

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Evaluation of Diversity and Multicultural Integration Training in Higher Education

Gloria D. Campbell-Whatley

University of North Carolina at Charlotte

Lisa Merriweather

University of North Carolina at Charlotte

Jo Ann Lee

University of North Carolina at Charlotte

Ozalle Toms

University of Wisconsin at Whitewater

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the effects of diversity training on course design and instruction using a quantitative methods research design. Faculty at a large research university in the southeast attended a diversity institute whose purpose was to assist faculty in infusing multicultural education into their syllabi, courses, and curriculum. The authors wanted to determine if faculty incorporated the skills learned in the institute into their courses and if students benefitted from the training faculty received. Both faculty and students were administered self-report surveys to provide feedback on the effect, if any, on the achievement of desired outcomes from diversity training. Overall, the analyses indicated that the institute positively affected both faculty and students.

Keywords: multicultural education, higher education, faculty diversity training, effects of diversity training, infusing diversity, infusing multicultural education

Due to a number of social shifts in the United States, colleges and universities, especially Traditionally White Institutions (TWIs), now encompass a wider range of student diversity. The ethnic and racial makeup of the population has changed, the age range of students has expanded, and greater numbers of religions and sexual orientation are represented. These changes en masse present challenges to faculty who are charged with addressing the needs of such a diverse population (Ancis, & Sedlacek, Mohr, 2000; Prater, & Devereaux, 2009). Colleges and universities have responded to this challenge by providing opportunities for faculty to participate in diversity training as they recognize the importance of improving the ability of faculty to address the needs of attending students. These institutions have invested significant resources to

this endeavor (e.g. faculty time, finances, inclusion in strategic plan) and seemingly remain committed to diversity training initiatives in spite of limited evidence based research to substantiate the effectiveness of training (Ancis, & Sedlacek, Mohr, 2000; Clark, 2011, Clark & Antonio, 2012; Smolen, Colville-Hall, Liang, & Mac Donald, 2006; Prater, & Devereaux, 2009; Sue, Torino, Capodilupo, Rivera, & Lin, 2009).

There is limited research on the effectiveness of diversity training and the effect on faculty and students. Therefore, the purpose of the current investigation was to assess the effectiveness of a diversity/multicultural training on faculty and students at a midsize research university in the southeast and provide data based research to the higher education community. The rationale of this study is to provide evidence that diversity/multicultural training for faculty can be effective and have a positive effect on students. For the purpose of this study, effectiveness is defined as self-reports from faculty and students on the inclusion of culturally relevant language and activities in course syllabi and materials.

The Effect of Diversity Training

Many diversity training initiatives use the framework of multicultural education programs as a base. Clark (2005) described a diversity initiative at the University of Maryland College Park, the Intergroup Dialogue as Pedagogy across the Curriculum (IDPC), a grant funded by the Ford Foundation. This training emerged from several prior diversity efforts to address the dissatisfaction of campus wide complaints that multicultural initiatives were unsatisfactory. Previous diversity related course requirements failed to promote cultural interaction, cultural competence, and cultural relationship building. New initiatives from the grant trained over 300 faculty and graduate teaching assistants to infuse multicultural education into courses. Stipends, in the sum of \$100,000 were provided to enhance multicultural education in several disciplines. Faculty worked collaboratively to integrate multicultural education into courses. Quantitative investigations confirmed better cultural understanding, relationships, and dialogues as a result.

Potthoff et al., (2001) described an initiative in which 49 participants in a higher educational setting completed 39 hours of multicultural education training. Training initiatives focused on awareness and diversity infusion methodologies (i.e., “Knowing Self,” “Knowing Others,” “Knowing How”). Qualitative and quantitative methodologies were used to examine program effectiveness. Participants were asked to complete a survey before and after training and a paired *t* pre-post experimental design indicated significant differences in 25 of the 28 items on the survey. Three themes emerged from the two qualitative questions on the survey: (a) the need for diversity training, (b) maintaining a positive learning environment for diversity, and (c) the application and growth of diversity initiatives. The participants received a stipend and the authors recommended buy-in from the university and the participants.

