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Abstract of the Dissertation

Purpose. The purpose of this study was to investigate an instrument, the Cross-cultural Understandings in Multicultural Education (CUME) Assessment, which was devised to measure third grade students' understandings of selected cross-cultural/multicultural concepts. These concepts were derived from a cultural anthropological perspective of human similarities and differences.

Procedures. The study examined the reliability and validity of the CUME Assessment, a multiple-choice, domain-referenced test consisting of twenty-one items based on seven instructional objectives. Third grade students, whose teachers indicated on a Teacher Questionnaire having taught these objectives as a part of the formal curriculum, were assessed. Three instruments were administered to this group (N = 100): the CUME Assessment, the Student Interview, and People Pictures, an instrument devised to measure attitudes toward foreign peoples. The CUME Assessment was examined and evaluated by a group of educational experts. Additionally, a quasi-experimental design was used to compare the CUME scores of the treatment group with those of a control group selected on the basis of the Teacher Questionnaire. Data were analyzed using both descriptive statistics and inferential statistics.

Findings. Analysis of the data established adequate reliability for the CUME Assessment. Expert evaluation of the item-objective congruence of the CUME yielded moderate to high mean scores for all subtests. The total scores of the Student Interview and the CUME Assessment were moderately correlated and significant (p<.001). The total scores of the CUME and those of People Pictures Unfavorable were moderately negatively correlated and significant (p<.001). There were no significant differences between the CUME scores of the treatment group and those of the control group.

Conclusions. A moderately high degree of content validity of the CUME Assessment was established. The investigation indicated adequate support for the reliability, construct validity and the concurrent validity of the assessment.

Recommendations. The CUME Assessment may be justifiably, but cautiously, utilized by educators to assess third grade students. It is an efficiently administered instrument which evaluates the quality of curriculum and instruction.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

Chapter 1 will provide a general introduction to the investigation of the CUME Assessment, an instrument designed to measure third grade students' understanding of selected multicultural/cross-cultural concepts. These concepts have been identified in the literature and in the guidelines of the State of California as ones which are central to multicultural education programs and curriculum. This chapter will provide a brief historical overview of events which led to the development of multicultural education as a component of the curriculum. It will also introduce a conceptual framework for multicultural education as it has emerged from converging educational rationales. Finally, it will introduce the problem central to this investigation, the examination of an assessment instrument.

Historical Overview

In 1954 and 1955, the Brown I and Brown II decisions of the United States Supreme Court marked a turning point of unprecedented magnitude in education. These decisions, which mandated desegregation in districts where de jure segregation was found to exist, became the basis for subsequent court findings related to the concept of equality of educational opportunity for racial, ethnic, linguistic minorities, women, and persons with special educational needs.
After these Supreme Court decisions, the public eye became increasingly focused on the inequitable educational conditions for minorities and the racism inherent in public school systems. The court findings resulted in changes in legislation and educational policies and led to programmatic and curricular changes in local schools. Consequently, desegregation as a national effort to eliminate inequality of opportunity for minorities focused attention on the nature of our culturally pluralistic society. Minority group demands and recognition of inequities led to legislation to provide monies to implement programs in qualifying schools.

While programs for remediation in basic skills areas were established for economically disadvantaged children, ethnic studies programs were also mandated in an attempt to lessen prejudice and racism. These initial ethnic studies programs were often based on the model of cultural pluralism which attempts to elevate the status of certain minority ethnic groups by emphasizing the study of the histories, cultures, and experiences of these selected groups in a context of a separate curriculum (Broudy, 1975).

Many educators, such as James Banks (1979, 1981), have specifically expressed concern over the practice of studying a particular ethnic group in isolation from an examination of the larger human condition and a comparative analysis of other group experiences. Banks feared the development of a kind of we-they attitude among students and teachers and the development of a limited and therefore limiting conceptualization
of ethnicity.

Gradually, in the 1970's, there was recognition that ethnic studies programs based on information about selected minority group cultures and their contributions to the larger society were not sufficiently reducing prejudice and the process of stereotyping. Many educators noted the importance of incorporating into ethnic studies programs the processes which develop positive intergroup relations.

In 1976, the National Education Association Bicentennial Committee of well-known international figures and professional educators reevaluated educational policy statements and reported that human relations skills, group process skills, and those based on cross-cultural and multiethnic insights are critical for education in the twenty-first century (Shane, 1976).

Furthermore, the 1981 Vanderbilt University study on desegregation found all experts and the research in agreement that human relations programs should begin at the earliest grade in order to counteract the formation of negative racial and ethnic attitudes (Hawley et al., 1981). Some educators have responded by advocating that ethnic studies and human relations programs be incorporated into the more broadly conceptualized and inclusive interdisciplinary process and content of multiethnic or multicultural education (Banks, 1979).

Multicultural education has therefore emerged in the literature, and to some extent in practice, as curriculum emphasizing both content and process. It particularly addresses
the need to improve students' knowledge, skills, and attitudes related to intergroup relations. Multicultural education has become an important curricular component in theory, if not always in practice, not only in desegregated schools, but in many schools.

In order to mandate and support the implementation of multicultural education in its schools, the State of California, through legislation resulting in educational policy and specific educational codes, has set standards for viewing diversity as a positive attribute and legitimate focus of study rather than as a deficit to be ignored or overcome. This model not only builds upon specific ethnic awareness programs, but reaches beyond, both conceptually and programmatically, to promote the positive ideal of cultural pluralism as the general acceptance of diversity in our society.

In the Guide for Multicultural Education Content and Context, developed by the California State Department of Education, Office of Intergroup Relations (1977), multicultural education is presented as a program for all children in all schools, regardless of the ethnic and racial composition of the student body. This interdisciplinary process is designed to "ensure the development of cultural awareness, recognition of human dignity, and respect for each person's origins and rights" (p. 2).

A Conceptual Framework

Historically, the field of multicultural education has been conceptualized by various and sometimes conflicting
approaches. In a review of the literature, Gibson (1976) identified these approaches as:

1. Education of the Culturally Different or Benevolent Multiculturalism
2. Education About Cultural Differences or Cultural Understanding
3. Education for Cultural Pluralism
4. Bicultural Education
5. Multicultural Education as the Normal Human Experience.

Gibson, an anthropologist, presented a rationale for and advocated the final approach, Multicultural Education as the Normal Human Experience. It is this model which most closely relates to the description of multicultural education provided by the State of California (1977).

While not without its opponents, this model, multicultural education as the normal human experience, is being strongly reinforced by rationales and research within another developing field of education, "global education," or "global perspectives in education." In the 1970's there occurred an acceleration of efforts by national leaders in various fields to promote the recognition of the need for students to develop the knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary in an emerging global age. Hanvey (1979), Becker (1982), and other leading conceptualizers in the field (Kinghorn, 1979) state that interdependence is the single most important characteristic of this new age and perspective-taking ability a critical skill.
The ideas of interdependence and perspective-taking ability are central, not only to multicultural education, but also to a broadly conceived citizenship education program. These concepts become evident when one examines the increasing rate and evidence of global interdependence, even within the local community. In the expanding interdependent nature of the world, decisions made in the home community can have positive and negative effects on persons living in other nations and vice versa. This condition has implications for the study of basic civic values in an expanded concept of civic education, which includes a less chauvinistic view of the world. Butts (1982), for example, views the inclusion of international human rights within citizenship education as an appropriate link with pluralistic and global themes in the social studies. These same themes are incorporated into multicultural education.

The History-Social Science Framework for California Public Schools, Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve was revised in 1981 and is now more obviously connected theoretically to both global education and multicultural education. The framework emphasizes the theme of diversity throughout the grade level recommendations for study, according to Cortés (1981), a primary author of this document. Embedded within this theme of diversity are the concepts of group identity and individuality and, thus, similarities and differences, in the context of citizenship. In this framework, the State of California (1981) defines a major goal of education:
The central purpose of history-social science education is to prepare students to be humane, rational, understanding, and participating citizens in a diverse society and in an increasingly interdependent world—students who will preserve and continue to advance progress toward a just society (p. 3).

This focus on the theme of diversity within the framework therefore serves to strengthen the content and context of multicultural education as the normal human experience and to legitimate even more the inclusion of generic concepts relevant to multicultural education in other aspects of the curriculum. According to Cortés (1981), students must be prepared to participate in

...not just a society, but a diverse society. Not simply the world, but an increasingly interdependent world. To become good citizens, people need to learn to function in such a society and world, dealing constructively with human diversity while recognizing national and pan-human commonalities (p. 1).

This document has therefore served to broaden the context for and the purpose of the study of diversity.

Historically, the rationale for a conceptualization of multicultural education has received the most attention from scholars. Current issues relate to program development and assessment of these programs and participating students. The scholarly literature and the State of California provide the conceptualization and guidelines for appropriate program
development in this area. Experts now advocate the implementation of multicultural education in the earliest grades.

As a result, many school districts have developed their own instructional programs. One such program is US: A Cultural Mosaic, produced by San Diego City Schools. Another, implemented as a pilot project in a primary school in Stockton, California was developed with federal desegregation funds and operated for a period of almost four years. This program, the ME Program, provided students with multi-disciplinary learning activities infused with comparative content about ethnic groups and approximated Gibson's (1976) recommended approach to multicultural education as the normal human experience. Both programs had well-defined goals and specific, domain referenced learning objectives.

While the Office of Intergroup Relations in the California State Department of Education has published clear guidelines for multicultural education program development, the development of appropriate, valid and reliable assessment instruments has not yet followed. The State has compiled and distributed a list of available programs and assessments, but it does not endorse any of these in particular. Rather, it has developed general guidelines for selecting or developing programs and for evaluating programs. Student assessment, particularly at the primary grade levels, has not been conclusively studied. Many instruments are in use in schools, based on differing conceptualizations of multicultural education, but these instruments frequently lack critical
statistical analysis. Furthermore, the testing of young children raises the issue of the developmental appropriateness of the instrument being used or being considered for use. The area of test development is therefore one in great need of research.

Statement of the Problem

There have been significant efforts by school districts to develop and implement multicultural curriculum, but the development of methods for assessing the effectiveness of this curriculum remains in a nascent stage. Instruments which are reliable, valid and easily and efficiently administered do not exist for assessing understandings of multicultural concepts in young children.

Purpose of the Investigation

The purpose of this study is to analyze and assess an instrument devised to measure third grade students' understandings of selected cross-cultural/multicultural concepts. The instrument, Cross-cultural Understandings in Multicultural Education (CUME) a domain-referenced test, will be investigated.

Research Questions

The present study answers the following questions about the CUME Assessment:

1. What is the association between the CUME Assessment subtotal score, obtained by adding CUME Subtest scores 1-6, (CSUBX), and the CUME Subtest 7 score (CSUB7)? Is objective 7 of the CUME Assessment a comprehensive objective which assesses the whole domain of objectives 1-6?
2. What is the relationship between the total score on the Student Interview (CUME objectives for Subtests 1-6) and the subtotal score obtained by adding CUME Subtest scores 1-6 (CSUBX)? Does an alternate assessment of objectives 1-6 of the CUME Assessment demonstrate the utility of the instrument?

3. What is the relationship between the total score on the Student Interview and the total score on the CUME Assessment?

4. What is the relationship between each of the Subtest scores (objectives 1-6) on the Student Interview and the corresponding Subtest scores 1-6 on the CUME Assessment? Can the validity of individual objectives of CUME be established?

5. What is the relationship between the CUME Assessment total scores and the total scores for People Pictures? Is there a strong relationship of CUME with People Pictures, an alternate assessment of its domain, thus establishing the validity of CUME?

6. What differences exist between the CUME Assessment total scores of a group of students whose teachers reported having taught the cross-cultural concepts of the CUME Assessment objectives 1-7 and a group of students whose teacher reported not having taught these objectives? Assuming accurate teacher reporting on the Teacher Questionnaire, are there significant differences in student scores between the experimental and control groups, thus demonstrating the efficacy of teaching the cross-cultural concepts?

7. What is the content validity of the CUME Assessment, as determined by a panel of experts? To what extent do a panel of experts agree on an evaluation of the content validity of CUME thus demonstrating the degree of utility of the assessment instrument?

Limitations

The following limitations must be applied to the results of this investigation. These findings are based upon the assessment of a small selected sample of third grade students in the Stockton Unified School District and the Lincoln Unified School District. This selection therefore limits the generalizability of the results. A larger sample from a broader geographical region would increase the ability to generalize from the findings. Also, because the selection of third grade classes was based in part upon the socioeconomic
status and ethnic diversity of the student population, these factors limit the findings to communities and schools of similar characteristics.

Furthermore, the study is limited by the inclusion only of students whose teachers volunteered to participate. Additional criteria limiting subject selection were the elimination of limited-English-proficient children and those requiring special education programs and services. These criteria affect the generalizability of the findings as well. Finally, the results are limited by the reliability and validity of the instruments, assessments and questionnaires selected to examine the CUME Assessment.

Assumptions

The study included the following assumptions:

1. It is assumed that the student interview format is a valid and reliable measure of students' understanding of the selected cross-cultural/multicultural concepts.

2. It is assumed that a student who exhibits understanding of the selected cross-cultural/multicultural concepts in an interview will be able to exhibit a corresponding understanding on written assessments.

3. It is assumed that teachers accurately reported the extent to which they taught the selected cross-cultural/multicultural concepts.

4. It is assumed that positive attitudes are reflected by student attainment of the selected cross-cultural/multicultural concepts.
5. It is assumed that a multidisciplinary, multicultural education curriculum implemented in the third grade can improve student attitudes toward ethnically and racially diverse peoples.

Definitions

This dissertation utilizes a number of terms which require specific definition. The following terms will be consistently applied as follows:

Culture--Culture consists of "the various standards for perceiving, evaluating, believing, and doing that... (a person) attributes to other persons as a result of his [her] experience of their actions and admonitions. ... By our definition of culture, the standards that a person thus attributes to a particular set of others are for him [her] the culture of that set... Insofar as a person finds he [she] must attribute different standards to different sets of others, he [she] may also be competent in more than one of them--be competent, that is, in more than one culture" (Goodenough, 1971).

Cultural Pluralism--1) a condition of a society which is made up of a number of cultures, cultural diversity or heterogeneity (Sanday, 1972) 2) a rejection of majority-enforced acculturation and assimilation, maintenance of cultural diversity which is viewed as critical to the survival of particular groups and to the basic tenets of a democratic society (James et al., 1974); "Education for cultural pluralism is actually a strategy for the extension of ethnic groups sociopolitical interests" (Gibson, 1976:12).
Multicultural Education— an interdisciplinary education process designed to ensure the development of human dignity and respect for all peoples; also an interdisciplinary program which emphasizes individual and group similarities and differences in a cross-cultural context (Office of Intergroup Relations, a, 1977; b, 1979). Also, "the process whereby a person develops competencies in multiple systems of standards for perceiving, evaluating, believing, and doing" (Gibson, 1976:15).

Ethnic Group— "any group which is defined or set off by race, religion, or national origin, or some combination of these categories... these categories have a common social-psychological referent in that all of them serve to create, through historical circumstances, a sense of peoplehood" (Gordon, 1964:159).

Ethnic Studies— "The scientific and humanistic study of the histories, cultures, and experiences of the ethnic groups within a society... The scope of ethnic studies is more limited than either multicultural or multiethnic education," however, it is "an essential component of both multicultural and multiethnic education" (Banks, 1979:23).

Multiethnic Education— "refers to the process used by educational institutions to reform their environments so that students from diverse ethnic and racial groups will experience educational equity" (Banks, 1981:13).

Cross Cultural— pertaining to those concepts which are based on knowledge about, awareness of, skill and competencies
in more than one culture and which are utilized in a comparative framework.

**Cultural Universals**--those concepts which pertain to all humans in all societies.

**Biological Needs**--those universal needs which all human beings must have satisfied in order to stay alive; culturally universal needs *(US: A Cultural Mosaic, 1974).*

**Non-biological Needs**--those universal needs not biological in nature; higher level psychosociological needs which add to human satisfaction and which distinguish humans from animals *(US: A Cultural Mosaic, 1974).*

**Summary and Overview**

Since the beginning of the civil rights movement, converging rationales have emerged in the literature in support of multicultural education. Although the State of California has published specific guidelines for program development and selection, the area of assessment of this educational domain has failed to develop concurrently. This study will examine a domain-referenced instrument, the **CUME Assessment**, which was designed to evaluate third grade students' understanding of selected cross-cultural/multicultural concepts.

Chapter 1 has outlined the background and rationale for this study. It has also provided the specific focus of this investigation with the statement of the problem. Limitations were discussed, assumptions were identified and definitions of terms utilized in this study were provided. An overview of the remaining chapters in the dissertation follows.
Chapter 2 reviews the literature pertaining to this study. Included are the following sections:

1. Related Social-Psychological literature;
2. Literature on the Development of Ethnocentrism, National Identity and Orientations Toward Other Peoples and Nations;
3. A Conceptualization of the Field of Multicultural Education;
4. Summary

Chapter 3 describes the methods and procedures selected for this study. It includes a description of the research design, the research questions examined, information about the setting, sample, and selection procedures, a description of the instruments utilized, the procedures for data collection and the methods for the analysis of data.

Chapter 4 provides an analysis of the results of this investigation. It presents the descriptive data on the assessment instruments central to this study. Then the results of the investigation of the seven research questions are examined. Chapter 5 summarizes the findings of the study, draws conclusions, and makes recommendations based on the statistical results presented in Chapter 4.
CHAPTER TWO
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Chapter two presents a review of the literature relevant to this investigation. Multicultural education, by its wide-ranging nature, draws from diverse areas of educational literature. This review is confined to the broad fields of attitude formation, multicultural education, and global education. Included are the following major sections:

1. Related Social-Psychological literature;
2. Literature on the Development of Ethnocentrism, National Identity and Orientation Toward Other Peoples and Nations;
3. A Conceptualization of the Field of Multicultural Education;
4. Summary

Related Social-Psychological Literature

Certain concepts from the social-psychological literature are central to this study. Theories on the process of stereotyping, the development of attitudes and the formation of prejudices continue to evolve and change with new research. This section will provide an overview of these theoretical orientations and examine the related developmental research.

Theories of Stereotyping

Stereotyping, as a process, has been judged to be either
negative or neutral by theorists. Some regard this process as incorrect, irrational and indicative of rigidity while others label stereotypes as immoral. Racial and ethnic stereotypes, for instance, tend to be more often characterized as incorrect (as overgeneralizations), rigid and irrational than those applying to age, sex or social class. Furthermore, according to Miller (1982), stereotypes can be activated in various dimensions. At times, confusion exists as to which category (race, sex, age, etc.) stimulates stereotyping. For example, stereotypes that initially indicate antiblack perceptions may more accurately be based on stereotypes about lower social classes (Smedley & Bayton, 1978).

While some define stereotyping as being morally wrong, others, such as Stephan and Rosenfield (1982), provide a neutral definition of a stereotype as "the set of traits that is used to explain and predict the behavior of members of a socially defined group" (p. 92). Earlier, Vinacke (1957) asserted that "Stereotypes should properly be regarded as concepts-systems, with positive as well as negative functions, having the same general kinds of properties as other concepts, and serving to organize experience as do other concepts" (p. 229).

The major function of labeling different ethnic and racial groups is to categorize and therefore organize otherwise chaotic information in a useful manner. Learned or developed criteria are used to divide the social world into groups. Some of the most frequently used criteria to define group membership are those which are most immediately
perceived such as skin color, language, gender, etc. (Stephen & Rosenfield, 1982).

Based on a review of the research (Smith, Shoben & Rips 1974; Gardner & Taylor 1969; Cantor & Mischel, 1979), Stephan and Rosenfield (1982) described two stages of the stereotyping process. First, the defining features of stereotyped categories of people are used to identify the group of which the individual is a member. Then the associated characteristic features of the group are elicited by the group label. Furthermore, these characteristic features serve to make predictions about and to explain behavior.

Assumptions and expectations for behavior of others help us determine appropriate responses. Stereotypes determine these assumptions and expectations and reduce the uncertainty of the social interaction. However, according to Stephan and Rosenfield, (1982), "The advantage of stereotypes is that they have a basis for interaction; the disadvantage is that they may be wrong" (p. 97).

Not only do stereotypes help to anticipate others' behavior and therefore plan responses perceived as appropriate, they also result in the polarization of traits into those belonging to the in-group and those belonging to the out-group. This polarization functions to maintain identification and a positive self-image of the in-group at the cost of rejecting outgroups. The tendency of racial and ethnic group members to identify with and to favor the ethnic ingroup and to reject outgroups, is basic to human social experience and
is found throughout the world (Campbell, 1967; Brewer, 1979). It has even been demonstrated that the creation of arbitrary groups can lead to ingroup-outgroup bias (Tajfel & Billig, 1974).

Ethnocentrism, or the notion of the centrality of perspective of one's own group, is relevant to the formation of stereotypes in that it biases the labeling of behaviors and traits of ingroups and outgroup members (Campbell, 1967). The trait of ethnocentrism itself is labeled "loyalty" and "patriotism" by the ingroup when referring to itself and the terms "clannishness," "unfriendliness" or "chauvanistic" are used to describe the same behavior of the outgroup (Stephan & Rosenfield, 1982).

Several studies show there is a tendency to attribute positive behavior by ingroup members to underlying traits. On the other hand, the same behavior by an outgroup member is attributed to constraints external to the situation. Likewise, ingroup members are unlikely to be blamed for negative behaviors but the same behaviors of outgroup members are attributed to their negative traits (Mann & Taylor, 1974; Stephan, 1977; Greenberg & Rosenfield, 1979).

Stephan and Rosenfield (1982) have concluded:

...in interaction with strangers, it is likely that people use whatever information is available to them in determining their behavioral intentions. This information almost always includes group membership and the norms governing behavior in the settings in which the
interaction occurs. In some cases it also includes information on the beliefs and personality of the other person. Stereotypes generally lead ingroup members to perceive that outgroup members possess a number of negatively evaluated personality traits, and to believe that they are very different from ingroup members. These assumed dissimilarities are likely to lead to negative attitudes toward outgroups and to a reluctance to interact with outgroup members unless they are counterbalanced by information on similarity or situational norms favoring interracial interaction (p. 115).

Furthermore, overgeneralization, a pervasive characteristic of stereotypes, results in individuals being perceived only as members of a homogeneous group rather than being identified for their unique qualities and merits. This process tends to enhance the assumption of dissimilarities between ingroup and outgroup members, regardless of individual differences. Pettigrew (1982) stated: "...once individuals categorize chicanos, Asians, and blacks, they are likely to exaggerate the commonalities within these groups and overlook the human similarities and universals that bind the groups to each other" (p. 882). It is this categorization which can, therefore, lead to erroneous conclusions and behaviors of a dehumanizing nature.

Kelman (1973) explored the issue of what it means to be fully human in his dehumanization thesis:

To perceive another as human we must accord him identity
and community....To accord a person identity is to perceive him as an individual, independent and distinguishable from others....To accord a person community is to perceive him--along with one's self--as part of an interconnected network of individuals who care for each other, who recognize each other's individuality, and who respect each other's rights (pp. 48-49).

Kelman's (1973) description is essentially the opposite of stereotyping. Dehumanization, a process central to stereotyping, represents the loss of the human attributes of individuality and uniqueness. First, a group of people is defined exclusively in terms of their group membership. Then this identified group is excluded from membership in the human family. Subsequently, the moral restraints against harming this group or a group member, are more easily overcome (Kelman, 1973).

Other psychodynamic factors contribute to the development of stereotyping. One factor, projection, occurs when undesirable traits in the ingroup are attributed to the outgroup (for example, hostility). Another factor is scapegoating, or the process of blaming the outgroup for the problems of the ingroup. Finally, expectations for outgroup behavior based on the stereotypes held by the ingroup often cause actual behaviors by both the ingroup and the outgroup members that lead to confirmation or perceived confirmation of the stereotypes. This, of course, strengthens the original stereotype (Stephan & Rosenfield, 1979).
Theories and Research on Attitude and Prejudice

According to Fisher (1977), the concept of attitude has elicited more definitions than any other in the field of social psychology. The concept is seen as having one component, the affective or evaluative; two components, the affective and the cognitive; or three components, the affective, the cognitive and the behavioral.

Stephan and Rosenfield (1982) reasoned that attitudes are related to both stereotypes and prejudice in that these can be considered to be two different types of attitudes:

For prejudice, the emphasis is on the affective component of attitudes, since prejudice is characterized by negative evaluations. In contrast, stereotypes emphasize the cognitive component of attitudes, since they are sets of beliefs about the traits that characterize a given group. Neither prejudice nor stereotyping has any necessary relationship to discrimination, the behavioral expression of racial and ethnic attitudes. While prejudice may predispose people to respond in negative ways toward members of the negatively evaluated group, the factors that determine whether this predisposition will result in discrimination are complex, including such things as situational constraints that may inhibit discriminatory behavior and the importance of racial and ethnic attitudes in the individual's value system (p. 93).

These types of attitudes, are, nevertheless, interrelated. Jones (1982) asserted:
The beliefs we have about a person or group partially determine our affective orientation to that person or group. Our affective orientation, in turn, is the main determinant of our intentions about how to behave toward the person or group. When dealing with a group, of course, our beliefs about the group and its members are part of our stereotype, and our affective orientation, particularly if it is negative, is referred to as prejudice toward the group (p. 79).

Although theoretically, "prejudice" can refer to either positive or negative attitudes, Jones clarified that it has come to be used almost exclusively in its negative connotation within the field of intergroup relations.

Two additional elements of prejudice (with a negative orientation) were examined by Pettigrew (1982): the norm of rationality, and the norm of human-heartedness. He described prejudice against racial and ethnic groups as, "an antipathy accompanied by a faulty generalization. It may be felt or expressed. It may be directed toward a group as a whole, or toward an individual because he is a member of that group" (p. 821). This type of prejudice, according to Pettigrew, violates the two basic norms of rationality (cognitive) and human-heartedness (affective).

Attitudes are learned and not inborn. They predispose individuals to perceive and interpret experiences and people in a particular way, although attitudes are modifiable and subject to change (Halloren, 1967).
Attitudes are formed, according to Allport (1954), primarily as a result of four factors:

1. Attitudes develop as a result of the integration of numerous specific responses that are similar in some important aspect. The nature of the attitude is thus determined by the accumulation of experience.

