his own uniqueness and individuality.

——— Montagu
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ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to examine the relationship between knowledge change and attitude change in prospective teachers when presented information about minorities, in the form of a Multicultural Instructional Unit. The treatment text, Kleg and Rice: Race, Caste and Prejudice (1970), was accompanied by its achievement test, the Kleg-Puglisi: Cognitive Measuring Instrument which was used to measure cognitive change. A modified Bogardus Social Distance Scale, and a modified Kelly, Ferson, and Holtzman Desegregation Scale were the attitude change measuring instruments.

Statistically significant differences were sought between experimental and control groups in cognition and attitudes, and attitude and cognition level differences were computed for each student relative to demographic variables. Statistical tools employed in the study were the coefficients of correlation and analyses of covariance. The study population consisted of second year students at Louisiana State University in Baton Rouge.

Three null-hypotheses were tested.
The first null-hypothesis stated that there will be no relationship between attitude change and cognitive change as measured by change scores for each student (posttest minus pretest) for the experimental group. Null-hypothesis one was accepted.

The second null-hypothesis stated that there will be no statistically significant difference between experimental and control groups pre- and posttreatment observations in (1) attitudes, as measured by Social Distance Scale adjusted means, (2) attitudes, as measured by Desegregation Scale adjusted means, and (3) cognition, as measured by Cognitive Measuring Instrument adjusted means.

It was concluded that attitudes toward ethnic groups, as measured by Social Distance Scale, were not modified. Attitudes toward Blacks and desegregation, as measured by the Desegregation Scale, were modified and change in cognition did occur. Null-hypothesis two, part (1) was accepted; parts (2) and (3) were rejected at the .05 level.

Null-hypothesis three tested the effect of demographic variables on cognitive and attitude change and was accepted.
"Attitude refers both to a predisposition causing consistency in behavior, and also as a general evaluation of an object, measurable by questionnaire" (Cushman, 1980, p. 3). A variety of studies have clearly validated the thesis that teacher attitudes toward the children with whom they are involved do have a major impact on the cognitive, psychomotor, and affective learnings of the children (Clark, 1965; Rosenthal, 1969; Payne, 1980). Only the importance of the family surpasses the significance of teacher attitudes and expectations on the self-concept and achievement of students (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1973; Cross, Happel, Doston, & Stiles, 1977).

Research has shown that initial attitudes of teachers remain quite stable over their professional life span and that teacher attitudes greatly influence their teaching approaches toward all, but especially toward minority children (Henrikson, 1971; Saunders, 1980). Since attitudes are closely related to behaviors, induced attitude change should also produce behavioral change. Such perceptual change was found to be most
effective when conducted during pre-service and under controlled conditions (Swick, 1972).

The effect of a multicultural instructional unit on the attitudes and behavior of pre-service teachers has wide application to education as an institution, especially to institutions of teacher education. Multicultural education directs its attention to the individual, perceiving each person as being more similar to than different from the rest of humanity. It addresses itself to ethnic, racial, linguistic, cultural, and sex differences, that is, to the study of the pluralistic composition of the people of the United States of America, and of its schools, which were established to pass on the values of the society as a whole to its new members, the children (Dewey, 1933).

In order for the teacher, who is more often than not a one-culture person, to deal successfully with racially, culturally, and linguistically heterogeneous groups, it is necessary to adjust to the needs and values of the members of these groups (Davis, 1975; Walsh, 1973). The teacher who, during the pre-service years, has been given the opportunity to make these adjustments is more likely to overcome the pressures inherent to the profession. Attitude change in pre-service teachers translated into behavioral change in in-service teachers may well result
in better human relations in the classroom and ultimately in society itself.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

This study was designed to determine if a Multicultural Instructional Unit (MCIU) will have an effect on the attitudes of teacher education students toward the minority child. The study examined the relationship between attitude change scores and cognitive change scores based on the MCIU's content and a social distance scale. The relationship between the scores obtained on the cognitive test and the desegregation scale was also determined by the use of the Pearson Product Moment Correlation and was tested for significance at the .05 level of confidence.

This study determined differences between experimental and control groups relative to adjusted means in cognition and attitudes by using three analyses of covariance with the pretest scores as the covariable. One single analysis of covariance was used for each dependent variable, that is, cognition, social distance and the attitude toward Blacks and desegregation as measured by the use of the pretest scores as the covariable.

The Personal Inventory data were examined to provide information on possible factors, such as private or pub-
lic school attended, religion, and previous experience with minority children, which may have influenced the effect of the experiment and were to be retained to become factors in further analyses.

Hypotheses

The following three null-hypotheses will be tested at the .05 level:

$H_{01}$ There will be no significant relationship between cognitive change and attitude change among students who receive the Multicultural Instructional Unit.

$H_{02}$ There will be no difference in knowledge and attitudes between experimental and control group subjects.

$H_{03}$ There will be no significant difference in attitudes, as measured by the Social Distance Scale and the Desegregation Scale, and in knowledge, as measured by the Cognitive Measuring Instrument based on data collected from the Personal Inventory Sheet.

The study attempted to answer the following questions:

1. Is there a statistically significant relationship in attitude change and cognitive change, as measured by change scores for each student on the pretest and posttest for the experimental group?
2. Is there a statistically significant difference between experimental and control groups relative to adjusted means in (a) cognition, (b) attitudes as measured by Social Distance Scale, Desegregation Scale, and Cognitive Measuring Instrument, and analyzed by using pretest scores as a covariable with the posttest scores as the dependent variable?

3. Is there a statistically significant difference between attitude and cognition level of the experimental and control groups based on public-private high school attended, socioeconomic background, religion, and previous experience with the minority child as indicated by the Personal Inventory Sheet, a demographic information form administered to all students during the initial observation phase?

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Attitude - "Attitude refers both to a predisposition causing consistency in behavior, and also as a general evaluation of an object, measurable by questionnaire" (Cushman, 1980, p. 3).

Cognitive Measuring Instrument - refers to a cognitive test consisting of 48 items developed by Kleg and Puglisi, geared to measure knowledge contained in the Instruc-
Desegregation Scale - A Likert-type attitude scale developed by Kelly, Ferson, and Holtzman consisting of 26 items.

Multicultural Education - "Multicultural education is preparation for the social, political, and economic realities that individuals experience in culturally diverse and complex human encounters. These realities have both national and international dimensions. This preparation provides a process by which an individual develops competencies for perceiving, believing, evaluating, and behaving in differential cultural settings. Thus, multicultural education is viewed as an intervention and an on-going assessment process to help institutions and individuals become more responsive to the human condition, individual cultural integrity, and cultural pluralism in society" (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, 1979, p. 13). (NCATE).

Social Distance Scale - attitude scale developed by E. S. Bogardus which measures attitudes toward several ethnic and racial groups in terms of seven social distance categories.
SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Information on the effect of multicultural education on the attitudes and cognitive achievement of teacher education students is needed. There are many theoretical studies dealing with this subject matter, but there are only a few studies which translate the theory into practice, and even fewer which evaluate already existing programs. Previous studies have only dealt with certain segments of the issues to which multicultural education addresses itself. Information gained from the current study provides more reliable data as to the effectiveness of such programs. If pre-service teacher attitudes toward culturally different children can be modified through the inclusion of multicultural education in their training, it can be assumed that this attitude change will be translated into behavior change and will enhance the effectiveness of instruction and will bring about conflict reduction and maximized student learning.

PROCEDURE

Population and Sample

The population is defined as all the undergraduate students enrolled in the College of Education attending Louisiana State University in Baton Rouge in the fall.
term of 1981.

The sample consisted of 4 sections of students enrolled in EDCI 2025 entitled Foundations and Principles in Teaching in the Elementary School. This is a required course and there are five to six sections of this course offered each fall. Each section consisted of twenty-five to thirty students. The sections were randomly assigned to experimental and control groups. The sample size was 119 students.

Data Collection and Instrumentation

1. The Personal Inventory Sheet

One hundred nineteen students, enrolled in EDCI 2025 in the fall of 1981, completed the Personal Inventory Sheet. This inventory collected information on high school attended, socioeconomic background, religion and previous experience with minority children. It is recognized that these characteristics may not be present in large enough quantities to influence the experiment. However, for those characteristics that were present in sufficient quantities, analyses of covariance were computed on the adjusted means and tests of significance at the .05 level of confidence. (Appendix A).
2. **The Social Distance Scale**

The Social Distance Scale used in this experiment was the primary instrument to measure attitudes toward various ethnic and racial groups. Developed by Bogardus, it is used to determine whether the respondent possesses a negative or positive attitude toward a particular ethnic or racial group. The Social Distance Scale was administered to both groups as a pretest and a posttest. (Appendix B).

3. **The Desegregation Scale**

The Desegregation Scale was developed by Kelly, Ferson, and Holtzman. It was selected for this study because of its relevance to social and political discussions currently occurring throughout the nation, the state, and East Baton Rouge Parish (County). The controversy over busing of students for the purpose of achieving racial balance in public schools and the re-examination of desegregation as a tool in assimilating the Blacks constituted the basis for the selection of an attitude scale which would evaluate attitudes pertinent to racial desegregation. This scale was administered both as a pretest and as a posttest. (Appendix C).

4. **The Cognitive Measuring Instrument**

The Cognitive Measuring Instrument was developed by Kleg and Puglisi. The instrument is based on the content
found in the instructional unit. As such, the Cognitive Measuring Instrument is an achievement test designed to evaluate the student's ability to recall and recognize material presented in the unit of instruction. (Appendix D).

5. The Experimental Unit

The text, Race, Caste and Prejudice, was prepared by Kleg and Rice and was used as the basis of the instructional material for the treatment.

Data Analysis

Three analyses of covariance were used, one for each dependent variable -- cognition, attitude, and attitude toward Blacks and desegregation, with pretest scores as the covariable.

Two tests of significance at the .05 level of confidence were conducted on Pearson Product Moment Correlation. These correlations determined whether statistically significant relationships existed between the degree of attitude change and knowledge change among students in the experimental group. These relationships were measured by the correlation between the Social Distance Scale and the cognitive test, and the Desegregation Scale and the cognitive test scores.

This study follows the Pretest-Posttest Control Group design, where equivalency of groups was achieved by group randomization, and it takes the following form:
Groups | Pretest | Treatment | Posttest
--- | --- | --- | ---
Experimental | T1(P,D,S,C) | X | T2(D,S,C)
Control | T1(P,D,S,C) | - | T2(D,S,C)

Explanation of Symbols

- P (Personal Inventory Sheet)
- D (Desegregation Scale)
- S (Social Distance Scale)
- C (Cognitive Measuring Instrument)

LIMITATION OF THE STUDY

The sample population was limited to students enrolled in the College of Education and attending Louisiana State University.

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The study consisted of an experiment in which second year university students majoring in elementary education participated. An entry level course, EDCI 2025, Foundations and Principles in Teaching in the Elementary School, was selected for this study. All elementary education majors are required to take this course as a first course. The sample population of 119 students was enrolled in four sections of EDCI 2025. Two of the four sections were randomly chosen to form the Experimental Group, Group 1. The other two sections were pre- and posttested and all spent three class hours a week in the classroom over a
period of four weeks.

Group 1, the Experimental Group, was given special, direct classroom instruction by the researcher emphasizing a multicultural approach to the elementary school child based on Kleg and Rice's *Race, Caste and Prejudice* module (1970). These students were not told that they were part of an experiment. Group 2, the Control Group, was given classroom instruction by the regularly assigned faculty who followed the normal, planned curriculum. The text used was *Education, an Introduction* by Armstrong, Henson, and Savitch (1981).