In 2010, Mayo and Larke examined 75 faculty members who participated in the Multicultural Curriculum Transformation Institute at a doctoral granting institution. The school had an enrollment of 25,000 students of which 25% was culturally and linguistically diverse. The Multicultural Curriculum Transformation Institute incorporated the theory of Morey and Kitano (described later in this study) (1997) and reflected the University’s strategic plan that all curricula should include a multicultural perspective. The institute ran for two weeks for the first two years and then one week for the last year. It included an intensive review of best practices

for cultural pedagogy and strategies to facilitate transformation and perspectives related to content, teaching strategies, classroom dynamics, and assessment.

Faculty across all colleges (Applied Arts, Business, Education, etc.) who participated were offered a stipend and were expected to deliver an infused curriculum. Faculty were given evaluations immediately after the institute and after using the infused curriculum in class for a year. On a 4 point Likert scale with 1 being the lowest and 4 being the highest, the cumulative rating of the training based on the faculty evaluations over 3 years was 3.73. Open-ended responses from faculty revealed that: a) students mentioned diversity and multicultural teaching on their course evaluations; b) faculty received more positive verbal comments from students related to diversity, and c) students made comments related to a “safe space” on faculty evaluations. One senior faculty noticed multiculturalism was mentioned more when tenure and promotion documents were examined. The authors noted faculty “buy in” for diversity training increased when the three “Rs”, revision, rewards, and research were offered.

Diversity and Students. Research also supports the premise that students learn better in a diverse educational environment and likewise, exposure to diversity develops and supports a more active and engaged thinking process (Gurin et al., 2002; Holley et al., 2008; Locks et al., 2008). Studies by Chang (1999) and Ancis, Sedlacek, & Mohr (2000) confirmed that universities that are more diverse create educational experiences that better prepare students for life after college. In 2003, even the US Supreme Court ruling (*Grazt v. Bollinger*, involving the University of Michigan and the diverse student population) supported the educational value of diversity while emphasizing the importance of preparing students to relate to all populations in society. In support, the American Association of Colleges and Universities suggested that excellence in diversity is demonstrated through organizational learning by promoting social and intellectual development while attending to cultural differences. These matters positively affect student outcomes as they relate to diversity (Locks et al., 2008). Faculty diversity training built from multicultural education pedagogy and culturally relevant material provides this type of social and intellectual development for the faculty which better prepares them to develop similar competencies within their students.

The aforementioned data-based research provides a starting place for understanding the effectiveness of multicultural education in higher education. Administrative persistence and faculty “buy in” were noted as essential components for the effectiveness of training (Mayo & Larke, 2010; Potthoff et al., 2001). The literature presented here indicates diversity infusion into higher education syllabi and curriculum has indicators for success (Mayo & Larke, 2010) and suggests faculty training has some impact on student engagement (Gurin et al., 2002; Holley et al., 2008; Mayo & Larke, 2010; Locks et al., 2008).

Context of Training for the Present Study

The university in this study is committed to developing a culture which honors diversity/multiculturalism and the Diversity Institute (DI or Institute) is one manifestation of this commitment. Since 2005, the Institute, a 5-day process, had instructed at the time of the study, over 223 faculty and full-time instructional staff across colleges on: a) methods to infuse diversity into their curriculum, b) opportunities to participate in awareness and sensitization exercises, and c) information about campus wide and community resources related to diversity

and multicultural education. Usually 25 to 40 faculty and instructional staff from all colleges (Arts and Sciences, Business, Education, Engineering, Health and Human Services, Architecture, and Computing and Information) participated. Faculty received a stipend provided by the university.

