

FINAL GRANT REPORT

“Theological Education in a Multicultural Environment: Identifying and Evaluating Best Practices for Empowerment”

Part One: Research and Planning



A study at Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, California
Funded by a grant from the Wabash Center



Cameron Lee, Ph.D.

Project Director

Joint Faculty Multiethnic Concerns Committee



July 2007

Learning Abstract

An empirical study of full-time students at Fuller Seminary was begun in 2005 to address issues of pedagogy and climate related to empowering a culturally diverse body of students. Initial qualitative data were used to construct a questionnaire that was completed by 298 students. A preliminary report of the findings was then circulated to external consultants and student focus groups for comment. Survey results indicated that pedagogical concerns were secondary to those of campus climate. Student focus groups responses raised significant concerns with implicit and explicit racism in the classroom. Overall, the study suggests that the empowerment of an increasingly diverse population of seminary students requires specific attention to the ways in which the classroom and campus environment may be experienced as unsafe and disempowering.

Theological Education in a Multicultural Environment: Identifying and Evaluating Best Practices for Empowerment

Conditions and Goals

The cultural and ethnic diversity of the student body at Fuller Theological Seminary's main campus in Pasadena, California, presents both opportunities and challenges for theological education. In 2002, the seminary's Joint Faculty Multiethnic Concerns Committee (JFMCC) drafted a *Statement on Racial Justice and Intercultural Life*. Through the subsequent adoption of that statement, the seminary community pledged to maintain a respectful and supportive multiethnic environment.

The ultimate goal has been to create and sustain a learning environment that is welcoming to students of all cultural backgrounds, and that best empowers students to minister effectively in the various cultures to which they are called. But how should we proceed? What do we know about student perceptions of the social environment of the seminary, and the appropriateness and effectiveness of the faculty's pedagogical methods? The JFMCC decided that concrete policy recommendations could not be made without at least some preliminary answers to such questions. The committee therefore established an intermediate goal of collecting relevant student data.

The present study was designed to provide systematically collected student data upon which recommendations for both classroom practice and broader seminary policies might be based. Various ad hoc studies regarding multicultural issues have been done in the past. While informative, these have tended to rely upon the anecdotal reports of a small number of students, raising questions about how well their experiences could be generalized to the whole student body.

Noting the lack of systematic data on which to base policy recommendations, the JFMCC applied to the Wabash Center and received a research and planning grant in the amount of \$20,260. The grant was awarded in 2004. This report summarizes the results of the research, which was completed in four stages.

Method / Grant Activities

Stage One: Qualitative questionnaire

Stage One began in the Winter of 2005. Narrative/qualitative responses were sought from a small but culturally diverse sample of Fuller students. A slate of 54 full-time students (6 students from each of 9 ethnic groups) from the Pasadena campus were nominated by the leadership of their respective student groups (e.g. the Korean Students Association), or by the Office of Student Advising, where no cultural student advocacy group was available. Within each group, 3 of the nominees were students in Fuller's School of Theology, two were from the School of Intercultural Studies, and 1 was from the School of Psychology.

All 54 students were contacted by a research assistant and offered \$30 bookstore gift certificates as incentives for completing a questionnaire comprised of 10 open-ended questions. The questions addressed five areas:

- *Campus climate*: How do faculty, students, and staff create (or fail to create) a campus environment that welcomes diversity?
- *Curricular adequacy*: What aspects of the curriculum are most helpful in preparing students for ministry in a multicultural world? What is missing?
- *Pedagogy*: Which classroom teaching practices do students of different backgrounds find most effective and culturally relevant?
- *Strategies of evaluation*: Of the many ways of evaluating learning and student progress, which are experienced as culturally appropriate or inappropriate, and why?
- *Empowerment for ministry*: How well does what the students learn apply to the settings in which they already minister? How well does it apply to their anticipated future ministries?

Questionnaires were provided in English, Spanish, and Korean, as needed.

Of the 54 nominees, 24 students consented to participate (44 %), and returned completed questionnaires. Students were not asked to provide any descriptive information about themselves, so the ethnic and gender characteristics of the 24 respondents are unknown. For the sake of brevity, their complex narrative responses to the 10 questions are not included in this report. These responses, however, were used to design a survey instrument for the second stage of the research.

Stage Two: Quantitative questionnaire

The second stage of data collection began in the Spring Quarter of 2005. Using the results of Stage One as a basis, a 7-page questionnaire was created to assess the degree to which those students' perceptions and experiences might be generalized to the whole of the student body. The questionnaire (available upon request), included the following:

- 12 demographic items;
- 3 items measuring expectations for multicultural training at Fuller;
- 3 items measuring the perceived success of this training;
- 14 general items regarding the social environment of Fuller (e.g. "People of different ethnic and cultural backgrounds are welcome at Fuller");
- Measures of the perceived helpfulness of 18 instructional practices;
- Measures of the perceived accuracy of 11 methods of evaluating student performance / learning;
- 3 items measuring whether students need extra consideration in assignments and exams;
- 15 items assessing the frequency of a variety of classroom experiences related to learning in a multicultural environment;
- A list of 12 campus events to assess each respondents overall level of involvement in explicitly or potentially multicultural activities;
- 4 items addressing the relationship of respondents' training to their anticipated ministries.

The final page of the questionnaire asked students to nominate a Fuller course that they considered exemplary in terms of multicultural training. Respondents were given space to comment on the characteristics of the course they found most helpful. This

information will be used for a further phase of study, and does not appear in the present report.

Questionnaires were distributed through classrooms with the permission of the instructors. At the beginning of class, either the instructor or a member of the JFMCC explained the study and solicited student participation. Each student who consented to participate received a packet containing a questionnaire and a cover letter/informed consent document explaining the research, a pen, and a ticket to be used later in a prize drawing (one of 50 bookstore gift certificates, in \$10 and \$20 denominations). Students were instructed when and where to return their completed questionnaires and tickets.