**Organization**

Chapter One stated the problem and the significance of the study. The definition of the terms particular to this experiment were presented together with an outline of the procedures. The chapter is concluded with the design and organization of the remainder of the study.

Chapter Two reviews the pertinent literature and is comprised of four parts. The first part concerns itself with an overview of multicultural education. The second part summarizes the research into teacher behavior toward the minority child. The third part presents the theories of attitude formation, change and measurement. Part four focuses on studies reflective of the relation-
ship between knowledge and attitudes.

Chapter Three presents the methodology and the selection of the instruments.

Chapter Four presents and analyzes the data.

Chapter Five summarizes the findings, draws conclusions and presents recommendations for further study and research.
CHAPTER II
A REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

OVERVIEW OF MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION

The President's Commission on Foreign Languages and International Studies (1979) revealed that not only are most (9 out of 10) Americans strictly monolingual, but they also have a marked disregard for those citizens who do possess bilingual, multicultural abilities (Gonzalez, 1980). As a result, the Commission warned that a national emergency exists which can only be dealt with by our policy makers and legislators. The schools, Goodlad (1979) maintained, are only in part educational institutions and if they are to be responsive to the needs of society they must react to the effects of racial mobility and the ethnic recomposition of their pupil population. State and local boards face their greatest challenge in the area of staffing and curriculum development which must reflect the unalterable American reality that there is "No One Model American" (American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, Commission on Multicultural Education, 1972). The philosophy of cultural pluralism as applied here means mutual cultural accommodation disavowing the viability of assimilationism with its connotation of submersion or
ingestion of one culture by another (Goodlad, 1979).

A national policy, articulated by NCATE (1979) and translated into action by colleges and universities desiring to retain and/or obtain accreditation in the field of teacher education, has served as a catalyst. National and international views have developed which see multicultural teacher education as a change agent, whereby schooling and education become one for the achievement of social purposes, assuring equal educational opportunity and the fulfillment of self-actualization needs (Banks, 1976, Goodlad, 1979; Maslow, 1971; and Saunders, 1980).

If cultural pluralism is so basic a need for the quality of our life, then it must be an integral part of the educational process at every level (Baptiste and Baptiste, 1980). It is in this spirit that multicultural teacher education is vested with special competencies and is characterized by Payne (1980) as the discipline which leads future teachers toward awareness by examining the existence of cultural differences and the world around us. Garcia (1980) sees two specific goals toward which multicultural teacher education should aim:

1. To prepare educators to function non-ethnocentrically with pluralistic classrooms and schools, and

2. To prepare educators to provide curriculum and instruction about
the pluralism of United States society (p. 495).

Gollnick (1980) in an exhaustive review of multicultural education's historical evolution views the function of multicultural education as the process which "recognizes cultural differences based on sex, age, socio-economic status, and physical and mental exceptionalities" (p. 1). She echoes Banks' (1977) major objective of pluralistic educational strategies as that which helps reduce discrimination against stigmatized groups and which presents all students with cultural alternatives.

The United States is by no means alone in its search for peaceful means to reduce intergroup conflict through education. A number of the countries in Europe find themselves having to come to terms with a large influx of migrant workers and immigrants. Watson (1979) reasons that out of this reality there exists a growing concern for equality of educational opportunity and for human rights. He grouped the countries into three categories based on their policies toward multicultural/racial education:

a) those that have a deep-rooted racial/cultural mix [that is, USSR, China, India];

b) those whose cultural mix is a direct or partial result of colonialism [that is, many of the Asian and African countries];
c) those that have become multiracial largely as a result of voluntary immigration [that is, USA, Canada, Australia and, more recently, Western Europe] (p. 20).

Educational policies have gone through many changes according to political and economic factors. However, it is clear that the non-recognition or laissez-faire approach toward ethnic/linguistic and racial minorities is no longer practicable (Ravitch, 1978). Brembeck (1980) argued that because of the growth of multicultural societies, educational planners, politicians and academicians are increasingly concerned about educational change processes in cross-cultural contexts. Since one area where fair attitudes can be developed and prejudice can be broken down is in education, and in teacher training in particular, the need to foster intercultural understanding appears imperative (Bennett, 1979). The Queensland (Australia) Working Party on Multicultural Education (1979, p. 14) summarizes the issue:

... All children, regardless of ethnic or cultural background, are disadvantaged by an educational practice which fails to give due emphasis to, and adequate preparation for, living in a multicultural society.

TEACHER BEHAVIOR AND THE MINORITY CHILD

There appears to be three dimensions to self-perception: self-concept, self-esteem and values (Beane, 1980).
This distinction is important for educators because their values may differ from those of the students and also, in the process of enhancement of the self, they ought to know which dimension they are dealing with (Purkey, 1978).

In the hundreds of studies that have been conducted on the subject a persistent relationship has been found between various aspects of self-perception and a wide variety of school-related variables (Wylie, 1979). Attitudes and perceptions of teachers of the individual child are rated among the highest (Purkey, 1978). Henrikson (1971) found that teacher attitudes have a great influence on their teaching approaches with disadvantaged children. Differing perceptions, beliefs, values, ways of life, and ideologies exist in various human groups and societies which often manifest themselves in potential and actual conflict (Snyder, 1973). Recent research has shown that initial perceptual sets of beginning teachers remain quite stable over the professional life span (Wannamaker, 1970). Cusic (1973) suggested that the student teacher in isolated [that is, segregated] schools assimilated the existing attitudes in the environment. It has been stated by specialists in the field of opinionaire and attitude development that to effect attitudinal change certain "Field-Life-Space" arrangements must be rearranged (Oppenheim, 1968). Harmon and Ingles (1970)
advocated that specified pre-service designs could effect attitudinal changes in teacher education majors. Snyder (1973) found that negative teacher-held attitudes concerning minority, lower-social class children can be modified as a result of exposure to cognitive/cultural information via comprehensive inservice training programs. The analysis of data collected by Puglisi (1973) revealed that a measurable difference in attitudes occurred among experimental and control group members. These data suggested that a conceptional structure of knowledge model based on the interrelationship of cognitive and affective components constituted an effective technique in modifying the prejudiced attitudes of teacher candidates in education. Cook (1955) documented that interracial contact significantly changed the racial attitudes in 40 percent of his subjects. Further data indicate that cognitive gains were made by the subjects with regard to understanding more adequately the characteristics and needs of disadvantaged children (Swick, 1969).

The important residual question becomes that of how prejudice and discrimination can be eliminated or reduced and value conflict kept within workable limits in a society where primary group relations among persons of different racial/ethnic backgrounds are at a minimum (Gordon, 1964). Drachsler (1920) in discussing the role of the government said that it should institute in the
public schools a program emphasizing knowledge and appreciation of the various ethnic/racial cultural heritages but it should guard against instituting quotas for the benefit of any special group.

Several approaches have been tried to bring about attitudinal and perceptual changes in teachers and student teachers toward racially or ethnically different children. Black people and other minorities frequently accept definitions of themselves perpetuated by the larger society. Negative approaches and low expectations result in low achievement, high drop-out rate, alienation and the continuation of inequality (Banks, 1977; Hurn, 1978; Williams, 1970). Wilkerson's (1980) study of 147 student teachers indicated that teacher expectations for black females was the lowest while black males came in third to the last. It appears essential that long standing distortions be corrected by adding credibility to definitions of genetic racial differences and not equating them with innate disabilities (Spratlen, 1977).

Labov's (1972) study, for example, revealed that black children were not deficient in language ability, but utilize a non-standard linguistic system. Thompson (1971) said that the study of linguistics could be a way which could lead to a change in attitudes and facilitate interaction among students and teachers. Banks (1978) strongly urged that future teachers accept the fact that
a child's language and cognitive development do not depend on his membership within a particular ethnic, racial or socioeconomic group. And as such their rejection and deprecation can only mean to the children the rejection of their person and culture and result in the more pronounced use of their dialect to assert themselves and to feel a certain independence from domination (Carey, 1977). Fishman (1968) also affirms that language is among the most important symbols of ethnicity and consequently of the self.

Apart from the linguistic component, additions of an Ethnic Relations Instructional Unit, a lecture-discussion-application course, inservice program designs which would emphasize scope, participation, resources and evaluation of multicultural education and an exploratory study in inner-city teacher preparation all aimed toward making teacher education truly responsible to the needs of our times (Arc, 1979; Puglisi, 1973; Simmons, 1972; Swick, 1972). This will be accomplished by raising teacher consciousness and the level of competencies in human relations so that future teachers may possess a most needed quality, that is, the respect for and the acceptance of all their pupils (Tisdale, 1980).

It is generally accepted that attitudes are learned mainly from other people and reinforced by nationalistic and economic motives (Henderson, 1973). Due to the white
Anglo-Saxon majority's negative attitude toward racial, ethnic and linguistic minorities, a social stratification occurred which, in order to perpetuate the majority's supremacy, refused recognition to minority group members in institutional settings (Giles, 1977). Now that these groups have overtly expressed dissatisfaction with their inadequate and negative social image and desire change, all of society must readjust to the sharing of power (Greeley, 1974). Also, recent legislation makes it risky to verbalize publicly racial/ethnic evaluations (Rothman, 1978). The total process of education must reflect these changes through multiculturalization of curricula from kindergarten through college and through a conversion to the philosophy of pluralism as expressed in the following definition of multicultural education which is viewed as a "process whereby a person develops competencies in multiple systems for perceiving, evaluating, believing, and doing" (Gibson, 1976, p. 11). The desire to implement courses of study that will effect perceptual and attitudinal changes in teachers toward minority children appears necessary. In the views of many, such studies are comprehensive and fundamental to all educational endeavors (Grant, 1975). Colleges of Education cannot but accept their responsibility toward the public and provide the educational establishment with much-needed leadership (Ziegler, 1981).
ATTITUDE FORMATION, CHANGE AND MEASUREMENT

Four-thousand-year-old Chinese dynastic documents reveal that the concept and importance of attitudes and attitude change were an integral part of a scholar's training. From childhood, those destined for positions of rank and power were inducted into the art of reading others' impressions, attitudes, beliefs, and opinions in order to adjust their own, and thusly reduce conflict (Pritchard, 1929). The Greeks, namely Aristotle and Plato, have both recognized the complexity of attitudes and first defined their components as cognition, affection, and conation (Plato, The Republic, n. d.). Though the term "attitude" was first used in English by Herbert Spencer in 1862, the thought-emotion-behavior distinction is essentially identical with the early Chinese and Greek concepts (Allport, 1935). Originally the term "attitude" referred to a person's bodily position or posture; however, for the social scientist it has come to mean a "posture of the mind." The many definitions of attitudes all center around five main characteristics, namely—that an attitude is readiness to respond to an attitude object, that it has a motivating and a driving force, and that it is relatively enduring and is evaluative (Allport, 1935). In recent years this last aspect of attitudes has been increasingly stressed (Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum,
Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) defined attitudes as "a learned predisposition to respond in a consistently favorable or unfavorable manner with respect to a given object" (p. 488). They also held that the term, attitude, should be solely reserved for the affective component while beliefs should be considered as the cognitive, and the behavior component be thought of as the behavioral intention aspect (Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975).

An attitude is a theoretical construct which is not observable in itself but serves as an intervening variable (McGuire, 1969). An attitude is also the sum total of past experiences--personal or vicarious--transmitted through the enculturation process by significant others. Many social science experts agree that attitudes are learned. The question as to how they are learned is the subject of dispute.

