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ABSTRACT

Given racial and ethnic demographic changes to the overall U.S. population (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011; U.S. Department of Education, 2003), educators are witnessing an increase in the racial and ethnic diversity of students in Grades K-12. To ameliorate cultural conflict in school settings, teachers may be taught how to make the classroom a more culturally compatible environment for Hispanic students. Bridging Cultures is a professional development program that educates teachers to increase their cultural knowledge and apply this knowledge in the classroom environment. The current study examined the efficacy of the Bridging Cultures Program in improving elementary teachers’ multicultural attitudes, multicultural competence, teacher efficacy, and motivation for teaching. Participants included 38 elementary teachers from an urban elementary school located in the mid-Atlantic region of the U.S. Teachers were randomly assigned to treatment and waitlist control groups. Teachers in both conditions completed pre- and posttest measures of multicultural attitudes, competence, motivation for teaching, and teaching efficacy. It was hypothesized that the BC program would improve participants’ scores. Descriptive statistics, t-tests, and mixed ANOVAs were run to test the four hypotheses. There was a significant interaction between time and group on teachers’ multicultural attitudes, multicultural competence, and teacher efficacy. There was no statistically significant effect on participants’ motivation for teaching. School districts should consider adding BC to their professional development programs, given that even in a relatively experienced sample, teacher attitudes improved. Support from administrators and other school personnel is important in helping teachers adapt their practices.
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Chapter 1: INTRODUCTION

The United States is composed of many diverse cultures. Data from the most recent Census indicates that the majority of the total population growth came from increases in those who reported their race as something other than White alone and those who reported their ethnicity as Hispanic or Latino (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011). The Hispanic population has increased by 43% between 2000 and 2010 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011). Within the non-Hispanic population, the number of people who reported their race as White alone grew just 1% from 2000 to 2010 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011). Data from the 2010 U.S. Census indicate that Hispanics now number nearly 51 million people, comprising 16% of the total population and accounting for more than half of the growth in the total population between 2000 and 2010 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011). The non-Hispanic population has grown relatively slower, increasing by just about 5% in the first decade of the 21st century.

The Student population is no exception to this shift. The proportion of students enrolled in kindergarten through Grade 12 public schools who are culturally and linguistically diverse has increased and mirrors changes in the overall U.S. population (Okagaki, 2006; U.S. Census Bureau, 2012). Census and school demographic data confirm that the school population continues to diversify and that both urban and suburban schools show a significant increase in culturally and linguistically diverse students (Reyes-Carrasquillo, 2007). Hispanics are the fastest growing student group in public schools (Harris & Goldstein, 2007), and the enrollment of Hispanic students spanning ages 3 to 34 has steadily increased across all levels of education from 2000 to 2009 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012). Of the 12 million children who speak a language other than English at home, 8.6 million of these children speak Spanish (U.S. Census Bureau, 2014).
Hispanics, however, have not been well served in schools, as reflected by educational attainment and high school dropout statistics. In fact, growth in the number of Hispanics has not corresponded with growth in education levels (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012). More specifically, educational attainment of Hispanics was lower than all other ethnic groups in the 2010 Census (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012) compared to White, Black, and Asian/Pacific Islander groups. Hispanics reported the lowest percentage at each attainment level – 62.9% completed high school and 13.9% completed at least a bachelors degree (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012). However, at least 84% of Whites, Blacks, and Asian/Pacific Islanders in each group earned a high school diploma or more. Of those who earn a college degree or more, White, Black, and Asian groups comprised 30.3%, 19.8%, and 52.4% of their groups, respectively (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012). According to the U.S. Department of Education (2009), Hispanic students in public and private high schools are more likely to drop out than are any other ethnic group. In 2009, 14.7% of Hispanics were high school dropouts, compared to Black and White dropouts, who were 8.2% and 6.9%, respectively, of the school-age population (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012).

In examining what has been referred to as the achievement gap, some anthropological research has distinguished between voluntary and involuntary minorities (e.g., Durkee & Williams, 2015; Goff, Martin, & Thomas, 2007; Hayes, Blake, Darenbourg, & Castillo, 2015; Ogbu, 2004). Ogbu and Simons (1998) maintain that African Americans and Native Americans were made part of the U.S. society against their will (i.e., conquered, colonized, enslaved). Voluntary immigrants choose to immigrate to the U.S. for better economic and educational opportunities. Because of this, the U.S. is better compared to their native country. As a result, these two groups have different outlooks and levels of trust towards government institutions. It must also be noted that differences between voluntary minority groups exist. Historically,
Asians have performed stronger compared to other racial/ethnic groups. Portes and Zhou (1993) maintain three reasons for this: (a) government policy, (b) societal reception, and (c) co-ethnic community. The positive position that Asian groups tend to take in these areas ameliorates assimilation and achievement (Portes & Zhou, 1993; Zhou, 2014).

Research indicates that there is a stark contrast between the ethnic makeup of the teaching workforce and student populations. The current teaching population, particularly at the elementary level, is overwhelmingly White and female (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012). Although increasing numbers of White teachers work in increasingly diverse schools, many teachers have never had significant interactions with individuals who are racially different from them (Milner, 2003; Milner, 2006). In fact, most have never taught, gone to school, or lived in neighborhoods with people of color (Milner, 2003; Milner, 2006). Given the differences in background of most teachers and the students they teach, it is important that students are served adequately. Unfortunately, many teacher education programs lack adequate training experiences to enhance educators’ cultural competency (Will, 2016).

In general, cultural conflict between home and school is rarely addressed, though sometimes it is invoked as a reason for students’ failure to achieve (Ogbu, 2004; Trumbull, Diaz-Meza, Hasan, & Rothstein-Fisch, 2000). Among the factors contributing to overrepresentation in special education is cultural mismatch (Skiba, Simmons, Ritter, Gibb, Rausch, Cuadrado, et al., 2008). Discrepancy in backgrounds may lead to different cultural values among students, teachers, homes, and schools. According to Hollins (1996), such a “cultural mismatch” is the misunderstanding or lack of understanding of different cultures (as cited in Mayfield, 2008). As the school-aged population becomes increasingly more diverse while the teaching force remains predominantly White, teachers must search for ways to connect with students of diverse
backgrounds who often come from communities and have life experiences that are completely foreign to their teachers (Irizarry, 2009). Research indicates that it is important for school districts to have a framework to deal with the demographic shifts taking place in the United States (Welton, Diem, & Holme, 2015). The overall social and cultural conditions and emotional climate of acceptance or rejection that host societies offer to their immigrant families and children will exert a major influence on children’s psychosocial adjustment (Chuang & Gielen, 2009).

Culture may shape teachers’ beliefs about their role as educators and the increasingly complex demands of serving diverse populations of students (Hoy, Davis, & Pape, 2006). U.S. schools operate on the basis of an implicit value system that reflects the values of the dominant culture, which are individualistic and organized by the parenting ideals of White middle-class families (Ansari & Crosnoe, 2015); however, large numbers of students (both immigrants and native-born students) have very different implicit value systems, which may be uncomfortable, unfamiliar, and set students at odd with their values (Burgos-Cienfuegos, Vasquez-Salgado, Ruedas-Gracia, & Greenfield, 2015; Trumbull, Rothstein-Fisch, & Greenfield, 2000; Vasquez-Salgado, Greenfield, & Burgos-Cienfuegos, 2015). Even immigrant parents with high levels of education usually do not have as much experience with how U.S. schools work and thus, may be less familiar with the written and unwritten rules of U.S. schools and associated norms about parenting (Ansari & Crosnoe, 2015). However, this kind of negative outcome may be minimized when teachers learn to recognize and tap students’ culture-based strengths as a result of conscious learning about school and home cultures (Trumbull, Rothstein-Fisch, et al., 2000). The purpose of the current study was to examine the efficacy of Bridging Cultures (BC), an
intervention that aims to train teachers to use students’ culture as a resource to inform their practices.
Chapter 2: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS

Several theoretical frameworks, reviewed here, are relevant to the conceptual development of the current study: multicultural education, ecological systems theory, self-efficacy, multicultural competence, and individualism. Multicultural education emphasizes the examination of the hidden curriculum, which includes implied rules to success in U.S. schools. Ecological systems theory takes into consideration multiple environments, which is necessary to examine conflicts experienced by students in their homes and schools. Self-efficacy is relevant to the current discussion because of its accounting for the internal characteristics of an individual. Multicultural competence may affect teacher professional development and is a variable to consider when discussing teacher change. Similarly, individualism/collectivism, which examines cultural differences, is another factor which may impact teacher change.

Multicultural Education

In light of the demographic changes of classroom composition, it is even more urgent to investigate the effects of the “hidden curriculum” in teaching and learning, which may become a barrier to the successful implementation of a curriculum in a multicultural classroom (Luconi, 2008). Jackson (1968) defined the hidden curriculum as all implicit norms and rules that students and teachers should master in order to succeed at the school (Luconi, 2008). Culturally-relevant pedagogy has received more attention in the literature. Multicultural education (ME) seeks to change schooling, services, and interventions related to curriculum, instruction, assessment, and home-school-community relationships (Reyes-Carrasquillo, 2007). ME prepares educators and students to live in a multicultural society and to better understand their own culture and others’ cultures (Reyes-Carrasquillo, 2007). Part of the rise in attention to multicultural training in teacher education programs stems from the rapid demographic shifts.
currently taking place in the U.S. (Ponterotto, Mendelsohn, & Belizaire, 2003). An even more
direct influence on the rapidly evolving curriculum of teacher education programs is the mandate
from influential teacher accreditation organizations, such as the Council of the Accreditation of
Educator Preparation (CAEP; CAEP, 2013).

**Ecological Systems Theory**

Ecological systems theory is an evolving theoretical system for the study of human
development based on the work of Urie Bronfenbrenner. According to Bronfenbrenner (2005),
human development refers to the phenomenon of constancy and change in the characteristics of
the person over the life course. The ecology of human development is the study of the
progressive, mutual accommodation between a human being and the changing properties of the
immediate settings in which the developing person lives. A critical element in the ecological
model is experience. Thus, the environment includes not only the environment itself, but also
how a person subjectively experiences the environment becomes important. This developmental
process continues throughout the life course and is affected by the relationship between these
settings and the larger contexts in which the settings are embedded (Bronfenbrenner, 2005).

These systems are nested and consist of the microsystem, mesosystem, exosystem, and
macrosystem. The microsystem is the pattern of activities, roles, and interpersonal relations
experienced by a given person in a face-to-face setting (e.g., home, school, peer group,
workplace). A mesosystem is a system of microsystems (e.g., relations between home and
school, home and the workplace). An exosystem consists of the linkage between two or more
settings, at least one of which does not ordinarily contain the person, but in which events occur
that influence processes within the immediate setting that does contain that person (e.g., for a
parent, the relation between school and the neighborhood group). A macrosystem consists of the
pattern of micro-, meso-, and exosystems characteristic of a given culture, subculture, or other broader social context.

**Self-Efficacy**

Siwatu, Frazier, Osaghae, and Starker (2011) asserted that teacher education activities should cultivate competence and confidence, which requires both the acquisition of related skills and the self-efficacy to put those skills to use. Although self-efficacy is often treated as a generalized trait, people differ in their efficacy across different domains of functioning and across various facets within an activity domain (Bandura, 2012). Self-efficacy reflects people’s belief in their capabilities to produce given attainments (Bandura, 2006). Teachers’ efficacy beliefs determine how much effort and persistence they expend and how long they persist in the face of challenges (Eslinger, 2014; Tschannen-Moran & Chen, 2014).

Teachers’ beliefs in their personal efficacy to motivate and promote learning drive their motivation to implement new strategies (Tschannen-Moran & Chen, 2014). Even if they have the necessary skills and knowledge to do so, teachers not confident in their capabilities are more likely to perceive pedagogical changes as a threat and give up in the face of difficulties (Tschannen-Moran & Chen).

**Multicultural Competence**

Multicultural counseling competence has emerged as one of the most important and widely discussed topics in the helping and human service professions; in fact, applied psychology, psychiatry, social work, counseling, health care, and education are among the many professions that acknowledge its importance (Ridley & Kleiner, 2003). This construct developed in response to the need for a multicultural perspective, particularly in counseling and education. A landmark paper introduced multicultural counseling competencies with a tripartite framework
– Beliefs/Attitudes, Knowledge, and Skills (Sue, Bernier, Durran, Feinberg, Pedersen, Smith, et al., 1982). Ten years later, Sue, Arredondo, and McDavis (1992) issued a call to the profession to implement multicultural counseling competencies and standards in counseling practice and education. These competencies should not be thought of as dichotomous constructs. Multicultural competency should be thought of as a process that forces one to engage in an honest explanation of one’s experience of racial and cultural reality and is not a fixed goal, but a process of personal and social change (Collins & Pieterse, 2007).