With the assistance of the Registrar, the SOT and SIS courses with the largest enrollment were selected. Because SOP courses are taught by cohorts (first year, second year, etc.), the largest courses for each cohort were selected. A total of 883 questionnaires were distributed; 298 were returned, for a response rate of approximately 34%.

In order to streamline the analysis, factor analysis and reliability testing were performed on larger sets of questions, in order to combine separate items into meaningful scales. Five such scales were created, as described below.

- *Perceived infrastructural need.* This scale was comprised of 3 of the 14 social environment items described above. They assess students' perceptions of the need for (a) more books by non-White authors as required reading for courses; (b) more library books in other languages; (c) greater ethnic diversity in the seminary faculty.¹
- *Unease with diversity.* Another 3 social environment items assessed student perceptions of unease with multicultural diversity in the classroom: (a) "Professors are not comfortable engaging cultural perspectives other than their own," (b) "Students are not comfortable engaging different cultural perspectives in the classroom," and (c) "The thoughts and opinions of people from all ethnic and cultural backgrounds are respected in the classroom" (this item was reverse-scored).²
- *Multicultural orientation in the classroom.* This scale was comprised of 8 of the 15 classroom environment items described earlier, asking students how often they actually observed various faculty or student behaviors in the classroom. Faculty-oriented items assessed whether professors (a) required books by non-White authors, (b) encouraged other cultural points of view, (c) solicited the input of students from minority cultures, (d) demonstrated knowledge of other cultures as appropriate, (e) referred to authors from diverse cultures, and (f) cautioned students against making culturally-biased overgeneralizations. Student-oriented items asked whether students (a) showed interest in other cultural points of view, and (b) had discussions in culturally diverse groups.³
- *Inappropriate humor.* Two classroom environment items assessed how often professors and/or students respectively used inappropriate racial humor.⁴

¹ Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient for this scale was .72.

² Cronbach's alpha = .70.

³ Cronbach's alpha = .84.

⁴ Cronbach's alpha = .80.

- *Cultural disrespect.* Another two classroom environment items assessed the overall attitude toward students of different cultures: (a) “What minority students said in class was treated with less seriousness or respect,” and (b) “Others showed impatience while non-English language students tried to express themselves.”⁵

Other items were analyzed separately.

Three types of information were gleaned from an extensive examination of the data. First, descriptive profiles were created to summarize the overall patterns of response to the variables (e.g. average scores).⁶ Second, group comparisons were conducted to determine whether students of different cultural / ethnic or gender groups differed in their perceptions of the campus environment. Cultural / ethnic differences were operationalized through four different comparisons:

- *Majority status.* Students who identified themselves by such terms as “white,” “Caucasian,” and “European” were classified into one group and compared to students who classified themselves differently. For the purposes of this report, the designations “majority” and “minority,” when applied adjectivally to respondents, will refer specifically to this variable.
- *Country of origin.* Students who were born in the United States were compared to those born outside the U.S. The former will be referred to as “U.S. born” or “USB”; the latter will be designated as “non-U.S. born” or “NUSB.”
- *First language.* Students whose first language was English were compared to those who cited a different language. In this report, respondents who affirmed English as their first language will be referred to as “English-first-language” students or “EFL”; the remaining respondents will be referred to as “other-first-language” students or “OFL.”
- *American ethnicity.* The subset of students born in the U.S. was further classified into the following categories: (a) White/Caucasian; (b) Black/ African-American; (c) Asian American; and (d) Hispanic/Latino American.

Third, correlational analyses were conducted to determine what social environment and classroom variables, if any, appear to be associated with four variables that potentially indicate whether Fuller is succeeding in the multicultural task of empowerment. These included one item measuring whether what is taught in the classroom was perceived by students as relevant to their anticipated ministries, and three items assessing whether training at Fuller was seen as succeeding in helping respondents learn (a) “the specific ways that cultures differ from each other,” (b) “how to be more culturally sensitive,” and (c) “how to be more critically aware of [his/her] own cultural biases.”

Results of the analyses will be reported below, under “Statistical Findings.” Findings will be presented in three stages, according to the three types of information described above: descriptive analyses, group comparisons, and correlational analyses.

Stage Three: Consultation and feedback

During the 2005-2006 academic year, questionnaire data were analyzed, and a preliminary report of the results was written by the Project Director. This report was then circulated to six external consultants for their consideration and written response. This

⁵ Cronbach’s alpha = .65.

⁶ Unless otherwise noted, “averages” reported in this document refer to the arithmetic mean.

ethnically diverse panel was sought for their known expertise in issues of cultural diversity. The consultants (listed alphabetically) were:

- Dr. Terry Anderson, Vancouver School of Theology;
- Dr. Miguel De La Torre, Iliff School of Theology;
- Dr. Nancy Ramsay, Brite Divinity School;
- Dr. Samuel Roberts, Union Theological Seminary;
- Dr. Darryl Trimiew, Medgar Evers College;
- Dr. Eui-Young Yu, California State University, Los Angeles.

An integrated summary of their questions and insights will be presented below under “Consultant Commentary.”

Stage Four: Student focus groups

From the Spring of 2006 to the Winter of 2007, a different type of consultant response was sought in the final stage of research. Concerned that the one-third response rate to the survey (and the under-representation of certain ethnic groups) might not adequately represent the student body, the JFMCC sought to convene student focus groups to read and comment on the preliminary report. Again, potential participants were nominated for participation, and contacted by a research assistant. Students were offered bookstore gift certificates as incentives for their participation. Participants were asked to individually read the report, reflect on the ways in which the report either reflected or failed to reflect their own experience at Fuller, and then attend a focus group discussion.