Some scientists go so far as to attribute attitude formation to genetic predisposition (Scott and Fuller, 1965) but the most widely accepted theories espouse (1) the direct experience (Staats, 1968; Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975); and (2) repeated exposure theories (Zajonc, 1968; Perlman and Oskamp, 1971), observing within either a certain developmental hierarchy.

McGuire (1969) referred to parental influence, that is, to childhood, as a "total institution," and compared it, in its degree of control, to confinement in a penal
institution or a concentration camp. The origin of prejudice and racial attitude in children has been traced to the authoritarian personality of parents (Triandis and Triandis, 1962; Harding, et al., 1969). Recent studies indicate that even though teenagers rebel against parental values, when these children become adults they are more likely than not to hold the same or similar political, racial and sexist attitudes as did their parents (Judd, et al., 1979; Larkin, 1980).

Second only to parental influences in determining children's attitudes are school teaching and indoctrination (Oskamp, 1972). Peer groups and the mass media tie for the third place because both change rapidly and are usually dispersive (Himmelweit, Oppenheim and Vince, 1958).

Attitude formation and attitude change are usually considered under the same heading (Lemon, 1973; Nuttin, 1975; Sherif and Sherif, 1965; Triandis, 1971). Interest in their development, alteration, and extinction span many generations. The view that attitude is the most distinctive and indispensible concept in social psychology (Allport, 1935) would have been an overstatement had there not been an upsurge of interest in the attitude-behavior relationship in recent years. The results of LaPiere's (1934) study seemed to have established the no-relationship theory which postulated that people's verbal expressions concerning what they would do in general and what
they actually do in particular are unrelated.

The attack on attitudes as a behaviorally relevant concept peaked when Wicker (1969), upon reviewing 31 studies, concluded that attitudes are more likely than not to be unrelated or minimally related to behavior. Since then conceptual and methodological advances have led to a more favorable view of the causal relevance of attitudes to behaviors (McPhee and Cushman, 1980). The emerging position seems to be that attitude is only one of many factors determining behavior (Ajzen and Fishbein, 1977). However, when target and action elements of the attitude-behavior relationship possess high correspondence, and when attitude measures are specific with respect to target, action, and context, in 26 out of 35 studies, high correlation ($r=.40$) was registered (Ajzen and Fishbein, 1977).

The interest in attitudes as they predict, relate and/or cause behaviors, spans all strata of human communication. The assumption of this relationship is responsible for the often divergent, theoretical speculations concerning attitudes as a means by which to change and modify behavior. Eagly and Himmelfarb (1978) cited that McGuire's (1969) essay is the basis of almost all current research on attitude change. His theory can be labeled as "information processing" whereby cognitive states, mechanisms and processes are identified as informational determinants which characterize attitudes and behaviors (Poole and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
McGuire (1969) has described a series of steps that characterize the attitude change process: attention, comprehension, yielding, retention, and action. In analyzing the attitude change process the process of who says what, how, to whom, and with what effect, must be considered. Three very important attitude change theories come to mind when considering these processes.

Poole and Hunter (1979) summarized the attitude-behavior question in light of the hierarchical theory of attitude change. They have developed and reviewed evidence relevant to several positions: (1) Individual differences in attitudinal structure make predicting of specific effect of a message on an individual difficult; (2) the higher up in a hierarchy a message can strike, the more wide-ranging its effect; and (3) messages do not necessarily have to change attitudes to influence behavior. It is sufficient that they rearrange, through cognitive processing, the hierarchy of attitudes to effect change in behavioral intentions and subsequently in behaviors themselves.

Rokeach (1979) agreed with this concept but questioned the long-range effect of the hierarchical attitude-change theory. He considered attitude change through values change which he called the self-confrontation theory. Here, the method employed is the arousal of self-
dissatisfaction which initiates change. Some 23 studies replicated this method and found some degree of value-attitude-behavior change in 22 cases. These findings were perplexing and elicited hitherto unanswered questions: How did these changes come about? Were there environmental factors, favorable to both subjects and to the experiment, responsible for the changes? The answers to these questions, concluded Rokeach, would enhance the education-oriented perspectives of further research.

It would seem difficult to change the persuasion-oriented perspectives of propaganda, advertising, and politics, etc. This theory gained recognition during the Second World War and was initiated by Carl Hovland and his associates. Nuttin (1975) summarized the findings of Hovland (1953) and Festinger (1957). Rosenberg (1965), and Mintz (1971), called this method the "forced compliance" paradigm which induced the subjects to active and/or passive self-exposure to attitude dissonant arguments or persuasive messages.

The above experimenters all attach a great deal of importance to the cognitive labeling of the message with which they elicited extremely strong, that is, positive or negative, responses which, in turn, caused change in the premeasured attitudes. Interestingly enough, in his closing remarks Nuttin (1975) scrutinized all research on
attitudes and behaviors by postulating that social psychologists have, perhaps, overestimated the complexity of human behavior. Rokeach (1979) took a more positive and constructive approach when he urged the broadening of the scope of education-oriented perspectives to facilitate "change in a direction that can genuinely serve the growth, development, or self-realization of others" (p. 528).

As early as 1935 Gordon Allport stated that attitudes were measured more successfully than they were defined. Scott (1968), in one of the most authoritative and most often cited articles, explained why it is so. He said he did not foresee a single final definition of attitudes, but since an attitude is a hypothetical construct it can be defined by the properties assigned to it. Determinants of any definition may change, but one should treat all of the defining properties as dimensions which can be conceptualized and measured. Of the two measurement theories mentioned by Scott (1968)--(a) the psychometric theory (Gulliksen, 1950) which for the most part is concerned with traits, and (b) the scaling theory (Edwards, 1957; Guilford, 1957; Thurstone, 1959), which has roots in psychophysics, the latter is the most used in actual practice.

Three stages can be identified in the process of attitude assessment: administration, scoring, and interpreting. The method of administration will depend on the
type of instrument used and instruments for measuring attitudes are classified by the types of responses sub-
jects make (Scott, 1968). Verbal responses are most common and they can be elicited by open-end single-item set and closed-end multiple-item set questions (Dawes, 1972; Lemon, 1973). These, however, introduce certain forms of biases, namely, that the researcher's phrasing of the questions provides the subject with a ready-made response-set and thusly can alter the attitude one set out to measure (Lemon, 1973). Secondly, the subject's desire to give socially acceptable answers can lead to the fakeability of the responses (Rosenthal, 1966).

The indirect method of assessing attitudes, as well as the disguised techniques, are less popular. Physiological measures used in clinical settings test skin, heartbeat, pupil dilation, etc. responses (Westie and DeFleur, 1959).

Responses elicited in the administration phase--verbal, physiological, or overt--must be converted into scores by way of some scale which represents either the attitude or one of its dimensions that is of interest (Scott, 1968). Verbal responses are usually measured judgmentally whereas, in the case of self-reports, summative, cumulative, consensual and criterion-oriented scaling can be used.

There are several widely accepted and used attitude
scales, each differing from the others due to the philosophical and theoretical views held by their creators.

Emory Bogardus (1925) was first to develop an instrument which measured a social trait and the results obtained were quantifiable. His social-distance scale was designed to measure the subject's attitudes toward different ethnic groups by way of marking how close a relationship the subject was willing to establish with a member or members of different ethnic, social, or religious groups. The greatest strength of this scale is that it is easy to administer, score and interpret. Its weakness is that, although it indicates the direction of the attitudes measured, it does not distinguish either the magnitude of the attitude nor the distance among the intentions expressed (Bogardus, 1931).

The best known and most often used method was developed by Rensis Likert in 1932. It was the first approach which measured the extent of the subject's agreement with each item. Instead of eliciting a "yes-no" answer, Likert suggested that the respondents use a linear answering system by responding to an attitude statement with a strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, strongly disagree statement. A great strength of this scale is its use of item analysis technique to "purify" the scale by keeping only the best items from the original pool (Oskamp, 1977).
The Likert-scale's theoretical shortcoming is that the subject's attitude score does not have a unique meaning. Guttman (1944) suggested and developed a method in which scores would have unique meanings by insuring that response patterns were cumulative and unidimensional, measuring only one attitude. Guttman's extremely stringent item scrutiny led to very short scales. Researchers, in their efforts to reproduce a Guttman scale, found that even more stringent measures were needed than recommended by Guttman to assure the truly unidimensionality of this scale.

To be able to measure any dimension or any characteristic of an attitude a more general scale was needed. Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum (1957) introduced the Semantic Differential Scale which, instead of using opinion statements, uses 7-point scales with bipolar, that is, two opposing adjectives (good-bad) at each end. Using factor analysis, it was possible to define several underlying attitudes and basic dimensions on which people make semantic judgments, that is, evaluative, potency, and activity, with the greatest emphasis on the evaluative dimension.

Triandis (1964) has modified the Semantic Differential Scale to measure the behavior component of attitudes and called his scale the Behavioral Differential Scale. His and the many other variations of this instru-
ment indicate its greatest strength, which is its adaptability to various purposes (Oskamp, 1977).

These techniques of attitude measurement assume that the true, underlying attitudinal construct is represented in the scores. However, most paper-and-pencil measures, such as those mentioned above, do not account for the "neutral" response. The experimenter must decide for the subject whether the "neutral" response means complete indifference or equally favorable or unfavorable response to the object. This dilemma has led to a new measure of attitudes which asserts that it can separate true neutrality from the degrees of indifference. This new measure is the attitude pie. Lull (1974) first presented his paper to a group of communication experts at the International Communication Association's New Orleans Conference. In his instrument the typical linear scales, like the Likert and the Semantic Differential, are replaced by a 1-3/8 inch pie with a k dot placed in the center. The subjects are told to consider the pie as "all their feelings" about the attitude object. They are instructed to draw in lines to indicate the positive, negative and indifferent components. The degree of indifference then is derived by using a protractor and measuring each angle. Thusly we obtain four scores, a positive, a negative, and a positivity score, which is obtained by subtracting the
negative score from the positive score. The fourth score is the indifference score, which the linear scales do not provide. It is derived by subtracting the sum of the positive and negative scores from 360. When tested for reliability with test-retest method the correlations reported were statistically significant. When these correlations were compared to correlations obtained for the Likert or Semantic Differential scales no statistical difference could be reported.

Attitude pies offer two types of information: evaluation and salience. To establish the validity of positivity and indifference scores the multi-trait multi-method technique was used. Again, the difference between validity scores for the pies and scores obtained for the Likert, Semantic Differential, and rank-order scales were statistically insignificant for groups. The one major disadvantage of the pie is the subject's unfamiliarity with conceptualizing his attitude as a pie shape. This appears to be outweighed by its advantages, that is, the many uses where this measure will yield manageable, multivariate data.

Lampert (1979) has presented findings on the use of the attitude pollimeter, a new attitude scaling device. The most remarkable aspect of this device is that its administration does not require either reading or writing ability or verbal ability of expression. Its limitation,
in its present form, is that it can only be used in personal interviews.

Lampert's study tested the pollimeter's relation to other scales. It was conducted following a careful experimental design. Four dimensions were examined:

(1) Which scale is the easiest to use;
(2) which scale represented best the respondent's attitude;
(3) which scale was the most pleasant to use;
(4) which scale was the most difficult to use?

Each of the questions had to be answered on all four types of scales and it was found that the pollimeter was second only to verbal measures in the degree of favorability among low-educational-low-socioeconomic level respondents.

The pollimeter is a simple box with movable, visual elements against a bipolar, black-to-white color chart which enables anyone to indicate his or her attitudes on a continuous scale.