2. Attitudes become more specific as a result of more experiences.

3. Attitudes become stronger as a result of traumatic or dramatic experience, whether negative or positive.

4. Attitudes are influenced by the attitudes of others.

This influence typically comes from friends, parents, teachers and, according to Cortes (1981), the larger society. Therefore, both direct and indirect experiences cause the formation of attitudes.

Lambert and Klineberg (1967) concluded that adults with whom children have contact have the greatest influence on attitudes developed by these children. They often transfer their own emotionally charged views of other peoples to these children. These views may in turn be based on limited or indirect experiences with the group. Therefore, children learn to categorize a new experience with another culture by stereotyping. The often fail to examine the specific nature of the experience.

Biased attitudes lead to prejudice. Simpson and Yinger
(1965) have defined prejudice as:

...an emotional, rigid attitude (a predisposition to respond to a certain stimulus in a certain way) toward a group of people. They may be a group only in the mind of the prejudiced person...he categorizes them together, although they may have little similarity of interaction (p. 24).

Therefore, although not all attitudes are prejudices, all prejudices reflect attitudes.

Several theories of prejudice and its maintenance have been analyzed by Rose (1962). These are identified as: (1) the racial and cultural theory, (2) the economic competition theory, (3) the social control theory, (4) the traumatic experience theory, and (5) the frustration-aggression theory.

The racial and cultural theory proposes that humans react with instinctive fear to individuals who are physically and culturally different. Rose refuted this theory as a rationalization for prejudice, which he believes is instead taught to children by adults in their lives. Likewise, he maintained that economic competition, although responsible for some hostility among groups, could not be the basis for some prejudice which endures without an economic rationale.

The social control theory asserts that prejudice is taught in order to perpetuate society's norms and traditions. This theory provides an explanation for continuing, although non-functional, prejudice. It does not explain its origin.

The traumatic experience theory maintains that a shocking
cross-cultural or racial experience in early childhood produces prejudice. Rose concluded, however, that this type of prejudice could only develop if the child had already been exposed to the concept of racial differences.

The final theory analyzed by Rose, the frustration-aggression theory, was also found to be an incomplete explanation of prejudice. This theory holds that when individuals are frustrated in their efforts to satisfy their needs, (such as self-esteem), others and other groups may become targets for hostility. According to Rose, this theory does not explain why some groups are singled out for this discrimination and scapegoating and others are not. He concluded that prejudice formation and maintenance is a complex process with multiple causes.

Miller and Gentry (1980), in a review of research related to children's peer interaction in desegregated schools note the support for the cognitive sophistication interpretation of prejudice reduction. This interpretation emphasizes the role of cognitive complexity, sophistication, and cynicism as deterrents to the development of prejudice:

Prejudice, as well as representing an explanation of group differences via completion of self-fulfilling prophecies, more fundamentally rests on the perception that true group differences do exist. Cognitive sophistication promotes immunity to prejudice by enabling one to deal more effectively with the truth component of stereotypes. It enables one to discriminate between
relative versus absolute differences, to curtail their overgeneralization, and by increasing one's understanding of how such differences arise, to resist prejudicial responses to them (p. 166).

They further note that the support for cognitive sophistication undermines the view of prejudice as a form of displaced hostility which arises from the self-hatred expressed by low self-esteem, high anxiety and a sense of rejection by others.

Developmental Aspects of Stereotyping, Attitude Formation and Prejudice

According to Stephan and Rosenfield (1982), relatively little research has been conducted which directly examines the development of stereotyping in young children. Work by Brigham (1974) is an exception. Brigham found that children have, by the fourth grade, definitely assimilated many of the basic features of cultural stereotypes held by adults in our society. Other studies have, however, examined the developmental aspects of racial and ethnic attitudes.

Since the 1930's researchers have examined racial and ethnic attitudes by presenting children with black and white dolls, pictures, and animals. They have asked questions related to stereotypes of physical attractiveness and perceived appropriateness of behavior potentially stimulated by these objects or pictures (Brigham, 1974; Lerner & Knapp, 1976). These studies have found that white preschool and early-school-age children most frequently choose the white

Studies that examine blacks' racial attitudes using the above stimuli have yielded less conclusive results. Some have found that the white doll is chosen more frequently by blacks as the nice-looking one and the black doll as the bad-looking one (Asher & Allen, 1969; Clark & Clark, 1947; Greenwald & Oppenheim, 1968). In other studies, blacks chose the black doll as looking nice somewhat more often than the white doll, and chose the white doll as looking bad considerably more often than the black doll (Fox & Jordan, 1973; Hraba & Grant, 1970).

These studies have been interpreted as an indication that both preschool and early-school-age black and white children stereotype blacks as being not nice and bad, although white children do this to a greater degree than blacks. A similar interpretation was applied to the results of a study which used stories and pictures of blacks and whites to assess racial attitudes (Williams & Morland, 1976). In this study, children applied value-laden stereotypic racial labels, such as clean, nice, smart, dirty, mean, stupid, etc., to their selected protagonist, either black or white. It was found that white and black children attribute more positive traits and fewer negative traits to whites than to blacks, and that whites do this to a greater extent than do blacks.

Williams, Best and Boswell (1975) had provided prior
evidence that this pro-white bias decreases from grade 1 to grade 4. Stephan and Rosenfield (1982), however, interpreted the results differently. They noted that because the adjectives used in the Williams and Morland (1976) study describe typical black and white stereotypes, "the scores reflect both the cognitive and the evaluative components of racial attitudes" (p. 109). Therefore, high scores (indicating positive attributes for whites and negative attributes for blacks) may connote subjects' knowledge of cultural stereotypes as much as their evaluative preferences for whites.

Carter, Detine-Carter, and Benson (1980) also challenged the notion of pro-white bias and the implication of black self-rejection. They claimed that the majority of studies dealing with race awareness have two major flaws: (a) most researchers conclude that their results reflect racial awareness rather than merely a knowledge of color, and (b) most studies do not present reliability and validity data. Carter, Detine-Carter and Benson (1980) concluded, "It is apparent that the questions proposed to detect racial knowledge or awareness only distinguish children at various levels of colour knowledge" (p. 120).

Other investigations support the dominance of color as a determining factor over race awareness. Even young children have been found to associate white with positive and good, and black with the negative or bad for both objects (Stabler et al., 1969) and adjectives (Williams & Roberson, 1967). Some have interpreted this prejudice against black as a fear of the
dark experience (Boswell & Williams, 1975). Furthermore, Simon (1974), in a study of 3-to-8-year-old white children living in multiethnic families, found that only the adjectives "clean" and "dirty" as opposed to "white" and "black" resulted in high positive and negative attributions, respectively.

In addition to examining the variable of color in racial awareness and preference studies, researchers have investigated other stereotyped categories which might, in fact, result in misinterpretation of the data. St. John and Lewis (1975), for instance, concluded that gender is "a much more important source of cleavage than is race" (p. 351). Other research indicates that interracial acceptance may be: behavior-related rather than race-related (Katz, 1964; Singer, 1967); achievement related rather than race-related (Carter et al., 1975); or more related to socioeconomic status than to race (St. John & Lewis, 1975; Glock et al., 1975).

A few researchers have grappled with the reliability and validity issues. Moreland (1958) and Porter (1971) concluded that when the number of questions used to evaluate racial awareness was increased, the degree of awareness decreased dramatically, even among 5-year-olds. Ballard and Keller's (1976) research with 85 black and white 3-to-7-year-olds compared six measures of racial awareness. They concluded that the picture technique was the most reliable and valid and that assessments using more stimuli are more reliable. The doll studies, in particular, have been questioned as to their reliability and validity for determining racial preference.
Williams et al. (1975) concluded that pro-white bias increases until age 7 and then decreases for white children and moderate pro-white bias is basically constant for black children until the age of 9. Furthermore, in reviewing studies on racial preference, Butler (1976) determined that the tendency for blacks to prefer white stimuli has decreased since 1966 and has resulted in a corresponding black preference for black stimuli.

W. C. Banks (1976), however, has refuted the findings of pro-white bias for blacks. In a reinterpretation of 25 doll studies of black children, he concluded that the phenomenon of black preference for white stimuli has never been demonstrated to exist.

In studies of racial classification, it has generally been concluded that this ability to categorize begins to develop as early as the age of three and appears to be fairly well established by age five (Clark & Clark, 1947; Williams & Morland, 1976). The development of evaluative racial preferences has been found to occur at a later age than the ability to classify by race (Goodman, 1952; Williams & Morland, 1976). Additionally, studies on the development of ethnocentrism among blacks and whites have produced mixed results (Williams & Morland, 1976). Stephan and Rosenfield (1978;1979) have found in several studies that both blacks and whites demonstrate ethnocentric attitudes and behavior by the fifth grade.

In a review of the literature on racial and ethnic
stereotypes, Stephan and Rosenfield (1982) concluded:

...information about the characteristic features of different groups can be acquired before or after the child becomes adept at using the defining features to distinguish between groups. The acquisition of information about the defining and characteristic features of groups may initially be independent of evaluative reactions and preferences for racial and ethnic groups. The norm of ethnocentrism begins to emerge in the early school years, and eventually results in a loose consistency among the cognitive, affective, and behavioral components of racial and ethnic attitudes (pp. 112-113).

Furthermore, Stephan and Rosenfield (1982) speculated that, based on the low correlations among these three components of ethnic and racial attitudes, they may be independently acquired during childhood.

This conclusion, therefore, does not support the linear developmental sequence suggested by theorists such as Goodman (1952). Instead, parallel processes of development related to awareness of racial categories, evaluations of ethnic groups, and integrated ethnic attitudes appear to occur simultaneously (Katz, 1976). While research suggests that the potential to change the attitudes, perceptions, beliefs and behaviors of adults is limited (Banks, 1981), there is evidence that curriculum in the earliest years may have positive effects on racial feelings (Katz & Rosenberg, 1978; Traeger & Yarrow, 1952).
Glock et al. (1975), for instance, determined that the racial attitudes of kindergartners are less negative and crystallized than those of students in the fifth grade. Banks (1981) agreed:

As children grow older, and no systematic efforts are made to modify their racial feelings, they become more bigoted. The curricular implications of this research are clear. To modify children's racial attitudes, a deliberate program of instruction must be structured for that purpose in the earliest grades. The longer we wait, the less our chances for success. By the time the individual reaches adulthood, the chances for successful intervention become almost—but not quite—nil (p. 153). It is therefore essential that curriculum development and implementation in the earliest years of schooling recognize and respond to this critical period of attitudinal development.

It seems clear from the literature that attitudes are learned and result from complex socializing forces in children's life experiences. Because of this complexity, theoretical constructs are abundant in this field of social psychology (Suedfeld, 1971). However, Morse and Allport (1952) considered exaggerated loyalty to one's particular group as being the single most important cause of discrimination. The literature on children's views of foreign peoples chronicles the development of this loyalty which frequently crosses the border into chauvinism. This research provides a
broader perspective of the development of attitudes and pre-
judice and a more comprehensive basis for evaluating
racial/ethnic/cultural discrimination within the United
States.

The Development of Ethnocentrism, National Indentity, and
Orientations Toward Other Peoples and Nations

The development of attitudes toward other peoples and
other nations (out-groups) appears to be related to general
cognitive development. This section will present a brief
review of Piaget's developmental theory and then examine its
relevance to the development of ethnocentrism, national
identity, and orientations toward other peoples and nations.

An Overview of Related Piagetian Theory

Based on Piaget's developmental theory, children of
roughly seven to nine years of age have, for the most part,
entered the stage of intellectual development Piaget called
"concrete operational." Children in this stage can, to
varying degrees, perform operations, classify objects, reason
about two kinds of classes simultaneously, and solve problems
with concrete objects. They can reverse logical thought
processes and de-center thought.

Concrete operational children are less egocentric than
previously. They are capable of understanding a point of view
other than their own (de-centered thought) and are interested
in communication with others. Their language is becoming
progressively more social. While concrete operational chil-
children can deal logically with concrete objects or events, they cannot hypothesize, solve entirely verbal problems or perform more complex operations (Piaget, 1928, 1967, 1970; Piaget & Inhelder, 1969).

Research on the Development of National Identity/Nationalism and its Relation to Other Group Affiliations

According to Torney-Purta (1982), "The classic work on the development of a concept of nation-state and a sense of national identity remains that done thirty years ago with Swiss children by Piaget and Weil" (p. 1). In the early childhood stage of pre-operational cognitive development, according to Piaget and Weil (1951), the child is unconsciously egocentric, presuming itself to be the center of the social world. As reciprocity of thought, a mutual understanding of relationship develops, this egocentric perspective begins to change. This study with the Swiss children found that the construct of reciprocity of thought was positively associated with the child's ability to move out of an egocentric view of the world, demonstrating the development of the concept of homeland and the notion of other countries.

Furthermore, this reciprocity of thought and subsequent ability to understand one's own and other countries was not found to develop until the age of ten or eleven. Piaget and Weil (1951) maintained that as children develop cognitively, they acquire information and develop different ways of observing, processing and synthesizing that information; that
the period between seven and ten years of age is a particularly important time to introduce concepts related to reciprocity. Factual information can, but will not necessarily, help children develop "that reciprocity in thought and action which is vital to the attainment of impartiality and affective understanding" (p. 579).

Many researchers have used Piaget's developmental theory in order to further examine children's concepts of nationality and group membership. It was found by Jahoda (1963) and Remy and others (1975) that children see themselves as the center of their social world until the age of five or six. Their research shows that there is a definite shift from an egocentric perspective to a broader world view by the age of eight. Jahoda (1963), in an interview study of Scottish children, found that the development of the concept of nationality was positively associated with the development of a child's ability to make spatial and geographic distinctions. He found that these children had developed the notion of the "homeland" by the age of eight or nine (Jahoda, 1963).

A study by Moodie (1980) in South Africa confirmed the developmental nature of Piaget's original construct, but found that the original rates of achievement were not substantiated in his sample of English-speakers and Afrikaan-speakers, the two dominant white groups in the country. The Afrikaan speakers were found to be more positive toward national political symbols in a nation which is politically controlled by Afrikaaners. Moodie (1980) suggested that "children
who have difficulty finding symbols of national identity are more likely to remain at a personal level for longer than those for whom a national identity is readily provided" (p. 117). The Afrikaaners, however, expressed increasing negative attitudes toward out-groups in their environment (English-speakers and blacks) with increasing age than did the English speakers.

Researchers such as Moodie (1980), Connell (1971), Cooper (1965), and Hess and Torney (1967) agree that young children have the capacity to develop positive feelings for their nation and its symbols. However, the study by Torney et al. (1975), Civic Education in Ten Countries, demonstrated that there is national variation in the strength of the sense of national identity. This survey also indicated considerable differences in patterns of interest and knowledge of other nations. The U.S. was the only country in which students exhibited substantially less interest in the discussion of international political topics than domestic politics. Jones confirmed these findings in a 1980 study.

Children tend to stereotype their own and other groups because of their inability to organize their socio-political environment in a logical manner (Remy et al., 1975). Lambert and Klineberg (1967) outlined the development of this stereotyping process in their study of youngsters' perceptions of differences between their own and other countries. In this study in the late 1950's conducted in eleven parts of the world, the researchers found that children's views of foreign
peoples are greatly influenced by their own self-concepts and group identity. Prejudice appeared to be developed before children were mature enough to make intellectual judgments. Younger children noted superficial differences among people from various countries; by fourteen, children had moved to a more sophisticated comparison based on personalities or political and religious behavior. At about age ten, American children tended to be interested in foreign peoples who were both similar and dissimilar; by age fourteen, U.S. children were no longer as positive toward dissimilar foreign peoples. The researchers further concluded that sociocultural events are primarily responsible for determining whether or not the favorable attitudes of the pre-teen years remain.

Torney-Purta (1982), in a review of literature, also concluded that, based on the existing research findings, the years between seven or eight and eleven or twelve may be a critical period in which to teach children about other people and nations. Piaget and Weil (1951) asserted:

The child's discovery of his homeland and understanding of other countries is a process of transition from egocentricity to reciprocity....Accordingly, the main problem is not to determine what must or must not be inculcated in the child; it is to discover how to develop reciprocity in thought and action (p. 578).

It is during this critical period, between ages seven or eight and eleven or twelve that the child undergoes a continuous process of construction, exploration, and testing of theories
with regard to society and social interactions, and is most open to and accepting of differences.

**Research on the Environmental Influence on the Development of National Identity/Nationalism**

There are in the schools existing environmental factors which affect student learning of prejudice and bias. In a review of the literature entitled, "Nationalistic vs. Global Education: An Examination of National Bias in the Schools and Its Implications for a Global Society," Nelson (1976) concluded that schooling all over the world promotes patriotism either directly or indirectly. Furthermore, in the process of fostering nationalism, other nations and other peoples to varying degrees become the "enemy." Thus, patriotism becomes linked with chauvinism to become a major obstacle to the formation of a global perspective. A sense of global interdependence, or a global perspective, is perceived to be incompatible with a sense of national identity and patriotism.

Nelson (1976) also examined state curriculum guides from California, Nebraska, New York, Florida and Hawaii. He concluded from a content analysis that these guides supported this linkage of patriotism and chauvinism. In another literature review, Mistakos (1977) concurred with Nelson that the United States is seen as the best country in the world, often at the expense of other nations.

A study conducted by Torney (1969) illustrates this conclusion. Torney interviewed U.S. children in 1968 in which general questions were asked about differences between the
U.S. and other nations. Asian countries, especially Vietnam, were indicated as being different from the U.S. four times more than non-Asian countries. The researcher speculated that student responses were strongly influenced by knowledge of the Vietnam war. In this same interview study, students often negatively referred to the differences based on language use. They viewed foreign peoples' use of languages other than English as not being right or normal. It seems evident that societal stereotypes and prejudices led directly to the rejection of the validity of diversity and the subsequent expression of intense chauvinism.

This section has provided a review of the literature related to the development of ethnocentrism, national identity, and orientations toward other peoples and nations. It has included an overview of Piagetian theory, research on the development of national identity/nationalism and research on the environmental influence on this development. The next section will examine, in a general sense, the relationship of this literature to multicultural education and will present various theoretical and programmatic elements of multicultural education.

A Conceptualization of the Field of Multicultural Education

This section presents a conceptualization of the field of multicultural education by examining the following areas:
1. Related theoretical orientations,
2. State of California policy and guidelines,
3. Global education,
4. Additional related literature on classroom goal structures and political socialization, and
5. Relevant multicultural/global education curriculum and evaluation.

The conceptualization of multicultural education developed in the historical context of the civil rights movement in the United States. The civil rights movement in turn gave birth to a variety of related educational programs: ethnic studies, multiethnic education, intergroup relations, citizenship education, bilingual education, and, to some extent, global perspectives in education. These various programs have been linked by the themes of equity, diversity, universal rights, and concepts of similarities and differences (Banks, 1979; Cortés, 1979; California State Department of Education, 1977; 1979). Ethnic studies and multiethnic education had popularized the notions of cultural pluralism and diversity by the mid-seventies resulting in the emergence of the conceptually broader field of multicultural education (Baker, 1983). Furthermore, several statements and position papers by educational organizations expanded the field conceptually.

The recognition of diversity, cultural pluralism, equity and human rights as broad social science concepts are widely accepted in the educational literature. The American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE, 1974) published an official statement, "No One Model American," endorsing multicultural education as the study of these concepts. Subsequently, the AACTE encouraged its member
institutions to incorporate multicultural components in their teacher education programs.

In 1977, the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (Grant, 1977) put forth a position with regard to cultural pluralism. Its statement emphasized the importance of preserving and recognizing the value of the uniqueness of every cultural group in our society and the mutual influence effect of these groups and their interdependent relationships. The statement also observed that in order for an individual to reach his or her fullest human potential, this person's cultural heritage must be validated (Grant, 1977).

At the state level, California's Office of Intergroup Relations (California State Department of Education, 1977) produced guidelines for the implementation of multicultural education programs at the precollegiate level. Multicultural education was defined as:

...an interdisciplinary process designed to ensure the development of cultural awareness, recognition of human dignity, and respect for each person's origins and rights. The process is meant to promote understanding and acceptance of differences as well as similarities between and among groups. This educational process is not a substitute for desegregation. It should be adapted to function in any school regardless of the schools racial and ethnic composition (p. 2).

It is interesting to note the emphasis on process as opposed to didactic content.
The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE, 1979) also provided a definition of multicultural education:

Multicultural education is preparation for the social, political, and economic realities that individuals experience in culturally diverse and complex human encounters. These realities have both national and international dimensions. This preparation provides a process by which an individual develops competencies for perceiving, believing, and behaving in differential cultural settings (p. 4).

Furthermore, NCATE conceived of multicultural education as an intervention and a continuous evaluation process committed to helping both institutions and individuals develop greater responsiveness to the human condition, to individual cultural integrity and to cultural pluralism in society.

In 1980, the Commission on Multicultural Education of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, AACTE, (Baptiste et al., 1980) emphatically linked multicultural education and global education:

As we enter a new decade, the Commission reaffirms its commitment to multicultural education and a equal educational opportunity for all students. As the interdependency of nations and people around the world accelerates, the need to prepare educators to be aware of, understand, accept, and function effectively in settings and with people culturally different from
themselves is more critical than ever. As teacher educators, we cannot neglect our responsibility to develop programs that reflect the multicultural realities of the United States and the world (p. iii).

This statement, part of a larger report, clearly emphasizes the essential need to educate all students in the multicultural realities of the United States and the world.

Furthermore, the emerging field of global education has strengthened the rationales for multicultural education and multiethnic education with its emphasis on identical components. Gilliom (1981) defines global education as:

Educational efforts designed to cultivate in young people a global perspective and to develop in them the knowledge, skills and attitudes needed to live effectively in an world possessing limited natural resources and characterized by ethnic diversity, cultural pluralism, and increasing interdependence (p. 169).

The ultimate goal of global education, according to Klausen and Leavitt, (1982), is the "development of a comprehension of the differences and similarities within humankind, of how people's actions reflect their perceptions of reality, of the stock and distribution of Earth's resources, and of the concepts of interdependence, global conflict, equity, and human rights" (p. 10). Multicultural education similarly reflects this ultimate goal.

In 1980, a revised statement on multicultural education by the AACTE (Baptiste et al., 1980) emphasized the uniqueness
of each human as a reflection of the infinite diversity of overlapping cultural group memberships and the importance of educational equity:

Multicultural education recognizes individual and cultural differences as they are reflected in learning, human relations, motivational incentives, and communicative skills. In multicultural education all students are recognized as individuals different from one another, because of the interaction between their cultural background and societal and political factors. The sex, race, ethnicity, age, socioeconomic level, physical and mental capabilities, and religion of students must be understood in order to develop an equitable educational environment... Multicultural education is a vehicle for both the examination and delivery of educational equity (p. 1).

This statement clearly extends multicultural education beyond the boundaries of cultural content and ethnic examination.

In addition to organizational support for multicultural education, several significant court decisions and legislative acts led to the legitimization of multicultural education as a valid curricular component and to the concept of the schools as an essential element in the process of social change. The Civil Rights Act of 1964, the 1968 Federal Government Bilingual Education Act, the Ethnic Heritage Studies Act of 1972, the Lau v. Nichols decision in 1974, set the precedents for further federal and state legislation and litigation which
lead to the national mandate for the schools to meet the needs of culturally pluralistic Americans. (This mandate is, however, being challenged by current Federal policies.)

Although many educators accept the concept of multicultural education, it is perhaps the generality of the concept which tends to mask deeper theoretical and philosophical differences among these educators. It is essential to explore these differences in order to comprehend more fully the political dimensions of program selection under the broad rubric of multicultural education.

Related Theoretical Orientations

This section presents the literature related to five major philosophical/theoretical orientations within the broadly conceptualized field of multicultural education. They are:

1. Assimilation
2. Intergroup education
3. Cultural pluralism
4. Multiethic ideology
5. Multicultural education

Assimilation. Until the end of the nineteenth century, immigrants to the United States had arrived primarily from Northern and Western Europe. Some, such as the Germans, had been successful at maintaining their language and customs, in spite of the English-dominant social/political/economic life in America. As new waves of immigrants arrived from Eastern
and Southern Europe near the turn of the century, conflicts, often violent, arose between the "new" immigrants, and the "old" immigrants and native-born Americans. Nativism became a popular expression of the latter groups whose chauvinism and prejudice against the foreign newcomers became the basis for government sponsored propaganda for fervent patriotism.

Concurrently, an ideology of assimilation developed which idealized the concept of a New American who would embody an amalgamation of all ethnic-Americans. This ideology was romanticized in 1908 by the popular play *The Melting Pot* by the English-Jewish author, Israel Zangwill. The vision was of a superior America resulting from this "melting pot." In reality, however, what occurred and continues to occur is the dominant influence of the Anglo-Saxon traditions in shaping the lives and institutions of the United States. Particularly following World War I, new immigrants found that in order to become more acceptable, in order to be able to participate more fully in American life, they had to give up their cultural characteristics and native languages (Tyack, 1974).

The role of the schools in this process of Americanization became the focus of prominent educational leaders as patriotic zeal increased. Cubberley described this role in 1909:

> Everywhere these people [immigrants] tend to settle in groups or settlements and to set up here their national manners, customs, and observances. Our task is to break up these groups or settlements, to assimilate and amalgamate these people as part of our American race, and to
implant in their children, as far as can be done, the Anglo-Saxon conception of righteousness, law and order, and popular government, and to awaken in them a reverence for our democratic institutions and for those things in our national life which we as a people hold to be of abiding worth (pp. 15-16).

The historic promise of the public school system was to give equal opportunity to all through assimilation and many adamantly believed in this promise.

Some, however, did not. The educational critics whose voices rose in response to the intensified quest for civil rights for minorities in the 1960's and 1970's reinterpreted this earlier period of schooling and exposed the great myth of public education. They argued that even for white ethnics, schools had been ineffective on the whole and that minorities had not yet been structurally integrated into American society. The ideal of the melting pot, which emerged as cultural assimilation, resulted in newcomers being stripped of their ethnic cultures and languages as government, industry and schools reinterpreted the ideal (Tyack, 1974; Weinberg, 1977; Sizemore, 1973). This "pressure cooking assimilation became, in truth, Anglo-conformity, as the Americanization movement accelerated, reached its peak in World War I and continued to influence both the professional and popular response to immigration" (Gordon, 1964, p. 99).