Three groups were convened, representing Latino, Korean, and African-American students respectively. To encourage candid responses, groups were facilitated by non-faculty: one African-American graduate student, one Korean-American graduate student, and one Latino alumnus. A summary of student observations will be presented below under “Student Commentary.”

Statistical Findings

Participants

The majority of respondents were female (60%), with two students declining to give their gender. Respondents ranged in age from 22 to 70 years, with a median age of 28. Over half of the sample was unmarried (56 %).

Forty seven percent of the returns were from SOT students (140), followed by SOP students (118), and SIS students (32). SOP students were thus overrepresented in the sample, and SIS students underrepresented. Eight students declined to state their school. Respondents reported having been students at Fuller for an average of just under 7 quarters.

Students were occupied not only with their studies, but with ministry and non-ministry related work off-campus. Nearly 80 percent of respondents reported at least 1 hour of ministry involvement per week: among these students, the median number of hours of ministry was 6 (with one student reporting 50 hours). Sixty percent of students were also engaged in paid work not related to ministry: these students averaged nearly 16 hours of work per week.

Of the 298 questionnaires returned, 276 (93%) were completed in English; only 11 each were returned in Korean and Spanish. Just slightly over half of the respondents

identified their ethnic / cultural background as “white,” “Caucasian,” or some similar term. The majority of the respondents were also born in the U.S. (71%) and had English as their first language (76%).

Descriptive analyses

Instructional methods

The questionnaire presented 18 different instructional methodologies used at Fuller, and asked respondents to rate “how helpful you have generally found that method to be in helping you learn.” Respondents were instructed to rate only those methods they had actually experienced. Table 1 shows the number of students who experienced each method and the average helpfulness score for each, then ranks the results from most to least helpful.

Table 1
How helpful are the instructional methods?

Method	#	Avg.	Rank
Lecture from lecture notes	291	3.55	15
PowerPoint	293	3.93	6
Interaction w/ prof outside class	257	4.27	2
Printed lecture outline/notes	289	4.17	3
Movie clips	272	3.92	7
Field trips	115	3.97	4
Music	183	3.40	17
Discussion with whole class	287	3.84	10
Panel discussion	211	3.86	9
Fishbowl	141	3.60	14
Small group discussion	290	3.80	12
Reflection papers	292	3.84	10
Research papers	285	3.87	8
Student presentations	255	3.51	16
Cultural immersion	91	3.96	5
Cultural autobiography	105	3.71	13
Profs question students on reading	230	3.20	18
Real world application of lectures	277	4.55	1

Note: 1 = not helpful at all; 2 = not very helpful; 3 = a little helpful; 4 = very helpful; 5 = extremely helpful

There was great variation, of course, in how often each method was actually experienced in this sample. Fewer than a third of the respondents had experienced cultural immersion assignments; only a slightly higher proportion had written cultural autobiographies or participated in field trips. Not surprisingly, nearly everyone had experienced lectures, PowerPoint presentations, discussions, and reflection and research papers as methods of learning.

But how helpful overall did students find each method to be in fostering learning? It should be noted first that all 18 methods were rated, on average, as being at least “a little helpful.” The highest-rated strategy (very to extremely helpful), however, was for professors to make “real world” applications of lecture material. The second most highly rated was in some ways not properly an instructional method as it was an alternative avenue for student learning: the interaction between a student and professor *outside* of class. The common practice of lecturing from lecture notes was ranked 15th in helpfulness; some respondents wrote additional comments on their surveys suggesting that *reading* from lecture notes was particularly unhelpful.

Evaluation method

The questionnaire also presented 11 methods by which faculty evaluate student performance. Respondents were asked to rate each according to “how accurately you think this type of evaluation measures what you’ve actually learned.” Again, respondents were instructed to rate only those methods they had experienced personally. Table 2 presents the results in a manner similar to Table 1.

Table 2
How accurate are the evaluation methods?

Method	#	Avg.	Rank
Research papers	287	3.52	7
Multiple choice exams	266	3.29	10
Essay exams	280	3.75	3
Student presentations	242	3.32	9
Experiential assignments	141	3.63	6
Creative writing assignments	132	3.49	8
Art projects	119	3.18	11
Reflection papers	286	3.69	5
Smaller quizzes spread throughout the quarter	243	3.76	2
Exams with mixed types of questions	250	3.70	4
Term papers that focus on integrating reading assignments	265	3.89	1

Note: 1 = not accurate at all; 2 = not very accurate; 3 = somewhat accurate; 4 = very accurate; 5 = extremely accurate

Again, there was expectable variation in how often such practices were actually used: while virtually all students have written research or reflection papers, fewer than half have done art projects or creative writing assignments.

The range of ratings of accuracy was more restricted than for the helpfulness of instructional methods. While all 11 methods of evaluation were rated at least “somewhat accurate” on average, none was rated “very accurate” or higher. The highest rated method was the use of term papers that integrate assigned readings. Second was the use

of smaller quizzes spread throughout the quarter. Essay and mixed format exams were ranked 3rd and 4th respectively, but multiple choice exams ranked 10th out of 11.

In a related question, students generally agreed⁷ that they “need to have assignments spread out over the quarter” as opposed to being due all at one time.

General social environment

Table 3 shows the average ratings for 10 measures of the social environment of the seminary, as it relates to cultural diversity. The results indicate a mixture of positive and negative views. On the one hand, respondents tended to agree that students of diverse background were welcome at Fuller, that this diversity had been personally valuable, and that they had made at least one good friend from a different cultural background. They also tended to disagree that there was a sense of unease with diversity in the behavior of professors and students.