The Institute used the Morey and Kitano model (1997) to integrate multicultural education into its diversity training and implemented several suggested best-practices. Morey and Kitano (1997) Higher Education Diversity Model provided integration on three levels: (a) Exclusive, (b) Inclusive, and (c) Transformed. The Exclusive Level of multicultural integration presented and maintained traditional mainstream experiences and perspectives; whereas, the Inclusive Level presented traditional views but adds alternative perspectives. The Transformed Level of multicultural integration challenged traditional views and assumptions, and encouraged diverse perspectives by capitalizing on the experience and knowledge students brought into the classroom. The model applied multicultural integration to four components of teaching a course: (a) content, (b) instructional strategies and activities, (c) assessment, and (d) classroom dynamics. In this way, the model addressed four elements instructors could choose to modify, depending on their personal philosophies, readiness, expertise, and the demands of disciplinary content (Kitano & Pederson, 2002; Kitano, et al., 1996).

Each year the institute featured different topics, e.g., *Diversity and Work: Moving from the Ivory Tower*, *Multicultural Education: A Research Perspective*, *Internationalization: A Focus on Research*, *Diversity: Realizing the Necessity*, *Higher Education: Achieving Curriculum Diversity*. There were, however, several staple topics included every year such as concept identity, classroom climate, gender differences, the International student, students with disabilities, religion, sexual orientation, and campus multicultural resources among others. These sessions were facilitated by speakers who were internal and external to the campus community. In addition to speakers and activities, faculty participated in group sessions where they incorporated what they learned into their syllabi and curriculum. A unique part of the Institute included sessions by graduates of the Institute who presented examples of how they diversified their syllabi and curricula.

The Office of the Provost commissioned an evaluation study to determine the extent to which faculty and students perceived the effectiveness of the diversity training. This study is the result of that evaluation. The purpose of the study is to assess the effectiveness of the Diversity Institute Training on faculty and students using survey data. Surveys were administered to four populations: Faculty who attended the Institute (Attendees), faculty who had not attended the Institute (Non-Attendees), students of faculty who attended the Institute (Students of Attendees) and students of faculty who had not attended the Institute (Students of Non-Attendees). The primary research question was: How does diversity/multicultural faculty training effect the perceptions of faculty and students as measured by self-reports after diversity/multicultural faculty training?

METHOD

The population sampled in this study was from a Traditionally White Institution (TWI) in a large urban setting in the southeast. At the time of the study, the faculty was 58% male, 42% female, 83% Majority populations (White), and 17% Non-Majority (non-White). At the time of the study, the university employed approximately 950 full-time faculty. The targeted university had

a student body of over 24,700 with 27% Non-Majority (culturally and linguistically diverse) populations, 73% Majority populations (White), 53% female and 47% male. It had undergraduate and graduate programs, including more than 18 doctoral programs.

Study Design

A quantitative methods research design was used to ascertain the effectiveness of the Institute training on faculty and the students they served. This study used a posttest only non-experimental design with nonequivalent groups (Shuttleworth, 2009) and investigated the hypothesis that diversity/multicultural training can be effective and can have a positive effect on faculty and students.

A five-person team, including experts in quantitative and qualitative research was assembled. This article reports the findings from the quantitative survey analysis and the qualitative analysis was reported in a separate study to limit the length of the article. The team spent six months designing the study and developing and testing instruments for data collection. Data collection took place over a 6 week period after permission from the Institutional Review Board was granted in the spring. Data analysis followed in the fall.

The surveys were sent through SurveyShare to all current faculty who had completed the program since its inception and they served as the faculty Attendee group. The researchers sent the list of faculty who had participated in the Institute to the registrar and the registrar randomly chose faculty who had not participated in the institute. These faculty served as the Non-Attendee group. Both groups of faculty were sent the same survey, but Non-Attendees were directed to skip items 6-9 because those items only addressed the concerns of faculty who attended the Institute (see Table 2).