Rudyard Kipling's (1940) verse continues to exemplify this dominant ideology:
All good people agree
And all good people say
All nice people like Us are We
And everyone else is They

(p. 769)

The public response to immigration, in spite of assimilation ideology, resulted in the Immigration Act of 1924 which effectively limited the number of immigrants from all but Northern and Western Europe, ending the mass influx of people from Eastern and Southern Europe.

**Intergroup education.** Despite the fact that the assimilationist ideology remained the dominant force in politics and educational policies in the United States until the 1960's, the intergroup education movement emerged after World War II as a response to racial conflict over jobs and housing in Northern and Western cities. Organizations such as the American Council on Education and the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith conducted workshops in the 1940's and 1950's to change the attitudes of teachers and students and reduce prejudice and discrimination toward ethnic minority groups. In the first effort, Hilda Taba and her colleagues Brady and Robinson (1952) produced a theoretical rationale for intergroup education which included four goals:

1. to teach students facts, ideas and concepts which will enable them to understand group relations;

2. to enable them to think rationally and objectively about people, their problems, their relationships, and their cultures;
3. to enable students to develop attitudes, values, feelings and sensitivities which will enable them to live more harmoniously and equitably in a pluralist society; and

4. to help students develop the necessary skills for getting along with individuals and for working successfully in groups.

Another intergroup education leader, Jean D. Grambs (1968) defined the assumptions underlying this approach:

If a person can learn to hate and distrust others, he can learn to like and trust others....This is the basic assumption of intergroup education....Intergroup education similarly assumes that, as a result of selected materials and methods, individuals will be changed, that their attitudes and behaviors toward persons of other groups, and toward members of whatever group they themselves belong to, will be changed. The change will result in more acceptance of persons who differ and more acceptance of one's own difference from others [italics in original] (p. 1).

This approach clearly has a goal of changing attitudes and behavior.

The goals advocated by this movement were never institutionalized at that time. Mainstream educators misinterpreted its goals for all schools and proponents failed to clearly articulate the philosophy and goals of the movement (Banks, 1983).
Cultural pluralism. While the assimilation ideology expressed the dominant thinking of the early twentieth century, a concurrent philosophy emerged which defended the rights of new immigrants to maintain their cultural traditions. Writers Kallen, Bourne and Drachsler argued for cultural democracy as a natural extension of political democracy and asserted that assimilationist policies denied these rights to both individuals and groups. "Cultural pluralism" was described as the ideological vehicle for this new cultural democracy which would negate the superiority and dominance of the Anglo-Saxon ideals and institutions. Isaac Berkson (1920) argued for the right of the individual to decide whether or not to assimilate or to retain native cultural attributes and associations.

While the new ideology of cultural pluralism went unheeded by most at the time that it was developed, it re-emerged as the civil rights movement grew in the 1950's and 60's. Minority groups, particular blacks, had become disillusioned with the assimilationist promise of "The One Best System" which had failed to dispel discrimination in employment, housing and education and overcome structural inequalities in society in spite of litigation and legislation (Tyack, 1974). Banks (1981) wrote, "In a sense, the Black civil rights movement legitimized ethnicity and other alienated ethnic groups began to search for their ethnic roots and to demand more group and human rights" (p. 14).

Assimilation became a cast-off ideal of minorities
replaced in many cases by an extreme interpretation of cultural pluralism-separatism. Brody (1975) made a comparison of the old cultural pluralism of Kallen (1915) with the "new" of Carmichael and Hamilton (1967). Kallen's concept, according to Brody, had not denied the importance of a unified national experience in addition to acceptance of cultural diversity; the new separatist ideology did. It was Brody's contention that interdependence of peoples is a requirement of social organization and one which would not be fulfilled by the new separatist movement.

The separatist movement, founded on cultural pluralism, was spurred on by ethnic consciousness which continued to have an impact upon educators in the 1970's. The impact of ethnic consciousness, did not, however, produce agreement upon definitions and concepts related to cultural pluralism, multi-ethnic studies and multicultural education.

Rivlin and Fraser (1973) asserted that "having a diversity of cultures within a single country can be a threat, a problem, or an asset" (p. 1). While some equated pluralism with tolerance, others (Hazard & Stent, 1973) contended that, "despite a bloody world history of cultural exploitation, cultures have rights paralleling those of people" (p. 15).

Educational critics have assailed the schools for practicing Anglo-conformity and cultural imperialism rather than cultural democracy, which presumes the right of ethnic groups to maintain their subgroup values and identities (Gordon, 1964). Castañeda (1974) articulated this criticism:
American public education has seriously jeopardized one of the three major features of American democracy. While American public education has continually attempted to keep alive the principles of political and economic democracy, it has been antagonistic to the principle of cultural democracy, the right of every American child to remain identified with his [her] own American cultural forms with regard to language, heritage, values, cognition, and motivation (p. 15).

Castañeda's voice reflected the sentiments of others.

Cultural pluralists asserted the rights of distinct groups to coexist in schools and societies, and yet maintain mutually supportive relations (Hazard & Stent, 1973). Some emphasized that the assimilationist tradition must be rejected prior to implementing cultural pluralism in the schools (Arcinéga, 1975); others emphasized that all children should always develop knowledge of diverse American cultures (Sussna, 1970; Seeling, 1975; Washburn, 1975; Banks, 1983). Arcinéga (1975) asserted, "Schools should give equal status and prestige to more than one language, more than one heritage, more than one history, if they are to truly reflect the cultural pluralist view" (p. 164).

The American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, AACTE, published a statement, "No One Model American" in 1973 which emphasized cultural pluralism in its support of multicultural education:

To endorse cultural pluralism is to endorse the principle
that there is no one model American. To endorse cultural pluralism is to understand and appreciate the differences that exist among the nation's citizens. It is to see these differences as a positive force in the continuing development of a society which professes a wholesome respect for the intrinsic worth of every individual. Cultural pluralism is more than a temporary accommodation to racial and ethnic minorities. It is a concept that aims toward a heightened sense of being and of wholeness of the entire society based on the unique strengths of its parts (no pagination).

The AACTE not only advocated cultural pluralism at the center of multicultural education for all, but it rejected both assimilation and separatism as ultimate goals.

Carlson (1976), however, disagreed with this definition on the basis that it failed to take into account the diversity within ethnic groups as well as between ethnic groups. He contended that cultural pluralists have assumed that all minorities prefer pluralism to assimilation and that, therefore, the ongoing process of acculturation in this country has not been taken into account. Furthermore, according to Carlson, the emphasis on differences may obscure reality, causing overgeneralization and labeling. It is clear that cultural pluralism, as an ideology, is a highly political and therefore highly controversial orientation. It has attracted strong advocates and equally determined detractors.
Multiethnic education. Multiethnic education emerged from the ideology of cultural pluralism and, in part, as a response to criticisms of this ideology. In his analysis of the emergence of multiethnic/multicultural education, or pluralistic education, Banks (1981) described several phases of development and advocated a model for multiethnic education. He identified these phases as:

1. Monoethnic courses. These are based on the assumption that only a member of an ethnic group should teach a course on that group and that only students of the selected ethnic heritage need to study a subject such as Chicano history. This type of course focuses on white racism and the oppression of minorities.

2. Multiethnic studies courses. These courses use a comparative approach while focusing on the similarities and differences of several ethnic cultures at once. These courses explore diverse perspectives in a more global, scholarly, comparative context and are less politically oriented. They are intended for all students and emphasize useful concepts, generalizations and theories.

3. Multiethnic education. This phase develops when educators recognize the need for substantial educational reform in order to ensure equality in schooling for minorities. According to Banks (1981), "Educators began to realize that ethnic studies were necessary but not sufficient to bring about effective educational reform and equity" (pp. 20-21). Multiethnic education is based on the total school
environment as the unit of change.

4. Multicultural education. This is a school reform movement that incorporates multiethnic education but extends the focus to include not only ethnic groups, but other cultural groups as well, and a comparison of the problems these groups experience. It may or may not emphasize the pluralistic educators' concerns for prejudice, alienation and racial discrimination.

5. Institutionalization. This is the process in which the key and most effective components of phases one through four permeate the school environment and curriculum.

As a strong advocate for multiethnic education, Banks (1981) emphasized its goals to "provide all students with the skills, attitudes, and knowledge they need to function within their ethnic culture, the mainstream culture, as well as within and across other ethnic cultures" (p. 26). Another major goal (Banks, 1981) is to "reduce the pain and discrimination members of some ethnic and racial groups experience in the schools and in the wider society because of their unique racial, physical, and cultural characteristics" (p. 26).

Yet another key goal of multiethnic-multicultural education, according to Banks (1981), is to help students develop cross-cultural competency. He asserted that educators need to develop standards for assessing this critical competency for both students of teacher education and for students in elementary and secondary schools. Banks states:

Helping students to develop cross-cultural competency is
one of the most important goals of multiethnic education. However, we need new conceptualizations of cross-cultural functioning in order to identify objectives and to measure outcomes in cross-cultural education (p. 33). Banks appears to strongly advocate the investigation of assessment related to cross-cultural education.

The analysis of the phases of development of pluralistic education by Banks (1981) led to his proposal for an alternative "multiethnic ideology" which he viewed as an eclectic and centric adaptation of the two extremes of cultural pluralism (as political separatism) and assimilation. He noted that, "Exaggerating the extent of cultural differences between and among ethnic groups might be as detrimental for school policy as ignoring those which are real" (p. 67).

This ideology recognizes the reality of a common culture, according to Banks (1981), but advocates its reassessment: "We need to determine what the common culture actually is and make sure that our new conceptualization reflects the social realities within this nation, and that it is not a mythical and idealized view of American life and culture" (p. 68). Yet at the same time that this ideology advocates acceptance of the norms and values of diverse ethnic groups, it promotes adherence to the idealized values of dominant American culture, such as justice, equality, and human dignity in order to advance societal cohesion. It depends upon a view of American society in which multiple acculturation is an ongoing reality of cultural groups, producing a continually evolving
universal culture. This process refutes the popular but inaccurate notion of the universal culture being Anglo-Saxon, but rather, reflects a biculturalization for most Americans (Banks, 1981).

**Multicultural education.** The conceptualization of multicultural education has emerged as an eclectic combination of cultural anthropology, pluralism, multiethnic education, intergroup relations, citizenship education, and international or global perspectives education. These various aspects have been linked by the themes of diversity, universal human rights, and concepts of similarities and differences. According to Baker (1983), multiethnic education is an essential component of multicultural education in content, process and social change goals. Historically, multicultural education emerged from ethnic studies and multiethnic education which had popularized the notions of cultural pluralism and diversity by the mid-seventies. Baker (1983) states:

> While multiethnic education has as its focus the content of the study of ethnic groups, multicultural education emphasizes the larger cultural groups that make up society and seeks to examine and respond to the impact of ethnicity upon the larger cultural group. Multicultural education looks at the many facets of diversity and helps to explain the concurrent involvement of individuals in more than one group (p. 12).

Baker (1983) further clarifies her notion of cultural groups
and the general concept of diversity in the following definition of multicultural education as:

a process through which individuals are exposed to the diversity that exists in the United States and in the world. This diversity includes ethnic and racial minority populations, religious groups, language differences, sex differences, economic conditions, regional limitations, physical and mental disabilities, age groups, and other distinctions (p. 9).

It is the role of the school, therefore, to validate diversity but within a framework of universal concepts and understandings.

Gollnick and Chinn (1983) approach multicultural education from its broad conceptual base of culture. They, in contrast to other educators, have not limited the approach to ethnicity, but focus on the complexity of pluralism in the United States. They note that "an individual's cultural identity is based not only on ethnicity but also on such factors as socioeconomic level, religion, and sex of the individual" (p. viii). In their examination of multicultural education, the concept of multiple group membership in the macroculture and various microcultures is central.

Gibson (1976), in a systematic analysis of several existing approaches to the conceptualization of multicultural education within the United States, clarified these approaches and their underlying assumptions. From her review of the literature she derived five basic approaches, four of them
programmatic based on educational literature and the fifth one stemming from a perspective of both education and culture based on the anthropological literature on cultural pluralism, ethnicity and acculturation. The following discussion section uses Gibson's topology to further explore the conceptualization of multicultural education.

1. Education of the Cultural Different or Benevolent Multiculturalism. This approach, in theory, rejects the minority-culture deficit model which was the premise for compensatory education programs (Baratz & Baratz, 1970; Valentine, 1971) and exchanges it for the Cultural Difference Model which is based on an assumption of parity of cultures. This model presumes to equalize educational opportunity for culturally different students by increasing home/school cultural compatibility with programs that will increase students' academic success. Rather than trying to change the child, as advocated by programs based on the cultural deficit hypothesis, proponents of this approach call for altering the school to fit minority cultures as well as the mainstream culture. It is assumed that equal educational opportunity must be judged on outcome and benefit to minority children in addition to access (Mazon & Arciniega, 1974).

While this approach acknowledges the poor performance of certain minority group students (Jencks, 1972; Coleman, 1966) it rejects the assumption that this condition is caused by cultural disadvantage rather than cultural difference. Lee and Groper (1974) who have labeled this the Cultural
Difference model, delineate an important element of its strength as the provision to examine functional cultural variations within a meaningful context as opposed to looking at cultural customs in isolation as exotic phenomena. This model assumes cultural parity and a non-hierarchical relationship among all cultures.

The Cultural Difference model contains an unexamined assumption that home/school cultural dissonance is the cause of minority groups' school failure and that multicultural education based on cultural difference will solve this schooling problem (Pettigrew, L. E., 1974). Another major shortcoming of this model, according to Gibson (1976), is that in actual implementation with minority groups, it may regress to the compensatory approach it seeks to replace. Hunter (1974), James (et al., 1974), Hilliard (1974), and others, have emphasized the detrimental paternalistic aspects of this approach in that it assumes that oppressed groups only need help and have little to offer.

2. Education About Cultural Differences or Cultural Understanding. This approach targets all students in teaching about cultural differences. Its purpose it to teach students to value cultural differences, to understand the meaning of cultural concepts, to accept others' rights to be different, and therefore to decrease racism and prejudice and to increase social justice. It is the cultural enrichment approach of ethnic studies which grew out of the struggles of ethnic groups in the United States to insure that their histories,
contributions and perspectives would be sensitively included as a significant aspect of curriculum (Wynn, 1974; Banks, 1981).

While the intended outcomes of this approach are appropriate, its unintended outcomes and expectations, according to L. E. Pettigrew (1974), are major shortcomings.

Multi-culturalism focuses its concepts on behavioral differences exclusively rather than on both similarities between and among all segments of the society. To continue to focus on differences is perhaps to continue subtly to support the inferiority-superiority hypothesis while at the same time postulating an acceptance on a level of party of differential behavior manifestations from all cultures. There is an inherent conflict in this approach since it tends to reinforce the seldom verbalized, but currently accepted belief that ethnic minority pupils cannot manifest an achievement level equal to that of the majority of white pupils. At the same time, it proposes that all cultural values and their resultant behaviors are equal (p. 82).

Pettigrew expressed fears that the inherent conflict in this approach will continue to promote teacher training practices which are paternalistic and which reinforce negative stereotypes about ethnic and racial minorities.

In addition, Garcia (1974) noted the unintended outcome of neglecting intragroup differences which leads to the danger of stereotyping. Still another unintended outcome of this
approach is that of romanticizing ethnicity and culture through positive stereotyping (Kleinfeld, 1975). A third shortcoming of this ethnic studies approach is that it is purported to diminish prejudice and solve the fundamental problem of inequality, which, besides being a social problem, is also a problem of sociological structures, processes and conditions (Gibson, 1976).

3. Education for Cultural Pluralism. The term cultural pluralism is difficult to depict. In its most loosely used sense, it is simply a synonym for cultural diversity. However, multicultural education for cultural pluralism is, for some, an ideal form of social organization which requires social action to achieve.

When cultural pluralism is conceived of as the equivalent of diversity, it is most likely incorporated in one or both of the first two approaches. However, when it is viewed as an idealized social structure which must be promoted, it involves the rejection of both the acculturation and assimilation models and of the melting pot theory and practice.

Proponents argue that the power of minority groups in society can be increased by maintaining cultural diversity through the extension of cultural pluralism in the schools. Gibson (1976) asserted that, "Education for cultural pluralism seeks to increase reward parity among groups by decreasing the power of the majority" (p. 11). This approach, according to Gibson confuses ideology and theory: it is actually a "strategy for the extension of ethnic groups' sociopolitical
interest" (p. 12), and therefore needs to be considered separately from the other approaches. Furthermore, "Education for cultural pluralism seeks to create and preserve boundaries between groups, while multicultural education, by every other definition, seeks to promote at least some sort of competence in operating across cultural and ethnic boundaries (p. 13).

4. Bicultural Education. This approach (and term) is most often used in conjunction with bilingual education. This form of multicultural education is viewed as a reciprocal process both for minority and majority culture students in which all learners develop competencies and skills in operating successfully in two different cultures and languages.

Bilingual Education rejects assimilation and fusion but legitimates acculturation in the recognition that it can lead to dual participation in cultural systems. It is limited by its over-emphasis on one language and cultural group.

5. Multicultural Education as the Normal Human Experience. Unlike the other four approaches, this approach is based on key concepts of education and culture from an anthropological context, rather than on literature of multicultural/bicultural education. In this context, education is viewed as part of a general human process of socialization; a cultural transmission. Gibson (1976) views this conceptualization as a basis for the evaluation of the other four approaches.

This approach replaces the idea of cultural/ethnic groups
and substitutes in its place the generic concept of groups, or sets of people, engaged in common activities. According to Goodenough (1971), this orientation thus distributes ethnic groups across a range of "cultural" groups or sets. Gibson (1976) stated that:

such a perspective, if adopted by proponents of multicultural education programs, would alleviate the tendency to stereotype students according to ethnic identities and would promote a fuller exploration of the similarities as well as differences between students of different ethnic groups (p. 15).

This perspective is in obvious contradistinction to those approaches based on an analysis of differences only.

Furthermore, the development of competence in a new culture requires interaction with sets of people who are already competent in that culture. Multicultural education promotes competence in multiple cultures, but not changes in primary social identification (Goodenough, 1971). Therefore, education for cultural pluralism, an ideology which maintains group boundaries as a political strategy for increasing group power, and multicultural education are mutually exclusive, from this conceptual base (Gibson, 1976).

"Multicultural education as the normal human experience" theoretically allows individuals and groups to fully express cultural diversity and recognize cross-cultural similarities rather than to limit themselves within potentially restrictive dichotomies. It supports the role of education, which is,
according to Gibson (1976), to find ways to promote rather than inhibit the acquisition of multicultural competencies.

Lewis (1976) posited that it is, however, impossible to consider the acquisition of these competencies for minority children in schools, without recognition of the racism and domination of the majority culture in society and therefore within its institutions. The resulting societal prejudice potentially creates conditions of inequality in the classroom which may make it impossible for minority students to have equal access to learning broader competencies which would enable them to function in the larger society. Lewis assumed structural inequality in the classroom which would serve to deny the legitimacy of minority group cultures, and their inherent cultural competencies.

In contrast, Gibson's (1976) model of "multiculturalism as the normal human experience" rests on the assumption of equality of cultures in the classroom and therefore presumes equal status of individuals and groups in the learning environment (Goodenough, 1976). Gibson (1976) suggested that this assumed condition requires further examination. She postulated that:

Given that individuals can and normally do develop competencies in multiple cultures, the question for educators is how best to create learning environments which promote rather than inhibit the acquisition of multicultural competencies. Social scientists can help to answer this question by studying the relationship
between the maintenance of group boundaries and development of cultural competence across such boundaries. By focusing on school situations, such an avenue for research may yield important insights for promoting multicultural education as part of the formal education process (p. 16).

This notion of "multicultural competencies" would appear to be in alignment with the general trend in education toward a competency-based curriculum.

It is clear that conflicting ideologies and conceptualizations of the general field of multicultural education will continue to exist in the literature. It is also possible that, as a given approach or combination of approaches become institutionalized through educational policy and practice, clarity of purpose will emerge.

State of California Policy and Guidelines

Educational leaders in the State of California appear to have emphasized Gibson's fifth approach to multicultural education, "multicultural education as the normal human experience." State Board of Education policy (California State Department of Education, 1977) adopted on March 9, 1978, states that the basic aim of multicultural education is:

...to help students accept themselves and other persons as having dignity and worth. To achieve this aim, a multicultural program should place emphasis on similarities and differences among individuals and groups. Similarities should be viewed as those
characteristics which make people human, and differences should be viewed as those characteristics which make each person or group unique and special. In this context, differences are viewed as positive. Thus, students will be helped to respect and accept a wide range of diversity, including physical differences, emotional differences, cultural differences, and differences in life-styles among individuals and groups (p. 5).

Thus, this policy statement clearly supports multicultural education as (a) the study of similarities in the context of human commonalities and cultural universals, (b) the examination of the uniqueness of individuals and groups, and (c) the recognition of the universal human need for psychological/sociological security.

Furthermore, the California State Department of Education handbook, Planning for Multicultural Education as a Part of School Improvement (California State Department of Education, 1979), indicates that a multicultural instructional program should be "cross-cultural in nature instead of being structured upon separate and distinct racial or ethnic groups" (p. 9). It cautions that the separate-group approach may strengthen stereotypes and reinforce ideas of segregation and separation: "A cross-cultural approach is more likely to promote respect and acceptance of all individuals and groups" (p. 9).

The state recommends that appropriate cognitive skills, positive affective behaviors, and self-concept enhancement be
major foci of a multicultural education program, in addition to factual information. At the primary level, these programs should deal with the more immediate experiences of the child, such as the individual, the family, and the community. People in the community are to be used to help students understand similarities and differences among individuals and groups. Furthermore, concepts selected for study should be developmentally appropriate for young children (California State Department of Education, 1979).

Clearly, the State of California has adopted a policy for the implementation of a broad, anthropologically based conceptualization of multicultural education. The next section will present additional support for this conceptualization based on the literature from the emerging global perspectives education movement.

Global Education and its Relationship to Multicultural Education

While the process of establishing multicultural education in the school curriculum was initiated as a part of the larger civil rights movement, a more comprehensive rationale for multicultural education has recently begun to emerge. The decade of the 1970's launched an intensification of efforts by educators, political scientists, economists, environmentalists and international leaders to acknowledge and respond to the increasing interdependent nature of "spaceship earth."

In the education field, these concerns and efforts began to lead to a translation of international education into global education or global perspectives education. Like
multicultural education, global education is a school reform movement which, in its most comprehensive form, emphasizes content and process and an integration and infusion of these elements across the curriculum, kindergarten through grade twelve.

While this emerging field of global education is, by its nature, broader in scope, it has a significant emphasis on cultural diversity and a major goal of improving cross-cultural understanding. Many educational leaders believe it is essential that we find the means to convey the importance of a global perspective to our citizens and to teach them the skills, knowledge and attitudes to function effectively in a world of rapidly increasing interdependence among diverse nations and peoples (Cleveland, 1980). And, as has been presented, the research on cognitive development related to attitudes and bias toward those who are different from oneself, directly relate multicultural education and global education.

According to the Report to the President from the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies, Strength Through Wisdom, A Critique of U.S. Capability (Perkins, 1979), also known as the Perkins Report, the majority of our pre-collegiate school systems, colleges and universities are not recognizing the need for their students to develop competencies to live in this ever-shrinking world. The concern for the "basics" of reading,
writing and mathematics has dominated the curricular focus for many years.

The Perkins Report emphasized that educators must recognize the new "basic" of understanding our global interrelatedness. It furthermore indicated that we, as a nation, can no longer afford to be stuck in the outmoded curriculum approaches of the past which, along with the mass media and other parts of our culture, perpetuate extensive myths about American society and Americanism that are ethnocentric and culturally encapsulating.

In a recently prepared pamphlet "A Global Perspective for Teacher Education," the International Council of Education for Teaching (ICET) and the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) (1983), succinctly defined and advocated education with a global perspective and presented a cogent rationale for its implementation. They stated that:

International education with a global perspective is more concerned with issues and problems that affect large numbers of persons, more concerned with the fact that all humans share common needs and cannot pursue their destinies in isolation... [It] should be considered a fundamental part of basic education (No pagination).

Hanvey (1979) defined this educational component as incorporating the following elements: perspective consciousness, state of the planet awareness, cross-cultural awareness, sense of global dynamics, awareness of emergent human goals, and awareness of ethical problems in the global context.
The developing field of global education was broadly conceived by Anderson (1979), Hanvey (1979), and others as citizenship education in a newly-emerging world paradigm. Their arguments are substantiated by considerable research on what U.S. students know about the world. Several major studies indicate that students have critical misconceptions about other nations, people, and global issues. In addition, their attitudes in general indicate an ethnocentrism and chauvinism that are the antithesis of a global perspective (Barrows, 1980; Pike & Barrows, 1979; Torney et al., 1975). An outcome of one such study suggests grave implications for any effort to globalize the curriculum: education majors scored the lowest in a national survey on what college students know about the world (Barrows, 1980).

According to Becker (1982), in spite of the attention of many eminent scholars to the effort of developing a coherent and uniform view of global education, such definition has not emerged. Becker's own view is that what is needed is not so much to broaden knowledge, but to reinterpret it through an understanding of global systems. Hanvey (1979) concurred:

The hallmark trait of the global approach seems to be the persistent attempt to show relationships, to show that problems ordinarily treated separately are in fact connected, to show that the individual is connected into larger biosocial systems and that this has implications for responsible personal choices and to show that our
best understanding of complex issues comes from the application of interdisciplinary analysis (p. 9). Hanvey (1979), and other leading conceptualizers in the field, have concluded that this interdependence is probably the most essential and basic concept within the structure of global education.

The report from the National Commission on the Reform of Secondary Education, a Report to the Public and the Profession, and especially the recent Perkins Report, have done much to hasten the process of implementation of global education programs. The theoretical conceptualization of the field appears to be consistent with regard to the central constructs of "interdependence" and multiple perspectives of reality (Becker, 1973 and 1979; Anderson, 1979; and King et al., 1976).

Several educators have begun to focus on an analysis of the relationship between multicultural education and global education. Carlos Cortés (1979) has cogently delineated this essential relationship:

Although they differ in emphasis, these two educational reform movements are linked by their common concerns. Both seek to improve human and intergroup relations. Both seek to increase awareness of the impact of global and national forces, trends, and institutions on different groups of peoples including nations and ethnic groups. Both seek to reduce stereotyping and increase intergroup understanding. Both seek to help students
comprehend the significance of human diversity, while at the same time recognizing underlying, globe-girdling commonalities (p. 84).