Table 3
Ratings of general social environment variables

Item / variable	#	Avg.
Perceived infrastructural need	249	2.90
Unease with diversity	292	2.07
Diverse people welcome at Fuller	297	3.39
“Multiculturalism” mostly valued as a politically correct slogan	289	2.40
Some students, for cultural reasons, need to be encouraged to speak up in class	291	3.02
Diversity at Fuller has been personally valuable	294	3.38
Students whose 1 st language is not English should have more time on exams in English language courses	290	3.03
Have made at least one good friend of another culture	296	3.25
Students socialize in culturally homogeneous groups	293	3.03
For a multicultural environment, professor / student attitude is more important than course content	296	2.93

Note: 1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = agree; 4 = strongly agree

On the other hand, respondents also agreed that students tend to socialize in their own culturally homogeneous groups; that students whose first language was not English should be allowed more time on exams; and that some students of minority cultures need to be encouraged more to speak up in class. Respondents tended to agree that more infrastructural support for diversity was needed, and seemed to be divided on the issue of whether or not “multiculturalism” was anything more than just a slogan for the sake of political correctness.

⁷Average score of 3.03 on a 4-point scale, where 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, and 4 = strongly agree.

Classroom environment

Table 4 shows the ratings for 6 variables related to the more specific matter of classroom environment. These were frequency ratings, ranging from “never” to “always.” Instances of inappropriate racial humor by faculty or students and manifestations of cultural disrespect were present but infrequent. More common was the event of majority students shying away from minority students in group discussions, and the expectation by professors that minority students would act as experts in their own cultures. Diversity issues were “sometimes” addressed without being integrated into the logic or structure of a course. The highest frequency rating went to indications of a positive multicultural orientation (see p. 5 above), but this occurs on average only “sometimes.”

Table 4
Ratings of classroom environment variables

Item / variable	#	Avg.
Multicultural orientation in the classroom	273	2.14
Inappropriate racial humor	294	.57
Cultural disrespect	291	1.03
Majority students shy away from minority students in discussions	291	1.53
Profs expect minority students to act as experts in their own cultures	293	1.92
Diversity issues addressed but not integrated into course	283	2.02

Note: 0 = never; 1 = seldom; 2 = sometimes; 3 = often; 4 = always

Expectations and perceived outcomes

Did students expect multicultural training at Fuller? If so, how well was Fuller succeeding in accomplishing this task? Table 5 displays the average ratings across the sample on 10 variables related to expectations and outcomes.

In general, students expected to be trained to work in a multicultural environment. This includes, in order of relative importance, being more critically aware of one’s own cultural biases, being more culturally sensitive, and understanding the specific ways in which cultures differ. Ratings of how well Fuller had actually succeeded in these latter three areas lagged behind expectations (these differences were significant), though success ratings were closer to “agree” than “disagree.”

The average rating for the relevance of classes to respondents’ anticipated ministries fell just short of “agree.” It should also be noted, however, that as a group, respondents were less than certain about what ministries they would actually be engaged in after graduation, making the relevance question more difficult to answer.

Table 5
Expectations and perceived outcomes

Variable	#	Avg
In terms of ministry, I know what I will be doing when I finish my training at Fuller	295	2.86
I expect Fuller to train me to work in a multicultural environment	297	3.12
Without Fuller's help, I already know most of what I need to know about the cultural context in which I will probably be working	293	2.35
What I am being taught in my classes is usually relevant to the kind of ministry I anticipate being involved in	296	2.96
I <i>want</i> my training at Fuller to...		
...help me understand the specific ways that cultures differ from each other	296	3.26 ^a
...teach me how to be more culturally sensitive	297	3.43 ^b
...teach me how to be more critically aware of my own cultural biases	297	3.52 ^c
Thus far, my training at Fuller has <i>succeeded</i> in...		
...helping me understand the specific ways that cultures differ from each other	295	2.79 ^a
...teaching me how to be more culturally sensitive	295	2.93 ^b
...teaching me how to be more critically aware of my own cultural biases	295	2.94 ^c

Note: 1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = agree; 4 = strongly disagree

^a Difference is significant: dependent measures $t(294) = 10.93, p = .000$.

^b Difference is significant: dependent measures $t(294) = 11.16, p = .000$.

^c Difference is significant: dependent measures $t(294) = 12.68, p = .000$.

Group comparisons

Since the respondents represented a culturally diverse student body, it is reasonable to expect that scores averaged across the entire sample would mask differences between cultural or ethnic groups. The above variables were therefore also analyzed for evidence of group differences, both by gender and cultural / ethnic background. As described earlier, the latter was operationalized by majority status, country of origin, first language, and ethnic differences within U.S.-born students.⁸

⁸ Independent measures t -tests are used for differences by gender, majority status, origin, and language; one-way analysis of variance is used for ethnic differences within the U.S. born students.

Significant differences between cultural / ethnic groups were further tested to see if the role of cultural differences was also complicated by gender effects.⁹

Gender and instructional / evaluation methods

Of the 18 instructional methods presented, only 2 showed statistically significant differences between women and men in terms of perceived helpfulness.¹⁰ Female students found printed outlines and field trips more helpful than male students did.¹¹ As was true of the sample as a whole, men and women alike found real-world applications of lectures and interactions with professors outside class to be the most helpful.¹² There were no significant gender differences on methods of evaluation.

Gender and general social / classroom environment

Female and male respondents differed significantly on only one measure of the general social environment: females were more likely to agree that students socialize in culturally homogeneous groups.¹³ For both men and women as a group, the two most highly endorsed items were that diverse students were welcome at Fuller, and that diversity had been personally valuable. There were no significant differences between genders on any of the variables related to classroom environment.

Gender and expectation / perceived outcome variables

Only one significant gender difference emerged for the expectation / outcome variables: men were more likely than women to agree that they knew what ministry they would be engaged in after graduation.¹⁴

Culture / ethnicity and instructional / evaluation methods

Thus, there were few significant group differences by gender. Were there differences by culture and ethnicity? Tables 6 and 7 show the results of cultural group comparisons on the instructional and evaluation variables. Only a handful of comparisons were statistically significant, but there was some consistency in the results.