This tripartite framework has also been updated. Sue (2001) proposed a multidimensional model of cultural competence (MDCC). Based on a 3 x 4 x 5 design, the MDCC incorporates three primary dimensions of cultural competence: race and culture-specific attributes of cultural competence (Awareness, Knowledge, and Skills), components of cultural competence (Individual, Professional, Organizational, and Societal), and the foci of cultural competence (African American, Asian American, Latino/Hispanic American, Native American, and European American). This multidimensional model allows for the identification of cultural competence in a number of different areas.

Because the U.S. favors the dominant culture’s orientation to the exclusion of many culturally diverse people, educators must take care that their practices not only reflect the values of the dominant culture but the values of the culturally different as well (Locke, 2003). The U.S. has a highly diverse population, representing peoples with many different cultural histories; however, understanding about how children develop, learn, and communicate is shaped primarily by a Euro-American model that represents what is normal for only one segment of the students whom teachers serve (Trumbull, Greenfield, Rothstein-Fisch, & Quiroz, 2007).
Teacher education programs must play a central role in helping preservice teachers develop the pedagogical and content knowledge necessary to meet the needs of all students (Milner, 2006). Along with this multicultural context is a concern for accountability, as evident in the increasing emphasis on standards for teachers and teacher education developed by professional organizations and government agencies (Villegas & Lucas, 2002). Similarly, the Association of Teacher Educators Standards (ATE) and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) indicated cultural competence as one of their critical standards (ATE, 2006; NCATE, 2008). It is critical for teacher educators to examine their own practices because what they do, say, and model in the classroom have the potential to influence teachers and students in classrooms (Milner, 2007). Even more recently, all teacher preparation programs must be able to demonstrate that their preservice teachers are prepared to teach all students from a diverse perspective at preschool, elementary, and secondary levels (Council of the Accreditation of Educator Preparation, 2013).

**Individualism/Collectivism**

As originally conceptualized by Hofstede (1983), there are two broad pathways of individual development: one is individualistic, the other is collectivistic. This continuum represents the degree to which a culture emphasizes individual fulfillment and choice versus interdependent relations, social responsibility, and the well-being of the group (Greenfield, Trumbull, & Rothstein-Fisch, 2003). Though both are part of a larger sociocultural system, each pathway places value on different aspects of development. Each category addresses development as a universal issue, but with different emphases.

Individualism and collectivism can be used as a framework to understand cultural differences in society. Educators can use this framework to help educators think about where
differences may lie, and thus, prevent potential conflict (Trumbull, Rothstein-Fisch, & Greenfield, 2000). Most cultures include a mixture of individualistic and collectivistic elements; one is simply emphasized more or less in one culture (LaRoche, Poplock, Batista, Lustig, & Brahms, 2015; Triandis, 1993; Triandis, 2002). Although no society can be characterized entirely by one or the other system (Trumbull, Rothstein-Fisch, & Greenfield, 2000), there are nonetheless societies that are more individualistic than others.

The fundamental difference between individualism and collectivism is the degree of emphasis on the individual versus the group (Trumbull, Greenfield, Rothstein-Fisch, & Quiroz, 2007). The individualistic pathway emphasizes individual identity, independence, self-fulfillment, standing out, self-reliance, and personal achievement (Trumbull, Rothstein-Fisch, & Greenfield, 2000). The United States is one such country with an individualistic orientation. In individualistic cultures, the self is viewed as an independent entity that is separated from others (Na, Kosinski, & Stillwell, 2015). Conversely, the collectivistic pathway stresses group identity, interdependence, social responsibility, and fitting in (Greenfield, Keller, Fuligni, & Maynard, 2003). In collectivistic cultures, the self is viewed as an interdependent entity embedded in social relations with others (Na, Kosinski, & Stillwell, 2015). Each orientation has benefits and costs (Trumbull, Rothstein-Fisch, & Greenfield, 2000).

Parents’ implicit views reflect and reinforce their cultural values when socializing their children as cultural beings (Greenfield, Trumbull, Keller, Rothstein-Fisch, Suzuki, & Quiroz, 2006). Socialization is intrinsically future oriented; it prepares children for an adulthood that has not yet arrived (Greenfield, Maynard, & Childs, 2000).

Individualism is most common in European-derived and industrial, urban, or commercial societies (Keller & Greenfield, 2000). This results in substantial differences in child rearing
practices between generations. Parents from Western industrialized cultural communities embrace parental views that express the cultural ideal of independence and individualism (Greenfield & Keller, 2004; Greenfield, Trumbull, Keller, Rothstein-Fisch, Suzuki, & Quiroz, 2006). Parents in these societies stress personal achievement and independence (e.g., creativity, curiosity, assertiveness; Greenfield et al., 2006).

U.S. cultures having non-Western origins often emphasize collectivist values (LaRoche, Poplock, Batista, Lustig, & Brahms, 2015; Sue, 1999). For example, overall, Latino/as report higher levels of collectivism than non-Hispanic Whites (LaRoche, Poplock, Batista, Lustig, & Brahms, 2015). Collectivism is more common in rural environments in Africa, Asia, and Latin America (Keller & Greenfield, 2000). Collectivist cultures emphasize attending to others, fitting within the community, role relationships, and interpersonal harmony (Sue, 1999). Collectivism emphasizes the interdependence of family members; within this system, children are taught to be helpful to others and to contribute to the success of any group they belong to – beginning with the family (Rothstein-Fisch, Greenfield, & Trumbull, 1999). Participants from non-Western cultural communities embrace parental ethnotheories that express the cultural ideal of interdependence and emphasize decency (i.e., responsibility and honesty) and proper demeanor such as politeness, respect for elders, and loyalty to family (Greenfield & Keller, 2004; Greenfield, Trumbull, Keller, Rothstein-Fisch, Suzuki, & Quiroz, 2006).

Differences in these two pathways also cause individuals from different cultures to view phenomena differently (Greenfield, 2009; Greenfield, Trumbull, Keller, Rothstein-Fisch, Suzuki, & Quiroz, 2006). Children may be faced with conflicting messages from home and from the outside world about the proper values, attitudes, and behaviors they should follow (Buckingham & Brodsky, 2015; Greenfield & Suzuki, 1998). Parents also must reassess their cultural
framework in a new setting where many of their own values may be in direct conflict with those of society at large (Greenfield & Suzuki, 1998).

**Conceptualization of cognitive phenomena.** Individuals from individualistic and collectivistic groups view cognitive and educational concepts differently (Garcia, Rivera, & Greenfield, 2015; Greenfield, 2006). Scientific intelligence, which emphasizes the person in relation to the world of objects rather than people, is a developmental goal of the individualistic pathway. Infants in these homes are left alone to manipulate technologically appealing toys. Conversely, social intelligence, which emphasizes relationships among people, is the ideal in collectivistic cultures, in which close bodily contact between the infant and the caregiver is emphasized. Knowledge also means different things to individualistic and collectivistic societies. In some cultures, “to know” involves the heart and soul and character, whereas “to know” in English involves the mind, which indicates factual knowledge, important in individualistic societies that value an individual’s possession of technical expertise.

Contrasts have also been found in conceptions of giftedness. In U.S. society, children’s needs are identified and met, whereas in some collectivistic cultures, the qualities of the gifted child are supposed to contribute to the well-being and cohesiveness of the community. Apprenticeship and creativity are also different in individualistic and collectivistic communities. In collectivistic communities, learning takes place in family settings and people work more collaboratively; however, questioning, skepticism, and curiosity are valued in individualistic societies where individuals work separately on different elements of a task. Likewise, creativity is community-dependent, whereas in individualistic societies what is considered “creative” is an individual decision and is anything that distinguishes an individual by being original and innovative.
Parenting styles are also different in these developmental pathways. “Authoritarian” parenting is characteristic of collectivistic communities. In these families, parent-child communication frequently uses directives and imperatives with encouragement of obedience and respect. The goal of the communication is comprehension, which elicits action, not speaking, which elicits verbalization. Little praise tends to be used particularly because appropriate behavior is expected. The ultimate goal is to raise obedient, respectful, and socially responsible children. At the other end of the continuum is “democratic parenting”, which is typical of individualistic communities. With this parenting style, self-expression and autonomy are encouraged and accepted. This parallels formal U.S. education, in which teachers ask questions that he/she already knows the answer to in order to assess a child’s verbal expression. Praise and positive reinforcement are important in such environments and academic achievement, autonomy, and creativity are important goals for child development.

Individualism and collectivism guide different developmental scripts for children and schooling; however, keener awareness of how these beliefs shape goals and behaviors can enable teachers and parents to interpret each other’s expectations better and work together more harmoniously on behalf of students (Greenfield, Trumbull, & Rothstein-Fisch, 2003).

**Strengths and critiques of model.** The individualism/collectivism framework’s usefulness has been most thoroughly explored in classrooms in several communities with large recent immigrant populations composed chiefly of families from poor, rural communities in Mexico and Central America (Trumbull, Rothstein-Fisch, & Greenfield, 2000). This framework can help teachers to better understand the source of their own orientation to child-rearing and schooling and see how it might differ in significant ways from that of many immigrant parents (Trumbull, Rothstein-Fisch, et al., 2000). This framework is both economical and generative.
(Trumbull, Greenfield, Rothstein-Fisch, & Quiroz, 2007). However, this conceptual framework is not without its critiques.

A common critique is that an individualist-collectivist framework is overly simplistic, especially given increased globalization and more complex conceptualizations of child development, which means that cultures cannot be neatly classified as purely collectivist or individualist (Tamis-LeMonda, Way, Hughes, Yoshikawa, Kalman, & Niwa, 2008). Given cultural complexity and changes, there are elements of individualism and collectivism in any society (Trumbull, Greenfield, Rothstein-Fisch, & Quiroz, 2007). In addition, the importance of individual differences is cited as well. Characterizations of cultures are fraught with potential for overgeneralization and stereotyping; thus, observable patterns of thought and behavior among cultural groups cannot necessarily be translated as predictors of individual behavior (Trumbull, Greenfield, Rothstein-Fisch, & Quiroz, 2007). Within-group variability and within-person complexity cannot be overlooked (Greenfield, 2009).

To avoid this pitfall, one must remember that within any given culture, individuals vary greatly in beliefs and practices (Trumbull, Rothstein-Fisch, & Greenfield, 2000) and may show wide variations in behavior, based on their level of schooling and socioeconomic status (Trumbull, Rothstein-Fisch, et al., 2000). In fact, conflict does not occur with every Latino parent. It is as presumptuous to assume that all Latinos hold the same developmental and socialization goals. Latinos are very diverse, differing in social class and education before immigration rural or urban origin, country of origin, acculturation, and race (Ortiz & Flanagan, 2002; Quiroz, Greenfield, & Altchech, 1999). Common themes in various Hispanic cultures may be found in Appendix B.
Third, acculturating is different from person to person. For immigrant families, values and practices may vary based on factors such as length of time in the U.S. and the level of education attained in countries of origin (Trumbull, Greenfield, Rothstein-Fisch, & Quiroz, 2007). This framework does not purport to suggest that school personnel should memorize a set of rules for when interacting with anyone from a collectivistic culture; instead, learning about a collectivistic orientation may help teachers acquire a sense of how a parent from such a background might think and feel, and what expectations such a parent may have of the school (Trumbull et al., 2007). Nonetheless, certain cultures tend to be more individualistic or collectivistic than others (Trumbull, Diaz-Meza, Hasan, & Rothstein-Fisch, 2000).

Because these pathways have different implications for the structuring of relationships, conflict can arise between them when they come into contact (Raeff, Greenfield, & Quiroz, 2000). The relative emphasis makes for important differences, and sometimes, conflicts (Trumbull, Rothstein-Fisch, & Greenfield, 2000). Schools are prominent areas for development (Greenfield, Trumbull, & Rothstein-Fisch, 2003). Differing worldviews lead parents to prepare children for school quite differently. In the classroom, these differences may manifest themselves in independence, self-achievement, self-expression, and personal choice (Greenfield, Trumbull, Keller, Rothstein-Fisch, Suzuki, & Quiroz, 2006). Schooling and its implications for the development of a cultural identity (i.e., self) and competence have been, and still are, targets of controversial debate (Greenfield, Trumbull et al., 2003). U.S. schools, in line with the individualistic nature of its society, encourage children to become independent thinkers and doers who focus on their own achievement and fulfilling their own individual needs (Greenfield et al., 2006). Children from individualistic families are taught that authority does not solely reside within the teacher; instead, they are encouraged to consult texts and build their own
knowledge (Greenfield et al., 2006). Verbal instruction is important in school-based learning, typical of individualistic societies, whereas observation and co-participation are common collectivistic societies (Greenfield et al., 2006). Children raised in collectivistic communities form a sense of self from recognizing their place in the community hierarchy and from affiliation with the group—principally the family (Trumbull, Rothstein-Fisch, & Greenfield, 2000). Personal items are readily shared and often seen as family rather than private property; people in these communities tend to share resources and cooperate to carry out tasks (Trumbull, Rothstein-Fisch, et al., 2000).

