

Fontbonne University

GriffinShare

All Theses, Dissertations, and Capstone
Projects

Theses, Dissertations, and Capstone Projects

2022

Culturally Responsive Teaching Preparedness: Differences and Similarities Among Preservice and Inservice Educators

Colleen Kinsella

Fontbonne University, CKinse01650@fontbonne.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://griffinshare.fontbonne.edu/all-etds>



Part of the [Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons](#), [Curriculum and Instruction Commons](#), and the [Curriculum and Social Inquiry Commons](#)



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 4.0 License](#).

Recommended Citation

Kinsella, Colleen, "Culturally Responsive Teaching Preparedness: Differences and Similarities Among Preservice and Inservice Educators" (2022). *All Theses, Dissertations, and Capstone Projects*. 549. <https://griffinshare.fontbonne.edu/all-etds/549>

FONTBONNE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND ALLIED HEALTH PROFESSIONS

CULTURALLY RESPONSIVE TEACHING PREPAREDNESS:
DIFFERENCES AND SIMILARITIES AMONG PRESERVICE AND INSERVICE
EDUCATORS

A Dissertation

SUBMITTED TO THE DOCTORAL FACULTY

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

degree of

Doctor of Education

By

Colleen M. Kinsella

St. Louis, Missouri

2022

In Copyright | CC-BY-NC-ND

By

Colleen M. Kinsella, 2022

I agree to make this work available online, either on the open internet or to the Fontbonne community. I retain all other rights to my work, including the right to copy and distribute the work.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I must extend my sincere thanks to my committee members: Dr. Jamie Doronkin, Dr. Sarah Huisman, and Dr. Jenna Voss. Without these women I would not be the researcher or writer that I am today; for this I am so grateful.

I would also like to extend thanks to my fellow cohort members. It has been such an arduous journey full of ups and downs during these past few years, and I am so glad I had all of you by my side as I navigated the unknowns.

Finally, I couldn't have done any of this without the love and support of my family- namely, my fiancé (almost husband!), Jeremiah and my parents, Mike and Mary Ann. They say it takes a village and that could not be more true in this case. Thank you for listening to my fears, comforting me when I felt discouraged, and celebrating in my victories. You made me believe in myself even when I didn't feel like it. Your unwavering certainty in my ability to accomplish this was the only thing that kept me going when I thought I couldn't take another step. I am so grateful to have the three of you in my corner. This work is yours as much as it is mine, and I dedicate it to all of you.

Contents

Title Page.....	i
Signature Page.....	ii
Copyright Page.....	iii
Acknowledgements.....	iv
Table of Contents.....	v
List of Tables.....	ix
Abstract.....	x
Chapter 1: Study Introduction.....	1
Introduction.....	1
National Context.....	3
Situational Context.....	5
Personal Context.....	7
Conclusion.....	8
Chapter 2: Literature Review.....	10
Introduction.....	10
Tenets of Culturally Responsive Teaching.....	10
Theoretical Frames.....	11
Culturally Responsive Teaching: Definition and Importance.....	12
Implicit Bias.....	13
Culturally Responsive Teaching in Preservice Education Programs.....	14
Diversity and Equity in Various Settings.....	17
Preparing to be Culturally Responsive.....	17

Implementation of Culturally Responsive Teaching.....	18
Qualities of Effective Teachers.....	19
High Expectations.....	21
Relationships.....	22
Creating a Culturally Responsive Community.....	23
Closing Thoughts on Chapter Two.....	23
Chapter 3: Methodology and Analysis Procedures.....	25
Introduction.....	25
Study Innovation and Research Questions.....	25
Study Design and Approvals.....	26
Study Setting and Participants.....	27
Participant Demographics.....	28
Instrument.....	32
Data Analysis Procedures.....	33
Threats to Validity and Reliability.....	34
Conclusion.....	35
Chapter 4: Results and Findings.....	36
Introduction.....	36
Analyses Introduction.....	36
Demographic Information.....	36
Reliability of Chosen Measures.....	37
Procedures and Findings.....	38
Research Question One.....	38

Research Question Two.....	40
Research Question Three.....	41
Research Question Four.....	42
Data Analysis Results.....	43
Additional Factors Regarding Results.....	45
Conclusion.....	45
Chapter 5: Discussion.....	47
Introduction	47
Study Overview.....	47
Study Findings in Relationship to Extant Literature.....	48
Theoretical Frameworks.....	51
Study Limitations.....	52
Implications for Practice.....	54
Organizational Improvement Plan.....	55
Problem of Practice.....	55
Problem of Practice History.....	56
Organizational History.....	57
Vision for Change: Change Readiness.....	57
Theory for Framing Change.....	59
Diagnosing and Analyzing Problems.....	60
Identification of Potential Solutions.....	61
Organizational Improvement Plan Pivot.....	61
Conclusion	63

References.....64

Appendix A: IRB Approval.....71

Appendix B: Siwatu Permission Email.....72

Appendix C: Siwatu Culturally Responsive Teaching Self Efficacy Survey.....73

Appendix D: Culturally Responsive Teaching Self Efficacy Survey-R Inservice.....75

Appendix E: Culturally Responsive Teaching Self Efficacy Survey-R Preservice...77

Appendix F: Informed Consent Form.....79

Appendix G: Participant Email Request.....80

List of Tables

Table 1 <i>Commonly Used Terms and Definitions</i>	2
Table 2 <i>Theoretical Framework Definitions</i>	12
Table 3 <i>Demographic Information</i>	31
Table 4 <i>Survey Averages- Inservice and Preservice Educator Responses</i>	39
Table 5 <i>Average Tenet Scores- Preservice and Inservice</i>	42

ABSTRACT

This quantitative study examined similarities and differences in preservice and inservice educators' confidence regarding Culturally Responsive Teaching. Data collected through a revised version of the Culturally Responsive Teaching Self-Efficacy Scale (CRTSES) (Siwatu, 2007) examined in which areas of Culturally Responsive Teaching both preservice and inservice educators felt confident and in which areas the two groups' confidence levels differed. Four categories of Culturally Responsive Teaching in the survey were determined by the researcher: Home-School Relationships; Home-School Culture; Classroom Community; Instructional Material/Curricula. These categories were used to determine which areas of Culturally Responsive Teaching participants scored the highest and lowest levels of confidence, and to assess where preservice and inservice educators differ in their feelings of confidence. It was also used to assess which areas, if any, preservice and inservice educators felt equally confident or unconfident. This information can be used to inform preservice program curricula, specifically concerning Culturally Responsive Teaching.

Keywords: preservice educators, inservice educators, Culturally Responsive Teaching, confidence, efficacy

Chapter One: Study Introduction

Introduction

It is no secret that modern-day America is as culturally divided as it was during the era of Jim Crow, in which people were segregated according to the color of their skin. Colin Kaepernick taking a knee during the national anthem in 2016 and subsequently exiting the National Football League, protests across the nation in the wake of George Floyd's death in 2020, and systemic racism in the justice system are concrete examples of racism and unrest in the United States. The incidence of the school to prison pipeline system is growing (ACLU, n.d.; Petty, 2018; Losen, et al., 2016) and as a result, students are not receiving necessary resources in schools (Osher, 2002; Darling-Hammond, 2010). Statistics from the 20/20 Bipartisan Justice Center show that "Black students are 1.9 times more likely than White students to be expelled and 2.3 times more likely to be disciplined through involvement of officers, such as a school related arrest" (Petty, 2018, para. 3). By receiving suspensions and expulsions in lieu of guidance, quality teaching, and specialized instruction that will support learners' needs when necessary, these students are being forced out of a system claiming to be appropriate for all. The problem of practice addressed in this study revolves around the idea that teachers and students who share a culture will have stronger relationships. While culture is not necessarily the only indicator of relationship-building, the sharing of cultures allows for a sense of trust between a student and teacher due to the fact that they may share important commonalities. The following table provides common definitions referenced throughout this study; additionally, the following sections in this chapter will review the national, situational, and personal context for this study.

Table 1*Commonly Used Terms and Definitions*

Term	Definition
Culture	The characteristics and knowledge of a particular group of people. Culture encompasses race, socioeconomic status, nationality, gender, family status, housing status, language, communication modality, or sexual preferences (Tochluck, 2009)
Constructivist	Theory in which learners construct knowledge rather than passively take in information; using experiences to incorporate new information into pre-existing knowledge (Piaget, 1977)
Preservice program	A program in which students are guided and supervised by a mentor or cooperating teacher; these students are studying education in a post-secondary education setting
Inservice educator	An educator who currently holds a teaching position
Discipline gap	The gap between White and Black students in discipline rates, especially in regard to suspensions and expulsions (Losen, 2015; National Center for Education Statistics, 2015; Tochluck, 2009)
Universal Design for Learning	An educational framework based on research that guides the development of flexible learning environments and spaces that can accommodate learning differences (Smith et al., 2017)
<i>Culturally Responsive Teaching</i>	A teacher's use of strategies that support a constructivist view of knowledge, teaching, and learning assists students in constructing knowledge, building on their personal and cultural strengths, and examining the curriculum from multiple perspectives, thus creating an inclusive classroom environment (Gay, 2010; Hammond, 2015; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Krasnoff, 2016)

National Context

According to the National Center for Education Statistics, in the 2017-2018 school year, 79% of the teaching population were White/non-Hispanic (National Center for Education Statistics, 2020, para.1). These data also showed that “teachers of a given race/ ethnicity were more often found in schools where their race/ethnicity matched a majority of the student body”, however, “at the same time, in schools where the majority of students were not White, the majority of teachers tended to be White” (NCES, 2020, para. 1). Because of the mismatch of educator and student racial and cultural identity, there could be a disconnect between educators and students. This could lead to more disciplinary action being taken against students of color, including in-school suspensions, expulsions, and arrests (Tervalon & Murray-Garcia, 1998). This is why now, more than ever, *Culturally Responsive Teaching* (Ladson-Billings, G, 1995; Gay 2010; Hammond, 2015) is a valuable tool schools should utilize to combat cultural inequities.

Culturally Responsive Teaching and Instruction is

a teacher’s use of strategies that support a constructivist view of knowledge, teaching, and learning assists students in constructing knowledge, building on their personal and cultural strengths, and examining the curriculum from multiple perspectives, thus creating an inclusive classroom environment” (Krasnoff, 2016, p. 2).

In other words, *Culturally Responsive Teaching* embraces the differences in each student and creates a space for students to express themselves and share and celebrate their culture in the classroom. It also accounts for the fact that students’ experiences are not

tantamount, and some students may need differentiated instruction in order to excel in the classroom.

Teachers must have an understanding of the various cultures present in the classroom before they can begin to implement *Culturally Responsive Teaching*. It is also important for teachers to understand how culture could affect learning and behavior (Krasnoff, 2016). In order to have a basic understanding of different cultures, teachers must be prepared in their preservice programs. By increasing familiarity of many different cultures, preservice teachers will be more equipped to create and foster a community in the classroom (Gay, 2002). Villegas and Lucas (2002) developed six characteristics that would prepare preservice educators to become culturally responsive: “socio-cultural consciousness, attitude, commitment and skills, constructivist views, knowledge of student’s life, and *culturally responsive teaching*” (pp. 25-26). In order to do this, however, teachers must be made aware that they need to learn about cultural responsiveness in the first place.

A factor that must be considered is how efficacious and confident teachers feel once they are in a school setting where they are perhaps the minority. Teacher efficacy is “teachers’ confidence in their ability to promote students’ learning” (Woolfolk Hoy, 2000, p. 2). The opportunity gap is rapidly closing between students of color and White students in public schools in America, but the number of White teachers is mostly maintained: 83% in 2004 vs. 79% in 2017 (NCES, 2020). Whether or not teachers and students share a culture, *Culturally Responsive Teaching* is a necessary, foundational practice for the teacher to educate themselves about all represented cultures in the classroom and integrate cultural practices appropriately.

Situational Context

According to Okonofua & Eberhardt (2015), racial bias can contribute to the disproportionate discipline gap. In their study, teachers were given school records and asked to identify the “troublemaker” student. The data show that student names which could have signified their race (for instance, “LaShawn”) influenced “how perceivers interpret a specific behavior, but also can enhance perceivers’ detection of behavioral patterns across time” (p. 620). This research shows that teachers were quick to label the students they perceived to be Black as troublemakers.

This is prevalent in several Midwestern, urban school districts. For example, the graduation rate disparity between Black and White students in Missouri is 17% (NCES, 2015). That means Black students are not graduating from high school at the same rate as their White counterparts, due to various causes. Black and White students in St. Louis show disparity in testing scores, as well. In 2010, 69.9% of Black 5th grade students scored at the “below basic/basic” level in communication arts on state-wide MAP tests. On the same subtest, only 42.9% of White students scored at the “below basic/basic” level (Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, 2010). This could be due to the fact that state-wide norm-referenced tests do not include culturally inclusive language, such as Ebonics or African American English, which is used by some members of the Black community (National Center for Education Statistics, 2015). These scores indicate that Black students are underperforming White students. This begs the question: are Black students set up for success at the same rate as White students?