U.S.-born students were more likely than NUSB students to rate music as a helpful instructional method, though relative to other methodologies, it was not highly rated by either group (see Table 6). More strikingly, both white majority students and EFL students were more likely to see interaction with professors outside of class as helpful than were their minority or OFL counterparts. All tests for ethnic subgroup differences within USB students were non-significant.

⁹ Using a two-way analysis of variance procedure to test for interaction effects.

¹⁰ Because of the large number of significance tests being performed, a more conservative alpha level of .01 will be employed; i.e. only results where $p < .01$ or better will be reported as statistically significant. The exception will be for tests for interaction effects, where alpha will remain at the conventional .05.

¹¹ For printed outlines: females, $n = 170$, mean = 4.29; males, $n = 117$, mean = 4.00; $t(285) = 3.08$. For field trips: females, $n = 61$, mean = 4.21; males, $n = 53$, mean = 3.68; $t(94) = 2.74$.

¹² The mean differences between men and women on both of these variables were significant at $p < .05$, with women higher in both cases.

¹³ Females, $n = 174$, mean = 3.11; males, $n = 117$, mean = 2.90; $t(289) = 2.58$.

¹⁴ Females, $n = 175$, mean = 2.71; males, $n = 118$, mean = 3.09; $t(291) = -4.15$, $p < .001$.

Table 6. Cultural / ethnic group differences on instructional methods

Method	Majority status				Country of origin				First language			
	White majority		Other		United States		Other		English		Other	
	#	Avg	#	Avg	#	Avg	#	Avg	#	Avg	#	Avg
Lecture	146	3.45	145	3.66	206	3.54	85	3.59	222	3.53	66	3.62
PowerPoint	148	3.87	145	4.00	207	3.89	86	4.04	223	3.91	67	4.03
Interact w/ prof outside class	133	4.42	124	4.11	188	4.33	69	4.10	202	4.34	53	3.98
Printed lecture outlines/notes	144	4.17	145	4.18	201	4.21	88	4.09	217	4.19	69	4.09
Movie clips	135	3.91	137	3.92	192	3.92	80	3.91	206	3.94	63	3.83
Field trips	51	4.14	64	3.84	78	4.06	37	3.78	82	4.05	32	3.75
Music	95	3.47	88	3.33	134	3.52	49	3.10	141	3.47	40	3.20
Discussion w/ whole class	147	3.88	140	3.79	203	3.90	84	3.68	219	3.86	66	3.76
Panel discussion	100	3.93	111	3.79	144	3.93	67	3.70	156	3.89	53	3.81
Fishbowl	65	3.79	76	3.43	94	3.68	47	3.43	100	3.68	41	3.39
Small group discussion	147	3.80	143	3.79	206	3.85	84	3.67	220	3.83	67	3.73
Reflection papers	146	3.88	146	3.81	206	3.85	86	3.81	222	3.84	67	3.85
Research papers	143	3.87	142	3.87	199	3.85	86	3.92	214	3.85	68	3.94
Student presentations	125	3.42	130	3.60	176	3.49	79	3.56	190	3.51	64	3.53
Cultural immersion	34	4.06	57	3.90	53	4.06	38	3.82	56	4.07	35	3.77
Cultural autobiography	47	3.65	58	3.77	68	3.68	37	3.78	72	3.65	32	3.88
Profs question students on reading	108	3.07	122	3.32	158	3.11	72	3.40	169	3.12	59	3.48
Real world application	140	4.58	137	4.52	197	4.58	80	4.46	213	4.59	61	4.39

Note 1: Pairs of scores in **bold/italic font** are significantly different at $p < .01$ (using independent-measures t -tests).

Note 2: 1 = not helpful at all; 2 = not very helpful; 3 = a little helpful; 4 = very helpful; 5 = extremely helpful

Regarding evaluation methods, two related group differences emerge (see Table 7). Majority and U.S.-born students were more likely to rate exams with mixed question types as accurate measures of their learning than were minority and NUSB students. Similarly, majority, USB, and EFL students rated essay exams more highly than their counterparts. As for the sample as a whole, term papers integrating assigned readings

were the preferred method of evaluation across the board. There were no significant group differences by American ethnic subgroups.

Table 7. Cultural / ethnic group differences on evaluation methods

Method	Majority status				Country of origin				First language			
	White majority		Other		United States		Other		English		Other	
	#	Avg	#	Avg	#	Avg	#	Avg	#	Avg	#	Avg
Research papers	144	3.49	143	3.54	202	3.50	85	3.57	217	3.49	67	3.60
Multiple choice exams	134	3.33	132	3.24	191	3.26	75	3.36	204	3.28	59	3.32
Essay exams	142	3.92	138	3.57	200	3.89	80	3.39	214	3.86	63	3.43
Student presentations	120	3.27	122	3.38	166	3.31	76	3.36	179	3.33	61	3.37
Experiential assignments	71	3.75	70	3.51	95	3.74	46	3.41	103	3.74	37	3.38
Creative writing	60	3.65	72	3.35	85	3.61	47	3.26	91	3.60	40	3.20
Art projects	60	3.22	59	3.14	82	3.29	37	2.92	85	3.29	34	2.88
Reflection papers	145	3.77	141	3.62	201	3.75	85	3.56	217	3.71	66	3.64
Quizzes throughout quarter	123	3.81	120	3.70	174	3.78	69	3.69	186	3.77	56	3.72
Exams w/ mixed question types	134	3.84	116	3.54	186	3.79	64	3.47	199	3.75	49	3.55
Term papers integrating readings	130	3.94	135	3.84	186	3.91	79	3.84	197	3.87	65	3.97

Note 1: Pairs of scores in **bold/italic font** are significantly different at $p < .01$ (using independent-measures t -tests).