In sum, these theoretical frameworks help shape the current study due to their potential relationship to teacher and student outcomes. ME theory may help teachers better understand their own and others cultures. For example, given a particular socialization experience and background, teachers may come to better understand individualistic and collectivistic cultures and how their own socialization experiences have come to inform their teaching practices and notions of what is “best” for a child. ME theory makes the implicit mastery of norms and rules crucial to success in U.S. schools more explicit. Ecological systems theory, which examines the mutual influence of environments on each other, is useful because it can take differences in a student’s home and school environments into account. Self-efficacious teachers may expend more active efforts in their classroom practices because they believe in their ability to impact change. Given this belief, they may make changes as necessary to do so. Multicultural competence is necessary for teachers to possess given the increase in the number of culturally and linguistically diverse children attending public schools in recent decades. What has historically been considered “normal” may only apply to certain segments of the U.S.
population; thus, pedagogical practices cannot remain the same. Figure 1 shows how these frameworks may be related.
Figure 1. Model of the Hypothesized Relationship between Theoretical Frameworks
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Chapter 3: LITERATURE REVIEW

Values have importance to societies in a broader sense, especially in the context of the current U.S. society where new immigrants from collectivistic cultures are bringing with them strong value codes (Roysircar-Sodowsky & Frey, 2003). One major implication of the multicultural reality of the U.S. concerns the possibility of different values among students, between students and teachers, and between home and school (Greenfield, Trumbull, & Rothstein-Fisch, 2003). The key fact about human culture is its intergenerational transmission through the socialization process, which includes informal education in the family as well as formal education (Greenfield, 1994). Insofar as home culture differs from school culture, it is possible that parents and teachers may construct different images of the ideal child because of their differing goals regarding child development (Greenfield, Quiroz, & Raeff, 2000).

Immigration, conquest, and colonization incorporate people from individualistic societies into collectivistic societies and vice versa. For school-age children, this can cause a conflict of socializing forces. Although there are commonalities (e.g., most parents want their children to do well in school and believe that school is important), there are also differences across ethnic groups with respect to their conceptions of education, school, and learning (Okagaki, 2006). When collectivistic students encounter individualistic schools, conflicts that are based on hidden values and assumptions can occur (Rothstein-Fisch, Greenfield, & Trumbull, 1999). These collectivistic values can be in conflict with the goals of educational development in individualistic societies that requires a “good student” to work independently, strive for excellent individual achievement, and to engage in skillful self-expression, which may undermine collectivistic developmental goals (Greenfield, Quiroz, & Raeff, 2000).
The United States is the most individualistic country in the world (Hofstede, 1983), while cultures in Asia, Africa, Mexico, Central America, and South America on the whole tend to be quite collectivistic (Trumbull, Rothstein-Fisch, & Greenfield, 2000). Misunderstandings can arise when children raised in a collectivistic home culture are expected to follow the independent pathway that is typical of U.S. school culture. Both school and home reciprocally influence and help determine the path children’s development takes (Esler, Godber, & Christenson, 2002). There is a genuine value conflict between the individualistic script required for educational and economic success and the collectivistic script required for social success in the family (Greenfield, 1994). Such cultural conflict, however, may be amenable to educational intervention. Within this diverse context, initial teachers, in particular, are challenged in their understandings for working effectively with culturally diverse students, suggesting a strong need for multicultural education within teacher preparation programs (Cicchelli & Cho, 2007). It is possible to introduce collectivistic values and practices into the classroom, while still making explicit the individualistic values that guide education for children who may not have met these values in their home cultures (Greenfield & Suzuki, 1998).

Teachers also bring their own cultural background to school with them. However, most members of the dominant society do not acknowledge themselves as cultural beings and instead, view culture as an exotic element possessed only by minorities (Ladson-Billings, 2006). The school professional’s cultural values generate one set of educational priorities, whereas the parents’ cultural values generate another (Trumbull, Greenfield, Rothstein-Fisch, & Quiroz, 2007). Miscommunication may have numerous causes, but some can be avoided through understanding potential cultural differences (Trumbull et al., 2007). These miscommunications can come in two forms: different expectations and power differences (Trumbull et al., 2007).
Any individual’s own culture greatly affects the way they view the world and others, including people from both within and outside the culture (Ortiz & Flanagan, 2002). Culturally relevant teachers understand the political nature of schooling and help students see their role in the community, nation, and world (Lipman, 1995). They also utilize students’ culture as a vehicle for learning (Ladson-Billings, 2006).

**School Cultural Conflict**

Raeff, Greenfield, and Quiroz (2000) examined how European American and Latino children, parents, and teachers in the Los Angeles area conceptualize relationships. Specifically, they found a significant interaction between school and role. At the predominantly European American school, parents, children, and teachers fell on the individualistic end of the scale (Raeff et al., 2000). At the predominantly Latino school, there was a significant difference between immigrant parents and teachers, children and teachers, and children and their parents. Although teachers’ conceptualizations did not differ between the two schools, Latino parents and children tended to be more collectivistic than European American parents and children (Raeff et al., 2000). Other studies confirm the notion that White children experience greater consistency between school and home cultures (Taylor & Quintana, 2003).

Relations between families and school personnel are crucially important for parents, children, and teachers (Greenfield & Suzuki, 1998). The educational goals of schools, both implicit and explicit, and the means for achieving them may be incompatible with students’ home values and norms (Quiroz, Greenfield, & Altchech, 1999; Rothstein-Fisch, Trumbull, Isaac, Daley, & Perez, 2003). Research supports the notion that Latinos have different conceptualizations of school and its goals. *Educacion* places the principal responsibility of a parent on the rearing of a moral and responsible child who will become what is referred to as
persona de bien (i.e., a good person; Gallimore & Goldenberg, 2001). Using ethnographic interviews and observations, Delgado-Gaitan (1992) attempted to understand what education means to Mexican-American families within the household setting and the family’s role in children’s education by examining day-to-day parent-child interactions and the household circumstances and conditions. Results indicated that parents’ educational background played an important role in their thinking about education for their children (Delgado-Gaitan, 1992). Familiarity with the educational system had a great deal to do with the parents’ ability to shepherd their children through the school system; parents who had more experience with the schools were better informed and could guide their children (Delgado-Gaitan, 1992). Although parents who had attended high school in the U.S. were able to better assist their children, other parents sought advice from other adults in their workplace, church groups, or family members (Delgado-Gaitan, 1992). Parents believed that education meant being considerate of others, kindness, respect for elders and authority, and cooperation (Delgado-Gaitan, 1992). In Spanish, children are said to be bien educado (i.e., well educated) when they are well mannered, speak to others kindly and respectfully, and are helpful to those who need help, for which formal schooling is not necessary to achieve (Delgado-Gaitan, 1992). Conversely, parents in the sample described a mal educado (i.e., poorly educated) person as one who mistreats others and does not respect others’ rights.

Okagaki and Sternberg’s (1993) study further supported immigrant and native-born parents’ differing beliefs. They collected data from immigrant parents from Cambodia, Mexico, the Philippines, Vietnam, and native-born Anglo-American and Mexican-American parents were asked questions about child rearing, what first- and second-grade teachers should teach their children, and what constitutes an intelligent child (Okagaki & Sternberg, 1993). Immigrant
parents rated conforming to external standards as being more important than developing autonomy; conversely, U.S.-born parents favored developing autonomy. Parents from all groups (except Anglo-Americans) indicated that non-cognitive characteristics (i.e., motivation, social skills, and practical school skills) were as important as or more important than cognitive characteristics (i.e., problem solving skills, verbal ability, and creative ability) were to their conceptions of an intelligent first-grade child. Parental beliefs about conformity were correlated with measures of kindergarten, first grade, and second grade children’s school performance. More recently, support has been found for Okagaki and Sternberg’s work. Greenfield and Quiroz (2013) found that in Latino immigrant parents, averaging a fifth grade education, they responded more familistically than the multiethnic teachers and European American parents in the sample.

Cultural differences also have been found in parent-teacher conferences, beyond the question of language (Greenfield, Quiroz, & Raeff, 2000). Using discourse analysis, researchers found that teachers desire to talk about academics and cognitive skills during the conference, while parents were more concerned about social behavior (Greenfield, Quiroz et al., 2000). Analysis of communication patterns revealed that more often than not, parents and teachers disagreed on goals for children (Greenfield, Quiroz, et al., 2000).

**Teacher Professional Development**

Teacher education can play an important role in reinforcing inequalities (Cross, 2003; Watson, 2012). Training and education to promote cross-cultural competence remains largely inadequate (Middleton, 2002; Ortiz & Flanagan, 2002) and preservice teachers have limited views of what constitutes diversity (Silverman, 2010), despite their self-reported positive perceptions toward multiculturalism (Hopkins-Gillispie, 2008; Jaber, 2008). Another challenge
is providing educators with opportunities to acquire the knowledge and skills they need to create multicultural education programs (Reyes-Carrasquillo, 2007). Surveys and interviews of practicing teachers have indicated that the multicultural training they received in their preservice programs was limited (Jaber, 2008; Miller, Miller, & Schroth, 1997). While student populations grow more diverse (Brown, 2004), the preservice teaching population is becoming more homogeneous, primarily White and middle-class (Causey, Thomas, & Armento, 2000; Cross, 2003; U.S. Census Bureau, 2012). Survey data gleaned from 337 music student teachers indicated that respondents who were racial-ethnic minorities held fewer beliefs and attitudes that would be seen as impeding their readiness to teach in culturally diverse educational environments compared to White respondents (McKoy, 2013). These teachers indicated differences in the following areas: preference for teaching in an environment where students were culturally similar to each other or to the teachers instructing them; experiences with other cultures; awareness of personal racial or ethnic biases that might affect their teaching; and the extent to which their own teachers were ethnically or racially similar to each other (McKoy). After controlling for years of experience, White teachers in city school settings report higher multicultural teaching knowledge compared to White teachers in more rural schools (Harrison, Carson, & Burden, 2010).

While the dialogue about teacher race is important and necessary (Cross, 2003), the background or setting of a teacher alone, however, does not necessarily mean that they are unable to effectively work with culturally and linguistically diverse students. Similarly, recruiting teachers of color into the workforce is not a panacea. In fact, several studies examining teacher-student match have not found support for such a model. Vierra (1984) examined the reading achievement of Hispanic students in Grades 3 and 4. After controlling for
pre-test scores, results indicated no difference in scores for Hispanic students with White teachers compared to Hispanic students with Hispanic teachers. Likewise, Tom and Cronan (1998) did not find support for ethnically-matched tutees experiencing increased academic gains compared to non-matched peers. Furthermore, there was no significant difference in maternal ratings of tutor satisfaction or attrition either. More recently, Banerjee (2013) found that Black and Hispanic students who were assigned to same-race teachers did not fare any better on measures of math and reading achievement.

**Teacher efficacy.** Barry and Lechner (1995), who examined teacher efficacy in a predominantly-White sample of pre-service teachers, found that the overwhelming majority (approximately 90%) anticipated working with diverse students; however only about a third of the sample reported having confidence in their ability to effectively work with diverse students. What’s more, they also indicated wanting to receive more training in ways to teach students with different cultural identities and to learn more ways to bring culture into the classroom (Barry & Lechner). Cho and DeCastro-Ambrosetti (2005, 2006), in a study which examined preservice teachers’ attitudes after enrolling in a multicultural education course, found that although participants endorsed increased awareness at posttest, they also indicated that they felt ill-prepared to work with culturally-diverse students, including a fear of rejection.

In a mixed-methods study of 36 prospective teachers in the final year of their coursework, Perkins (2012) found that self-report on the Multicultural Awareness-Knowledge-Skills Survey – Teacher Form indicated that teachers felt prepared to teach diverse student populations. However, in-depth interviews with a selected subset of this sample indicated that these prospective teachers did not feel as confident in their preparation to teach diverse students as they endorsed in the survey.
Most teachers report that their preservice preparation did little or nothing to prepare them for today’s diverse classrooms (Ladson-Billings, 2000) and acknowledge the gap between theory and practice in the classroom (Jefferson, 2013). Teachers report that what is missing from their professional development is a deeper understanding of the social ideals, values, and behavioral standards that shape approaches to child-rearing and schooling (Trumbull, Rothstein-Fisch, & Greenfield, 2000). These findings underscore the notion that many teachers may not feel assured in their ability to meet the needs of diverse students in their classrooms.