It is clear that both multicultural education and global education share major areas of concern and emphasis.

In his assessment of whether or not multiethnic education and global education can be partners in the 1980's, Cortés (1983) examined both their similarities and differences. Both have similar goals for improving human understanding, communication and equity. However, while global education is predicated on the condition of growing interrelatedness of all peoples, multiethnic education emerged as a response to increased recognition of diversity within the U.S. Cortés (1983) analyzed this relationship:

The most important force for cooperation between global and multiethnic education is the similarity of goals and content. Both reform movements seek to improve intergroup and global understandings and relations, to improve multicultural communication, to reduce stereotyping, and to help students comprehend human diversity without losing sight of the traits that all peoples share. Four areas of mutual interest—the meanings of groups, image formation, perspective, and intercultural communication—exemplify the possibilities of partnership between multiethnic and global education (p. 569).

Although Cortés uses the term "multiethnic education," it is clear that he has broadly conceptualized this term.
Cortés (1983) expressed the belief that, because of these commonalities and because of the problem of competition for scarce time allotment in the curriculum, global education and multiethnic education might find cooperation a more effective strategy. He also asserted that "multicultural education provides a logical meeting ground for multiethnic and global education" (p. 571). It is within multicultural education programs that multiethnic and global education are combined. Both seek a better future for all, through helping to make today's students more constructive future actors on the changing state of the world.

Banks (1981) suggested that there are some problems in linking global education with multiethnic education. These he identified as: (1) the possibility that the teacher will emphasize foreign cultural content but eliminate content related to American ethnic groups, and (2) the possibility that teachers may ignore the distinct American aspect of United States ethnic groups in favor of the study of original homeland culture.

Banks (1981) does, however, recognize the important learning outcomes that can result from linking multiethnic and global education. Both reform movements are attempting to help students acquire similar skills, attitudes and behaviors. Both have major goals of helping students develop cross-cultural competency and perspective-taking ability related to ethnic and nationality groups.

Additionally, Banks theorizes that there is a sequential
development of identifications related to these movements: Students can develop clarified and reflective global identifications only after they have developed clarified and reflective ethnic and national identifications... Many students from all ethnic groups come to school with confused, unexamined and nonreflective ethnic and national identifications and with almost no global identification or consciousness. Identity is a concept that relates to all that we are...the school should help students to develop three kinds of highly interrelated identifications that are of special concern to multi-ethnic educators: an ethnic, a national and a global identification (pp.213-214). (See Figure 1.) Furthermore, these identifications must be clarified, reflective and positive. Students with such identifications will have the competencies and desires to take action in support of their ethnic, national and global communities' values and norms. It is these cross-cultural competencies which the school should teach to support the process of participatory cultural democracy (Banks, 1981).

The philosophical/theoretical and pragmatic basis for global education clearly expands the rationale for multicultural education. The next section will examine additional related literature.

Additional Related Literature

This section will present additional literature which is related to this investigation. It will include literature on
Figure 1. The Relationship Between Personal Identity and Ethnic, National, and Global Identifications. Personal identity is the "I" that results from the life-long binding together of the many threads of a person's life. These threads include experience, culture, heredity, as well as identifications with significant others and many different groups, such as one's ethnic group, nation, and global community. Note. From Multiethnic Education, Theory and Practice (p. 219) by J. A. Banks, 1981, Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc. Copyright 1981 by Allyn and Bacon, Inc. Reprinted by permission.
Research on classroom goal structures. The research on cooperative learning and goal structures, by definition, form a natural link with the multicultural education/global education concept of interdependence. Deutsch (1962) and Johnson and Johnson (1975) identified and described three major categories of goal structures: individualistic, competitive, and cooperative. In their discussion of the cognitive prerequisites for working cooperatively in groups, Johnson and Johnson (1975) identified the need to be able to recognize that outcomes in a given situation are a result of "mutual causation." One must perceive relationships between decisions, actions and resulting consequences. Kagen and Madsen (1971) described this mutual causation awareness as "interdependency" and, based on their research, concluded that this trait develops after age five but before age ten.

The appropriate use of classroom goal structures appears to be a critical environmental factor leading to successful learning (Johnson & Johnson, 1978). Cooperatively structured learning leads to greater mastery, retention, and transfer of concepts, rules and principles, according to Johnson and Johnson (Johnson et al., 1981). Reviews of the literature on cooperative learning by Sharan (1980) and Slavin (1980) support these findings. In addition, these reviews conclude that cooperative learning strategies significantly improve intergroup relations in ethnically mixed classrooms.
Additionally, it is significant that greater cognitive and emotional perspective taking is associated with cooperative learning than with either individualistic or competitive goal structures (Bridgeman, 1977; Johnson et al., 1976). Social perspective taking is defined by Johnson and Johnson as the ability to understand how a situation appears to another person and how that person is reacting cognitively and emotionally to the situation. Furthermore, an actualized definition of interdependence is based on a person's ability to see another's point of view (Johnson & Johnson, 1978).

In conclusion, the literature identifies a positive relationship between concept attainment and cooperative goal structures. In addition, greater perspective-taking ability has been shown to occur as a result of students engaging in cooperative group learning.

Related findings from the political socialization literature. Given the rationales for the need of our citizens to develop cross-cultural, perspective-taking ability, a larger question emerges as to the proper role of the school and curriculum in this process of political socialization. Selected research findings from the literature in political socialization are presented in this section.

Ehman, in a 1980 review of the literature, concluded that schooling is important in transmitting knowledge about the political system and that the schooling effect increases from elementary to high school. However, it appears to be less important than the family and the media in shaping political
attitudes and behavior. There tends to be an exception with regard to this last influence for members of low social status groups, whose attitudes appear to be more influenced by school curriculum than members of higher status groups.

Ehman asserted that systematic and carefully designed curriculum programs can improve political knowledge at both the elementary and secondary levels. In addition, he found that the credibility of the teacher appears to be a key attribute in determining teacher influence on political attitudes of students.

Classroom climate, as influenced by the leadership of the teacher, has also been shown to be strongly linked to the development of student attitudes (Ehman, 1980). A climate of openness and acceptance of expression of diverse opinions and one where students have rights and power to influence classroom procedures has been shown to be linked positively and consistently with the development of positive political attitudes.

Likewise, student participation in school government and extra-curricular activities is positively related to these attitudes. The research suggests that it is the latent curriculum of how students are taught that influences attitudes, and therefore effective citizenship, rather than the manifest curriculum which affects knowledge but not political participation (Ehman, 1980). Ehman concludes that field experimental research must include:

1. an investigation of specific curriculum materials and
approaches as to their influence on political attitudes as well as knowledge;

2. an investigation of the teacher credibility factor and
3. an investigation of the dimensions of classroom climate.

These findings confirmed the results of the International Education Association, IEA, national survey published by Torney, Oppenheim and Faran in 1975. It was found in nearly all nine countries that scores of scales measuring democratic values and interest in political participation were highest among students whose classes consisted, not of printed drills and rote learning, but of many opportunities for student centered discussion in an atmosphere of acceptance of and respect for diverse opinions. An earlier study by Bellak (1966) resulted in similar findings, and in addition determined that student test performance on knowledge of international economic problems was superior in classes where teachers spent a smaller proportion of time lecturing.

It appears, then, that expanded knowledge of and positive attitudes toward cross-cultural issues and a global perspective is dependent upon classroom climate, teacher credibility, and the type of teacher-student interaction. Decisions made about the delivery of curriculum content in the classroom seem to be critical to the learning process. The next section will examine relevant research on curriculum and evaluation.
Curriculum and Evaluation

This section will include two areas of research. First the research related to international/global education curriculum will be presented. Then pertinent research from the field of multicultural education will be examined.

Research findings from international/global education.
There is concern among a number of social scientists and educators that superficial treatment of an intercultural dimension in the curriculum may actually enhance negative attitudes or anti-global perspectives (Beyer & Hicks, 1970; Torney & Morris, 1972; Bohannan et al., 1973). Mitsakos (1977) carried out a research project to determine whether or not a carefully designed comprehensive social studies program could have a positive effect on primary grade children's perspective of foreign peoples. The Family of Man social studies program was selected as one which has a strong global education and cross-cultural dimension and which focuses on human diversity within the context of cultural universals.

In this large, nationally-sampled study, Mitsakos (1977) concluded that this type of program can have a significant impact of children's attitudes toward and knowledge about foreign peoples. The children in the experimental group, as opposed to the two control groups, also displayed a better understanding and a more comprehensive view of themselves, in addition to others, and of the the United States.

Another conclusion by Mitsakos (1977) was that social studies curricula which have organized, sequential materials
based on well-defined objectives achieve better results than those which do not have these features. An important outcome of this research was the validation that effective assessment instruments can be developed to measure the young child's perspective of other nations and peoples. This could advance efforts to assess additional innovative programs.

Mitsakos (1979) carried out a later study for the National Council of Elementary School Principals. This project involved eighteen teachers in six elementary schools who agreed to participate in a series of teacher training workshops on global education and to incorporate a strong global education approach in their social studies classes for a year. Mitsakos' general conclusions were similar to those for his earlier study: a strong global education dimension in social studies program can have a positive effect on the way children view other nations and peoples. He also found that the teacher training sessions on global education had a significant impact on participants' teaching behavior.

An interesting field experiment by Jongewaard (1981) tends to support the contention that global education programs can make a difference. He attempted to actualize the concept of interdependence, a concept central to multicultural education and global education, as an instructional strategy in sixth grade social studies classes, in addition to teaching about this concept.

A sequence of learning materials was selected by Jongewaard (1981) to engage students in learning about the
concept of interdependence. These materials were chosen based on criteria to eliminate stereotypes and emphasize depth of understanding. In addition, students were organized for learning according to the classroom goal structures of individualistic and cooperative behavior (Deutch, 1962; Johnson & Johnson, 1975). (The third goal structure, competition, was not a variable in this study.) In the individualistic approach, each student works toward the achievement of the learning goal independently of the other students; in the cooperative model, students can only achieve the goal if others in their group also achieve the goal. Thus, a condition of mutual dependence, or interdependence, exists.

Jongewaard (1981) concluded that cooperative goal structures are an effective teaching strategy for global education activities and that cooperative, interdependent learning experiences enhance the students' understandings of the concept itself. He furthermore determined that a non-textbook, activity-oriented series of coordinated lessons was an effective teaching strategy, in obvious support of the findings from the political socialization literature.

The results of teacher designed and conducted research projects by Williams (1961) in Great Britain and Elley (1964) in New Zealand suggests that schools must make a conscious effort to foster effective international/global education programs and that improved attitudes do not necessarily result from increased knowledge. Both of these studies used non-
traditional methods and content while focusing on traditional topics.

A study by Kehoe (1980) on human rights education compared two approaches in teaching about the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In the first approach, teachers led student discussions on the topic. In the second method, students worked in small groups at learning stations around the room where, in addition to group discussion, they read newspaper stories and wrote reactions to these stories on the topic. A post-test showed superior results for this group over the discussion only group (Kehoe, 1980).

One element that may be common to all these studies is the use of a non-traditional curriculum. Those programs which are based in experiential learning seem to promote more effective learning of content. As noted in the section on political socialization, there is a growing body of literature which supports the importance of active learning experiences in teaching abstract concepts instead of lectures, drills and practices (Phillips et al., 1980). According to Piaget (1964), the essence of knowledge is derived from an individual's interaction with physical objects through the process of experience. This element of any experimental curriculum project needs to be identified and evaluated.

Curriculum conceptualizations and evaluation in multicultural education. There have been several adequate studies of children's knowledge and perceptions of other peoples and nations. What appears to be needed at this point, according
to Torney-Purta (1982) in a review of the literature, are measures which are more sensitive to student perceptions, such as interviews and evaluations assessing the impact of international education programs in the schools. She noted that in 1980, the Department of Education collected data on international projects funded from 1956 to 1977 and identified only fifteen out of some five hundred in the category, "Teaching and Learning About Other Countries," that had any evaluation of learning effectiveness.

This is equally true for multicultural education programs. Educational leaders rushed to plan and implement inservice training for teachers and programs for children as a response to desegregation and the civil rights movement. The result was a lack of comprehensive programs based on sound theory, an articulated philosophy, and evaluation. Ill-conceived efforts ultimately hindered this social change process.

Too often, programs and evaluation relied on simplistic and easily-measured factor components. Gay (1983) asserts that:

Many of the efforts to implement multiethnic programs lacked sufficient conceptual understanding, clearly defined goals, long-range planning, adequate diagnoses of needs, and the necessary pool of professionally prepared and committed personnel. Hence, the theory was advancing, emerging, and evolving with apparent continuity, but multiethnic practice remained largely fragmentary,
sporadic, unarticulated, and unsystematic (p. 562). It seems evident that adequate resources have not been mobilized to implement effective multicultural education programs.

In an early attempt to remedy this situation, Gay (1975) had identified reform strategies which would emerge from a sound philosophy and clear objectives to implement this school change process through an interdisciplinary, experiential curriculum. One of the approaches she described, the cultural component approach, is built upon universal cultural themes with concepts which reflect the human condition selected from across disciplines. These concepts, Gay asserted, would insure greater learning than the memorization of facts about ethnic groups.

This conceptual approach, according to Blumberg (1981), will help to alleviate errors of past curriculum in multicultural education by avoiding emphasis on "either our very real similarities or our equally real differences" (p. 18). It will move us away from the notion that multicultural education is only for oppressed minorities.

Blumberg (1981), in an article called "Multiethtnic Education in the 80's: An Action Agenda," identified some important resources in multiethical/multicultural education for school districts. These included the curriculum guides from the State of California (1977, 1979), The Madison (Wisconsin) Public School Guide, Individual Differences (1974), and US: A Cultural Mosiac (San Diego City Schools, [SDCS], 1974), all of
which are central to this study. (US: *A Cultural Mosaic* is now being published by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.) Such programs meet the major challenges for the future of multiethnic and multicultural education as identified by Gay. These challenges are, according to Gay (1983), "to translate theory into practice, to institutionalize the concept, and to provide hard evidence of its efficacy" (p. 563).

**US: A Cultural Mosaic** (SDCS, 1974), the program central to this study, is based on a cultural anthropological perspective of society. Its objectives reflect and contrast the common biological and psychological needs of humans and the distinctive cultural manifestations of groups. It also focuses on the ideosyncratic nature of the individual which results from the interaction of these biological and cultural factors. The curriculum reflects the definition of multicultural education provided by the State of California (1977, 1979), the Standards for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, 1976), by Gibson (1976) in her review of the literature and others. **US: A Cultural Mosaic**, Level A, has the following goal and objectives:

**Goal 1:** The child will recognize similarities among individuals and respect them as those characteristics which make each person a member of the human family.

**Objective 1:** The child will recognize and identify the
physical traits which make him/her like other children.

Objective 2: The child will identify needs common to all members of the human family.

Objective 3: The children will discover that members of the human family have non-biological needs. The children will be able to name the non-biological needs.

Objective 4: The children will recognize the uniqueness of their own families and will be able to tell how their families are unique.

Objective 5: The child will be able to identify those characteristics which make him/her unique and special.

Objective 6: The child will recognize that all human beings have inside differences.

Objective 7: The child will recognize and accept differences among individuals and groups as those characteristics which make them unique and special.

As an interdisciplinary learning program, US: A Cultural Mosaic expresses a commitment to make the total school environment multicultural. Grant (1978) defines this commitment as "education that is multicultural."

Although this program is widely implemented in schools and districts throughout the West, the problem of evaluating the effects of this curriculum have not been solved. Golden
(1978) found that the paper and pencil assessment designed for US: A Cultural Mosaic, an Exercise for Assessing Student Perception of Individual Similarities and Differences (The Council for REAL Education, 1976) did not discriminate between those students who had been provided with the curriculum and those who had not. Furthermore, the assessment did not discriminate among pupils of thirty-five teachers. Golden, in her conclusions, seriously questioned the validity of the instrument used and recommended further research to develop and/or investigate other assessment techniques in order to more adequately evaluate the effectiveness of the program objectives and concepts.

It is clear that assessment continues to need the attention of researchers in order to assist both curriculum leaders and practitioners in planning and evaluating multicultural education programs. The Family of Man Social Studies Program emerged from a comprehensive effort at the University of Minnesota to create a new, sequential curriculum in the social studies. More importantly, it has been the focus of a major assessment effort (Mitsakos, 1977).

Initially, the concept of culture from an anthropological perspective was the common thread for a kindergarten through grade 12 program, called the Minnesota Project Social Studies (Fraser, 1968). In response to the subsequent recommendations of a major United States Office of Education study on international education (Becker, 1969), the objectives of both the Minnesota Project Social Studies and international education
were integrated into the program which became the Family of Man.

The Family of Man is based on the social science generalizations that all people have many things in common including biological needs, basic drives, learned attitudes and behavior, and the family as a group membership. The concepts of cultural universals, including the psychic unity of humankind, cultural diversity and interdependence are central to the curriculum. The Family of Man program promotes attitudes which value human dignity, appreciate and respect the cultural contribution of others and accept diversity as natural (West, 1971). This program was described by Torney and Morris (1972) as one of the few internationalized studies programs which is clearly identifiable and designed for primary schools. It is also obviously aligned theoretically with "multicultural education as the normal human experience."

In a major national study of the effectiveness of The Family of Man, Mitsakos (1977) utilized instruments adapted from two global education studies in the United States and one conducted by UNESCO in eleven countries, including the United States. Mitsakos found significant differences in favor of the experimental group in the subjects' attitudes toward and understanding of foreign peoples. These children had a more favorable view and a more comprehensive understanding of foreign peoples. One of the instruments, People Pictures, is utilized to investigate the CUME Assessment in this study.
This section has examined curriculum conceptualizations and the status of evaluation related to this investigation. The final section will summarize the review of the literature.

Summary

The literature relevant to this investigation has been reviewed in this chapter. Because of the comprehensive nature of multicultural education, this literature has been drawn from three major areas of social-psychological literature, international/global education literature, and multicultural education literature.

The first section of this chapter examined pertinent social-psychological literature on the process of stereotyping, the development of attitudes and the formation of prejudices. It also examined the developmental aspects of these processes.

Both stereotypes and prejudice are considered to be two different types of attitudes. Prejudice expresses the affective component of attitudes and stereotypes express the cognitive component. While prejudice is almost always determined to be a negative evaluation, particularly with regard to ethnicity, race or gender, stereotypes are theorized to be concept-systems, with positive as well as negative functions, enabling one to label, categorize and therefore organize experience and otherwise chaotic information.

The tendency of racial and ethnic group members to favor the ingroup and reject outgroups on the basis of stereotyping, appears to be a universal social experience. However, a
common problem with stereotyping is that it is a process characterized by overgeneralization. Therefore, once an individual is categorized as a member of a group, often based on the most immediately perceived criteria such as skin color, gender, language, etc., individual uniqueness is not acknowledged. It is this categorization which can lead to erroneous conclusions and behaviors of a dehumanizing nature.

Although theories and research results are contradictory, it is generally held that the formation of attitudes is a complex process impelled by numerous environmental conditions and developmental factors. It is thought that prejudice can be reduced through the development of cognitive sophistication. More accurate knowledge about stereotyped groups and comprehension of the process of stereotyping and attitude formation can reduce prejudice.

An examination of developmental aspects of stereotyping and attitude formation indicate contradictory conclusions. Early studies using dolls which found pro-white bias for both black and white children, have been recently challenged by several researchers. Studies have often been unable to sort out the variables of color, race awareness, evaluative adjectives, achievement, gender, etc. Often, too, studies do not indicate adequate reliability and validity for the assessments used.

It has been found that both blacks and whites demonstrate ethnocentric attitudes and behaviors by the fifth grade. But the sequence of this development is not linear, as earlier
postulated. Instead, parallel processes of development related to awareness of racial categories, evaluations of ethnic groups, and integrated ethnic attitudes appear to occur simultaneously. While there is little potential to change adult attitudes, there is evidence that curriculum in the earliest years may have positive effects on racial and ethnic attitudes.

The second section of the chapter examined the development of ethnocentrism, national identity and orientations toward other peoples and nations. It appears that the development of attitudes related to these areas is aligned with general cognitive development. Piagetian theory has, in particular, been the basis for related research. It was found that, along with the development of decentered thinking and reciprocity of thought, children between the ages of seven or eight and ten and eleven develop the concept of homeland and of other nations. This period is a particularly important one for introducing broader world views and for fostering multi-perspective realities. Without this effort, intense patriotism and chauvinism often result in the labeling of other nations and peoples as the enemies.

The final section of the chapter examined the field of multicultural education. It compared and contrasted the major theoretical orientations of assimilation, intergroup education, cultural pluralism, multiethnic ideology and multicultural education. Other dimensions of this examination, the State of California policy and guidelines
related to multicultural education, international/global education, additional related literature, and curriculum and evaluation, lend support to a broad-based conceptualization of multicultural education.

This conceptualization, based on a cultural anthropological perspective of society which examines human diversity within the context of cultural universals and human rights, has led to the development of multicultural education curriculum. Two such curricula, *US: A Cultural Mosaic* and the *Family of Man*, are particularly significant to this investigation in that their goals and learning objectives exemplify this anthropological conceptualization of multicultural/cross-cultural education.

Furthermore, many authorities have noted the importance of developing reliable and valid assessment instruments to improve the measurement of multicultural education concepts. The next chapter will describe the methods and procedures used in an investigation of a specific instrument designed to measure such concepts.
CHAPTER THREE

Methods and Procedures

This chapter presents the procedures used to investigate the CUME Assessment instrument which was designed to measure third grade children's understanding of selected cross-cultural/multicultural concepts. The chapter includes information about (1) the basic research design used, (2) the research questions examined, (3) the nature of the setting, the sampling and procedures for determining the sample, (4) the instruments used in the investigation, (5) the procedures used to conduct the research and (6) the procedures for data analysis.

Research Design

The primary purpose of this study was to investigate the Cross-cultural Understandings in Multicultural Education (CUME) Assessment, a domain/criterion-referenced instrument. The instrument attempts to measure the achievement of specific objectives and mastery of a well-defined content domain, yielding a score which is interpreted as an absolute rather than a norm-referenced, relative measurement (Martuza, 1977).

The CUME Assessment was originally developed over a period of years, administered to students and revised several times prior to its evaluation for content validity by a group of six selected experts. The instrument was revised according to the suggestions of the experts and a dissertation committee.
The CUME Assessment was administered to 123 students in four schools in two school districts as a group assessment. An interview protocol was designed to give an individual measure of each subject's achievement of the CUME Assessment objectives. The Student Interview was administered by trained interviewers to 100 students in three schools. This provided a parallel assessment to investigate validity. Another instrument, People Pictures, which was used in a large national study, was also administered to these students as another means of investigating the validity of the CUME Assessment. Both the Student Interview and People Pictures were judged to be assessments of the same domain of cross-cultural concepts which were designed to be assessed by the CUME Assessment. The establishment of the validity of CUME will determine its utility as an assessment of these concepts.

In addition to the 100 students, a control group of 23 was established in a fourth school. The research design utilized in this part of the study was a quasi-experimental design often used in educational research. Subjects were not selected from a given population and randomly assigned to an experimental or control group. Rather, the natural unit of the classroom was used to select participants, thus establishing a static-group comparison design. The quasi-experimental group was selected on the basis of the teacher's reports of the subjects having participated in an experimental curriculum with specified objectives, while the control group was selected from a teacher's report that the subjects had not
been taught this specified set of objectives. Both groups received a posttest. These steps are represented by the following diagram:

\[ x \quad \circ \]

where \( x \) represents the experimental treatment, \( \circ \) represents the posttest measurement of the dependent variable, and the broken line indicates that the experimental and control groups were not formed randomly. The CUME Assessment was used as the posttest to determine whether or not students of teachers who reported on the Teacher Questionnaire having taught the selected cross-cultural objectives assessed by CUME received significantly higher scores on the posttest than those students whose teacher reported not having taught these objectives.

**Research Questions**

This study investigated the Cross-cultural Understandings in Multicultural Education (CUME) Assessment instrument. The instrument was designed to measure selected cross-cultural/multicultural concepts and attitudes in third grade children.

In order to examine the instrument, the following questions were asked:

1. What is the association between the CUME Assessment subtotal score, obtained by adding CUME Subtest scores 1-6, (CSUBX), and the CUME Subtest 7 score (CSUB7)? Is objective 7 of the CUME Assessment a comprehensive objective which assesses the whole domain of objectives 1-6?
2. What is the relationship between the total score on the Student Interview (CUME objectives for Subtests 1-6) and the subtotal score obtained by adding CUME Subtest scores 1-6 (CSUBX)? Does an alternate assessment of objectives 1-6 of the CUME Assessment demonstrate the utility of the instrument?

3. What is the relationship between the total score on the Student Interview and the total score on the CUME Assessment?

4. What is the relationship between each of the Subtest scores (objectives 1-6) on the Student Interview and the corresponding Subtest scores 1-6 on the CUME Assessment? Can the validity of individual objectives of CUME be established?

5. What is the relationship between the CUME Assessment total scores and the total scores for People Pictures? Is there a strong relationship of CUME with People Pictures, an alternate assessment of its domain, thus establishing the validity of CUME?

6. What differences exist between the CUME Assessment total scores of a group of students whose teachers reported having taught the cross-cultural concepts of the CUME Assessment objectives 1-7 and a group of students whose teacher reported not having taught these objectives? Assuming accurate teacher reporting on the Teacher Questionnaire, are there significant differences in student scores between the experimental and control groups, thus demonstrating the efficacy of teaching the cross-cultural concepts?

7. What is the content validity of the CUME Assessment, as determined by a panel of experts? To what extent do a panel of experts agree on an evaluation of the content validity of CUME, thus demonstrating the utility of the assessment instrument?

Setting, Sample Size and Selection

Two school districts were selected for participation in this study. The districts are in close proximity with one another and both had schools reporting the use of US: A Cultural Mosaic or the objectives from this multicultural instructional program in grades K-3.

The first school district, Lincoln Unified School District, is a suburban district in the metropolitan area of Stockton, California. In this district of 6962 students, and a minority student population of 30% for 1982-3, two schools were found which had adopted US: A Cultural Mosaic as their
multicultural education program. These are referred to as school 1 and school 2 in the study.

