DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 354 234 SP 034 352

AUTHOR Sparks, William G.; Verner, M. Elizabeth
TITLE Intervention Strategies in Multicultural Education: A Comparison of Pre-Service Models.
PUB DATE Jan 93
NOTE 27p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Affective Objectives; *Attitude Change; Cognitive Structures; *Consciousness Raising; *Education Courses; *Education Majors; Elementary Secondary Education; Global Approach; Higher Education; Integrated Activities; Intellectual Disciplines; Learning Activities; *Multicultural Education; Physical Education; Preservice Teacher Education; *Student Attitudes

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to identify and compare the effects of two different multicultural education intervention strategies (an integrated model and a subject-specific model) on the knowledge and attitudes of preservice teacher education students (N=228) in both a classroom and a field-based setting. Physical education has included an orientation toward the cognitive and affective domain for many years; because of its social orientation it can play an important role in the process of gaining an understanding and appreciation toward ethnic and cultural diversity. Pre- and post-test assessments were administered to four treatment groups utilizing the Multicultural Physical Education Instrument designed to assess the knowledge and attitudes of students in regard to important multicultural issues. The two classroom intervention strategies were primarly presented as course work. Results reveal that the attitudes of preservice teachers regarding multicultural issues can be enhanced both through discipline-specific as well as integrated courses. Field-based experiences, however, were not particularly effective in helping the teacher education students to gain a higher multicultural tolerance level. (Contains 17 references.) (LL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED354234

INTERVENTION STRATEGIES IN MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION: A COMPARISON OF PRE-SERVICE MODELS

DR. WILLIAM G. SPARKS

DR. M. ELIZABETH VERNER

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, PHYSICAL EDUCATION, RECREATION AND DANCE

ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY

NORMAL, IL 61761

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

W. G. Sparks

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

January 1993

SP034352

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Intervention Strategies in Multicultural Education: A Comparison of Pre-Service Models

William G. Sparks III, Illinois State University

M. Elizabeth Verner, Illinois State University

With the many changes throughout the world, the demographics of the United States are rapidly changing. As an agent of a global society, the schools must embrace changes through policies that reflect an appreciation of multicultural educational practices. In order for multicultural education to impact teaching practices, the development of an understanding and appreciation toward cultural diversity is imperative. Therefore, in an attempt to determine the best model for teaching multicultural concepts and changing prejudicial attitudes, this study was undertaken to identify and compare the effects of two different multicultural education intervention strategies (an integrated model and a subject-specific model) on pre-service collegiate professional students in terms of their knowledge and attitudes in a classroom and in a field-based setting. The results will assist in determining specific interventions to successfully teach multicultural knowledge and to reduce prejudicial attitudes of pre-service teacher education students.

Intervention Strategies in Multicultural Education: A Comparison of Pre-Service Models

Introduction

With the many changes throughout the world, the demographics of the United States is rapidly changing. We are quickly becoming a global society. As we enter the twenty-first century, the cultural mix within our society will become even more diverse. The schools as an agent of that society will reflect a student population that is culturally and racially non-white (Swisher & Swisher, 1986). The public school system must embrace these changes through policies that reflect an appreciation and understanding of multicultural educational practices. Recognizing the existence of a culturally diverse citizenry, a multicultural, non-sexist curriculum is based upon the theory of cultural pluralism which celebrates the diversity of a nation founded upon the mixing of all cultures. It reflects cultural and sex role examination and involves the educational processes which promote an understanding and appreciation of the diversity that exists within a pluralistic society (Barta & Anderson, 1982).

For many years, educational agencies and reform forces have encouraged increased involvement in multicultural education. If schools are to prepare students to function in today's society, multicultural education should be an integral part of the school's curriculum (Garcia, 1980). Many schools have begun this process through the development and distribution of multicultural materials. The teachers responsible for developing multicultural curricular materials and for delivering subsequent interventions have a tremendous impact on the success of multicultural education in the schools. Banks (1986; 1987) suggests that a teacher is a cultural mediator and an agent of change. In order for that change to be long term, the teacher needs to integrate components of multicultural education within disciplinary content. Content knowledge is extremely important, but even more important

is the ability to infuse that content knowledge naturally in both the cognitive and affective domains within the discipline and do so utilizing appropriate methodological strategies.