It has to be assumed that the basic principles and procedures of measurement applied to attitude assessment are not any different from those applied to other psychological processes (Scott, 1968). Any measuring instrument must stand the scrutiny of reliability and validity measures. The most often employed test of reliability for attitude assessment is the test-retest method, which is also called a measure of stability (Bohrnstedt, 1970).
The internal consistency of a scale can be measured by examining the covariants among all of the items simultaneously rather than in particular and arbitrary splits. The Kuder-Richardson formulas and generalizations derived from them remain the most popular approach to reliability today (Lemon, 1973).

There are a number of problems which may affect the validity of attitude scales. The wording of attitude questions is one of the main factors (Dawes, 1972). Secondly, response sets can also invalidate attitude questionnaire answers (Scott, 1968). Response sets are systematic ways of answering and are not related to the content of the question, but are behavioral characteristics of the respondent (Oskamp, 1977). Carelessness, social desirability, extremity of response, and acquiescence are the most often encountered response sets. To remove their effect, inasmuch as possible, the researcher must enlist the cooperation of the respondents, must eliminate ambiguous items and should try to assess the subject's attitude toward the attitude object by unobtrusive observation of behavior (Lemon, 1973; Scott, 1968; Cook and Selltiz, 1964).

KNOWLEDGE AND ATTITUDES

The studies of attitude change within a classroom setting supported Allport's (1954) contentions that atti-
tudes can be changed by information and vicarious experience (Bennett, 1979). O'Keefe (1980) posits that less cognitionally complex persons (in the interpersonal domain) tended to behave in a much more attitudinally consistent manner than highly complex persons. This finding represents strong support for correlational studies in the field of cognitive development and attitude change.

In an attempt to gain greater validity concerning such a relationship researchers have employed long and short range studies. Murphy and Likert (1967) involved 129 students over a 5-year period at two universities measuring the students' attitudes toward Blacks. They found that attitudes changed positively as students achieved higher levels of education. When correlating information on racial attitudes, Nettler (1946) reported consistency in the significance of research findings that knowledge is one of many attitude determinants.

Some studies involved the use of treatments. Students were given special units of instruction and measurements of attitudinal changes were made (Bolton, 1935; Kelly, Ferson, and Holtzman, 1958; Kleg, 1970; Puglisi, 1973; Swick, 1972; Bennett, 1979; Swick and Lamb, 1981).

In 1935 Bolton attempted to measure the attitudes of teacher trainees toward Blacks. She taught two classes on the history of American Education. Both classes were pre- and posttested. The experimental group was given
instruction on Negro education in the South and the students were required to write a term paper on Blacks. When describing her findings Bolton reported that 90 percent of her students had never had any instruction on Blacks and/or on race problems in all of their previous schooling. Her comparisons of cognitive and attitude scores made her conclude: "... that the study of the problems of Negro education in the South had no effect on the attitudes of students toward the social rights of the Negro ..." (p. 80).

Early studies were reflective of the general philosophy of education toward Blacks dominated by the 1896 Supreme Court ruling in the case of Plessy vs. Ferguson (163 U.S. 53F, 1896), where the Separate but Equal doctrine was handed down. This doctrine sanctioned the existence of racism and segregation that maintained its strongest bastion in the area of education (Baptiste, 1979). Advocates of cultural pluralism, Horace Kallen, Julius Drachsler, and John Dewey, raised their voices in philosophical arguments against the Anglo-Saxon domination, but they were defeated (Itzkoff, 1967).

Research findings notwithstanding, judicial and legislative actions were necessary before any action reflecting change in attitudes toward Blacks and minorities could be initiated. In the 1954 Brown vs. Board of
Education case the Supreme Court reversed Plessy vs. Ferguson, and ruled that separate educational facilities were inherently unequal.

In the wake of court ordered busing to achieve desegregation Jacobson (1980) asked "what effect does a court ruling which orders a city to desegregate its schools have on the attitudes and feelings of residents of the city?" (p. 699). The results were encouraging. Those affected by the ruling, that is, parents with children attending public schools, showed favorable attitude changes due to the authority's ruling. Based on his follow-up studies he posited that most Americans will accept integration but that the community leaders' attitudes are very important in facilitating the change.

Kelly, Ferson, and Holtzman (1958) conducted a study of a representative population of white college students in Texas which resulted in the development of a Desegregation Scale designed to measure the students' attitudes toward Blacks in the context of contemporary segregation problems. They found that neither sex nor urban/rural background was significant; however, geographic region, religion, father's income, and the major field of study revealed highly significant differences. Of ten major areas of study, students in education ranked third in their favorableness toward desegregation, that is, toward Blacks.
In 1966 Venditti and Nunnery, within the framework of an in-service institute, conducted a study on the change in attitudes of teachers, school administrators, and staff. The participants responded that the workshop had a favorable effect on their attitudes toward desegregation and felt more positively toward Blacks and other culturally deprived children.

Kleg's (1970) study appears to have been the first experimental study which rigidly adhered to the theories and practices of scientific research in the area of cognitive change and its influence on attitudes toward ethnic groups. The choice of three schools located in urban, suburban, and rural areas allowed Kleg to build into his study the influence of geographic location and the socioeconomic background of the samples. An all-black school in Atlanta and two all-white schools in St. Louis provided Kleg with two classes each. One of the two intact classes in each school were instructed by the regular method of instruction in social studies and formed the control groups. The experimental groups were following the methodology and text designed by Kleg and Rice.

An analysis of the findings indicated that positive attitude change occurred in the predominantly white schools. The black school failed to yield significant changes in attitudes following the treatment. There were, for the most part, significant relationships between cog-
nitive achievement and attitudinal changes.

In 1973 Puglisi conducted an experimental study on the relationship between an instructional unit based on an ethnic relations structure of knowledge and the modification of prejudiced attitudes held by teacher trainees in elementary education. Data were collected through the administration of pretreatment and posttreatment observations. Analysis of the data failed to yield a significant relationship among experimental subjects with high knowledge gains and experimental subjects with low knowledge gains and attitude change. Therefore, Puglisi's study did not support the assumption that accelerated cognitive acquisition was accompanied by greater modification of prejudiced attitudes.

The late sixties witnessed the implementation of programs in education which aimed at decreasing the home and school discordance (Gibson, 1976). Compensatory education was initiated by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act's Title I programs (1965) to educate the "disadvantaged" child (Banks, 1977; Gay, 1979). The literature is replete with theories (Coleman, 1966; Jencks, 1973; Jensen, 1972) on deficiencies minority children bring with them into the schools. However, by the early seventies it became evident that being "different" did not mean being "deprived." The connotation of cultural deprivation as was previously applied to racial, linguistic and
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ethnic minorities became unacceptable. More recent studies (Bennett, 1979; Swick and Lamb, 1981) define the minority child as culturally different.

Bennett (1979) described the purpose of his study as that of "... changes in pre-service teachers' perceptions of racial and cultural groups after completion of an undergraduate secondary course ... regarding racial and cultural groups" (p. 235). His main assumption was that pre-service teachers experiencing a multiethnic/multicultural approach in their studies are more likely to apply this practice in teaching than those without such instruction. Thirty-five students comprised his sample population. The experimental group was instructed by the multicultural approach. Bennett's findings indicate a significant difference in attitudes toward ethnic groups among students in the experimental and control groups as measured by the "Survey on Groups," an instrument designed on the premise that prejudice involved irrationality. The data presented in this study indicate that attitudes of pre-service teachers toward racial and cultural groups, other than their own, can be changed through instruction.

The literature reviewed presented an overview of research in the area of attitude change and cognitive gain. There are indications that some, mostly positive,
changes exist between knowledge gain through education and the changing of negative attitudes toward culturally different groups. The educational implications of these findings appear self-evident and researchers agree that there is a need for continued research, curriculum development, and program evaluation of already existing multicultural programs and their effect on the prejudiced attitudes of pre-service teachers.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURE

The present experiment involved four major phases. First, the selection of the instructional material required an extensive search and review of materials currently available. It was imperative that the chosen text be adaptable both to the time frame (number of class hours) and to the general objectives of the course. EDCI 2025, Foundations and Principles in Teaching in the Elementary School, is an introductory course required of all students pursuing an elementary teacher education curriculum. The catalog statement for the course reads as follows:

Catalogue description: Open only to students who are actually enrolled in programs leading to teacher certification. Introduction to organization, financing, and purposes of the American elementary school. Emphasis upon managerial aspects of instruction with attention to teaching in a pluralistic society (p. 259).

The instructional text was developed by Kleg and Rice and is entitled Race, Caste and Prejudice. It is divided into four parts. The first three parts deal, respectively, with race, social class and caste, and prejudice and ethnocentrism. The fourth section consists
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of appendices, which include case studies, and a bibliography. The study's highest degree of control is predicated upon administering the treatment under the normal and usual conditions. The text is accompanied by its own cognitive-objective test which was developed by Kleg and Puglisi. The attitude scales were selected because of their relevance to current educational needs - assessments in the cognitive-affective domain suggested by Bloom's (1956) taxonomy and the belief-affect-conation perspective of social interaction processes.

The second phase involved a search of the literature on the needs of teacher-trainees. Taba's (1952) inter-group-human relations approach was followed in formulating a theoretical rationale for education. The four major goals identified by Taba were (p. 36):

1. To provide students with facts, ideas and concepts basic to intelligent understanding of group relations;

2. to develop the ability to think objectively and rationally about people, their problems, relationships, and cultures;

3. to develop those feelings, values, attitudes, and sensitivities necessary for living in a pluralistic society;

4. to develop skills necessary for getting along with individuals similar to and different from themselves, and for working successfully in groups.
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In keeping, also, with Abraham Maslow's (1971) theory of self-actualization, the experiment was developed adapting his theoretical support of, and theoretical justification for, multicultural education. This theory, as developed by Maslow, is a theory of innate, human needs and of the motivation to satisfy those needs. According to Maslow and other humanistic psychologists, a self-actualized person's basic and growth needs are satisfied, therefore, he or she has a more healthy outlook, is more accepting of others, has more healthy interpersonal relations, has more humanistic values, and has a greater sense of purpose and meaning in life. These are goals that teachers, especially, in a pluralistic society, should possess in order to foster these same qualities in the children they teach.

Maslow saw the self-actualizer as rising above ethnocentrism and chauvinistic rationalism. To achieve this, transcultural/multicultural education is needed, dealing with values, human behavior patterns and social institutions which are found in all cultures, and are universal. Thus the oneness of humanity could be stressed. Multicultural education, or education per se, may be effective if educators are helped to become self-actualized individuals and, in turn, help young people to grow into self-actualized adults.

Phase three dealt with the development of the module,
the statement of general objectives, lesson planning and the composition of a course outline and glossary which were distributed to experimental group subjects during the first class meeting after the pretest observations. The concept for the module development was that colleges and instructors should adapt their own methods to the needs of students they are training to be teachers so that these students, when employed as teachers, would adapt to the needs of individual pupils within their multicultural classrooms. While adhering to the basic structure of Race, Caste and Prejudice, the lessons were organized to incorporate differences, identified by teachers and ethnic/minority educational leaders, that confront teachers in America's public school systems. These differences were the culture-related aspects of

(1) language
(2) motivation
(3) learning styles
(4) time organization
(5) family relationships
(6) special customs (Banks, 1981; Best, 1972).

It was recognized that teachers cannot be trained to attend to every teaching aspect of every culture, and, our schools are "every culture." The direction followed in the construction of the lesson plans was the usage of objectives with cross-cultural, that is, universal appli-
The following exemplify the use of general objectives directed toward the examination of the interaction process among and between ethnic groups:

(1) Develop an understanding of and appreciation for the various culturally different groups by describing the concepts of "ethnic groups" and "ethnic relations" as they affect the interaction process among and between those groups.