The second school district, Stockton Unified School District, is the largest urban district in the Stockton area with 24,637 ethnically and racially diverse students. Multicultural education had been written into curriculum plans for the district and individual schools for several years, although schools had flexibility to adopt specific programs. At least, one school, school 3 in the study, had implemented a clearly-articulated multicultural education program similar to, and based on the objectives from, US: A Cultural Mosaic. This pull-out program for entire classes was part of the curriculum for all K-3rd grade children in the school for four years, ending in May, 1982. The initial development of the CUME Assessment took place at this site.

Another school in Stockton Unified School District, school 4 in the study, placed little emphasis on multicultural education and had no clear programmatic objectives related to this domain as determined by an interview with the principal and an examination of its written program.

Schools 1, 2 and 3, two in Lincoln Unified School District and one in Stockton Unified School District, were selected for participation in the study because of their use of similar multicultural objectives. Additional major criteria were their match for socio-economic status of the families and relative ethnic and racial diversity in the school population. The researcher was advised on the school selection by the
principal of one of the selected schools in Lincoln Unified and by a program evaluator in Stockton Unified, as well as the principal of School 4. See Tables 1 and 2 for a comparison of school population characteristics. On the basis of the Teacher Questionnaire the experimental group was selected from the third grade classes of these schools and the control group was selected from the third grade classes of school 4 in Stockton Unified School District.
Table 1

Comparative Data of Participating Schools, 1982-83, California Assessment Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Experimental N = 100</th>
<th>Control N = 23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School 1 K-6</td>
<td>School 2 K-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% AFDC</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% LES/NES</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Index</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The principals of all four schools were approached to secure support for their schools' involvement in this study. Third grade teachers in these schools were then asked to attend a meeting at each respective school site to discuss the study. Their cooperation was requested.
Table 2

Ethnicity of Students in Participating Schools, 1982-83

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Experimental N = 100</th>
<th>Control N = 23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School 1&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>School 2&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amer. Ind.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Other</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total minority</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Based on 3rd grade population
<sup>b</sup>Based on K-3 population
<sup>c</sup>Based on K-6 population
Table 3

Sample Selection

Experimental N = 100 (52 girls and 48 boys)  Control N = 23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School 1</th>
<th>School 2</th>
<th>School 3</th>
<th>School 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T* number in class</td>
<td>T number in class</td>
<td>T number in class</td>
<td>T number in class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T</th>
<th>n per class</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>n per class</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>n per class</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>n per class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total N per School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>42 subjects</th>
<th>25 subjects</th>
<th>33 subjects</th>
<th>23 subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 girls</td>
<td>13 girls</td>
<td>18 girls</td>
<td>11 girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 boys</td>
<td>12 boys</td>
<td>15 boys</td>
<td>12 boys</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* T = Teacher
All third grade teachers in schools 1 and 2 agreed to participate. One third grade class in school 2 was used for a pilot study while the other two third grade classes at this school participated in the actual study. In School 3, three of the four third grade teachers agreed to participate. All participating teachers and their classes were selected on the basis of a Teacher Questionnaire/Interview in which they indicated to what degree they did in fact teach the objectives to be measured in the study. The experimental group was drawn from the students of eight teachers from schools 1, 2 and 3. One third grade teacher in school 4 was asked to and agreed to participate. This class was selected as a control group on the basis of the principal's analysis of the selection criteria on the teacher response on the Teacher Questionnaire/Interview indicating that the objectives to be tested in the study by the CUME Assessment were not taught in a systematic way in this class. See Appendix A for a copy of the Teacher Questionnaire.

Certain categories of students were eliminated from the sample. Students were eliminated if they entered school after October 1, 1982, missed more than twenty days of school during 1982-3, were of limited English proficiency (LEP), or were educationally handicapped. The experimental group contained 100 and the control group 23 students.

An attempt was made to distribute equally the 100 subjects in the experimental group among schools 1, 2 and 3 in order to balance possible undetermined programmatic differences among them. As noted above, certain categories of
students were eliminated. Where the adjusted school populations exceeded approximately 33 students, the sample was selected using enrollment lists and a random numbering system. School 2, which used US: A Cultural Mosaic, lacked an adequate number of subjects. Therefore, more subjects were selected from school 1 which also used the instructional program, US: A Cultural Mosaic. An attempt was made to equalized the number of female and male subjects in order to control for possible gender differences. See Table 3 for a summary of the sample selection.

Instrumentation

Three instruments were used in the study. The Cross Cultural Understandings in Multicultural Education (CUME) Assessment, was the focus of this investigation. The Student Interview was developed by the researcher as a parallel assessment. The third instrument, People Pictures, was selected as an assessment of an attitudinal domain which is related to the cognitive and affective domains assessed by CUME. People Pictures was used in a national assessment of the effects of the third grade social studies program, A Family of Man, to measure students' attitudes towards foreign peoples. (Mitsakos, 1977).

The CUME Assessment

The CUME Assessment, a domain/criterion-referenced instrument, was developed in 1979 by this researcher specifically to measure the cognitive and affective objectives of the
school-wide multicultural education curriculum at a K-3 school. Both the goals and objectives of this K-3 multicultural education program were based on *US: A Cultural Mosaic, Level A*, a multicultural education program for Kindergarten through third grade which was derived from the program, *Individual Differences*, of Madison, Wisconsin, and further developed and produced by San Diego City Schools. The written curriculum is now published by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith as Levels A, B and C, and is in use throughout California.

Although the goals and objectives assessed by the CUME Assessment differ slightly in language and elaboration from those listed in Level A, they are very similar. The revision of the goals and objectives was an attempt to clarify the original statements and to be more specific with regard to defining the domains of the specific objectives.

The CUME Assessment is an instrument designed to evaluate education programs which have the following goals:

**Goal 1:** The child will recognize similarities among individuals and respect them as those characteristics which make each person a member of the human family.

**Goal 2:** The child will recognize the individual differences among people, both personal and cultural, and respect them as those characteristics that add to the richness and diversity of American life.

The CUME Assessment measures the following learning objectives:

**Objective 1:** The child will recognize and identify the physical traits which make him or her like other children.
Objective 2: The child will identify needs common to all members of the human family, the biological needs:
- air
- water
- food
- clothing
- shelter
- rest

Objective 3: The child will identify needs common to all members of the human family, the non-biological needs, such as:
- the need for communication
- the need to have their human rights respected
- the need for cooperation
- the need for affection
- the need to feel important and valuable

Objective 4: The child will recognize and value the uniqueness of various families, including his or her own.

Objective 5: The child will be able to identify those characteristics which make an individual unique and special, including himself or herself.

Objective 6: The child will recognize that all human beings have inside differences, such as different ideas, thoughts, likes and dislikes.

Objective 7: The child will recognize and accept differences among individuals and groups as those characteristics which make them unique and special.

The rationale for a conceptually-based multidisciplinary, multicultural education curriculum, such as US: A Cultural Mosaic, is predicated on the intimate linkage between the development of cognitive constructs and the formation of attitudes. Test item 12 of the CUME Assessment in figure 2 illustrates this linkage. The concept of communication is developed cognitively through curricular activities. These activities also promote both the concept of cultural relativity of language, and positive attitudes toward language diversity.
Figure 2

Sample CUME Assessment Item

12 Look at the pictures and listen. These children speak both Spanish and English.

What do you think is true?

A People communicate in different ways.
B English is a better language.
C These children eat the same food.

Mark one box to show what you think is true.
At first glance, several of the test items in the CUME Assessment might, in fact, appear to be testing vocabulary. Weiland Joyce (1978), however, stated in Information Processing Models of Teaching:

The capacity to recognize examples of the concept in new situations distinguishes conceptualizing from symbol transmission. The alternative to learning conceptually is to memorize examples of facts. (p. 48)

Martorella (1972), based on work of Bruner and Viand, has operationally defined concept as:

a continuum of inferences by which a set of observed characteristics of an object or event suggests a class identity, and then additional inferences about other unobserved characteristics of the object or event. As with any subject area, teachers may "teach to a test," thus reducing conceptual learning to mere symbol transmission. The validity of any test may therefore depend upon the quality and integrity of the instructional program. (p. 5.)

The CUME Assessment, as with any assessment instrument, must be examined in light of this consideration.

The network of inferences resulting from past and present schooling and life experiences, allow these experiences to be categorized and defined by a rule. The category of experience has a set of positive instances or exemplars with attributes and usually a name. Attributes are the identifying features of a concept resulting from a process of generalization. Martorella (1972) cautioned:

Stereotypes, for example, present an extreme example of overgeneralization. Where the learner has formed rigid concepts which do not assimilate and accommodate experience, a teacher's role in these situations is to initiate the process of qualifying such over generalizations by presenting new and objective information for concept modification. (p. 7)

It is this concept modification that attempts to initiate
attitudinal change as well. DeCecco (1968) suggested:

If the child excludes members of some races, religions, and nationalities from the general concept human being, some instruction is strongly indicated. Or, if the child lists the attributes of one race as intelligent, socially responsible, sanitary, and, achieving and the attributes of another race as stupid, irresponsible, dirty and lazy, the teacher can provide a wide array of positive and negative examples for both races than the child may have experienced before. (p.400)

The CUME Assessment attempts to measure the effects of a curriculum which has as its purpose developing or changing concepts and attitudes attached to these concepts in order to attain the stated goals and objectives.

The scores resulting from CUME are intended to be used to evaluate and improve curriculum and instruction implemented in a multi-disciplinary program. The objectives tested are ones which focus on the improvement of attitudes by taking a cognitive approach to understanding and appreciating individual similarities and differences. The test results are not intended to be used to label or classify students but to determine program effectiveness.

An assessment instrument had been designed by a private consulting firm, The Council for REAL Education, to measure student perception of individual similarities and differences, the curriculum content of US: A Cultural Mosaic. However, it was determined by this investigator, after discussion and correspondence with the test developers and after use of the instrument, that their instrument was not sufficiently valid and reliable.

The CUME Assessment was designed as a domain--
referenced instrument of twenty-one multiple-choice items with three items designed to measure each of the seven objectives. Because of the nature of Objective 7, "The child will recognize and accept differences among individuals and groups which make them unique and special," it was hypothesized that this cumulative objective might measure a general attitude toward differences and might therefore correlate with the total score for the CUME Assessment.

The CUME Assessment is to be administered to a class of children or smaller groups in a school setting. The general test directions are read aloud by the test administrator as is each test item. Students are given ample time to respond and need not depend on their reading ability to understand the questions and potential answers. The test takes approximately 30 to 40 minutes to complete. The final version of the CUME Assessment used for this investigation was analyzed for readability by a reading specialist. This expert felt the test language was appropriate for third grade students, given the test administration procedures. See Appendix B for a copy of the CUME Assessment and administration instructions.

Reliability data on an earlier version of the CUME Assessment instrument were collected in 1981-82. At that time, the CUME Assessment was administered to approximately 400 first through third grade students who had participated in a multicultural education program based on the CUME Assessment objectives. The Kuder-Richardson 20 test of reliability was calculated by the research department of Stockton Unified
School District using the pretest and posttest scores of a random sample of thirty students at each of the grade levels. This statistical method of analysis was selected because traditional measurements of reliability can be applied to a criterion-referenced test if there is sufficient score variability (Gay, 1980). The research department determined that the overall reliability for the CUME Assessment pretest was .86 and for the posttest, .87. An item analysis revealed two items of low reliability and these were revised for the CUME Assessment form used in this study.

According to Gay (1980), standardized achievement and aptitude tests ought to have a reliability of at least .90 and attitude scale reliabilities usually fall in the sixties to eighties range, with most being in the seventies. Furthermore, when tests are developed in new areas, it is expected that lower reliability will be obtained initially. The CUME Assessment, as a new test and one which assesses both the cognitive and affective domains, was therefore judged to be sufficiently reliable for this investigation. Descriptive statistics resulting from the pretest and posttest data analysis can be found in Appendix C.

The content validity of the CUME Assessment was determined by a panel of experts. The CUME Assessment was sent to seven educational leaders and six of them responded to the request to evaluate the instrument. Three of these educational leaders are university professors: one is a professor of history, who is well known in the field of multicultural education
and global education; and two teach and write in early childhood education and multicultural education. Two other educational leaders are responsible for curriculum in two different school districts. The remaining educational leader is a consultant for the Office of Intergroup Relations in the State Department of Education. These experts were designated as follows:

A. Professor of History
B. Professor of Early Childhood Education
C. Professor of Early Childhood Education
D. School District Director of Curriculum
E. School District Coordinator of Curriculum
F. State Educational Consultant in Intergroup Relations

The experts were asked to rate the extent to which each item on the CUME Assessment would measure the conceptual understanding related to each objective. The rating method used was a Likert scale of 0 to 5, with 0 designated as "not at all" and 5 designated as "a great deal". Figure 3 illustrates an example from the Content Rating Form. The complete form is found in Appendix D, along with the responses.
Figure 3

**CUME Assessment Content Rating Form Sample Item**

To what extent do you feel the items will measure conceptual understanding related to each objective? Please refer to the test booklet.

Please circle the most appropriate number for each item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objective 1: The child will recognize and identify the physical traits which make him or her like other children.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Student Interview

The Student Interview was developed by the researcher with assistance from her committee, to investigate the concurrent validity of the CUME Assessment. The interview was designed to assess individually student achievement of objective 1-6 of the CUME Assessment. Objective 7 was not assessed in the interview because it was determined that Objective 7 is a general, cumulative objective that actually reflects the conceptual domain and psychological construct of objectives 1-6. It was specifically investigated in another aspect of this research.

Two trained interviewers conducted the Student Interview which takes approximately 35 to 45 minutes per student. The directions to the interviewers indicate that they should conduct the interview at the school in a quiet place free from distractions and that they should begin by establishing a rapport with the student, putting him/her at ease with the process. See Appendix E for the Student Interview and instructions.

Objectives 2-6 are assessed using a story, Maria's Blue Bottle, which was written by the researcher. The story was developed to provide an alternate context for the cross-cultural concepts assessed by the CUME Assessment instrument. As indicated above, students demonstrate conceptual learning when they can recognize examples of the concept in new situations (Weil and Joyce:1978).

The story is read to the student, then sections are re-
read and questions related to the objectives are asked. Directions for scoring are specific with a point awarded for each examplar named. A scoring form is provided. The scores for each objective range from 0 to 3. The answer key contains the story with underlined sections keyed to each objective. The following is an example of the interview protocol and scoring procedures:

Give the child a copy of the story, *Maria's Blue Bottle*.

"I am going to read this story to you called, *Maria's Blue Bottle*. Follow along with your eyes while I read it to you. Listen carefully."

Read the story out loud.

"Think about the story. The story has examples of things all humans need to have to stay alive."

"I will read parts of the story again and then you will tell me what needs are mentioned that keep humans alive."

Read section 1.

"Tell me what needs are mentioned that keep humans alive"

Read section 2.

"Tell me what needs are mentioned that keep humans alive."

Read section 5.

"Tell me what needs are mentioned that keep humans alive."

Stop when the child has identified three examples.

**Scoring:**

I don't know. 0

"mother", "love", etc, a non-exemplar which is another kind of need; 1 biological need 1
Objective 1 is assessed by showing the student a black and white photo of children of various ethnic and racial origins. The following example shows how the interview and scoring procedure operate:

Objective #1: Show the child the selected photo of children of various ethnic backgrounds.

"These children have some things in common with each other and with all other human beings."

"They all need to have certain things to stay alive. What do they have in common with each other and with all other people?"

"What else do these children have in common?"

**Scoring**

They are not the same; I don't know 0

They are people, children; child names other things the children have in common such as clothing, feelings, friendliness, etc. 1

Child indicates they have the same body parts or names various body parts that they have in common 2

Child indicates that they are all human beings, they are all alive 3

The total possible score for the Student Interview Assessment is 18 points.

**People Pictures**

People Pictures was developed by Mitsakos (1977) for use in a national evaluation of the effects of The Family of Man,
a primary grade social studies program, on third grade children's views of foreign peoples. It is based primarily on the research of Lambert and Klineberg (1967), Berg (1971), and Pike and Barrows (1979), related to international education. The research of Lambert and Klineberg (1967) examined, through a series of interviews with six, ten, and fourteen year olds, how children viewed each of seven standard reference people--Americans, Brazilians, Chinese, Germans, Indians from India, African Negroes, and Russians. Children were asked such questions as:

"In what way are they like you, or not like you?" "Tell me what else you know about them?"

Children's responses to these questions and others were later categorized as favorable (i.e., friendly, strong, peaceful), general (i.e., happy, normal, strong), or unfavorable (i.e., bad, ugly, mean) and used for coding purposes.

In 1971, Berg reported on related research. In an interview setting, Berg employed adjectives and sets of pictures of the standard reference peoples derived from the Lambert and Klineberg study. Children's responses to the pictures were recorded on a semantic differential scale.

While Mitsakos based People Pictures primarily on the above research, a "scatter inventory" format was substituted for the semantic differential format as suggested by the research of Pike and Barrows (1979). The nationalities of peoples in the photographs were not presented to the children because of research reviewed in Chapter Two which indicated
that children associate certain evaluative images with the name of a country.

People Pictures uses the standard reference peoples which were used in the Lambert and Klineberg (1967) study: Kenyans, Germans, Chinese, and Americans. Brazilians were the standard reference people selected for the practice pages. The following descriptive adjectives were drawn from the above study to use in a scatter inventory format:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Favorable</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Unfavorable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kind</td>
<td>normal</td>
<td>strange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>strong</td>
<td>bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friendly</td>
<td>happy</td>
<td>awful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nice</td>
<td>different</td>
<td>mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like us</td>
<td></td>
<td>stupid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smart</td>
<td></td>
<td>ugly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pretty</td>
<td></td>
<td>unfriendly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three photographs for each of the four standard reference peoples in Picture Peoples show people in universal kinds of activities such as work roles, families at home, and recreational activities. The resulting twelve photographs and the evaluative descriptions were randomly ordered and sequenced through the use of a table of random numbers.

Two well-known social studies educators, Dr. Edith West, professor of education and Director of the University of Minnesota Project Social Studies Curriculum Center, and James Becker, Director, the Social Studies Diffusion Project and President of the Mid-America Center for Global Perspectives in Education, assessed People Pictures for content validity. Their responses were positive.
A field test of *People Pictures* by Mitsakos (1977) resulted in t-tests which found that there were significant differences at the .0005 level between a group of third grade students that had a well-defined global education program and a group that had not had a well-defined education program. In the national evaluation, *An Examination of the Effect of the Family of Man Social Studies Program on Third Grade Children's Views of Foreign Peoples*, Mitsakos (1977) concluded:

Children in the Experimental Group had a more favorable view of foreign people according to their performance on *People Pictures*. They used significantly fewer "unfavorable" evaluative descriptions such as mean, stupid, and unfriendly to describe the four standard reference peoples used in the instrument. (p.119)

The difference for the "unfavorable" factor as a whole was significant at the .05 level.

In its final form, *People Pictures* is a sixteen page booklet consisting of two practice pages and twelve pages of the assessment. Each page consists of one photograph of standard reference peoples engaged in activities which are conceptually universal at the top with 18 evaluative descriptions in a scatter inventory in the remaining space. Children are asked to study a photograph and examine what the people are doing. They are directed:

Ask yourself, how do you feel about the people and what they are doing? Now let's look at words that might be used to tell something about these people and what they are doing. I'll read each word aloud as you read it to yourself. Draw a line around any word that tells what you think. Circle as many words as you think tell about these people and what they are doing in this picture.
People Pictures was selected to investigate the construct validity of the CUME Assessment. A copy of People Pictures is included in Appendix F.

**Procedures for Data Collection**

The researcher first engaged two interviewers who were recommended by School of Education faculty at a nearby university. Both were within a few months of completing their bachelor's degrees and their preliminary teaching credential. They met with the researcher initially for a two-hour training program and several times during the course of the data collection period in the spring of 1983.

Principals and teachers were contacted and agreements to participate in the research were secured during this period. The parents or guardians of children in the participating classes were informed in writing of the study and were asked to respond if they objected to their child's participation. Copies of the letters are included in Appendix G.

The Student Interview was initially field tested by the researcher, refined and pilot tested by the trained interviewers. All interviews were audio tape recorded and the tapes were played back during training sessions to identify problems in scoring and to refine directions and techniques. The interviewers were assisted in standardizing their scoring procedures. Interrater reliability was established using a Pearson r correlation and a sample of 10 interviewees. (r=.76 at p<.01). See Table 4.
The 100 subjects in the sample were identified, coded, and arbitrarily divided into two equal groups, Group I and Group II. Subjects in Group I were first interviewed by the trained interviewers and then all subjects were given the CUME Assessment and People Pictures in group settings of not more than 30 students by the researcher. Then Group II subjects were interviewed by the interviewers. The split-group interview process was used to control for the teaching effect of the test. All interviews were audio-taped for data retrieval.

The written assessment, CUME, and People Pictures were administered by the researcher to an additional 23 subjects who constituted a control group. Their teacher had indicated on the Teacher Questionnaire that she did not have a formal multicultural education program that taught the seven learning objectives central to this investigation. These subjects were not interviewed.

The collection of data took place in April, May and early June of 1983. Students responded in writing in the CUME Assessment and People Pictures test booklets and the interviewers recorded the scores from the Student Interview. All data were transferred to computer scoring cards for statistical analysis. Demographic data on the selected schools were gathered by the researcher during this time period. See Appendix H for the request for school data.

**Procedures For Data Analysis**

The major purpose of the analysis of the data was to investigate the validity of the CUME Assessment and therefore
its utility for educators. The instrument attempts to measure student achievement of selected multicultural/cross-cultural concepts and attitudes and mastery of a well-defined cognitive and affective domain, yielding a score which is interpreted as an absolute rather than a norm-referenced, relative measurement (Martuza, 1977). In order to answer the research questions proposed, the following analyses of data were performed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) (Nie, et al, 1975).
Table 4

Student Interview Pilot Study:
Interviewers X and Y Interrater Reliability
using Pearson Correlation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obj*</th>
<th>Obj 2</th>
<th>Obj 3</th>
<th>Obj 4</th>
<th>Obj 5</th>
<th>Obj 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>r=.65</td>
<td>r=.66</td>
<td>r=.59</td>
<td>r=.81</td>
<td>r=.97</td>
<td>r=.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Obj = Objective

Overall Reliability r=.76 at p<.01
Research Question 1

What is the association between the CUME Assessment subtotal score obtained by adding CUME Subtest scores 1-6 (CSUBX) and the CUME Subtest 7 scores (CSUB7)? Is Objective 7 of the CUME Assessment a comprehensive objective which assesses the whole domain of Objectives 1-6?

Chi square was used to assess the construct validity of the CUME Assessment. Specifically, it was hypothesized that the content domain of Objective 7, "The child will recognize and accept differences among individuals and groups as those characteristics which make them unique and special," reflected a comprehensive objective which, in fact, incorporated the content domain of objectives 1-6. Therefore, a chi square was used to determine the association between CUME Subtest 7 scores (CSUB7) and the subtotal score of CUME obtained by adding the subtest scores of Subtests 1-6 (CSUBX). An ETA coefficient was calculated to determine the magnitude of the effect.

Research Question 2

What is the relationship between the total score on the Student Interview (CUME objectives for Subtests 1-6) and the subtotal score obtained by adding CUME Subtest scores 1-6 (CSUBX)? Does an alternative assessment of objectives 1-6 of the CUME Assessment demonstrate the utility of the instrument?

In order to determine this relationship, a Pearson Correlation was selected as the statistical procedure. The coefficient of determination ($r^2$) was calculated to determine the proportion the tests have in common.

Research Question 3

What is the relationship between the total score on the Student Interview and the total score on the CUME Assessment?
In order to determine this relationship, a Pearson Correlation was selected as the statistical procedure and the percent of variation was determined.

**Research Question 4**

What is the relationship between each of the Subtest scores (Objectives 1-6) on the Student Interview and the corresponding Subtest scores 1-6 on the CUME Assessment? Can the validity of individual objectives of CUME be established?

A Pearson Correlation was used to further examine the validity of the CUME Assessment by determining the degree of relationship between each of the objectives 1-6, as measured by the Student Interview scores, with the CUME Assessment subtest scores for each of the same objectives 1-6. The percent of variation was reported.

**Research Question 5**

What is the relationship between the CUME Assessment total scores and the total scores for People Pictures? Is there a strong relationship of CUME with People Pictures, an alternate assessment of its domain, thus establishing the validity of CUME?

A Pearson r correlation coefficient was computed to determine the degree of relationship between CUME Assessment total scores, CTOT, for each of the three categories of People Pictures, "general," "favorable," and "unfavorable." The percent of variation was calculated.

**Research Question 6**

What differences exist between the CUME Assessment total scores of a group of students whose teachers reported having taught the cross-cultural concepts of the CUME Assessment
Objectives 1-7 and a group of students whose teacher reported not having taught these objectives? Assuming accurate teacher reporting on the Teacher Questionnaire, are there significant differences in student scores between the experimental and control groups; thus demonstrating the efficacy of teaching the cross-cultural concepts?

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was selected as the statistical procedure to determine whether there is a significant difference between the subtest means of the groups. An F ratio was computed to determine significance.

Research Question 7

What is the content validity of the CUME Assessment, as determined by a group of experts? To what extent do a panel of experts agree on an evaluation of the content validity of CUME thus demonstrating the degree of utility of the assessment instrument?

The evaluation of the CUME Assessment by selected experts was determined by computing mean scores for each of 21 items and for each of 7 subtest scores. The mean scores were then compared to the evaluative statements on the Likert rating scale.

Summary

This chapter dealt with the specific methods and procedures used to investigate the appropriateness of using the CUME Assessment to measure selected cross-cultural/multicultural conceptual understandings. The sections included were: 1) the basic research design used in the investigation, 2) the research questions examined, 3) the nature of the sampling and the procedures for determining the sample, 4) the instruments used in the investigation, 5) the procedures used for data collection, and 6) the procedures used for the data analysis.
CHAPTER FOUR

Analysis of the Results

The purpose of this study was to investigate the CUME Assessment as a criterion-referenced assessment of third grade students' understanding of selected cross-cultural/multicultural concepts. This chapter presents the descriptive data on the three assessments central to this study, the CUME Assessment, the Student Interview, and People Pictures and the Teacher Questionnaire. Then data relevant to the seven research questions identified in Chapter One are examined.