Physical education as a specialized body of knowledge has included an orientation toward the cognitive and affective domain for many years. Healthy social development through planned group activities is central to a well-rounded, quality physical education program (Bucher, 1988; Hellison, 1985; Lawson and Placek, 1981; Jewett and Bain, 1985; Siedentop, 1980). The promotion of healthy social development through various partner, small group or team experiences will continue to be an important part of physical education. In that physical education has a significant emphasis within the affective domain, a unique opportunity exists to promote multicultural sensitivity and understanding throughout instructional units. Swisher and Swisher (1986) point out that multicultural concepts integrated within a sound physical education program are more than just the mere introduction of unique games but help promote the acquisition of an informed social attitude by creating a knowledge base that communicates that diversity is desirable and to be different is okay.

In order for multicultural instructional units such as this to be developed that foster well-informed, non-prejudicial attitudes and have a positive influence upon teaching practices, it is imperative that students gain an understanding and appreciation toward ethnic and cultural diversity. Curricular materials and instructional strategies in all subject areas, including physical education should therefore be designed to help eliminate all prejudices and to promote multicultural understanding. Physical education, because of its strong social orientation, can become an important role in this process. Regardless of disciplinary areas though, teachers need to develop a multicultural environment within their classrooms in which they (1) teach children to respect the cultures and values of others; (2) help all children learn to

function successfully in a multicultural, multi-racial society; (3) develop a positive self-concept in those children who are most affected by racism, sexism, handicappism or other prejudicial attitudes that tend to label children different from the norm and; (4) encourage children to view people of diverse cultures as unique parts of a whole community.

Because teachers serve as role models for many youth and because they have tremendous control over the classroom environment through selected curriculum and intervention strategies, it is extremely important that they are knowledgeable and sensitive to multicultural issues. This effort should begin with pre-service training for teachers. Mitchell (1987) points out that there have been only moderate efforts extended by universities to strengthen the attitudes and knowledge of pre-service teacher education students in the area of multicultural education. These efforts emphasize cultural pluralism and attempt to upgrade the multicultural tolerance level of pre-service teacher education students, but have been generic to teacher education rather than specific to a discipline and have been elective rather than required. Gay (1983) suggests that pre-service preparation should include knowledge about ethnic and cultural diversity, exposure to instructional materials which reflect cultural pluralism and a framework for converting multicultural knowledge into instructional strategies. But how should pre-service teacher education students acquire this information? Should there be one or more general teacher education classes that teach only multicultural information or should multicultural content be infused into disciplinary content within major courses? Which approach offers the most effective means of providing critical multicultural information to pre-service teacher education students: (1) a general approach in which all teacher education students are required to complete one class in multicultural education that is taught in the education department, or (2) an approach in which multicultural information is infused into a required disciplinary course?

The teacher education program in one regional, public university in Illinois with an enrollment of approximately 22,000 students is attempting to meet this need through two distinctly different models. The first approach, utilized by early childhood, elementary, junior high, and special education majors, is an integrated experience that is elective. This model includes an entry level course, Introduction to Multicultural Education (C&I 110), followed by a field experience, Urban Practices in Education (C&I 312). The course entitled Introduction to Multicultural Education assists students in exploring the theories and processes of multicultural education as a basis for understanding cultural pluralism and social diversity. Through extensive reading, role playing and videotape analysis students develop an increased multicultural and multiethnic awareness, gain insight into the sources of cultural conflict, examine the dynamics of diverse cultures as well as acquire fundamental multicultural concepts that can be used future professional settings.

In order to enroll in the second course, Urban Practices in Education, students are required to have satisfactorily completed Introduction to Multicultural Education. Urban Practices in Education then serves as an off-campus field-based experience that is community based. Students are placed in local schools, government or private agencies or institutions that serve youth. This course allows students to develop a greater understanding of urban life, become aware of the services available to urban adolescent populations and helps students gain insight into the relationship between the problems and services offered and it's impact on urban education. The field experience also exposes youth to diverse cultures in order to assist students in gaining an understanding and appreciation of the importance positive feelings and attitudes have in working with youth in an urban setting. Through this experience, students are given the opportunity to assess the depth of their personal prejudices or negative attitudes. The course also provides a forum for students to be able to work through these feelings.

