

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

Clare S. Creighton for the degree of Master of Science in College Student Services Administration presented on April 21, 2009.
Title: Faculty Perspectives on Multicultural Components of Course Curriculum

Abstract approved:

Jessica E. White

Multicultural curriculum, as a facet of multicultural education is not a new topic in higher education. Although there are many theories that describe multicultural curriculum (Banks, 1997b ; Bennett, 2007), and a multitude of ideas and suggestions for best practices, several studies show there is not overwhelming faculty support for or implementation of multicultural curriculum in the college classroom, (Lindholm, Szelényi, Hurtado, and Korn , 2005; Maruyama & Moreno, 2000; Mayhew & Grunwald, 2004; Milem, 2001). This study explored how faculty members at a large, public, research university understand (a) the role of multicultural components in course curricula, (b) the rationale for, as well as the perceived challenges of implementing these components, and (c) personal and academic experiences that impact these views. Themes emerged from this research that offer interesting implications for faculty and administrators.

© Copyright by Clare S. Creighton
April 21, 2009
All Rights Reserved

Faculty Perspectives on Multicultural Components of Course Curriculum

by
Clare S. Creighton

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of

Master of Science

Presented April 21, 2009
Commencement June 2009

Master of Science thesis of Clare S. Creighton presented on April 21, 2009

APPROVED:

Major Professor, representing College Student Services Administration

Dean of the College of Education

Dean of the Graduate School

I understand that my thesis will become part of the permanent collection of Oregon State University libraries. My signature below authorizes release of my thesis to any reader upon request.

Clare S. Creighton, Author

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many, many, many thanks to the following people, without whom I may never have taken on and completed this thesis:

- To my committee members, Dr. Susan Shaw, Dr. Larry Roper, and Mark Reed for their assistance. Special thanks to Dr. Jessica White, my thesis advisor, for her guidance in the process, and without whom I would not have mastered the APA style. And thanks as well to Tom Scheuermann and Janet Nishihara for additional guidance and assistance along the way.
- To Dennis Bennett, for his time and effort working with me on drafts of this thesis, and for teaching me about the Oxford comma.
- To my participants, without whom this would not have been possible.
- To my friends and ‘Corvallis family’ for their unyielding support and encouragement- particularly when it took the form of much-needed distractions.
- To the members of my CSSA cohort who have made this adventure memorable, exciting, and hilarious at every turn.
- And finally, to my family, and McLean, and the dogs, who endured the successes and struggles of the thesis process, and usually with generous love. Sorry I broke the couch.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Background and Significance of Study	2
Overview of Methodology	5
Definitions of Key Terms	6
Organization of Thesis	10
Chapter 2: Literature Review	12
Theory	13
Faculty Support and Practice of Multicultural Curriculum	17
Faculty Views and Understanding of Multicultural Curriculum	21
Summary of Related Literature	26
Chapter 3: Methodology	28
Research Question	28
Research Perspective	29
Methodology	29
Personal Disclosure	38
Summary Statement	39
Chapter 4: Results	40
Participants	40
Data Analysis	41
Question: Role of Multicultural Components in Course Curricula	42
Question: Implementation Rationale and Perceived Barriers	50
Question: Participant Experiences	59

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	<u>Page</u>
Chapter 5: Summary and Discussion	68
Summary of the Study	68
Discussion of the Results	70
Unanticipated Findings	74
General Findings	77
Implications for Practice	78
Limitations	80
Recommendations for Further Research	82
Concluding Thoughts	82
References	84
Appendices	90

Faculty Perspectives on Multicultural Components of Course Curriculum

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

In 1995, the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) described the need for fostering multicultural education experiences across multiple disciplines and in multiple experiences when they observed: “we should not delude ourselves that a dedicated course or two will adequately prepare our students for a world characterized by multiplicity, inequitable difference, and continuing appeals to principles of justice” (p. 23). Furthermore, they recognized the need for “an across-the-curriculum approach that teaches students throughout the whole of their studies, modes of inquiry and forms of engagement appropriate to a world whose hallmark is multiplicity and deep-founded, deep-rooted differences” (p. 23). Nearly fifteen years later, scholars, researchers, institutions, administrators, and instructors continue this process in the quest to educate students about this diverse and challenging world.

The AAC&U is among many institutions and individuals who over the past few decades have focused attention and efforts on the importance of multicultural education and strategies to implement it. Bennett (2007) reports some of the recognized benefits and positive results of multicultural education: multicultural education promotes and provides academic excellence and equity among all students as they become educated about a diverse world shaped by many cultures and perspectives. In an interconnected world, multicultural education teaches the importance of global cooperation in the face of poverty, famine and environmental destruction (Bennett). In a multiethnic society, multicultural education affirms diversity and promotes cultural pluralism among students, as well as in a larger society (Bennett). Finally, multicultural education promotes the democratic ideas of: “basic

human rights, social justice, respect for alternative life choices, and equal opportunity for all” (pp. 18-19). Given the role of educating students, an increasing number of higher education institutions have acknowledged and acted on the goals and values of multicultural education.

The curricular aspect of multicultural education is often one of the most recognized. Banks (2004) states that most scholars and researchers agree that for “multicultural education to be implemented successfully, institutional changes must be made in the curriculum: the teaching materials, teaching and learning styles; the attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors of teachers and administrators; and the goals, norms and culture of the school” (p. 4). Despite this near consensus, multicultural curriculum is not a regular or established higher education practice at this point (Lindholm, Szelényi, Hurtado, and Korn, 2005; Mayhew & Grunwald, 2006; Milem, 2001). Thus, much research and effort is still needed as educators and administrators seek to provide students with a multicultural education and the ability to think critically about the world around them.

Background and Significance of the Study

Multicultural education and multicultural curriculum as topics have generated substantial research that ranges across multiple interpretations of multiculturalism, a breadth of offshoot topics, and through all levels of educational institutions. This research study was designed to contribute to that body of knowledge through the investigation of faculty perspectives toward multicultural components of course curriculum.

The significance of this research is three-fold: (a) there is a gap in existing research around the topic of faculty perspectives toward multicultural components of course curriculum, (b) the results may have implications for faculty and administrators concerning the development, practice, and support of multicultural curriculum, and (c) this is of personal significance to me as a researcher.

There is minimal research that directly explores higher education faculty perspectives, attitudes, and beliefs on the topic of multicultural curriculum or curriculum in general. Much of the existing research on multicultural education examines diversity content as a measurable item in curriculum. Several quantitative studies examine the correlation between the inclusion of “diversity related content” in the classroom and factors such as race/ethnicity, gender, and department (Mayhew & Grunwald, 2006; Maruyama & Moreno, 2000). A lot of research and theory focuses on K-12 education and the education of pre-service teachers (Banks, 1997b; Bennett, 2001; Kanu, 2005; Moore, 1999). Some literature documents the experiences of faculty members who teach multicultural education in their curriculum, and describe best practices for those faculty members (Higbee, Miksch, Jehangir, Lundell, Bruch, Jiang, 2004; Kanu; Reddick, L.A., Jacobson, W., Linse, A., and Young, D., 2005; Xing, Roper, & Shaw, 2005). Despite this research and body of knowledge, the views of faculty members remain relatively unexplored. The research that does examine faculty perspectives often does so as a cursory aspect of research (Krishnamurthi, 2005; Reed & Peet, 2005). A more complex understanding of faculty perspectives on this topic will contribute greatly to an understanding of multicultural curriculum practice.

Existing research indicates that multicultural education remains a largely optional and additive concept in higher education curriculum (Lindholm, Szelényi, Hurtado, and Korn, 2005; Mayhew & Grunwald, 2006; Maruyama & Moreno, 2000). If faculty and administrators in higher education want to decrease the gap between theory, research, and practice it is essential that research on this topic be undertaken. Administrators and faculty who understand the factors involved in implementing multicultural components in course curriculum may be better able to support and accommodate faculty, and thereby increase the regularity of multicultural curriculum in courses. This research and the results may be of interest to faculty, administrators, and researchers involved with or interested in higher education. In addition, this subject has personal interest to me as a researcher.

Through my several years in higher education, I have had the fortunate experience of being taught by a range of faculty members who inspired and provoked critical thinking and consideration of the world and topics I studied. Teaching faculty members make up a crucial constituent in the learning and education students receive while in higher education. Despite this fact, there is little research that explores faculty perspectives in a way that approaches the complexity of their role in educating students, and the impact of their thoughts, values, and experiences on curriculum design. Through this research I seek to more thoroughly understand the perspectives of the faculty toward multicultural components of course curricula. In the process of examining and implementing educational opportunities that help students understand the complexities of a diverse world and the impact of power and privilege on society, it is presumptuous to assume to understand the practices, values, or perspectives of all

faculty members. Given Banks' (2004) statement that teaching materials and styles as well as attitudes and perceptions of teachers and administrators are key to successful implementation of multicultural curriculum, it is important to explore faculty attitudes and perceptions, and understand the implications of these on curricula. Faculty development theory (Bergquist & Phillips, 1975; Knowles, 1992; Marchesani & Adams, 1992), indicates that faculty attitudes and experiences are important "ingredients" of teaching and learning. Given their role in teaching, it is essential to understand how faculty members perceive the value of and practice of multicultural components of course curriculum in their teaching in order to better understand the presence or absence of multicultural curriculum in higher education in general. Therefore, I believe it essential to ask faculty members directly about their experiences and perspectives around this topic and ask them to discuss its place in their courses. This research was conducted to help me better understand faculty members, and their perspectives and culture, as I enter the profession of student services.

Overview of Methodology

This research study explored the perspectives of faculty at a single large research institution. I utilized a general qualitative study methodology to elicit detailed and descriptive responses that shed light on how faculty perceive multicultural components of course curricula. One-on-one interviews conducted with faculty members generated a meaningful and descriptive understanding of the varied perspectives of faculty members concerning multicultural components of course curricula. Given the size of the sample of participants and the limitations of this study as qualitative research, the results are not intended to be generalizable to all faculty

members. Rather, the intent is to learn more about some faculty perspectives on multicultural curricula so as to better understand the beliefs, values, and perspectives of some members of this population. This study adds additional information to existing research and hopefully generates further inquiry and research into the nature of faculty perspectives, the formation of those perspectives, and the impact on multicultural education in higher education.

Definitions of Key Terms

Given the ambiguity and varied definitions of several of the terms in this research, it is important to address the function of these words specific to this research. The general confusion surrounding multicultural terms and ideas, along with the complexity of understanding and evaluating multicultural curricula, necessitates a more complete understanding of the concepts. The following section provides definitions for several key terms used in this proposal: (a) faculty, (b) course curricula, and (c) multicultural education, (d) multicultural curriculum, and (e) multicultural components of course curricula including a definition drawn from existing theory and research and the application and specificity of this meaning to this research.

Faculty. For the purpose of this research, faculty will refer to the employees or staff members of a college or university who are part of the teaching body of that institution. Although this term is sometimes used to include administrators as well, for the purpose of this research I focused on those faculty members whose duties at the university include teaching classes. I believe that adopting this narrower definition allowed for a more detailed understanding of faculty perspectives as they pertain to course curricula. The findings may be relevant to administrative faculty as well, or

they may provide impetus for a future study focusing on administrative faculty and those involved in student affairs.

Course curricula. Within an educational setting, curriculum can have a wide variety of applications, most of which are used to describe a program of learning. The term course curriculum is used in this research to describe the program of learning specific to a course or class being taught. Specifically, it includes the intentional elements of a course planned by the instructor including (a) textbooks, texts and resources, (b) lectures, class activities, exercises and in-class teaching methods, (c) homework assignments, and (d) evaluation methods.

Multicultural education. Multicultural education is the educational response to multiculturalism – an intellectual movement following the Civil Rights Movement in the 1960's. Founded from many active efforts to increase the equality in schools, multicultural education often refers to “the diverse courses, programs and practices that educational institutions devised to respond to the demands, needs and aspirations” of marginalized groups (Banks, 1997b, p. 6). Though multicultural education has been present as a concept and a practice for several decades, definitions and theories surrounding multicultural education continue to evolve.

According to Banks (1997b), multicultural education can be used to mean: “an idea, an educational reform movement, and a process whose major goal is to change the structure of educational institutions” (p. 1). In providing a definition for multicultural education, Banks (1997b) agrees the terms are used in a variety of ways, often to refer to programs and practices related to educational equality. Despite variation in practice, he defines this term as “a total school reform effort designed to

increase educational equity for a range of cultural, ethnic, and economic groups” (p. 7) and has as its goal the need to help students “develop the knowledge, attitudes, and skills needed to function within their own micro-cultures, the U.S. macro-culture, other micro-cultures, and within the global community” (p. 26). This definition is referred to by Branch, (2005), Bennett, (2007), and Gay (2000), among others. Because this definition refers to a variety of programs, multicultural education takes a different shape each time it is implemented. In this study, the researcher will acknowledge Banks’ overarching definition of multicultural education, and examine how these components, in the context of course curricula, function to develop the knowledge, attitudes, and skills to which Banks refers.

Multicultural curriculum. Multicultural terms are often ambiguous and understood differently (Ayala, 2008; Norman, 1994). For this reason, I aimed for a definition of multicultural curriculum based on existing theories that seems to be accepted and used in similar research. According to multicultural curriculum theory, multiculturalism within course curriculum can be integrated on a range of levels and in multiple areas of the curriculum (Banks, 1997), (Morey & Kitano, 1997). Because multicultural course curricula can look very different depending on the form, depth, and nature of implementation, there is not a definitive line on which you can measure the presence or absence of specific content. Therefore, the definition I have chosen to identify is characterized by the goals of multicultural education.

Based on Banks’ (1997b) definition of multicultural education, Bennett (2007) describes multicultural curriculum as aspects of a course that are “intended to develop student understandings, values, attitudes, and behaviors related to the goals of

multicultural education” (p. 31). She elaborated on this definition with a conceptual model of Comprehensive Multicultural Curriculum, which includes the four core values and six main goals of a multicultural curriculum. This model demonstrates the philosophy behind a curricular reform driven by the goals of multicultural education. In hoping to develop student attitudes, values and behaviors, multicultural curriculum has as its goals: (a) to develop multiple historical perspectives; (b) to strengthen cultural consciousness; (c) to strengthen intercultural competence; (d) to combat racism, sexism, and all forms of prejudice and discrimination; (e) to increase awareness of the state of the planet and global dynamics; and (f) to build social action skills (Bennett 2007). How these goals are addressed differs dramatically between subjects, courses and instructors. Despite these differences, however, multicultural curricula are characterized by their common goals. This is to say that curriculum is multicultural because it attends to goals of multicultural education.

Multicultural components of course curriculum. James Banks’ (1997b) model of Dimensions of Multicultural Education includes (a) content integration, (b) the knowledge construction process, (c) equity pedagogy, (d) prejudice reduction and (e) an empowering school culture. In addition, Morey and Kitano (1997) present four elements of course curriculum as they apply to multicultural course change: (a) content, (b) instructional strategies and activities, (c) assessment, and (d) classroom dynamics. By melding these two theories I offer the definition I utilize in this research: multicultural components of course curricula are the elements of course curricula that meet the goals of multicultural education. Banks’ dimensions of multicultural education are examples of such and can be implemented in different areas of the

curriculum. For example, one multicultural component of course curriculum is course content which includes “examples, data, and information from a variety of cultures and groups to illustrate key concepts, principles, generalizations, and theories” (Banks, 1997a p.21). Course content is an element of the curriculum and by using examples and information from a range of cultures, this component addresses several goals of multicultural education and multicultural curriculum. The multicultural components of course curriculum addressed in this study are further detailed in Chapter 3: Research Design.