Resources are not distributed evenly in many urban school districts. This is evidenced by multiple schools that have lost accreditation, thus forcing these districts to

outsource students to other districts (NCES, 2020). In order to pay tuition for these students, the unaccredited schools must pay \$20,000 per year per student to out of district schools (Crouch & Bock, 2014). This process pulls already limited funds and resources out of these unaccredited districts, which depletes funding for educational resources for the remaining students in the district. With many of these schools being unaccredited and underfunded, the students who stay in these schools are negatively impacted. This leaves students who remain in the district without many necessary educational materials, such as textbooks, school supplies, and classroom materials such as SMART boards or Auditory-Visual equipment (Crouch & Bock, 2014). Furthermore, teachers migrate away from schools when resources are depleted, which leaves some of these schools understaffed. As a result of these students being outsourced to a new district, they find themselves in an unfamiliar neighborhood with unfamiliar people. This could mean that they are out of their comfort zone and their culture is not represented in this new school's student population. *Culturally Responsive Teaching* is important in this situation, for students cannot thrive until they feel safe in their environment; Maslow's hierarchy of needs shows this (Maslow, 1943). If students feel their culture is accepted and embraced in their environment, there is motivation for success.

Culturally Responsive Teaching practices are needed everywhere. Just as Universal Design for Learning, which is a framework based on research that guides the development of flexible learning environments and spaces that can accommodate learning differences (Smith et al., 2017), benefits every learner, *Culturally Responsive Teaching* benefits all students, not solely the students it is intended to serve. If all students learn to appreciate and celebrate one another's differences, the world could

become more equitable and just for all. Integrating *Culturally Responsive Teaching* into classrooms could be a catalyst for change in future generations and could mitigate some of the cultural inequities which are very present.

Personal Context

As I began my career teaching in a preschool classroom for children with hearing loss, I realized how much I didn't know about cultural responsiveness. That first year, my class of six students consisted entirely of families whose primary languages were not English. These families were from various parts of the world, and their culture seeped into my classroom. I gladly embraced this widening of my own cultural lens; however, I quickly understood that I had much to learn about cultural responsiveness and integrating culturally appropriate activities into my classroom.

It is important to note that I identify as a White, cis-gendered woman. As I navigated my first year of teaching, I became increasingly curious about how different cultures place value on different things. For instance, one student's family immigrated from Mexico before he was born. This family was extremely close-knit, and I knew they socialized with their extended family often. One day, we had just begun our "House" theme in the classroom. We began by talking about what kind of house we lived in, what our bedrooms looked like, and who lived in our house. I was extremely confused when this particular student told me he lived in an apartment with his grandmother, grandfather, aunt, uncle, and cousin, along with his parents and two brothers. I thought, "Surely he must be mistaken. Maybe he's thinking about a time they came to visit and stayed in his family's home". I asked him two or three times if he was sure. He insisted that he was correct, so I decided to take his word for it and moved on with the lesson. I

am aware that this is not necessarily a practice embraced by all Mexican families, but this practice may be common in Latinx culture; extended family often live in the same house together. I look back on this experience and feel shame that I could have embarrassed this student by pressing him about his housing situation. This experience could have happened to any new teacher who did not share a the racial/cultural identity of her students; however, I believe that if teachers were exposed to the cultural practices of the multiple different cultures that could be represented in their classrooms, this type of incident could have been handled in a different way (specifically, one in which the student would not feel embarrassed or singled out for their family's cultural practices).

During that first year of teaching, I spent a lot of time researching different cultures and trying to figure out how I could integrate the practices of these cultures into my classroom. I discovered that my efforts fell flat since I had failed to ask the students' families how they wanted their culture represented in the classroom. I didn't recognize that some families do not celebrate certain aspects of their cultures, and therefore it was disrespectful for me to do so. In order to appropriately integrate these cultures into the classroom and allow these families to feel represented, I needed to delve into *Culturally Responsive Teaching* practices and understand how I could apply them in my classroom.

Conclusion

Chapter one examined the national, personal, and situational context of this dissertation. It also provided definitions for key terms to be used throughout the dissertation. This dissertation sought to examine and understand how confident preservice educators and inservice educators feel about implementing *Culturally Responsive Instruction* in their classrooms. I examined self-efficacy scores where

preservice educators and inservice educators rate themselves on a scale (the Culturally Responsive Teaching Self-Efficacy Scale, revised and used with permission from Siwatu, 2007). These responses were rated on a scale of 1-100, with 1 being the least efficacious and 100 being the most efficacious. Responses from each group (preservice and inservice) were then compared and analyzed for themes. The following research questions were analyzed:

1. How do preservice educators rate their ability to efficaciously implement *Culturally Responsive Teaching* practices during their educator preparation programs?
2. How do inservice educators rate their ability to efficaciously implement *Culturally Responsive Teaching* practices in their classrooms?
3. What components of *Culturally Responsive Teaching* (home-school relationships, home-school culture, classroom relationships and community, instructional material and concepts/curricula) do both inservice and preservice educators feel the most efficacious in implementing?
4. What components of *Culturally Responsive Teaching* (home-school relationships, home-school culture, classroom relationships and community, instructional material and concepts/curricula) do both inservice and preservice educators feel the least efficacious in implementing?

Chapter Two: Literature Review

Introduction

The previous chapter defined *Culturally Responsive Teaching* and highlighted the importance of utilizing *Culturally Responsive Teaching* in schools. *Culturally Responsive Teaching* is a teacher's use of strategies that support a constructivist view of knowledge, teaching, and learning assists students in constructing knowledge, building on their personal and cultural strengths, and examining the curriculum from multiple perspectives, thus creating an inclusive classroom environment (Gay, 2010; Hammond, 2015; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Krasnoff, 2016). This chapter examines and reviews existing literature. The literature examined in this section informed this dissertation, including specific strategies for implementing *Culturally Responsive Teaching*, preparing pre-service teachers for cultural responsiveness, teacher expectations, and the importance of strong student-teacher relationships. The motivation for this dissertation, methodology, and theoretical frameworks are examined and explained.

Tenets of Culturally Responsive Teaching

Four tenets of *Culturally Responsive Teaching* were identified prior to data collection for this study. These tenets were aligned with components of competencies from Preservice Teachers' Culturally Responsive Teaching Self-Efficacy and Outcome Expectancy Beliefs (Siwatu, 2007). These competencies include "curriculum and instruction, classroom management, student assessment, and cultural enrichment" (Siwatu, 2007, p. 1089). The present study adapted these tenets, with permission, to focus on relationships, culture, and curricula. The four tenets of *Culturally Responsive Teaching* that were the focus of this study are as follows:

1. Home-school relationships
2. Home-school culture
3. Classroom relationships
4. Instructional material and curricula

Theoretical Frames

Transformative framework (see Table 2) influenced the context of this study; education is not equitable, and *Culturally Responsive Teaching* provides actionable steps to be taken by individual educators in their interactions with learners toward creating equitable education opportunities for all learners (Creswell & Poth, 2018). Both the framework of *Culturally Responsive Teaching* (Table 2) and the implementation strategies are examined in this study. In order to properly implement *Culturally Responsive Teaching* in the classroom, the framework must be utilized. Educating teachers on the basic strategies to empower their students in the classroom regardless of race, class, or gender is a foundational concept of *Culturally Responsive Teaching*. It was the intention of this dissertation to urge the participants to examine their weaknesses in utilizing *Culturally Responsive Teaching* and discuss why they need more training in specific areas of cultural responsiveness. By examining this, an additional intention of the study was that these participants will learn more about *Culturally Responsive Teaching* as a framework and theory and learn more about effectively implementing *Culturally Responsive Teaching* in their classrooms.

Table 2*Theoretical Framework Definitions*

Framework	Definition
Transformative Framework	Participation between researcher and communities is studied; collaborative processes of research, highlighting issues and concerns (Creswell & Poth, 2018)
Culturally Responsive Teaching	Creates student-centered learning environments; affirms cultural identities (Gorski & Pothini, 2018, Gay, 2010; Hammond, 2015; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Krasnoff, 2016)

Culturally Responsive Teaching: Definition and Importance

As defined in Chapter One, *Culturally Responsive Teaching* is

a teacher's use of strategies that support a constructivist view of knowledge, teaching, and learning, assists students in constructing knowledge, building on their personal and cultural strengths, and examining the curriculum from multiple perspectives, thus creating an inclusive classroom environment" (Krasnoff, 2016, p. 2).

Students in the United States are culturally, ethnically, and linguistically diverse; though the educator population does not necessarily reflect this diversity (U.S. Department of Education Equity and Excellence Commission, 2013; NCES, 2020). In order for teachers to use best practices, they need to be made aware of the impact culture has on learning. If teachers are not prepared to teach students who are culturally different from themselves, a

cultural gap will be created (Gay, 2010; Ladson-Billings, 2009). If teachers ignore and exclude culturally diverse materials in curriculum, culturally diverse students will not receive the same learning experiences as their White peers. By embracing differences rather than avoiding or ignoring them, teachers can change classroom experiences for diverse learners.

Culturally Responsive Teaching is “neither simple nor static” (Borrero, Flores, & de la Cruz, 2016, p. 30). It is constantly evolving and changing as new information is learned and presented. Essentially, *Culturally Responsive Teaching* is a process, not a final destination (Borrero, Flores, & de la Cruz, 2016). Students must be exposed to different cultures and practices early in life so they will experience an accurate representation of what it means to live in a multicultural society (Ladson-Billings, 2005). Additionally, culturally diverse learners deserve to see themselves represented in professional contexts in order to “boost the self-worth of students of color and motivate this population of students to strive for social success” (Villegas & Irvine, 2010, p. 177). In other words, if diverse learners see themselves represented in the classroom in a positive manner, such as adults being represented in leadership positions within their school, this will inspire and motivate them to set expectations for themselves. White students already have these expectations set due to curriculum materials and many academic leadership positions being representative of their culture.

Implicit Bias

Culture influences the attitudes, expectations, and values teachers bring into the classroom. Thus, teachers come into the classroom with implicit, intrinsic bias. Brown (2012) defines the concept of intrinsic bias amongst educators as a pedagogical kind,

which is “a type of educator whose subjectivities, pedagogies, and expectations have been set in place prior to entering the classroom” (p. 298). Because there is a disparity of students of color and teachers of color in the United States, White teachers outnumber teachers of color by quite a large number: almost 80% of the teaching population is White (NCES, 2020). Therefore, cultural matching between students and teachers is unlikely in many cases. Because of this, teachers must be made aware how to integrate culturally diverse materials and differentiate instruction to accommodate diverse learning styles (Gay, 2002). Building community in the classroom will allow students who are culturally diverse to feel welcomed and valued (Borrero, Flores, & de la Cruz, 2016).

Culturally Responsive Teaching in Preservice Education Programs

Teacher preparation is a crucial aspect of *Culturally Responsive Teaching*. America’s student population is growing more diverse year by year (NCES, 2020), alternatively the teaching force is remaining largely the same: populated primarily by White women (NCES, 2020). Because of this, students of color often do not see their culture represented in their teachers (Borrero, Flores, & de la Cruz, 2016; Kohli & Pizarro, 2016). There are multiple reasons the teacher workforce continues to remain homogenous. Some of these reasons include fewer people of color opting to teach when they have accessibility to other, more lucrative professions; licensing and certification requirements not attracting people of color into the profession of teaching; and performance gaps between students of color and their White counterparts in grades K-12, which decreases post-secondary schooling opportunities (Ladson-Billings, 2005; Kohli & Pizarro, 2016; Delpit, 2006; Liang, Rocchino, Gutekunst, Paulvin, Li, Elam-Snowden, 2020). With this information in mind, it is clear that the teacher workforce remains

populated by White women due to systematic and systemic causes (Villegas & Irvine, 2010).

Educators of color “generally are more committed to multicultural teaching, social justice, and providing children of color with an academically challenging curriculum” (Sleeter, 2001, p. 95). In order to prepare White educators to teach students with different cultural backgrounds, pre-service teaching programs must have clear guidelines and curricula in place. Gorski (2009) discussed five “defining principles of multicultural education” that may serve as a guide for pre-service programs when designing syllabi for coursework requirements. These five principles are:

- 1) Multicultural education is a political movement
- 2) Social justice is an institutional matter, and as such can be secured only through comprehensive school reform
- 3) Comprehensive school reform can be achieved only through a critical analysis of systems of power and privilege.
- 4) Multicultural education’s underlining goal...is the elimination of educational inequities.
- 5) Multicultural education is good education for *all* students” (p. 310).

These guiding principles suggest that *Culturally Responsive Teaching* begins at an institutional level; that is, it must be taught in teacher preparation programs in order to be widely accepted in schools and thus practiced in classrooms. It is important to note that in recent work from Gorski, the author utilizes the term “educational equity” in lieu of “multicultural education” (Gorski, 2016). The reason for this is “although some culture-centric frameworks are grounded in commitments to educational equity, they often are

implemented in ways that essentialize marginalized students and mask the forms of structural injustice that feed educational outcome disparities” (Gorski, 2016, p. 221). The language used in Gorski’s more recent work centers around equity rather than culture in order to progress toward educational justice.

Principles such as those mentioned in the previous paragraph must be in place in teacher preparation programs because teaching students of diverse backgrounds can be a challenge for many of those who are unfamiliar with “their students’ lived experiences and their communities” (Saffold & Longwell-Grice, 2007, p. 187). Placing a teacher in an urban school for fieldwork will not necessarily prepare them to work in a culturally diverse school. In fact, it may bring harm to their students and negatively affect the teacher’s view of teaching in an urban setting (Saffold & Longwell-Grice, 2007).