Descriptive Statistics

This section will summarize the data for the CUME Assessment, the Student Interview, People Pictures and the Teacher Questionnaire, using descriptive statistics. The average, or typical score, in each case is reported by the mean, a measure of central tendency. The median is also presented as a measurement of the midpoint of the sets of scores. Variability in test scores is reported using the standard deviation and the range. A small standard deviation indicates that scores are close together and a large standard deviation indicates that the scores are more spread out. The range provides a rough estimate of this variability. In addition to the above descriptive statistics, reliability coefficients obtained for each of the assessments are presented.
The CUME Assessment

The analysis of the CUME Assessment was begun by computing the descriptive statistics for the instrument by subtest and for the total scores (N = 100). Table 5 provides a summary of the results. Out of a possible total score of 21, the mean score was 17.8 and the Standard Deviation was 2.37. The means for subtest scores ranged from 2.1 for CSUB6 to 2.86 for CSUB1. The data indicate that the total scores had a slight negatively skewed distribution. Typically, this would indicate that most of the students did well, but a few scored very poorly. However, the mean was high, which would be expected on a criterion-referenced test where all students are expected to reach criterion.

As reported in Chapter 3, the Kuder-Richardson 20 test of reliability was applied to 1981-82 CUME Assessment data by the research department of Stockton Unified School District. Reliability coefficients of .86 for the pretest random sample of 90 subjects and .87 for the posttest random sample of 90 resulted from this analysis. The application of this traditional measure of reliability was judged to be appropriate because of adequate score variability.

An application of the Kuder-Richardson 21 formula to the CUME Total scores (N = 123) yielded a coefficient (r) of .51. As expected due to the lower score variability, this coefficient is smaller. Gay (1980:183) stated that it is appropriate to apply traditional measures of reliability to a
criterion-referenced test even with low score variability, if one recognizes that the reliability coefficient (r) will tend to be lower. That is, it will be a conservative or underestimate of reliability. According to Hopkins and Stanley (1981: 1933), on mastery criterion-referenced or teacher made tests which have several easy items, KR 21 becomes quite conservative and may underestimate the actual measure of internal consistency of a test by as much as .15. This traditional procedure is used because there is no approach which is generally accepted as appropriate for the calculation of the reliability of criterion-referenced tests.

The Student Interview

The descriptive statistics for the Student Interview are reported in Table 6. A Kuder-Richardson Formula 21 reliability coefficient was not calculated for this assessment because the Student Interview is not scored as items with yes/no responses and therefore KR 21 is inappropriate. However, as reported in Chapter Three, interrater reliability was established using a Pearson r correlation. This statistical procedure resulted in a correlation of .76 (p<.01). (See page 125 for a presentation of the reliability coefficients by subtest).

People Pictures

The descriptive statistics for People Pictures are summarized in Table 7 for each of the categories Favorable,
General, and Unfavorable (N = 100). With a possible score of 84 for PPF, the mean was 47.13 and the standard deviation 17.61. PPG scores resulted in a mean of 23.29 out of a possible score of 48, and PPU scores yielded a mean of 6.12 with a possible score of 84. According to Mitsakos (1977), the test developer, a lower mean score on the Unfavorable and General factors indicates a more positive view of other peoples and a higher mean score on the Favorable factor indicates a more positive view of other peoples.

In order to determine the reliability of People Pictures, the Kuder-Richardson Formula 21 was computed for each subsection, Favorable, General and Unfavorable. Table 8 reports the resulting reliability coefficients which ranged from .92 to .95, indicating a high level of reliability for all sections.

Teacher Questionnaire

On the Teacher Questionnaire, teachers in the experimental group and the teacher in the control group were asked to respond to the question, "To what extent do you feel you address the following objectives in your teaching?" Each of the seven CUME objectives were listed followed by a Likert scale of 0, "Not at all," to 5, "A great deal," for a possible total score of 35.

The control group teacher reported having taught the CUME objectives to a much lesser degree than did the experimental
group teachers, with the exception of objective 5. See Table 9 for a comparison of the results.
Table 5

Descriptive Statistics for the CUME Assessment
(N = 100)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CUME Assessment Subtest and Total Scores</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD^a</th>
<th>SE^b</th>
<th>Low-High Mean</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSUB 1</td>
<td>2.860</td>
<td>2.919</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSUB 2</td>
<td>2.490</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>.522</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSUB 3</td>
<td>2.210</td>
<td>2.267</td>
<td>.769</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSUB 4</td>
<td>2.800</td>
<td>2.890</td>
<td>.449</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSUB 5</td>
<td>2.560</td>
<td>2.775</td>
<td>.729</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSUB 6</td>
<td>2.110</td>
<td>2.100</td>
<td>.665</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSUB 7</td>
<td>2.810</td>
<td>2.932</td>
<td>.563</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTOT</td>
<td>17.800</td>
<td>18.289</td>
<td>2.374</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>10-21</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^aSD = Standard Deviation

^bSE = Standard Error
Table 6

Descriptive Statistics for the Student Interview
(N = 100)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CUME Objectives</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>SE&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Low-High Mean</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obj. 1</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obj. 2</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obj. 3</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obj. 4</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obj. 5</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obj. 6</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S I Total</td>
<td>14.720</td>
<td>15.079</td>
<td>2.598</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>5-18</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>SD = Standard Deviation
<sup>b</sup>SE = Standard Error
Table 7

Descriptive Statistics for **People Pictures**
Favorable, General and **Unfavorable**

(N = 100)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>SE&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Low-High Mean</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPF</td>
<td>47.130</td>
<td>48.500</td>
<td>17.610</td>
<td>1.761</td>
<td>8-82</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG</td>
<td>23.290</td>
<td>22.500</td>
<td>10.811</td>
<td>1.081</td>
<td>5-48</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPU</td>
<td>6.120</td>
<td>2.250</td>
<td>10.125</td>
<td>1.012</td>
<td>0-53</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>SD = Standard Deviation

<sup>b</sup>SE = Standard Error
Table 8

Kuder-Richardson Formula 21 Test of Reliability for People Pictures Favorable, General and Unfavorable

(N = 123)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPF</td>
<td>44.764</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>351.43</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG</td>
<td>21.61</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>117.17</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPU</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>88.05</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9

A Comparison of Control Group and Experimental Group
Teacher Responses to the Teacher Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD^a</th>
<th>SE^b</th>
<th>Low-High Mean</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obj. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>3.187</td>
<td>3.508</td>
<td>.890</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obj. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>3.057</td>
<td>3.364</td>
<td>1.422</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obj. 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>3.472</td>
<td>3.588</td>
<td>.935</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obj. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>3.659</td>
<td>3.872</td>
<td>.922</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obj. 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>3.756</td>
<td>3.762</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Low-High Mean</td>
<td>Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Obj. 6</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>3.691</td>
<td>3.762</td>
<td>1.153</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>2-6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Obj. 7</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>3.358</td>
<td>3.582</td>
<td>.780</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>24.179</td>
<td>25.806</td>
<td>5.786</td>
<td>.522</td>
<td>14-33</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( ^a SD = \) Standard Deviation

\( ^b SE = \) Standard Error
The Research Questions

Research Question 1

What is the association between the CUME Assessment subtotal score obtained by adding CUME Subtest scores 1-6 (CSUBX) and the CUME Subtest 7 scores (CSUB7)? Is Objective 7 of the CUME Assessment a comprehensive objective which assesses the whole domain of Objectives 1-6?

In order to address this research question, a Chi Square statistical test of association was applied to the two sets of scores, CSUBX and CSUB7. The results of analysis of these variables yielded a $\chi^2$ of 49.05 which was significant (p<.01). An ETA coefficient of .55 demonstrated the magnitude of the effect on the variables. Apparently, there is a moderately large association between the two sets of scores. Those students who scored higher on CSUBX also tended to score higher on CSUB7. The results are reported in Table 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p&lt;</th>
<th>ETA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSUBX with CSUB7</td>
<td>49.053</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 2

What is the relationship between the total score on the Student Interview (covering CUME Objectives 1-6) and the subtotal score obtained by adding the CUME Assessment Subtest scores 1-6 (CSUBX)? Does an alternate assessment of Objectives 1-6 of the CUME Assessment demonstrate the utility of the instrument?

A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was computed in order to determine the relationship between the sets of scores for Objectives 1-6, derived from both the CUME Assessment and the Student Interview. The results are reported in Table 11. This statistical analysis yielded a Pearson r of .44 (p<.001) indicating a moderate correlation. Approximately twenty percent of the variation in the Student Interview scores can be accounted for by the performance on the CUME Assessment Subtests 1-6 (CSUBX). Apparently, the higher the scores on the Student Interview, the higher the subtotal scores on the CUME Assessment subtests 1-6 (CSUBX).

Table 11

The Results of the Pearson r Analysis of the Relationship Between the Student Interview Scores and the CUME Assessment Subtotal Scores for Subtests 1-6 (CSUBX) (N = 100)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>r</th>
<th>r²</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SITOT with CSUBX</td>
<td>.4433</td>
<td>.1965</td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 3

What is the relationship between the total score on the Student Interview and the total score on the CUME Assessment?

In order to examine this relationship, a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was computed using Student Interview total scores (SITOT) and the CUME Assessment Total scores (CTOT). The results are reported in Table 12. This statistical analysis yielded a Pearson $r$ of .45 ($p < .001$) indicating a moderate correlation. Approximately twenty percent of the variation in the Student Interview scores can be accounted for by performance on the CUME Assessment. Apparently, the higher the scores on the Student Interview, the higher the scores on the CUME Assessment.

Table 12

The Results of the Pearson $r$ Analysis of the Relationship Between the Student Interview Scores and the CUME Assessment Total Scores

$(N = 100)$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SITOT with CTOT</td>
<td>.4494</td>
<td>.2020</td>
<td>$p &lt; .001$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 4

What is the relationship between each of the Subtest scores (Objectives 1-6) on the Student Interview and the corresponding Subtest scores 1-6 on the CUME Assessment? Can the validity of individual objectives of CUME be established?

In order to examine this relationship, a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was computed for each set of scores for the Student Interview Objectives 1-6 and the corresponding Subtest scores 1-6 for the CUME Assessment. The results are reported in Table 13.

This statistical analysis yielded only one moderate correlation, a Pearson r of .48 (p<.001) for Objective 6, "The child will recognize that all human beings have inside differences, such as different ideas, thoughts, likes and dislikes." Approximately twenty-three percent of the variation in the Student Interview score for Objective 6 can be accounted for by the performance on the CUME Assessment Subtest 6 score.

Research Question 5

What is the relationship between the CUME Assessment total scores and total scores for People Pictures? Is there a strong relationship of CUME with People Pictures, an alternate assessment of its domain, thus establishing the validity of CUME?

In order to examine this relationship, Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were computed for sets of scores: CUME Assessment total scores (CTOT) and People Pictures Favorable (PPF); CTOT and People Pictures General (PPG); and CTOT and People Pictures Unfavorable (PPU). See Table 14 for a summary.
Table 13

The Results of the Pearson r Analysis of the Relationships Between Sets of Corresponding Scores From the Student Interview and the CUME Assessment, Subtests 1-6 (N = 100)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>r</th>
<th>r²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SI 1 with CSUB 1</td>
<td>.2736*</td>
<td>.0749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI 2 with CSUB 2</td>
<td>-.0879</td>
<td>.0077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI 3 with CSUB 3</td>
<td>.0058</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI 4 with CSUB 4</td>
<td>.1441</td>
<td>.0208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI 5 with CSUB 5</td>
<td>.1470</td>
<td>.0216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI 6 with CSUB 6</td>
<td>.4767**</td>
<td>.2272</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.01  
** p<.001
For CTOT and PPU, a Pearson r of -.44 (p<.001) resulted in a moderate negative correlation in which twenty percent of the variation in CTOT scores can be accounted for by the scores achieved on PPU. Apparently, the higher one scores on the CUME Assessment, the lower the score on People Pictures Unfavorable. The relationships between CTOT and PPF scores and CTOT and PPG scores were not significant.

Research Question 6

What differences exist between the CUME Assessment total scores of a group of students whose teachers reported having taught the cross-cultural concepts of the CUME Assessment Objectives 1-7 and a group of students whose teacher reported not having taught these objectives? Assuming accurate teacher reporting on the Teacher Questionnaire, are there significant differences in student scores between the experimental and control groups, thus demonstrating the efficacy of teaching the cross-cultural concepts?

In order to examine this research question, Teacher Questionnaire scores were organized by quartiles, with Quartile 1 representing the scores in the lowest 25% and Quartile 4 representing the scores in the highest 25%. An analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to determine whether there were significant differences between the means of each CUME subtest score 1-7, and the Teacher Questionnaire total scores. See Table 15.

The F ratios were not significant in any part of this analysis. Apparently, teachers who reported having taught the CUME Objectives to a greater degree did not produce higher scoring students on the CUME Assessment than the teacher who reported not having taught the CUME objectives to any great extent.
Table 14

The Results of the Pearson $r$ Analysis of the Relationship Between the CUME Assessment Total Scores and Each of People Pictures Favorable, General, and Unfavorable

(N = 100)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CTOT with PPF</td>
<td>0.0488</td>
<td>0.0024</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTOT with PPG</td>
<td>-0.0021</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTOT with PPU</td>
<td>-0.4393</td>
<td>0.1930</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15

Summary of the Main Effects of the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) of Student Scores on the CUME Assessment, by Subtest, With the Teacher Questionnaire Total Scores Indicating the Degree of Teaching of the CUME Objectives (N = 123)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CUME Objectives</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F ratio</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obj. 1</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.418</td>
<td>.740*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obj. 2</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.857*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obj. 3</td>
<td>2.452</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.817</td>
<td>1.334</td>
<td>.267*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obj. 4</td>
<td>1.142</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td>1.514</td>
<td>.215*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obj. 5</td>
<td>2.312</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.771</td>
<td>1.582</td>
<td>.197*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obj. 6</td>
<td>1.839</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.613</td>
<td>1.504</td>
<td>.217*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obj. 7</td>
<td>.609</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.203</td>
<td>.709</td>
<td>.549*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NS
Research Question 7

What is the content validity of the CUME Assessment, as determined by a group of experts? To what extent do a panel of experts agree on an evaluation of the content validity of CUME, thus demonstrating the degree of utility of the assessment instrument?

Seven experts were asked to evaluate the CUME Assessment. Six of them responded to this request. See Table 16 for a summary and Appendix D for the complete results.

The experts were asked to rate the extent to which each item on the CUME would measure an understanding of the concepts related to each objective. The rating method was a Likert scale of 0-5, with 0 designated as "not at all" and 5 designated as "a great deal." As recommended by Hambleton (1980), when an expert's rating was far out of line with the median response of the group of experts, it was eliminated from the calculations. This was determined to be necessary for items #10, #17, and #20. The means for the items ranged from a low of 3.5 for item #2 to a high of 4.9 for item #12. The means ranged from a low of 4.1 for Objective 4 to a high of 4.6 for Objective 2 indicating a .5 point spread. Apparently, the CUME Assessment was rated moderately high for content validity by the six experts.
Table 16

A Summary of the CUME Assessment Content Validity Rating by a Group of Experts
(N = 6)

"To what extent do you feel the items will measure conceptual understandings related to each objective?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>A great deal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CUME Items and Objectives</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Low-High</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obj. 1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obj. 2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#15</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#20*</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obj. 3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10*</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#17*</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#21</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16 (con't.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CUME Items and Objectives</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Low-High</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obj. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#14</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obj. 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#11</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#16</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#19</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obj. 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#13</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#18</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obj. 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#12</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*One outlying score was eliminated from the calculations.*
Summary of the Findings

The results of the study were presented in Chapter Four. The Chi Square analysis of association between the sets of scores of the CUME Assessment subtotal score obtained by adding the CUME Assessment subtest scores 1-6, CSUBX, and the CUME Subtest 7 score, CSUB7, revealed that the association was significant (p<.01). Apparently, there is a moderately high association between the two sets of scores. Those students who scored higher on CSUBX also tended to score higher on CSUB7.

A Pearson r correlation of the relationship between the sets of scores CSUBX and the Student Interview total scores was moderate and significant (p<.001). Those students who scored higher on the Student Interview tended to score higher on the CUME Assessment subtotal for Objectives 1-6, CSUBX.

Likewise, a Pearson r analysis of the relationship between the CUME Assessment total scores and the Student Interview total scores yielded a moderate correlation (p<.001). The higher the scores on the CUME Assessment, the higher the scores tended to be on the Student Interview.

In the examination of the validity of the individual objectives of the CUME Assessment, a Pearson r correlation with the corresponding subtests scores of the Student Interview, resulted in only one moderate correlation (p<.001) for Objective 6.

A Pearson r correlation of the CUME Assessment total scores with the three scores for People Pictures demonstrated
a moderate negative relationship between CUME and People Pictures Unfavorable (p<.001). Apparently, the higher the CUME Total Scores, the lower the scores on People Pictures Unfavorable.

It would seem that the CUME Assessment may be assessing the same psychological construct as that assessed by People Pictures Unfavorable. The other two sections of People Pictures, General and Favorable, do not appear to be correlated to the CUME Assessment.

The analysis of variance between the student scores on the CUME Assessment and the teachers' ratings on the Teacher Questionnaire indicating the degree to which they taught the CUME objectives, yielded no significant differences. Those students who had a teacher reporting not having taught the CUME objectives did not, as a group, score differently from those whose teachers reported having taught the objectives.

Finally, the mean scores resulting from expert evaluation of the CUME Assessment for content validity were consistently moderate to high on a validity scale of 0-5, with 5 being the highest. The range of 4.1 to 4.6 indicated that all subtests means fell within .5 points on the scale; no item mean was lower than 3.7.

The final chapter summarizes the study and draws conclusions based on the analysis of the data presented in Chapter Four. Chapter Five also includes recommendations and suggestions for further educational research related to this investigation.
CHAPTER FIVE

Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

This study was concerned with the assessment of multicultural/cross-cultural concepts taught to third grade children. This chapter includes a summary of the study, the conclusions derived from the analysis of the results, educational recommendations, and suggestions for further research.

Summary

While educators have developed and implemented various multicultural curricula, the development of reliable and valid methods of assessment of learning has not kept pace. This is particularly true with regard to the assessment of young school age children.

Review of the Literature

The literature was reviewed to determine the important conceptual understandings in multicultural education which ought to be taught to young children and assessed to determine their degree of learning. The literature reviewed was drawn from three major areas: social-psychological literature, international/global education literature, and multicultural education literature. Literature in the first area examined the process of stereotyping, the development of attitudes, the formation of prejudice, and the developmental nature of these processes.
Stereotypes are conceptualized as the cognitive component of attitudes, allowing one to label, categorize and organize otherwise chaotic experience. As concept-systems, they are neither positive nor negative. The social experience of favoring the ingroup over the outgroup on the basis of stereotyping appears to be universal. Overgeneralization is a common problem with stereotyping and leads to erroneous conclusions and possibly to dehumanizing behaviors toward outgroup members.

Prejudice, on the other hand, expresses the affective component of attitudes and, as such, almost always involves a negative evaluation. It is generally held that the formation of attitudes is a complex process influenced by numerous environmental conditions and developmental factors. It is thought that prejudice can be reduced through the development of cognitive sophistication. More accurate knowledge about stereotyped groups and comprehension of the processes of stereotyping and attitude formation can reduce prejudice and there is evidence that curriculum in the earliest years may have positive effects on racial and ethnic attitudes.

The literature related to international/global education examined the development of ethnocentrism, national identity and orientations toward other peoples and nations. It appears that the development of attitudes related to these areas is in alignment with general cognitive development. Children between the ages of seven or eight and ten or eleven develop the concept of homeland and awareness of and attitudes toward
other peoples and nations. This period is a particularly important one for introducing broader world views and for fostering multiperspective realities.

Finally, the literature drawn from the field of multicultural education indicated several major and sometimes conflicting theoretical orientations and approaches: assimilation, intergroup education, cultural pluralism, multiethnic ideology and multicultural education. Evidence of support for a conceptualization of multiculturalism as the "normal human experience" was presented from the State of California policy and guidelines related to multicultural education, the field of international/global education, and additional related literature. A broad-based, anthropological conceptualization of multicultural education which emphasizes both human similarities and differences was indicated. Two curricula in particular, US: A Cultural Mosaic and the Family of Man significantly reflect this conceptualization. There is a need for more reliable and valid assessments of identified multicultural concepts.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to analyze and assess an instrument devised to measure third grade students' understandings of selected cross-cultural/multicultural concepts. The instrument, Cross-cultural Understandings in Multicultural Education, CUME, was investigated.
Materials, Subjects and Data Collection

The CUME Assessment is used to assess the efficacy of a curriculum implemented to teach specific cross-cultural/multicultural concepts to young children. These cross-cultural/multicultural concepts are the basis of a curriculum with seven specific learning objectives designed to teach children to understand and appreciate differences in human behavior, beliefs, and values. Through this curriculum, which uses a cross-cultural context, children also learn about cultural universals and commonalities among all peoples.

The CUME Assessment is a domain-referenced, multiple-choice instrument consisting of seven subtests based on specific objectives which assess well-defined concept areas in cross-cultural/multicultural education. Each subtest includes three items for a total of twenty-one items. The resulting scores are interpreted as absolutes rather than as norm-referenced, relative measures. They are used to evaluate and improve curriculum and instruction, rather than to classify individual students.

A Kuder-Richardson 20 test of reliability was applied to CUME data collected in 1981-82 resulting in a reliability coefficient of .86 for the pretest and .87 for the posttest. Thus, the CUME was determined to have adequate reliability.

The CUME Assessment was administered as a group assessment to 123 third grade students in four schools. One hundred of these students had had instruction of the multicultural concepts assessed by CUME, as determined by a Teacher.
Questionnaire. These 100 students were also individually interviewed using a protocol designed to assess these same concepts. This Student Interview thus provided a parallel assessment to investigate the concurrent validity of CUME. The 23 students in the control group were selected on the basis of a Teacher Questionnaire which indicated that the teacher did not systematically teach the concepts assessed by CUME.

The treatment group and the control group were also assessed using the instrument, People Pictures. This assessment was used to further examine the concurrent validity of CUME.

In order to determine the content validity of the CUME Assessment, six educational experts were asked to evaluate the instrument. The experts rated each of twenty-one items on a Likert scale.

Instrumentation

Two instruments, the Student Interview and People Pictures, were used to assess the concurrent validity of the CUME Assessment. Both the Student Interview and People Pictures were judged to be assessments of the same domain of cross-concepts which were designed to be measured by the CUME Assessment.

The Student Interview was administered individually to assess CUME Objectives 1-6. Students were read a story and asked questions specific to these objectives. Students could
score from 0-3 on each objective with a total of 18 points for the assessment.

**People Pictures** was developed for a national assessment of *The Family of Man* social studies program. It was used to assess third graders' views of foreign peoples. It is a group administered written test in which students are asked to examine three photos of each of four standard reference peoples, Kenyans, Germans, Chinese and Americans, in a test booklet. They are asked to circle any of 18 descriptive words under each picture which apply to the picture. These are arranged in a scatter inventory format. For scoring purposes, the words are categorized as Favorable, General, and Unfavorable and the student receives a score under each category.

**Findings**

Data were treated to statistical assessment using the computer and the *Statistical Package for the Social Sciences*, (SPSS). Descriptive statistics, Chi Square, Pearson Correlations, and a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), were computed to analyze the results. A summary of these findings is presented next.

Descriptive statistics for the assessment instruments in this investigation were reported first. The analysis of the CUME Assessment scores (N = 100) yielded a mean of 17.8 out of a possible score of 21, a Standard Deviation of 2.37 and a standard error of measurement of .24. The Kuder-Richardson 20 test of reliability applied to 1981-82 CUME Assessment data
which had adequate score variability \(N = 90\) resulted in coefficients of .86 and .87 for the pretest and posttest, respectively. The Kuder-Richardson 21 formula which was applied to data from this investigation \(N = 123\) resulted in a coefficient of .51. As expected, this coefficient was an underestimate of reliability due to the lack of variability of scores.

The Kuder-Richardson Formula 21 was also used to examine the reliability of the Student Interview. This resulted in an \(r\) value of .64. The application of a traditional method of analysis to a criterion-referenced test generally underestimates reliability.

The analysis of the data from People Pictures \(N = 100\) yielded a mean of 47 of a possible score of 84 for the "Favorable" category; a mean of 23 of a possible score of 48 for the "General" category; and a mean of 6 out of a possible score of 84 for the "Unfavorable" category. The lower mean score for the "Unfavorable" category indicated a more positive view of other peoples.

In order to determine the reliability of People Pictures, the Kuder-Richardson Formula 21 was computed for each subsection resulting in \(r\) values ranging from .92 to .95. Thus, a high level of reliability was indicated for all three sections.

The Teacher Questionnaire data was collected from a Likert Scale response rating to questions. The control group teacher reported having taught the CUME Assessment objectives
to a much lesser degree than did the experimental group teachers. The total score mean for the experimental group teachers was 24 and for the control group teacher, 14.

A Chi Square analysis of the CSUBX scores (subtest scores 1-6) and CSUB7 ("The child will recognize and accept differences among individuals and groups as those characteristics which make them unique and special.") scores of CUME yielded a moderately large association between the two sets of scores (p<.01) Those students who scored higher on CSUBX also tended to score higher on CSUB7.

The scores for CUME SUBX and the Student Interview total scores were moderately correlated (p<.001). Those students who scored higher on the Student Interview (CUME Objective 1-6) tended to score higher on CUME CSUBX (Objectives 1-6).

Similarly, an analysis of the relationship between the CUME Assessment total scores (Objectives 1-7) and the Student Interview total scores yielded a moderate correlation (p<.001). The higher the score on the CUME, the higher the score tended to be on the Student Interview. In an examination of the validity of Objectives 1-6 of CUME, correlations with the corresponding subtest scores of the Student Interview resulted in only one moderate correlation for Objective 6 (p<.001).

A correlational analysis of the CUME Assessment total scores with the three scores for People Pictures demonstrated a moderate negative relationship between CUME and People Pictures Unfavorable (p<.001). Apparently, the higher the
CUME total scores, the lower the scores on People Pictures Unfavorable. The other two sections of People Pictures, General and Favorable, do not appear to be correlated to the CUME Assessment.

The analysis of variance between the student scores on the CUME Assessment and the teachers' ratings on the Teacher Questionnaire, indicating the degree to which they taught the CUME Objectives, yielded no significant differences. Those students who had a teacher reporting not having taught the CUME Objectives did not, as a group, score differently from those whose teachers reported having taught the objectives.