**Teacher change.** Research examining how pre-service teachers’ beliefs and attitudes change over time is conflicting, which may be in part due to differences in program characteristics, instructional approaches, and research methodology (Akiba, 2011). What’s more, teaching practices do not change easily (Webel & Platt, 2015) and attitude change may not be sustained and long-lasting (Kernahan & Davis, 2010).

However, research indicates that engaging in learning around multicultural teaching practices can prompt teacher changes in teaching readiness, hands-on experience, understanding and confidence, self-awareness, identity development, and multicultural competence, whether through a formal multicultural education course (Keengwe, 2010; Milner, 2006; Rogers, 2012; Tran, Young, & Di Lella, 1994), field practicum placement (Bleicher, 2011; Bloom, Peter, Margolin, & Fragnoli, 2015; Wiggins & Follo, 1999), or service learning project (Bollin, 2007).

**Teacher expectations and stereotypes.** Teachers’ expectations can lead students to feel as though they do or do not belong in the classroom, affecting their engagement in learning and consequently, their achievement (Greenfield, Trumbull, & Rothstein-Fisch, 2003). Likewise, parents can come to feel at home in, or alienated from, their children’s schools depending on the
way in which the school and its personnel interact with them (Greenfield, Trumbull, et al., 2003). Prospective teachers often turn to experiences from their past for clues on how to interpret and respond to the contemporary behaviors of the children they teach (Gomez, 1993); however, given the expectations, beliefs, and attitudes literature, this may be very problematic. Research on teacher expectations and student success suggests that teachers’ beliefs about students lead to differential expectations and treatment of students (Avery & Walker, 1993; Middleton, 2002; Sperling, 2007). When teachers hold a deficit perspective about diverse students, they may lower their expectations of these students accordingly (Ford & Grantham, 2003). Research also has demonstrated that teacher expectations are influenced by cultural mismatch in schools, whether based on race, socioeconomic status, or ethnicity, which in turn can lead to lowered expectations, stereotypes, and perceptions of belonging for disadvantaged students or students from minority racial and ethnic groups (Byrd, 2015; Hauser-Cram, Sirin, & Stipeck, 2003; Terrill & Mark, 2000). Furthermore, hesitancy to talk about race, cultural gaps, and misunderstandings that intensify behavioral challenges may play a role in disproportionality (Skiba, Simmons, Ritter, Kohler, Henderson, & Wu, 2006; Watson, 2012).

Together, professional development has under-prepared preservice and inservice teachers to deal with such cultural conflict and with culturally and linguistically diverse students, as they report varied levels of preparedness. Although most teachers express a desire to teach children from similar backgrounds as their own, this may not be a possibility, given recent demographic shifts in the population; thus, it is important that educators are prepared to teach many different groups of children and interact with their parents. Intervention may be a very real and necessary step, given the literature shows that some teachers may treat children differently solely based upon ethnic group and socioeconomic status. In fact, some educators still regard bilingualism as
a deficit (Brown & Souto-Manning, 2008). The professional development program featured in this study, Bridging Cultures (BC), is one such intervention that has demonstrated some promise to help remediate cultural conflict in the classroom and arm teachers with the skills they need to bridge the gap between home and school culture.

**Areas of Home-School Conflict**

Based on ethnographic observations, Trumbull, Rothstein-Fisch, and Greenfield (2000) identified potential home-school cultural conflicts in eight areas: (a) The child as individual versus the child as part of the group, (b) independence versus helpfulness, (c) praise versus criticism, (d) cognitive skills versus social skills, (e) oral expression versus listening to authority, (f) parent as educator versus teacher as educator, (g) personal property versus sharing, and (h) competition versus cooperation.

**Independence versus helpfulness.** Teachers may highly value children’s ability to work independently and to focus on getting their own work done, but parents from a collectivistic orientation tend to care more about how helpful and cooperative a child is in the classroom. Thus, teachers are likely to promote other behaviors or school practices that foster children’s increasing independence from their parents, while parents continue to promote interdependence.

**Praise versus criticism.** Parents with a strong collectivistic orientation are likely to be uncomfortable hearing extended praise of their children. Teachers who have completed Bridging Cultures have noted that the standard wisdom in most U.S. schools is to sandwich a small amount of criticism in between a lot of praise; however, this advice may be relatively unhelpful because children themselves may be uncomfortable with public praise because they have grown up believing no one should be singled out so since doing so diminishes others.
**Cognitive versus social development.** Collectivistic parents may see cognitive development as dependent on social or moral development. As described previously (e.g., Gallimore & Goldenberg, 2001; Okagaki & Sternberg, 1993), many parents do not distinguish between education as schooling (i.e., intellectual growth) and education as upbringing (i.e., social development).

**Oral expression versus respect for authority.** Skillful self-expression, critical thinking, and the ability to engage in discussion and argument are all valued attributes of the “ideal student” according to current educational theory. To work toward these goals, individualistic parents tend to socialize their children to ask questions, speak up, and tell the teacher what they need.

**Parents’ roles versus teachers’ roles.** The educational maxim that “parents are children’s first teachers” guides the thinking of many educators. Letters are often sent home urging parents to work with their children on specific academic skills, explaining this as a necessary role for parents such as how many hours to spend, where to have the child study, and what supplies to have on hand. However, collectivistic parents may see the functions of parent and teacher as clearly distinct. Specifically, they may believe that academic instruction should be restricted to school and their primary role is to socialize the child. Further, for parents who had limited educational opportunities in their homelands, they may not have the subject-matter skills to tutor their children or help with homework.

**Personal property versus sharing.** In many Latino immigrant families, most possessions are shared. People use things when they need them and share responsibility for taking care of material goods. In sum, parents and teachers, viewing the same behaviors through different cultural lenses, may interpret them differently. Conflicts in these and other areas may
cause the child to be torn between the values and expectations of their native culture and those of the mainstream culture, which in turn, may negatively impact their school engagement and academic achievement.

**Bridging Cultures: Description and Overview**

BC seeks to bridge Latino students’ home and school cultures by making the expectations of both environments explicit and facilitating these students’ development of bicultural skills. This research-based professional development program (e.g., Rothstein-Fisch, Greenfield, & Trumbull, 1999; Trumbull, Rothstein-Fisch, & Greenfield, 2000) was created to help teachers understand the assumptions underlying individualism and collectivism. Bridging Cultures is rooted in literature that documents cultural conflict between Latino immigrant families and the schools (e.g., Trumbull, Rothstein-Fisch, & Greenfield, 2000). For example, Latino immigrant parents are generally more collectivistic in their orientation to child socialization than their children’s teachers; as a result, the parents and teachers have different expectations of children and schooling (e.g., communication, discipline, and everyday tasks). Such cultural orientations shape a whole cluster of beliefs, expectations and behaviors. Although less visible, value orientations form the basis for ways of viewing the world. Even as teachers try to help immigrant students navigate a new system of education, their own teaching methods and most routine classroom expectations can come into perplexing conflict with children’s cultural ways of knowing and behaving (Trumbull, Rothstein-Fisch, & Greenfield, 2000).

The goal for BC is to help teachers and schools understand Latino home culture and school culture in order to create an educational “bridge” between the two. BC began as a series of workshops for seven (6 female, 1 male) bilingual elementary (Grades K – 5) school teachers in Southern California. Four teachers were Latino and three were European American. Three of
the four Latino teachers were immigrants (two from Mexico, one from Peru); one of the European-American teachers was an immigrant (from Germany). All of the immigrants came to the United States when they were children (between 2 and 8 years of age). These teachers were experienced, with 5 to 21 (mean = 12.7) years of professional experience.

**Bridging Cultures: Outcome Research**

Trumbull, Diaz-Meza, Hasan, and Rothstein-Fisch (2000) reported multiple positive outcomes resulting from implementation of BC. For example, participating teachers successfully shifted from an initial individualistic orientation toward an understanding of both individualism and collectivism upon completion of BC. Teachers shifted from a very strong individualistic orientation (85% of responses) on the pre-assessment to one that was either much more collectivistic (50% of responses) or balanced in individualistic and collectivistic strategies (43% of responses) on the post-assessment (Rothstein-Fisch, Trumbull, Isaac, Daley & Perez, 2003). Teachers also demonstrated changes in their thinking about culture as well as their instructional practices. BC positively impacted teachers’ interpersonal relationships, classroom management, instructional strategies, and home-school relations. In addition, teachers and others involved with Bridging Cultures have documented changes in student and parent behaviors associated with student achievement (i.e., attendance, homework completion, parent involvement, time on academic task). Teachers noted improvements in student attendance, homework return rates, and time on task (Trumbull, Diaz-Meza, et al., 2000). Finally, teachers rated the BC workshops highly, and they characterized meetings as valuable and successful (Trumbull, Diaz-Meza, et al., 2000).

Although BC has shown positive outcomes, extant literature on the outcomes of Bridging Cultures is somewhat limited in scope and breadth. For example, sample representativeness has
been an issue, which has potential external validity implications. In the initial phase of the study, all of the BC teachers were bilingual and entered the project already committed to improving their practices, specifically with their immigrant and otherwise “minority” students in mind (Trumbull, Diaz-Meza, Hasan, & Rothstein-Fisch, 2000). Although locations of training workshops have included other states (e.g., Florida, Louisiana, North Carolina, Ohio, Texas) and countries (e.g., Canada, Netherlands), research has been concentrated in California. However, research is needed with larger samples and in another geographical region of country, particularly where Hispanics are not the numerical majority. In addition, there is a need for replication by an independent researcher with no potential conflict of interest relative to BC. The researchers even acknowledge the desire to have some outside evaluation of the project (Trumbull, Diaz-Meza, et al., 2000) and to use uniform instruments. Finally, most of the research to date has been predominantly qualitative in nature (Rothstein-Fisch, Trumbull, Isaac, Daley, & Perez, 2003; Trumbull, Diaz-Meza, Hasan, & Rothstein-Fisch, 2000). While this research has proven useful, research based on an experimental design will supplement the extant BC literature and provide a more complete picture of BC outcomes. Thus, the focus of this study was to examine the BC program as it relates to teacher change.

Current Study

Rationale

A critical pathway for improving minority student achievement is reform of schools and teaching (Gallimore & Goldenberg, 2001). There are several reasons why the proposed study is important. First, there is a serious need for educators to become multiculturally competent. According to some estimates, only about 8% of teachers are multiculturally competent (Taylor & Quintana, 2003). It would be a serious mistake for educators and mental health practitioners to view multiculturalism as a “fad” that will soon pass from attention (D’Andrea, Daniels, &
Educators are challenged to understand the U.S. racial landscape and what it means to teach linguistically and culturally diverse students (Fergus, 2008). To increase their future viability, relevance, and respectability, educators and mental health professionals have been strongly urged to become more culturally competent so they might be able to work more effectively and ethically with individuals from diverse cultural-ethnic groups in general (D’Andrea et al., 2003). Because many Latino immigrants come to the U.S. with a collectivistic background, understanding collectivism becomes invaluable for teachers serving immigrant Latino children (Rothstein-Fisch, Greenfield, & Trumbull, 1999).

Second, the individualism/collectivism framework may benefit teachers. If schools are to succeed in promoting meaningful school involvement for parents and successful education for children, they need to understand how these orientations shape a whole host of beliefs, expectations, and behaviors – on the part of families on the one hand and teachers and school personnel on the other (Greenfield, Trumbull, & Rothstein-Fisch, 2003). Third, there is a need for improvement in teacher professional development. BC may help improve inservice teachers’ efficacy. If schools are to better serve the needs and interests of students, particularly students from groups that have not fared well in the U.S. educational system, then low expectations, negative stereotypes, biases/prejudices, and cultural misconceptions held by teachers must be identified, challenged, and reconstructed (Pohan & Aguilar, 2001).