Additionally, I would like to acknowledge that definitions of multicultural education and curriculum are often over-simplified or assumed. Cress (1997) uses the term “multiculturalism” to refer to the presence of “readings on racial and ethnic issues” (p. 11). This oversimplification of multiculturalism to race and ethnicity does not fairly represent the diversity of populations and perspectives at the root of multicultural education. In this study, the term multicultural curriculum is not limited to race and ethnicity, but should reflect the wealth of diversity and perspectives in our communities, the nation and globally, including but not limited to: (a) ability, (b) age, (c) economic group, (d) ethnicity, (e) gender identity, (f) nationality, (g) race, (h) religion, (i) sex, and (j) sexual orientation and the diversity among these facets of identity.

Organization of the Thesis

This research explores faculty perspectives on multicultural components of course curricula. This research topic is significant because it explores multicultural education in an area that thus far, has been under-researched. Faculty perspectives in

general offer insight and information about the culture and view of academic faculty at a research-based institution. The combination of these factors makes this research of interest to and relevant to faculty, staff, administrators, students, and researchers in institutions of higher education. The following chapter provides a review of literature and research that creates a foundation for this study. Subsequent chapters include (a) Chapter 3: Research Design, (b) Chapter 4: Results, and (c) Chapter 5: Summary and Discussion.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Existing literature and research offers a valuable frame for the discussion of faculty perspectives on multicultural components of course curriculum. In exploring this topic, I used a range of search engines and documents to develop an in-depth understanding of the existing research on this topic. My initial review began with literature pertaining to multicultural education. A search of Education Resources Information Center (ERIC) Ebsco Host, Academic Search Premier, Dissertation Abstracts, and the OSU Library, Summit, and ILL catalogs produced thousands of results. Throughout the research process I focused on topics that provided information on faculty perspectives as well as views toward and practice of multicultural and diversity courses, curriculum, and education. I narrowed results considerably when I focused on perspectives rather than practice, as much of the research specifically addresses implementation of multicultural components.

A review of research and literature related to faculty perspectives and multicultural components of course curriculum produced three primary areas of research and literature: (a) multicultural theory and models, (b) faculty support and implementation of multicultural curriculum, and (c) faculty views and understanding of multicultural curriculum. The theoretical portion of this chapter explores multicultural education theory and multicultural curriculum theory, both of which illustrate how multicultural concepts can be understood within education and curriculum. The second section demonstrates the abundance of research implying faculty perspectives on multicultural curriculum through the measurement of their support and practice of it. Finally, the third section presents research that specifically

explores faculty views and understanding of multicultural curriculum and illustrates the gaps in this field of research. The information I discuss below frames this study and implications drawn from this research informs my research design and data analysis.

Theory

Theories of multicultural education and multicultural curriculum serve a specific role in this research. As evidenced in Chapter 1, multicultural education and multicultural curriculum can be interpreted in a range of ways. The attention to and use of the theories in this study was deliberate as it ensures a multifaceted understanding of how multicultural education can exist in course curricula. Multicultural education theory lays the groundwork for the definition and multicultural components used in this research. Multicultural curriculum theory explains and deconstructs how the concepts of multicultural education take form in course curricula. In tandem, these theories help the researcher and readers conceptualize how multicultural education can be seen, understood and implemented in course curricula.

Multicultural education theory. As a complex concept, both in practice and theory, it is no surprise that there are multiple theories of multicultural education in current scholarship and research. James Banks (1997b) among others, has contributed greatly to the field with his Dimensions of Multicultural Education. Banks' (1997b) model is referenced throughout multicultural curriculum research and can be used to understand how course instructors at the college and university level engage multicultural education in their curriculum. Although originally used in the context of

K-12 education, his model is relevant to multicultural education in higher education as well (Bennett, 2001; Morey & Kitano, 1997; Reddick, Jacobson, Lense & Young, 2005). His theory divides multicultural education into components that are easier to understand and applicable across a range of education areas.

Banks' (1997b) five dimensions of multicultural education include (a) content integration, (b) the knowledge construction process, (c) an equity pedagogy, (d) prejudice reduction, and (e) an empowering school culture. Many of these dimensions directly apply to how teachers and faculty design their programs of learning. *Content integration* refers to "the extent to which teachers use examples, data, and information from a variety of cultures and groups to illustrate key concepts, principles, generalizations, and theories" (p.21) within their field or subject. It is the most common multicultural education practice, but has many limitations when used as the entirety of multicultural teaching (1997a), which is a common interpretation (see Cress, 1997, as an example). The *knowledge construction process* describes how teachers and faculty can make students aware of "the implicit cultural assumptions, frames of reference, perspectives and biases within a discipline [that] influence the ways in which knowledge is constructed" (1997a, p. 24). This dimension is part of an overall assumption that "knowledge is not neutral but is influenced by human interests, that all knowledge reflects the power and social relationships within society" (Banks, 1993, p. 9). Bennett (2001) builds on this idea of knowledge as part of curriculum reform in her discussion of what she calls 'historic inquiry,' specific to multicultural education.

The third dimension, *equity pedagogy* refers to the modification of teaching styles and methods to promote achievement for diverse students (Banks, 1997a). According to Bennett, equity pedagogy is the larger movement aimed at transforming the climate, achievement levels, and teaching styles to produce fair and equitable educational opportunities for all students. Minimal research has explored equity pedagogy (Bennett, 2001). *Prejudice reduction* focuses on student attitudes and explores how to promote positive attitudes towards others through teaching methods and materials (1997a). Prejudice reduction also appears in Bennett's model as a subgenre of Multicultural Competence, which aims at preparing and developing students to participate in multicultural societies. The *empowering school culture* to which Banks refers consists of components of the entire organization that support equity across all departments, activities, and programs (1997a).

Other models of course curriculum share common attributes with Banks' (1997b) model. Content integration, equity pedagogy, and knowledge construction appear in several other theoretical discussions, (Ayala, 2008; Bennett, 2001; Higbee, Miksch, Jehangir, Lundell, Bruch & Jiang, 2004; Reed & Peet, 2005) and are, according to Bennett, compatible across content areas in most teacher education programs. These three dimensions are used primarily in this research as a way to understand the different elements of multicultural education that can appear in multicultural courses. Although multicultural education theory can be applied to curriculum, it does not specifically address or explain how and to what degree multiculturalism can be incorporated into the classroom. Multicultural curriculum theory, as described below, approaches these questions in a more comprehensive way.

Multicultural curriculum theory. Several models exist which demonstrate ways to conceptualize multicultural curriculum. Morey and Kitano (1997), in creation of their Paradigm for Multicultural Course Change, illustrate that multicultural course curriculum is made up of multiple components and progressively increasing levels of multicultural implementation. The model consists of three levels of courses: (a), the exclusive course, (b) the inclusive course, and (c) the transformed course. Similar to previous models (Banks, 1997b; Green, 1989; Ognibene, 1989), the lowest level (the exclusive course) “presents and maintains traditional, mainstream experiences and perspectives,” (p.23). The inclusive course “presents traditional views but adds alternative perspectives” (p.23) and the transformed course “challenges traditional views and assumptions; encourages new ways of thinking; and reconceptualizes the field in light of new knowledge, scholarship, and ways of knowing” (p.23). A unique characteristic of this model is the dissection of each level into the following elements of course curriculum (a) content, (b) instructional strategies and activities, (c) assessment, and (d) classroom dynamics.

One critique of Morey and Kitano’s (1997) model is that it over-simplifies the variety of courses that make up the middle stage. Other models have several levels that make up this intermediary stage of curricular design: Banks’ model includes an *additive* level and a *transformation* level; Green’s model includes the *exceptional outsider, understanding the outsider, getting inside the outsider* as the three middle levels of that model. Despite this critique, the model is useful to this research as it illustrates how specific courses components can characterize each level of this model.

The multicultural curriculum theories discussed above provide guidance and strategies for understanding curriculum and curricular components as multicultural. In addition there are a multitude of books (Lutzker, 1995; Moore, 1999; Morey & Kitano, 1997; Xing, Li, Roper & Shaw, 2005, et al) that offer suggestions on how to practice and implement courses with multicultural curricula. Despite prolific presence of these theories and recommendations, Banks (2004) points out that a disparity exists between theory and practice in multicultural education. “Theory development has outpaced development in practice, and a wide gap exists between the two” (p.3). Given the perceived gap in theory and practice (Banks, 2004; Gay, 2000), my research study is designed to explore faculty perspectives on multicultural components of course curriculum to better understand this gap. Through exploring faculty perspectives towards these components, researchers, faculty, and administrators in higher education may gain insight into potential explanations of this gap between theory and practice.

Faculty Support and Practice of Multicultural Curriculum

When I began this research, I focused on the role of faculty members in the development of course curricula. As Krishnamurthi (2005), observed in her discussion of diversity programs at Northern Illinois University, “faculty have the primary responsibility for curricular transformation” (p. 263). The following two sub-sections describe general quantitative research that describes faculty support and practice of multicultural curriculum. The results of these studies have implications for faculty perspectives towards multicultural curriculum.

Faculty support of multicultural curriculum. According to Maruyama and Moreno (2000), how faculty members view and value diversity and multicultural education directly affects the likelihood that they will incorporate aspects of multicultural education into their curriculum and classes. They argue, “if faculty members view diversity as either unimportant or irrelevant to teaching and learning, they are likely to ignore it in their classes” (p.18).

In their study, “University faculty views about the value of diversity on campus and in the classroom,” Maruyama and Moreno (2000) investigated the perceptions of faculty members concerning institutional values about diversity and the effects and values of diversity as a community and as a practice in the classroom. In surveying 500 faculty from nationwide Carnegie Research-I institutions, they found that most faculty members had positive attitudes about diverse populations on campus, the effects of this diversity for students, and positive perceptions about the institutional and departmental support of this diversity. Despite these positive attitudes and the general belief in the value of aspects of multicultural education, Maruyama and Moreno found faculty members did not adjust their classroom practices to raise issues of racial/ethnic issues, adjust their syllabi or course content, change pedagogy or examine assessment techniques in response to increased student diversity. This discrepancy between faculty perspectives and actions is congruent with Gay’s (2000) observation of the gap between theory and practice of multicultural education.

Several studies have explored how faculty view and value multicultural education in general terms. In the 2004-2005 Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) Faculty Survey, Lindholm, Szelényi, Hurtado, and Korn, (2005) compiled and

analyzed data from 40,670 faculty surveys. Data revealed a general interest in multicultural education. For instance, 59% of faculty selected the following goal: “enhance students’ knowledge of and appreciation for other racial/ethnic groups,” as ‘very important [to]’ or ‘essential’ to undergraduate education. In addition, 53% of faculty “believe ‘strongly’ or ‘somewhat’ that racial and ethnic diversity should be more strongly reflected in the curriculum” (Lindholm, et. al, p. 15). These trends surfaced in faculty goals as well with 54% of faculty selecting “[the promotion of] racial understanding” as a personal and professional goal. Despite these trends in perspectives, Lindholm et al still found that practice and implementation lagged behind in comparison to values. Data revealed that 20% of faculty use “readings on racial and ethnic issues” and 18% of faculty use “readings on women and gender issues” in ‘most’ or ‘all’ of their classes. Traditional approaches to teaching and evaluation are still the most common, with 55% using ‘extensive lecturing,’ and 32% using ‘multiple choice mid-term and/or final exams,’ compared with 48% using cooperative learning and 19% grading on a curve. These results highlight just a few examples but confirm the findings of Maruyama and Moreno’s (2000) study.

Thus, there is not only a gap between theory and practice (Banks, 2004), but there is a gap between perspectives/values and practice as well. Some existing research has explored that gap by examining which faculty members do and which faculty members do not incorporate aspects of multicultural education into their course curriculum.

Faculty practice of multicultural curriculum. Several studies have explored which faculty members practice multicultural curriculum and why by identifying

predictive factors for faculty incorporation of components of multicultural education (Cress, 1997; Hisbee, et al, 2004; Mayhew and Grunwald, 2006). In 1997, Cress examined HERI data for a correlation between personal characteristics, professional background, individual goals and attitudes, institutional characteristics and perceptions of institutional values and goals and the inclusion of “readings on racial and ethnic issues in undergraduate courses” (p. 11). Among 33,986 faculty members at 384 institutions of higher education, Cress found that “individual characteristics play a much more significant role than do institutional environment variables” (p. 24). Specifically, she identified women and faculty members of color were most likely to incorporate race/ethnic related readings in their curriculum. In addition, faculty in humanities and social science were more likely to integrate these readings than faculty in the physical sciences.

In Milem’s (2001) examination of the 1992-3 HERI data, his research found that only 14% of faculty incorporated any diversity-related content into their courses and, for those that did, academic discipline, gender, race, institutional commitment to diversity, and faculty interest in research and teaching were predictive factors. Based off of later HERI data, Lindholm et al (2005) also found that faculty in the early stages of their career (versus mid or late stages) were more likely to use student-centered teaching and assessment. Expanding on Milem’s research, Mayhew and Grunwald (2006) pursued the study of factors which predict the incorporation of diversity related content in the curriculum. In this study, the dependent variable was “diversity-related course content,” and their results confirmed the correlation between perceived departmental values and incorporation of diversity related content.

One limitation of these quantitative studies is that the classifications used for multicultural components of curricula are often vague and do not reflect the range and complexity of integrating multicultural components into course curriculum. With dependent variables such as “diversity-related content” or “readings on racial and ethnic issues,” both a single reading as well as a curriculum structured around critically relevant pedagogy would have elicited a positive response in many of these studies.

The research studies described above provide evidence of three main ideas relevant to this current research: (a) although some faculty demonstrate interest or value in multicultural components of course curricula, many do not implement them in their courses; (b) individual characteristics including gender, race, discipline, and stage in career predict diversity-related course content, and (c) existing research utilizes a narrow conceptualization of multicultural curriculum. Although the quantitative data provide information that may be generalized, the studies mentioned do not elicit substantial information about faculty views and their experiences or values that contribute to the incorporation of multicultural components into their course curriculum.

Faculty Views and Understanding of Multicultural Curriculum

In the sections that follow, I describe some research and literature that go beyond the correlation and prediction shown in the quantitative studies above. These studies provide insight into how faculty members perceive the implementation of multicultural curriculum. Existing literature and research has revealed the following: (a) faculty members conceive of multicultural or diversity as distinct from existing

curriculum topics and content (Kanu, 2005; Krishnamurthi, 2005; Martinez-Aleman & Salkever, 2004; Moore, 1999; Rose & Robbs, 2001), (b) faculty member's views and understanding of knowledge impacts their conceptions of curriculum change (Martinez-Aleman & Salkever, 2004; Reed & Peet, 2005), and (c) department or institutional climate, and a range of specific personal experiences impact a faculty member's view and practice of multicultural curriculum (Ayala, 2008; Kanu, 2005; Knowles, 1992, Moore, 1999; Norman, 1994). Existing research offers a breadth of information about faculty and multicultural curriculum, however it becomes apparent there are still gaps in this field of research.