Approximately half (462) of the current faculty who had not attended the Institute (Non-Attendees), and 7,000 of their students (Students of Non-Attendees) were sent surveys. Participation in the current study required that these students were not currently registered in a class taught by faculty who attended the Institute; all students of a selected class were sent surveys. Students of Non-Attendees were identified using class rosters obtained from the Registrar's Office. Faculty Attendees were solicited to allow distribution of the student surveys in their classes. The researchers went to the classes at an assigned time to administer and collected the survey. The students in those classes constituted the "Students of Attendees group." Participants of this group were the only ones who received the survey face-to-face.

Participants

A total of 897 people completed the surveys; 73 faculty Attendees (48%), 149 faculty Non-Attendees (67%), 263 Students of Attendees (38%) and 412 Students of Non-Attendees (62%). A total of 223 faculty surveys comprised the Attendees and Non-Attendees groups (see Table 1). There were 130 (57%) females and 93 (43%) males. Twenty one percent of the participants were from the Education Department, 41% were from Liberal Arts, 6% from Engineering, 9% from Health and Human Services, 7% from Arts and Architecture, 7% from Business, and 2% from Computing and Informatics.

A total of 675 students participated in the study. There were 459 (47%) females and 216 (33%) males (see Table 1). Graduate students comprised 28%, while, 72% represented the undergraduate population. The student majors were: 41% Liberal Arts and Sciences, 18% Education, 8% Engineering, 12% Health and Human Services, 2% Arts and Architecture, 11% Business, and 4% from Computing and Informatics.

TABLE 1
Faculty and Student Demographics

Faculty Ethnicity		Students Ethnicity	
Black	7.2 % (n=16)	Black	18.6 % (n=128)
White	78.0% (n=174)	White	63.4 % (n=430)
Asian	5.4% (n=12)	Asian	5.5% (n=38)
Hispanic	2.7% (n=6)	Hispanic	5.2% (n=36)
Multiracial	2.2% (n=5)	Native American	.6% (n=4)
Other	2.2% (n=5)	Multiracial	3.9% (n=27)
No Response	2.2% (n=5)	Other	1.7 % (n=12)
Total	N=223	Total	N=675

Instrumentation

The Faculty Diversity/Multicultural Survey, developed specifically for this study to assess the impact of training, was composed of 9 diversity-related items and 8 demographic-related items. Items specific to faculty Attendees was 9, and Faculty Non-Attendees responded to 5 diversity related items. The Student Diversity/Multicultural Survey, also specifically developed for this study, was composed of 7 diversity-related and 8 demographic-related items (see Table 2). Both surveys used a self-report 4-point Likert scale and higher scores indicated more favorable diversity/multicultural related impact. Cronbach's *alpha* reliability (1951) was computed using the survey scores of participants and the reliability coefficient was .88 for the student survey and .89 for the faculty survey within this sample. The items were adapted from several articles related to diversity/multiculturalism. To strengthen content validity, both of the surveys were sent to 10 faculty and staff members involved in diversity related services (e.g., Director of the Office of Disability Services; Director of Multicultural Services) or teaching and research related to diversity or multicultural education (e.g., researchers, professors). For both surveys, the final instruments incorporated some of their suggestions.

TABLE 2
Survey Items

Student Diversity/Multicultural Education Survey Items	Faculty Diversity/Multicultural Education Survey Items	
1. I was aware that my professor/instructor integrated diversity material into the course?	1. Multicultural concepts were easy to implement in the course(s) I teach (taught).	
2. Diversity materials/knowledge were included on the syllabus?	2. I integrated multicultural/diversity information into my syllabus (syllabi).	
3. I found a connection between diversity/multicultural education and my particular subject area in this course.	3. I integrated diversity information into my curriculum(s).	
4. I benefitted from the infusion of diversity material/knowledge in the course.	4. I am confident in my use of diversity/multicultural strategies?	
5. The diversity/ multicultural knowledge made me more aware of people from non-dominant groups or people that are different from me.	5. I integrated diversity into most syllabi of the courses that I teach.	
6. When explaining material, my professor used examples that included diverse communities.	Answer Items 6-9 only if you attended the Diversity Institute	
7. Based on what I learned in this class, having some knowledge and understanding of people from diverse communities is relevant to work in this field.		
		6. At least 10% of my curriculum was affected by information learned in the diversity institute?
		7. I found a connection between what I learned in the institute and my subject area?
	8. I have incorporated diversity/multicultural education of my course(s) for at least 10% throughout the semester.	
	9. I see a positive benefit for my students as a result of integrating multicultural/diversity examples, activities, strategies, and/or knowledge into my curriculum(s)	