The second model designed to increase multicultural knowledge is discipline-specific. Similar to the first model, it includes a two-course sequence which is required by all pre-service physical education teacher education students. This model includes a sophomore level course, Cultural Perspectives of Human Movement (HPR 252) as well as the traditional field-based course, Student Teaching in Physical Education (HPR 399). The course entitled Cultural Perspectives of Human Movement is designed to provide an overview of selected historical and cultural concepts and their relationship to the theoretical base of physical education. Students gain insight into the significance of culture in the evolution of physical education. Principles that establish human movement as an experience reflective of cultural patterns, values, or beliefs as well as the cultural influence of human movement on American socialization patterns are studied. In addition, sex role, minority influence as well as socioeconomic class and its relationship to the social system of sport are examined.

Student Teaching in Physical Education is a disciplinary-based field experience which is required of all teacher education students within physical education. This experience provides the opportunity for preservice students to apply concepts and knowledge learned throughout the discipline in a field-based setting including information acquired in the course, Cultural Perspectives in Physical Education. Placements are made in central Illinois and within the Chicago area both of which include culturally diverse environments. Within this experience, students plan and teach physical education activities to culturally and socially diverse populations including racial and ethnic minorities, students with disabilities, students of mixed socioeconomic class as well as single-sexed classes, co-educational classes and classes containing students of differing motor abilities.

In comparing these models, the question then becomes which approach will best prepare teacher education students in the area of multicultural education? Is

the preference an integrated model which includes a single course and a field-based experience focusing exclusively on multicultural education that is not discipline specific? Or is the preference a discipline-specific model designed only for students within the major which would infuse multicultural concepts and principles into a single required course and field experience? Grant (1983) argues that multicultural experiences must be infused within the discipline but there seems to be little data to support this view.

The current literature suggests that multicultural education within the schools will continue to be a significant issue as we move forward into the next decade (Sleeter & Grant, 1987; McCarthy, 1988; First, 1988). Therefore, as a means to assess the impact that two models of multicultural education had on the knowledge and attitude of pre-service teacher education students, this study was initiated.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to systematically identify and compare the effects of an integrated and a discipline-specific model of multicultural education on the knowledge and attitude of pre-service teacher education students.

Specific Objective

Specifically, the objectives of this study were to determine initial and final multicultural knowledge and attitude as well as assess the change in multicultural knowledge and attitude as a function of the two models.

Hypotheses

Initial Knowledge and Attitude.

1a: There is no significant difference between the discipline-specific and integrated groups regarding initial multicultural knowledge.

1b: There is no significant difference between the discipline-specific and integrated groups regarding initial multicultural attitudes.

Final Knowledge and Attitude.

2a: There is no significant difference between the discipline-specific and integrated groups regarding final multicultural knowledge.

2b: There is no significant difference between the discipline-specific and integrated groups regarding final multicultural attitude acquisition.

Change in Knowledge and Attitude Between Groups.

3a: There is no significant difference between the discipline-specific and integrated groups regarding change in multicultural knowledge.

3b: There is no significant difference between the discipline-specific and integrated groups regarding change in multicultural attitude.

Change in Knowledge and Attitude Within Groups.

4a: There is no significant difference within the discipline-specific and integrated groups regarding change in multicultural knowledge.

4b: There is no significant difference within the treatment groups for the discipline-specific and integrated groups regarding change in multicultural attitude.

Course Descriptions

C&I 110, Introduction to Multicultural Education, is an integrated course experience, one taken by students from different majors. It explores the theories and processes to assist students in acquiring increased multicultural and multi-ethnic awareness in order to work successfully with culturally diverse groups in traditional educational settings. This course is taken by students majoring in early childhood, elementary, junior high, and special education.

HPR 252, Cultural Perspectives in Physical Education, is a discipline-specific course experience, taken by only physical education majors, which incorporates selected cultural and sociological concepts into the study of human movement. It assists students in identifying human movement as an experience that is reflective

of cultural patterns and social beliefs.