Multicultural as distinct. In her review of the institutional transformation taking place at Northern Illinois University (NIU) Krishnamurthi (2005) describes faculty perspectives she encountered. Although she focused on assessing the general climate and progress of diversity initiatives, she saw in some faculty a

reluctance [that] was often conveyed in comments such as 'multicultural issues are not relevant to my course and discipline,' 'my syllabus is already full and if I have to include multicultural issues then I will have to sacrifice some of the content,' 'if students are interested in multicultural issues they can take courses on those topics from programs that offer such courses,' and 'there is no incentive or recognition for me to integrate inclusiveness issues in my courses' (p. 263).

The arguments she describes are not atypical; Lutzker's (1995) anecdotal list of potential refutations to employing multicultural curricula raises some of the same concerns. Demonstration of these perspectives through research is fairly limited, but the research of Martinez-Aleman & Salkever (2004) does examine faculty perspectives at a liberal arts college and reveals similar themes.

Martinez-Aleman & Salkever (2004), in their qualitative case study of a private liberal arts college, interviewed faculty and administrators on their views of multiculturalism and their perspectives of the role of “Deweyian multiculturalism” in the pedagogy of liberal arts education. Their findings illustrated a general “concern for how multiculturalism disturbs the traditions of liberal educational pedagogy for good and for bad” (p. 54). Themes emerged from interviews that demonstrated that faculty thought that (a) the most natural home for multiculturalism was within interdisciplinary studies programs, (b) teaching styles were developed primarily to attract students of color, and that (c) diversity was enumerative and focused on numbers rather than impacting the larger curriculum (Martinez-Aleman & Salkever).

These studies illustrate some of the perspectives faculty members have concerning diversity and multiculturalism in education. As Krishnamurthi (2005) and Martinez-Aleman and Salkever (2004) discuss, faculty members often struggle with the concept of multicultural curriculum as it pertains to their courses. One of the potential explanations for this struggle is how faculty understand their discipline and field and the role of multiculturalism in their field.

Faculty views on knowledge. Reed and Peet (2005) examined perspectives of faculty, students, and program and organizational structures in place at a social work graduate school undergoing institutionally-imposed curricular change. One key finding was the impact of different assumptions of “the nature of knowledge, how students learn, and the methods of teaching that best facilitate learning” (p. 479) on faculty beliefs and perspectives towards the curricular change process. Some faculty “believe that knowledge is ‘constructed’ through dialogue, discourse, and debate,” a

fact which greatly impacted their teaching style and the role of the student in the learning process. For those within this perspective, “‘expertise’ [. . .] includes the ability to engage in and/or facilitate a knowledge-making process with others” (p. 479). On the other hand, they found “most faculty members’ training prepared them to approach knowledge, teaching, and learning as ‘content experts’ who impart knowledge and skills to students in their area of expertise” (p. 479-80). This research indicates that faculty members derive their perceptions of the nature of knowledge, learning and teaching from their discipline, which in turn implies that these views impact how they view and design their courses, particularly as it concerns multicultural components. Since at least one multicultural component specifically addresses the concept of knowledge construction and another the implementation of varied teaching styles and methods, Reed and Peet’s research supports the exploration of faculty perspectives toward multicultural components in course curricula.

Reed and Peet (2005) illustrate that faculty have beliefs and perspectives specific to their discipline and field, and it is likely that these perspectives influence their beliefs about incorporating multicultural components into course curriculum. These findings reinforce the data elicited from previous quantitative research (Cress, 1997; Milem, 2001), and from existing theories (Banks, 1997a; Bennett, 2001).

Experience and multicultural curriculum. In his model of the biographical transformation of teachers, Knowles (1992) argues that the experiences of family, school, teachers, and teaching and training can impact the developing teacher-role identity of pre-service and beginning teachers. A few research studies focused on teachers, faculty, and multicultural curriculum offer evidence of this impact. Existing

research illustrates the potential impact of organizational environment (including department and administrators) and prior experiences on faculty perspectives toward multicultural components of course curriculum (Ayala, 2008; Kanu, 1995; Moore, 1999; Norman, 1994; Shaw & Popkin, 2005).

Kanu (1995), in a study of high school teachers, identified some challenges of integrating Aboriginal information and perspectives into the curriculum. Through journals, observations, and interviews, Kanu's analysis revealed that: perceived personal lack of knowledge, a lack of resources available, school administrators' minimal support, and a school culture that did not promote these values challenge teachers who implement multicultural curricula. Her findings illustrate the impact of teachers' personal experiences and institutional climate on the integration of multicultural components in curricula. These results underscore the important link between personal experience and transforming curriculum particularly in the context of higher education.

In 1999, Moore conducted an information analysis of thirty-six studies concerning teacher perspectives and student diversity. The research cited in this analysis focuses on teachers of K-12 education, however, and focuses on faculty beliefs about student diversity and the impact of different variables on faculty diversity practices. Relevant findings include the implication that teachers "come with distinct beliefs and conceptualizations about diversity" (p. 26) and those beliefs influence the implementation of diversity issues in curriculum. While the studies Moore summarizes are particular to K-12, the implications can be extended to higher education as well. Shaw and Popkin (2005) assert that

few faculty members finish a graduate program having been taught to teach. Fewer still have been taught to transform the curriculum of their discipline so that difference and power are at the center of their understanding and teaching of the discipline (p. 67).

During data collection, a study emerged exploring faculty perspectives on the depth of diversity in courses. Ayala's (2008) recent qualitative study consisted of interviews and syllabi analysis at a university level education program. He found two themes that contributed to why faculty pursued deeper levels of diversity in course curriculum. According to his research, personal experiences with the 'isms,' and mandates and goals that promote diversity work were primary reasons faculty members cited for moving their curriculum to a deeper level of diversity work. Ayala's research echoed a finding of Norman (1994) that some of her participants could attribute their perceptions of multicultural music to experiences teaching, student, and life.

As a whole, research that explores faculty values and understanding around multicultural components of course curriculum reveal four relevant themes: (a) faculty struggle with understanding how multicultural components fit in course curricula, (b) views of knowledge and teaching styles must be considered in examining faculty perspectives on multicultural curriculum, (c) there is a clear argument for the impact (both positive and negative) of personal and professional experiences on perspectives of multicultural components of course curriculum, (d) there is a need for additional research on this topic, specific to faculty in higher education.

Summary of Related Literature

Although divided into several sections, this review of literature creates the foundation for the current research study. Theories and research offer help, advice, and

guidance for those wishing to make their courses more multicultural. Studies exist that demonstrate generally positive faculty attitudes towards diversity in higher education. Yet as Banks (2004) points out, there remains a disparity between theory and practice. The instinctive question is “Why does this disparity exist?” The aim of this research study is to contribute to a body of knowledge that attempts to answer that question. The range of research cited above examines the topic of faculty perspectives toward multicultural curriculum either tangentially, specific to K-12 education, or with a narrow definition of multicultural curriculum. No research has focused specifically on asking faculty about their multicultural curriculum perspectives and the role of personal experiences in these perspectives. This research asks questions specific to this topic in an attempt to further understand why there is a gap between multicultural theory and the practice of multicultural curriculum in higher education.

In summary, given the complexity and depth of faculty perspectives, it is important that a research study on this topic be (a) exploratory and flexible in its understanding of potential faculty perspectives, and (b) specific in its definition of multicultural components of course curriculum. The research and literature presented in this chapter have guided and informed the design of this research study, which is detailed in the subsequent chapter.

Chapter 3:Methodology

The methodology of this research was informed by the purpose and questions it seeks to answer relevant to faculty perspectives on multicultural components of course curricula. This chapter details (a) the research question, (b) an overview of the design of the study, (c) the rationale for this study design, and (d) other factors that affected data collection and analysis of this research.

Research Question

The primary question explored in this study was: What are faculty members' perspectives and views on multicultural components of course curricula? Subsidiary questions include: (a) What do faculty members see as the role of the following multicultural components of course curricula: multicultural course content, examination of the knowledge construction process, and equity pedagogy within course curricula in their field? (b) Why do faculty members choose to or choose not to develop courses with multicultural components of course curricula? And (c) What personal experiences or processes contributed to or influenced the development of these perspectives? Given the complexity and variety of definitions and interpretations of the concept of multiculturalism in curricula, and in consultation with my research committee, the components I identified were based on James Banks's (1997) five Dimensions of Multicultural Education and echoed through additional research (Bennett, 2001), (Morey & Kitano, 1997), (Schmitz, 1992). The chosen three dimensions were common among curriculum models and I felt they were most easily understood and applicable to a range of course curriculum and teaching perspectives.

Research Perspective

As this research topic indicates, I am interested in how people understand the world around them and how they make meaning of that world and their experiences. According to Neuman (2003), the interpretive social science approach to methodology “sees social reality as consisting of people who construct meaning and create interpretations through their daily social interactions” (p.77). In an environment where meaning is made for students on a daily basis, it is important to acknowledge the many ways that personal experiences and perspectives can inform curriculum. The more we know about how faculty members interpret and understand their world, the better we will understand their perspectives, particularly within the context of curricular design.

As part of interpretive social science, the paradigm of constructivist research implies that information be situated within a context. As Stage and Manning (2003) describe, “the action studied and resulting interpretations of that action must be viewed within the situation from which it arises” (p. 22). The study of faculty perspectives must be viewed within the context of faculty culture and of the prior experiences of those faculty members. Throughout the research process, I have intended to situate the methodology and analysis in the context of the culture of faculty members in their discipline and university, as well as in connection with prior experiences that may have impacted their perspectives.

Methodology

The purpose of this study is to explore faculty perspectives on multicultural components of course curricula. Qualitative inquiry is the most suitable methodology for this research as it seeks to understand participants’ perspectives and experiences

(Creswell, 2008). This style of inquiry is at the heart of the research questions that ask what, how and why about faculty views on multicultural components of course curricula.

This research study takes the form of a generic qualitative study (Lichtman, 2006) informed by both ethnographic design and phenomenological design. Like ethnographies, I seek in this research to describe, analyze, and interpret the behaviors and beliefs of a culture sharing group and use this information to enhance an understanding of a larger issue (Creswell, 2008). The culture sharing group this research addresses is the teaching faculty of a large higher education institution. Exploring the behaviors and beliefs of faculty members concerning multicultural components of course curricula offers insight into the larger issue of multicultural education in general. Phenomenology explores the “lived experiences of those who have experienced a certain phenomenon” (Lichtman, p. 70). This study also addresses the experiences of faculty. Both methodologies lend themselves to in-depth data collection, interviews and data collection based on coding and themes. The data collection methods described below and the attention to the role of the researcher reflect the philosophy and methodology of qualitative inquiry.

Study site. This research was conducted at a higher education institution in the Pacific Northwest from here on referred to as Anonymous University (AU). This institution was selected because of its position as a large, public institution. Previous qualitative research on this topic has focused on small private liberal arts colleges (Martinez Alemán & Salkever, 2004), and thus a study focusing on faculty at a large public institution, and an institution with a focus on research, will greatly contribute to

the base of knowledge on this subject. In addition, AU offers a breadth of programs in different field and disciplines, and this, as well as the large pool of faculty from which to solicit participants, makes it a natural setting for this research.

Sampling. This research used a purposeful strategy for recruiting research participants. As Creswell (2008) describes, this method allows the researcher to “select people . . . that best [help] us understand our phenomenon” (p. 2004). Purposeful sampling employs a selection of participants who will offer in-depth data and provide a deeper understanding of the question. The initial population of potential participants included all teaching faculty at AU, including a range of teaching positions and ranks. Ortiz (2003) recommends the researcher should carefully select a sample “such that both rich data and a wide variety of perspectives are obtained” (p. 39). In an attempt to meet these objectives, two kinds of sampling were used – maximum variation sampling and snowball sampling.

In an effort to capture data from “those who represent the widest possible range of characteristics of interest for the study” (Merriam, 1998, p. 63), maximum variation sampling was employed. The primary characteristic of variation is the perspective towards multicultural components in course curriculum. The sampling in this research was designed based on information from existing research with the aim to develop a sample of participants that represented a range of perspectives on multicultural components of course curricula.

In addition, existing research has demonstrated a correlation between academic discipline, gender, race and the inclusion of diversity related content in course curriculum (Mayhew & Grunwald, 2006; Maruyama & Moreno, 2000; Milem,

2001). Given these factors and the desire to explore diverse perspectives on the incorporation of multicultural components in course curriculum, the research employed maximum variation sampling.

The variation for constructing the sample population was structured around discipline and field primarily. The sample included faculty members from the College of Liberal Arts, the College of Business and across the field of Applied Science: the Colleges of Science including Engineering, Agriculture, Forestry, and Health Science. Although AU has additional academic programs and colleges, the focus of this research was on undergraduate programs and to this end the three colleges with exclusively graduate programs were not included in the sample.

Although race, ethnicity and gender have presented a corollary factor for faculty incorporation of multiculturalism in the curriculum in previous research (Cress 1997; Maruyama & Moreno 2000; Mayhew & Grunwald 2006), there are three reasons I chose not to use race, ethnicity and gender as variations for constructing the sample population. First, despite corollary research to this fact, I chose not to assume that race, ethnicity and gender would yield the “range of perspectives” toward multicultural curricula that I pursued. Second, like many institutions in the Northwest, AU faced a challenge recruiting and retaining faculty of color. Thus, I felt it would too greatly limit my sample population to require maximum variation across this demographic in addition to department/field. I chose to define the sample based on colleges and hope that my recruitment included faculty of both genders and a range of race/ethnic identities. Third, it was important to retain anonymity for participants in

this research and demographic information in conjunction with college may have been factors through which these individuals could have been identified.

This research also employed snowball sampling to seek participants. In situations where the researcher does not know the sample population, this method employs the assistance of others more familiar with the population to recommend individuals who may contribute perspectives that help better understand the studied phenomenon (Creswell, 2008). My lack of knowledge of all departments across the AU campus made this sampling strategy very useful. The combination of this sampling strategy and the maximum variation strategy described above were used in the following participant recruitment.

Participant recruitment. Participants were recruited and selected because they were: (a) current teaching faculty at AU, and (b) represented a range of departments and colleges across campus. Faculty members were considered regardless of rank, and no demographic information was collected or used in the recruitment process.

To begin the participant recruitment process, I contacted two faculty members who each have knowledge of faculty members across multiple disciplines. Using the script (Appendix A), I described the research and asked them to identify teaching faculty in a range of departments and colleges. I was provided with a list of 28 potential participants. From the provided list, I checked the AU website and departmental websites to confirm positions as teaching faculty. Three potential participants were eliminated from the original list because they did not fit the research parameters. Based on the AU website, one potential participant only taught graduate courses, another was in a college not part of the sample, and the third was not a

teaching faculty member. The remaining twenty-five identified faculty members were contacted with an email (Appendix B) to explain the study and ask about initial interest in participating in the study. I received eight responses from faculty members who were too busy or uninterested and had nine individuals who did not respond. I received eight positive responses and sent a follow up email to the participants to arrange for an interview time and to answer any further questions they had. Of the eight responses, I was able to schedule appointments with seven participants over the course of six weeks. An additional email was sent to each of the participants approximately one week prior to the interview with an attached copy of the Informed Consent form (Appendix C) and some selected interview questions (Appendix D) for participant review.

In an attempt to generate more participants, I used snowball sampling as well. At the end of each interview (Appendix E), I asked participants if they would be willing to give me the names of colleagues in their department that I might interview. I explained that neither the participants' names, nor any aspect of their identity would be released to the recruited participants. I received responses from almost all of the participants and sent out the initial recruitment letter to seven additional faculty members. I received two positive responses and was able to schedule one interview with a participant. Over the course of fall 2008, I interviewed eight faculty members.