Learning methodology and course content is an important step in the process of becoming culturally responsive. However, having rich experiences with members of different cultures, overcoming implicit biases and stereotypes associated with certain cultures, and diminishing the use of colorblindness is perhaps more effective in increasing cultural responsiveness (Saffold & Longwell-Grice, 2007).

Implementation of *Culturally Responsive Teaching* is not intuitive for many. In fact, cultural matching between students and teachers does not necessarily lead to strong relationships. It is likely that common experiences and cultural commonalities will foster a bond between student and teacher. However, it is damaging to posit an expectation on teachers of color simply based on the fact that they share a culture with students of color. Brown (2012) states that “there is an assumption that the connection between a positive adult Black male and a troubled Black male youth could profoundly impact the boy’s

life...[however] for decades they were positioned as the source of the problem” (p. 302). Teachers of all cultures must be well-versed in curricula that maintains the principles of multicultural education and culturally responsive instruction; this includes preservice teachers of color.

Diversity and Equity in Various Settings

Cultural responsiveness is undoubtedly a necessary practice to utilize in a classroom to foster learning, strong relationships, and student growth. It must be mentioned that cultural responsiveness is a necessary practice in places outside of the classroom as well. *Culturally Responsive Teaching* is fundamental to the implementation of diversity and inclusion across industries; this includes therapeutic settings, corporate business settings, medical settings, and educational settings. When cultural responsiveness is present, it seems intuitive: this is the way people should interact with each other. When *Culturally Responsive Teaching* is not present- whether that be in a classroom, in an office, in a hospital, or elsewhere- the evidence is obvious. There is a mismatch when educators, managers, and administrators are ill prepared to implement this practice. What can be done to ensure that all people in positions of power (whatever those positions may be) are prepared to understand and feel confident implementing *Culturally Responsive Teaching*?

Preparing to be Culturally Responsive

The first step in becoming culturally responsive is reflecting on the beliefs, behaviors, and practices that can impede constructive, positive responses to students or employees (Hammond, 2015). As previously stated, *Culturally Responsive Teaching* is a journey; therefore, it requires developing social-emotional awareness skills and practicing

the self-awareness necessary to positively impact those with whom people in positions of power interact (Hammond, 2015). Challenges can arise when interacting with those who have different ethnic backgrounds, socioeconomic status, or gender. Reflecting on implicit biases and understanding one's own identity will aid them in accepting those with different points of view.

Additionally, "identifying cultural frame of reference, widening cultural aperture, and identifying key triggers" are necessary tasks to "uncover implicit bias and prepare to work with culturally and linguistically diverse" people (Hammond, 2015, p. 56). Reflecting upon one's own culture will allow them to "accept and understand themselves as cultural beings" (Hammond, 2015, p. 56), which "acts as a set of reference points that shape our mental models" (Hammond, 2015, p. 56). Expanding one's ability to understand the way things are done in cultures different than one's own will allow for less miscommunication and unintentional misinterpretation of a message (Hammond, 2015).

Implementation of Culturally Responsive Teaching

Strategies for implementing *Culturally Responsive Teaching* vary depending on the time period in which research was conducted. Older research (conducted prior to 2000) suggests that students of color and White students should not be taught in the same manner (Ladson-Billings, 2000). A more recent method to approach cultural responsiveness allows students of color to represent themselves by telling their stories from their own perspective and giving students the opportunity to have an immersive community experience, which may guide students into cultural responsiveness (Borrero, N.E., Flores, E. & de la Cruz, G., 2016). Differentiating instruction based on race without

taking other educational or cultural factors into consideration is not the most equitable approach to *Culturally Responsive Teaching*.

Representation of different cultures in the classroom- especially teachers of color- is one component in ensuring that students of color feel comfortable and thus ready for rigor. Diversifying the teaching force is an important step in the call to action of giving students who have “historically been marginalized” high quality, rigorous education that White students have been receiving for years (Villegas, Strom, & Lucas, 2012, p. 299). Existing research shows that White pre-service educators tend to manage racism and discrimination by employing colorblindness. Colorblindness is an unwillingness to see or talk about race due to feelings of guilt about racism (Tochluck, 2009). This strategy is ineffective; in fact, it is harmful to students who feel that their culture and identity is erased when people claim not to see color- if one does not see color, they are not seeing the student (Tochluck, 2009). Additionally, “as long as racism exists, colorblindness merely masks this reality, blocking us from seeing and addressing its roots and trivializing the experiences of people of color” (Gorski & Pothini, 2018, p. 134). Since White teachers bring little understanding of racism and discrimination into the classroom, relatability with students can be more difficult (Sleeter, 2001; Borrero, Flores, & de la Cruz, 2016).

Qualities of Effective Teachers

Cultural responsiveness is essential to be an effective educator. There are five qualities that elevate effective teachers from less effective ones:

- 1) Hold high expectations for all students

- 2) Contribute to positive academic, attitudinal, and social outcomes for students
- 3) Use diverse resources
- 4) Contribute to the development of classrooms and schools that value diversity
- 5) Collaborate with colleagues, administrators, parents, and education professionals to ensure student success (Krasnoff, 2016, p. 3).

These qualities provide a baseline from which pre-service educators may begin to form relationships with students, co-workers, and students' families, and thus become culturally responsive.

Qualities of effective educators are not necessarily inherent to individual personalities; they must be cultivated during teacher preparation programs. *Culturally Responsive Teaching's* tenets, theories, and ideologies (Siwatu, 2007; Hammond, 2015; Gay, 2010; Gorski, 2009) are integral to implement in teacher preparation programs. Providing preservice educators with a model of *Culturally Responsive Teaching* will allow them to learn how to apply these skills and use them effectively in the classroom

As previously stated, these qualities are effective for all learners. All students find success when they are able to gain access to basic skills, think critically, recognize their own strengths, and feel a sense of community (Delpit, 2006). When teachers truly believe that all students are capable of success (whether that be academic, social, or emotional), a sense of community is built (Ladson-Billings, 1995). One of the most important factors in fostering student success is having high expectations for learners, regardless of the learner's current performance (Sleeter, 2008).

High Expectations

As discussed earlier, implicit bias from teachers can influence the way teachers interact with students, particularly students of color. Academic and behavior outcomes can be negatively impacted by poor student-teacher relationships and educators' implicit bias about the students they serve (Liang, et al., 2020). A direct result of implicit bias is educators holding low expectations for students who are students of color, students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds, and students from diverse socioeconomic backgrounds. Students of certain cultures are subject to low expectations because of stereotypes of biases associated with their culture and/or race (Krasnoff, 2016). Low expectations cause low motivation in students and can negatively affect students' attitudes about school. Educators must maintain consistent goals and expectations for each student in the classroom, regardless of students' academic success. One way to create high expectations for students is to use SMART goals: specific, measurable, attainable, relevant, and timely (Krasnoff, 2016). This isn't effective all of the time, however. SMART goals can be influenced by stereotypes held by the educator, which can therefore affect the goal. Additionally, educators must communicate high expectations to all students, regardless of culture.

The Teacher Expectations Student Achievement (TESA) Interaction Model researched and identified 27 behaviors that may communicate high expectations to students (Montgomery County Public Schools, 2010). Some of these expectations include: calling students by name as they enter the room (Ladson-Billings, 2009); learning and using words from each student's native tongue (Schwarzer, Haywood & Lorenzen, 2003); affirming and correcting all comments during class discussions (Shade,

Oberg, & Kelly, 2004); modeling positive self-talk (Aronson, 2004); and giving specific feedback to improve performance (Cole, 1995). When educators provide behaviors that communicate high expectations for learners, deep relationships are fostered. This is necessary to create an environment in which teachers and students feel mutually respected. The next section of this chapter will detail the importance of relationships, especially with regard to *Culturally Responsive Teaching*.

Relationships

Teachers who place an emphasis on creating relationships with students and building partnerships with student families create better academic and behavioral outcomes (Liang, et al., 2019). “Prejudice reduction” and interpersonal relationships can improve students’ attitudes and beliefs about school (Gorski, 2009, p. 310). Forming relationships with students is perhaps the most important aspect of *Culturally Responsive Teaching*; at its very core, *Culturally Responsive Teaching* is based upon the principles of assisting in student knowledge and creating an inclusive classroom environment. In fact, one teacher “thought that relating to students as relatives allowed her to establish a special and intimate bond that helped decrease disciplinary and classroom management problems” (Villegas & Irvine, 2010, p. 183). In order to walk hand-in-hand with students through their educational journey, teachers must be willing to care deeply and develop strong bonds with students of all cultures. This can be challenging for myriad reasons; many of which are stated in the preceding paragraphs. However, sharing experiences and building partnerships can lead to trusting relationships, which can lead to better outcomes.

Creating a Culturally Responsive Community

Creating a safe space for all learners is an integral step to maintaining a culturally responsive community, in the classroom and beyond (Hammond, 2015). The environment in which a learner spends most of their time must be “physically, socially, and intellectually safe” (Hammond, 2015, p. 144). That is to say, once a learner’s brain is relaxed and comfortable, effective learning takes place (Hammond, 2015). The environment in the classroom must communicate strong values to learners through authentic cultural elements that represent all cultures. The unconscious mind will interpret these representations as a safe space in which all learners are included.

Establishing routines and rituals that support students’ emotional growth is another necessary step to creating a culturally responsive classroom community. When students are exposed to a consistent, reliable routine that incorporates cultural responsiveness, they feel that they are represented in their classroom community. These routines can include rituals such as starting the day with a restorative circle or reciting the school motto in several different languages. Hammond said it best when she stated “We should not underestimate the power of the classroom community to support dependent learners’ move toward more independent learning” (Hammond, 2015, p. 150).

Closing Thoughts on Chapter Two

A synthesis of relevant literature was reviewed in Chapter Two. Theoretical frameworks were discussed and examined, and the intention of this dissertation was provided. This dissertation is needed because there is a gap in the current literature; research must be conducted which examines the differences between preservice educators and current educators in confidence and efficacy in regard to Culturally Responsive

Teaching and Instruction. Chapter Three will provide a description of the setting and participants, data sources, data collection, and strategies for data analysis.

Chapter Three: Methodology and Analysis Procedures

Introduction

The previous chapter provided information about the theoretical frameworks, stance of the researcher, and review of existing literature. Chapter Two also reviewed the need for this dissertation and identified gaps in the literature. Chapter Three will provide the study design, permissions, setting, participants, demographics, research questions, instruments, data collection procedures, data analysis procedures, and threats to validity and reliability.

Study Innovation and Research Questions

Preservice preparation and inservice practice of *Culturally Responsive Teaching* are integral to student outcomes; an examination of the use of *Culturally Responsive Teaching* both in the classroom and in preparation programs will be examined in this chapter. Researchers such as Siwatu (2007), Gorski (2009), Krasnoff (2016), and Sleeter (2008) have collected data on preservice educators' confidence in implementing *Culturally Responsive Teaching* in a classroom setting upon completion of their preservice program. Implications for teacher education and curricula development were discussed. However, a comparison of preservice educators and current educators in regard to confidence in *Culturally Responsive Teaching* has not been examined and thus has been determined as a gap in the literature.

The following research questions examined differences and similarities in levels of confidence in preservice and inservice educators:

1. How do preservice educators rate their ability to efficaciously implement Culturally Responsive Teaching practices during their educator preparation programs?
2. How do inservice educators rate their ability to efficaciously implement Culturally Responsive Teaching practices in their classrooms?
3. What components of Culturally Responsive Teaching (Home-school relationships, home-school culture, classroom relationships and community, instructional material and concepts/curricula) do both inservice and preservice educators feel the most efficacious in implementing?
4. What components of Culturally Responsive Teaching (Home-school relationships, home-school culture, classroom relationships and community, instructional material and concepts/curricula) do both inservice and preservice educators feel the least efficacious in implementing?

Study Design and Approvals

This study was conducted in the 2021-2022 academic year. The entirety of this study was conducted virtually via a survey on the platform of Microsoft Forms from November 2021- December 2021. After obtaining Institutional Research Board (IRB) approval (see Appendix A), two separate surveys were developed by revising, with permission (see Appendix B), from an existing survey (see Appendix C) titled “Culturally Responsive Teaching Self Efficacy Survey” (Siwatu, 2007). One novel survey, Culturally Responsive Teaching Self Efficacy Survey-R-Inservice Educators, was disseminated only to inservice educators (see Appendix D). The other survey, Culturally Responsive Teaching Self Efficacy Survey-R- Preservice Educators, was disseminated

only to preservice educators (see Appendix E). This quantitative study was designed to utilize scores on a Likert-type scale to compare differences and similarities in levels of confidence among preservice and inservice educators.

Study Setting and Participants

Study participants were recruited via purposive snowball sampling (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Burkholder, Cox, Crawford, & Hitchcock, 2020). These participants were recruited via email and through social media using several different outreach attempts (see Appendix F). To recruit preservice participants, emails were disseminated to the directors of education programs listed in the National Association for the Education of Young Children Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation listserv. One hundred and fifty-five directors were contacted via email and asked to disseminate the appropriate survey to preservice educators who were members or followers of their programs. Additionally, the student teaching director at a private university in the Midwest region of the United States was contacted and asked to disseminate the survey to preservice student teachers in the education department. Inservice participants were recruited via social media group postings, through emails to directors of educational groups and associations found on the State Department of Education and Special Education website for a state in the Midwest region of the United States, and through emails to colleagues of the researcher. Additionally, a statewide list of educational administrators in a Midwestern state were emailed to the researcher by a principal who had received the recruitment email. The 2,400 building administrators on that list were contacted with a recruitment email as well.