HPR 399, Student Teaching in Physical Education is a traditional, culminating, field-based experience that is discipline-specific and allows students to apply knowledge learned in supervised practical settings. Only physical education majors are involved in this experience.

C&I 312, Urban Field Experience in Education, is an off-campus, integrated, supervised field-based experience that allows students to apply knowledge learned in a supervised practical setting focused within an urban environment. Students from early childhood, elementary, junior high, and special education take this course.

Methodology

Subjects

Subjects for the study included undergraduate college students of different races. Both genders were represented as well as undergraduates at each of the four educational levels and a breadth of socioeconomic classes. These students were registered for the fall semester 1991 and the spring semester 1992.

A total of 228 subjects participated in this study. The four treatment groups had the following number of subjects in each:

I. Classroom Models (Clsr)

- Dspl HPR 252, N=82 (Cultural Perspectives in Physical Education, a discipline specific taken only by physical education majors)
- Intg C&I 110, N=102 (Introduction of Multicultural Education, an integrated course taken by all majors)

II. Field-based Models (FldB)

- Dspl HPR 399, N=31 (Student Teaching in Physical Education, a discipline specific teaching internship in K-12 public school environments)

Intg C&I 312, N=13 (Urban Experience, urban social services integrated internship experience for all majors). Because this course is offered only during the summer semester, all students registered during the summer 1992 semester were included in the study.

Instrumentation

Pre and post test assessments were accomplished by administering the Multicultural Physical Education Instrument (MPEI). This instrument was designed to assess the knowledge and attitudes of students in regard to important multicultural issues. Validity was established through review of the instrument by a panel of experts that included professors who were trained in a taught multicultural education and were conducting research or had published in the area. They reviewed the instrument in terms of clarity and preciseness. Ten of the 24 items were rewritten based on these responses. The instrument included three sections:

Demographic Information. Location of high school was requested. This was done to determine community size.

Attitudinal Information. Attitudinal bias on selected items that reflect multicultural orientations and feelings prior to and following participation in one of the four instructional activities (integrated classroom experience, discipline-specific classroom experience, integrated field-based experience and discipline-specific field-based experience) were indicated by scaled responses. For example, respondents were asked to indicate to what degree they believed in assisting students to gain an appreciation of other cultures based upon ethnic consideration, race or gender. Responses were selected from strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, or strongly disagree. There were 15 items seeking information that identified strength of feelings about multicultural issues.

Knowledge Identification. Initial multicultural knowledge and change in multicultural knowledge prior to and following participation in one of four instruc-

tional activities (integrated classroom experience, discipline-specific classroom experience, integrated field-based experience and discipline-specific field-based experience) were indicated by nominal responses. In this section the respondents were asked to indicate yes, no or unsure to items such as "Do you understand the concept of stereotyping racial and cultural groups according to personal bias?" There were nine items that identified the degree of understanding in regard to important multicultural concepts.

The Treatment

The two classroom intervention strategies were primarily presented as course work. Students were exposed to assigned readings, research reports, multicultural issues, role playing, oral presentations, and extensive interaction during class. The focus of these activities included cultural identity/awareness, demographic trends/issues, gender roles and sex role stereotyping, ethnic/cultural groups and understanding racism, prejudice, and discrimination. In comparing the two classroom (Clsr) courses, the integrated (Intg) course examines multicultural educational concepts, whereas the discipline specific course (Dspl) infuses the concepts into human movement study. For example, in the Intg course the significance of cultural difference and its impact on American society would be discussed. Whereas, in the Dspl course, the impact of a human movement form specific to a given culture is identified. This might include information relative to the contribution that the German gymnastic movement had on American physical education.

The two field-based experiences provided opportunities for interaction with people of color, people with disabilities, people of both sexes, and people of diverse cultural backgrounds. Through extensive observation, interaction or instruction with these varied populations, students were provided with opportunities to apply concepts learned in the multicultural courses which impacted attitudes or knowledge.

Data Collection

The instrument was administered to four treatment groups at the beginning and end of each semester. Respondents were given sufficient time to complete the questionnaire without time constraint. However, 15 minutes was the average time taken to complete the responses to the instrument.