(2) Perceive and promote positive racial and ethnic attitudes by identifying
   a) an attitude as a learned pattern of behavior;
   b) prejudice as a negative attitude;
   c) stereotyping as a mental process based on oversimplified beliefs;
   d) discrimination as the acting out of prejudiced belief and feelings;
   e) scapegoating as the acting out of aggression and hostility toward undeserving groups or individuals.

(3) Recognize the origin, nature and need to dispel cultural, racial, and ethnic myths by constructively involving students in the promotion of democracy as the condition for social, political, and economic equality.

The fourth phase in the development of this experiment was the synthesis of the text Race, Caste and Preju-
The text was originally designed to cover 36 classroom hours. For the purposes of this experiment the content had to be reduced to be presented in 12 class hours, including pre- and posttesting. Lecture and discussion were used as the methods of instruction. Student input was ensured through class reports reflective of the concepts presented. Experimental group subjects were required to research their own ethnic backgrounds and were directed to engage in student-student and student-teacher discussions. The pretests were administered during the first full week of instruction, that is, from August 31-September 4, 1981, and the posttests from September 30-October 4, 1981. Of the 119 students who originally formed the experimental and control groups, 81 observations were used in the statistical data analysis.

**MEASURING INSTRUMENTS**

The Cognitive Measuring Instrument was developed by Kleg and Puglisi. It is described as an achievement test designed to measure cognitive achievement based on information in the instructional unit, here entitled Multicultural Instructional Unit.

The cognitive test consists of 48 multiple choice items. All items require recall and recognition. A few items could be classified within Bloom's taxonomy under application, understanding, and analysis (Kleg, 1970;
The Cognitive Measuring Instrument was administered on two occasions as a pretest and a posttest. The two observations were identical in content; however, the posttest items were randomly rearranged. For the construction of the cognitive test a pool of 87 multiple choice items were prepared based on the content of the text. From this pool of 87 items, 48 were selected for the final cognitive test.

Validity

The items for the cognitive test were developed based on the content material in Kleg and Rice: Race, Caste and Prejudice, the text used by the experimental group during the treatment period. These items were pilot-tested on a target population of students and the basis for selection of the 48 items was the discriminatory power of the items.

Reliability

The cognitive test was analyzed by the Test Scores Statistical Analysis (TSSA). The TSSA was employed only on the posttests. Using the Kuder-Richardson Formula 20, the test reliability was 0.75 with a standard Error of Measurement of 2.76.

The TSSA showed, in the case of Kleg's study, that the distribution of the experimental groups' cognitive posttest scores indicate a normal curve.
The Desegregation Scale (D-Scale)

The Desegregation Scale was developed by Kelly, Ferson and Holtzman and was one of the attitude scales used in the current experiment. The designers of the D-Scale compiled a pool of 200 statements reflecting attitudes toward Blacks (Kelly, Ferson and Holtzman, 1958). The statements were extracted through an in-depth search and review of the literature. Some items were added dealing with contemporary segregation problems. Kelly, Ferson and Holtzman reduced the original pool to 76 items and 102 college students scaled the items according to the degree of favorableness toward Blacks. The scaling technique used was the Thurstone technique otherwise known as the Equal-Appearing Intervals Method. The construction of such a scale is extremely complex because it is supposed to indicate, rather precisely, the amount of difference between one subject's attitude and another's (Os-kamp, 1977). According to the Thurstone scaling process, each item has a specific value. For purposes of the scaling of the 76 items, 11 intervals were used. Items which indicated an extremely unfavorable attitude toward Blacks were represented by a value of 11. The Desegregation Scale was formed by taking the 26 items with minimum variance and approximately equal interval distribution on the 11 point scale, excluding those statements which fell too close to the neutral point.
The architects of the scale found it desirable to combine the Thurstone and Likert methods. Collection of data is greatly simplified on a Likert-type scale with a five-point continuum from strongly agree through undecided to strongly disagree.

In keeping with the Likert-type scale construction method, weights of 0, 1, 2, 3, and 4 were assigned as values to the five response choices of each item. The weights were summed and the higher the score more intolerance toward Blacks was assessed. A scale value of four was given to the strongly agree response when the statement toward Blacks was negative.

**Sample negative item:**

Blacks are often dishonest and would increase cheating if admitted to white schools.

**Sample positive item:**

I would not mind having my children taught by a Black teacher.

The Desegregation Scale, as the Cognitive Measuring Instrument, was administered twice. Experimental and control group subjects completed the Desegregation Scale both as a pretest and a posttest. The content of the Desegregation Scale remained unchanged. The only difference between the pretest and posttest observations was in the sequence in which the three instruments followed one another.
The Social Distance Scale

The earliest definition of social distance is found in R. E. Park's (1921) essays on ethnic groups in society. Park has stated that social distance measures the extent to which one is disposed to treat others personally. The greater the intimacy, the shorter the social distance. Social distance is deliberately maintained between rich and poor, rulers and ruled. However, democracy, at least in theory, aims at doing away with social conditions which are responsible for the establishment and perpetuation of social distances (Bogardus, 1924). Park and Bogardus both credited negative attitudes as one of the responsible expressions which lead to social distance. At the time Park first defined social distance and Bogardus designed his scale, little was known about the nature of prejudice and its actual relationship to social distance.

Bogardus' Social Distance Scale, the first measure of social attitudes, was constructed by preparing a list of 60 items which described various types of social relationships. Bogardus (1933) described the theoretical process of scale construction as follows:

In developing a scale for social distance the writer has attempted to penetrate through opinions to attitudes. Attitudes may be regarded as more fundamental than opinions . . . . By asking persons to give their first feeling reactions to a number of questions it is thought that they will disclose attitudes (p. 98).
One hundred persons served as judges evaluating and scoring for each statement, from the point of view of social distance perceived, into seven categories.

The seven social distance situations were:
1. would marry
2. would have as regular friend
3. would work in same office
4. would have as neighbor
5. would have as speaking acquaintance only
6. would have live outside my neighborhood
7. would have live outside my country.

The seven social distance statements underwent several refinements before each was incorporated into the final Social Distance Scale.

The Bogardus Scale originally measured social distance between an individual and various groups in terms of ethnic, occupational, and religious criteria. The Social Distance Scale employed in the study related primarily to ethnic and racial criteria as the primary determinant upon which individuals initiate negative ethnic/minority evaluations.

The Social Distance Scale was administered as a pretest and as a posttest.

THE EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

The experiment was designed to be used with students
enrolled in the College of Education at Louisiana State University's Baton Rouge campus. The experiment was conducted during the fall semester from August 27, 1981 through October 4, 1981. The samples were enrolled in the course, EDCI 2025, entitled Foundations and Principles in Teaching in the Elementary School. The experimental group met for 3 class hours a week for a total of 12 class hours, including pre- and posttest observations. The control group met for the same length of time and followed the normal curriculum.

Foundations and Principles in Teaching in the Elementary School is a part of each prospective elementary teacher's program. The course is designed to introduce students to organization, financing, and the purposes of the American Elementary School.

The current study employed the Nonequivalent Control Group Design. According to Campbell and Stanley (1968), when preassembled classrooms are the only available groups for the experiment, this design "should be recognized as well worth using" (p. 47). Especially when homogeneity is confirmed by the pretest data, it can be assumed that the design controls for internal validity, and the differences observed in pretest and posttest scores for the experimental group, can be attributed to the effect of the treatment only.

Kerlinger (1964), when describing the techniques of
analysis of covariance in educational research, states that through the employment of the above design and ANACOVA "it is often possible to control class and other group differences statistically" (p. 350).

The Sample

The sample consisted of students enrolled in four sections of the course, EDCI 2025, entitled Foundations and Principles in Teaching in the Elementary School. The students were mostly sophomores who were attending Louisiana State University and were enrolled in the College of Education. During pretest observations demographic data on experimental and control group subjects were collected. The data collected dealt with information on the subject's background, such as public/private school attended, socioeconomic status of parents, religion, and information on whether the student had had previous experience with minority children.

TREATMENT OF THE DATA

The purpose of the study was to seek answers to three questions. The calculation of correlation coefficients and analyses of covariance were the statistical tools used to provide these answers.

The first question dealt with the relation of attitude change and cognitive change. Answers to this question were obtained by computing correlation coefficients.
for the experimental group on change scores from the pre-
test to the posttest.

The second question was concerned with the difference
between experimental and control groups relative to ad-
justed means in (a) cognition, as measured by the Cogni-
tive Measuring Instrument, and (b) attitudes, as measured by
Social Distance Scale and Desegregation Scale. Analyses
of covariance were used with the pretest scores as covari-
able and the posttest scores as the dependent variable.

The third question sought answers to attitude and cog-
nition level differences based on public/private highschool
attended, socio-economic background, religion, and previous
experience with the minority child as indicated by the
Personal Inventory Sheet, a demographic information form,
administered to all students during the initial observation
phase (Appendix D). The statistical tools employed were
analyses of covariance with the pretest scores as the co-
variable and the posttest scores as the dependent variable.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Chapter IV presents the study's findings and a discussion of these findings as they relate to the null-hypotheses, that is, to the questions the investigation was to answer. The chapter also describes the tools and techniques employed in analyzing the data obtained during pretreatment and posttreatment observations.

Correlations

In testing the first hypothesis, that is, in answering the first question, a test of significance was conducted on Pearson Product Moment Correlations in order to determine whether significant relationships existed for each student in the experimental group in attitude change, as measured by the Social Distance Scale, and cognitive change, as measured by the Cognitive Measuring Instrument based on pretest-posttest differences. A test of significance was also conducted on Pearson Product Moment Correlations in order to determine for each student among experimental subjects attitude change, as measured by the Desegregation Scale, which measures specific attitudes toward Blacks, and knowledge change as measured by the
Cognitive Measuring Instrument using pretest-posttest differences.

The attitude change - cognitive change comparisons yielded coefficients of correlation on the Pearson r. These coefficients were tested for significance at the .05 level.

The correlations were as follows:

1. Cognitive Difference Scores (posttest minus pretest) correlated with Desegregation Difference Scores ($r = -0.09, p = .56 [> .05]$ not significant).
2. Cognitive Difference Scores correlated with Social Distance Scale Difference Scores (posttest minus pretest) ($r = 0.07, p = .62 [> .05]$ not significant).

Table 1).

Analyses of Covariance

The second null-hypothesis, that is, the second question, states that there will be no difference in knowledge and attitudes between students who participate in the experiment and receive the Multicultural Instructional Unit and the students who do not. This question was composed of three parts: whether there is a statistically significant difference in (1) attitudes, as measured by Social Distance Scale; (2) attitudes, as measured by Desegregation Scale; and (3) cognition, as measured by
Table 1

Correlation of Cognitive Difference Scores with Desegregation Scale Difference Scores and Social Distance Scale Difference Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desegregation Scale Difference Scores</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.56 (&gt;0.05) N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Distance Scale Difference Scores</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.62 (&gt;0.05) N.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p = probability
N.S. = not significant
Cognitive Measuring Instrument.

The first goal of the analysis of this hypothesis was to determine whether the instructional module had a significant influence on modifying the expressed negative behavioral intentions, that is, attitudes, as measured by the Social Distance Scale. The revised Bogardus Social Distance Scale was administered to both the experimental and control groups during pre- and posttreatment observations. As a part of a previous study (Kleg, 1970) the Social Distance Scale was correlated with the Remmer's Attitude Toward Any Deprived Group Scale and was found to have a correlation of .75. Tolbert (1961) reported that a correlation of .70 to .75 suggests a strong relationship between two variables.