Diversity/Multiculturalism was defined at the beginning of both surveys, using the school's definition. Respondents were asked to think of diversity/multiculturalism "as including, but not limited to ability/disability status, age, culture, ethnicity, gender, language, race, religion, sexual orientation, and socio-economic status" and to indicate their level of agreement with each statement. The invitation explained that all responses were anonymous, as no identifying information would be collected, and only aggregated data would be reported.

Attendees, Non-Attendees, and Students of Non-Attendees were sent the survey three times. Online surveys contained a disclaimer that participation indicated implied consent,

approximate survey completion time, a confidentiality statement, a definition for diversity/multicultural, and a personal contact email and telephone number for the lead researcher, as well as the phone number for the Research Compliance Office. Students of Attendees completed the survey in their respective classes.

Data Analysis

For this study, *t* tests were used to determine if statistically significant differences existed between the mean ratings of faculty Attendees and faculty Non-Attendees groups on items 1-5. For each *t* test, Cohen's *d* (Biddix, 2014), was calculated to get an effect size to measure the strength of the relationship between two variables. Items 6-9 that were answered only by the Attendees group are represented as percentages. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), a statistical method for making simultaneous comparisons between two or more means, was used to test for differences among the 7 items as well as differences between Students of Attendees and Students of Non-Attendees.

RESULTS

Significant differences were found on 3 of the 5 items for faculty: "Multicultural concepts were easy to implement in the course(s) I teach (taught)," "I integrated multicultural/diversity information into my syllabus (syllabi)" and "I integrated diversity into most syllabi of the courses that I teach." Table 3 contain *t* tests results for survey items, comparing mean ratings of the faculty Attendees group and mean ratings of the faculty Non-Attendees group. Mean ratings by those who attended the Institute were higher than those who did not attend the Institute, with higher ratings indicating higher levels of agreement. Only item 2 had a notable effect: "I integrated multicultural/diversity information into my syllabus (syllabi)." Significant differences were not found for items 3 and 4.

TABLE 3
Means, Standard Deviations, Obtained t-Statistics, and Effect Sizes for Attendees and Non Attendees of the Diversity Institute (Faculty)

Item	Non-Attendees (<i>n</i> = 149)		Attendees (<i>n</i> = 73)		Obtained <i>t</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>ES</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
1. Multicultural concepts were easy to implement in the course(s) I teach/taught.	2.90	.760	3.21	.730	-2.84	.005	.41
2. I integrated multicultural/diversity information into my syllabus/syllabi.	2.65	.601	2.89	.393	-3.02	.003	*.61
3. I integrated diversity information into my curriculum(s).	2.71	.598	2.84	.472	-1.60	.110	.22
4. I am confident in my use of diversity/multicultural strategies.	2.75	.500	2.81	.490	-.833	.406	.12
5. I integrated diversity into most syllabi of the courses that I teach.	2.64	.604	2.81	.490	-1.98	.048	.28

Note. **=Large Effect Size *=Medium Effect Size
 $d = .20$ to be a small effect, $d = .50$ a medium effect, and $d = .80$ a large effect
 Effect size computed using Cohen's *d*
 $p < .05$

Descriptive statistics are reported in Table 4 for items 6-9. The data indicated that the majority of participants agreed with all of the statements, indicating positive attitudes. However, none of the participants marked "Strongly Agree." Of all the items, item nine was the one with which the majority of the participants (91.9%) agreed: "I see a positive benefit for my students as a result of integrating multicultural/diversity examples, activities, strategies, and/or knowledge into my curriculum(s)"