Confidentiality and anonymity of results were assured throughout data collection. Data were analyzed as group data in a matched pairs design. Only the responses of those subjects for whom there was both a pre and a post test instrument were included in the data analysis.

Analysis

Responses were coded and statistically analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) with an alpha level of .05. Where significant differences were detected between the groups, the Scheffe Multiple Range Test was utilized to identify where the differences occurred. A t-test for paired samples with an alpha level of .05 was used to determine differences within the groups from the pre to the post test. Subjects were included only if they provided both a pre and a post test.

Results

Knowledge

The scale of possible scores for the knowledge section of the instrument ranged from 0 to 9. This was computed by assigning a score of 1 for each "yes" response, a 0 for each "no" response, and a .5 for each "not sure" response. A total of nine items composed the knowledge section of the instrument. Therefore, a perfect score of "yes" to all items would be 9, indicating a high degree of multi-cultural knowledge.

Group means and standard deviations depicting multicultural knowledge for the four groups prior to the treatment are found in Table 1. These include Dspl-Clsr (N=82), Intg-Clsr (N=102), Dspl-FldB (N=31), Intg-FldB (N=13). The pre test group

mean scores ranged from 7.21 to 8.00 with the standard deviations ra .ging from .06 to 1.46.

Insert Table 1 about here

The analysis of variance presented in Table 1 which compares the four groups with respect to level of multicultural knowledge prior to beginning the courses showed no significant difference ($F = 2.53$, $p = .06$) between the groups. This demonstrated the homogeneity of the groups prior to treatment and provided the basis for accepting hypothesis 1a.

The post test group mean scores ranged from 7.81 to 8.39 with the standard deviations ranging from 0.79 (N=102) to 1.63 (N=13). No significant difference was found in the analysis of variance comparing the four groups on the basis of multicultural knowledge following completion of the courses ($F = 1.98$, $p = .12$). Therefore hypothesis 2a was accepted. See Table 2.

Insert Table 2 about here

However, as demonstrated by Table 3, there was a significant difference ($F = 4.10$, $p = .01$) in the change of multicultural knowledge which provided the basis to reject hypothesis 3a. Three of the four groups increased in multicultural knowledge while the Intg-FldB group decreased. The means for the Intg-Clsr and the Intg-FldB groups were identified as significantly different by the Scheffe Multiple Range Test (Table 4). This indicates that while a gain in multicultural knowledge occurred in the integrated classroom course (Intg-Clsr), multicultural knowledge decreased during the integrated field experience (Intg-FldB). Perhaps one reason why multicultural knowledge appeared to decrease in the Intg-FldB group was due to the small number (N=13) which was dissimilar in size comparison to the other groups. This anomaly may have resulted from the statistical analysis utilizing an N which differed considerably from the others.

Insert Tables 3 & 4 about here

The value of the traditional classroom environment in teaching multicultural knowledge is further supported by the t-test for paired samples which revealed that both the Dspl-Clsr and the Intg-Clsr groups significantly increased in multicultural knowledge during the treatment period. Therefore hypothesis 4a was rejected. Both the Dspl-Clsr and the Intg-Clsr groups increased in knowledge from the pre to the post test as evidenced by scores significant at the .05 level. See Table 5.

Insert Table 5 about here

Attitude

The scale of possible scores for the attitude section of the MPEI ranged from 15 to 75. This was computed by assigning a score of 5 for each "strongly agree" response, a 4 for each "agree" response, a 3 for each "undecided" response, a 2 for each "disagree" response, and a 1 for each "strongly disagree" response. A total of 15 items composed the attitude section of the instrument. Therefore a perfect score of "strongly agree" to all items would be 75, indicating a positive attitude and commitment to multicultural education.

Group means and standard deviations depicting multicultural attitudes for each group prior to the treatment are found in Table 6. The pre test group mean scores ranged from 63.43 to 70.62 with the standard deviations ranging from 3.55 to 6.21.