Potential participants were asked to read the Informed Consent (see Appendix G), which was provided through an embedded link at the beginning of the survey. These surveys were generated using Microsoft Forms. Branching was used to direct participants to the appropriate questions on the survey; if a participant answered “no” to the qualifying question at the beginning of the survey, they were directed to a page that stated “Thank you for your time. You are not an eligible participant for this survey”. By proceeding onto the first question of the survey, participants acknowledged their consent. Following the completion of the survey, participants could opt to provide their contact information to enter into a drawing for a gift card. These responses were anonymized and winners were contacted individually.

The survey was closed on December 31, 2021. Following the closure of the survey, data were collated and examined. Inservice surveys and preservice surveys were examined separately. The numeric values supplied by the participants for each survey question were added together and then divided by the number of participants to obtain an average level of confidence for each survey question. These data were used to compare levels of confidence among preservice educators and inservice educators. Results were interpreted separately first, and then collectively (Burkholder et al., 2020) in order to analyze how individual responses compared to group responses.

Participant Demographics

This study was conducted virtually with participants recruited across the United States through a snowball sampling (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Burkholder, et al., 2020). Data were gathered using the 20-question survey, with six additional demographic questions at the end (see Appendices D & E). Preservice educators took an average of

five minutes to complete the survey, while inservice educators took an average of nine minutes.

The study obtained data from 231 participants; 99 participants self-identified as inservice educators and 132 participants self-identified as preservice educators. Participants were invited to read the informed consent form (see Appendix G) prior to completing the survey and acknowledged doing so by proceeding onto the first question of the survey. Participants were also required to answer “yes” or “no” to a qualifying statement prior to beginning the survey; for inservice educators, this statement was “I am currently a certified educator”. For preservice educators, this statement was “I am currently studying education and/or working toward obtaining my teaching license”. If the participant answered “no” to this qualifying statement, they were not able to answer any questions on the survey.

Inservice educators ranged from 18-70 years old. Inservice educator demographic data showed that 90% (n=81/90) of participants identified as female, with 8% (n=8/90) identifying as male and 1% (n=1/90) identifying as “none of the above”. Additional demographic data showed that 91% (n=82/90) of inservice participants identified as White or Caucasian, 4% (n=4/90) identified as Black or African American, 1% (n=1/90) identified as Asian or Pacific Islander. No participants identified as Latinx, American Indian, or Alaska Native. Additionally, 2% (n=2/90) participants identified as two or more of the ethnic backgrounds listed, and 1% (n=1/90) did not identify with any of the backgrounds listed. The ethnic backgrounds listed in this survey were found via the census.gov website. The grade level taught by participating inservice educators varied: 32% (n=27/90) of participants self-reported teaching Kindergarten-3rd grade. Similarly,

number of years of field experience varied: 22% (n=20/90) of participants reported having 0-5 years of experience; 22% (n=20/90) of participants reported having 6-10 years of experience; 30% (n=27/90) reported having 21 or more years of experience. Fifty-six different zip codes were represented among inservice participants.

The majority of preservice educators self-reported an age of 21-30 years old, with 56% (n=73/130) of participants selecting this age range; 40% (n=52/130) of participants reported being 18-20 years old; 1% (n=2/130) of participants reported being 31-40 years old; zero participants reported being 41-50 years old; 2% (n=3/130) of participants were 51-60 years old and zero participants reported being 71 years or older. Additional demographic data shows that 89% (n=116/130) of preservice participants identified as female; 9% (n=12/130) identified as male; 1% (n=1/130) identified as nonbinary; and 1% (n=1/130) preferred not to disclose their gender. Ethnic background data showed that 85% (n=111/130) of preservice participants reported being White or Caucasian; 3% (n=5/130) self-identified as Black or African American; 3% (n=4/130) identified as Latinx; and 2% (n=3/130) identified as Asian American. Zero participants reported having an ethnic background of American Indian/Alaskan Native or Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander; 6% (n=7/130) of participants identified with two or more ethnic backgrounds listed; and zero selected “none of the above”. Additional demographic data showed that 45% (n=59/130) of preservice participants stated that they desired to teach Kindergarten-3rd grade upon graduation; 1% (n=1/130) of participants reported that they wished to teach Birth-3 years old/Early Intervention; 12% (n=15/130) stated that they wished to teach Pre-K/Preschool; 11% (n=14/130) wish to teach 4th-5th grade; 8% (n=11/130) wish to teach 6th-8th grade; 21% (n=27/130) wish to teach high school; and

2% (n=3/130) want to teach in higher education/post-high school. One hundred and ten zip codes were represented among preservice educators. Table 3 to compares demographic information from this dissertation to national averages.

Table 3
Demographic Information

Demographic Information	Preservice		Inservice		NCES Average
	n	%	n	%	%
Gender Identity					
Male	12	9	8	8	24
Female	116	89	81	90	76
Nonbinary/none	1	1	1	1	
Age					
18-20 years	52	40	0	0	No data
21-30 years	73	56	24	24	No data
31-40 years	2	1	25	25	No data
41-50 years	0	0	29	30	No data
51-60 years	0	0	19	19	No data
61 + up	0	0	2	2	No data
Ethnic background					
White/Caucasian	111	85	82	91	79
Black/African American	5	3	4	4	6
Latinx	4	3	0	0	9
American Indian/Alaska Native	0	0	0	0	0.2
Asian American	3	2	1	1	2
Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	0.2
Two or more	7	6	2	2	2

Instrument

To measure self-efficacy, participants were given a 20-question survey revised with permission from Siwatu's 2007 study, *Preservice teachers' culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy and outcome expectancy beliefs* (see Appendix C). These surveys, titled Culturally Responsive Teaching Self-Efficacy Scale-R- Inservice, and Culturally Responsive Teaching Self-Efficacy Scale-R- Preservice, requested participants to rate their confidence in their ability to successfully accomplish tasks related to *Culturally Responsive Teaching*. The survey items were rated on a scale of 0 (no confidence at all) to 100 (completely confident). The survey measured educator knowledge of students' home cultures, adaptation and differentiation of instruction, building relationships with students and families, and examining curriculum and standardized tests for inequities.

The original survey, Culturally Responsive Teaching Self-Efficacy Scale (Siwatu, 2007) contained 41 questions. These questions were measured on a Likert scale of 0-100. This was done because Siwatu (2007) noticed

Pajares et al. (2001) examined whether a self-efficacy scale ranging from 0 to 100 was psychometrically stronger than a traditional Likert formatted scale. They believed that 0–100 scales should result in greater discrimination than narrower Likert scales. The results of their study suggest that Bandura's assertions about the use of a scale with many options are empirically grounded. The 0–100 response format was psychometrically stronger compared to the Likert scale (p. 1090).

These questions related to educator preparedness to implement *Culturally Responsive Teaching* in the classroom. The revised versions of the surveys used in this

study omitted 21 questions from the original survey. This was done intentionally to shorten the survey in order to encourage more participation. The questions that remain on the survey were chosen because they all fit into one of the following categories: Knowledge of Home Cultures, Adaptation and Differentiation of Instruction, Relationships with Students and Families, and Examining Curricula for Inequities. These categories represent some of the tenets of *Culturally Responsive Teaching* and were derived from 27 competencies which “reflect the essential skills and knowledge that are clearly identifiable among teachers” (Siwatu, 2007, p. 1089). The categories identified in the Siwatu (2007) study are: “curriculum and instruction, classroom management, student assessment, and cultural enrichment” (Siwatu, 2007, p. 1089). The categories chosen related best to the researcher’s research questions and were derived from the categories in the Siwatu (2007) study.

Demographic information was collected at the end of each survey (see Appendices D & E). These demographics included: age, gender identity, ethnic background, and zip code for all participants. Some demographic information on educational experiences varied between the two surveys. The inservice educators were asked which grade or age level taught and their years’ experience in the field. Preservice educators were asked which grade or age level they wished to teach and their anticipated graduation date.

Data Analysis Procedures

The survey was closed on December 31, 2021 at which time data collection and examination began. Inservice and preservice surveys were examined separately. Using the IBM software SPSS, numeric values supplied by the participants for each survey

question were added together and then divided by the number of participants to obtain an average level of confidence for each survey question. These data were used to compare levels of confidence among preservice educators and inservice educators. Results were interpreted separately first, and then collectively (Burkholder, et al., 2020) in order to analyze how individual responses compared to group responses. The researcher merged data sets, checked for outliers to ensure homogeneity of variance, created mean scores for each tenet, and ran ANOVAs to answer the research questions.

Quantitative data were analyzed by comparing results of the preservice educators' and the inservice educators' self-efficacy surveys. These scores were used to determine which group (preservice or inservice educators) had the lowest confidence and self-efficacy scores in *Culturally Responsive Teaching*. These results were used to determine which items on the survey were the most difficult for participants, or the areas in which they felt the least confident in their abilities to successfully accomplish the task.

Threats to Validity and Reliability

Many considerations were taken to ensure reliability and validity. Reliability implies that the results of the study are consistent and glean similar results no matter how many times the study is performed (Creswell & Poth, 2018). Validity implies that the researcher measured what they intended to measure (Creswell & Poth, 2018). Peer debriefing (Creswell & Poth, 2018) was utilized with the researcher's Dissertation Committee in order to reframe questions, format the survey, and provide potential participant connections. Participants were asked a qualifying question prior to completing the survey; this ensured that the appropriate participants were completing the survey.

Participants could also change their responses on the survey at any point prior to submitting it.

The biggest threat to reliability in this study was the lack of contact with the participants. Since participants were recruited through emails and social media to administrators and department heads, the researcher never communicated directly with participants. This is a threat to reliability because some participants could have answered “yes” to the qualifying question at the beginning of the survey, even if it was not an accurate answer. Another threat to validity is the Halo Effect, which is common amongst self-efficacy protocol, understood as the cognitive bias educators may apply to themselves when self-rating their skills (Nicolau, Mellinas, & Martin-Fuentes, 2020). All participants may have provided inaccurate information due to the Halo Effect (Nicolau, Mellinas, & Martin-Fuentes, 2020) on their survey in order to present a positive perception about their efficacy as educators.

Conclusion

Chapter Three detailed the methodology used in this dissertation study. Setting and participant information, instruments, data collection and analysis processes and procedures, and reliability and validity were examined in this chapter. The results of this study will be discussed in Chapter Four.

Chapter Four: Results and Findings

Introduction

Sample demographic data, information on research questions, instruments, data collection procedures, and threats to validity and reliability were presented in Chapter Three. Chapter Four discusses the analysis process and findings for each research question.

Analyses Introduction

Study data were triangulated with member checking and consultation with experts in order to provide validity and corroborate findings among data sources (Creswell & Poth, 2018). The instruments developed in this study were utilized to gain an awareness and an understanding of self-reported efficacy scores regarding *Culturally Responsive Teaching* in both preservice and inservice educators. Mean scores collected from participants for the four tenets (home-school relationships, home-school culture, classroom relationships and community, instructional material and curricula) discussed in Chapter Three were analyzed, along with individual mean scores, and a collective mean score of participants' self-reported levels of confidence for inservice and preservice educators.

Demographic Information

Information pertaining to participants' age, gender identity, ethnic background, and zip code were collected at the end of the 20-question survey. This was used to inform the researcher of the various backgrounds of the participants and aided the researcher in interpreting the data. The demographic information provided an important framework by which the researcher could gain insight into the participants' mindset and experiences

based on their location, ethnic background, age, and gender identity. These demographics cannot paint a picture of the precise lived experiences and outlooks of each participant, but they do provide a general representation of the field of education (see Table 3).

It is important to note that the participants in this survey did not necessarily represent the exact demographics of the field of education in every area of the United States. However, data were collected nationwide, and participants were recruited from each major region of the country: the Northwest, Midwest, South, and Northeast. This survey was distributed to multiple preservice education programs throughout the country (see Appendix H), and inservice participants were recruited via social media. Additionally, listserv data were utilized for schools across the United States to recruit participants.

Reliability of Chosen Measures

Quantitative data were measured through survey results from all participants. These results were used to determine high and low scores of confidence among the participants regarding implementation of *Culturally Responsive Teaching*. The participants were asked to self-rate confidence and efficacy on a Likert scale of 0 (not confident at all) to 100 (completely confident). The components of the survey which scored the lowest and the highest were then highlighted and will be discussed in Chapter Five. Similarly, the scores for all four tenets will be discussed at length in Chapter Five.

This sample size contained 219 participants (130 preservice and 89 inservice). Participants' responses represented a wide range of self-reported confidence and efficacy of *Culturally Responsive Teaching* in the classroom. Background information was

obtained anonymously in order to prevent the researcher analyzing data with any information in mind that might have influenced the interpretation of raw data.