Data collection. Data for this research were collected through in-person, one-on-one interviews, consisting of open- and closed-ended questions. Creswell (2008) recommends open-ended questions for ethnographic research as the participants "can best voice their experiences unconstrained by any perspectives of the researcher"

(Creswell, p 225). This data collection procedure was chosen for the rich data it would produce. In addition, this data collection method allowed for exploration of this topic determined by the participants. In a study that addresses a previously under-researched topic, this is an important method for gathering information.

In researching university faculty, Austin (1994) recommends faculty be made aware of why the data is being collected, how it will be used, and confidentiality and anonymity protocols, as “it is very important for faculty to know that the expression of their views and concerns about the culture or climate will not have a negative impact on them” (Austin, p. 57). The data collection procedures described below, including the review of the Informed Consent Form and a discussion of the purpose of the research prior to beginning the interview, were designed to create a comfortable environment for research participants.

The interviews began with a discussion of the research purpose, review of and signing of the Informed Consent document (Appendix C) and a discussion of the format of the interview. Participants were given an opportunity to ask questions prior to the beginning of the interview. The interview questions moved from low-risk exploratory questions to more in-depth and reflective questions to build comfort for the participant and rapport between participant and interviewer (Ortiz, 2003). The interviews were recorded with a digital audio recorder and notes were taken during the interviews to accompany the audio recordings. Interviews took place at mutually agreed upon locations, all in the offices of the participants themselves.

Given the propensity for confusion and misunderstanding around concepts of multicultural topics, the interview questions were based off of James Banks’s (2004)

Dimensions of Multicultural Education. Three of his five dimensions were chosen and the interview questions were designed to probe faculty for their perspectives on these components of course curricula. The questions ask faculty to reflect on knowledge, values, and experience as aspects of their perspectives on these components. In accordance with the research perspective and methodology, the follow up questions were designed to elicit data that describe the context and experiences that contribute to faculty perspectives. These questions were pilot tested for clarity and usefulness with four faculty members prior to the first interview. Based on the pilot testing, I took out some of the questions that measured practice and added questions about experiences and the influence of field or discipline. I also chose to send the questions out prior to interviews based on some feedback from these experiences. Although a list of questions was generated and followed, I asked additional follow up questions and probes to elicit further detail and descriptions when relevant to the topic.

Data analysis. Following the interviews, the audio recordings were sent via email to a professional transcription service. Approximately one week after the interview, transcriptions of the interviews were returned to the participant for member checking. Participants were given two weeks to make any additional edits or additions. Four chose to make revisions.

Per recommendation by Creswell (2008), I began my examination of data with a preliminary exploratory analysis through the data by reading the interview transcriptions, taking notes, and getting a sense of the data as a whole. After an initial read-through I coded the data by hand, dividing it into segments that could be understood in broad themes and eventually reduced that information to themes that

can be recognized across multiple participants. I used those themes and segments to respond to the research questions posed in Chapter One. In addition, I used Morey and Kitano's (1997) Paradigm for Multicultural Course Change to aid in analysis and understanding of how multicultural components in course curricula were evident in the participants' data.

Strategies to ensure protection of human participants and soundness of findings. Participants in this research were protected through the Institutional Review Board at Oregon State University. The research protocol, recruitment documents and procedures, interview questions, and inquiry methods were submitted to and approved (Appendix E) by the Institutional Review Board prior to the beginning of data collection.

Each research design lends itself to particular methods for ensuring accuracy and trustworthiness. Three methods have been used to enhance the accuracy of this study. During the data collection process, member checking was used to ensure accuracy. Lincoln and Guba (1985) described member checking as "the most crucial technique for establishing credibility" (p. 314). Transcribed scripts from the interviews were returned to the participants as an opportunity to correct any errors and clarify any points from the interview. During the data analysis process and the writing of the results section, I employed the use of thick, rich descriptions. According to Creswell and Miller (2000), rich descriptions provide a context for the people and information and thus enable "readers to make decisions about the applicability of the findings to other settings or similar contexts" (p. 129). This feature was congruent with the

research perspective and methodology, and offered additional credibility to the research.

Finally, Creswell and Miller (2000) encourage the use of researcher reflectivity wherein “researchers report on their personal beliefs, values, and biases that may shape their inquiry . . . [so as to] allow readers to understand their positions, and then to bracket or suspend those researchers biases as the study proceeds” (p. 127). In an effort to demonstrate researcher reflectivity, I have identified below potential biases and values relevant to this research. Throughout all stages of the research process, I reflected on and addressed my perspective as a researcher in order to remain as neutral as possible. This was particularly important during the framing of interview questions, the interviews with participants, and the data analysis process.

Personal Disclosure

As Creswell and Miller (2000) describe, reflection on the part of the researcher helps make transparent any potential biases that might influence the research. Throughout my high school and undergraduate education, I have had several classes which opened my eyes to a breadth of cultures and groups, provoked my examination of assumptions, perspectives, and biases that impact how knowledge is constructed, and conveyed through a wide range of teaching methods and styles. I believe the presence of these curricular components have given me (a) a greater appreciation for the diversity of perspectives in my community, region, nation, and world, (b) the ability to think critically about the privilege and power that impacts the information I encounter, and (c) fostered in me a commitment to equal opportunities, social justice, and the values of a pluralistic society. Despite the value that I place on such learning

opportunities, throughout this research I recognized the diversity of opinions that exist surrounding this topic and endeavored to inquire without judgment about all of these perspectives. The assumption I have about the value of these curricular components has likely impacted my approach, methods, and data analysis during the exploration of this topic. In developing interview questions, in particular, I aimed to create questions which indicated a neutral position on the inclusion/exclusion or support of/opposition to multicultural components of course curricula and allowed participants to speak comfortably about a range of perspectives. Despite my potential bias, throughout the recruitment process and data collection procedures I worked to conduct this research from a neutral position, emphasizing my interest in all perspectives and positions around this topic. As a white, female, graduate student in education, it is important that I acknowledge my position on multicultural components in course curriculum and the privilege and perspective I have that enables me to research this topic.

Summary Statement

In summary, this is a qualitative study examining faculty perspectives on multicultural components of course curricula. The research design I used sought meaning and understanding of this topic through (a) purposeful sampling, (b) the collection of detail-rich data, (c) intentional coding and analysis of data and (d) several strategies to create credibility in the research. The research described above yielded the results described in the subsequent chapter: Chapter 4: Results.

Chapter 4: Results

As described in Chapter 1, this study explores the perspectives of faculty members toward multicultural components of course curricula. This chapter begins with an introduction to the participants from whom this data was collected, and an explanation of my approach in presenting the results. Following this introduction, the chapter is organized in terms of the specific research questions posed in Chapter One. I begin with an examination of faculty understanding of the role of multicultural components of course curricula and the implication of these components for student learning. The subsequent section explains the rationale and/or perceived barriers concerning the implementation of multicultural components of course curricula as a discussion of why faculty choose or choose not to implement such components. The final section discusses themes that arose from faculty discussion of experiences that impacted or developed their perspectives towards the components of course curricula discussed. Each of these sections will describe the themes that emerged from the data and the data that support these themes.

Participants

The research design took the form of a qualitative investigation through interviews of faculty participants at Anonymous University (AU). I interviewed eight participants, all of whom have been teaching faculty at AU for at least one year. According to departmental websites, two are full professors, three are associate professors and three hold positions as assistant professors. Two participants taught in the College of Business, two in the Colleges of Applied Sciences, and four in the

College of Liberal Arts. Of the eight participants, five were women and three were men.

Data Analysis

I gathered data from these participants through individual interviews that ranged from 30-60 minutes. Given the complexity of the topic and the potential for a range of interpretations of “multicultural,” interview questions were divided into three specific components of multicultural curricula based on James Banks (1997a) *Dimensions of Multicultural Education*: (a) content integration, (b) knowledge construction process, and (c) equity pedagogy. As indicated in Chapter 2, content integration refers to the use of “examples, data, and information from a variety of cultures and groups” (p. 21); knowledge construction process describes how teachers and faculty can make students aware of the influence of implicit cultural assumptions, frames of reference, perspectives and biases on how knowledge is constructed. Equity pedagogy refers to the modification of teaching styles and methods to promote achievement for diverse students. Using these dimensions in the interview questions drew out a more intricate discussion of multicultural course curricula.

Although the breakdown of these components did elicit more depth in the conversation of multicultural curricula, throughout the interview process, and after reviewing the data, I discovered two things related to the use of Banks’ (1997) three multicultural dimensions: (a) not all participants specifically discussed each component in their responses, and (b) participant discussion of each component was fluid and interwoven with other components, making it difficult to analyze each component individually. Given the trends in the data, I chose to discuss all three

components together and not draw strict lines between how each participant addressed each component. Rather than examining participant views on *each* of Banks' dimensions of content integration, knowledge construction process, and equity pedagogy, I discuss how participants view multicultural components in course curricula in general. When identifiable, however, I attempt to label the specific component(s) to which the participant seemed to refer.

In addition, although I pursued perspectives of three components of course curricula, a fourth emerged. A few participants referred to components of their curriculum designed to promote awareness of discrimination and knowledge of social justice issues. I believe this is evidence of what Banks describes as prejudice reduction, the fourth dimension of his model. This emerging component is included in the data analysis and results.

Data analysis from the transcribed interviews yielded themes specific to each of my research questions. Those themes are described and illustrated in the sections that follow. The presentation of those results follow the research questions posed earlier. I have, for the most part, attributed quotations and discussion to the participants themselves, using the coding system described in Chapter Three. In instances when the quotation alluded to a specific field or subject, I did not identify the participant in order to protect the anonymity of the coding system.

Role of Multicultural Components in Course Curricula

The first research sub-question I explored asks "what do faculty members see as the role of the following multicultural components of course curricula: (a) multicultural course content, (b) examination of the knowledge construction process,

and (c) equity pedagogy within course curricula in the field?” Throughout the interviews, participants described multiple functions of multicultural components including: (a) personal and intellectual growth of students, (b) developing students as professionals, (c) better understanding of subject, and (d) accessibility of material and education. The first theme includes responses that demonstrate how multicultural components function to help students develop personally or intellectually, particularly through broadening viewpoints and promoting critical thinking. The second theme, helping students develop as professionals, was similar to the first, but aimed to specifically prepare students for a career field and discipline. The third theme, better understanding of subject, describes faculty perspectives on the contribution of these multicultural components to a greater understanding of the subject and course. The fourth theme, accessibility of material and education, describes how multicultural components can allow more students to become more engaged with the course materials including texts, ideas, and assessment. These roles emerged from the data analysis process and they are each described below.

Personal and intellectual growth. Five participants described the function of multicultural components of course curriculum as stimulating personal or intellectual growth in students. This appears in participant responses through a discussion of how new information or perspectives push students’ boundaries of understanding themselves and the world. Three participants spoke of multicultural components as “getting [students] to think about things that are outside of their comfort zones” (Participant A), “stretch[ing] students out of their comfort zone” of learning styles (Participant B), or through work with the course material, expanding their academic

skills and “complicat[ing] our understanding of different” (Participant C). These examples indicate that participants feel multicultural components, in complicating understanding and stretching them beyond the familiar, help students learn to think critically about the world around them.

Two participants were more specific about how pushing students to consider new ideas could result in personal or intellectual growth. One participant described the discussion of “social justice issues” as:

transformative to students personally and professionally [. . .] because the material often is such that they’ve never seen it before like looking through a lens that they didn’t even know exists. So here [are] all these webs that they’ve been walking through all their life and they had no idea that they were there. And I think it’s really important for people to have that experience (Participant B).

For this participant, the multicultural components served to make students aware of new ideas, and exposure to those ideas was, in fact, transformative. This participant went on in the interview to discuss her own experiences with exposure to these ideas, which impacted her understanding of her own life and work as a faculty member.

Another participant similarly discussed the impact of multicultural components on students’ understanding of the world. Participant F described one curricular goal as helping students understand “how these systems of inequality and privilege work in our culture to structure our lives.” This participant goes on to describe the function of such learning:

hopefully this will help them reflect on their personal stuff in a way that will empower them to see the world in different ways or maybe be willing or interested in changing the world, changing their lives, and then hopefully changing the world. So that piece is really important (Participant F).

Participant F and Participant B see the role of some multicultural components as helping students develop personally. Referencing their discussions of the knowledge construction process and prejudice reduction, both participants emphasize the importance of these components as well as the function they have for students when included in course curricula.

Developing students as professionals. Four participants spoke of the function of multicultural components as helping students develop in ways that prepare them for a profession. These perspectives arose in two primary applications: knowledge of other cultures, and knowledge of bias and prejudice.

As evidence of this first application, two participants said that discussion of cultures and differences helped individuals learn to work with others across cultures in professional settings. Participant G said that one course objective is:

to prepare people who are going into a real different culture to be able to deal with some of the cultural differences there with an objective of making sure that the people from our company aren't surprised when they get over there at some of the thing they might run into but also to help ensure that they don't commit any cultural faux pas as they're over there.

For this participant, including examples, information, and assignments from a variety of cultures, helps prepare students for professional intercultural interactions. Similarly, Participant A noted:

I could probably spend more time in highlighting some of those differences, not because there's a lot of people that would go and work in an international context, but they're likely to be working with people from other countries who have a different perspective.

For these participants, learning the specific information about other cultures was important to being a competent professional in the field. While this demonstrates the role of content integration as developing students as professionals, it also illustrates an

interpretation of culture as primarily international and homogenous groups. This limited conception of diversity may make it difficult for participants to see multicultural components as applicable across their curricula.

A second application of this theme arose as participants describe multicultural curricula as helping students develop as professionals through increased awareness of bias and prejudice. One participant said developing professional students should be aware of bias: “there’s plenty of room for racism and so forth to get into decision making [in this profession], it’s incumbent upon us to be aware of these kinds of issues” (Participant E). Another participant gave an example of the importance of ethical decision making and critical thinking as a part of competency and “professional obligation” in the field, and considered the impact of personal values on this decision making an important idea to address with students.

Although the participants who referenced professional development of students consider different skills important to the development of professionals in their field, all of them felt that multicultural components in course curricula served the purpose of helping students become better professionals.

Better understanding of subject. Another theme that emerged from participant responses was the contribution of these components to a better understanding of the subject and topics addressed in the class. Participant responses indicate that multicultural components of course curriculum (a) contribute to the accuracy of the course material, and (b) challenge traditional thinking and constructs. I have combined these ideas under this sub-heading as they both seem to indicate a desire to help

students develop a “better” (meaning both more accurate and more complex) understanding of the subject material.

In discussion of the use of “gender balanced examples, making a conscious effort all the time to use gender accurately in language to make the existence of girls and women visible,” one participant emphasizes the importance of accuracy:

it’s not accurate to say he when you mean everybody, she and he. It’s just not accurate. It doesn’t have anything to do with how we feel about men and women or what gender relationships should be or not be. It’s just important as a scientist to be accurate.

This participant goes on to discuss the inclusion of other examples of women and girls to balance out the androcentric tradition of the discipline. For this participant, the role of multicultural components is to make the subject matter as accurate as possible.

Another participant discussed a similar function for multicultural examples and perspectives in course curricula:

it’s important for students to realize that there were more than just dead white males [. . .] at least in the periods that I study and that those other voices, even if they weren’t always attended to particularly closely at the time, can now be attended to by us, enriching our understanding of the historical record.