Fourth, use of BC could have potentially beneficial student outcomes. There is inevitable loss when children are forced to choose between home and school expectations (Trumbull, Rothstein-Fisch, & Greenfield, 2000). Parents, teachers, administrators, and students all need some awareness of how these conflicts operate in classrooms and schools, so that all have a hand in addressing them (Trumbull, Rothstein-Fisch, et al., 2000). According to Quiroz and
Greenfield, unaddressed conflicts can cause children to become alienated from their parents and from school (as cited in Trumbull, Rothstein-Fisch, et al., 2000). When teachers and parents are both aware of how their orientations differ, they have a greater chance of forging alliances and discovering goals for children they can both support (Trumbull, Rothstein-Fisch, et al., 2000). Latino children who fare better in school may have access to higher earnings and therefore, greater chances at economic stability. One of the potential benefits of higher educational attainment is economic success, particularly through access to higher earnings (U.S. Census, 2009). Another potential student benefit is bicultural competence. Bicultural competence is a result of living in two cultures (LaFromboise, Coleman, & Gerton, 1993). Research suggests that individuals living in two cultures may find the experience to be more beneficial than living a monocultural lifestyle (Kao & Thompson, 2003; LaFromboise et al., 1993). The key to psychological well-being may well be the ability to develop and maintain competence in both cultures (LaFromboise et al., 1993). The purpose of this study was to examine the effect of Bridging Cultures on elementary teachers’ professional development; namely, to examine teacher outcomes in the context of four primary areas: (a) multicultural competence, (b) multicultural attitudes, (c) motivation, and (d) efficacy. Four research questions guided the current study.

**Research Questions and Hypotheses**

1. Does Bridging Cultures improve elementary teachers’ self-reported multicultural competence?
2. Does Bridging Cultures improve elementary teachers’ multicultural attitudes?
3. Does Bridging Cultures improve elementary teachers’ self-reported motivation for teaching?
4. Does Bridging Cultures improve elementary teachers’ teaching efficacy?
Based on these questions, theory, and prior ethnographic studies, four hypotheses were tested.

Hypothesis 1. BC improves the multicultural competence of elementary teachers.

Hypothesis 2. BC improves the multicultural attitudes of elementary teachers.

Hypothesis 3. BC improves elementary teachers’ motivation for teaching.

Hypothesis 4. BC increases elementary teachers’ perceptions of their teaching self-efficacy.
Chapter 4: METHOD

Participants

Data were collected from a mid-Atlantic urban public elementary school with an enrollment of approximately 800 students. The average elementary class size for the school district is 18 students. The racial and ethnic distribution of the student body includes: Black (30.94%), Hispanic (34.95%), White (26.74%), Asian (4.32%), Native American (less than 1%), Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (less than 1%) and Multiracial (2.32%). The students come from 125 different countries and speak 87 different languages. Approximately 58% of students in the district are eligible for free or reduced price meals, 28% receive English as a Second Language (ESL) services, and 10% are enrolled in special education services. There are 1,415 employed teachers in the school district, 77% of whom have advanced degrees.

There are 13 schools in the district which serve students in grades kindergarten to five. Multiple recruitment strategies were employed to recruit participants. This included the following: presenting the current study to all elementary school principals in an effort to seek buy-in; multiple announcements in the school system’s daily electronic newsletter; posting on the school system’s website. Of these 13 schools eligible to participate, one principal selected to participate. This elementary school served students in grades kindergarten and through grade five and includes 59 licensed staff, 73% of whom have post-graduate degrees. As of September 2014, the majority of the student body was African American (39%). Asian/Pacific Islander/American Indian, Hispanic, White, and Unspecified students accounted for 5%, 28%, 25%, and 3% of the student population, respectively. A total of 38 teachers agreed to participate in this study. The age of participants ranged from 23 to 60 ($M = 36.71, SD = 8.79$). The majority of the sample had a masters degree ($n = 25, 65.8\%$). Table 1 summarizes teacher characteristics by group. On average, the teachers were fairly experienced ($M_{years teaching} = 10.11,$}
SD = 7.46). The following is the self-identified race of participants: White (n = 19, 50%), Black/African American (n = 13, 34.2%), Asian/Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (n = 3, 7.9%), and more than one race (n = 3, 7.9%). The sample was comprised of all female schoolteachers.
Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of Participants by Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Control Group (n = 19)</th>
<th>Treatment Group (n = 19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Attainment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some graduate school</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>73.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-identified Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo/European descent</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one race</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-identified Ethnic Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>73.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Ed Teacher</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>84.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Ed Teacher</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL Teacher</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Specialist</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level Taught</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Grade</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Grade</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Grade</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Grade</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth Grade</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one grade</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of years teaching (M/SD)</td>
<td>10.37/7.67</td>
<td>9.84/7.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ELL = English Language Learning.
Measures
Participants completed identical questionnaires on two occasions. They completed information about their demographic background, as well as surveys designed to capture the primary hypothesized outcomes of interest: the Teacher Multicultural Attitude Survey, the Multicultural Awareness-Knowledge-Skills Survey-Teachers Form, the Motivation for Teaching Scale, and the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale.

Demographics. Participating teachers completed a demographic questionnaire requesting information about their age, level of education, years of teaching, race, ethnicity, grade taught, gender, current annual salary, and role at the school.

Multicultural attitudes. To measure multicultural attitudes, participants completed the Teacher Multicultural Attitude Survey (TMAS; Ponterotto, Baluch, Greig, & Rivera, 1998). The TMAS is a 20-item self-report inventory of teachers’ multicultural awareness and sensitivity. Akin to previous studies (e.g., Rogers-Sirin & Sirin, 2009), multicultural attitude was defined as teachers’ awareness of, comfort with, and sensitivity to issues of cultural pluralism in the classroom. The TMAS uses a 5-point Likert-type scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), with seven items requiring reverse scoring. Questions on the TMAS reflect attitudes toward economic status, culture, race, exceptionality, and gender.

Ponterotto et al. (1998) examined the psychometric properties of TMAS scores with a sample of 227 graduate students in teacher education programs, and found empirical support for a single-factor model of general multicultural awareness and sensitivity. Ponterotto et al. reported adequate levels of internal consistency (α = .86). Test–retest reliability over a 3-week interval with 16 teacher education students (in a separate sample) was .80. Construct validity of
the TMAS was assessed through convergent correlations with three related instruments (Ponterotto et al.). The TMAS was positively correlated to the Quick Discrimination Index (QDI) with $r = .45$ for race and $r = .35$ for gender and the Multi-group Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM) with $r = .31$ for other-group orientation. The TMAS had no significant relationship with social desirability as measured by the Social Desirability Scale ($r = .00$), indicating that social desirability contamination was not a concern on the TMAS. To establish criterion-related validity using the group differences approach, there was a statistically significant difference found for those who had completed professional workshops/training scored higher than those who had not (Ponterotto et al.). In other studies, the Cronbach alphas have ranged from minimally acceptable (.70 for the pretest and .71 for the posttest; Rogers-Sirin & Sirin, 2009) to acceptable ($\alpha = .82$; Cicchelli & Cho, 2007). For the current study, internal consistency was .82 and .76 for Time 1 and Time 2, respectively).

**Multicultural competence.** To measure teachers’ multicultural competence, participants were administered the Multicultural Awareness-Knowledge-Skills Survey-Teachers Form (MAKSS-Form T; D’Andrea, Daniels, & Noonan, 1994). The MAKSS-Form T is a self-report instrument developed to measure teachers’ (preservice & inservice) level of multicultural competence. All items are presented in a multiple-choice format in which the respondent chooses between 1 of 4 possible responses to each question. The content and format was adapted from the Multicultural Awareness-Knowledge-Skills Survey-Counselor Edition. Participants in previous studies required 15-20 minutes to complete the survey (D’Andrea, Daniels, & Noonan, 2003). Factor analysis yielded a three-factor model that constituted 62% of the total variance (D’Andrea et al., 2003). The three subscales are Awareness (8 items); Knowledge (13 items); and Skills (20 items). In a sample of 171 undergraduate and
graduate teacher education students, Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients were .73, .86, and .93 for Knowledge, Awareness, and Skills, respectively. Intercorrelation coefficients were .62 between Awareness and Knowledge, .54 between Knowledge and Skills, and .50 between Awareness and Skills (D’Andrea et al., 2003). Internal consistency estimates on all three subscales for both pretest and posttest data were similar to previous studies: .81 and .78 for Awareness; .86 and .83 for Knowledge; and .85 and .84 for Skills.

Motivation for teaching. The Motivation for Teaching Scale (Schraw & Olafson, 2003) is a 20-item scale that was used to assess teacher motivation. This measure consists of two subscales: Intrinsic Motivation and Extrinsic Motivation. Intrinsic Motivation (11 items) measures personal satisfaction with teaching. Extrinsic Motivation (9 items) measures environmental advantages to teaching, such as respect from others and having summers off. Schraw and Olafson reported acceptable internal consistency for Intrinsic (.81) and Extrinsic Motivation (.74), and the intercorrelation between the two subscales was .62 (Schraw & Olafson). Though another study has used the Motivation for Teaching Scale (e.g., Kyles & Olafson, 2008), psychometric properties were not reported. Although a scale acronym was not identified by the original researchers, for the purposes of the current study, MFTS is used as an acronym for this measure. In the current study, the internal consistency of the MFTS was lower during both administrations (.46 and .44, respectively) than previous studies. The following steps were taken with the MFTS: (a) inspection of accuracy of the entry of MFTS items into SPSS, (b) inspection of inter-item correlations and (c) inspection of descriptive statistics by item. In addition, negatively worded items were recoded. Inter-item correlations ranged from -.61 to .59 at Time 1 and -.61 to .65 at Time 2.
**Teacher efficacy.** The Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001) was used as a measure of teacher efficacy. Developed using 410 participants, the TSES consists of three scales: Efficacy for Instructional Strategies, Efficacy for Classroom Management, and Efficacy for Student Engagement. The internal consistency indices of the subscales for the long form (24 items) are as follows: .91 for Instructional Strategies (8 items), .90 for Classroom Management (8 items), and .87 for Student Engagement (8 items; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy). Intercorrelations for the subscales ranged from .58 to .70. Total TSES scores were positively related (.28 to .48) to the Rand measure and Hoy and Woolfolk’s 10-item adaptation of the Gibson and Dembo (1984) Teacher Efficacy Scale (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). Internal consistency for the long form was slightly lower in this study than previous studies: .74 and .62 for Instructional Strategies; .64 and .71 for Classroom Management; and .66 and .73 for Student Engagement.

**Social desirability.** Social desirability refers to a need for social approval and acceptance and the belief that this can be attained by means of culturally acceptable and appropriate behaviors (Marlowe & Crowne, 1961). Given that the variables of this study may be of a sensitive nature to some and that past research has examined the social desirability of self-report measures in multicultural research (e.g., Constantine & Ladany, 2000), collecting this information helped verify that participants’ answers were honest and accurate self-depictions of themselves. Thus, the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (MCSDS; Crowne & Marlowe, 1960) was used as a measure of participants’ social desirability. The MCSDS Short Form consists of 13 true-false items. Higher scores indicate more socially desirable responding. The Kuder-Richardson 20 was .88, and 1-month test-retest stability was .89 (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960) in the initial study of the psychometric properties of MCSDS scores. More
recently, internal consistency of .73 was reported (DeWitz, Woolsey, & Walsh, 2009). In this study, Kuder-Richardson 20 estimates were .58 (pretest) and .68 (posttest).

**Procedure**

Approval for this study was granted through the Pennsylvania State University Institutional Review Board and school system. A recruitment letter (see Appendix D) and electronic copy of the signed consent form were circulated to teachers via email over the email mailing list at their school. Teachers were randomly assigned into treatment and waitlist control groups. After a participant indicated their desire to participate by signing and returning the consent form, they received instructions to sign up for the study via the school division’s electronic professional development system and the aforementioned measures to complete. All measures were counterbalanced to prevent possible order effects. When the primary investigator received the completed pretest measures, participants received the *Readings for Bridging Cultures: Teacher Education Module*, with instructions to read these materials prior to the training. These readings consist of five previously published articles and one book chapter which provided teachers with a background of the individualism-collectivism framework, the BC Project, and areas of home-school cultural conflict (see Appendix C). They were instructed to read these materials before attending the workshop, in order to better contribute to and facilitate discussion. All participants received materials at no personal cost to them and in exchange for their participation, received six recertification points toward their licensure renewal.

Although the BC script can be implemented in one 3-hour session if short on time, the developers recommend spreading the workshop over several sessions if possible. Thus, the module was divided into two 90-minute sessions for the current study. During these sessions, teachers explored the differences between the values of school and the values of immigrant
Latino families through a variety of classroom-based problems. *The Bridging Cultures: Teacher Education Module* was used to implement the BC training. The Teacher Education Module includes a 3-hour facilitator’s script, overhead transparency masters, and handout templates. The script is intended as a lecture-discussion with structured opportunities for guided dialogue and small group interaction. The script includes facilitator notes in the margins, cues for overhead transparency use, and places to stop for discussion. During the first session, the activities consisted of the following: ground rules and introductions (20 minutes), jobs scenario (20 minutes), and description of individualism and collectivism (25 minutes). The second session, sources of home-school conflict (45 minutes), bridge activity (15 minutes), and evaluation (10 minutes) were completed. All times were approximate and adapted as necessary to allow participants adequate time to process and discuss. Refreshments were provided for the duration of the workshops.