Procedures and Findings

Quantitative data were obtained through a Likert-scale survey revised with permission from Siwatu (2007) (see Appendix A). This survey contained 20 questions and was used to assess confidence and efficacy through a self-scoring method. This survey was disseminated to educator preparation programs around the country. One hundred and thirty-two preservice responses were collected, and 130 responses were utilized in data collection. Two outliers were excluded due to insufficient or inaccurate responses to the survey. Ninety-nine inservice responses were collected, and 10 outliers were excluded due to insufficient or inaccurate responses. Upon further reflection, a survey which asked questions more than one time would increase reliability and decrease the incidence of Halo Effect (Nisbett & Wilson, 1977); however, the revised survey was useful in gathering participants, as it took five to ten minutes to complete and therefore was attractive to those with busy schedules. Ultimately, the information gathered from these surveys provided background information with which to proceed with analysis of preservice and inservice educators' levels of confidence in implementing *Culturally Responsive Teaching*. Additionally, these scores provided a baseline with which to compare preservice educators' and inservice educators' confidence and efficacy in regard to *Culturally Responsive Teaching*.

Research Question One

Research question number one (How do preservice educators rate their ability to efficaciously implement Culturally Responsive Teaching practices during their educator

preparation programs?) examined how preservice educators rated their ability to efficaciously implement *Culturally Responsive Teaching* practices during their educator preparation programs. Data collected from the preservice survey showed that, on average, preservice educators reported highest confidence relative to other prompts in their ability to develop a personal relationship with students (Question 12) (see Table 4). The average self-reported score for this survey question for preservice educators was 90.38.

Additionally, preservice educators reported, on average, the least confidence in their ability to implement strategies to minimize the effects of mismatch between students' home culture and school culture (Question 2) (see Table 4). The average self-reported score for this survey question for preservice educators was 65.61. A single-factor ANOVA indicated an average score of 79.53 across all items on the survey for preservice educators.

Table 4
Survey Averages- Inservice and Preservice Educator Responses

Preservice Average	Inservice Average	Survey question
78.22	77.18	1. Identify ways that the school culture (e.g., values, norms, and practices) is different from my students' home culture
65.61	70.01	2. Implement strategies to minimize the effects of the mismatch between my students' home culture and the school culture.
74.80	76.52	3. Obtain information about my students' home life.
88.44	89.17	4. Build a sense of trust in my students.
77.74	82.31	5. Establish positive home-school relations.
81.11	82.16	6. Develop a community of learners when my class consists of students from diverse backgrounds.
79.40	72.95	7. Use my students' cultural background to help make learning meaningful.

Preservice Averages	Inservice Averages	Survey question
84.98	83.10	8. Use my students' prior knowledge to help them make sense of new information.
81.87	82.27	9. Identify ways how students communicate at home may differ from the school norms.
77.96	75.87	10. Obtain information about my students' cultural background.
79.46	72.95	11. Design a classroom environment using displays that reflects a variety of cultures
90.38	92.62	12. Develop a personal relationship with my students.
76.79	87.78	13. Communicate with parents regarding their child's educational progress.
72.53	87.62	14. Structure parent-teacher conferences so that the meeting is not intimidating for parents.
82.15	81.34	15. Help students to develop positive relationships with their classmates.
75.67	76.00	16. Revise instructional material to include a better representation of cultural groups.
78.30	78.23	17. Critically examine the curriculum to determine whether it reinforces negative cultural stereotypes.
89.09	88.98	18. Help students feel like important members of the classroom.
75.02	76.97	19. Use examples that are familiar to students from diverse cultural background.
81.13	82.36	20. Explain new concepts using examples that are taken from my students' everyday lives.

Research Question Two

Research question number two (How do inservice educators rate their ability to efficaciously implement Culturally Responsive Teaching practices in their classrooms?) examined how inservice educators rated their ability to efficaciously implement *Culturally Responsive Teaching* practices in their classrooms. Interestingly, data

collected from the inservice survey showed that, on average, inservice educators also reported they were the most confident in their ability to develop a personal relationship with students (Question 12). The average self-reported score for this survey question for inservice educators was 92.62. Another interesting finding was that inservice educators, like preservice educators, reported, on average, the least confident in their ability to implement strategies to minimize the effects of mismatch between students' home culture and school culture (Question 2). The average self-reported score for this survey question for inservice providers was 70.01. A single-factor ANOVA showed that the average score of all items on the survey for inservice educators was 80.80.

Research Question Three

Research question number three, "What components of Culturally Responsive Teaching (home-school relationships, home-school culture, classroom relationships and community, instructional material and concepts/curricula) do both inservice and preservice educators feel the most efficacious in implementing?", examined which tenet (home-school relationships, home-school culture, classroom community, instructional material and curricula) of *Culturally Responsive Teaching* both inservice and preservice educators felt the most efficacious in implementing. The data showed varied results. Inservice educators felt the most confident implementing *Culturally Responsive Teaching* in home-school relationships, with a score of 87.58 (see Table 5). Preservice educators felt the most confident implementing *Culturally Responsive Teaching* in classroom relationships and building a classroom community with a score of 84.05 (see Table 5). There is a statistically significant difference between preservice and inservice ratings in home-school relationships as shown by the ANOVA ($p < .001$; $F = 18.075$). There was no

statistical significance between preservice and inservice educators for the other three tenets ($p=0.794$, $p= 0.391$, $p=0. 677$).

Within the four identified tenets, inservice educators felt more confident in the areas of home-school relationships and home-school culture when compared to preservice educators. Inservice educators' confidence score averages in these areas were 87.58 and 76.59, respectively. Preservice educators' confidence score averages in these tenets were 79.36 and 75.69, respectively. Alternatively, preservice educators felt more confident in building classroom relationships/classroom community and instructional material and curricula when compared to their inservice counterparts. Preservice educators' confidence score averages were 84.05 and 79.08, respectively. Inservice educators' confidence score averages were 82.92 and 78.26, respectively.

Table 5
Average Tenet Scores- Preservice and Inservice

Tenet	Preservice average	Inservice average
Home-school relationships	79.36	87.58
Home-school culture	75.69	76.49
Classroom community	84.05	82.92
Instructional material/curricula	79.08	78.26

Research Question Four

Research question four (What components of Culturally Responsive Teaching (Home-school relationships, home-school culture, classroom community, instructional material/curricula) do both inservice and preservice educators feel the least efficacious in implementing?) examined which tenet both inservice and preservice educators felt the

least efficacious in implementing. As discussed for Research Question Three, preservice and inservice educators were diverse in their levels of confidence for all four tenets (see Table 4). Inservice educators self-reported lower levels of confidence in areas concerning the classroom: classroom relationships/classroom community and instructional material/curricula when compared with preservice educators' responses. Alternatively, preservice educators self-reported lower levels of confidence in areas concerning students' home lives: home-school relationships and home-school culture when compared with inservice educators' responses.

When examining the tenet in which both preservice and inservice educators self-scored the lowest amount of confidence, their results yield the same tenet: home-school culture. Preservice educators self-reported a score of 75.69 for this tenet. Inservice educators self-reported with an average score of 76.49 (see Table 5).

Data Analysis Results

The sample size of 231 participants (132 preservice and 99 inservice) was fairly representative of the entirety of preservice and inservice teachers, as participants completed the survey from 110 different zip codes across the country. After data were analyzed, outliers were identified from each participant group. There were two outliers in the preservice group and ten outliers in the inservice group; after eliminating outliers, the sample contained 219 participants (130 preservice and 89 inservice). Information and overarching themes could be gleaned from the results of the survey. Results from each participant's survey were analyzed and then compared to both the preservice educator group and the inservice educator group. This was done in order to examine which areas both preservice and inservice teachers felt the least efficacious and to identify any

similarities or differences between the two groups. The survey consisted of 20 items and the value for Cronbach's Alpha for the survey was $\alpha = .921$. Additionally, the Cronbach's Alphas for each tenet were as follows: Tenet 1 $\alpha = .798$; Tenet 2 $\alpha = .821$; Tenet 3 $\alpha = .797$; Tenet 4 $\alpha = .853$. The Cronbach's Alpha for Siwatu's 2007 study was $\alpha = .960$.

The Culturally Responsive Teaching Self-Efficacy Survey-R contained items that related to teaching in a classroom. Participants were asked to self-rate on a Likert-scale of 0-100, 0 meaning they had no confidence at all in their abilities and 100 meaning they were completely confident in their abilities. Interestingly, both preservice and inservice educators self-rated the same items on the survey that they felt the most confident and the least confident (see Table 4). They also self-rated the same tenet (home-school culture) the lowest in their confidence implementing *Culturally Responsive Teaching* (see Appendix I).

Preservice educators rated their confidence, on average, lower than inservice educators on many components of the survey. Inservice educators, on average, self-rated more survey components above 80 than preservice educators did. However, the self-rated scores were very similar for the two groups across the whole survey. There were 8 survey components in which preservice educators rated themselves higher than inservice educators (see Table 4). These survey components are inconsistent with any sort of theme; they vary across all tenets. All tenets are represented in this subset besides home-school relationships. These data provided ordinal information about the level of confidence efficacy both preservice and inservice educators felt implementing *Culturally Responsive Teaching*.

When demographic information was gathered at the end of the survey, results for both groups were similar. Zip code varied among participants. Ages of participants were consistent with their grouping; 89% of preservice educators were between the ages of 18-30 years old, and most inservice educators were 31-50 years old. Both groups had 89% of participants identify as female. Additionally, both groups were predominantly White: 84% of preservice participants and 85% of inservice participants identified as White when asked their ethnic background. This is consistent with national statistics of educator ethnic background.

Additional Factors Regarding Results

This study was impacted by the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic. Schools shut down in March 2020, which forced teachers to reimagine their instructional processes and pivot their teaching to an online or virtual format (Fishbane & Tomer, 2020; Bozkurt & Sharma, 2020). This, understandably, caused a lot of stress and strife for both inservice and preservice teachers. Teachers were not prepared pedagogically for online teaching (Wagner, Hassanein, & Head, 2008). In the researcher's pilot study conducted in 2020, all four participants discussed the impact of the pandemic and subsequent school shut-downs in their interviews. They all expressed a level of frustration, fear, and feelings of inadequate relationship-building due to virtual teaching. These feelings likely apply to the participants in this study, as the studies were conducted less than one year apart.

Conclusion

The responses from preservice and inservice educators provide insight on confidence and efficacy with regard to implementing *Culturally Responsive Teaching*. These responses are important to analyze in order to discover what type of curricula or

learning experiences will best benefit preservice teachers and allow them to feel confident in their cultural responsiveness both prior to entering the classroom and during their first year of teaching. This will be further discussed in Chapter Five.

Chapter Five: Discussion

Introduction

The previous chapter discussed data analysis and the results of data gathered in this study. This chapter will discuss the complementarity of these data, the relationship to extant literature, connection to theoretical frameworks, limitations and implications for practice and future studies. Additionally, an organizational improvement plan will be included.

Study Overview

This study was conducted in the 2021-2022 academic year and analyzed self-reported *Culturally Responsive Teaching* confidence scores from 219 preservice and inservice educators across the country. The entirety of this study was conducted virtually via a survey on the platform of Microsoft Forms, and the study's data were collected from November 2021- December 2021. After obtaining Institutional Research Board (IRB) approval (see Appendix A), two separate surveys were developed and revised with permission (see Appendix B), from an existing survey (see Appendix C) titled "Culturally Responsive Teaching Self-Efficacy Survey" (Siwatu, 2007). One novel survey, Culturally Responsive Teaching Self Efficacy Survey-R-Inservice Educators, was disseminated only to inservice educators (see Appendix D). The other novel survey, Culturally Responsive Teaching Self Efficacy Survey-R- Preservice Educators, was disseminated only to preservice educators (see Appendix E). This quantitative study was designed to utilize survey results from scores on a Likert-type scale to compare self-scored preparedness of implementation of *Culturally Responsive Teaching* among preservice and inservice educators.

Study Findings in Relationship to Extant Literature

The results of this study provided an interesting perspective on the differences and similarities among preservice and inservice educators' confidence in implementing cultural responsiveness in the classroom. Preservice educators (n=130) rated their confidence, on average, lower than inservice educators on many components of the survey. Inservice educators, on average, self-rated more survey components above 80 than preservice educators did on a scale of 0-100. However, the self-rated scores were very similar for the two groups across the whole survey. These results do not align with existing research, which states that preservice educators often have higher levels of confidence when compared to inservice educators (Woolfolk Hoy, 2000). There were eight survey components in which preservice educators rated themselves higher than inservice educators: Questions # 1, 7, 8, 10, 11, 15, 17, and 18. (see Table 4). These survey components are inconsistent with any sort of theme; they vary across all tenets. All tenets, with the exception of home-school relationships, are represented in this subset; this is inconsistent with the results presented by Siwatu in 2007 and 2011. Both of Siwatu's studies implemented the CRTSES, and the 2011 study results stated that preservice educators were able to observe inservice educators modeling behaviors such as "communicating with families" and this "helps us learn how to use them and understand how to use them and how they work and how they are effective ... because you see the teacher implement those strategies and be successful at them and so that gives you confidence to try them and to adapt them to fit your needs in the classroom that you will be working in" (Siwatu, 2011, p. 365). These data provided ordinal information about the

level of confidence and efficacy both preservice and inservice educators felt implementing *Culturally Responsive Teaching*.

Preservice and inservice educators provided a range of confidence across all four tenets (home-school relationships, home-school culture, classroom relationships and community, instructional material and concepts/curricula). Inservice educators (n=89) self-reported lower levels of confidence in areas concerning the classroom: classroom relationships/classroom community and instructional material/curricula when compared with preservice educators' responses. Alternatively, preservice educators self-reported lower levels of confidence in areas concerning students' home lives (home-school relationships and home-school culture) when compared with inservice educators' responses. These results are consistent with existing literature (Siwatu, 2007; Siwatu, 2011; Woolfolk Hoy, 2000; Borrero, Flores, & de la Cruz, 2016).