Analysis of covariance was conducted to determine whether there is a statistically significant difference between experimental and control groups, as measured by Social Distance Scale, relative to adjusted means in attitudes using the pretest scores as covariable with the posttest scores as the dependent variable. Analysis of adjusted posttreatment means failed to yield significant differences between experimental and control groups (Table 2). It was, therefore, concluded that experimental and control groups were homogeneous in their behavioral intentions toward ethnic and racial groups, and part one of null-hypothesis two was accepted.
Table 2

Analysis of Covariance
Average Social Distance Quotient

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Adjusted Sum of Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Attended</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents' Educational Level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents Income</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course in Human Relations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience with Minority Child</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest Score</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30.82</td>
<td>93.70</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>23.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Desegregation Scale was administered to experimental and control groups both as a pretest and posttest. An analysis of the adjusted means comprised part two of null-hypothesis two. Twenty-six statements dealing with attitudes toward Blacks were selected to form the Desegregation Scale for the study of racial discrimination. The examination of intercorrelations between it and other scales is statistically significant. Kelly, Ferson and Holtzman (1958), the designers of the Desegregation Scale, found that generalized ethnocentrism, including prejudice, appears to be an important factor in the study of racial problems.

Using the pretest scale scores as covariate, analysis of covariance was employed to determine differences between experimental and control groups relative to adjusted means in attitudes as measured by the D-Scale. It was found that the experimental group differed significantly from the control group (Table 3). It was, therefore, concluded in the case of the Desegregation Scale that the null-hypothesis, predicting that there would be no difference in attitude change between students who received the Multicultural Instructional Unit and those students in the control group who did not, was rejected at the .05 level.

The Cognitive Measuring Instrument was designed by Kleg and Puglisi and was administered both as a pretest
Table 3

Analysis of Covariance
Desegregation Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Adjusted Sum of Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>545.30</td>
<td>9.15</td>
<td>0.0035*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Attended</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26.79</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.5047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39.11</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.4205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents' Educational Level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43.96</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.3933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents' Income</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.26</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.6651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.9088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course in Human Relations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>139.90</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>0.1299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience with Minority Child</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.7593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest Score</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6242.83</td>
<td>104.79</td>
<td>0.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4230.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level
and a posttest to experimental and control groups. The Cognitive Measuring Instrument consisted of 48 items predicated on the Multicultural Instructional Unit's content. The instrument was previously submitted to panels of judges who reviewed the items for content validity. Content validity is defined by Ebel (1974) in the Encyclopedia of Educational Research as "... topic validity which defines and demonstrates how closely the topic or subtopics correspond to the objectives of instruction which the test is intended to evaluate" (p. 790).

Part three of null-hypothesis two used the pretest scores as covariate in the analysis of covariance to determine differences between experimental and control groups relative to adjusted means in cognition as measured by the Cognitive Measuring Instrument. It was found that significant differences existed in cognition between experimental and control groups (Table 4). Part three of the second null-hypothesis was, therefore, rejected at the .05 level.

The third null-hypothesis, that is, the third question, states that there is no difference between attitude and cognition levels based on public/private high schools attended, religion, parents' educational level, parents' income, rural/urban residence, course in Human Relations, and previous experience with minority children. The goal of the analysis of this hypothesis was to determine
Table 4

Analysis of Covariance
Cognitive Measuring Instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Adjusted Sum of Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2868.12</td>
<td>163.34</td>
<td>0.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Attended</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>0.1747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28.15</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.2096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents' Educational Level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.17</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.4723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents' Income</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.33</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.3693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47.35</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>0.1050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course in Human Relations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.90</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.3446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience with Minority Child</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>58.46</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.0723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest Score</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>748.38</td>
<td>42.62</td>
<td>0.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1246.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level
whether the above mentioned demographic variables were responsible for any differences that may have influenced attitude and cognitive levels.

Table 5 relates the comparison of adjusted means between groups. When examining the means of the D-Scale (adjusted posttest means for the experimental group were 30.9 and the adjusted posttest means for the control group were 36.5) it should be recalled that weights of 0, 1, 2, 3, and 4 were assigned to the five response-choices of each item, and a total score was obtained by summing the weights. The theoretical range of scores was 0 to 124 for the completed D-Scale, the high score showing intolerance of Blacks.

Analyses of adjusted posttreatment means on the Desegregation Scale Scores (posttest minus pretest) failed to yield significant F-values relative to the demographic variables.

Analyses of adjusted posttreatment means on the Social Distance Scale Scores (posttest minus pretest), that is, the average Social Distance Quotients obtained by using analysis of covariance failed to yield significant F-values.

Analyses of adjusted posttreatment means on the Cognitive Measuring Instrument Scores (posttest minus pretest) failed to yield significant F-values relative to the demographic variables. It was concluded that cog-
Table 5
Adjusted Posttest Means Between Groups for Average Social Distance Quotient, Desegregation Scale, and Cognitive Measuring Instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average Social Distance Quotient</th>
<th>Desegregation Scale</th>
<th>Cognitive Measuring Instrument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Experimental</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Control</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highschool Attended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Private</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Public</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Catholic</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Protestant</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents' Educational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Elementary/Some</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Degree</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents' Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Below $18,000</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Above $18,000</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Urban</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Rural</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course in Human</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-No</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Yes</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>33.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-No</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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native levels concerning ethnic, racial and religious groups were not influenced by the reported demographic variables. The null-hypothesis failed to be rejected (Table 5).
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

SUMMARY

The purpose of the study was to examine the change in attitudes, the change in knowledge and the relationship between knowledge change and attitude change in prospective teachers when presented information about minorities, in the form of a Multicultural Instructional Unit. The setting for the study was provided by the College of Education at Louisiana State University in Baton Rouge. The sample was drawn from second year students enrolled in the College of Education. The course, EDCI 2025, Foundations and Principles in Teaching in the Elementary School, is required of all students majoring in elementary education. There are five to six sections of this course offered each fall. In 1981 there were five sections, four of which participated in the experiment. The sample size was 119 students. There were 81 complete data sets used in the statistical analyses in testing the hypotheses, that is, in answering the questions raised in the study.

Instruments for the study were the Kelly, Ferson and Holtzman Desegregation Scale, modified to reflect
current definitions of racial prejudice toward Blacks and
desegregation; the Bogardus Social Distance Scale, modi-

fied to include ethnic, religious and racial groups to
measure the extent to which one is disposed to treat
others personally; the Cognitive Measuring Instrument de-
veloped by Kleg and Puglisi, an achievement test, designed
to measure recall and recognition of content presented
in the form of a Multicultural Instructional Unit to
experimental subjects.

After registration for the fall semester of 1981,
four of the five sections of EDCI 2025, Foundations and
Principles in Teaching in the Elementary School, were
designated to form the sample. Two of the four sections
were randomly selected to serve as the experimental group,
and the other two sections as the control group.

The pretests were administered to each pre-formed
intact class during the first full week of instruction,
that is, from August 31, 1981 to September 4, 1981. The
treatment for the experimental group followed.

Race, Caste and Prejudice, developed by Kleg and
Rice (1970), formed the content basis for the instruc-
tion. The text was supplemented by theoretical and
methodological components relative to recent practices
in Multicultural teacher education for a pluralistic
society. Discussions directly affecting the students
due to recent court-ordered desegregation of Louisiana's
public educational institutions were introduced. Each student was asked to write a term paper on his/her family's ethnic/racial/religious background.

The posttests were administered during the week of September 30-October 4, 1981. One hundred and three students were posttested.

Of the 119 students who originally formed the experimental and control groups, 81 (68 percent) were used in the statistical data analysis. Whenever possible, maximum available data were used in testing the null-hypotheses, that is, in answering the questions. Data loss was due to mortality: students dropping the course, incomplete sets, students adding the course after the pretreatment observations.

The study sought answers to three questions. The first question concerned itself with the relation of attitude change and cognitive change for the experimental group. The second question was concerned with differences between experimental and control groups in cognition and attitudes. The third question sought answers to attitude and cognition level differences relative to demographic data.

Statistical tools employed in the study were the coefficients of correlation and analyses of covariance.
CONCLUSIONS

The study sought answers to three problems which are reflected in the questions and in the null-hypotheses presented in the first chapter. The first null-hypothesis stated that there will be no relationship between attitude change and cognitive change as measured by change scores for each student (posttest minus pretest) for the experimental group. The data collected and analyzed revealed no significant relationships between attitude change and knowledge change. It was concluded that the treatment did not relate significantly to attitude change for experimental subjects. Null-hypothesis one failed to be rejected.

Data collected from the pre- and posttreatment administration of the Social Distance Scale failed to yield significant differences between experimental and control groups relative to adjusted means. Thus, it was concluded that the treatment did not modify the prejudiced attitudes of experimental group subjects, that is, that experimental and control groups remained equal in their behavioral intentions toward ethnic/racial/religious groups. Therefore, part one of null-hypothesis two was accepted.

Data collected from the administration of the Desegregation Scale during pre- and posttreatment observations revealed a significant difference between experimental
and control groups relative to adjusted means. Thus, it was concluded that the treatment was instrumental in modifying the prejudiced attitudes of subjects toward Blacks and desegregation. Part two of null-hypothesis two was rejected at the .05 level.

The two scales' approach to attitude measurement differs significantly. The Social Distance Scale attempts to discuss the subject's "first feeling reactions" as to attitudes toward behaviors, from the most to the least intimate, relative to ethnic/racial/religious groups. The students' lack of familiarity with ethnic and religious groups, infrequently encountered or represented in relatively small numbers in Louisiana, may be responsible for the negative results. Whereas, the Desegregation Scale's items measure attitudes toward a group with which they are familiar. The Desegregation Scale comes closer to measuring attitudes toward socially acceptable relationships between Blacks and whites. Although no item addresses itself directly to attitudes toward classroom behaviors between teacher and student, some of the items are work or school related. Review of the literature indicates that attitudes can be changed by authority, by law and by the position of the attitude in the hierarchy of general or specific attitudes the measure is aimed at modifying. The 12 class hours only allowed for in-depth discussion of minority groups that the students are most
likely to encounter in the practice of their profession as teachers. Students suggested in their comments that more time should be provided for multicultural education by offering it as a regular course with field and visual experiences (Appendix E).

The third part of null-hypothesis two predicted that there will be no difference between experimental and control groups relative to adjusted means in cognition as measured by the Cognitive Measuring Instrument. Significant cognitive changes did occur, therefore, part three of null-hypothesis two was also rejected at the .05 level.

The third question, or null-hypothesis three, stated that there will be no significant difference in cognition and attitude based on demographic data collected during pretreatment observations. It was concluded that none of the demographic variables were responsible for differences occurring. The third null-hypothesis failed to be rejected.

The conclusions of the study may be summarized as follows: For education students enrolled in EDCI 2025, Foundations and Principles in Teaching in the Elementary School, who formed the experimental group for the study, no significant relationship existed between attitude change and cognitive change.

Between experimental and control groups no signifi-
cant difference could be observed in attitudes as measured by the Social Distance Scale. However, significant differences were observed between experimental and control groups in cognition and attitudes as measured by the Desegregation Scale and the Cognitive Measuring Instrument. Demographic variables relative to cognitive and attitudinal levels revealed to be insignificant.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The current study was the result of an urgent need to evaluate the effects of multicultural teacher education. The American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE) sponsored a conference in October 1980 on the implementation of the NCATE standards relative to multicultural education. Participants represented a cross-section of Colleges of Education of the United States of America. Among the many concerns, one dealing with the evaluation of the effectiveness of multicultural teacher education was voiced most frequently. The following recommendations delineate possible direction for further research in this area.