TABLE 4
Number and Percentage Table for Faculty Attendees

Items	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
6. At least 10% of my curriculum was affected by information learned in the diversity institute?		n=52 71.2%	n=18 24.7%	n=2 2.7%
7. I found a connection between what I learned in the institute and my subject area?		n=60 82.2%	n=10 13.7%	n=3 4.1%
8. I have incorporated diversity/multicultural education of my course(s) for at least 10% throughout the semester.		n=62 84.9%	n=8 11.0%	n=3 4.1%
9. I see a positive benefit for my students as a result of integrating multicultural/diversity examples, activities, strategies, and/or knowledge into my curriculum(s)		n=67 91.8%	n=2 2.7%	n=4 5.5%

Means and standard deviations of the student data are presented in Table 5. Significant differences ($p < .05$) between means of Students of Attendees and Students of Non-Attendees were found with Items 2 through 7. For Item 1 (“I was aware that my professor/instructor integrated diversity material into their course”) significant differences were not found between the Students of Attendees and Students of Non-Attendees groups ($F(1,662) = 2.97, p < .085$). Significant differences were found between Students of Attendees and Students of Non-Attendees groups on; a) item 2, “Diversity materials/knowledge were included on the syllabus” did demonstrate a significant difference between the ($F(1,627) = 9.53, p < .002$); b) item 3, “I found a connection between diversity/multicultural education and my particular subject area in this course” ($F(1,663) = 15.84, p < .000$); c) item 4, “I benefitted from the infusion of diversity material/knowledge in the course” ($F(1,658) = 5.11, p < .024$); d) item 5, “The diversity/multicultural knowledge made me more aware of people from non-dominant groups or people that are different from me” ($F(1,657) = 4.49, < .034$); e) item 6, “When explaining material, my professor used examples that included diverse communities” ($F(1,658) = 11.10, p < .001$); and f) item 7, “Based on what I learned in this class, having some knowledge and understanding of people from diverse communities is relevant to work in this field” ($F(1,663) = 5.26, p < .022$).

TABLE 5
Descriptive Statistics of Student Items

Groups	Q1		Q2		Q3		Q4		Q5		Q6		Q7	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Students of Non-Attendees (n=412)	2.8	.872	2.8	.872	2.8	.906	2.8	.894	2.8	.916	2.9	.820	3.1	.858
Students of Attendees (n=263)	2.9	.899	2.9	.816	3.1	.779	2.9	.738	2.9	.792	3.1	.770	3.2	.769

Note. Text of survey items are contained in Table 2.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of the study was to determine the effect of the Institute training on faculty and students at a large urban institution in the southeast. Faculty who participated were compared with a group of faculty who did not attend the Institute to determine the impact of the training on diversity practices within the classroom. The data suggest that the Institute was effective in helping faculty to increase multicultural pedagogical knowledge to influence diversity practices in the development and implementation of their courses. Faculty Attendees implementation of multicultural concepts into their courses was noticed by their students based on analysis of six items on the student survey, meaning the student data supports the overall findings from the faculty data. The Students of Attendees were more likely to agree that diversity materials, knowledge, and examples were included on the syllabus, that they recognized a connection between the diversity/multicultural education and their subject areas and professional practice that they benefitted from diversity material and knowledge and were more aware of diversity. The data indicate that the Diversity Institute had a ripple effect in that the students of faculty who attended the Institute, and those faculty who attended were more engaged with the concept of diversity and understood the importance of diversity for their future practice than students of faculty, and the faculty who did not attend the Institute's diversity training workshop.

These findings agreed with research by Potthoff et al., 2001 and supported the need for diversity training, particularly structured in the environment in which it is to be implemented. Attention to the environment promoted transformation of the curriculum and multicultural education training as it encourages community building and participation. The Morey and Kitano Model (1997) used in the present study is also reinforced. Mayo and Larke (2010) discussed the same model of multicultural infusion and received supportive evaluations and positive comments. These authors both indicated that infusion of diversity issues increased the instructor ability to talk about racial differences as a relevant part of the course and encouraged a safe environment for students to discuss multicultural issues.