Both preservice and inservice educators expressed the lowest levels of confidence in the home-school culture tenet. Preservice educators self-reported a score of 75.69 for this tenet. Inservice educators self-reported with an average score of 76.49. This finding was expected, based on information provided by existing literature, especially Siwatu's 2007 and 2011 studies. In Siwatu's studies, preservice educators felt, on average, "more confident in their ability to execute many of the more general teaching practices that may not require the integration of students' cultural and linguistic background (e.g., "build a sense of trust in my students"). On the other hand, preservice teachers' self-efficacy beliefs were lower for successfully completing tasks that were specific to culturally responsive teaching (e.g., "identify ways that the school culture is different from my students' home culture")." (Siwatu, 2011, p. 366).

Existing literature supports the notion that teacher preparation programs should provide strong *Culturally Responsive Teaching* curricula for preservice teachers (Gay, 2002; Gorski, 2009; Siwatu, 2007; Sleeter 2008). This study sought to identify in which areas of *Culturally Responsive Teaching* preservice and inservice educators felt the least confident and efficacious and the most confident and efficacious. The data show that preservice and inservice educators self-reported statistically similar confidence in implementation of *Culturally Responsive Teaching*; additionally, they self-reported lower confidence in the implementation of certain tasks of *Culturally Responsive Teaching*. This information is especially useful when compared to inservice educators' responses because the areas in which preservice and inservice educators' lowest amounts of confidence and efficacy overlap must be the areas targeted first in *Culturally Responsive Teaching* education in teacher preparation programs, specifically, the tenet of home-school culture. Inservice educators self-reported higher scores, on average, than preservice educators, and their lowest self-reported scores were consistently higher values than preservice scores. These results do not align with existing research on efficacy, which states that preservice educators often have higher levels of confidence when compared to inservice educators (Woolfolk Hoy, 2000). However, it does align with research on *Culturally Responsive Teaching*. Both preservice and inservice educators expressed the lowest levels of confidence in the home/school culture tenet. Preservice educators self-reported a score of 75.69 for this tenet. Inservice educators self-reported with an average score of 76.49. This finding was expected, based on information provided by existing literature, especially Siwatu's 2007 and 2011 studies. In these studies, preservice educators felt, on average, "more confident in their ability to execute

many of the more general teaching practices that may not require the integration of students' cultural and linguistic background (e.g., "build a sense of trust in my students"). On the other hand, preservice teachers' self-efficacy beliefs were lower for successfully completing tasks that were specific to culturally responsive teaching (e.g., "identify ways that the school culture is different from my students' home culture")." (Siwatu, 2011, p. 366). Preservice teachers feel high amounts of confidence in implementing general teaching strategies while they are in their preservice programs, but when it comes to *Culturally Responsive Teaching*, they do not feel as confident.

Theoretical Frameworks

Transformative framework influenced the context of this study; education is not equitable, and *Culturally Responsive Teaching* provides actionable steps to be taken by individual educators in their interactions with learners toward creating equitable education opportunities for all learners (Creswell & Poth, 2018). Both the framework of *Culturally Responsive Teaching* (Table 2) and the implementation strategies were examined in this study. In order to properly implement *Culturally Responsive Teaching* in the classroom, the framework must be utilized. Educating teachers on the basic strategies to empower their students in the classroom regardless of race, class, or gender is a foundational concept of *Culturally Responsive Teaching*. The findings from this study indicate that preservice and inservice educators feel, statistically, the same amounts of confidence in implementing *Culturally Responsive Teaching* in all areas but one: home-school relationships. It was the intention of this dissertation to urge the participants to examine their weaknesses in utilizing *Culturally Responsive Teaching* and discuss why they need more training in specific areas of cultural responsiveness. By examining this,

an additional intention of the study was that these participants will learn more about *Culturally Responsive Teaching* as a framework and theory and learn more about effectively implementing *Culturally Responsive Teaching* in their classrooms.

Study Limitations

The data gleaned from this study were robust enough to answer the research questions, thus, there are implications for practice and future studies to be discussed. These data obtained from the survey would be well suited for a case study approach in a future study. Monitoring a small group of educators from both groups for an increased amount of time and interviewing them would provide more information about why and how preservice and inservice educators felt prepared to implement *Culturally Responsive Teaching* in the classroom.

If data were gathered from a larger sample size of preservice and inservice teachers, especially inservice teachers in their first year of teaching, one could identify the gaps in curricula and implementation of strategies learned in preservice programs. Since the inservice educator participants had different levels of experience, it was difficult to pinpoint exactly where the confidence breakdown occurred. Additionally, since the participants answered inconsistently (with preservice educators self-reporting higher amounts of confidence with regard to two *Culturally Responsive Teaching* tenets, and inservice educators self-reporting higher amounts of confidence with regard to the other two tenets), it was difficult to ascertain why certain educators felt confident and others did not. It may have been beneficial to have developed open-ended questions on the survey that specifically addressed why educators felt confident or unconfident, as this would provide more information to inform curricula in preservice programs.

Additionally, an interview component for a selected sub-set of participants could have provided more information. The original intention of this study was to learn about preparedness, confidence, and efficacy of *Culturally Responsive Teaching* among preservice and inservice educators, and, in particular, examine whether confidence among preservice educators dwindles as they enter the field of education as certified educators.

Future studies could provide more information if they incorporated the following modifications. First, including a qualitative component to this study would have provided more robust information about why educators felt more efficacious in implementing certain aspects of *Culturally Responsive Teaching* than others. Additionally, modifying the scale of the survey down to a traditional Likert of 1-5 could potentially have changed variants and responses. The researcher relied on construct validity in this study; utilizing psychometrics of the tenets would aid validity and reliability of the revised surveys. Finally, future studies could explore ratings of confidence in preservice educators compared to specific program-level coursework, curricula, and elements of preparation such as practicum experience. Correlating self-ratings from the surveys and known aspects of *Culturally Responsive Teaching* could inform preservice programs of areas of weakness and strength within program curricula.

The large scale of 0-100 utilized in the survey could also be seen as a limitation of this study. Because the researcher maintained integrity to the original survey, it is undeterminable to know if self rating would differ if the scale were a smaller, more traditional Likert of 1-5. There is not a lot of variance among groups, and it is difficult to assess whether the large scale affected this.

The last limitation of this study was the researcher's own personal bias. Since the researcher was a teacher and graduated from a preservice teaching program, it was difficult to ignore personal knowledge of the required coursework in preparation programs for preservice teachers. Additionally, the subject of *Culturally Responsive Teaching* is important to the researcher and has been a focus of study for the past three years. Due to this, it is difficult to remove personal thoughts and feelings about this subject matter. Additionally, since the surveys used in this study were revised from the original Culturally Responsive Teaching Self Efficacy Scale, the researcher's bias potentially entered into the selection of questions on the revised surveys.

Implications for Practice

The intention of this study was to identify which areas of *Culturally Responsive Teaching* preservice and inservice educators feel most confident and least confident. The findings from this study indicate that inservice educators feel, on average, more confident in implementing Tenet One (home-school relationships), Tenet Two (home-school culture), and Tenet Four (instructional material and curricula) than preservice educators. With this knowledge, it is possible to target areas for potential growth in teacher preparation programs; based on this study's findings, these could be home-school relationships, home-school culture, and instructional material and curricula. The lack of a major variance between the two groups indicates that both preservice and inservice educators share similarities in confidence levels. However, information about the effectiveness of *Culturally Responsive Teaching* education in teacher preparation programs could be examined if the sample size were increased and diversified, and

specific questions were asked on the survey targeting why educators felt the way that they did.

Another potential implication from this study would be for educators, preservice and inservice alike, to examine their individual skillset and reflect upon which areas of *Culturally Responsive Teaching* they could grow. Oftentimes, educators have so many work-related demands (Bozkurt & Sharma, 2020) that they do not have time to discover areas of education that they may want to explore.

The last section of this dissertation explores ways in which Culturally Responsive Teaching could be more systematically applied in schools using change management theory. The upcoming sections will review the Problem of Practice, a vision for change, readiness of the field, theory for framing change, and identification of potential solutions.

Organizational Improvement Plan

This Organizational Improvement Plan will review this study's problem of practice, the history of the problem of practice, and the organizational history. Additionally, a vision for change and identification of potential solutions will be examined.

Problem of Practice

The world of teacher preparation programs is inundated with cultural homogeneity, especially in the form of racial identity. White women specifically make up a large portion of the cultural landscape of teachers in the United States (NCES, 2020). In a world where cultural diversity is growing yearly (NCES, 2020), culturally diverse students are not being represented in the classroom (Kohli & Pizarro, 2016; Villegas & Irvine, 2010). Furthermore, researchers of color are not represented in academia, with

White authors being at the forefront of many peer-reviewed articles on culture, cultural responsiveness, resilience, and diversity (Borrero, Flores, & de la Cruz, 2016). White, middle class, female-identifying teachers and researchers do not always possess the skills necessary for cultural responsiveness, and thus perpetuate a cycle of oppression in United States school systems, in academia, and beyond (Ladson-Billings, 2000; Delpit, 2006; Krasnoff, 2016; Sleeter, 2012). This problem of practice was introduced in Chapter One in the National Context and Situational Context sections.

Problem of Practice History

Teachers must have an understanding of the various cultures present in the classroom before they can begin to implement *Culturally Responsive Teaching*. It is also important for teachers to understand how culture could affect learning and behavior (Krasnoff, 2016). In order to have a basic understanding of different cultures, teachers must be prepared in their preservice programs. By increasing familiarity of many different cultures, preservice teachers will be more equipped to create and foster a community in the classroom (Gay, 2002). Villegas and Lucas (2002) developed six characteristics that would prepare preservice educators to become culturally responsive: “socio-cultural consciousness, attitude, commitment and skills, constructivist views, knowledge of student’s life, and culturally responsive teaching” (pp. 25-26). In order to do this, however, teachers must be made aware that they need to learn about cultural responsiveness in the first place.

A factor that must be considered is how efficacious and confident teachers feel once they are in a school setting where they are perhaps the minority. Teacher efficacy is “teachers’ confidence in their ability to promote students’ learning” (Woolfolk Hoy,

2000, p. 2). The gap is rapidly closing between students of color and White students in public schools in America, but the number of White teachers is mostly maintained: 83% in 2004 vs. 79% in 2017 (NCES, 2020). If students and teachers do not share a culture, it is the responsibility of the teacher to educate themselves about all represented cultures in the classroom and integrate cultural practices appropriately.

Organizational History

Culturally Responsive Teaching is “a teacher’s use of strategies that support a constructivist view of knowledge, teaching, and learning, assists students in constructing knowledge, building on their personal and cultural strengths, and examining the curriculum from multiple perspectives, thus creating an inclusive classroom environment” (Krasnoff, 2016, p. 2). Students in the United States are culturally, ethnically, and linguistically diverse; the teacher population does not necessarily reflect this diversity (U.S. Department of Education Equity and Excellence Commission, 2013; NCES, 2020). In order for teachers to use best practices, they need to be made aware of the impact culture has on learning. If teachers are not prepared to teach students who are culturally different from themselves, a cultural gap will be created (Gay, 2010; Ladson-Billings, 2009). If teachers ignore and exclude culturally diverse materials in curricula, culturally diverse students are not receiving the same learning experiences as their White peers. By embracing differences rather than turning a blind eye toward them, teachers can change classroom experiences for diverse learners.

Vision for Change: Change Readiness

Stakeholders may find themselves wondering, “How can we encourage students to be culturally responsive and get along with each other if we do not guide them into

tough relationships and encourage culturally diverse relationships in the classroom and beyond?” It shouldn’t be the educator’s job to force students into a relationship with each other; rather, the educator should model what positive relationships look like for students and set up environments where relationships can flourish. Additionally, using restorative practices such as morning meetings could improve relationships between students. Since my problem of practice was very focused on relationships, I decided to center my Organizational Improvement Plan around building relationships and using those relationships to create a safe space in the classroom for all learners. As demonstrated in the Chapter Two literature review, there is a lack of diverse authors of peer-reviewed articles in research of resilience and *Culturally Responsive Teaching*. This action plan includes steps to broaden my research bank to include more authors of color.

As I reflected on the challenges of conducting research on culturally responsive teaching, I wondered how literature on resilience and *Culturally Responsive Teaching* would yield different results if there were more peer-reviewed articles by researchers of color. Additionally, I wondered how increasing the number of prospective teachers of color in teacher preparation programs would bring different perspectives to the field of education and foster resilience in young students of color. If young students of color had teachers that share a culture or ethnic background with them, would they be more likely to create deep relationships and increase their resilience by doing so? Resilience is fostered by strong, trusting relationships; will students feel more comfortable with an educator that shares a culture with them and, by extension, certain experiences? I hypothesize that greater numbers of teachers of color in preparation programs will challenge program assumptions and faculty thinking, and positively influence diverse

students. Additionally, literature on culture will reveal different themes when conducted by researchers of color.