1. Further study is needed in the development of appropriate cognitive-affective instruments to measure the effectiveness of multicultural teacher education programs on a longitudinal basis. A systematic evalua-
tion of the students' perception toward minorities should be implemented starting at the introductory level and continuing through the conclusion of student teaching.

2. The development of a universal multicultural curriculum adaptable to local, geographic and demographic conditions is needed. Until such a curriculum is developed, efforts, such as the current study are limited in application. Results gleaned can only be generalized to the population from which the sample was drawn. This study is unique in that it reveals that attitudes toward Blacks and desegregation, even in such a short period of time as was allowed for this experiment, that is, 12 class hours, can be modified through the inclusion of cognitive information about these minorities.

3. Attention should be given to the needs of preservice and inservice teachers and to their requests when implementing multicultural education relative to length and content of courses offered by Colleges of Education. Colleges should consider the use of textbooks which contain multicultural units and follow through with appropriate field experiences to better prepare their teacher education students for the pluralistic classrooms of America's schools.

4. Further research is needed in the development of empirically based attitudinal criteria which accurately measure a preservice teacher's behavioral intentions and
attitudinal predisposition. Such data could be helpful for teacher educators and administrators when evaluating a candidate's potential for working in a multicultural classroom. Since the National Teacher Examination scores are almost nationally accepted criteria for certification, an attitude toward minority scale should be included. The results, together with the multicultural section's cognitive scores which are currently part of the NTE, should be made available to prospective employers.
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PERSONAL INVENTORY SHEET

1. Your name:______________________________________________________

2. Social Security number:_________________________________________

3. Indicate type of high school you have graduated from:
   a. parochial
   b. private
   c. public

4. Indicate your sex:
   a. Male
   b. Female

5. What is your racial stock?
   a. Black
   b. White
   c. Oriental

6. What is your religious background? (If you do not ascribe to a particular group, give the group that your parents ascribed to when raising you.)
   a. Catholic
   b. Protestant
   c. Jewish
   d. Moslem
   e. Other

7. Highest level of education of parent who was head of household?
   a. Elementary
   b. Between 7th and 10th grade
   c. High school 11th grade or high school graduate
   d. Some college (include junior college)
   e. College degree (4-year degree or higher)

8. Annual income of family which raised you?
   a. Below $18,000
   b. Above $18,000
9. Place of residence?
   a. Urban
   b. Rural

10. Have you ever had a course in HUMAN RELATIONS?
    a. Yes
    b. No

11. Have you ever worked with minority children?
    a. yes
    b. no
You are urged to give yourself as complete freedom as possible. In fact, the greater the freedom you give yourself, the more valuable will be the results. Use only checkmarks or crosses.

Seven kinds of social contacts are given.

You are asked to give in every instance your first feeling reactions. Proceed through the tests without delaying. The more you "stop to think," the less valuable will be the results. Give your reactions to every race, occupation, or religion in the following lists which you have ever heard of.

Remember to give your first feeling reactions in every case. Give your reactions to each race as a group. Do not give your reactions to the best or the worst members that you have known.

Put a cross after each race in as many of the seven columns as your feeling reactions dictate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>1. Would marry into group</th>
<th>2. Would have as close friends</th>
<th>3. Would have as next door neighbors</th>
<th>4. Would work in same office</th>
<th>5. Would have as speaking acquaintances only</th>
<th>6. Would have as visitors only to my nation</th>
<th>7. Would debar from my nation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arabs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(U.S. white)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipinos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French/Cajuns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Please remember to give your first feeling reactions for every group.
2. Remember to give feeling reactions to your chief picture of each group as a whole.
3. Also, to check as many columns for each group as you can, and to work rapidly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Would marry into group.</th>
<th>2 Would have as close friends</th>
<th>3 Would have as next door neighbors</th>
<th>4 Would work in same office</th>
<th>5 Would have as speaking acquaintances only</th>
<th>6 Would have as visitors only to my nation</th>
<th>7 Would debar from my nation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Germans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Greeks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Hungarians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Indians (American)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Indians (of India)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Iranians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Italians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Jews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Koreans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Libyans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Mexicans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Negroes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Norwegians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Poles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Please remember to give your first feeling reactions for every group.
2. Remember to give feeling reactions to your chief picture of each group as a whole.
3. Also, to check as many columns for each group as you can, and to work rapidly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Would marry into group</th>
<th>2 Would have as close friends</th>
<th>3 Would have as next door neighbors</th>
<th>4 Would work in same office</th>
<th>5 Would have as speaking acquaintances only</th>
<th>6 Would have as visitors only to my nation</th>
<th>7 Would debar from my nation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Russians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Scots</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Turks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This is not an intelligence test nor an information test. There are no "right" or "wrong" answers. The best answer is your honest, frank opinion. You can be sure that whatever your opinion may be on a certain issue there are some people who agree, some who disagree. And this is what we want to find out: How is public opinion really divided on each of these socially important topics?

It must be emphasized that the sponsors of this survey do not necessarily agree or disagree with the statements in it. We have tried to cover a great many points of view. We agree with some of the statements and disagree with others. Similarly, you will probably find yourself agreeing strongly with some of the statements, disagreeing just as strongly with others, and being perhaps more neutral about still others.

Instructions:

a) Read each statement carefully and mark it according to your first reaction. It isn't necessary to take a lot of time for any one question.

b) Answer every question.

c) Give your personal point of view. Don't talk about the questions with anyone until you have finished.

d) Be as sincere, accurate, and complete as possible in the limited time and space.

For every item, please circle your personal reaction to the statement according to the following code:

SA -- Strongly Agree
A -- Agree
U -- Undecided or Uncertain
D -- Disagree
SD -- Strongly Disagree

1. Blacks will remain ignorant and superstitious despite equal educational opportunities.

   SA -- Strongly Agree
   A -- Agree
   U -- Undecided or Uncertain
   D -- Disagree
   SD -- Strongly Disagree

2. Blacks should be allowed to enter any university they choose.

   SA -- Strongly Agree
   A -- Agree
   U -- Undecided or Uncertain
   D -- Disagree
   SD -- Strongly Disagree
3. One of the reasons for maintaining segregation is that Blacks will be able to find more equal opportunities with their own people.

SA -- Strongly Agree
A -- Agree
U -- Undecided or Uncertain
D -- Disagree
SD -- Strongly Disagree

4. I would not object to participating in school athletics with Blacks.

SA -- Strongly Agree
A -- Agree
U -- Undecided or Uncertain
D -- Disagree
SD -- Strongly Disagree

5. If Blacks are allowed to share all public facilities and institutions with White people, they will soon become arrogant and overbearing.

SA -- Strongly Agree
A -- Agree
U -- Undecided or Uncertain
D -- Disagree
SD -- Strongly Disagree

6. I would not mind sharing a table with Blacks in a crowded cafeteria.

SA -- Strongly Agree
A -- Agree
U -- Undecided or Uncertain
D -- Disagree
SD -- Strongly Disagree

7. Admitting Blacks to White schools does not work because most Blacks do not have the necessary background to keep up with White students.

SA -- Strongly Agree
A -- Agree
U -- Undecided or Uncertain
D -- Disagree
SD -- Strongly Disagree

8. The Black race will eventually reach the cultural and intellectual level of White people.

SA -- Strongly Agree
A -- Agree
U -- Undecided or Uncertain
D -- Disagree
SD -- Strongly Disagree

9. I would not mind having my children taught by a Black school teacher.

SA -- Strongly Agree
A -- Agree
U -- Undecided or Uncertain
D -- Disagree
SD -- Strongly Disagree
10. A Black Army officer could never do a good job leading White soldiers because they might lack confidence in him.

SA -- Strongly Agree
A -- Agree
U -- Undecided or Uncertain
D -- Disagree
SD -- Strongly Disagree

11. I would not hesitate to join a fraternity or sorority which admitted Blacks

SA -- Strongly Agree
A -- Agree
U -- Undecided or Uncertain
D -- Disagree
SD -- Strongly Disagree

12. If a Black were elected to public office, social pressures would prevent his doing a good job.

SA -- Strongly Agree
A -- Agree
U -- Undecided or Uncertain
D -- Disagree
SD -- Strongly Disagree

13. Separate churches for White and colored people should be maintained, since church membership is a matter of individual choice.

SA -- Strongly Agree
A -- Agree
U -- Undecided or Uncertain
D -- Disagree
SD -- Strongly Disagree

14. The fact that there is no racial segregation in certain European countries indicates that desegregation can be made to work here.

SA -- Strongly Agree
A -- Agree
U -- Undecided or Uncertain
D -- Disagree
SD -- Strongly Disagree

15. Blacks should be allowed to occupy any seats they can afford to pay for at a concert, sports event, or other public program.

SA -- Strongly Agree
A -- Agree
U -- Undecided or Uncertain
D -- Disagree
SD -- Strongly Disagree

16. If one of my best friends married a Black I would stop inviting him to my house.

SA -- Strongly Agree
A -- Agree
U -- Undecided or Uncertain
D -- Disagree
SD -- Strongly Disagree
17. The best way to solve the race problem is to encourage intermarriage so that there will eventually be only one race.

SA — Strongly Agree  
A — Agree  
U — Undecided or Uncertain  
D — Disagree  
SD — Strongly Disagree

18. Blacks are often dishonest and would increase cheating if admitted to White schools.

SA — Strongly Agree  
A — Agree  
U — Undecided or Uncertain  
D — Disagree  
SD — Strongly Disagree

19. The trouble with letting Blacks into White schools is that they would gradually give them a typical atmosphere.

SA — Strongly Agree  
A — Agree  
U — Undecided or Uncertain  
D — Disagree  
SD — Strongly Disagree

20. I would consider dating a Black providing he or she met all of my other standards.

SA — Strongly Agree  
A — Agree  
U — Undecided or Uncertain  
D — Disagree  
SD — Strongly Disagree

21. I would not object to sharing a public swimming pool with Blacks.

SA — Strongly Agree  
A — Agree  
U — Undecided or Uncertain  
D — Disagree  
SD — Strongly Disagree

22. I would not object to dancing with a good Black dancer.

SA — Strongly Agree  
A — Agree  
U — Undecided or Uncertain  
D — Disagree  
SD — Strongly Disagree

23. Blacks living in White neighborhoods lower the standards of cleanliness.

SA — Strongly Agree  
A — Agree  
U — Undecided or Uncertain  
D — Disagree  
SD — Strongly Disagree
24. The prospect of intermarriage is repulsive to me.

SA -- Strongly Agree
A -- Agree
U -- Undecided or Uncertain
D -- Disagree
SD -- Strongly Disagree

25. The Army's desegregation policy is an advance toward interracial understanding.

SA -- Strongly Agree
A -- Agree
U -- Undecided or Uncertain
D -- Disagree
SD -- Strongly Disagree

26. I would accept a traffic ticket as graciously from a Black as from a White police officer.

SA -- Strongly Agree
A -- Agree
U -- Undecided or Uncertain
D -- Disagree
SD -- Strongly Disagree
Cognitive Measuring Instrument

MULTICULTURAL CURRICULUM PROJECT
Louisiana State University
College of Education - EDCI 2025

Instructions: This test consists of 48 items. You are to read each question carefully and choose the one answer you think is best.