Before beginning the first training session, BC developers recommend establishing a trustworthy and safe environment because participants may feel vulnerable about sharing personal culture-based experiences, or feel uneasiness or defensiveness. Therefore, “ground rules” were established before the presentation for optimal participation which included attentive, respectful, nonjudgmental listening to one speaker at a time, and a code of confidentiality within the group so that personal disclosures were not shared beyond the sessions. These expectations were agreed to and adopted by the participants. Participants were asked if they wanted to generate additional ground rules, but elected not to do so. One month following the completion of the training, teachers were mailed a packet of the same measures to complete, along with instructions for return via inter-office mail. Upon the conclusion of the second wave
(posttest) data collection, the control group received the identical BC training that the treatment
group received.

**Design and Analysis**

The current study utilized a pretest-posttest control group design. To examine both
between- and within-group differences, mixed factorial analysis of variance (ANOVA)
procedures was used. Mixed ANOVA allows one to examine both within-group (in this case,
time) and between-group (in this case, treatment and control groups) differences, as well as
interaction effects. Thus, mixed ANOVA allowed the primary investigator to determine (a) if
there was a significant change in scores over two time periods (main effect for time), (b) if there
was a statistically significant difference in scores between two groups (main effect for group),
and (c) whether the change in scores over time is different for the two groups (interaction effect).
The data were screened visually and statistically to assess its appropriateness for the fundamental
analyses. A series of tests were performed to ensure data met the required assumptions in this
study. This included testing for linearity, normality, homogeneity of variance, and sphericity.

The pretest measures were used as a baseline assessment of teachers’ skills and
attitudes. In addition, pretest scores were used to examine whether statistically significant
differences existed between treatment and control groups. Additionally, the sample was tested
for outliers, in order to identify extreme values.

Given that extant multicultural and education literature provided no theoretical or
empirical foundation to combine the variables of interest (i.e., multicultural competence,
multicultural attitudes, teaching motivation, and self-efficacy) simultaneously, separate analyses
were calculated for each outcome variable. Each mixed ANOVA featured a 2 x 2 factorial
design, or *Time* (Pretest, Posttest) x *Group* (Treatment, Control).
Criteria for testing hypotheses. Although initially an a priori alpha level of .05 was used to test each hypothesis, a Bonferroni correction was used to adjust the familywise error rate to correct for the computation of multiple statistical tests. This was done to reduce the chance of obtaining a false positive result. Effects were interpreted using the omnibus $F$-test and statistical significance ($p \leq .0125$). Partial eta-squared values were examined for practical significance using the guidelines of small (.01), medium (.06), and large effects (.14; Cohen, 1988). Statistically significant interactions were graphed. Although post-hoc comparisons, which compare means against all other means, were initially planned, these were unable to be completed due to having less than three groups.
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Preliminary Analyses

All analyses were conducted using the Statistical Packages for the Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 23.0. First, descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations, and correlations) were calculated, including parametric statistics assumptions of linearity, normality, homogeneity of variance, and sphericity. Linearity was inspected using matrix scatterplots. Normality was examined via skewness and kurtosis values. Acceptable skew and kurtosis are ≤ the absolute values of 2; however, ANOVA is fairly robust to violations of this assumption (Leech, Barrett, & Morgan, 2008). Homogeneity of variance was tested using Levene’s test for equality of variances, while sphericity was tested via Mauchly’s test of sphericity.

To test the primary hypotheses for the study, separate 2 x 2 factorial design mixed ANOVAs for Time (Pretest, Posttest) x Group (Treatment, Control) were conducted using scores from the MAKSS, TMAS, MFTS, and TSES. There were no cases with missing data points at the item-level in either group across time. Descriptive characteristics of the sample were examined. Univariate and multivariate outliers were tested via the outlier labeling rule (Hoaglin & Iglewicz, 1987; Hoaglin, Iglewicz, & Tukey, 1986) and Mahalanobis distance values.

The pretest measures were used as a baseline assessment of teachers’ skills and attitudes. In addition, t-tests were conducted to determine whether statistically significant differences existed between treatment and control groups on pretest scores on the MAKSS-Form T, TMAS, TSES, and MFTS. Results indicated no statistically significant differences between groups. To examine social desirability bias, bivariate correlations were calculated between
scores on the MCSDS and all outcome variables. Results revealed that participants’ responses on the MCSDS were not significantly related to their responses on any measures. However, given the lower than expected observed internal consistency of the MCSDS and MFTS, this will be addressed in the Discussion.

Table 2

*Intercorrelations Among Outcome Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Multicultural Competence</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Multicultural Attitudes</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Motivation for Teaching</td>
<td>-.48**</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teacher Efficacy</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Social Desirability</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.** p ≤ .01.

**Hypothesis 1**

The first hypothesis was that the BC program would increase teachers’ multicultural competence. Descriptive statistics, including means and standard deviations are presented in Table 3. Statistical assumptions were examined to ensure the data were appropriate for proposed analyses. Matrix scatterplots confirmed linearity. Visual inspection of histogram indicated that all variables approximated a normal distribution. Skewness and kurtosis values fell within the range of normality for all variables. Levene’s test indicated that homogeneity of variance was met. Mauchly’s Test was nonsignificant, indicative that the variances of the differences between conditions were equal. The outlier labeling rule and Mahalanobis distance values indicated no extreme values for any cases.
A mixed analysis of variance consisting of a 2 (Time) x 2 (Group) factorial design, or Time (Pretest, Posttest) x Intervention (Treatment, Control) was conducted to assess differences in multicultural competence as measured by the MAKSS-T. Results indicated a statistically significant interaction between time and group (Table 4). As shown in Figure 2, the treatment group reported significantly higher multicultural competence than the control group at Time 2.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Control Group</th>
<th></th>
<th>BC Group</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Skew</td>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4

Mixed Model ANOVA for Multicultural Competence as a Function of Time and BC Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Partial η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>21.380</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.781</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time*Group</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>22.759</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (Time)</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (Group)</td>
<td>6.316</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2

*Multicultural Competence by Time and Group*
Hypothesis 2

The second hypothesis was that the BC program would increase participants’ multicultural attitudes, as measured by an increase in mean scores on the TMAS. Descriptive statistics are presented in Table 5. Statistical assumptions were examined to ensure the data were appropriate for proposed analyses. Linearity and normality were confirmed. Levene’s and Mauchly’s tests indicated that homogeneity of variance and sphericity were met, respectively. No outliers were identified.

Results of the mixed ANOVA indicated there was a significant interaction between time and group for teacher multicultural attitudes (Figure 3). As indicated in Table 6, there was a significant main effect for time, but no statistically significant effect for group.

Table 5

Mean, Standard Deviation, Skewness, and Kurtosis Values of Multicultural Attitudes by Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Control Group</th>
<th>BC Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( M )</td>
<td>( SD )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6

*Mixed Model ANOVA for Multicultural Attitudes as a Function of Time and BC Participation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Partial $\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>.291</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.291</td>
<td>8.888</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>.266</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.266</td>
<td>1.776</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time*Group</td>
<td>.490</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.490</td>
<td>14.972</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (Time)</td>
<td>1.177</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (Group)</td>
<td>5.400</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3

*Multicultural Attitudes by Time and Group*
Hypothesis 3

The third hypothesis was that there would be significant differences in teachers’ motivation for teaching scores, as measured by the MFTS after participating in the BC program. Descriptive statistics (Table 7) of the MFTS were examined, including matrix scatterplots, histograms, and skewness and kurtosis values. Results indicated that the distribution was slightly leptokurtic in both treatment and control groups. As indicated in Table 8, mixed ANOVA analyses revealed that there were no statistically significant effects.

Table 7

*Mean, Standard Deviation, Skewness, and Kurtosis Values of Motivation for Teaching by Time*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Control Group</th>
<th>Treatment Group</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Skew</td>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8

*Mixed Model ANOVA for Motivation for Teaching as a Function of Time and BC Participation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Partial ( \eta^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>1.884</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.797</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time*Group</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>1.884</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (Time)</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (Group)</td>
<td>3.284</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 4

The fourth and final hypothesis tested in this study was there would be significant differences in teacher efficacy scores as a result of the BC program. Descriptive statistics are presented in Table 9. Statistical assumptions were examined to ensure the data were appropriate for proposed analyses. Matrix scatterplots confirmed linearity. Visual inspection of histograms and statistical inspection of all skewness and kurtosis values indicated that all variables approximated a normal distribution. The data met the assumptions for homogeneity of variance and sphericity. No extreme values were present in the sample.

Results from the mixed ANOVA indicated that there was a significant interaction between time and group, as well as a main effect for the time, but not group (see Table 10, Figure 4).

Table 9

Mean, Standard Deviation, Skewness, and Kurtosis Values of Teacher Self-Efficacy by Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Control Group</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Treatment Group</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Skew</td>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10

*Mixed Model ANOVA of Teacher Efficacy as a Function of Time and BC Participation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Partial η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>12.687</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>.448</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.448</td>
<td>1.395</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time*Group</td>
<td>.474</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.474</td>
<td>24.322</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (Time)</td>
<td>.701</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (Group)</td>
<td>11.555</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4

Teacher Efficacy by Time and Group
Chapter 6: DISCUSSION

The purpose of the current study was to examine the effectiveness of a teacher professional development program, Bridging Cultures, in promoting teachers’ multicultural competence and attitudes, motivation for teaching, and teaching self-efficacy. In addition, the study was conducted by an independent researcher with a more racially/ethnically heterogeneous sample in a different geographical region of the country than previous studies. There were several positive outcomes for teachers who participated in Bridging Cultures. Representative comments of teacher feedback relative to the hypotheses of interest in the current study are shared. Overall, results mirrored those of other teacher professional development studies (Bleicher, 2011; Bollin, 2007; Tran, Young, & Di Lella, 1994) indicating that real-world exposure to urban schools and English Language Learners as well as providing training regarding culture, bilingualism, and cultural learning styles can prompt attitude change with both beginner and veteran teachers.

Hypothesis 1: Bridging Cultures Increases Multicultural Competence

The first hypothesis was supported. Mixed ANOVA analyses suggested that there were significant differences in multicultural competence between the two groups. At posttest, the BC group displayed an increase in their multicultural competence as measured by the MAKSS-T relative to the waitlist control. This difference was not only statistically significant but also explained a large amount of the variance in teachers’ multicultural competence. For example, on the BC evaluation form, one teacher noted “. . . made me more aware [how] different . . . situations are viewed and handled. It will make me more aware of the different attitudes of different cultures.” While no other BC study to date has examined its effect on teacher multicultural competence, other teacher professional development studies have indicated that learning through a formal multicultural education course prompts change in multicultural
competence (Bleicher, 2011; Keengwe, 2010; Milner, 2006; Rogers, 2012; Tran, Young, & Di Lella, 1994).

**Hypothesis 2: Bridging Cultures Increases Multicultural Attitudes**

Similarly, the second hypothesis was supported given the statistically significant difference in multicultural attitudes between the BC and control group over time. Effect size estimates indicated that nearly one-third of the variance in teachers’ multicultural attitude scores, as measured by the TMAS, could be attributed to the BC program. A teacher who offered feedback on the evaluation form commented that BC “. . . remind[ed] me to have open eyes with my students and families.” There is no extant literature on BC and the TMAS (or other measures of multicultural attitudes) on which to compare and contrast. However, Rogers (2012) did find an increase in preservice teacher candidates’ TMAS scores after engaging in a semester-long multicultural education course. These effect sizes were both “modest” and “strong” in control and treatment groups ($d = .23$ and $d = .71$, respectively), with the treatment group showing a stronger change in their multicultural attitudes. Given that large effect sizes were found for the BC group in the current study, this speaks to BC’s potential to affect change in a relatively short period of time, which is something that teachers often do not have in excess.

**Hypothesis 3: Bridging Cultures Increases Motivation for Teaching**

The third hypothesis was not supported based on the results of the current study. There was no difference in participants’ motivation for teaching as a result of participating in BC.

One potential explanation for this finding is the psychometric properties of the MFTS. Given that a low Cronbach’s alpha estimate may be indicative of weakly related items, there may be problems with how the MFTS currently measures motivation for teaching. Unreliable measurement of teacher motivation, as indicated by low internal consistency, could lead to
inaccurate conclusions between groups if this construct is not reliably measured. Unfortunately, there is not much extant literature to compare the reliability observed in the current study with that found in prior studies. Although adequate reliability data were reported when the MFTS was initially developed and validated, Kyles and Olafson (2008) did not report psychometric data in their use of the MFTS. Thus, it remains unclear if the reliability observed in the current study was an irregularity or if other studies have encountered a similar issue.