Finally, the mean scores resulting from expert evaluation of the CUME Assessment for content validity were consistently moderate to high. On a scale of 0-5, no item mean fell below 3.7.

Conclusions Relating to the Research Questions

This section presents the conclusions reached as a result of this study. The assumptions and limitations delineated previously must be taken into account when generalizing the results. Specifically, the nature of the sample and the inclusion of only those teachers who volunteered to participate affect the generalizability of the findings. Also, the limitations regarding the validity and reliability of the instruments, assessments and questionnaires selected to examine the CUME Assessment must be considered.

Given the above cautions, the following conclusions are
drawn from the seven research questions analyzed in Chapter Four. These questions were organized and are presented here according to the type of conclusion which was drawn about the CUME Assessment. Conclusions related to content validity and construct validity are presented first because of their equal importance in the establishment of the general validity of a domain-referenced assessment (Messich, 1975; Linn, 1979; Hambleton, 1980).

Content Validity

Content validity has traditionally been viewed as the critical type of validity of a domain/criterion-referenced assessment. Adequate content validity allows one to make inferences about how well an examinee would do on a population of items which the test is presumed to represent. Research Question Seven addresses the issue of the content validity of the CUME Assessment.

Research Question Seven. What is the content validity of the CUME Assessment, as determined by a panel of experts? To what extent do a panel of experts agree on an evaluation of the content validity of CUME, thus demonstrating the degree of utility of the assessment instrument?

Content validity is a major concern in assessing a criterion-referenced test. This research question was designed to elicit expert judgment about the degree to which the CUME items measure the achievement of the stated objectives. In this case, six selected experts rated each of
the 21 items on a 0-5 Likert scale. They were asked to rate the extent to which each item would measure an understanding of the concepts related to each objective. Zero was designated as "not at all" and 5 was designated as "a great deal." The means for items ranged from 3.7 to 4.9; the means for objectives ranged from 4.1 to 4.6.

Apparently, the experts judged the content validity to be moderately high for the CUME Assessment, both in terms of individual items and all seven objectives. The result of this analysis therefore lends important support to the usefulness of the CUME Assessment.

As Berk (1980) has stated, "It cannot be overemphasized that this [item-objective congruence] is crucial to the effectiveness of the total test and the usefulness of the results" (pp. 64-65). It appears that, in terms of content validity, the CUME can be utilized with a high degree of confidence that test items measure the identified instructional objectives.

Construct Validity

Construct validity is considered to be an important component of a domain referenced assessment validation. Adequate construct validity allows one to make inferences about an examinee's relative standing on some hypothetical continuum, presumed to be the primary determinant of test performance.

This hypothetical continuum represents a theoretical idea
or psychological construct that explains or organizes some element of existing knowledge. More than a label, it is a dimension understood or inferred from its network of interrelationships. Construct validity, then, measures the degree to which certain explanatory concepts or constructs account for performance on the test.

Research Questions One and Five pertained to the construct validity of the CUME Assessment. The conclusions related to the results of these investigations are presented next.

Research Question One. What is the association between the CUME Assessment subtotal score, obtained by adding CUME Subtest scores 1-6, (CSUBX), and the CUME Subtest 7 score (CSUB7)? Is objective 7 of the CUME Assessment a comprehensive objective which assesses the whole domain of objectives 1-6?

Research Question One was designed to determine a possible association between the domains of Objectives 1-6 and the domain of Objective 7 of the CUME Assessment. It was theorized that Objective 7 assesses the psychological construct, acceptance of diversity, which would also be assessed by the more specific and related domains of Objective 1-6.

The results of this analysis suggest that there is support for the construct validity of CUME. The moderately large association between the sets of scores indicated that those students who scored higher on CSUBX also tended to score higher on CSUB7.

Research Question Five. What is the relationship between the CUME Assessment total scores and the total scores for
People Pictures? Is there a strong relationship of CUME with People Pictures, an alternate assessment of its domain, thus establishing the validity of CUME?

This relationship was examined in order to assess the construct validity of CUME. It was determined that People Pictures assesses the psychological construct, acceptance of diversity.

Pearson product-moment correlations were computed for three sets of scores from People Pictures, Favorable, General and Unfavorable, and from the CUME total scores. There was a moderate and significant (p<.001) inverse correlation between People Pictures Unfavorable scores and CUME scores. Apparently, the higher one scores on the CUME Assessment, the lower one scores on People Pictures Unfavorable. The relationships between the other sets of scores were not significant.

These results are similar to the ones found by Mitsakos (1977), developer of People Pictures in his national evaluation of the Family of Man social studies program with international content. Children in his experimental group used significantly fewer unfavorable evaluative descriptions of foreign peoples.

As presented above, construct validity allows justification about the examinee's location on some hypothetical trait or construct continuum, in this case, acceptance of diversity. This construct, acceptance of diversity, is assumed to be the primary determinant of the Cume Assessment.
performance. If one accepts the assumption that *People Pictures* measures the construct, then it appears that the moderate and significant correlation which resulted between *People Pictures Unfavorable* and *CUME* supports the construct validity of *CUME*.

While both *People Pictures* and *CUME* are relatively easy to administer to young children, *CUME* may have the greater advantage of assessing the cognitive dimension of attitudes, in addition to the affective dimension, which is more obviously measured by *People Pictures*. *CUME*, with its several objectives, assists the teacher in focusing on specific instructional content through which a child will develop an "acceptance of diversity."

Because a moderate degree of construct validity has resulted from this investigation, the *CUME* results would not be used to make judgments about individual students. However, the *CUME Assessment* was never intended for this purpose. *CUME* scores are to be used to evaluate instruction and curriculum and not to establish a ranking of students. The evidence of moderate construct validity that Research Questions One and Five have established is adequate for this purpose.

**Concurrent Validity**

Concurrent validity indicates the extent to which a given assessment may be used to estimate an individual's or group's present standing on the criterion. In the case of this investigation, an attempt was made to determine to what degree
the CUME Assessment could provide an accurate estimate of student understanding of the identified multicultural/cross-cultural concepts as measured by the Student Interview. If adequate concurrent validity could be established, it was theorized that the CUME Assessment would provide a more efficient form of assessment than a time consuming individual interview. Research Questions Two, Three and Four explored the relationships which have implications for the concurrent validity of the CUME Assessment.

Research Question Two. What is the relationship between the total score on the Student Interview (CUME objective for Subtest 1-6) and the subtotal score obtained by adding CUME Subtest scores 1-6 (CSUBX)? Does an alternate assessment of objectives 1-6 of the CUME Assessment demonstrate the utility of the instrument?

This question was designed to determine the concurrent validity of the CUME Assessment by comparing subtotal scores of Objectives 1-6 on CUME to total scores on the Student Interview. A Pearson product-moment correlation was computed in order to examine the relationship between the sets of scores. The correlation was moderate and significant (p<.001). Apparently, the higher the scores on the Student Interview, the higher the CSUBX scores on the CUME Assessment.

Research Question Three. What is the relationship between the total score on the Student Interview and the total score on the CUME Assessment?
This question was designed to determine the concurrent validity of CUME by comparing the total scores on CUME to the total scores on the Student Interview. A Pearson-product moment correlation was moderate and significant (p < .001). Apparently, the higher the scores on the Student Interview, the higher the scores on CUME.

Research Question Four. What is the relationship between each of the Subtest scores (objectives 1-6) on the Student Interview and the corresponding Subtest scores 1-6 on the CUME Assessment? Can the validity of individual objectives of CUME be established?

This question was also designed to assess the concurrent validity of the CUME Assessment, in this instance by comparing subtest scores on CUME CSUB 1-6 and the Student Interview Objectives 1-6. A Pearson product-moment correlation was computed in order to examine the relationships between the corresponding sets of scores. This analysis yielded only one moderate and significant correlation for Objective 6 (p < .001).

It would appear that adequate concurrent validity was established for utilizing the CUME Assessment as an efficient measurement of group attainment of the selected multicultural concepts as a whole. While the correlations for CSUBX and CTOT with the Student Interview were moderate, there is evidence that the size of a correlation between two tests is in part determined by the extent to which these tests measure the same trait and partly by the similarity or dissimilarity
of the item forms from one test to the other (Martuza, 1977). It is possible that the dissimilarity of item forms between the CUME and the Student Interview had a negative effect on the concurrent validity coefficients.

An analysis of the appropriateness of the item forms themselves indicates that the Student Interview protocol may have been more difficult than the multiple-choice item form used for CUME. A young child may be less able to isolate and select appropriate responses from a complex array of information, both written and oral, than to select one of four answers from a highly simplified and structured multiple-choice question.

While Research Question Four resulted in only one moderate and significant correlation between subtest scores, the number of items in each subtest (three) is so small as to preclude any negative conclusions about the validity of individual subtests. The degree of subtest validity simply cannot be conclusively determined from this analysis. Furthermore, it is important to remember that moderate to high correlations resulted from the content validity analysis. In any case, a decision to improve or increase class instruction of a particular objective based on the CUME subtest results is unlikely to have a deleterious effect on the children involved.

The Quasi-Experimental Design

Research Question Six was designed to determine the general validity of the CUME Assessment by comparing CUME
scores from a treatment and a control group. The following section presents conclusions related to this investigation.

Research Question Six. What differences exist between the CUME Assessment total scores of a group of students whose teachers reported having taught the cross-cultural concepts of the CUME Assessment objectives 1-7 and a group of students whose teacher reported not having taught these objectives? Assuming accurate teacher reporting on the Teacher Questionnaire, are there significant differences in student scores between the experimental and control groups, thus demonstrating the efficacy of teaching the cross-cultural concepts?

This question was raised to compare the total scores on CUME for the control group and the treatment group. An analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to determine whether there were significant differences between the means of each CUME subtest score 1-7 and the Teacher Questionnaire total scores. (The Teacher Questionnaire scores were used to establish the control group and the treatment group.) The F ratios were not significant in any part of this analysis.

Apparently, teachers who reported having taught the CUME objectives to a greater degree did not produce higher scoring students on the CUME Assessment than the teacher who reported not having taught the CUME objectives to any great extent.

There are some considerations which must be addressed with regard to the above results. First, it is possible that the control group teacher did not accurately report the extent to which the CUME objectives were taught by her. In
fact, after the data were collected, this teacher indicated that, although she did not teach these concepts, a team of individuals from an outside agency presented a puppet show on intergroup relations concepts each week in her class. Furthermore, both the control group and the treatment group scored high on the CUME total scores—a possible indication that both groups had been exposed to the instructional concepts.

Secondly, the control group and teacher were selected from a school district whose school population is made up of a majority of ethnic and racial minority students. The inner-city district has long had an emphasis on multicultural education and third grade students would more than likely have been exposed to multicultural curricula prior to the third grade. In certain educational settings, it may be improbable that an adequate control group can be found.

Thirdly, the elimination of Limited English Proficient Students and those receiving special education services reduced the control group size (N = 23) significantly. This factor must be considered in drawing conclusions.

The circumstances surrounding this result make it difficult to come to any general conclusion about the CUME Assessment. The question as to whether or not the CUME differentiates significantly between those students who have had an instructional program based on its objectives and those who have not has not been answered.
General Conclusions

It is tentatively concluded as a result of this investigation that, given the state of the art, the CUME Assessment may be justifiably, but cautiously, utilized by educators to assess third graders' knowledge of the identified multicultural/cross-cultural concepts. The literature clearly provides a rationale for teaching these concepts and identifies the need for reliable and valid assessment instruments to evaluate such instructional programs.

Domain-referenced assessments have been identified as the most appropriate type of assessment for this purpose. As a domain-referenced instrument, the CUME Assessment has the potential of assisting educators in presenting an objectives-based curriculum. Objectives-based curricula are designed to improve the quality of instruction, and some researchers have documented the superiority of objectives-based learning over more traditional curricula (Klausmeier, Rossmiller & Saily, 1977; Torshen, 1977). Objectives help to define the curricula, align the instruction with the objectives, individualize instruction, and evaluate on an ongoing as well as cumulative basis.

Furthermore, the CUME Assessment is easily and efficiently administered as a group assessment. The multiple-choice format tends to be more objective, more efficient, and less subject to item sampling error than the essay approach, for instance. Many test specialists agree that the multiple-choice test is the preferred item format (Martuza, 1977). It
is a format familiar to teachers and is accepted as a testing method which is easily and objectively scored by hand or by computer.

**Educational Recommendations**

Assessment of young children's understanding of multicultural concepts provides a particular challenge to educators. In spite of two decades of debate and curriculum development in multicultural education, driven by concerns for equity, the development of valid and reliable assessments of these curricula continues to lag behind, particularly for young school-age children.

Further investigation of instruments designed to assess important cross-cultural/multicultural concepts is critically needed. Because testing tends to drive the curriculum (Kirst, 1984), the development of reliable, valid and easily administered assessments is essential if multicultural education curricula are to become a standard part of the school learning experience. It is recommended that teams of test developers include content area specialists as well as psychologists.

Social studies educators have succeeded in the past few years in lobbying for social studies to be added to the California Assessment Program (CAP). There will soon be required state-wide tests, which include the social studies, to be administered at the 8th, 10th, and 12th grade levels. The results of these tests will be used to evaluate programs, not individual students or teachers. The CAP test includes three areas from the California History/Social Science Framework.
(1981) which overlap with multicultural education concepts central to the CUME Assessment. They are 1) the ability to compare similarities and differences, 2) the recognition of stereotypes, and 3) the recognition of different value orientations and different ideologies.

Furthermore, it is anticipated that the CAP testing in Social Studies will eventually be implemented at the 3rd and 6th grade levels, while the 8th grade will continue to reflect a cumulative assessment.

Therefore, it is recommended that educational leaders concerned about multicultural education pay particular attention to this test development process in the State Department of Education. Continued investigation of the CUME Assessment and other assessments may be one small step in exerting important influence on the shape of school curriculum to come.

Additionally, a paper and pencil test format which is easily administered and scored may be more successful in making inroads in the schools than the more behaviorally oriented but more cumbersome assessments of sociograms, anecdotal records, teacher observation or projective techniques. This is not to imply that these types of assessments are not important, but rather to recognize the practical limitations of less institutionalized assessment strategies.

There may be greater potential in today's educational marketplace of ideologies to incorporate critical multicultural concepts into the social studies as was accomplished,
in part, with the Family of Man program. Elementary teachers rarely even find time to teach social studies today with the increasing pressure to include the "basics" of reading and math. It may be unrealistic to expect a separate multicultural education program to be implemented in the classroom unless it is designated as the social studies program, as US: A Cultural Mosaic was in some of the schools selected for this investigation.

Finally, the successful teaching of cross-cultural/multicultural concepts to children depends upon well-trained teachers who have, in Bank's (1981) terms, clarified their various individual and group identities. Curriculum must be taught in a manner which reflects positive attitudes toward and valuing of diversity in addition to knowledge of content. An ability to organize and teach relevant concepts rather than mere facts further identify a competent teacher of multicultural education. Assessment instruments may not be able to measure these critical components of instruction, but an increased emphasis on teaching a curriculum which is to be evaluated may motivate and stimulate teacher learning.

Suggestions for Further Research

The results of this study indicate, in general, that more research is needed. The following recommendations are made to extend this investigation of the CUME Assessment:

1. Use additional assessments to measure the construct validity of CUME. These should be identified not only by the
content domains assessed, but by evidence of adequate reliability and validity.

2. Field test the CUME with a larger sample.

3. Increase the items in each subtest from three to six to improve the reliability; administer the test in two parts.

4. Replicate the study with a more reliable teacher (and therefore, subject) selection method. Expand the Teacher Questionnaire to cross-check information and conduct a follow-up classroom observation with a checklist.

5. Control the implementation of the multicultural education curriculum and then administer the CUME Assessment to the treatment group and a control group.

6. Replicate the investigation with a pretest-posttest experimental design using the CUME Assessment.

The above recommendations for further investigation of the CUME Assessment would greatly enhance information about its reliability and validity. This ultimately would provide educators with a critically validated assessment and program evaluation tool for an essential but often neglected area of the curriculum, multicultural education.
REFERENCES


Appendix A

Teacher Questionnaire

Respondent's Name Date

Please take a few minutes to respond to the following questions. Remember that the purpose of this research project is to validate an assessment instrument, not to evaluate your teaching. It is critical to the research that I know to what extent you teach the objectives being assessed by the instrument. Therefore, please answer as honestly as you can. I will collect the questionnaire and briefly discuss it with you. Thank you so much for your cooperation with this effort.

Doni Kobus

To what extent do you feel you address the following objectives in your teaching?

Please circle the most appropriate number for each item.

| not at all | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | a great deal |

Objective #1: The child will recognize and identify the physical traits which make him or her like other children.

Objective #2: The child will identify needs common to all members of the human family, the biological needs.
Objective #3: The child will identify needs common to all members of the human family, the non-biological needs, such as:

- the need for cooperation
- the need to have their rights respected
- the need for communication
- the need for affection
- the need to feel important and valuable

To what extent do you feel you address the following objectives in your teaching?

Please circle the most appropriate number for each item.

| not at all | a great deal |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Objective #4: The child will recognize and value the uniqueness of various families, including his or her own.

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Objective #5: The child will be able to identify those characteristics which make an individual unique and special, including himself or herself.

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
Objective #6: The child will recognize that all human beings have inside differences, such as different ideas, thoughts, likes and dislikes.

Objective #7: The child will recognize and accept differences among individuals and groups as those characteristics which make them unique and special.

Comments:
Appendix B

The CUME Assessment

General Instructions for Test Administration

CUME is a twenty-one item, multiple choice, paper and pencil test. It requires approximately one-half hour to administer as a group test. It is to be given under normal testing conditions.

Students must practice the test format by completing the sample test item in the test booklet before the test begins. Students must select an answer to each item and mark the box corresponding to the selection with an "X". When you feel confident that students understand how to mark their selected answers, please begin the test. If the students need more practice, use an additional sample on the chalk board.

Read each test item, including the choices for answers, twice, pacing your reading in a manner appropriate for testing conditions. Allow students adequate time to respond. Students are to follow along in the test booklet while you read each item.

Instructions to the Students

I will read some sentences to you. Listen carefully and follow along in your test booklet while I read.

You will answer the question or complete the sentence by marking the box by the answer you think is right. Do your own work and do the best that
you can. Do not worry if you do not know the answer.

Put your finger on the #1 (#2, #3, etc.) in the circle. Follow along in your booklet while I read aloud.

(The teacher should check to make sure all students are on the correct item.)
Kobus Assessment

C Cross-Cultural
U Understandings in
M Multicultural
E Education

Student Name _____________________
Teacher ________________________ Room __________
Grade ________________________
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Look at the pictures and listen. What do you know about the children in these pictures?

A □ They all like ice cream.
B □ They all go to the same school.
C □ They all have the same kinds of body parts.

Mark one box to show what you think is true.
Listen. What do you think is true?

My family is unique and special because

A □ ...we watch T.V.
B □ ...we go on picnics with friends.
C □ ...in some ways we are different from other families.

Mark one box to show what you think is true.

Look at the pictures and listen.

Which family is unique and special?

A □ Family 1.
B □ None of the families.
C □ Family 3.
D □ Each family.

Mark one box to show what you think is true.
Look at the pictures and listen. What do you think is true?

All human beings have...

...a book  ...a jacket  ...a nose

A  B  C

Mark the box which makes the sentence true.
5) Look at the pictures and listen.

Find the picture of a biological need of all humans.

Mark the box under the picture that shows a biological need.
Listen to this story.

Pat and Sandy are best friends at school. They both like to play kickball and they like to be winners in the class math contests. Their friend, Maria, likes the math contests, but she does not like to play kickball.

What do you think is true?

A ☐ It is all right for people to like different things.
B ☐ Maria should find new friends.
C ☐ Pat and Sandy should stop playing kickball and play a different game with Maria.

Mark one box to show what you think is true.
Look at the picture and listen.

A girl wears special clothing to school one day.

What do you think is true?

A □ She should wear clothes like other children.
B □ She looks funny.
C □ She is unique and special.

Mark one box to show what you think is true.
Look at the picture and listen.

This Chinese-American family eats special food to celebrate Chinese New Year.

What do you think is true?

A □ This family should eat hamburgers.
B □ This family is unique and special.
C □ This food is funny.

Mark one box to show what you think is true.
9. Listen.

What do you think is true?

All people are alike because...

A  ... they all speak the same language.
B  ... they all live in the city.
C  ... they all eat the same food.
D  ... they all have human bodies.

Mark one box to show what you think is true.

10. Look at the pictures and listen.

Find the picture that shows cooperation.

Mark the box below the picture that shows cooperation.
Listen to the story.

The children in Mr. Jones' room were asked to bring food from home to share with others at a class party. Juan brought tortillas, Mimi brought rice balls and Tammy brought cornbread.

Which child is unique and special?

A □ Juan is unique and special.
B □ Mimi is unique and special.
C □ None are unique and special.
D □ Each child is unique and special.

Mark one box to show what you think is true.
Look at the pictures and listen.

These children speak both Spanish and English.

What do you think is true?

A □ People communicate in different ways.
B □ English is a better language.
C □ These children eat the same food.

Mark one box to show what you think is true.
13 Listen.

Susie likes fried eggs but Juan likes scrambled eggs.

What do you think is true?

People are unique and special because...

A [ ] ...all people like some things more than others.
B [ ] ...all people eat eggs.
C [ ] ...all people need food.

Mark one box to show what you think is true.

14 Listen.

What do you think is true?

All families...

A [ ] ...eat hot dogs.
B [ ] ...speak the same language.
C [ ] ...are different from my family in some ways.

Mark one box to show what you think is true.
Look at the pictures and listen.

Find the picture of a **biological need** of all human beings.

Mark the box under the picture that shows a **biological need**.

Listen. What do you think is true?

I am unique and special because...

A [ ] ...I like ice cream.
B [ ] ...no one else is just like me.
C [ ] ...I live with a family.

Mark one box to show what you think is true.
Look at the picture and listen.

Allen said to his mother, "I told my friends about my camping trip."

Find the sentence below that best tells about the picture and the sentence.

A  All people need to cooperate.
B  All people need to communicate.
C  All people need affection.

Mark the box by the sentence that best tells about the picture of Allen and the sentence about Allen.
18 Look at the pictures and listen. What do you think is true?

These twins are unique and special because...
A [ ] ...they go to school.
B [ ] ...they have a mother.
C [ ] ...they have some different ideas.

Mark one box to show what you think is true.

19 Listen. What do you think is true?

Because I am unique and special, I am...
A [ ] ...the same as some people.
B [ ] ...different from everyone in some ways.
C [ ] ...the same as my family.

Mark one box to show what you think is true.
(20) Listen. What do you think is true?

**Biological needs** are...

A □ ...body parts.
B □ ...needs all human beings have.
C □ ...needs only I have.

Mark **one** box to show what you think is true.

(21) Look at the pictures and listen.

Find the picture that shows the need all people have for **affection**.

Mark the box under the picture of the need all people have for **affection**.
Appendix C

The CUME Assessment: Stockton Unified School District
Analysis of the 1981-82 Pretest and Posttest Data

Percentage of Students by Grade Level Mastering Each of Seven Objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>1st Grade</th>
<th>2nd Grade</th>
<th>3rd Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>136 students</td>
<td>122 students</td>
<td>129 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 2</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 3</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 4</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 5</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 6</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 7</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>1st Grade</th>
<th>2nd Grade</th>
<th>3rd Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>114 students</td>
<td>121 students</td>
<td>129 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 1</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 2</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 3</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 4</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 5</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 6</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 7</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

CUME Content Rating Form and Results

Letter to Experts

Enclosed you will find a copy of an instrument, Cross-Cultural Understandings in Multicultural Education (CUME), which is being evaluated to determine whether or not it will accurately assess third grade children's understanding of the concept of similarities and differences among people. This understanding is the basis of a curriculum for multicultural education, as indicated in the State of California Office of Intergroup Relations publications, Guide for Multicultural Education, Content and Context and Planning for Multicultural Education as a Part of School Improvement.

In addition, the California State Department of Education's History-Social-Science Framework for California Public Schools focuses on the concept of diversity throughout its recommendations:

The central purpose of history-social science education is to prepare students to be humane, rational, understanding, and participating citizens in a diverse society and in an increasingly interdependent world--students who will preserve and continue to advance progress toward a just society.

The framework infuses the critical concept of diversity within each grade level theme. Briefly, the K-3rd grade level recommendations are as follows:
Kindergarten-Myself and Others in My World--an exploration of the similarities and differences which make the individual both unique and part of the family of humanity.

Grade One-People at Home and at School--an examination of one's own family and the varieties of families in the community, nation, and world.

Grade Two-People as Members of Groups--an analysis of the many groups, including ethnic, gender, and linguistic groups, to which one belongs and the significance of that belonging.

Grade Three-People as Members of Communities--a study of the diverse cultures and peoples who comprise and contribute to the local community.

The notion of similarities and differences is an essential element of understanding diversity. The CUME Assessment attempts to measure conceptual knowledge related to seven objectives based on recommendations from social studies/multicultural education development projects, the State of California recommendations and requirements for multicultural education, and the California State framework for history-social sciences. It is also based on the conceptualization from the literature in educational anthropology that through the teaching of cultural universals, students can best learn about the concept of similarities and differences as a part of the general theme of diversity.

Moreover, the development of these conceptual understandings in young children is related to their general level of cognitive functioning. Therefore, you will note that
appropriate testing (and teaching) of these understandings is based on experiences and examples which have concrete meaning for children who are assumed to be functioning at Piaget's "concrete operational" stage of development.

As a doctoral candidate at the University of the Pacific, I am in the process of field-testing the CUME Assessment for my dissertation. I would very much appreciate having your expertise in validating the items as they relate to each objective. Would you please take the time to assist in this process?

I have enclosed a response sheet with instructions. Please return this response sheet as soon as possible and not later than Friday, April 8th. A return envelope is provided for your convenience.

Thank you in advance for your assistance. Your contribution is invaluable!

Sincerely,

Doni Kwolek Kobus
Cross-Cultural Understanding in Multicultural Education--CUME

CUME is an assessment instrument for a multicultural education program which has the following goals:

Goal 1: The child will recognize similarities among individuals and respect them as those characteristics which make each person a member of the human family.

Goal 2: The child will recognize the individual differences among people, both personal and cultural, and respect them as those characteristics that add to the richness and diversity of American life.

CUME assesses the following learning objectives:

Objective 1: The child will recognize and identify the physical traits which make him or her like other children.