Note 2: 1 = not accurate at all; 2 = not very accurate; 3 = somewhat accurate; 4 = very accurate; 5 = extremely accurate

Did any of these cultural differences interact with gender? Only one significant interaction effect emerged for instructional methods, and none for evaluation methods. In the case of the helpfulness of interacting with professors outside class, gender interacted with the difference between language groups.¹⁵ Males on average were less likely to find such interaction helpful than females. Moreover, the helpfulness gap between EFL and OFL groups was greater for males than for females. In other words, among male respondents, the mean for EFL students was 3.68, as opposed to 4.28 for OFL students, a gap of over half a point on a five-point scale. By contrast, the corresponding means for women were 4.32 and 4.37, a gap of only .05. Thus, overall, males found interaction

¹⁵ For the interaction, $F(1, 251) = 4.69, p = .03$; for the main effect of gender, $F(1, 251) = 8.60, p = .004$; for the main effect of first language, $F(1, 251) = 6.69, p = .01$.

with the professor less helpful than females, EFL students found such interaction more helpful than OFL students, and the language distinction made more difference to men.

Table 8. Cultural / ethnic group differences on general social environment

Variable	Majority status				Country of origin				First language			
	White majority		Other		United States		Other		English		Other	
	#	Avg	#	Avg	#	Avg	#	Avg	#	Avg	#	Avg
Infrastructural need	113	2.71	136	3.07	167	2.82	82	3.08	180	2.84	66	3.08
Unease with diversity	147	1.92	145	2.23	207	1.99	85	2.28	222	2.02	67	2.25
Diverse people welcome	149	3.54	148	3.25	210	3.48	87	3.19	225	3.45	69	3.18
Multiculturalism mostly a PC slogan	145	2.21	144	2.59	205	2.32	84	2.59	221	2.36	66	2.55
Some students need to be encouraged to speak up	144	2.90	147	3.14	204	2.94	87	3.22	220	2.96	68	3.22
Diversity at Fuller personally valuable	147	3.51	147	3.25	208	3.43	86	3.25	223	3.41	68	3.26
More time on exams for non-English students	145	2.94	145	3.11	204	2.95	86	3.22	218	2.94	69	3.30
Have made 1 good friend of another culture	149	3.21	147	3.28	209	3.24	87	3.27	225	3.24	68	3.26
Students socialize in culturally homogeneous groups	145	2.97	148	3.08	205	3.01	88	3.06	221	3.02	69	3.07
Attitude more important than course content	148	2.83	148	3.03	208	2.87	88	3.09	224	2.90	69	3.09

Note 1: Pairs of scores in **bold/italic font** are significantly different at $p < .01$ (using independent-measures t -tests).

Note 2: 1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = agree; 4 = strongly agree

Culture / ethnicity and general social environment

As Tables 8 and 9 demonstrate, it was in the perception of the social and classroom environment that cultural group differences emerged most consistently.

Results for general social environment variables are presented in Table 8 above. Not surprisingly, NUSB and OFL students were more likely to endorse the idea that OFL students should be given more time on exams. This was additionally supported by consistent group differences on two additional survey items, “Because of my language

skills, I am anxious in exams,” and “I need extra time for essay questions.” Minority, NUSB, and OFL students tended toward agreement with both of these items significantly more than their majority, USB, and EFL counterparts.¹⁶

White majority students were more likely to agree that diversity had been personally valuable. This distinction did not hold for country of origin and language; though the mean differences were in the same direction, the differences were not large enough to be statistically significant. The difference did, however, hold for the ethnic subgroups within respondents born in the U.S., with white students scoring significantly higher in their appreciation of Fuller’s diversity than Asian-Americans.¹⁷ This latter result, however, was based on a small subgroup of only 21 Asian-American students and should be viewed with caution.

Minority students and those born outside the U.S. were also more likely to agree that multiculturalism was a political slogan at Fuller, though it should be noted that the mean score of 2.59 in both cases suggests that this opinion was not strongly held throughout the entire group. This distinction also held between American ethnic groups, with African-American students tending more toward agreement (2.88) than white students (2.21).¹⁸ Again, an interpretive caution: this result was based on information from only 16 black students.

While students of all backgrounds agreed that Fuller welcomes diverse people, majority, USB, and EFL students were likely to agree more strongly. There were no corresponding group differences among the American ethnic subgroups.

The most consistent findings in this category pertained to the composite variables of perceived infrastructural need and unease with diversity. Minority, NUSB, and OFL students were all more likely to agree that greater multicultural resources were needed. There was also a significant difference between American ethnic groups on this variable, with a post hoc comparison showing that African-American students were significantly more likely to agree (average of 3.34) than white students (2.70).¹⁹

Similarly, significant differences emerged across all four cultural group distinctions on the variable of perception of unease with diversity. Though the tendency for all groups was to disagree that such unease exists, minority, NUSB, and OFL students disagreed less strongly. Within the American-born subgroups, Hispanic/Latino students disagreed most strongly (average of 1.79), followed by white students (1.93); African-American students were significantly less likely to disagree (2.47) than either group.²⁰ As with the African- and Asian-American students, the Hispanic/Latino-American group was small, comprised of only 13 individuals.

¹⁶ On anxiety in exams: majority, $n = 146$, mean = 1.37; minority, $n = 141$, mean = 2.11; $t(285) = -7.27$, $p < .001$; USB, $n = 201$, mean = 1.37; NUSB, $n = 86$, mean = 2.52; $t(285) = -10.92$, $p < .001$; EFL, $n = 218$, mean = 1.42; OFL, $n = 66$, mean = 2.71; $t(282) = -11.33$, $p < .001$. On extra time for essays: majority, $n = 148$, mean = 1.98; minority, $n = 143$, mean = 2.53; $t(289) = -5.11$, $p < .001$; USB, $n = 206$, mean = 2.03; NUSB, $n = 85$, mean = 2.77; $t(289) = -6.38$, $p < .001$; EFL, $n = 221$, mean = 2.05; OFL, $n = 67$, mean = 2.92; $t(286) = -7.00$, $p < .001$. Items use a 4-point scale, where 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, and 4 = strongly agree.