Another possible explanation may be that BC truly does not affect change in teachers’ motivation. Given that teachers were, on average, relatively experienced, motivation for teaching may be a variable or trait that is somewhat more difficult to affect in such a population. Given that BC more explicitly address variables and issues related to culture and how this affects attitudes towards schooling, teacher motivation does not seem to be more directly related to BC – it may be that BC does not directly affect motivation for teaching, but rather is mediated or moderated by another variable.

**Hypothesis 4: Bridging Cultures Increases Teaching Self-Efficacy**

Lastly, Hypothesis 4 also was supported as the BC group demonstrated a statistically significant increase in their teaching self-efficacy compared to the control group, whose scores remained relatively the same. The BC program also yielded a large effect size in participants’ teaching self-efficacy. While no previous study has examined BC and self-efficacy, the significant increase in teachers’ self-efficacy is consistent with prior research indicating that training tends to improve self-efficacy (Bleicher, 2011; Milner, 2006) and in contrast to earlier studies indicating that teachers felt unprepared to work with culturally diverse students after being in a multicultural education course (Cho & DeCastro-Ambrosetti, 2005). However, the difference in participants may account for the difference in findings. Cho and DeCastro-
Ambrosetti used preservice teacher candidates, while the current study used inservice teachers. It may be that one course may not be sufficient, especially for preservice teachers, to improve their self-efficacy. However, with inservice teachers, a combination of training and actual experience in the field may work to help improve self-efficacy.

Taken together, teachers who participated in Bridging Cultures reported indicated increases in their multicultural competence, multicultural attitudes, and teaching self-efficacy compared to the waitlist control group. These differences not only were significant but also practically meaningful with BC program exposure explaining a large portion of variance in the posttest scores. As a result of participating in training around the BC program, teachers indicated greater awareness, knowledge, skills, sensitivity, and greater beliefs in their capabilities.

**Limitations & Future Directions**

Although the current study adds to the extant literature regarding the BC program with respect to teacher change, this study is not without threats to internal and external validity. First, the sample was a convenience sample of teachers who self-selected to participate. As a result, there may have been selection bias on the part of teachers. These teachers may have been more interested in topics of diversity and multiculturalism, or been intrinsically motivated to improve their teaching practices. In fact, it has been documented elsewhere that teacher candidates with multicultural schooling and life experiences are more likely to have favorable beliefs and attitudes regarding cultural diversity (Kyles & Olafson, 2008). Thus, results from the current study may be considered to be the upper limit of BC’s effect on the dependent variables featured in this study. Given that previous studies have documented that White teachers in urban settings tend to report higher multicultural teaching knowledge compared to Whites in rural settings.
(Harrison, Carson, & Burden, 2010), results from this study may not be generalizable to rural teachers.

In addition, although the sample size for this study was larger than those in previous studies of the BC program, the sample still was relatively small. One explanation for the challenge in recruiting participants for the current study could be due to the increasing demand on teachers’ schedules, such as instructional duties and assessment-driven responsibilities (Torino, 2015). Although the sample was ethnically more heterogeneous than previous BC program samples, it should be noted that the sample still remained primarily White, similar to previous teacher samples of professional development research and national population data (Causey, Thomas, & Armento, 2000; Cross, 2003; U.S. Census Bureau, 2012). The sample was also all female, and all from the same elementary school. However, the demographics of the current sample were reflective of the school system’s elementary teaching population, which was predominantly White female, and also reflective of previously reported national teacher demographic data (U.S. Census Bureau).

Another limitation of the current study was the use of self-report measures to assess the primary variables of interest. Specifically, participants may have over- or underrated their responses. Based on item content, teachers may have recognized the purpose of the study and marked what was not truly reflective of their actual beliefs. Issues with the discrepancy between what a participant says and what a participant does have been documented (Constantine & Ladany, 2000; Debnam, Pas, Bottiani, Cash, & Bradshaw, 2015). This includes social desirability, which refers to a response style bias of individuals to present themselves favorably (Constantine & Ladany, 2000; Ponterotto, Mendelsohn, & Belizaire, 2003; Worthington, Mobley, Frank, & Tan, 2000). The current study may be reflective of Perkins’s (2012) results,
which indicated that in-depth interviews with teachers revealed that they were not as confident as their responses on the MAKSS-T. Although no significant relations were found between outcome measures used in the current study and the measure of social desirability (MCSDS), reliability estimates of the MCSDS were slightly below the desired threshold. As such, although social desirability is possible, it did not seem to be an issue with the current teacher sample.

Further, participants did not fill out survey measures in front of the instructor/primary researcher, so that they would not feel any undue influence.

The current study also had some other potential measurement limitations. Internal consistency of the TSES, while not severely low, was just slightly lower than acceptable, as established in previous studies (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). It should be noted that the internal consistency of the MFTS and MCSDS fell below the accepted threshold of 0.70 for research purposes (Nunnally, 1978; Lance, Butts, & Michels, 2006) and were lower than reported in previous studies (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960; DeWitz, Woolsey, & Walsh, 2009; Schraw & Olafson, 2003). There could be several reasons for the low observed internal consistency in the current study. Accuracy of internal consistency coefficients may change according to sample size, especially for samples with less than 50 (Javali, Gudaganavar, & Raj, 2011). Sample size may influence the magnitude of reliability coefficients because larger samples have less sampling error than small samples (Aguinis, Henle, & Ostroff, 2002).

Additionally, given that the MFTS has been used less than the other measures featured in the current study, there is less psychometric support for its use in the extant literature.

Because participants completed pretest and posttest measures on their own time, there were not opportunities to clarify any items which may have needed clarification. Although no participants indicated any discomfort, negative reactions, or confusion, this is a possibility.
Given that information was gleaned via self-report in the current study, direct observation and information from students and parents would strengthen methodology in future research. Lastly, my dual role of principal investigator and BC instructor could be another confounding variable. Bias, which may be intentional or unconscious, could not be completely eliminated in the current study given there was no blinding. I was also the principal investigator and thus, already had pre-conceived hypotheses about the results. Even given these considerations, I do not have a vested or conflict of interest with BC and thus, could be considered to have less potential bias than previous trainings conducted by the developers of BC.

Although this study has its limitations, it has yielded new questions and directions for future research. These include replicating this study with a much larger sample size, more individuals of color, more geographically representative places, and including teachers at the secondary level. The current sample was relatively experienced, averaging around 10 years of teaching experience. However, future studies should examine the BC program with less experienced teachers and preservice candidates in teacher education programs. Replication with both larger and more diverse samples may help shed light on whether these results hold true and under what conditions. Future researchers may also want to consider collecting additional demographic information that may be used as a covariate, such as teachers’ certifications and pre- and in-service multicultural training. These demographic characteristics could be confounding variables and thus, should be controlled.

Future research also should examine whether changes in teachers’ attitudes result in actual changes in practice and are maintained over time. Longitudinal mixed-method research that combines in-depth interviews with intensive participant observations with a greater number of teachers is needed to help clarify whether teacher attitudes indicated on self-report surveys
mirror that of their classroom practices or whether there is a discrepancy between the two. Observations may also help establish how teachers translate their attitudes about multicultural education, self-efficacy into actual practice. Longitudinal data could help bridge the gap in understanding how worldviews change and develop over time, with or without direct interventions. This may help illuminate patterns, within-sample change, and short- and long-term changes. Examining dynamic and longitudinal processes, both across and within populations could supplement results. Given that culture is not static (Greenfield, 2009), longitudinal data may provide a fuller picture of culture both between and within generations, especially given that Greenfield, Maynard, and Marti (2009) found support for such an assertion. Addressing these limitations is important to understanding the literature on BC and professional development.

In addition, the supplement of observational, student, and parent data would help booster the validity and also to examine whether discrepancies exist between what is reported versus what is practiced. Research that determines whether participants follow through in practice what they indicate in attitudinal measures will be critical. Similar to previous BC research, future research could determine whether the BC Program leads to direct changes in student outcomes, such as homework completion, school engagement, positive social behavior, conduct problems, sense of belonging, emotional distress, and academic achievement. The training outcomes found in this study, if generalized, could provide a model for school systems to include in their professional development sequence.

More recently, cultural values generally have been viewed to be an intermediate variable (rather than a causal factor for developmental pathways such as child-rearing and school values), strongly influenced by sociodemographic factors in the macroenvironment (Greenfield, 2009).
Further study of such new theory and how it applies in educational environments warrants further study, especially as it applies to teachers, students, and their parents. Doing so may further reveal how and where culture fits into multicultural education and affects pedagogical practices.

**Implications**

Cultural competence is not an end-goal; rather, it is a continuum and lifelong journey (Ortiz & Flanagan, 2002; Teel, 2008). No single training experience is sufficient for the development of multicultural competence (Rogers-Sirin & Sirin, 2009). Multiple opportunities over time are needed rather than isolated opportunities (Kyles & Olafson, 2008). Thus, learning must be ongoing. School administrators should consider identification of potential targets for intervention in their respective school systems. School personnel must be encouraged and given opportunities by administrators to participate in professional learning which advances their cultural competence.

BC helped teachers negotiate differences with parents and students in a positive way, rather than having teachers look at their way as the “right way” of doing things.

The framework provided by the BC program is only one approach for understanding cultural differences but does open the door to new ways of thinking and acting for teachers (Rothstein-Fisch, Greenfield, & Trumbull, 1999). The current literature is conflicting with how to best implement and promote attitudinal or behavioral change most effectively. However, the current study demonstrated that even just a few training sessions can have an impact on changing teacher attitudes.

Although the literature on BC outcomes is limited, the current study is consistent with previous qualitative studies (Rothstein-Fisch, Trumbull, Isaac, Daley, & Perez, 2003; Trumbull,
Diaz-Meza, Hasan, & Rothstein-Fisch, 2000), which found that teachers demonstrated changes in their thinking about culture, classroom, classroom management, and instructional strategies. Consistent with Rothstein-Fisch et al. and Trumbull et al., even under experimental conditions, teachers who participate in BC demonstrate attitude change in their multicultural awareness, understanding, self-awareness, and confidence in their ability to work with Hispanic students.

While individualism-collectivism conceptualizations have limitations (Greenfield, 2009, 2010), findings from the present study do build on the BC literature. These findings enhance the current understanding regarding how BC can play a role in teachers becoming culturally competent through their professional development. Examination of one’s practices should begin early. This means beginning the conversation with teacher candidates at the preservice level. Given the literature on teacher professional development, a re-examination of the ways teacher candidates are prepared for the multicultural realities of schools and society is important. It is important to promote teacher candidates’ development to facilitate their understanding of their future students in a broader social context. This includes going beyond the surface conversations around culture to address teacher candidates’ self-efficacy beliefs as well. BC generates a discussion about culture in a specific way and how it might affect orientation to school values. BC may be one such professional development program to better help prepare those individuals who feel especially unprepared.

Based on my observations and feedback shared from teachers in the current study, several observations and considerations should be made when implementing BC. First, it is critical for BC instructors, who facilitate such conversations and experiences, to make participants feel safe and comfortable in order to participate. This is necessary in order to help generate a rich discussion that goes beyond the surface. Second, the change process may be initiated by
engaging preservice teachers in an examination of their own identities and cultures, and how these may impact their pedagogy. These implications may extend to school districts if changes translate into culturally competent behavior in the classroom. Thus, the conversation and need for training should not stop at the preservice level; rather, it should be revisited and continue at the inservice level.

Third, increasing self-awareness, as demonstrated by the teachers in the current study, may increase teachers’ ability to adopt alternative ways of perceiving the world. Teachers should better understand their own values and how they may differ from the families with whom they work. When they do, they can consciously work to build students’ bicultural competence and help them navigate U.S. schools. School districts may want to consider adding BC to their professional development and preparation sequence. When teachers better understand students’ home culture, they can work to make classrooms more welcoming for students and families. Support of school administration officials will be critical to ensure that teachers get the support they need to implement such change.

Conclusion

The present findings, together with prior research on the BC program, offer several insights for training educators. The study also contributes to the extant literature regarding why it is important to be culturally competent and to give educators a different view of children situated within family and school systems. By better informing teachers about children’s families of origin, teachers were able to better understand worldviews different from their own and how that influenced one’s engagement and interaction with the U.S. school system. This study also provides a framework for examining teacher change resulting from the BC program. Future research is recommended to see if the current findings replicate with larger and more
diverse samples. Results of the current study indicated that the BC Program demonstrates promise as a potential resource within a teacher professional development curriculum/program.
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Appendix A

Key Terms

The term “American culture” serves to discount people of Canada, Central, and South America, and is more accurate when referred to as U.S. culture (Locke, 2003). Thus, for the purposes of this study, culture in the United States will be referred to as U.S. culture. Other terms such as culture, race, and ethnicity, have been inconsistently defined in the literature. It is important to define terms that were used throughout the current study to maintain clarity. Thus, this section refers to several key terms, which are reviewed and defined.