Theory for Framing Change

It can be difficult to communicate the message that we need more teachers of color in our field (Kohli & Pizarro, 2016). Since so many people embrace the “colorblind” mindset, talking about affirmative action and raising Black and Indigenous People of Color’s (BIPOC) voices above our own can sometimes be considered offensive or unnecessary. As preliminary data collection prior to this study, I discussed the impact of culture sharing with my colleagues in the Early Intervention department of a small, private institution for children with hearing loss. As we discussed the influence of our whiteness on our students and families, all of my coworkers seemed open to any ideas I could share about cultural responsiveness and inclusion practices we can implement in our therapy. Since I’m still learning about actionable steps, I do not feel completely confident about guiding my coworkers in this practice. However, reading several peer-reviewed articles on inclusion and cultural responsiveness gave me some clarity and I was able to effectively summarize some steps we (both as an organization and individual therapists) could take to be aware and respectful of cultural differences.

According to Dr. Kotter’s methodology, “The 8-Step Process for Leading Change”, deciding on a sense of urgency is the first step in the process for leading change. This step is crucial since stakeholder involvement is of the utmost importance regarding this problem of practice. If stakeholders are not fully invested in taking responsibility for their own biases and reflecting upon what changes they need to make in the classroom to promote cultural responsiveness, *Culturally Responsive Teaching* will

not be at the forefront of the classroom. Additionally, if teacher preparation curricula designers do not feel that *Culturally Responsive Teaching* is an urgently important pedagogy to impart to preservice teachers, it will not be at the forefront of curricula (Gay, 2010; Ladson-Billings, 2000).

Diagnosing and Analyzing Problems

Both preservice and inservice educators must be prepared to implement *Culturally Responsive Teaching* in their classrooms. There is often a discrepancy in confidence and self-efficacy in general education strategy implementation between preservice and inservice teachers (Woolfolk Hoy, 2000). If I discover the areas in which both preservice and inservice educators feel the least efficacious and confident, I will be able to ascertain what information about *Culturally Responsive Teaching* should be implemented in preservice curricula. The results of this study found that home-school relationships, home-school culture, and instructional material and curricula are areas in which preservice teachers do not feel as confident or prepared as their inservice counterparts when implementing cultural responsiveness. One potential reason for this is that inservice educators may receive seminars or personal development workshops that discuss *Culturally Responsive Teaching* strategies at length in order to increase confidence in *Culturally Responsive Teaching* implementation.

By consuming literature that does not utilize Black and Brown voices, I am contributing to the issue that Black and Brown voices are not heard in academia. Is there literature on resilience and relationship-forming that is written by Black and Brown authors? How might I go about finding this literature? How can I discern the ethnicity and culture of authors? Research shows that increasing the number of prospective

teachers of color in teacher preparation programs will bring different perspectives to the field of education and increase resilience in young students of color. How could literature on cultural responsiveness yield different results if there were more peer-reviewed articles authored by researchers of color?

Identification of Potential Solutions

The most important actionable step I feel I should take right now is broadening the number of peer-reviewed articles I consume to include more BIPOC authors. Having more authors represented in future literature reviews will promote cultural responsiveness and equity in my studies. In order to prioritize wider inclusion, it would be helpful to use a database such as “Cite Black Authors” (<https://citeblackauthors.com/>) or searching for BIPOC professors in specific programs to ensure that authors of color are represented in the literature being reviewed. Additionally, using information about classroom culture will be helpful to understand the importance of making and maintaining relationships in the classroom.

Change can be measured by comparing scores on the Culturally Responsive Teaching Self Efficacy Survey (Siwatu, 2007) from before and after any specific instruction or curricula materials on *Culturally Responsive Teaching* are disseminated. However, this would not be possible to do during the short amount of time allowed during dissertation; perhaps a long-term study could examine these differences more closely.

Organizational Improvement Plan Pivot

As a conclusion to discussing my Organizational Improvement Plan, I would like to highlight my current career position. Since I am no longer in the field of education, I

have pivoted my Organizational Improvement Plan in order to make it more applicable to me. Some of the same ideals can fit into what I'm doing with my current employment. It should be noted that I work at a cochlear implant manufacturer in consumer sales, so I work with clients who are deaf and/or hard of hearing daily. Being deaf or hard of hearing is a culture unto itself, as it is something that can impact a person's lived experiences. The actionable steps that could be taken at my place of employment could be as follows.

The first actionable step could be hiring more people with hearing loss at my company. As it stands, my team of 33 people has three people with hearing loss on it currently. I do not have exact statistics for the global company; however, based on what I have seen at national sales meetings and in discussions with people outside of my team, this ratio seems to be consistent across the company. By hiring more people with hearing loss we would see our company become 1) more equitable and 2) more representative of the population whom we serve.

The second step that could be taken in my OIP is stepping down during conferences and events and allowing one of my teammates or a recipient of our cochlear implants to present information to the public. A major part of my job is to do presentations and awareness campaigns at conferences and events. By sharing that space and elevating coworkers and colleagues who are deaf or hard of hearing, I would allow people who are deaf or hard of hearing to be heard in a space where they may not always have a chance to raise their voice.

Lastly, I would like to look into the economic disparity that can sometimes limit people with hearing loss from getting an implantable hearing device. Our implants are

typically covered by insurance, but if someone doesn't have insurance, it is an extremely expensive procedure. I could investigate scholarship and grant programs and discuss these with surgeons and clinicians to discover what they typically offer patients who are unable to finance this expensive procedure.

Conclusion

From forming my research questions and submitting my IRB to gathering and analyzing data, to integrating the study's findings into an organizational improvement plan, this dissertation was rich with learning experiences and lessons. First and foremost, I learned how important it is to write answerable research questions. I do believe that I answered my research questions according to the data collected, but there were still lingering questions. What information can we gather to inform teacher preparation programs about *Culturally Responsive Teaching*? Who is responsible for educating preservice and inservice teachers about evolving practices in the classroom? How can we know the best way to educate preservice teachers about the importance of *Culturally Responsive Teaching*?

In Chapter One, I wrote about my personal relationship with this subject matter. I referenced this section when the data seemed too difficult to analyze or the writing process was too lengthy. This is what will keep me going in any future research as well. This is, perhaps, the most important lesson I learned from this whole process. Addressing cultural responsiveness in an education setting alone will not provide a robust, culturally responsive society. Implementing culturally responsive practices in settings such as a corporate workplace, hospitals, and even familial settings will help propagate cultural responsiveness throughout our society.

References

- American Civil Liberties Union (n.d.) *School to prison pipeline*. Retrieved November 15, 2020 from <https://www.aclu.org/issues/juvenile-justice/school-prison-pipeline>
- Aronson, J. (2004). The threat of stereotype. *Educational Leadership* 62(3), 14-19.
- Borrero, N.E., Flores, E. & de la Cruz, G. (2016). Developing and enacting culturally relevant pedagogy: Voices of new teachers of color. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 49(1), 27-40.
- Bozkurt, A., & Sharma, R. C. (2020). Emergency remote teaching in a time of global crisis due to Corona Virus pandemic. *Asian Journal of Distance Education*, 15(1), i-vi.
- Brown, A. (2012). On human kinds and role models: A critical discussion about the African American male teacher. *Educational Studies*, 48(3), 296-315.
- Burkholder, G., Cox, K., Crawford, L, Hitchcock, J. (2020). Research design and methods. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Buss, R. R. & Zambo, D. (n.d.) *A practical guide for students and faculty in CPED-influenced programs working on an action research dissertation in practice* (n.p.).
- Cole, R. W. (1995). *Educating everybody's children: Diverse teaching strategies for diverse learners*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Creswell, J. W. & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Crouch, E. and Bock, J. (2014). Money being paid by Normandy, Riverview Gardens to other districts not being spent. St. Louis Post-Dispatch. Retrieved November 15, 2020 from https://www.stltoday.com/news/local/education/money-being-paid-by-normandy-riverview-gardens-to-other-districts/article_f2ae8233-bf03-57b3-9270-dcc5366de090.html
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). *The flat world and education: How America's commitment to equity will determine our future*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Delpit, L. D. (2006). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom* (Updated ed.) New York, NY: New Press.
- Fishbane, L., & Tomer, A. (2020, March 20). *As classes move online during COVID-19, what are disconnected students to do?* Brookings. <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/the-avenue/2020/03/20/as-classes-move-online-during-covid-19-what-are-disconnected-students-to-do/>
- Gay, G. (2002). Preparing for culturally responsive teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(2), 106–116.
- Gay, G. (2010). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Gorski, P. (2009). What we're teaching teachers: An analysis of multicultural teacher education coursework syllabi. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25, 309-318.
- Gorski, P. (2016). Rethinking the role of “culture” in educational equity: From cultural competence to equity literacy. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 18(4), 221-226.
- Gorski, P. & Pothini, S. G. (2018) *Case Studies on Diversity and Social Justice Education* (2nd edition). New York: Routledge.

- Hammond, Z. (2015). *Culturally responsive teaching & the brain: Promoting authentic engagement and rigor among culturally and linguistically diverse students*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin, A SAGE Company.
- Kohli, R & Pizarro, M. (2016). Fighting to educate our own: Teachers of color, relational accountability, and the struggle for racial justice. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 49*(1), 72-84.
- Krasnoff, B. (2016). *Culturally responsive teaching: A guide to evidence-based practices for teaching all students equitably*. Region X Equity Assistance Center, Education Northwest, 1-25.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal, 32*(3), 465–491.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2000). Fighting for our lives: Preparing teachers to teach African American students. *Journal of Teacher Education, 51*(3). 206-214.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2005). Is the team all right? Diversity and teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 56*(3). 229-234.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2009). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children* (2nd ed.) San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Liang, C., Rocchino, G., Gutekunst, M., Paulvin, C., Melo Li, K., Elam-Snowden, T. (2020). Perspectives of respect, teacher-student relationships, and school climate among boys of color: A multifocus group study. *Psychology of Men & Masculinities, 21*(3), 345-356.
- Losen, D., Hosdson, C., Keith M.A., Morrison, K., & Belway, S. (2015). Are we closing the school discipline gap? *K-12 racial disparities in school discipline*. 1-50.

- Losen, D., Keith, M.A., Hodson, C.L., Martinez, T.E. (2016). Charter schools, civil rights, and school discipline: A comprehensive review. *The Center for Civil Rights Remedies at The Civil Rights Project*. 1-36.
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50(4), 370-96.
- Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. MAP scores, 2010.
- Montgomery County Public Schools, Office of Human Resources and Development, Equity Initiative Unit. (2010). *Equitable classroom practices 2010*. Retrieved on November 19, 2020 from <http://www.montgomeryschoolsmd.org/departments/development/resources/ecp/ECp%20-%2008-13-10.pdf>
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2015). *The condition of education 2015*. US Department of Education. Retrieved November 15, 2020 from <https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2015/2015144.pdf>
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2020). *Race and ethnicity of public school teachers and their students*. U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved November 15, 2020 from <https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2020/2020103.pdf>
- Nicolau, J. L., Mellinas, J. P., & Martin-Fuentes, E. (2020). The halo effect: A longitudinal approach. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 83, 102-110.
- Nisbett, R. E., & Wilson, T. D. (1977). The halo effect: Evidence for unconscious alteration of judgments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 35(4), 250–256.

- Okonofua, J.A. & Eberhardt, J.L. (2015). Two strikes: Race and the disciplining of young students. *Psychological Science (0956-7976)*, 26(5), 617-624.
- Osher, D. (2002) Schools make a difference: The overrepresentation of African American youth in special education and the juvenile justice system. *Racial Inequity in Special Education*, 4, 90-102. (Daniel J. Losen & Gary Orfield eds.)
- Piaget J. (1977). The development of thought: Equilibration of cognitive structures. (A. Rosin, Trans). New York: The Viking Press
- Petty, C. (2018) *School to prison pipeline*. 2020 Bipartisan Justice Center. Retrieved November 15, 2020 from <https://2020club.org/school-to-prison-pipeline/>
- Rothstein, R. (2017). *The color of law*. Liveright Publishing: New York, New York.
- Saffold, F. & Longwell-Grice, H. (2007). White women preparing to teach in urban schools: Looking for similarity and finding difference. *Urban Rev*, 40, 186-209.
- Schwarzer, D., Haywood, A., & Lorenzen, C. (2003). Fostering multiliteracy in a linguistically diverse classroom. *Language Arts*, 80(6), 453-460.
- Siwatu, K. O. (2007). Preservice teachers' culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy and outcome expectancy beliefs. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23, 1086-1101.
- Siwatu, K.O. (2011). Preservice teachers' culturally responsive teaching self efficacy-forming experiences: A mixed methods study. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 104, 360–369.
- Shade, B. J., Oberg, M., & Kelly, C. (2004). *Creating culturally responsive classrooms* (Updated reprint). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

- Sleeter, C.E. (2001). Preparing teachers for culturally diverse schools: Research and the overwhelming presence of whiteness. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52(2). 94-106.
- Sleeter, C. E. (2008). Preparing white teachers for diverse students. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. FeimanNemser, & J. McIntyre (Eds.), *Handbook of research in teacher education: Enduring issues in changing contexts*, 3rd ed. (pp. 559-582). Routledge.
- Sleeter, C. E. (2012). Confronting the marginalization of culturally responsive pedagogy. *Urban Education*, 47(3), 562–584.
- Smith, D., Frey N., Pumpian, I., & Fisher, D. (2017). *Building equity: Policies and practices to empower all learners*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Tervalon, M. & Murray-Garcia, J. (1998). Cultural humility versus cultural competence: A critical distinction in defining physician training outcomes in multicultural education. *Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved*, 9 (2), 117-125.
- Tochluck, S. (2009). *Witnessing Whiteness: The Need To Talk About Race and How To Do It*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- U.S. Department of Education, Equity, and Excellence Commission (2013). *For each and every child: A strategy for education excellence and equity*. Retrieved on November 16, 2020 from <https://www2.ed.gov/about/bdscomm/list/eec/equity-excellence-commission-report.pdf>
- Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (2002). Preparing culturally responsive teachers: Rethinking the curriculum. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(1), 20–32.