Potthoff et al., (2001) and Mayo and Larking (2010) both recommended buy-in by administrators and recommended change at the policy level to invest in multicultural education training. The targeted university identifies itself as an urban university. It is housed in a city that is 60% diverse and a state that is 32% diverse (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). The university is cognizant of the diversity of people it serves and has incorporated diversity initiatives into its strategic plan.

The university has continued to increase its efforts to infuse diversity in the curriculum. The administration at the university has developed a Quality Enhancement Plan that had three major goals which it has now begun to implement. At the present time diversity related activities and intercultural awareness has been infused into targeted freshmen courses throughout the entire college campus. The campus wide initiative assures systematic interweaving of multicultural/diversity pedagogy to promote a curriculum incorporating “awareness of self and of others.” Continued multicultural integration training will help faculty and students experience more cross-racial interactions and challenge their own diversity consciousness efforts. Increased initiatives are more apt to promote exposure to diversity which develops and supports a more active and engaged thinking process which is essential to social integration for students (Gurin et al., 2002; Holley et al., 2008; Locks et al., 2008).

Previous research indicated that diversity training had a positive impact on faculty (Pottoff, et al., 2001; Mayo & Larke, 2010) and students (Ancis, Sedlacek, & Mohr, 2000; Chang, 1999; Gurin et al., 2002; Holley et al., 2008; Locks et al., 2008). The findings from this research provide further support for the effectiveness of faculty diversity training and the importance of administrative buy-in. The training was found to be beneficial for faculty but also supported the positive aspects of diversity for students. Students also indicated their professors who attended the Institute integrated diversity in their courses at a higher level and as a result, they too had a greater understanding of the importance of diversity.

LIMITATIONS

There were limitations in the study. First, the sample came from one university and therefore the results may not be generalizable to other TWIs. Future research should collect data at other universities or the schools within the university system to determine replication of results. The study is limited in scope and contains threats to validity. It does not guard against assignment bias, because the researcher knows little about individual differences within the control group and how they may have affected the outcome. Even with randomization of the initial groups does not address assignment bias.

The results of such a study will always be limited in scope but they do describe what happened at the targeted university. While pretest-posttest designs are more desirable, this study was limited in that it primarily used post priori data. According to Shuttleworth (2009), the posttest only design with non-equivalent groups is usually reserved for analyses performed post facto, such as this study. The research seeks to observe the effect of a training program that has already been administered. By describing what happened at the targeted university, program administrators, curriculum developers, department heads, faculty, and content-area specialists will gain additional perspectives on the benefits derived from infusing diversity/multicultural training as a part of faculty training programs.

The response rate was low for Students of Non-Attendees. We cannot explain the low response rate. The surveys were distributed early in spring semester when other academic commitments (e. g., midterm exams and finals) and distractions (e. g., other electronic surveys) were assumed to be minimal. A higher response rate would increase our confidence in the generalizability of the results. Other survey techniques, such as mail surveys or face-to-face meetings, may be more successful in obtaining a higher response rate. Additionally, some

students may have felt the word “Diversity” in the title was an indication that the survey was for diverse persons only.

CONCLUSION

On campuses across the nation, the trend of increased diversity is veering from just race and ethnicity to include varied ages, religions and sexuality on college campuses. There is a need to address the further integration of campus diversity efforts. Diversity training for faculty has been adopted by universities across the nation as a means to better support the ever increasing diversity within their student populations. The Institute was one such training which was created to help faculty integrate multicultural education into their syllabi, curriculum, and research. There are limited studies which have examined diversity and multicultural training efforts on college and university campuses, especially the effects of training on students. Few data-based studies exist which validate the effectiveness of diversity training for higher education faculty. This study supports the premise that diversity/multicultural training for faculty can be effective and can have a positive effect on students. The results of these surveys provide information to guide institutions of higher learning in addressing issues of diversity/multicultural training. There is a need, however, to conduct more research to determine to what extent these findings may be generalized to other campuses in similar, as well as different geographical areas.