Insert Table 6 about here

The analysis of variance presented in Table 6 which compares the four groups with respect to level of multicultural attitude prior to beginning the courses showed a significant difference ($F = 8.71$, $p = .00$) between the groups. This demonstrates a lack of homogeneity between the group attitudes prior to the treatment and provided the basis for rejecting hypothesis 1b. The Scheffe Multiple Range Test (Table 7) indicated this difference occurred between Dspl-Clsr and Intg-Clsr as well as

between Dspl-Clsr and Intg-FldB. Prior to exposure to multi-cultural concepts, the Dspl-Clsr students demonstrated a less tolerant multicultural attitude than did students in either of the integrated courses.

Insert Table 7 about here

Following completion of the courses, there was a significant difference found in the analysis of variance comparing the four groups on the basis of multicultural attitude ($F = 8.02$, $p = .00$). Therefore, hypothesis 2b was rejected. See Table 8. The Scheffe Multiple Range Test revealed that this difference existed between the Dspl-Clsr and the Intg-Clsr treatment groups as demonstrated by Table 9. The Intg-Cisr group continued to demonstrate a significantly more positive multicultural attitude following treatment than did the Dspl-Clsr group. The pre test difference in attitude between Dspl-Clsr and Intg-FldB students was not apparent following completion of the courses.

Insert Tables 8 & 9 about here

As demonstrated by Table 10, there was no significant difference ($F = 2.28$, $p = .08$) between the groups in the amount of change of multicultural attitude gained over the treatment period. This supported acceptance of hypothesis 3b. Within the various groups, however, a matched pair t-test (Table 11) indicated that students in the traditional lecture classes (Dspl-Clsr and Intg-Clsr) made significant gains in both knowledge and attitude, while students in the field-based classes (Dspl-FldB and Intg-FldB) did not. As a result, hypothesis 4b was rejected. Thus the practice of requiring these lecture courses as prerequisites for the field-based experiences provides for enhancement of multicultural knowledge and attitude prior to beginning a field-based experience.

Insert Table 10 & 11 about here

Discussion

Multicultural knowledge increased significantly for the discipline-specific classroom group. This supported Banks (1986; 1987) assertion that discipline-specific courses are effective in increasing multicultural tolerance among students. Similarly the integrated classroom group increased in multicultural knowledge. This supported Mitchell (1987) who found that multicultural knowledge improved among students taught in general teacher education courses open to all education majors.

Significant change in multicultural knowledge from pre to post test was not found for either of the field-based groups. However, in support of Banks (1986; 1987), the discipline-specific field-based group declined in multicultural knowledge which was contrary to Mitchell (1987). This decline may be the result of a relatively small sample (N=13) for the integrated field-based group. With such a small number, outliers may have had a greater impact on the mean, possibly causing this effect.

It was interesting to note that the only significant difference in multicultural knowledge acquisition was apparent between the integrated classroom group and the integrated field-based group. While the former increased, the latter decreased. This finding again may have resulted from the small N associated with the integrated field-based group.

Regarding initial attitude toward multicultural issues, the discipline-specific classroom group was significantly less tolerant than either the integrated classroom or the integrated field-based group. This would support the need to include a multicultural emphasis within physical education professional preparation programs. Similarly, while both the discipline-specific classroom group and the integrated classroom group increased in multicultural attitude, the discipline-specific group was still less tolerant following treatment. Again this supports the importance of multicultural instruction within the discipline.

In response to Mitchell's (1987) concern that attempts to strengthen multicultural attitudes and knowledge among pre-service teachers has been generic to teacher education rather than specific to a discipline, this study examined the effectiveness of promoting multicultural attitudes in discipline-specific courses as opposed to integrated courses which included teacher education students from all majors. While the attitude of students in both the discipline-specific and the integrated courses revealed greater tolerance, neither group increased significantly more than the other. Therefore, it appears that the attitudes of preservice teachers regarding multicultural issues can be enhanced both through discipline-specific as well as integrated courses.

Multicultural attitude within the discipline-specific classroom group increased significantly from the pre to the post test. This supports the Swisher and Swisher (1986) assumption that multicultural concepts included within the physical education content promotes the acquisition of an informed social attitude. It was interesting to note that an increase in multicultural attitude also occurred within the integrated classroom group, which suggests that either process is effective in promoting multicultural tolerance.