- Villegas, A. M. & Irvine, J. J. (2010). Diversifying the teacher force: An examination of major arguments. *Urban Rev*, 42, 175-192.
- Villegas, A.M., Strom, K., & Lucas, T. (2012). Closing the racial/ethnic gap between students of color and their teachers: An elusive goal. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 45(2). 283-301.
- Wagner, N., Hassanein, K., & Head, M. (2008). Who is responsible for e-learning success in higher education? A stakeholders' analysis. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society*, 11(3), 26–36.
- Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2000). Change in teacher efficacy during the early years of teaching. The Ohio State University. 1-26.

Appendix A



September 24, 2021

Dear Colleen Kinsella:

The Fontbonne University Institutional Review Board (IRB) has approved your study proposal entitled, “Culturally Responsive Teaching Preparedness: Differences and Similarities Among Preservice and Inservice Educators.” You may begin your research at any time.

The approval number for this project is **FBUIRB09032022**. This number needs to appear on any materials that research participants may see. This includes informed consent forms or statements, questionnaires, surveys (both hard copy and digital), and any other materials given to participants.

Your approval will expire one year from the approval date, September 3, 2022. If you need an extension or the protocols of your study change, please contact Dr. Joanne Fish, the IRB Chairperson, at jfish@fontbonne.edu or submit a revision via the online process.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions

or concerns. Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Dr. Joanne Fish".

Dr. Joanne Fish, IRB Chairperson
Assistant Professor of Education/Special
Education East Building 225
Fontbonne University
6800 Wydown Blvd
St. Louis, MO 63105

Appendix B

Found in Sent - CKinse01650@fontbonne.edu Mailbox 

CKinse01650@fontbonne.edu July 9, 2021 at 4:06 PM 

Change to the CRTSES
To: kamau.siwatu@ttu.edu

Hello Dr. Siwatu,
I hope this message finds you well. I reached out to you last winter to ask your permission to use the CRTSES in my pilot study. I have decided to move forward and expand upon my pilot study for my dissertation and wish to use the CRTSES again with some modifications. I want to shorten it from 41 questions to about 20 questions and potentially reword some of the questions to use different phrasing. I haven't determined which questions I am going to eliminate yet, as I wanted to obtain permission from you before I did anything. Please let me know if this is ok with you, and I will proceed as you wish.
Thank you!
-Colleen Kinsella
Fontbonne University

Siwatu, Kamau July 9, 2021 at 4:23 PM 

RE: Change to the CRTSES
To: Kinsella, Colleen

   

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]: This email originated from outside of the organization. DO NOT CLICK links or open attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello -

Sure. I do not mind you making changes.

Kamau

[See More from CKinse01650@fontbonne.edu](#)

Appendix C

Culturally Responsive Teaching Self-Efficacy Scale

Rate how confident you are in your ability to successfully accomplish each of the tasks listed below. Each task is related to teaching. Please rate your degree of confidence by recording a number from 0 (no confidence at all) to 100 (completely confident). Remember that you may use any number between 0 and 100.

0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
No					Moderately					
Completely										
Confidence					Confident					Confident
At all										

I am able to:

1. Adapt instruction to meet the needs of my students.
2. Obtain information about my students' academic strengths.
3. Determine whether my students like to work alone or in a group.
4. Determine whether my students feel comfortable competing with other students.
5. Identify ways that the school culture (e.g., values, norms, and practices) is different from my students' home culture.
6. Implement strategies to minimize the effects of the mismatch between my students' home culture and the school culture.
7. Assess student learning using various types of assessments.
8. Obtain information about my students' home life.
9. Build a sense of trust in my students.
10. Establish positive home-school relations.
11. Use a variety of teaching methods.
12. Develop a community of learners when my class consists of students from diverse backgrounds.
13. Use my students' cultural background to help make learning meaningful.
14. Use my students' prior knowledge to help them make sense of new information.

15. Identify ways how students communicate at home may differ from the school norms.
16. Obtain information about my students' cultural background.
17. Teach students about their cultures' contributions to science.
18. Greet English Language Learners with a phrase in their native language.
19. Design a classroom environment using displays that reflects a variety of cultures
20. Develop a personal relationship with my students.
21. Obtain information about my students' academic weaknesses.
22. Praise English Language Learners for their accomplishments using a phrase in their native language.
23. Identify ways that standardized tests may be biased towards linguistically diverse students.
24. Communicate with parents regarding their child's educational progress.
25. Structure parent-teacher conferences so that the meeting is not intimidating for parents.
26. Help students to develop positive relationships with their classmates.
27. Revise instructional material to include a better representation of cultural groups.
28. Critically examine the curriculum to determine whether it reinforces negative cultural stereotypes.
29. Design a lesson that shows how other cultural groups have made use of mathematics.
30. Model classroom tasks to enhance English Language Learner's understanding
31. Communicate with the parents of English Language Learners regarding their child's achievement.
32. Help students feel like important members of the classroom.
33. Identify ways that standardized tests may be biased towards culturally diverse students.
34. Use a learning preference inventory to gather data about how my students like to learn.
35. Use examples that are familiar to students from diverse cultural backgrounds.
36. Explain new concepts using examples that are taken from my students' everyday lives.
37. Obtain information regarding my students' academic interests.
38. Use the interests of my students to make learning meaningful for them.
39. Implement cooperative learning activities for those students who like to work in groups.
40. Design instruction that matches my students' developmental needs.
41. Teach students about their cultures' contributions to society.

Appendix D

Culturally Responsive Teaching Self-Efficacy Scale- R- Inservice Educators

Rate how confident you are in your ability to successfully accomplish each of the tasks listed below. Each task is related to teaching. Please rate your degree of confidence by recording a number from 0 (no confidence at all) to 100 (completely confident). You may use any number between 0 and 100. Please type your numeric response after each question.

0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
No					Moderately					
Completely										
Confidence					Confident					Confident

I am able to:

1. Identify ways that the school culture (e.g., values, norms, and practices) is different from my students' home culture.
2. Implement strategies to minimize the effects of the mismatch between my students' home culture and the school culture.
3. Obtain information about my students' home life.
4. Build a sense of trust in my students.
5. Establish positive home-school relations.
6. Develop a community of learners when my class consists of students from diverse backgrounds.
7. Use my students' cultural background to help make learning meaningful.
8. Use my students' prior knowledge to help them make sense of new information.
9. Identify ways how students communicate at home may differ from the school norms.
10. Obtain information about my students' cultural background.
11. Design a classroom environment using displays that reflects a variety of cultures
12. Develop a personal relationship with my students.
13. Communicate with parents regarding their child's educational progress.
14. Structure parent-teacher conferences so that the meeting is not intimidating for parents.
15. Help students to develop positive relationships with their classmates.
16. Revise instructional material to include a better representation of cultural groups.

17. Critically examine the curriculum to determine whether it reinforces negative cultural stereotypes.
18. Help students feel like important members of the classroom.
19. Use examples that are familiar to students from diverse cultural backgrounds.
20. Explain new concepts using examples that are taken from my students' everyday lives.
21. Number of years in the field:
22. Subject or grade taught:
23. Ethnic background:
24. Age:
25. Zip code:

Replicated and modified with permission from:

Siwatu, K. O. (2007). Preservice teachers' culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy and outcome expectancy beliefs. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23, 1086-1101.

Appendix E

Culturally Responsive Teaching Self-Efficacy Scale- R- Preservice Educators

Rate how confident you are in your ability to successfully accomplish each of the tasks listed below. Each task is related to teaching. Please rate your degree of confidence by recording a number from 0 (no confidence at all) to 100 (completely confident). You may use any number between 0 and 100. Please type your numeric response after each question.

0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
No					Moderately					
Completely										Confident
Confidence					Confident					Confident

I am able to:

1. Identify ways that the school culture (e.g., values, norms, and practices) is different from my students' home culture.
2. Implement strategies to minimize the effects of the mismatch between my students' home culture and the school culture.
3. Obtain information about my students' home life.
4. Build a sense of trust in my students.
5. Establish positive home-school relations.
6. Develop a community of learners when my class consists of students from diverse backgrounds.
7. Use my students' cultural background to help make learning meaningful.
8. Use my students' prior knowledge to help them make sense of new information.
9. Identify ways how students communicate at home may differ from the school norms.
10. Obtain information about my students' cultural background.
11. Design a classroom environment using displays that reflects a variety of cultures
12. Develop a personal relationship with my students.
13. Communicate with parents regarding their child's educational progress.
14. Structure parent-teacher conferences so that the meeting is not intimidating for parents.
15. Help students to develop positive relationships with their classmates.
16. Revise instructional material to include a better representation of cultural groups.

17. Critically examine the curriculum to determine whether it reinforces negative cultural stereotypes.
18. Help students feel like important members of the classroom.
19. Use examples that are familiar to students from diverse cultural backgrounds.
20. Explain new concepts using examples that are taken from my students' everyday lives.
21. Anticipated graduation date:
22. Desired subject or grade to teach:
23. Age:
24. Ethnic background:
25. Zip code:

Replicated and modified with permission from:

Siwatu, K. O. (2007). Preservice teachers' culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy and outcome expectancy beliefs. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23, 1086-1101.

Appendix F

To whom it may concern:

My name is Colleen Kinsella and I am an Ed.D. student at Fontbonne University in St. Louis, MO. I was wondering if you could disseminate a survey for my dissertation to the members of your organization. My dissertation chair, Dr. Jamie Doronkin, is copied on this email. The title of my research is Culturally Responsive Teaching Preparedness: Differences and Similarities Among Preservice and Inservice Educators (IRB#: FBUIRB09032022). Could you please copy and the below text to the educators in your school district? Please let me know if you have any questions. Thank you so much in advance for your support!

Seeking educators! I would like to invite you to complete a survey for my doctoral dissertation, titled Culturally Responsive Teaching Preparedness: Differences and Similarities Among Preservice and Inservice Educators.

Here is the Informed Consent form: <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1MoEuo5LzkK34g2vYmLUYLzgaEniN3eLB/edit?usp=sharing&ouid=105265447225398676342&rtpof=true&sd=true>

The link to the survey is below:

https://forms.office.com/Pages/ResponsePage.aspx?id=B0hl-YTnSUy0iCRpmvdAXb_xp6n_MHNAk5-JVRtkh4IUQIA0VUpQUzkxRVNaOVhXOTE4UUxMMFNDNS4u

Participants may choose to be entered into a drawing to win one of two \$50 gift cards to Amazon or Target. Winners will be individually notified. Participants must read the informed consent before participating in the survey. By clicking on the survey link, you are giving your informed consent.

Thank you!

Warm regards,

Colleen Kinsella

Appendix G

Informed Consent Form

You are invited to participate in a study of Culturally Responsive Teaching Preparedness: Differences and Similarities Among Preservice and Inservice Educators. I hope to learn information about which areas of Culturally Responsive Teaching (CRT) both preservice and inservice educators feel confident and efficacious implementing. Current research does show in which areas of CRT inservice educators feel confident, but there is no existing research that provides data for similarities and differences between inservice and preservice educators. This information will show which areas (if any) preservice and inservice teachers feel similarly and different, which can inform curricula in preservice programs. You were selected as a possible participant in this study because you are either enrolled in a preservice education program or an inservice educator.

If you decide to participate, you will complete a 20-question survey and return it to the researcher within two weeks of receiving it. The survey requires number responses on a scale of 0-100 and should take approximately ten minutes to complete. There are four demographic questions at the end of the survey that will ask questions such as your age, ethnic background, and teaching experience. These surveys will remain anonymous. All data collected will be stored on the researcher's password protected computer.

There are certain potential benefits and risks associated with your participation in this research. One benefit is reflecting on your personal teaching experience and background to examine areas of strength and areas for growth. Another benefit is contributing to knowledge about this topic and informing novel research. The risks may be feeling inconvenienced or feeling uncomfortable answering questions.

Any information obtained in connection with this study that can be identified with you will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission. In any written reports or publications, you will not be identified or identifiable.

For your participation, you will be entered into a raffle in which two participants from the study will each receive a \$50 gift card to either Amazon or Target.

Your decision whether to participate will not affect your future relations with Fontbonne University, your place of employment, or your preservice program in any way. If you decide to participate, you are free to discontinue participation at any time without affecting such relationship(s).

If you have any questions, please ask me. If you have any additional questions later, please contact Colleen Kinsella at CKinse01650@fontbonne.edu or Jamie Doronkin at JDoronkin@fontbonne.edu and we will be happy to answer them.

IRB# FBUIRB09032022

Colleen Kinsella MA, CED

8/20/2021

Signature of Principal Investigator

Date

Revised July, 2020

Note: Questions and Concerns can also be referred to the IRB Committee Chair at: jfish@fontbonne.edu