Universities will continue to experience growth in enrollment of students from diverse backgrounds and will therefore need to remain committed to ensuring that faculty are equipped to meet their needs and support the advance of the university’s diversity initiatives. This study provides evidence that diversity/multicultural training can have a positive effect on faculty, students, and the campus community.

REFERENCES

- Ancis, J. R., Sedlacek, W. E., & Mohr, J. J. (2000). Student perceptions of campus cultural climate by race. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 78*, 180-185.
- Biddix, P. J. (2014) *Research Rundowns*. Retrieved from: <http://researchrundowns.wordpress.com/quantitative-methods/effect-size/>
- Chang, M. J. (1999). Does racial diversity matter?: The educational impact of a racially diverse undergraduate population. *Journal of College Student Development, 40*, 377-395.
- Clark, C. (2011). Diversity initiatives in higher education: Just how important "is" diversity in higher education?. *Multicultural Education, 19*(3), 57-59.
- Clarke, C., & Antonio, A. (2012). Rethinking Research on the Impact of Racial Diversity in Higher Education. *Review Of Higher Education, 36*(1), 25-50.
- Clark, C. (2005). Diversity initiatives in Higher Education: Intergroup dialogue as pedagogy across the curriculum, *Multicultural Education, 21*, 51-61.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika, 16*, 297-334.
- Gurin, P., Dey, E., Hurtado, S., & Gurin, G. (2002). Diversity and higher education: Theory and impact on educational outcomes. *Harvard Educational Review, 72*, 330-366.
- Gratz Vs Bollinger (2003). <http://caselaw.findlaw.com/us-supreme-court/539/244.html>
- Holley, L., Larson, N., Adelman, M., & Treviño, J. (2008, March). Attitudes among university undergraduates toward LGB and five ethnic/racial groups. *Journal of LGBT Youth, 5*(1), 79-101.
- Kitano, M. K., & Pedersen, K. S. (2002). Action research and practical inquiry: Multicultural content integration in gifted education: Lessons from the field. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 25*, 269-289.

- Kitano, M. K., Lewis, R. B., Lynch, E. W., & Graves, A. W. (1996). Teaching in a multicultural classroom: Teacher educators' perspectives. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 29*, 70-77.
- Locks, A., Sylvia, S., Hurtado, H., Bowman, N., & Oseguera, L. (2008). Extending notions of campus climate and diversity to students' transition to college. *Review of Higher Education, 31*(3), 257-285. Retrieved December 3, 2008, from Academic Search Premier database
- Mayo, S., & Larke, P. J. (2010). Multicultural education transformation in higher education: getting faculty to "buy in". *Journal of Case Studies In Education, 11*-9.
- Morey, A. I., & Kitano, M. K. (Eds.). (1997). *Multicultural course transformation in higher education: A broader truth*. Needham Heights: Allyn & Bacon.
- Potthoff, , D. Dinsmore, J., & Moore, T. (2001). The diversity cohort: A professional development program for college faculty. *Teacher Educator, 37*(2), 145-56.
- Prater, M., & Devereaux, T. (2009). Culturally responsive training of teacher educators. *Action in Teacher Education, 31*(3), 19-27.
- Shuttleworth, M. (2009). Pretest-Posttest Designs. Retrieved from *Explorable.com*: <https://explorable.com/pretest-posttest-designs>
- Smolen, L., Colville-Hall, S., Mac Donald, S., & Liang, X. (2006). An empirical study of College of Education faculty's perceptions, beliefs, and commitment to the teaching of diversity in teacher education programs at four urban universities. *The Urban Review, 38*, 45-61.
- Sue, D. W., Lin, A. I., Torino, G. C., Capodilupo, C. M., & Rivera, D. P. (2009). Racial microaggressions and difficult dialogues on race in the classroom. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 15*(2), 183.