¹⁷ The overall $F(3, 198) = 4.76$, $p = .003$. A post hoc Scheffé test reveals a significant difference ($p < .05$) between White/European-Americans, $n = 152$, mean = 3.52 and Asian Americans, $n = 21$, mean = 3.05.

¹⁸ $F(3, 195) = 4.89$, $p = .003$; post hoc Scheffé test significant at $p < .05$.

¹⁹ $F(3, 157) = 6.30$, $p = .000$; post hoc Scheffé test significant at $p < .05$.

²⁰ $F(3, 197) = 6.48$, $p = .000$; post hoc Scheffé test significant at $p < .05$.

These differences, again, were examined for the possibility of gender interactions. Several significant interactions arose from the analyses. As we have seen, majority students were more likely to agree that diversity at Fuller had been personally valuable. There was no direct relation of gender to this social environment variable. There was, however, an interaction between gender and majority status, such that the latter made more difference to women than it did to men where the evaluation of diversity was concerned.²¹ Minority women showed the lowest average level of agreement (3.11) and majority women the highest (3.54), while there was a much smaller difference between minority men (3.42) and majority men (3.44).

Similarly, gender interacted with cultural group differences on the variable of supporting more time on exams for OFL students. In these cases, cultural group status made more difference for the men than for the women. OFL students, as we have seen, were more apt to support more time on exams, and there was no direct effect of gender on this variable.²² But language made more difference for the men: male EFL students were least supportive (2.91), while male OFL students were most supportive of granting more time (3.47). Women's average agreement scores fell in the middle (2.96 and 3.13 respectively).²³ A similar pattern held for the group distinction of country of origin. American-born males were least likely to agree that more time should be given (2.90) while NUSB males were most likely to agree (3.37). Again, women's average scores fell between these two groups (2.97 and 3.06 respectively).²⁴

Gender also interacted with all three group differences in Table 8 on the variable of perceived infrastructural need. In each case, the interaction was accounted for in part by the greater disparity between cultural groups among males than among females. This disparity was least striking (though significant) when viewed through the lens of majority status. Minority students were more likely to view Fuller's infrastructure as lacking than were white majority students, and in this case, there was also a gender difference, such that women were more likely to perceive this lack than men.²⁵ But again, the culture gap was greater for men than for women.²⁶ White males were least likely to agree that there was an infrastructural need, with an average score of 2.46; minority men, by contrast, averaged 3.03. White women averaged in the middle at 2.86; but minority women were the most likely to see the need, with an average score of 3.11.

Where country of origin and language were the group distinctions, it was again the men who showed the greatest disparity. American-born and EFL men were least likely to agree that there was an infrastructural need (2.57 and 2.63 respectively). By contrast, NUSB and OFL men were most likely to perceive such a need (3.17 and 3.11 respectively). Women's scores fell between these extremes. Women born inside versus

²¹ For the interaction term, $F(1, 288) = 6.43, p = .01$; for the main effect of gender, $F(1, 288) = 1.78, p = .18$; for the main effect of majority status, $F(1, 288) = 7.90, p = .005$.

²² For the main effect of language status, $F(1, 283) = 14.61, p = .000$; for the main effect of gender, $F(1, 283) = 2.46, p = .12$.

²³ For the interaction term, $F(1, 283) = 4.06, p = .05$.

²⁴ For the interaction term, $F(1, 284) = 4.33, p = .04$; for the main effect of gender, $F(1, 284) = 1.84, p = .18$; for the main effect of country of origin, $F(1, 284) = 9.56, p = .002$.

²⁵ For the main effect of majority status, $F(1, 243) = 29.48, p = .000$; for the main effect of gender, $F(1, 243) = 10.15, p = .002$.

²⁶ For the interaction term, $F(1, 243) = 4.34, p = .04$.

outside the U.S. averaged 2.96 and 3.08 respectively. Similarly, EFL women averaged 2.97, as compared to their OFL counterparts, who averaged 3.06.²⁷

Table 9. Cultural / ethnic group differences on classroom environment

Variable	Majority status				Country of origin				First language			
	White majority		Other		United States		Other		English		Other	
	#	Avg	#	Avg	#	Avg	#	Avg	#	Avg	#	Avg
Multicultural orientation in classroom	140	2.35	133	1.92	197	2.25	76	1.87	212	2.19	58	1.97
Inappropriate humor	150	.42	144	.74	209	.54	85	.66	225	.55	66	.67
Cultural disrespect	149	.77	142	1.31	208	.83	83	1.53	224	.88	64	1.55
Majority students shy away from minority in discussions	148	1.30	143	1.77	207	1.41	84	1.85	224	1.43	64	1.89
Profs expect minority students to act as experts	148	1.93	145	1.91	207	1.94	86	1.87	223	1.95	67	1.81
Diversity addressed but not integrated	147	1.91	136	2.14	202	2.01	81	2.05	218	2.02	62	2.02

Note 1: Pairs of scores in **bold/italic font** are significantly different at $p < .001$ (using independent-measures t -tests).