However, the field-based experiences were not particularly effective in helping the teacher education students gain a higher multicultural tolerance level. Neither the discipline-specific nor the integrated field-based group increased significantly in multicultural attitude between the pre and the post test. This may result from varied experiences that traditionally occur in field-based settings.

Conclusions

Multiculturalism is a viable topic in teacher education programs. Enhancing both knowledge and attitude among preservice teachers is important. This study revealed that both can be effectively enhanced in either a discipline-specific or an integrated approach within a classroom setting.

Table 1

Pre Test Multicultural Knowledge (Between Groups)

Analysis of Variance

Source of Variation		DF	Mean	SD	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Sig. of F
Between Groups		3			13.39	4.47	2.53	.06
Dspl-Clsr	(N=82)		7.21	1.36				
Intg-Clsr	(N=102)		7.29	1.46				
Dspl-FldB	(N=31)		7.79	.97				
Intg-FldB	(N=13)		8.00	.58				
Within Groups		224			395.54	1.77		
Total		227			408.93			

Table 2

Post Test Multicultural Knowledge (Between Groups)

Analysis of Variance

Source of Variation		DF	Mean	SD	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Sig. of F
Between Groups		3			5.82	1.94	1.98	.12
Dspl-Clsr	(N=82)		8.13	1.09				
Intg-Clsr	(N=102)		8.39	0.79				
Dspl-FldB	(N=31)		8.15	0.98				
Intg-FldB	(N=13)		7.81	1.63				
Within Groups		224			219.84	0.98		
Total		227			225.66			

Table 3

Change in Multicultural Knowledge (Between Groups)

Analysis of Variance

Source of Variation		DF	Mean	SD	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Sig. of F
Between Groups		3			28.22	9.41	4.10	.01
Dspl-Clsr	(N=82)		0.93	1.69				
Intg-Clsr	(N=102)		1.09	1.42				
Dspl-FldB	(N=31)		0.35	1.22				
Intg-FldB	(N=13)		–0.19	1.69				
Within Groups		224			513.79	2.29		
Total		227			542.01			

Table 4

Multicultural Knowledge Acquisition Differences

Scheffe Multiple Range Test

	Dspl-Clsr	Intg-Clsr	Dspl-FldB	Intg-FldB
Dspl-Clsr (N=82)	0.93			
Intg-Clsr (N=102)		1.09		*
Dspl-FldB (N=31)			0.35	
Intg-FldB (N=13)				–0.19

*Notes significant difference between groups

Table 5

Multicultural Knowledge Acquisition (Within Group)

T-Test for Paired Samples

Course	Variable	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	T-Value	DF	2-Tail Prob.
Dspl-Clsr	Pre	82	7.21	1.36	-4.96	81	.000*
	Post	82	8.13	1.09			
Intg-Clsr	Pre	102	7.29	1.46	-7.79	101	.000*
	Post	102	8.39	.79			
Dspl-FldB	Pre	31	7.79	.97	-1.62	30	.116
	Post	31	8.15	.98			
Intg-FldB	Pre	13	8.00	.58	.41	12	.689
	Post	13	7.81	1.63			

*α = .05

Table 6

Pre Test Multicultural Attitude (Between Groups)

Analysis of Variance

Source of Variation		DF	Mean	SD	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Sig. of F
Between Groups					893.70	297.90	8.71	.00
Dspl-Clsr	(N=82)		63.43	5.71				
Intg-Clsr	(N=102)		66.85	6.06				
Dspl-FldB	(N=31)		66.55	6.21				
Intg-FldB	(N=13)		70.62	3.55				
Within Groups		224			7657.61	34.19		
Total		227			8551.31			

Table 7

Multicultural Attitude Pre Test Group Differences

Scheffe Multiple Range Test

	Dspl-Clsr	Intg-Clsr	Dspl-FldB	Intg-FldB
Dspl-Clsr (N=82)	63.43	*		*
Intg-Clsr (N=102)		66.85		
Dspl-FldB (N=31)			66.55	
Intg-FldB (N=13)				70.62

*Notes significant difference between groups

Table 8

Post Test Multicultural Attitude (Between Groups)