The attention to accuracy appears in representation of voices and topics covered in the course work (content integration), but also, for this participant, it appeared in his effort to address the knowledge construction process. In his courses, this participant believes it is

useful to recognize the artificiality of those categories [. . .] of course we spend most of the term using those categories and using those generalizations, but I at least make clear to students that as far as I’m concerned we need to recognize that that’s the way that we construct the knowledge in our field, but it’s not necessarily true to the reality of the lived experience.

For both these participants multicultural components function in course curricula to contribute to an accurate and examined view of the subject matter. In contrast, other participants saw the role of these components as further complicating and challenging the existing traditions.

A few participants mentioned the function of content integration and a discussion of the knowledge construction process as it is used to complicate an understanding of the “traditional” and “typical” course material. One participant describes the incorporation of different examples and experiences to “give students ideas of what it’s like in different places, so they don’t get an idea that there are typical [professional] activities and typical responsibilities,” (Participant A). In this situation, the role of multicultural components is to broaden the understanding of the subject matter. Participant F said it is “absolutely essential” to have a discussion of how knowledge is constructed because “otherwise you just, well, you reify traditional knowledge. Part of what [this field] does is talk about the politics of knowledge; that all knowledge comes from somewhere.” For these participants, the multicultural components that challenge typical understanding and traditional knowledge provide a broader and more complex understanding of the subject matter.

In tandem, the ideas of improved accuracy and a more complex understanding of the subject illustrate that some participants thought that multicultural components had an impact on the curriculum itself and improved students’ understanding of the subjects and field.

Accessibility of material and education. The final theme that emerged from participant discussions of the role of multicultural components of course curriculum

was the view that these components create more accessible educational experiences for students. Participants that identified this role spoke primarily of teaching styles and methods designed to produce these results (equity pedagogy), although content integration came up as well.

On the one hand, several participants indicated the belief that different teaching styles enable more students to be successful. Participant D says “they may not always get As on the exams, but at least there’s a variety of content and format that will speak to different kinds of ways that people can be successful.” Two other participants shared this view. One simply said “diverse students learn differently” (Participant B), implying that those differences required a range of teaching styles, presumably to make sure all students are able to learn. Another participant said that efforts to vary teaching methods reach more students:

I think it’s important to try to get the material across in different ways, but that’s not as much of a – part of it – that’s a teaching philosophy that comes from the research, because we know that people, for them to maximize their learning, they need to see things in different ways. (Participant A).

These comments indicate that some participants employ a range of teaching styles and methods to improve the success of students in the course.

Multicultural components in course curricula can also serve to make course material more accessible and engage students. One participant mentioned that:

I always assume a multiplistic framework, that is, I assume our students are not homogeneous communities in the views that they are going to take, and I try to avoid things that are polarizing and pick, or try to stage the issue at a level of generality that will allow people to participate from different perspectives (Participant C).

Allowing for students to bring a range of perspectives to the course material promotes participation and engagement for more students. Participant F has a similar goal in

mind when she structures the format of her classes to include discussion and participation:

I try to help them come to their own understanding. [. . .] If I can get a student to talk about the point that I want to make, it's so great so it means that I don't have to be the one that says it, so that then students can take ownership, they participate.

Although the approach varies between participants and courses, several participants did speak of the use of multicultural components to create more accessible and successful learning experiences for all students. For these participants, one role of multicultural components is to improve the student educational experience.

In summary, the collected data yields several themes that demonstrate how participants view the role of multicultural components in course curricula. These components functioned to promote personal and intellectual growth for students, help students develop professionally, contribute to a better understanding of the subject, and maximize the accessibility of the material and assessment methods for all students. In general, participants' discussion focused on content integration examples. However, evidence of other components was obvious as well. Although all participants spoke to the role or function of some multicultural component of course curricula at some point during the interview, it was clear in interviews that, regardless of any perceived role, many participants struggle with implementing these components.

Implementation Rationale and Perceived Barriers

The second research question asks "why do faculty members choose to or choose not to develop courses with multicultural components? Although the reasons participants gave were interwoven with other aspects of the interviews, several themes

emerge that illustrate the rationale for, as well as the challenges and perceived barriers to, implementing multicultural components into course curricula. In the first subsection I describe some of the themes related to participants' rationale for employing multicultural components including feelings of personal or professional responsibility. In the remaining sub-sections, I describe the themes that emerged as challenges or barriers to multicultural components, including, (a) issues of time and space, (b) perceived expectations and priorities, and (c) lack of experience and lack of expertise. All of the themes that emerged provide insight into the considerations of faculty members in the decision of whether or not to include multicultural components in their course curricula. The first theme, time and space, refers specifically to the time and space within the scope of the course. Perceived expectations and priorities describes the pressures participants may feel in determining course content. The third theme of prior experience and expertise refers to participants discomfort and/or unfamiliarity with multicultural components and the barriers that that creates.

Rationale for multicultural components. For a few participants, data indicate a sense of the role of "educator" as a primary motivation for ensuring a place for multicultural components in courses. In the context of a discussion of teaching styles and methods, one participant said:

it's my responsibility to train them in ways that meet them where they are, not try to make them be something else and if they don't learn best in one way, it is my responsibility to try in another way to reach them. That's – I just – it's just my responsibility is why (Participant D).

This emphasis on responsibility as an educator was echoed by another participant, who, in the context of a discussion of knowledge construction and prejudice reduction, noted "our job is to talk about well, what is the bias? What are the consequences of

that bias? And those kinds of things” (Participant F). For those participants, multicultural components were an integral part of their understanding of their work as teachers. While not speaking directly about his role as educator, Participant E did demonstrate a concern for students who were not exposed to some of these components: “we could have philosophers do it, but then the [students in this department] will see it as peripheral to [this field] and we don’t want that, so we’ve got to bring it back in.” I believe this quotation also speaks to the participant’s view of his role as educator and the responsibility on his department to educate students on multicultural issues as well.

In addition to the role of educator as a rationale for multicultural components, a few faculty spoke directly or alluded to personal philosophies that contributed to their perspectives on these issues. In speaking of “questions of multiculturalism, around issues of culture and around issues of race and gender, ethnicity, around issues of sexual diversity,” Participant D discussed a personal philosophy that compelled her to include these concepts and ideas. “It’s that for me, my values as a feminist, my values as an ally for all kinds of groups that I don’t necessarily belong to, have to be in the classroom or I don’t feel authentic.” Another participant echoed this sentiment in a discussion of her personal understanding of the role of the student and the role of the teacher as different from other faculty in her field. She says more traditional faculty view

the teacher’s job [as] simply to transmit knowledge of “standard readings,” but to do so as if the teacher were a kind of muse-figure who stands between the reader and the text, giving the illusion of some kind of transparency; so students get the idea that teachers don’t really construct readings at all, that it’s all a “given.”

In contrast, her personal view of the relationship between student, content, and teacher impacts how she approaches the course material and teaching in general. Similar to Participant D, this participant has a personal philosophy and approach to the topic that motivates her to include multicultural components in her course curricula.

Despite the evidence of rationale for implementing multicultural components into course curricula, there was substantial discussion of some of the challenges to implementing these components as well. Most of the participants (six of eight) cited at least one challenge or barrier to implementing these curricular components, and some participants naturally revisited these difficulties throughout the interview.

Competition for time and space. A common and potentially predictable challenge to implementing multicultural components in course curriculum is the minimal time and space in course curriculum. A few participants demonstrated this in their conversations, primarily in discussion of course content. One participant said “It’s just that in my picking and choosing out of 16 chapters, which are gonna get covered in ten weeks, those two [multicultural topics] are often the ones that end up going” (Participant A). This example illustrates the perspective that this course content can be added on to the curriculum or left off, depending on the time and space in the course. This appears in other interviews, and seems to indicate a perception of these components as in competition with other aspects of the course material. One participant, who does incorporate a “range of perspectives,” still struggles with this tension:

that’s a problem in a ten-week quarter. It really is a zero sum game. Some get left out in order for other people to make it onto the syllabus, but that’s a sacrifice that in most cases I feel comfortable with (Participant H).

This issue was echoed by other participants who felt that “there are certain things [that] must be covered” (Participant E), and there are some things that are “non-negotiable” (Participant H). Also, “there’s a point where it’s just too much information” (Participant A), implying that some aspects of the course must be cut in order to make room for others. These comments indicate participants recognize a conflict or competition between a “standard set of things” (Participant D) that must be included and the integration of multicultural content when it comes to time and space in curriculum. From these comments, it seems that several participants view multicultural components as distinct from existing curriculum, and that the competition between the distinct materials must be reconciled within the time and space in the course.

For a few of the participants that discussed this tension between time and space, one of the contributing factors was the pressure and expectation that their course would cover specific topics, thus limiting the amount of time and space they had left to incorporate these additional examples and perspectives into the course. This theme is explored in the section below.

Perceived expectations and priorities. The most common theme addressing challenges and perceived barriers to implementing multicultural course components was that of the expectation that certain topics and material would be included in course curriculum. A related aspect of this theme is the sense that certain ideas and subjects were communicated as priorities over others. These expectations and priorities can come from within the university in the form of departmental expectations, and also from external pressures – either related to an accreditation

process or as a general expectation of the discipline itself. One participant provides an example of these departmental expectations.

This tension between [a] standard set of things, content, and a variety of ways that people expect students to know when they leave a particular class partly because [departmental] curriculum builds on itself, I mean like many majors do. Right? Students start out with introductory material and they're supposed to build to a greater understanding so if you're teaching a higher level class and you can't count on previous classes actually communicating the content, it's hard to teach those higher level classes (Participant D).

While Participant D was the only one who spoke directly of a department expectation to cover certain material, other participants discussed influences from the field and discipline on what needed to be included in their courses, particularly in introductory or survey level courses (Participant H, Participant A). A few participants spoke of a similar expectation that their courses cover specific material, emphasizing though that these expectations came from external sources such as accrediting agencies. In one interview, a participant mentioned that “course content is very rigid and set so in [this discipline]– we're a professional school like law or medicine so we have an external board, accreditation board that comes in and oversees our curriculum content.” In the context of this interview, this participant went on to say that because accreditation standards were very specific to some topics, but not multicultural components, that communicated a specific prioritization of traditional content over multicultural components. This sentiment was echoed by another participant as well.

Not only do participants receive messages about expectations for specific curricular content from external and departmental sources, but some also spoke of perceived priorities that fail to recognize the value of multicultural work. One participant said the field “kind of follows a rank order of privilege in terms of who

gets grant money, which creates graduate students, which creates longevity, which creates having your theories sustainable over time and therefore a much broader influence over the field,” (Participant D) and that some of the topics that overlap with multicultural components are at the bottom of this hierarchy. Similarly, Participant E spoke to great lengths about his perception of the implicit understanding in his department that research was the highest priority, followed by teaching, and that teaching about these multicultural issues had “substantially less value associated with that” than the traditional interpretation of the discipline. This illustrates that a department as well as a discipline can convey clear messages to faculty as to the value of these multicultural components. Implications of these messages will be discussed in Chapter Five.

Lack of comfort and expertise. One final theme concerning the choice to include multicultural components in course curriculum concerns participant discussion of their own experiences and expertise in these areas. While there is significant overlap between this topic and the subsequent section on the role of faculty experiences on their perspectives, it is important to highlight a theme that emerged from the data and implies a challenge or barrier to implementing multicultural components into course curricula. Several participants discussed how their lack of comfort, personal preference for other styles, and lack of exposure to other teaching styles act as challenges and barriers for the implementation of multicultural components of course curricula.

When discussing the potential use of teaching styles and methods that promote achievement for diverse students (equity pedagogy, Banks, 1997), one participant said

“there was definitely some talk of ways to change the way we evaluate students too, but I felt less comfortable putting those into practice” (Participant H). Another participant had a similar point to make concerning his preference for traditional lecture-based style of content delivery over different teaching methods such as PowerPoint:

I don't know what the hell to do with that stuff and I suppose I could go and learn, but it's – I'm only with them like three contact hours a week in the class and so during those three hours, I do the things that I'm just best at doing.

For both of these participants, comfort level with traditional teaching methods seems to be a definitive reason to continue using these styles rather than implementing styles that may promote achievement for diverse students. One participant cited his personal preference and experience as a student as a reason to conform to the traditional lecture-based style of teaching:

I sort of go on from my own experiences here, remembering as an undergraduate that too much group work can be bothersome, and I felt like what I was at university for was more to hear the opinions and perspectives of my professors than of my fellow students who, as far as I was concerned, weren't any – for the most part weren't any better informed or more intelligent than I was (Participant D).

Similarly, another participant noted that her own educational experiences had modeled traditional content and knowledge and thus, she feels it is easy to:

get stuck in this rigid type of curriculum that focuses on [this discipline] and just not questioning [the discipline] and you don't take these courses you just eat the [subject up, and] then you apply it and really don't look at how that's evolved (Participant B).

In addition, one participant described the climate of the university setting as isolating in terms of practice of multicultural components:

the interpretation of academic freedom has been 'do what you want in your classroom.' And yes, I mean that's part of academic freedom.

That's fine and I wouldn't want that infringed on for myself or anyone else. But it does mean that there has been very little oversight. There's been very little real mentorship on any of [the ideas brought up in the research questions]. So – and so for that reason, I also couldn't tell what other people do in their classrooms. It's a very kind of go it alone model that we seem to follow (Participant D).

This participant's account seems to view the lack of mentoring and collaboration as a potential barrier to implementing multicultural course components. The significance, in this instance, is not the existence of expectations and experiences but the lack of them. For this group of six participants, comfort level and confidence with a variety of teaching styles, and preference for or exposure to specific forms of teaching, work against the implementation of multicultural components.

Participants cited a range of reasons and ideas that impacted their decisions to or not to implement multicultural components in course curricula. For a few participants, the rationale they gave was based on their teaching philosophy itself or seemed to flow naturally from the course material and field. In contrast, those who spoke about perceived barriers and challenges discussed reasons based on external pressures: competition for time and space within curriculum, heavy influence from perceived field and departmental expectations and priorities, and the clash between multicultural components and the participants' own experiences and expertise in education. In summary, this sub-section also indicates that participant experiences have an impact on their consideration of multicultural components of course curricula. The following section explores in more detail the kind of experiences that participants say impacted their views toward multicultural components of course curricula.

Participant Experiences

The final research question is “what personal experiences or processes contributed to or influenced the development of faculty members’ perspectives toward multicultural components of course curricula?” In contrast to the prior sections describing faculty perspectives, this question digs deeper, looking for the root experiences that impact the development of these perspectives.

As evidenced in the previous two sections, participant discussion of their experiences often overlaps with their perspectives on multicultural curricula; this occurred in the interviews as well. For the most part, participant discussion of the influence of experiences focused on positive encounters with these ideas and topics. Thus, the primary focus of this section is on the nature of the experiences that seemed to have a positive influence on views toward multicultural components.

Participants discussed a wide range of experiences that were classified in three primary categories: (a) personal experiences, (b) informal academic experiences, and (c) formal academic experiences. Personal experiences participants described included experiences with oppression, moments of self reflection, and any other experiences that took place outside of an academic setting. The theme, informal academic experiences, is a category designed to encompass experiences that took place in an academic setting but are less formal and unofficial, including experiences with mentors, students, and peers. The final category, formal academic experiences, is one that includes prearranged and official academic experiences. Examples of formal academic experiences from the data include encounters with advisors and professors, faculty development programs, and formal training.