Culture. Social and demographic changes, along with evolving political conditions and new economies, reinforce the notion that ethnicity, race, and culture are dynamic concepts representing fluid dimensions of individual and community life (Fisher, Jackson, & Villarruel, 1998). There is no one definition of ethnicity, race, and culture that is universally agreed upon (Okazaki & Sue, 1995). There are more than 150 definitions of culture, an abstract concept often used to explain behavior (Locke, 2003). Culture, a dynamic phenomenon (Keller & Greenfield, 2000), is composed of habitual patterns of behavior that are characteristic of a group of people transmitted from one generation to the next through symbolic communication (Locke, 2003). As with other developmental processes, the transmission of culture across generations and its individual meaning are dynamic (Fisher, Jackson, & Villarruel, 1998).

Race and ethnicity. Racial and cultural competence must include an understanding of how racial/ethnic identification is constructed (Fergus, 2008). However, it must be noted that the notions of race and ethnic minority status are highly charged with potential political ramifications (Okazaki & Sue, 1995). Use of the term “race” implies biological factors, as races are typically defined by observable physiognomic features such as skin color, hair type and
color, eye color, and facial features (Okazaki & Sue, 1995). Ethnicity refers to the characterization of a group by its common nationality, culture, or language (Sattler & Ysseldyke, 2001). Although sometimes used interchangeably, race and ethnicity are not the same. Some researchers believe that a discussion of ethnicity is relevant to a discussion of school achievement because observations of the relationship (or lack thereof) between academic identity and ethnic identity have led some researchers to believe that the degree to which academic achievement is compatible with their ethnic identity contributes to ethnic “minority” students’ motivation to learn in school (e.g., Ogbu, 1990, 1992, 1993, 1994; Okagaki, 2006).

Although there are many within-group differences in any ethnic group, there are nonetheless within-group similarities that are viewed as significant enough to qualify as a cultural group (Locke, 2003). A social group is defined not primarily by a set of shared attributes, but by a sense of identity (Young, 2000). Racial and ethnic groups usually develop from shared “material interests” (e.g., politics, language) which themselves are constructed from specific historical circumstances or contexts such as migration, economic conditions, policy (Fergus, 2008). When groups such as Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, or Salvadoran Americans are grouped together into a label such as “Latino” while experiencing similar kinds of prejudice, social and linguistic discrimination, and economic disparities, what may draw them together in opposition to the dominant culture are those values shared across nationality, racial or ethnic group, or linguistic style (Locke, 2003). It is identification with a certain social status, the common history that social status produces, and self-identification that define the group as a group (Young, 2000). One such group is Latinos.

However, some researchers object to the use of pan-ethnic labels (e.g., Asian, Latino, Hispanic, Native American). The development of pan-ethnic labels serves as a key example of
how contexts construct and shift boundaries of identity (Fergus, 2008). Panethnic labels have grown out of a political or economic need to categorize various groups into one category (Fergus, 2008). Broad racial comparisons may obscure considerable heterogeneity within panethnic groups. For example, Hispanics, Cubans, and to a slightly less extent South and Central Americans have higher educational outcomes than Mexicans, on average (Kao & Thompson, 2003). Although there are advantages to examining Latino nationalities as a group, it cannot be overlooked that inevitably, there are within-group differences that contribute to heterogeneity of racial and ethnic groups. The fluidity in shifting identity among Latinos, specifically, lies in the salience of race, ethnicity, and national origin (Fergus, 2008). For purposes of this study, information describing cultural groups will be as specific as possible and report data by national origin, whenever available.

**Minority.** The term minority will be sparingly used. There are two reasons for this. First, the degree to which certain groups can be considered a “minority” varies by state (Ortiz & Flanagan, 2002). Therefore, use of the term minority is sometimes inaccurate. Half of all Hispanics live in just two states: California and Texas (U.S. Census Bureau, 2001). Second, the term “minority” is offensive to some, suggesting being “less than” (Ortiz & Flanagan, 2002; Trumbull, Greenfield, Rothstein-Fisch, & Quiroz, 2007). Thus, minority will be used sparingly. Instead, the term culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) will be used when referring to groups traditionally referred to as “minorities.”

**Census categories.** The United States government provides a number of categories for the identification of race or ethnicity. All the categories are denoted as a race, with Hispanic or Latino considered an ethnicity. The Federal Register (1997) defines these groups as follows: American Indian/Alaska Native refers to a person having origins in any of the original peoples of
North and South America (including Central America), and who maintains tribal affiliation or community attachment. Asian is defined as a person having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, or the Indian subcontinent including Cambodia, China, India, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, Pakistan, the Philippine Islands, Thailand, and Vietnam. Black or African American is considered a person having origins in any of the black racial groups of Africa. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander refers to a person having origins in any of the original peoples of Hawaii, Guam, Samoa, or other Pacific Islands. White refers to a person having origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, the Middle East, or North Africa.

**Latino and Hispanic.** *Latino* refers to the Latin-based romance languages of Spain, France, Italy, and Portugal. Latino embraces Portuguese-speaking Brazilians in a way that the word *Hispanic* does not. Hispanic is an American derivation from *Hispaña*, the Spanish-language term for the cultural diaspora created by Spain (Fears, 2003). For the purposes of the current study, Latino will be used because it is a broader term for peoples from Latin America, some whose first language is not Spanish (Trumbull, Diaz-Meza, Hasan, & Rothstein-Fisch, 2000). And refers to a person of Cuban, Mexican, Puerto Rican, South or Central American, or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race.
Appendix B

Common Themes of Hispanic Culture

Latinos at a Glance

More than one in eight people in the United States are of Hispanic origin (U.S. Census Bureau, 2002). The Hispanic population grew over seven times as fast as the rest of the general population between 1980 and 1990 (U.S. Census Bureau, 1993). However, growth in the Hispanic population is not uniform across nationalities. Mexicans increased by 52.9%, Puerto Ricans by 24.9%, and Cubans by 18.9%. Hispanics of other origins increased by 96.9% (U.S. Census Bureau, 2001). Most Latinos living in the U.S. are mestizos – descendants of both oppressive European cultures and oppressed indigenous peoples (De Las Fuentes, Baron, & Vasquez, 2003). Latinos come from 22 different countries of origin; some are White, some are Black or Asian, but most are mestizos, most of who immigrated after World War II (De Las Fuentes et al., 2003).

Gender issues and the family. One of the characteristics shared among all Latino groups involves the importance of strong family values and unity (De Las Fuentes, Baron, & Vasquez, 2003). Traditional gender role socialization for Latinos includes strict norms prescribing specific behaviors, attitudes, and beliefs for girls and boys (De Las Fuentes et al., 2003). For example, a preferred role for Latinas includes showing the virtuous and maternal characteristics that are attributed to the Virgin Mary, or marianismo (De Las Fuentes et al., 2003). Latino boys and men are traditionally given more social and familial freedoms (De Las Fuentes et al., 2003). This continuum is that of caballero-macho. The caballero identity encompasses values of being a gentleman, respectable family leader and role model, and primary wage earner, deserving of the respectful title of Don (De Las Fuentes et al., 2003). A machista is proud of his sexual prowess and may have one or more mistresses (De Las Fuentes et al., 2003).
The caballero is upheld as ideal and any deviation from that is considered shameful (De Las Fuentes et al., 2003).

**Simpatia and respeto.** Simpatia involves being polite and avoiding ill-mannered behavior in all situations to prevent discord (De Las Fuentes, Baron, & Vasquez, 2003). Along with deference to authority, simpatia is an aspect of respeto (respect) shown to persons in positions of authority (De Las Fuentes et al., 2003). For example, children are expected to use the formal, second-person pronoun of usted (you) when addressing adults until permission is granted to do otherwise (De Las Fuentes et al., 2003). Similarly, it is considered disrespectful and condescending to use first names before familiarity is established among adults (De Las Fuentes et al., 2003).

**Familismo and personalismo.** Familismo is the primary organizing principle of the Latino family, indicating that the needs of the family and group are primary (Calzada, Huang, Linares-Torres, Singh, & Brotman, 2014; De Las Fuentes, Baron, & Vasquez, 2003). Large and geographically close families have traditionally been an important source of financial, emotional, and spiritual support for Latino families (De Las Fuentes et al., 2003). In contrast, U.S. dominant culture values individualism as an organizing principle (De Las Fuentes et al., 2003). Personalismo in Latino culture focuses on the unique qualities in the individual that make a family and community proud (De Las Fuentes et al., 2003). It is not separateness, but recognition of the pride a family and community has in the gifts and talents of its individual members (De Las Fuentes et al., 2003).

**Religion and spirituality.** Catholicism has been a pervasive force in the lives of many Latinos (De Las Fuentes, Baron, & Vasquez, 2003). Adherence to traditional Catholic values, specifically the religious value of marianismo and the practice of aguantar, may prevent the
seeking of psychological services, favoring instead the support of religious and laypersons in their churches (De Las Fuentes et al., 2003). *Curandería* (folk healing) is practiced by many Latinos, possibly a legacy of the hybridizing of native religions with European Christianity (De Las Fuentes et al., 2003). *Curanderismo* has been described as a set of folk and medical beliefs, rituals, and practices that address the psychosocial and spiritual concerns of some Latinos, particularly Mexicans and Mexican Americans (De Las Fuentes et al., 2003). Other key terms that are germane to the current study and the justification for their use are included in Appendix A.

**Cultural caveat.** There is a need for social understanding that goes beyond the relatively superficial aspects of culture often addressed in multicultural education, such as major holidays, religious customs, dress, and foods (Trumbull, Rothstein-Fisch, & Greenfield, 2000). The Hispanic population is very heterogeneous. Heterogeneity is very salient among various Hispanic subgroups because of differences in acculturation, socioeconomic class, history, migrational patterns, educational and occupational levels, and English proficiency levels (Rosado, 1986). Not every single individual from even the most circumscribed culture will display any or all of the features commonly associated with it (Ortiz & Flanagan, 2002). Adherence to the aforementioned attitudes and beliefs vary greatly as a function of acculturation (De Las Fuentes et al., 2003).
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Table of Contents for Readings for Bridging Cultures: Teacher Education Module

Article 1
Bridging Cultures in our schools: New approaches that work

Article 2
Bridging Cultures with classroom strategies

Article 3
Bridging Cultures with a parent-teacher conference

Article 4
Cross-cultural conflict and harmony in the social construction of the child

Article 5
Conceptualizing interpersonal relationships in the cultural contexts of individualism and collectivism

Article 6
Independence and interdependence as developmental scripts: Implications for theory, research, and practice
Appendix D

Participant ID Number: _______________________

Demographic Information

1. What is your age? ______

2. Highest level of education you completed? ___Bachelors degree
   ___Some graduate school
   ___Masters degree
   ___Doctoral degree

3. For how many years have you been teaching? ______

4. What is your race? ___Anglo/European descent
   ___Black/African American
   ___Native American/American Indian
   ___Asian/Hawaiian/Pacific Islander
   ___More than one race (Please specify)

5. What is your ethnicity? ___Hispanic/Latino
   ___Not Hispanic/Latino

6. Please circle the grade you teach. K 1 2 3 4 5

7. Gender ___Male
   ___Female
   ___Transgender

8. What is your current annual income? ___Less than $40,000
   ___$40,000-50,000
   ___$50,001-60,000
   ___$60,001-70,000
   ___$70,001-80,000
   ___More than $80,000

9. Role: ___General Education Teacher
   ___Special Education Teacher
   ___ELL Teacher
   ___Paraprofessional
   ___Administrator
   ___Other (please specify): ___________________

10. Name of school: _______________________________________

On the pages that follow are several questionnaires. These questionnaires are designed to measure people’s attitudes. You may find that some of the questions refer to sensitive issues. Answer as honestly as possible; there are no right or wrong answers. Circle the response that best describes how you feel. Thank You!
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2012-2016 Talented and Gifted (TAG) Program Overview, April 2016
Better than Bullies, February 2016
Students with Behavioral & Emotional Challenges: Prevention & Intervention, March 2015
Cultural Competence: So Broad yet so Personal, August 2014
Teen Depression: The More than Sad Program, March/April 2014
Dealing with Peer Pressure and Promoting Positive Relationships, April 2013
The Yellow Wallpaper Project, February/March 2013
School Resources: School-Based Problem-Solving Processes, January 2013
Student Services, January 2012
Depression and Anxiety in Gifted and Talented Children, March 2011
Working with Diverse Students: Considerations for Educators, October 2008
Anxiety in Children and Adolescents, October 2008
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