Analysis of Variance

Source of Variation		DF	Mean	SD	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Sig. of F
Between Groups		3			727.47	242.49	8.02	.00
Dspl-Clsr	(N=82)		66.52	6.10				
Intg-Clsr	(N=102)		70.29	5.21				
Dspl-FldB	(N=31)		67.71	5.12				
Intg-FldB	(N=13)		70.69	4.35				
Within Groups		224			6772.78	30.24		
Total		227			7500.26			

Table 9

Multicultural Attitude Post Test Group Differences

Scheffe Multiple Range Test

	Dspl-Clsr	Intg-Clsr	Dspl-FldB	Intg-FldB
Dspl-Clsr (N=82)	66.52	*		
Intg-Clsr (N=102)		70.29		
Dspl-FldB (N=31)			67.71	
Intg-FldB (N=13)				70.69

*Notes significant difference between groups

Table 10

Change in Multicultural Attitude (Between Groups)

Analysis of Variance

Source of Variation		DF	Mean	SD	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Sig. of F
Between Groups		3			228.78	76.26	2.28	.08
Dspl-Clsr	(N=82)		3.10	6.54				
Intg-Clsr	(N=102)		3.44	5.70				
Dspl-FldB	(N=31)		1.16	4.58				
Intg-FldB	(N=13)		0.08	3.17				
Within Groups		224			7489.48	33.44		
Total		227			7718.26			

Table 11

Multicultural Attitude Acquisition (Within Group)

T-Test for Paired Samples

Course	Variable	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	T-Value	DF	2-Tail Prob.
Dspl-Clsr	Pre	82	63.43	5.71	–4.29	81	.000*
	Post	82	66.52	6.10			
Intg-Clsr	Pre	102	66.85	6.06	–6.10	101	.000*
	Post	102	70.29	5.21			
Dspl-FldB	Pre	31	66.55	6.21	–1.41	30	.168
	Post	31	67.71	5.12			
Intg-FldB	Pre	13	70.62	3.55	–0.09	12	.932
	Post	13	70.69	4.35			

*α = .05

References

Banks, J.A. (1987, May). The social studies, ethnic diversity and social change. Elementary School Journal, 87(5), 531-543.

Banks, J.A. & Lynch, J. (1986). Multicultural education in western societies. London: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Barta, S. & Anderson, T. (1982). Multicultural, nonsexist education: Physical education in Iowa schools. Iowa State Department of Public Instruction: Educational Equity Section, 1-23.

Bucher, C.A. & Wuest, D.A (1987). Foundations of physical education and sport. St. Louis, MO: C.V. Mosby.

First, J.M. (1988). Immigrant children in U.S. public schools: Challenges with solution. Phi Delta Kappan, 70, 205-211.

Garcia, R.L. (1980, May). Curriculum Trends. Waterford, CT: Croft-NEI Publishers.

Gay, G. (1983, Winter). Why multicultural education in teacher preparation programs? Contemporary Education, 54(2), 79-85.

Grant, C.A. (1983, April/May). Multicultural teacher education—Renewing the discussion: A response to Martin Haberman. Journal of Teacher Education, 34(2), 29-32.

Hellison, D.R. (1985). Goals and strategies for teaching physical education. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Jewett, A.E. & Bain, L.L. (1985). The curriculum process in physical education. Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown.

Kendall, F.E. (1983). Diversity in the classroom: A multicultural approach to the education of young children. Early Childhood Education Series. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

Lawson, H.A. & Placek, J.H. (1981). Physical education in the secondary schools. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

McCarthy, C. (1988). Rethinking liberal and radical perspectives on racial inequality in schooling: Making the case for nonsynchrony. Harvard Educational Review, 58, 265-279.

Mitchell, B.M. (1987, Spring). Developing multiculturally-sensitive teachers. Equity and Excellence, 23(1-2), 129-130.

Siedentop, D. (1980). Physical Education: Introductory analysis. Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield.

Sleeter, C.E. & Grant, C.A. (1987). An analysis of multicultural education in the United States. Harvard Educational Review, 57(4), 421-444.

Swisher, K. & Swisher, C. (1986, September). A multicultural physical education approach: An attitude. Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance, 57(7), 35-39.