Personal experiences. When asked about influences toward multicultural components, a few participants discussed their ongoing identity-related experiences and individual encounters. Some participants cited their roles as mothers, as activists; others cited family influences as impacting their view towards multicultural curricula. One participant spoke more specifically:

I came of age in second wave feminism, and like many white, professionally-inspired women of a certain age, I was interested in these matters, so it kind of came with the territory, a little bit, of my generation, and my privilege, and my opportunities.

Another participant mentioned that her experiences as an international student gave her an

understanding of [the] culture shock [some] students that come into a different system [experience] and so that's been helpful. I think our personal experience [is] always a part of how we devise curriculum and how we think about things.

For the participants who spoke about personal experiences, the impact was generally affirming the importance and pertinence of these topics to them. In the interviews themselves, I did not probe specifically for personal experiences, or for the specific impact of those experiences, so this category is rather narrow. It does, however, demonstrate that experiences outside of academia play a role in curricular design.

Informal academic experiences. Informal academic experiences include any events or encounters that take place in the academic setting but are not within the bounds of a prearranged interaction or organization. This category includes work with mentors, faculty peers, students, and teaching. Six out of the eight participants described informal academic experiences.

Three participants spoke of the impact of mentors or peers on their consideration and use of varied teaching styles and methods. One participant described a faculty member in a different department that acted as a mentor by

teaching me about how to do more discussions and follow the group problem-solving and things like that and I tend to gravitate towards that. I try to mix it up so we do group discussions, I lecture a little bit, we do in-class activities (Participant B).

For this participant, the experience of having been mentored by a faculty peer introduced her to new ideas concerning teaching styles and methods, which she was then able to implement in her courses. There is a clearly demonstrated impact of this experience on the multicultural components in the curriculum. Another participant had experiences in graduate school that influenced her consideration of these matters including

discussions that we were all having with ourselves and with mentors at that time. It was the sense of how much of your identity do you share with students in the classroom. How much do you bring in topics that you personally might find difficult or important, but challenging for students? How much of that do you engage in or do you cultivate a – or is it better for one to cultivate a much more detached keep them guessing, bring these ideas in, but don't take a stand on those issues (Participant D).

Exposure to these questions had an impact on this participant, as she continued to discuss and address these issues in her own consideration of multicultural curricula. Another participant spoke at great length – and this was, in fact, a focus of the interview – on his experiences getting to know a peer faculty member and the subsequent impact of encountering new perspectives: “then I went out in the margins to learn about her instead of having her report to us on what – and then going out there, then you start living out there and I learned a lot from that” (Participant E). He described this experience as difficult “you just feel miserable and guilty, but then after

awhile, you learn not to take it personally, and it's more just the way things are. It's the structures we live in." This participant went on to describe the process of becoming interested in issues of social justice (prejudice reduction), but that that interest caused him to feel alienated and marginalized: "then getting suddenly put in a different category of value, I became, you know, 'Oh, he's a teaching guy.'" His experience with a peer, as well as the experience of being marginalized in his field, both influenced his perspectives on multicultural components. These experiences, although categorized as academic, can be very personal as well. This fact was evident in other interviews as well, as two other participants described awareness of their roles as women in fields dominated by men.

Finally, two participants described experiences where they learned directly from students. While these come from classroom discussions, I consider them to be informal because the comments themselves came out of a context of a student-faculty interaction that is not prescribed and formal. One participant recounts attempts to integrate a newly learned multicultural concept into the class:

We tried to teach that to first year students; it was a disaster. Oh it was just horrible and they really got fixated on this opening and shutting the door thing and what she was trying to say and it was very painful trying to learn how to do this appropriately (Participant B).

Another participant described an experience when she brought an exercise in heterosexism into the class and "had a student come to me who said that [the exercise] was very difficult for her and very shocking for her, because she in fact had come out [. . .] I hadn't thought that through. I kind of assumed that my whole class was heterosexual." Another example she noted was a discussion about anti-Semitism, to

which a few students mentioned they'd wished she'd addressed anti-Muslim sentiments as well. That participant went on to say:

but I learned from it, I learned that I can't just talk about anti-Semitism as if the [. . .] Palestinian-Israeli conflict didn't happen. Because, of course, it did happen, it was present in their lives and for me to talk about anti-Semitism and not include that perspective, not include readings about the perspective of anti-Muslim [sic] in the United States, which of course, became much worse after 9-11. That was an error on my part.

In both instances, the meaningful experience came from an interaction with student(s).

Participants were able to describe a range of experiences and interactions in the informal academic environment that they say influenced their perspectives toward multicultural components of curricula. One striking characteristic of these experiences is the emotions and feelings associated with them. Several of these experiences were personally challenging for the faculty who described them, but seem to have a positive impact on their perspectives.

Formal academic experiences. In their discussion of experiences that influenced their perspectives on multicultural components of course curricula, participants most often mentioned formal academic experiences. These experiences included general impressions of undergraduate education, interactions with graduate advisors, teaching training, and faculty development experiences. Six out of eight participants mentioned formal academic experiences that influenced their perspectives on the topic of multicultural components of course curricula.

A few participants described the general effects of undergraduate or graduate education on their views. One participant mentioned that "my undergraduate experiences were quite formative on these particular issues" (Participant D). Another said "it was a critique of the traditional knowledge of my field in my graduate program

that encouraged me to do what I do today” (Participant F). These participants came away from their education having had a transformative experience that influenced their perspectives on multicultural components of course curricula. Comments from other participants supported this theme. Several mentioned graduate training experiences that emphasized social sciences or discipline specific knowledge and the exposure to multiple perspectives and consideration of knowledge construction in those settings.

While most of the participants mentioned a graduate or undergraduate experience with a teacher or advisor, two in particular described experiences that influenced their views on multicultural issues specifically. One participant recounted:

I remember when I was presenting my dissertation outline to [my advisor]. She was like, ‘So, where are the women?’ And that was a good reminder for me that I had to sort of consciously expand my subject matter that I was going to work on if I wanted to – and she was right. Even if I wanted to make the kinds of arguments that I wanted to make in my dissertation, I couldn’t, I shouldn’t and couldn’t really do that from a purely masculinist perspective.

Another participant spoke about a professor who continually challenged her and the other students’ assumptions:

She'd go into a seminar and she'd say, well, this is a seminar chair, and we know which tushies sit on those cushions, usually – she meant the seat of masculine authority is constructed by seating arrangements – and I'm going to move around the room a little bit, anyway. That's kind of anecdotal, but I do think it's been an important personal experience for me to see an awareness of difference played out (Participant C).

For these participants, interactions with individuals have left lasting impressions on them, to such an extent that they are able to describe these conversations and moments in detail. These experiences indicate that formative experiences happen during these

formal elements of education and may have an enduring influence on awareness or values of multicultural components.

One of the more formal academic experiences one can have is through a faculty development or training that is intentionally designed to address faculty teaching. One participant mentioned a faculty development seminar that focused on how to integrate different perspectives and address issues of power and difference in curriculum:

It really proved quite useful in helping me translate things that I knew in theory about the importance of diversity and the importance of expanding the canon and the importance of making course materials relevant to students' lives, all of which I knew in theory but maybe wasn't translated into my practice as well or as much as it should have been.

Another participant had taken this seminar as well and said that it “was radicalizing, it was making connections with people across the university who share values and interests in these kinds of questions. It was practical useful tips and tools.” These experiences, in contrast to the other experiences, have clear connections to the implementation of multicultural components. While other experiences expose participants to ideas and concepts that may promote an interest in these topics, the faculty development sessions may have motivated participants to include multicultural components in their course curricula.

Participants reported a variety of experiences that impacted the formation of their perspectives towards curricular components. In the context of these experiences, I feel it is important to mention one other dimension that appeared. A few participants described their initial encounters with new ideas; other experiences that were described affirmed already established ideas or proved motivational, rather than

exploratory. For example, one participant noted that a graduate student had opened her eyes to a new teaching method, “I probably wouldn’t have done that if it hadn’t been for [the Graduate Assistant’s] influence and thinking about [the subject], so that was real helpful. So colleagues have been helpful with that” (Participant F). Another participant who chose to take courses outside of her department said she experienced

a transformative moment I think, taking that course and it was really nice in that I was starting to get the words to describe my experience as a woman in a male-dominated field. It was through my life - I’m a lesbian – I started getting words like oppression and privilege and really understanding. Oh people have these words that are used to describe what’s really happening. This world that I’ve always known existed but could never explain it to anybody.

These accounts illustrate how experiences can impact participants by introducing new ideas or providing an encounter or exposure to a different way of interacting with or considering the world.

In contrast to initial exposure experiences, other participants described encounters that affirmed and encouraged ideas with which they were already familiar. One participant discussed his experience in a faculty development seminar “that was really helpful in reminding me and reinforcing me. And also showing me that, for instance, some ideas that were still sort of lingering for me about, well-‘but we have to cover so and so,’ or ‘we have to do such and such.’” Another participant described the research interview itself as causing her to think about some of these issues. According to her, this has “forced me to think about them consciously” as it has:

been a lot of time since I’ve thought about some of the questions, and this is the first time I’ve had to think about them as kind of a cohesive group of questions. So I wouldn’t mind going back and actually thinking some more about all of those (Participant A).

This distinction between exposure to new ideas and revisiting or validating existing ideas appeared for a few participants, but not all and therefore was not a focus of developing themes for this research question. It is worth mention, however, as it may have implications for the discussion of these data results or additional research.

Summary

Through the interview process, participants interpreted and interacted with interview questions and topics in unique ways, demonstrating the range of understanding and contact that faculty can have with multicultural components of curricula. Themes that emerged naturally from the data addressed the research questions this study was designed to explore and yet also illustrate a complicated relationship many participants have with these topics and ideas. As I discovered, multicultural components appear to be viewed and conceptualized differently by everyone, making this a complex topic to discuss. Although all participants said that these components serve a purpose in education, the purpose and process was different for each participant. Despite identified contributions to education and the personal philosophies of some, the implementation of these components is complicated for many and includes a balance and negotiation between time and space, as well as internal and external expectations. Finally, the data indicate that experience plays a large role in perspectives toward multicultural components, as it surfaced throughout the interviews even when I had not specifically inquired about it. The following chapter will provide a discussion of these results and the relationship to existing literature and theory, describe limitations, and consider the implications of this research.

Chapter 5: Summary and Discussion

The research study outlined in the previous chapters explored faculty perspectives on multicultural components of course curricula. In the final chapter of this thesis, I provide an overview of the research that was conducted, summarize the findings and discuss the results, implications, limitations, and recommendations. I begin with a summary of the research study including research question, methods, and results. The main sections of this chapter discuss the results from the study and the implications of these results.

Summary of the Study

This study was conducted to explore faculty perspectives on multicultural components of course curricula. The primary question explored in this study was: What are faculty members' perspectives and views on multicultural components of course curricula? Subsidiary questions include: (1) What do faculty members see as the role of the following multicultural components of course curricula (a) multicultural course content, (b) examination of the knowledge construction process, and (c) equity pedagogy, within course curricula in their field? (2) Why do faculty members choose to or choose not to develop courses with multicultural components of course curricula? And (3) what personal experiences or processes contributed or influenced the development of these perspectives?

In Chapter 3, I explored the research questions through a general qualitative study. This research was designed to better understand the views and values of faculty members concerning this topic. To find participants I used primarily purposeful sampling facilitated by two faculty members who served as “gatekeepers” to the

faculty population at AU. In addition, I also employed snowball sampling. Data were gathered through thirty to sixty minute individual interviews with eight faculty participants. Interviews were transcribed and participants were given the opportunity to review their transcripts to improve accuracy. Data were analyzed and coded by hand, through a series of transcript readings, and looking for themes that occurred across multiple participants.

In Chapter 4, I presented the results of the data analysis and sorted these findings into themes to coincide with the three research sub-questions. In response to the first question about the role of multicultural components in curricula, four themes emerged: (a) multicultural components create opportunities for personal and intellectual growth for students, (b) multicultural components help students develop as professionals, (c) multicultural components contribute to a better understanding of the subject or course, and (d) multicultural components improve the accessibility of the material and education in general to students. In discussing reasons that affect implementation of multicultural components, participants described their roles as educators and personal philosophy of this role as rationale for use of multicultural components. In addition, three barriers and challenges emerged from data concerning implementation: (a) Multicultural components are seen as in competition with other course materials for time and space, (b) perceived expectations and priorities of other course materials from department and discipline constitute a challenge to implementing these components, and (c) prior experience or lack of expertise in using and integrating these components was an implementation barrier. Finally, participants described a range of personal experiences, informal academic experiences, and formal

academic experiences that influenced their perspectives toward multicultural components of course curricula.

Discussion of the Results

The results of this study affirm findings of previous research in several ways, but they also offer further information and insight into the perspectives of faculty toward multicultural components. This section is organized into discussion of the each of the research questions and the relation of the results to existing research and theory.

Role of multicultural components. Participants discussed several roles and functions of multicultural components, as well as their own use of these components in their course curricula. In general, the implications of these themes uphold existing research. All the participants of this study were able to identify at least one positive function or role of multicultural components in course curriculum. While the functions themselves differed between participants, this result suggests that all participants saw at least some value in these components, regardless of whether or not they implement them. This result corresponds with the findings of previous research (Lindholm, Szelényi, Hurtado & Korn, 2005; Maruyama & Moreno, 2000) that many faculty members have positive views towards ideas of multicultural topics and diversity in educational settings.

Themes from the first research question concerning the role of multicultural components support previous research that disciplinary differences can impact course design and understanding of curricular components (Banks, 1997; Martinez-Aleman & Salkever, 2004; Reed & Peet, 2005). As a primary observation, participant discussion of multicultural components differed considerably, and I believe were heavily

influenced by discipline and subject. The participants that described the function of multicultural components as “developing students as professionals” were primarily from science and business subjects. Other participants discussed the function of multicultural components of course curricula as promoting “personal and intellectual development” and critical thinking, which may be more indicative of the pedagogy typically found in the liberal arts. Another example is the approach to the topic of knowledge construction. When asked about knowledge construction and addressing it in curriculum, several participants rerouted conversation back to other interpretations or components with which I believe they were more comfortable. Examples included discussion of text books or general information about the subject matter. For those participants I believe knowledge construction was not a regular or traditional part of their discipline, and thus difficult to conceptualize how this applies to their discipline, much less how it would fit into their courses. Other participants were more familiar with the idea and spoke easily about it, offering examples of ideas and exercises that address this in class. This dichotomy may be further indicative of the differences between disciplines. Although Banks (1997b) argues that his model can be applied across all disciplines, my results are more closely aligned with those of Martinez Aleman & Salkever (2004), who argue that components of course curricula have a natural home in liberal arts subject areas. Martinez Aleman & Salkever’s research explored a liberal arts college and these results indicate that this trend is evident at research universities as well.

What affects implementation. The data results from this research reveal several reasons that impact if and how faculty implement multicultural components in

curricula. For six out of the eight participants, the topic of the challenges and barriers to implementing multicultural curricular components arose several times throughout the interview. The implications of these challenges provide insight into the faculty perspective. The themes that arose were (a) competition of multicultural components and traditional curriculum for time and space, (b) perceived expectations and prioritization of traditional interpretations of the curriculum by the department, institution, or accreditation committee, and (c) individual experience and confidence in particular areas are in alignment with research that has already been conducted on similar topics and was discussed in Chapter Two.