1. What is a man-made classification of mankind into different groups based upon common hereditary features?
   1. religion
   2. race
   3. nationality
   4. all of the above
   5. none of the above

2. Desegregation refers to a situation or condition in which
   1. prejudiced attitudes between and among ethnic groups are eliminated
   2. ethnic groups live harmoniously together in an integrated society
   3. de jure and de facto obstacles to ethnic group social, political, and economic equality are eliminated
   4. parents are permitted to exercise "freedom of choice" in selecting schools for their children
   5. school children are not permitted to attend neighborhood schools

3. In which society today is ascribed status generally most important?
   1. U.S.A.
   2. Japan
   3. European
   4. India
   5. Israel

4. The "American dilemma" involves the conflict between
   1. whites and blacks
   2. values and behavior
   3. discrimination and prejudice
   4. tolerance and discrimination
   5. law and crime
5. **Group** | **Brain Size**
---|---
White Americans | 1390 cc
Black Americans | 1350 cc
African Blacks | 1200 cc

If we accept the above chart as correct, then we can logically infer that ____________.

1. American Blacks are less intelligent than White Americans but more intelligent than the African group in the chart.
2. American Blacks are closer to American Whites than to the African group in intelligence.
3. American Whites have higher I.Q.'s than the remaining groups.
4. all of the above
5. none of the above

6. When a class is somewhat strictly hereditary, we may call it ____________.

1. a caste
2. an oligarchy
3. a hereditary class
4. an open class society based on ascribed status
5. a closed class based on achieved status

7. What does discrimination require as opposed to prejudice?

1. overt action
2. a feeling
3. a preference
4. scapegoating
5. a belief

8. A property owner who seeks to dissuade his neighbors from selling their homes to non-whites and who himself refuses to sell to non-whites because he believes that they are of unsavory character is ____________.

1. expressing prejudiced attitudes
2. discriminating against non-whites
3. stereotyping non-whites
4. all of the above
5. none of the above

9. What motive led to the murder and exodus of Mormons in Missouri in 1838?

1. frustration and deprivation
2. fear
3. guilt evasion
4. the sinful way Mormons lived
5. the Mormon practice of polygamy
10. In which place is race prejudice not a major social problem?
   1. Malasia
   2. Northern Ireland
   3. USSR
   4. Kenya
   5. None of the above

11. Focusing hostility upon an individual or group when they are partly or completely innocent of causing this hostility is called _________________.
   1. racism
   2. prejudice
   3. discrimination
   4. scapegoating
   5. extremism

12. The hostility and prejudice exhibited toward Japanese-Americans as illustrated by the Korematsu case demonstrated the principle that _________________.
   1. in times of national crisis ethnic group prejudice and scapegoating increases
   2. Japanese-Americans were a source of anti-American sentiment during World War II
   3. in times of national crisis ethnic groups experience great unity and cohesiveness
   4. in times of national crisis prejudice and scapegoating directed toward ethnic groups decreases
   5. none of the above

13. What term described the following situation? "While better off today than we were 20 years ago, we, poor people, are more poor now when we compare our gains with the gains of other folk."
   1. relative increase in cost of living
   2. relative deprivation
   3. relative poverty
   4. the situation does not make sense
   5. discrimination

14. Which group is racist in the United States?
   1. Ku Klux Klan
   2. Black Muslims
   3. White Citizens Council
   4. all of the above
   5. none of the above
15. What type of scapegoater best describes Hitler?
1. conforming
2. conventional
3. calculating
4. thwarted
5. prejudiced

16. The correlation between prejudice, ethnocentrism, and xenophobia is ____________.
1. positive
2. negative
3. neutral
4. insufficient data
5. none of the above

17. Which of the following illustrates scapegoating?
1. refusing to sell property to members of an ethnic group
2. voting for a candidate who supports passage of a constitutional amendment which would prohibit busing
3. believing that White Anglo-Saxon Protestants are bigots
4. declining membership in an integrated social club
5. painting a swastika on the door of a synagogue

18. What type of definition of a race is used by state laws which describe a Black as "any person with any percentage of Black blood"?
1. social
2. scientific
3. typological
4. geographical
5. anthropological

19. Which of the following best illustrates the vicious cycle of discrimination?
1. (a) believing that blacks are intellectually inferior to whites, (b) voting for a candidate who opposes busing as a means to integrate schools
2. (a) believing that Italians are not competent workers, (b) refusing to hire Italians, (c) criticizing Italians for a high rate of unemployment among Italians
3. (a) believing that Jews are greedy and corrupt businessmen, (b) shopping at a department store owned by Jewish businessmen, (c) criticizing the quality of merchandise carried by the store
4. (a) believing that Indians are excellent workers, (b) hiring Indians, (c) praising Indians for their industrious character
5. none of the above
20. Which of the following is the greatest barrier to social mobility in America?

1. lack of education
2. low status occupation
3. low status of parents
4. lack of money
5. lack of middle class values

21. What correctly explains the case if in New York a garbage collector earns more money than a teacher?

1. garbage collectors do more physical labor
2. income is NOT important for social status
3. there is no relationship between occupation and income
4. this is an exception to the rule
5. all of the above

22. If one accepts the fact that southern blacks are inferior in intelligence to whites, since in the south, whites have higher I.Q. scores, then one must accept the fact that

1. blacks in the north are inferior
2. northern blacks are more intelligent than southern whites
3. northern blacks are equal in intelligence to southern whites
4. all blacks are alike
5. northern blacks have I.Q. scores lower than southern whites

23. Which is true about races?

1. they are stable
2. they are based only on skin color
3. they change
4. some racial groups are superior to others
5. some racial groups evolved more quickly than others

24. Which statement is true according to Social Darwinism?

1. Darwin was a racist
2. superior races produce superior cultures
3. all men were created equal
4. man's ancestor was the ape
5. man and ape evolved from a common primate

25. Which of the following illustrates a form of scapegoating?

1. rumors
2. mayhem
3. coercion
4. all of the above
5. none of the above
26. The scientific concept of race _____________________.
   1. applies to national groups
   2. applies to religious groups
   3. applies to cultural groups
   4. is purely biological
   5. all of the above

27. What is a readiness to react toward an object, person, or place?
   1. belief
   2. attitude
   3. value
   4. prejudice
   5. predilection

28. The statement, "It pays to get a good education," refers to the fact that ____________.
   1. educators receive high salaries in comparison to other professions
   2. education is generally considered a low prestige profession
   3. education is generally considered a high prestige profession
   4. all of the above
   5. none of the above

29. What might be expected if a person is exposed superficially to only a few people of a particular group.
   1. most likely his prejudices will be reduced
   2. the information is insufficient
   3. his attitude will not change
   4. his prejudices will be increased
   5. his stereotypes of these people will be reinforced

30. Which group in Northern Ireland has about the same status as Blacks in America?
   1. Catholics
   2. Jews
   3. Blacks
   4. Protestants
   5. British

31. Which group has been the most common victim of prejudice in western history?
   1. Catholic
   2. Jew
   3. Black
   4. Protestant
   5. American Indian
32. What motivates the scapegoater who says, "The race problem is simply explained by the fact that Blacks do not want to live in peace"?

1. fear
2. conformity
3. tabloid thinking
4. frustration and deprivation
5. absolutism

33. A displacement of aggression or projection of blame toward relative innocent persons of objects is called ________.

1. predilection
2. prejudice
3. discrimination
4. scapegoating
5. intolerance

34. What term describes the selection of a particular group or member of that group for differential and unequal treatment?

1. discrimination
2. prejudice
3. predilection
4. intolerance
5. scapegoating

35. What is a negative attitude based on a fixed overgeneralization and directed toward various groups or their individual members?

1. negative belief
2. prejudice
3. predilection
4. ethnocentrism
5. intolerance

36. Which component(s) of attitude does the following statement reflect? "Blacks are intellectually inferior to whites."

1. behavioral
2. cognitive
3. affective
4. all of the above
5. none of the above

37. Which is a society that does NOT allow for any social mobility?

1. a class society
2. a caste society
3. a socialistic society
4. societies with barriers to social mobility
5. aristocracy
If we accept the above chart as correct, then we can logically infer that ________________.

1. the American Black has the same mental capacity for intelligence as the White American
2. on the average, the White American is more likely to have greater intellectual ability than the American Black
3. we can expect the White American to develop a more technological society than the Black American
4. White Americans on the average have a more highly developed brain than the American Black
5. none of the above

39. The Black in America ________________.

1. is given equal treatment before the law
2. is usually given the easy jobs
3. prefers to collect welfare rather than work
4. is set off into a caste
5. will have equal opportunity once he obtains equal education

40. Which factor is usually most important in gaining a higher status in America?

1. education
2. occupation
3. income
4. family background
5. place of residence

41. Which group properly identifies the degrees of human relationships from friendly to hostile?

1. discrimination, predilection, prejudice, scapegoating
2. predilection, prejudice, discrimination, scapegoating
3. scapegoating, prejudice, predilection, discrimination
4. predilection, discrimination, prejudice, scapegoating
5. prejudice, predilection, discrimination, scapegoating

42. What do we call a group of people who live in the same society and have about the same social status?

1. a class
2. an ingroup
3. an ethnic group
4. a caste
43. Which is the most successful way for a Hindu shoemaker in India to change his status?

1. move away and change occupation to tanner
2. move away and change religion and occupation
3. become a high government official
4. become very wealthy
5. all of the above

44. Roy's father and mother are both Black Americans. Roy's major barrier to social mobility is ________________.

1. his family background
2. income
3. lack of good educational opportunity
4. race
5. his lack of middle class value

45. Who probably earns more if Sam and Mike are mechanics? Sam has an eighth grade education and Mike is a high school graduate.

1. they probably earn the same
2. Mike
3. Sam
4. there is no way of telling because they have the same occupation
5. it depends on who is more skilled

46. What determines the social status of an individual in every society?

1. the values of the culture
2. the sum of all his statuses
3. the class to which he belongs
4. social status is based upon how good a person is in terms of honesty, education, wealth, and his job

47. In India, Moslems are discriminated against and in Egypt Moslems ________________.

1. are scapegoats
2. are a minority
3. discriminate against Christians
4. discriminate against Arabs
5. are the racial majority

48. Which is one difficulty with using the term "race"?

1. it is absolute
2. it refers only to skin color
3. it is based on inherited traits
4. it is a relative term
5. it is NOT a scientific term
1. What things did you expect to learn in this course that you have not learned?

2. List changes that you would suggest that I make in the course.

3. List the major strengths of the course.

4. List the major weaknesses of the course.

5. How would you rate this course overall?
   Excellent  1  2  3  4  Poor  5

6. How much did you learn from this course?
   A lot  1  2  3  4  Nothing  5

7. Please give any other comments.
# APPENDIX E

**STUDENT EVALUATION OF MULTICULTURAL MODULE**

1. What things did you expect to learn in this course that you have not learned?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not know what to expect but learned a lot</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing; covered all material expected</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More about different cultures</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N = 61</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. List changes that you would suggest be made in this course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More time</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of guest speakers and visuals</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N = 61</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. List the major strengths of the course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Important, interesting material covered</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved understanding; overcame prejudice</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N = 61</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. List the major weaknesses of the course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weakness</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>49.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. How would you rate this course overall?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excellent</strong></td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poor</strong></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>88.6%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. How much did you learn in this course?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A lot</strong></td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nothing</strong></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>88.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Please give any other comments.

Thirty-six of the sixty-one students in the experimental group responded to this question as follows:

Twenty-four rated highly the effectiveness of the module content; seven re-emphasized the need for more time; three remarked that it was of no value to them; and two students expressed the need to use more visuals, examples, etc.
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