Objective 2: The child will identify needs common to all members of the human family, the biological needs:
- air
- water
- food
- clothing
- shelter
- rest

Objective 3: The child will identify needs common to all members of the human family, the non-biological needs, such as:
- the need for communication
- the need to have their human rights respected
- the need for cooperation
the need for affection
the need to feel important and valuable

Objective 4: The child will recognize and value the uniqueness of various families, including his or her own.

Objective 5: The child will be able to identify those characteristics which make an individual unique and special, including himself or herself.

Objective 6: The child will recognize that all human beings have inside differences, such as different ideas, thoughts, likes and dislikes.

Objective 7: The child will recognize and accept differences among individuals and groups as those characteristics which make them unique and special.

A curriculum for kindergarten through third grade would implement these objectives at each grade level and use CUME at the end of the third grade to assess the conceptual understanding of the children.
CUME Content Rating Form Sample

Respondent's Name

Please Return by

To what extent do you feel the items will measure the conceptual understanding related to each objective? (Please refer to the test booklet.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Item #1</th>
<th>Item #4</th>
<th>Item #9</th>
<th>Item #5</th>
<th>Item #15</th>
<th>Item #20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The child will recognize and identify the physical traits which make him or her like other children.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The child will identify needs common to all members of the human family, the <strong>biological</strong> needs.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**CUME Content Rating Results**

Objective 1: The child will recognize and identify the physical traits which make him or her like other children.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Expert</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ok-just not very conceptually challenging for age level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>'same body parts' or 'same kinds of body parts'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>If students perceive hair as body part this could be a problem. All have hair, but it is not the same.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 4$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| #4    | A      | 4     | OK-just not very conceptually challenging. Appropriate for age level. |
| B     | 5      |       |          |
| C     | 5      |       |          |
| D     | 5      |       |          |
| E     | 5      |       |          |
| F     | 4      |       |          |
| Mean  | $\bar{x} = 4.7$ |

| #9    | A      | 1     | I don't like "the same" in the question. If you put in 'similar' you would be in business. |
| B     | 5      |       |          |
| C     | 5      |       |          |
| D     | 5      |       |          |
| Mean  | $\bar{x} = 5$ |
Objective 2: The child will identify needs common to all members of the human family, the **biological needs**.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Expert</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#9 (cont)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>_________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>_________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean $\bar{x}$ = 4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean $\bar{x}$ for objective 1 = 4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Expert</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>_________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Add to the bottom a brief definition of 'biological needs'. The item itself is good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>_________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Biological needs-heavy term for young child.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>_________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>_________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean $\bar{x}$ = 4.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Expert</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#15</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Not all kids drink tap water. This item may be confusing to such children. Maybe you could just use the glass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Add to the bottom a brief definition of 'biological needs'. The item itself is good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>_________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>If child understands term--OK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Note: money would be a great distractor here!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>_________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean $\bar{x}$ = 4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items</td>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#20</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>Not a good question. Not all people have all of the same biological needs. There are some biological needs that only some individuals and groups have (boys/girls).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Add to the bottom a brief definition of 'biological needs'. The item itself is good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>OK if term is understood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Note: all three (items 5, 15, 20) require that students have learned the specific vocabulary 'biological need'. Would it help to paraphrase for those who understand the concept but have not learned the vocabulary; i.e.--biological need--that is, something all human bodies need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean $\bar{x} = 4.6$

Mean $\bar{x}$ for Objective 2 = 4.6

Objective 3: The child will identify needs common to all members of the human family, the non-biological needs, such as:

- the need for communication
- the need to have their human rights respected
- the need for cooperation
- the need for affection
- the need to feel important and valuable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Expert</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#10</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>I marked it this low because the other 2 pictures could conceivably be viewed as cooperation: 1) baby being quiet 2) kids not intruding on each others' play.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items</td>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10 (cont.)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>'slanted eyes' again. OK if children understand cooperation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Distractor B may cause some confusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean $\bar{x} = 4.6$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#17</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>Either B or C would be proper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>heavy, abstract terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean $\bar{x} = 4.2$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#21</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>But I would change picture C--it could be interpreted as needing affection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>OK if term is understood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>'C' is probably intended to be 'feel important and valuable' but some children feel 'my teacher likes me' when picture is put up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean $\bar{x} = 3.8$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean $\bar{x}$ for Objective 3 = 4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objective 4: The child will recognize and value the uniqueness of all families, including his or her own.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Expert</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>OK--just not challenging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Add 'and special'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Picnics are pretty unique anymore--maybe 'B' could be changed. Unique may be difficult for young child.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean $\bar{x} = 3.7$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| #3    | A      | 5     | excellent |
|       | B      | 5     | Add 'and special'. |
|       | C      | 3     |             |
|       | D      | 4     | 'Slanted' eyes a 'no-no' in depicting Asian-Americans. |
|       | E      | 5     | Note: item B should be none of the families is unique. None is singular! |
|       | F      | 3     |             |
| Mean $\bar{x} = 4.2$ |

<p>| #14   | A      | 5     |             |
|       | B      | 5     |             |
|       | C      | 4     |             |
|       | D      | 4     | Syllogism form?? difficult. [Items 2, 3, 14]: Conceptual level of young child--can he/she really understand 'unique'? |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Expert</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#14 (cont.)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean $\bar{x} = 4.5$

Mean $\bar{x}$ for Objective 4 = 4.1.

Objective 5: The child will be able to identify those characteristics which make an individual unique and special, including himself or herself.

| #16 | A | 3 | Almost just a definition |
|     | B | 5 | Add 'and special' |
|     | C | 4 | \_\_\_\_\_\_ |
|     | D | 5 | \_\_\_\_\_\_ |
|     | E | 5 | \_\_\_\_\_\_ |
|     | F | 5 | \_\_\_\_\_\_ |

Mean $\bar{x} = 4.5$
Items | Expert | Score | Comments
--- | --- | --- | ---
#19 | A | 3 | Almost just a definition.
    | B | 5 | Remove 'Because I am unique....' Begin: I am....
    | C | 4 | 
    | D | 5 | 
    | E | 5 | 
    | F | 3 | 

Mean $\bar{x} = 4.2$

Mean $\bar{x}$ for Objective 5 = 4.3

Objective 6: The child will recognize that all human beings have inside differences, such as different ideas, thoughts, likes and dislikes.

#6 | A | 3 | B would not be a bad answer.
    | B | 5 | 
    | C | 5 | 
    | D | 3 | You may get 'A' or 'C' depending upon sensitivity of child to needs of another. May not test what you intend.
    | E | 4 | Under some circumstances B or C could be the best answer.
    | F | 4 | 

Mean $\bar{x} = 4.0$

#13 | A | 3 | You could answer the question without reading the statement.
    | B | 5 | Remove 'People are unique because....' Capitalize the first letter of Statements A, B, C.
    | C | 3 | Confusing. I answered 'wrong'!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Expert</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#13 (cont)</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>This stem does not match the objective. OK if you use 'likes or dislikes'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>I have some problem with the use of the word 'ideas' to represent different tastes in food.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean $\bar{x} = 3.8$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#18</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Excellent; thought-provoking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Add 'and special'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>OK if child understands 'idea'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean $\bar{x} = 4.7$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean $x$ for Objective 6 = 4.2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objective 7: The child will recognize and accept differences among individuals and groups as those characteristics which make them unique and special.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Expert</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#7</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>You may get lots of A &amp; B that will show where the need for work is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Add 'and special' to C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>She wants to share something different about herself? With young child do you want to focus on differences?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items</td>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The word unique can be a give away. Also, the answer seems to address obj. 5 while the problem is addressing objective 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean $\bar{x}$ = 4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Add 'and special' to B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>The picture does not present an attractive (or real) picture of Chinese--object to 'slanted eyes'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Again, unique is a clue. Also, the answer addresses objective 4, the question, obj. 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean $\bar{x}$ = 4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#12</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>Misleading picture--not all Spanish-speaking children are dark.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean $\bar{x}$ = 4.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean $\bar{x}$ for Objective 7 = 4.5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supplementary comments of Experts

A. See page 230.
B. None.
C. None.
D. I feel the abstract terms may be rather difficult for many children in this age bracket...unless teachers really spend a great deal of time...and will they? I also wonder whether emphasis on differences is the direction one should take with young children. Not sure whether my concerns are justified; suggest that if you have not, you may wish to ask an expert in child development (like [name of expert who responded to the Content Rating Form, Expert B]) to give you an opinion. This is a difficult area to validity test. You've done a very commendable job!

E. In spite of all these remarks, I do like your program objectives and most of the items. I do know from past experience that our ingenious children will manage to circumvent our best intentions, though! P.S.--I kept a copy--hope you don't mind.

F. None.

*Outlying score which was eliminated from the calculations
April 11, 1983

Ms. Doni Kwolek Kobus
1135 West Poplar Street
Stockton, CA 95203

Dear Doni:

I've been out of the country and, in plowing through my stacks of back mail, I came across your Assessment Instrument, so I wanted to get it back to you as quickly as possible. Hope I'm not too late. I think you are on the road to a very exciting instrument...I've been tough on you at spots, but I know you wouldn't want anything else. I really think you can turn it into a first-rate instrument. Hope my comments are of help.

Sincerely,

Dr. Carlos E. Cortés
Professor of History

Enc.: Evaluation Form
Appendix E

CUME Student Interview Protocol and Instructions

General Instructions

Make every effort not to disturb classroom activities. Interview students in a quiet corner of the classroom or in a quiet area outside the classroom which has been designated by the principal.

Be friendly and reassuring to the student; establish a rapport with the student.

Audio-tape record all interviews. Write the student code number which appears on your list of subjects, on the tape. Also write the student code number of the INTERVIEW SCORING FORM. Date the interview on this form.

Read and speak clearly. Repeat information and questions for the student as necessary, probe but do not prompt or lead the student to the correct response.

Scoring

Circle the appropriate number corresponding with the student response during the interview. For each non-exemplar given as a response, subtract 1 exemplar from the tally. Transfer all scores to the Interview Scoring Form following the interviews. Keep a record of how long the interviews take to complete, on the average.

Should you have any problems with or questions about the procedures, please contact me immediately.
Interview Protocol

Objective #2

Give the child a copy of the story, Maria's Blue Bottle.

-I am going to read this story to you called, Maria's Blue Bottle. Follow along with your eyes while I read it to you. Listen carefully.

Read the story aloud.

-Think about the story. The story has examples of things all humans need to have to stay alive.

-I will read parts of the story again and then you will tell me what needs are mentioned that keep humans alive.

Read section 1.

-Tell me what needs are mentioned that keep humans alive.

Read section 2.

-Tell me what needs are mentioned that keep humans alive.

Read section 5.

-Tell me what needs are mentioned that keep humans alive.

Stop when the child has identified three examples.

Scoring:

I don't know. 0

"mother", "love", etc, a non-exemplar which is another kind of need; 1 biological need 1

child names 2 biological needs 2

child names 3 biological needs 3
**Objective #3**

(a)

- Think about the story again. The story has some examples of other kinds of needs all people have. One of the needs all people have is for cooperation. How did the people cooperate in the story?

Read section 1.

- How did the people show their need for cooperation in this part of the story?

Read section 2.

- How did the people show their need for cooperation in this part of the story?

Read section 4.

- How did the people show their need for cooperation in this part of the story?

Read section 5.

- How did the people show their need for cooperation in this part of the story?

**Stop when the child has identified three examples.**

**Scoring:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student names 0 exemplars</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student names 1 exemplar</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student names 2 exemplars</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student names 3 exemplars</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Think about the story again. Another need that all people have is the need for communication. How did the people in the story communicate?
- I will read some parts of the story and you think about the examples of communication.

Read section 2.

- What are the examples of communication in this part of the story?

Read section 3.

- What are the examples of communication in this part of the story?

Read section 4.

- What are the examples of communication in this part of the story?

Stop when the child has identified three examples.

Scoring:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student names 0 exemplars</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student names 1 exemplar</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student names 2 exemplars</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student names 3 exemplars</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Think about the story again. Another need that all people have is the need for caring and affection. How did the people in the story show caring and affection?
Read section 6.
- How did the people show their need for caring and affection in this part of the story?

Read section 9.
- How did the people show their need for caring and affection in this part of the story?

Scoring:
Student names 0 exemplars 0
Student names 1 exemplar 1
Student names 2 exemplars 2
Student names 3 exemplars 3

Average a, b, and c for a final score for Objective #3.

Score_______

Objective #4
(a)
- Think about the story of Maria and her family. How is her family unique and special?
- Is there anything else?

Scoring:
Student gives 0 exemplars 0
Student gives 1 exemplar 1
Student gives 2 exemplars 2
(b)

- Maria's family was unique and special in some ways.
- Are all families unique and special in one way or another, or not?

**Scoring:**

Student answers "no", "I don't know", "maybe", "sometimes", or is generally uncertain 0

Student answers "yes" 1

Add (a) and (b) for the final score for objective #4.

Score

**Objective #5**

(a)

- Think about the ways each person in the story, Maria's Blue Bottle was unique and special. I will read parts of the story while you follow along.

Read section 3.

- Tell me how each person in the story is unique and special in some way.

Read section 9.

- Tell me how each person in the story is unique and special in some way.

**Scoring:**

Student gives 0 exemplars 0
Student gives 1 exemplars

Student gives 2 exemplars

(b)

- People in the story, Maria's Blue Bottle are unique and special in some ways.
- Are all people unique and special in one way or another, or not?

Scoring:

Student indicates some people are more unique and special than others; student doesn't know, or student is confused

Student indicates that all people are unique and special in some ways

Add (a) and (b) for the final score for objective #5.

Score

Objective #6

(a)

- Think about the story again. Tell me about the different ideas, feelings, likes or dislikes or abilities the people in the story had.

READ the indicated sections and STOP when the student has given 2 exemplars.

Read section 6.

- Tell me about the different ideas, feelings, likes or dislikes or abilities each person had.
Read sections 7 and 8, if necessary. Request the above information after reading each section.

Scoring:

Student gives 0 exemplars 0
Student gives 1 exemplar 1
Student gives 2 exemplars 2

(b)

- You thought about the different ideas, feelings, likes or dislikes, and abilities that the people in the story had.
- Do all people have different ideas, feelings, likes or dislikes and abilities, or do only some people have these?

Scoring

Student answers that only some people have these, student doesn't know, or student seems confused 0
Student indicates that all people have these 1

Add (a) and (b) for a final score for objective #6.

Score_____

Objective #1

Show the child the selected photo of children or various ethnic backgrounds.
- These children have some things in common with each other and with all other human beings.
- They all need to have certain things to stay alive.
What else do they have in common with each other and with all other people?
- What else do these children have in common?

Scoring:

They are not the same; I don't know 0

They are people, children; child names other things the children have in common such as clothing, feelings, friendliness, etc. 1

Child indicates they have the same body parts or names various body parts that they have in common 2

Child indicates that they are all human beings, they are all alive 3
Maria's Blue Bottle--Story and Answer Key

1. Maria and her family \(^3\) like to do things together. All the children \(^3\) help their mother cook the \(^2\) food for dinner and they each \(^3\) take turns washing the dishes. Instead of watching T.V. after dinner, \(^4\) they have some special ways they spend their evenings before \(^2\) bed-time.

2. After Maria and her brothers finish their homework, \(^3\), \(^4\) their mother plays a game with them. They all sit around the kitchen table in the \(^2\) house trailer where they live. In the summer time when it's hot, Maria sets a big pitcher of iced drinking \(^2\) water on the table for nice cool drinks. \(^3\) Maria's mom starts to tell a story, but she does not finish it. \(^3\), \(^b\) Maria and her brothers and their mom take turns adding to the story. \(^3\), \(^4\) They tell stories together.

3. \(^3\) Sometimes the stories they tell are funny and sometimes they are scary. \(^3\), \(^5\) Sam likes to make the stories scary, but \(^3\), \(^5\) Jim likes the funny ones. \(^3\) He is a great comic and imitates funny voices and sounds when it is his turn. \(^3\) Maria's mom likes to add surprise endings to the stories, and \(^3\), \(^5\) Maria likes stories about people who live in other countries. \(^3\), \(^4\) Sometimes they write down the best stories so they can read them to their friends.

4. Maria's \(^3\), \(^4\) family also likes to collect glass bottles of different colors. \(^3\), \(^4\) They turn them upside down and stick them in the dirt to line their flower garden in the yard. One
day 3a Maria and Sam worked together to make a 3b sign which says, "Please do not walk on the bottles." 3b They wrote it in Spanish.

5. The family does not have a car so 4a they walk a lot. They have to put on warm 2 clothes when it is cold. While they walk, they look for bottles people have thrown away even though a sign says, "$50 Fine For Littering." Not only do 3a, 4a they help clean up the neighborhood and get plenty of 2 fresh air, but 3a, 4a they make the yard pretty at the same time.

6. 6a Maria likes the blue bottles best. 6a She has sharp eyes and can spot the shining glass a block away. Jim wears thick glasses because he needs help to see. 3c Maria holds his hand while they walk. 6a Jim is not so quick to spot the bottles, but he is always ready with a bag to carry them home. 3c Their mom gives them a hug for each new bottle they find.

7. Once a man and a woman came by their trailer and saw the bottles. 6a They got all excited and waved at the children when they saw one tiny blue bottle. They said it was very valuable. 6a They wanted to buy it for their bottle collection.

8. 6a Maria's mom said it was up to Maria to decide. She was the one who had found the bottle. Maria did not know what to do at first. 6a She loved that funny blue bottle. 6a But the people wanted to give them two hundred dollars for it!
Finally, her mom and brothers said she could decide how to spend the money if she sold it.

9. Maria sold the bright blue bottle. She had never had so much money before. She decided to use part of the money to buy a tape recorder for the family. She wanted to record their story-telling. Jim gave her a big kiss when he found out. Sam squeezed her hand and smiled.

10. Now they can all listen to themselves being storytellers. Maria wants to tell a story about a funny blue bottle which travels from country to country with people who love it.
From: Rainbow ABC's, Ethnic Public Heritage Program Seattle Public School District No. 1: ("Reproduction of worksheets by the classroom teacher for use in the classroom and not for commercial use is permissible.")
### Interview Scoring Form: Cross-Cultural Understanding in Multicultural Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name _________________________________</th>
<th>ID# ___</th>
<th>Group# ___</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Obj. #1

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>(a) 0</td>
<td>(a) 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(b) 0</td>
<td>(b) 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Obj. #2

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Obj. #3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Averaged Score</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) 0</td>
<td>(a) 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(b) 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Obj. #6

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL INTERVIEW SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERVIEWER</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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People Pictures
NAME ____________________________
SCHOOL __________________________

FAMILY OF MAN EVALUATION STUDY PROJECT

PEOPLE PICTURES

The Family of Man Evaluation Study Project is being conducted in cooperation with the Social Education Department of the School of Education at Boston University under a grant from the Longview Foundation for Education in World Affairs and International Understanding.

Copyright © 1976 FAMES Project
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Specific Directions for Administering Test to Students

Be sure to read through these directions carefully before you administer the student instrument. To insure that all participants in the study take the test under the same conditions, the directions should be followed closely. The instructions that are to be read aloud are enclosed in boxes, so that you can more readily identify them.

Check to see that all needed supplies are on hand. You will need to have in hand your sample copy of the booklet to be administered, in order to provide instructions as indicated below. Spread the students out so that they cannot readily look at one another's work.

After the students have been seated properly, say:

(Read only prior to the first testing session.)

You have been chosen to take part in a project called The Family of Man Evaluation Study Project. Other children will be doing the same in many parts of the country. We want to find out what you know about other lands and the people who live there, and how you "feel" about the world outside the United States. Your answers will help teachers in the United States to understand better what children think and know about other countries and the people who live there.
Now look at the booklet People Pictures. (Hold up.)

Make sure that each student is looking at the booklet, then say:

We would like to find out how you feel about these people and the kinds of things they do. Since everyone will have different ideas, there are no right or wrong answers.

At the top of the cover page, print your first and last names. (Pause.) On the second line, print the name of our school.

Check to be sure that the children have printed their first and last names and the name of their school. When this has been completed, say:

Now please open your booklets to practice page A. Look at the picture at the top of this page. Study the people in the picture. Look carefully at what they are doing. Ask yourself, how do you feel about the people and what they are doing? Now let's look at words that might be used to tell something about these people and what they are doing. I'll read each word aloud as you read it to yourself. Draw a line around any word that tells what you think. Circle as many words as you think tell about these people and what they are doing in this picture.
Read each word or phrase, line by line, aloud, using your copy of the instrument. Pause to allow the children to draw their circles. Answer any questions about the meaning of a word but do not elaborate on what is going on in the photograph or where to photograph may have been taken. Proceed in a similar manner with the second practice page. When the children have finished the practice pages, say:

There are 12 more pages. On each page there is a different picture. Circle the words you would use to tell what you think about the people in the picture and what they are doing. Remember that since we all have different ideas, there are no wrong or right answers. Look carefully at the picture and then ask yourself if a word can be used to tell what you think.

Be sure to read all the words on a page, but decide quickly which words to circle. As you finish each page, go right on to the next page.

Are there any questions? (Answer these briefly.)
Ready? Begin.

As the children progress through the booklet:
- Check to be sure that no pages are skipped.
- Encourage children to mark as many words that describe what they think about the people and what they are doing in each photograph.

When the class has completed the booklets say:
Please close the booklet.

Collect the booklets. Please place them in alphabetical order.

Photograph Credits


National Geographic Magazine:

Vol. 122, p. 344. People Picture A.


Vol. 135, p. 204. People Picture 11.


June 7, 1983

Ms. Doni Kobus
1135 W. Poplar Street
Stockton, California 95203

Dear Ms. Kobus:

Thank you for your note of May 18 and the check which you enclosed. I would like to take this opportunity to wish you much success with your study and would appreciate learning of the results. I look forward to hearing from you upon completion of your project.

Sincerely,

Charles L. Mitsakos

CLM/sf
Appendix G

Letters to Teachers and Parents

Dear

The principal of your school has agreed to allow me to conduct a research project at your school which will involve the third grade classes. I am therefore in need of your cooperation.

I am a doctoral student at the University of the Pacific and a former teacher in Stockton Unified School District, where my last assignment was to develop and run a multicultural education program for K-3rd grad students at ______ School. My dissertation topic is to validate an assessment instrument to measure third grade students' understanding of concepts related to cross-cultural/multicultural education. These concepts have been translated into objectives which are thought to be assessed by the Cross-Cultural Understandings in Multicultural Education (CUME) assessment instrument. These selected objectives were derived from the state education code relating to multicultural education and from written guides from the California State Department of Education on the content and context of multicultural education.

My project is to show whether or not the CUME Assessment does, in fact, measure the objectives and concepts. This process of test development and validation is very technical, but basically, I will assume that I can, by interviewing students, determine to what extent they understand the
concepts that are assessed by the **CUME Assessment**. Then, I will give the **CUME Assessment** to those same students and through the use of statistics, determine how close each student's scores on the interview evaluation are to those on the written evaluation, **CUME**.

This project is **NOT** concerned with:

1) evaluating teachers
2) evaluating individual students for purposes other than the above

I will need approximately 35-40 students from the third grade level at your school. These students will be selected at random from your roll sheets.

The interview should take about 15 minutes per student and I would prefer to conduct it in a quiet corner of the student's classroom, if possible. The **CUME Assessment** will be given as a group test and it takes about one-half hour to administer. You will not be responsible for giving either the interview or the written group test.

The names of all students involved in the study will be coded after the data is collected to protect their privacy. I will provide a letter to inform parents of the study and of their child's possible participation in it. I will also be glad to provide information related to the outcome of the study to any interested persons.

I will ask you to fill out a brief questionnaire for some background information on multicultural education in your classroom. It should take you about five minutes to complete.
I will then collect these and clarify any questions you might have. I will keep you informed as the project progresses.

I want you to know that I really appreciate your cooperation in this research effort. If you have any questions or concerns, I can be reached at [phone number]. Thank you so much for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Doni Kwolek Kobus
To the parents of third grade students:

School has agreed to assist in an educational research project. As a doctoral candidate in education at the University of Pacific, I will be conducting this research. I am also a former teacher of School, where I was in charge of the ME Program, the multicultural education program at the school.

[Principal] and I are requesting your permission for your child to participate in the research project. The research involves the validation of an assessment instrument, Cross-Cultural Understandings in Multicultural Education. Students will be randomly selected to participate. If your child is selected, his/her participation will not take more than a total of one to one-and-a-half hours of time.

The results of the assessment will not in any way affect your child's grades in school and the identity of all students involved will be coded so that they will remain anonymous in reporting the results. The students will not be evaluated for any purpose other than the validation of the instrument.

It is my hope that you will be willing to allow your child to participate, should he/she be selected at random, as research in education is very important. If you are unwilling to have your child contribute to this effort, you may sign the form below and return it to your child's teacher. You only need to return the form if you do not want your child to participate.
Thank you so much for your cooperation. Your child will be making a valuable contribution to our knowledge of assessment.

Sincerely,

Doni Kwolek Kobus

Return this form only if you do not want your child to participate in the research project to validate the assessment instrument, Cross-Cultural Understandings in Multicultural Education.

I am unwilling to have my child participate.

Parent's name ___________________________ Date ______

If you do not want your child to participate, please return this form by Monday, April 18th, 1983.
Appendix H

Request for School Data

Sample Letter

January 19, 1984

Dear [Principal]:

As you know, in April and May of 1983, I conducted research on the acquisition of cross-cultural concepts among selected third grade students at your school. I indicated to you at that time that I would need to obtain descriptive data on your school in order to analyze the results of the assessment data I collected. I hope that by now your district research department has compiled basic information on your student population in 1982-83, such as reading and math test scores, ethnicity of the school population, and socioeconomic levels of your children. I would also appreciate any other pertinent descriptive information, especially information on the existence of school programs or curriculum in 1982-83 intended to improve intergroup relations and/or self-concept development.

I realize that as a principal in these times of educational stress and strain, you are already overworked. However, the success of my research project depends to a great extent on having this basic information. I certainly hope to be able to share my results with you at the end of this study, so that you and your teachers might have a better idea how to assess
multicultural concept acquisition among young children.
I will contact you the week of January 31 to make arrangements
to pick up the descriptive material. I really do appreciate
your cooperation and extra effort on my behalf.

Sincerely,

Doni Kwolek Kobus
Visiting Assistant
Professor of Education