These themes affirm existing research that describes potential challenges faculty face when implementing multicultural components. The impact of department expectations and discipline specific expectations and priorities was found previously by Kanu (1995) and Krishnamurthi (2005). Lack of experience and confidence with some of these curricular changes was also mentioned by participants, a finding that supports Shaw & Popkin's (2005) claim about the natural ability of faculty to re-center their curriculum around issues of difference.

In general, the discussion of challenges and barriers to implementation demonstrates an understanding of multicultural components as fundamentally different from existing curriculum, an idea that has implications in multicultural curriculum theory. The results of this question demonstrate what Banks (1997b) and Morey & Kitano (1997) describe as additive or exclusive approaches to curriculum integration. It stands to reason that viewing these components as separate from existing curriculum would create a substantial barrier to implementation, as one would have to reconcile

adding additional information on top of a presumably already packed curriculum. In contrast, the “transformed course” level of Morey & Kitano’s theory not only includes these components on top of existing content, but also transforms the entire curriculum to re-conceptualize knowledge and the subject in general. Similarly, the Banks’ model requires an understanding of multicultural components that can transcend specific topics and is integrated through the whole of the course structure. The data also provides evidence of this approach to multicultural curriculum. I found that the two participants who did not discuss any challenges or barriers in their interviews were those who most easily discussed all three multicultural components of course curricula, and discussed them as embedded within the curriculum, rather than added to existing curricular components.

Experiences that impact. The participants that I interviewed recounted a range of experiences that impacted their views on multicultural components of course curricula, and in fact all were able to describe some event or encounter with these ideas. In my observations during the interview process and in analyzing the data, I found two conclusions worthy of discussion: (a) impactful experiences took a range of forms and types, and (b) the influence of those experiences varied between individuals.

Participants discussed a range of experiences that impacted their views toward multicultural components of course curriculum. These experiences support the existing research that illustrates personal and academic experiences have an impact on the role of teaching practice (Knowles, 1992). Experiences ranged from informal conversations with students and colleagues to participation in faculty development

workshops, leading to the conclusion that influential experiences for faculty come in different forms. Some of these experiences serve to introduce participants to new ideas; others were actually influential in motivating or helping participants to implement changes in their curricula.

Unanticipated Findings

In analyzing the data from this research, I discovered an interesting connection between faculty responses concerning the function of multicultural components of course curricula and the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) research data (Lindholm, Szelényi, Hurtado & Korn, 2005) describing “faculty goals for undergraduate education.” The HERI data describe some of the goals for undergraduate education that were identified as “very important” or “essential” by faculty taking the survey. In examining these data again, it is clear that the roles participants identified for multicultural components coincide with faculty goals for general educational goals for students. For instance, I identified the theme of “creating opportunities for personal and intellectual growth of students.” The HERI survey found that 60% of faculty said that “enhanc[ing] students’ self understanding” is an important goal of education, and 98 % of faculty said “develop[ing the] ability to think critically” is an important goal as well. Faculty respondents in the HERI survey also identified the following goals as “very important” or “essential”: (a) “prepar[ing] students for employment after graduation” (73%), and (b) “help[ing students] master knowledge in a discipline” (94%) (p. 40). Faculty participants in my study seemed to be talking about similar things when describing the function of multicultural components as (a) developing students as professionals and (b) contributing to a better

understanding of the subject for the students. This connection between the two seems to indicate that faculty members view the function of multicultural components as complementary to the goals of undergraduate education in general.

In looking at why faculty members choose or choose not to implement multicultural components in course curriculum, I found an interesting and previously un-discussed contrast between reasons. On the one hand, the reasons that participants gave as challenges and barriers to implementation were fairly concrete and factual, dealing with time, space, and departmental expectations. In contrast, the rationale for implementing multicultural components seems to come from a more personal philosophy. Participants describe responsibility as educators, personal philosophy toward their subject or teaching as rationale for and reason for the importance of multicultural components in course curricula. Thus the motivation was primarily for personal reasons, rather than institutionally-based. This finding is in contrast to Ayala's (2008) results indicating that faculty primarily implemented diversity because of a programmatic mandate.

Another unanticipated finding arose from participant discussion of experiences that impact their views of multicultural components. In general, all participants were able to recount some event or encounter with the multicultural components I discussed. Participants described informal and formal academic experiences as well as personal experiences that impacted their views of multicultural components; however, the nature of these experiences and the impact of these experiences varied considerably between participants. For some participants their discipline and department reinforced the inclusion of and attention to multicultural components of

course curriculum. For others, the tradition of their field and their own experiences served to establish comfort and confidence with traditional teaching methods and content, at the expense of multicultural components. My conclusion from this evidence is that although institutions may make efforts to provide opportunities for formal academic experiences, the informal experiences can have an equally significant impact on faculty perspectives and development. This research indicates that all kinds of experiences can have an impact on faculty views toward multicultural curriculum, a finding which has implications for faculty, professionals, and administrators.

In regards to the impact of these experiences, some participants attributed specific incidents and events as helping them to actually begin to implement multicultural components into course curricula, whereas other experiences served to introduce someone to an idea for the first time. For instance, two participants spoke of a faculty development seminar which they left with specific ideas about how to adjust their course curricula. Another participant told of interactions with a mentor that exposed her and encouraged her to practice a variety of teaching styles and methods.

I believe these accounts indicate that some experiences serve to *introduce* faculty to ideas, others serve to *reinforce* these ideas, and yet others help faculty *implement* these ideas into practice. For a few participants, the interview itself caused them to reconsider some of the ideas we discussed. This result indicates that faculty members are likely at different levels with their evaluation of and desire to implement multicultural components into their course curricula. Thus the impact of different experiences may differ between individuals.

General Findings

Deeper exploration of faculty perspectives revealed similarities and consistency with existing research in terms of the general value and practice of multicultural components in course curricula. In addition, my intention with this research was to explore a perceived gap between faculty values of multicultural components of course curriculum and the implementation of these curricular components. In demonstrating the connection between general faculty goals for undergraduate education and the perceived function of multicultural components of course curriculum, I hope to make it easier to envision multicultural curriculum as fostering the goals of general education. From the implementation side of this gap, my results indicate two important findings for these participants concerning these components: (a) barriers and challenges to implementing multicultural components often feel external or out of faculty member's own control, and (b) these barriers may be exacerbated by faculty members' understanding of multicultural components as in competition with traditional components of course curriculum. To further complicate the connection between faculty perspectives and implementation, personal, informal academic, and formal academic experiences often expose faculty to new ideas, promote awareness of multicultural concepts, and may provoke implementation or changes in course curricula. This research cannot pinpoint one explanation for the gap between values and implementation of multicultural components, but it contributes to an understanding of why this gap exists.

Implications for Practice

Given the results discussed above, I believe this research has implications for practice that are valuable to teaching faculty, administrators, and other professionals in higher education. In order to work with faculty members and promote the development of multicultural curricula, three implications arose from this research. First, it is important to recognize discipline-specific differences that may exist. Taking into account the goals and values of a department and discipline when discussing and implementing multicultural components is a necessity, particularly given the confusion surrounding some of these components. Second, work done around multicultural course curriculum must acknowledge and address a potentially pervasive view that multicultural components are in competition with traditional curriculum. Faculty members who want to incorporate these multicultural components may have to reconcile the contradiction they see between these components of curriculum and consider how the goals of multicultural curricula are relevant to the general educational goals of their discipline and the institution. Third, there is clear evidence that there exist some pressures and priorities that discourage or work against the inclusion of multicultural components, including department and field pressure that downplays the importance of multicultural components. Attempts to support or develop the practice of multicultural curriculum should explore and address these ideas.

The results and discussion of participant experiences offer some of the more valuable ideas when it comes to practical implications of these ideas and two ideas stand out. First, faculty members will be in different places and perspectives when it

comes to values and desires to engage in transformation of course curriculum. Thus providing a range of opportunities and experiences for faculty development will reach more faculty. Additionally, though institutions focus on formal faculty development programs, the results of the present study indicate that informal experiences can have a significant impact on faculty perspectives and practice. Institutions and administrators who seek to implement programs to increase the number of courses that implement multicultural components will need to reflect on the institutional goals for faculty development in this area. If institutions want to provide opportunities for faculty to see the value of including multicultural components in their courses, administrators may be best served in creating a range of informal opportunities and formal programs through which faculty can either encounter ideas for the first time or develop curricular changes.

This study shows that there are already faculty members who view multicultural components as valuable in the curriculum. Taking these results together, an institution might be inclined to encourage informal discussion, mentoring and other forms of sharing among and between departments in an effort to generate such experiences as these participants had. Finally, some participants clearly described how a faculty development seminar allowed them to take some ideas they were previously exposed to and adopt them in their courses. The practical application of such a program is clearly valuable to faculty wishing to teach a more multicultural curriculum.

Given the American Association of Colleges and Universities' (AAC&U) demonstrated commitment to diversity issues and initiatives (*Diversity Digest; More*

Reasons for Hope: Diversity Matters in Higher Education, 2008 among other publications), addressing diversity and multicultural issues in higher education will continue to be a pressing issue for colleges and universities. Additional research and ongoing exploration on the part of faculty and administrators to the complexity of faculty understanding and perspectives on this topic will be imperative to addressing diversity and multicultural curriculum.

Limitations

Over the course of this study, I have learned a considerable amount about research and outline the following limitations both as realizations that I made throughout the research process as well as limitations over which I had little control.

Time and resources were a particularly notable limitation to this study, and contribute in some ways to the narrowly applicable results. The method I chose of determining participants was due to the time constraints of writing a Masters' thesis in a year. Given more time and resources I would have been able to interview a wider range of participants, who may have demonstrated a wider range of perspectives. Although I sought out participants from a range of departments, those that I interviewed demonstrated at least some interest in multicultural components of course curricula. I believe the method of identifying participants was the cause of this as I was relying on a few faculty members to identify individuals. In retrospect, I might have found a wider range of perspectives if I had chosen to conduct more interviews and selected participants randomly. Thus one of the limitations of this research is the potentially narrow sample population, which cannot therefore be seen as representative of all faculty members at AU or other institutions. Having said that,

connections with previous research do indicate shared patterns and themes beyond this participant group. Additionally, looking back on this research I would have chosen to collect demographic data and further information about participant identity prior to discussing curriculum, as this might have opened up the conversation to further connections between personal experiences, identity, and perspectives on multicultural curricula.

Time constraints and financial constraints of interviewing and transcribing also influenced my decision to only use one 30-60 minute interview. Having conducted this research, I would consider the small amount of time with which I spent with the participants to be a limitation. Were I to have scheduled more than one interview or longer interviews I may have been able to delve more deeply into the meaning and experiences behind some of the perspectives of my participants.

Another limitation of this research was the decision to span multiple departments and colleges in my participant population. While this enabled me to understand how these themes may exist across different subjects and field, I was unable to go into further depth as to the nature of the relationship between discipline/department and faculty perspectives towards multicultural components. It would be beneficial to conduct additional research as a collective case study of different colleges, and thus focus individually on how faculty in a specific field view these components, but summarize these findings across the entire institution as well. While I considered this option in formulating the methodology of this research, I felt that an extensive study was beyond the scope of what could be accomplished in a Masters' thesis.

Recommendations for Further Research

A number of recommendations for further research emerged during the course of this research. I think it is possible to expand on this research by seeking a wider range of perspectives and giving greater attention to the impact and influence of discipline. Thus my initial recommendation would be to continue similar research that asks faculty for their views on multicultural components of course curricula. I think the answers that arise from this kind of research are valuable in understanding the gap between multicultural education theory and actual implementation of multicultural components or course curricula. In continuing this research, I would make the argument for discussing multicultural curriculum as made up of specific components, such as Banks (1997) dimensions. In this study, focus on specific components may have alleviated some confusion over what multicultural curriculum means and provided opportunities for participants to go into more depth with each of components.

In presenting my results I created themes based on the nature of the experiences, however, there is potential to delineate these experiences based on the outcome of the experience. That is, are the experiences introducing the faculty member to an idea for the first time, bolstering or solidifying an existing idea, or aiding in the implementation of that idea into actual practice? Additional research that explores that topic would greatly contribute to this field and knowledge set.

Concluding Thoughts

I hope the results of this study offer insight into the perspectives of faculty on this topic, inspire additional research exploring faculty perspectives, and help faculty and administrators better understand how to support faculty learning concerning

multicultural curriculum. Over the course of my own education, I may have taken for granted that faculty members are individuals with experiences and perspectives beyond what they share in the classroom. This research was a personal attempt to learn more about faculty perspectives, and an endeavor to bring to light the ideas and experiences that influence how and why faculty choose to or choose not to teach multicultural curricula, and the important role of the university and administrators in supporting and promoting the integration of multicultural components into course curricula.

References

- Association of American Colleges and Universities. (1995). *American pluralism and the college curriculum: Higher education in a diverse democracy*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities..
- Association of American Colleges and Universities. (2008). More reasons for hope: Diversity matters in higher education. Washington, D.C. : Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Association of American Colleges and Universities. (2009). *Diversity Digest*. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Austin, A.E. (1994). Understanding and assessing faculty cultures and climates. *New Directions in Institutional Research*, 84, 47 – 63.
- Ayala, J.I. (2008). Faculty perspectives on diversity curriculum. (Doctoral dissertation, Oregon State University, 2008). OSU Online Database: <http://hdl.handle.net/1957/9718>.
- Banks, J.A. (1993). The canon debate, knowledge construction, and multicultural education, *Educational Researcher* 22(5), p. 4-14.
- Banks, J.A. (1997a). Approaches to multicultural curriculum reform. In Banks, J.A. & C.A. McGee-Banks. (Eds) *Multicultural education: Issues and perspective* (6th ed.). New York: Wiley.
- Banks, J.A. (1997b). Multicultural education: characteristics and goals. In Banks, J.A. & C.A. McGee-Banks. (Eds) *Multicultural education: Issues and perspective* (6th ed.). New York: Wiley.

- Banks, J.A. (2004). Multicultural education: Historical development, dimensions and practice. In Banks, J.A. & McGee Banks, C.A. (Eds) *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Boss.
- Bennett, C. (2001). Genres of research in educational education. *Review of Educational Research*, 71(2). (p. 171-217).
- Bennett, C. (2007). *Comprehensive multicultural education: Theory and practice*, (6th ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- Bergquist, W. H. & Phillips, S. R. (1975) In Quehl, G. H. (Ed.) *A Handbook for faculty development I*. Montpelier, VT: Capital City Press.
- Branch, A. J. (2005) Practicing multicultural education in “United States history for teachers”: The Case of Dr. Johnson. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 33 (3), pp 305 – 328.
- Cress, C. M. (1997). *Multiculturalism in the classroom: Predictors of faculty efforts to diversify course content*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Annual Meeting of the Association for the study of Higher Education, Albuquerque, NM, November 6-9, 1997.
- Creswell, J.W. *Educational research: Planning, conducting and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Education.
- Creswell, J. & Miller, D. (2000). Determining validity in qualitative inquiry. *Theory into Practice*, 39(3), 124-130.

- Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research and practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Green, M.F. (1989). *Minorities on campus: A handbook for enhancing diversity*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.
- Higbee, J.L., Miksch, K.L., Jehangir, R.R., Lundell, D.B., Bruch, P.L., Jiang, F. (2004). Assessing our commitment to providing a multicultural learning experience. *Journal of College and Reading* 34 (2), pp 61 – 74. Retrieved from Education Research Complete on February 18, 2008.
- Kanu, Y. (2005). Teacher perceptions of the integration of Aboriginal culture into the high school curriculum. *Alberta journal of educational research* 51 (1), pp 50 – 68.
- Knowles, J.G. (1992). Models for understanding pre-service and beginning teachers' biographies. In Goodson, I.F.'s (Ed.) *Studying teachers' lives*. New York: Teachers College Press, Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Krishnamurthi, M. (2005). Institutional transformation to support inclusive teaching initiatives. In Morey, A.I & Kitano, M.K. (Eds.) *Multicultural course transformation in higher education: A broader truth*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Lichtman, M. (2006). *Qualitative research in education: A User's guide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. New York: Sage.
- Lindholm, J. A., Szelényi, K., Hurtado, S., & Korn, W.S. (2005). *The American college teacher: National norms for the 2004-2005 HERI faculty survey*. Los

Angeles, CA: Higher Education Research Institute, University of California, Los Angeles.

Lutzker, M. (1995). *Multiculturalism in the college curriculum: a handbook of strategies and resources for faculty*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Manning, K., & Stage, F.K. (Eds). (2003). What is your research approach? In *Research in the college context* (pp 19-31). New York: Brunner-Routledge.

Marchesani, L.S., & Adams, M. (1992). Dynamics of diversity in the teaching-learning process: A Faculty development model for analysis and action. In Adams, M (Ed.) *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 52, pp. 9 – 20.

Maruyama, G. & J.F. Moreno. (2000). University faculty views about the value of diversity on campus and in the classroom. In G. Maruyama, J.F. Moreno, R.H. Gudeman & P. Marin (Eds), *Does diversity make a difference? Three research studies on diversity in college classrooms*. Retrieved February 8, 2008 from <http://www.acenet.edu>.

Martinez Alemán, A.M. & Salkever, K. (2004). Multiculturalism and the American liberal arts college: Faculty perceptions of the role of pedagogy. *Studies in Higher Education* 29(1). Pp. 39 – 58.

Mayhew, M.J & Grunwald, H.E. (2006). Factors contributing to faculty incorporation of diversity-related course content. *The Journal of higher education* 77 (1), pp. 148 – 168.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education: Revised and expanded from case study research in education*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

- Milem, J. P. (2001). Increasing diversity benefits: How campus climate and teaching methods affect student outcomes. In *Diversity challenged: Evidence on the impact of affirmative action* (pp. 233-250). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.
- Moore, C. (1999). *Teaching thinking and student diversity*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service. No ED 429947).
- Morey, A.I., & Kitano, M.K. (1997). *Multicultural course transformation in higher education: A broader truth*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Neuman, W. L. (2003). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*, (5th Ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Norman, K. N. (1994). Multicultural music education: Perceptions of current and prospective music education faculty, music supervisors, and music teachers. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1994). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 51, 0127.
- Ognibene, E.R. (1990). Integrating the curriculum: From impossible to possible. *College Teaching*, 37(3), 105-110.
- Ortiz, A.M (2003). The Ethnographic interview. In F.K. Stage & K. Manning (Eds.), *Research in the College Context: Approaches and Methods* (pp. 35 – 48). New York: Brunner – Routledge.
- Reddick, L.A., Jacobson, W., Linse, A., and Young, D. (2005). A Framework for inclusive teaching in STEM disciplines. In Ouellett, M.L. (Ed.) *Teaching Inclusively: Resources for Course, Department & Institutional Change in Higher Education*. Stillwater, OK: New Forums.

Reed, B.G. & Peet, M.R. (2005) in Ouellett, M.L. (Ed.) *Teaching Inclusively: Resources for Course, Department & Institutional Change in Higher Education*. Stillwater, OK: New Forums.

Rose, P., & Robbs, B. (2001). Multicultural issues in the advertising curriculum. *Journalism and Mass Communication Educator*, 55, p. 30-38.

Schmitz, B. (1992). Cultural pluralism and core curricula. In Adams, M. (Ed.) *New Directions for Teaching and Learning: Promoting Diversity in College Classrooms: Innovative Responses for the Curriculum, Faculty and Institutions*, 52. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Shaw, S. A. & Popkin, A.(2005). Teaching teachers to transgress: Facilitating the DPD seminar. In Xing, J., Roper, L., & Shaw, S. (Eds.) *Teaching for change*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Xing, J., Roper, L., & Shaw, S. (2005) (Eds.) *Teaching for change*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: Script for Identifying Participants

Hello. I am currently conducting a research study to learn more about faculty perspectives on course curriculum. This research study will contribute to my fulfillment of the Masters of Science in Education in the College Student Services Administration program.

The purpose of this study is learn more about faculty perspectives on components of course curricula design that illustrate or teach a critical view of the course content, knowledge construction process and pedagogy and aim to educate students about these facets of multiculturalism within the context of a specific field or course. The resulting data will provide some depth to the existing research on theories and practices of critical curriculum design and help faculty and administrators better understand how some faculty members view aspects of diverse perspectives, critical views of knowledge construction, systems of power and other examples of multiculturalism in course curricula.

I am interested in identifying faculty members in the three colleges, or group of colleges who, if they consent to participate in the study, will provide thoughtful responses to interview questions on my research subject. I am interested in identifying several participants in each of the College of Liberal Arts, the College of Business, and the group of colleges of applied science (including the College of Science, Agricultural Science, Forestry, and Health and Human Sciences).

This study will benefit greatly from a diversity and range of perspectives on this topic. Because of that, I am interested in interviewing a range of individuals across several disciplines and hope to explore a range of views and perspectives on multicultural course curricula. I am writing [speaking with you] today to ask if you would recommend individuals who would contribute valuable and insightful responses to my research topic.

Your name, any identifying aspects of your identity or role at this University will not be released at any point during this research, including divulging your identity to the recruited participants or referencing you in the writing of this thesis or any subsequent materials.

I greatly appreciate your assistance in this process.

Thank you for your time,

Clare S. Creighton
Graduate Student
CSSA Program, Oregon State University
509.429.1306
clare.creighton@oregonstate.edu

APPENDIX B: Initial Contact Letter for Recruitment

Date, 2008

(name of faculty member)
 (address of faculty member)
 (address)
 (address)

Dear (name of faculty member),

My name is Clare Creighton and I am a graduate student in the College Student Services Administration program at Oregon State University. You have been recommended to me as someone who would give thoughtful perspectives on my research topic, and I am writing to invite you to be a participant in my thesis research.

The purpose of this research is to learn more about faculty perspectives about components of curriculum content. The resulting data will have implications for faculty, administrators and institutions in the support of faculty course and curriculum development.

Your name was provided by a colleague who recommended you for your ability to articulate your perspectives concerning my research topic. I would like to interview you as part of my research. If you choose to participate, I will schedule a 30-60 minute interview with you at your convenience. If you agree to this interview, it will be transcribed and I will share a copy of the transcript with you, to ensure completeness and accuracy. In about a week, I will send you an email to ask if you are interested in participating and set to an appointment for the interview.

I have enclosed an "Informed Consent" document. If you are interested in participating in this study, please read the informed consent document. I will be contacting you shortly to set up an appointment. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at the phone number or email address provided below.

If you are not interested in participating in this study at this time, please let me know.

Thank you for your time; I look forward to speaking with you.

Clare S. Creighton
 Graduate Student
 CSSA Program, OSU
 509.429.1306
clare.creighton@oregonstate.edu

APPENDIX C: Informed Consent Form



College Student Services Administration
Oregon State University, Education Hall, Corvallis, Oregon 97331
Tel 541-737-8576 || College Student Services Administration

INFORMED CONSENT DOCUMENT

Project Title: Faculty Perspectives on Components of Multiculturalism in Course Curricula
Principal Investigator: Jessica White, College Student Services Administration
Co-Investigator(s): Clare Creighton, College Student Services Administration

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY?

You are being invited to take part in a research study to learn more about faculty perspectives on components of course curriculum. This research aims to explore faculty members' views on components of course curriculum such as cultural content, how knowledge is constructed and promotion of equity for all students. By gaining a better understanding of these perspectives, faculty members, administrators and institutions can support faculty in the design and implementation of course curricula. The results of this research will be used in writing a thesis in completion of a Master of Science in Education. We are studying this because it is of value to understand how faculty view components of course curricula design.

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THIS FORM?

This consent form gives you the information you will need to help you decide whether to be in the study or not. Please read the form carefully. You may ask any questions about the research, the possible risks and benefits, your rights as a volunteer, and anything else that is not clear. When all of your questions have been answered, you can decide if you want to be in this study or not.

WHY AM I BEING INVITED TO TAKE PART IN THIS STUDY?

We are inviting you to participate in this research study because you are a current faculty member at [REDACTED]. You were recommended by a colleague as someone who would give thoughtful perspectives on this research topic.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN DURING THIS STUDY AND HOW LONG WILL IT TAKE?

If you agree to participate, your involvement will last a little over an hour, which includes the time it takes to read and sign this document, set an appointment with me for the interview, and to participate in an interview. If you decided to participate, we will set up an interview via email. The interview will take place at an agreed upon location such as your office, or a classroom or meeting room on campus.

The interview will be a semi-structured interview that lasts 30 – 60 minutes and will be audio-recorded.

WHAT ARE THE RISKS OF THIS STUDY?

The possible risks and/or discomforts associated with the procedures described in this study include: possible discomfort with discussing the sensitive issues surrounding views, values and perspectives on the content of course curricula and cultural content.

WHAT ARE THE BENEFITS OF THIS STUDY?

There are no expected direct benefits for the participants. We do believe that faculty, administrators and institutions may benefit from this study because they will learn more about faculty perspectives on course curricula.

Oregon State University · IRB Study #:4021 Approval Date: 12/03/08



College Student Services Administration
Oregon State University, Education Hall, Corvallis, Oregon 97331
Tel 541-737-8576 || College Student Services Administration

WILL I BE PAID FOR PARTICIPATING?

You will not have any costs for participating in the research project.
You will not be compensated for participating in this research project.

WHO WILL SEE THE INFORMATION I GIVE?

We will protect your identity throughout the data collection process. Participants' identities (including name, department) will not be identified on the audio recordings. During the interview process, participants will be referred to by an identification code number that correlates to the college or group of colleges in which they are a faculty member. Any mention of specific courses or course material during the interview process, that may imply the faculty member's identity will not be directly referenced in the results and discussion of the thesis. Any potential collected documents will be stripped of the faculty members' name, address and other identifying features and labeled with the participants' identification code number. These documents will not be included in the final publication of the thesis, in order to protect the work and identity of the participants. All documents and recordings will be stored in a locked and confidential location for the duration of the study. Transcripts, recordings and documents will be destroyed upon the completion of the research study or after a period of no more than one year from the date of the interview.

If the results of this project are published your identity will not be made public.

AUDIO RECORDING

The audio recordings will be transcribed by a professional transcription service and I, Clare S. Creighton will be the only person with access to these recordings and transcripts. All documents will be stored in a locked and confidential location for the duration of the study. Transcripts, recordings and documents will be destroyed upon the completion of the research study or after a period of no more than one year from the date of the interview.

DO I HAVE A CHOICE TO BE IN THE STUDY?

If you decide to take part in the study, it should be because you really want to volunteer. You will not lose any benefits or rights you would normally have if you choose not to volunteer. You can stop at any time during the study and still keep the benefits and rights you had before volunteering. You are not required to respond to all or any of the questions or discussions posed during the interview.

You will not be treated differently if you decide to stop taking part in the study. You are not required to respond to all or any of the questions or discussions posed during the interview. If you choose to withdraw from this project before it ends, the researchers may keep information collected about you and this information may be included in study reports.

WHAT IF I HAVE QUESTIONS?

If you have any questions about this research project, please contact: Jessica White, 541-737-8576, Jessica.White@oregonstate.edu or Clare Creighton, 509-429-1306, Clare.Creighton@oregonstate.edu.

If you have questions about your rights as a participant, please contact the Oregon State University Institutional Review Board (IRB) Human Protections Administrator, at (541) 737-4933 or by email at IRB@oregonstate.edu.

Oregon State University · IRB Study #:4021 Approval Date: 12/03/08



College Student Services Administration
Oregon State University, Education Hall, Corvallis, Oregon 97331
Tel 541-737-8576 || College Student Services Administration

Your signature indicates that this research study has been explained to you, that your questions have been answered, and that you agree to take part in this study. You will receive a copy of this form.

Participant's Name (printed): _____

(Signature of Participant)

(Date)

Oregon State University - IRB Study #:4021 Approval Date: 12/03/08

APPENDIX D: Abbreviated Interview Questions Sent to Participants

Interview Questions

- a) Could you tell me a little about your philosophy when it comes to designing your course curriculum?
- b) What elements do you consider essential in designing your course curriculum?

The questions listed below explore three components of course curricula. Follow up questions may explore your perspective and beliefs about these components and any educational experiences you may have had that contribute to these perspectives.

- c) First component: examples, data and information from a variety of cultures and groups.
 - i) To what extent, if any, do you use or consider this component [examples, data and information from a variety of cultures and groups] in your courses?
- d) Second component: Making students aware of implicit cultural assumptions, perspectives and biases that influence the ways in which knowledge is constructed.
 - i) To what extent, if any, do you make students aware of any assumptions, perspectives and biases in your courses?
- e) Third component: use of teaching styles and methods that promote achievement for diverse students.
 - i) To what extent, if any, do you use or consider this component [diverse teaching styles and methods] in your courses?

APPENDIX E: Interview Script and Questions

Interview Information

- Date and Time:
- Interviewee identification number:
- College or Group of Colleges:

Informed Consent Form

- Review of Form
- Signature Obtained

Begin Audio-Recording

Interview Questions

- a) Could you tell me a little about your philosophy when it comes to designing your course curriculum?
- b) What elements do you consider essential in designing your course curriculum?

Three components of course curriculum, based on James Banks' work, with sub-questions for each:

- c) First component: examples, data and information from a variety of cultures and groups.
 - a. Could you describe any use of this component [examples, data, and information from a variety of cultures and groups] in your courses?
 - b. Do you believe these [examples, data and information from a variety of cultures and groups] are important in your course curricula and could you speak about why or why not?
 - c. How does your field and discipline influence your view on this curricular component?
 - d. Can you describe any personal or educational experiences that influence[d] your view of this curricular component?
- d) Second Component: making students aware of implicit cultural assumptions, perspectives, and biases that influence the ways in which knowledge is constructed – referred to by Banks as knowledge construction process.
 - a. Could you describe any use of this component [making students aware of these assumptions, perspectives and biases] in your courses?
 - b. Do you believe these [making students aware of these assumptions, perspectives and biases] are important in your course curricula and could you speak about why or why not?
 - c. How does your field and discipline influence your view on this curricular component?
 - d. Can you describe any personal or educational experiences that influence[d] your view of this curricular component?

- e) Third Component: use of teaching styles and methods that promote achievement for diverse students.
- a. Could you describe any use of this component [diverse teaching styles and methods] in your courses?
 - b. Do you believe these [diverse teaching styles and methods] are important in your course curricula and could you speak about why or why not?
 - c. How does your field and discipline influence your view on this curricular component?
 - d. Can you describe any personal or educational experiences that influence[d] your view of this curricular component?
- f) Conclusion/Follow-Up
- a. Do you have anything else you would like to add?

End Recording

Thank You

- Thank you for your time
- I will provide a copy of the informed consent document for your record
- Can you recommend any other individuals from your college that I might talk to?