Note 2: 0 = never; 1 = seldom; 2 = sometimes; 3 = often; 4 = always

Culture / ethnicity and classroom environment

Group differences also emerged with respect to 4 of the 6 classroom variables. See Table 9 above. Even though instances of inappropriate racial humor were rare, minority students appeared more likely to notice them. A similar distinction holds for American ethnic subgroups: African-American students were significantly more likely to report instances of inappropriate humor than were white/Caucasian students.²⁸

Majority and USB students, on the other hand, were more likely to see a positive multicultural orientation in the classroom than were their counterparts, though these frequency ratings were also relatively low. Again, a similar distinction held within the American-born students when compared by ethnic groups. Caucasian students were

²⁷ For country of origin: main effect of gender, $F(1, 243) = 4.66, p = .03$; main effect of country of origin, $F(1, 243) = 16.19, p = .000$; interaction, $F(1, 243) = 6.99, p = .01$. For first language: main effect of gender, $F(1, 242) = 2.86, p = .09$; main effect of language, $F(1, 242) = 10.38, p = .001$; interaction, $F(1, 242) = 5.15, p = .02$.

²⁸ Overall $F(3, 199) = 6.44, p = .000$. For African-American students, $n = 16$, mean = 1.16; for white students, $n = 154$, mean = .43. Post hoc Scheffé significant at $p < .05$.

more likely to report instances of such a positive orientation (average score of 2.35) than were Asian-American (1.91) or African-American students (1.68).²⁹

There were also significant group differences across majority status, country of origin, and first language on the composite variable of cultural disrespect and the item regarding majority students shying away from minority students during discussions. (These differences did not hold similarly for the American-born ethnic subgroups.) While average frequency ratings for these variables across the board fell between “seldom” and “sometimes,” they were more likely to be noticed and reported by minority, NUSB, and OFL students.

Unlike the group differences on the general social environment, none of these differences regarding classroom environment showed any significant interactions with gender.

Culture / ethnicity and expectation / perceived outcome variables

Did cultural groups differ in terms of what they expected from Fuller, and what they perceived of Fuller’s success in meeting those expectations? Table 10 shows the results of these comparisons.

There was little difference between groups in terms of expectations. All groups agreed that they wanted Fuller to train them to work in a multicultural environment, understand cultural differences, be more culturally sensitive, and be more critically aware of their own cultural biases. We should not miss the potential significance of this. It is perhaps too easy to assume that “multicultural” training means teaching majority students to be more aware of and responsive to the ideas, values, and opinions of minority students. But students from *all* groups, including minority groups, agreed that they wanted to be more self-critical and culturally sensitive.

The sole significant group difference was that American-born students were somewhat more likely to agree that they wanted to learn cultural sensitivity than those born outside the U.S. There was a gender interaction here, such that country of birth made more difference to women than it does to men. USB women were most desirous of learning cultural sensitivity (3.56), while NUSB women were least (3.21). The men’s scores fell between: USB males averaged 3.37, while NUSB men averaged just slightly lower at 3.34.³⁰

²⁹ Overall $F(3, 188) = 9.76, p = .000$. Post hoc Scheffé significant at $p < .05$. N 's for groups: white, 144; Asian-American, 20; African-American, 15.

³⁰ For the interaction term, $F(1, 292) = 4.07, p = .05$; for the main effect of gender, $F(1, 292) = .13, p = .72$; for the main effect of country of origin, $F(1, 292) = 5.95, p = .02$.

Table 10. Cultural / ethnic group differences on expectations and perceived outcomes

Variable	Majority status				Country of origin				First language			
	White majority		Other		United States		Other		English		Other	
	#	Avg	#	Avg	#	Avg	#	Avg	#	Avg	#	Avg
I know what ministry I will be doing after Fuller	149	2.77	146	2.96	207	2.80	88	3.02	223	2.79	69	3.09
I expect Fuller to train me to work in a multicultural environment	149	3.14	148	3.10	209	3.11	88	3.13	225	3.11	69	3.13
I already know most of what I need about the cultural context in which I'll probably be working	147	2.20	146	2.49	205	2.25	88	2.56	221	2.26	69	2.63
Classes usually relevant to my anticipated ministry	148	3.03	148	2.89	208	2.29	88	2.89	224	2.97	69	2.92
I want my training at Fuller to help / teach me to...												
Understand cultural differences	149	3.28	147	3.24	209	3.26	87	3.25	225	3.25	69	3.28
Be more culturally sensitive	150	3.49	147	3.37	210	3.49	87	3.28	226	3.46	69	3.32
Be more critically aware of my cultural biases	150	3.61	147	3.43	210	3.58	87	3.37	226	3.58	69	3.33
Thus far, my training at Fuller has succeeded in helping / teaching me to...												
Understand cultural differences	148	2.83	147	2.76	209	2.77	86	2.84	225	2.77	68	2.84
Be more culturally sensitive	148	3.07	147	2.79	209	2.96	86	2.85	225	2.95	68	2.87
Be more critically aware of my cultural biases	148	3.07	147	2.81	209	3.00	86	2.80	225	2.97	68	2.85

Note 1: Pairs of scores in **bold/italic font** are significantly different at $p < .01$ (using independent-measures t -tests).

Note 2: 1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = agree; 4 = strongly agree

More salient differences arose with respect to the ratings of success. Majority students were more likely than minority students to agree that Fuller had succeeded in teaching them cultural sensitivity and critical self-awareness. This result was confirmed by the further comparison of ethnic subgroups within American-born students, where there were significant group differences on all three measures of success. African-American students were significantly less likely to agree that Fuller had succeeded in teaching them to understand cultural differences than were any of the other three groups.³¹ A similar result held for teaching critical self-awareness: black students were significantly less likely to rate Fuller as successful in this area than students of other ethnic groups.³² Black and Asian-American students were also less likely than white / Caucasian students to agree that Fuller had succeeded in teaching them cultural sensitivity.³³ There were no gender interactions with respect to these three variables of success.

Tests for association between variables

The previous analyses demonstrate that there were important differences between cultural and ethnic groups in terms of the variables examined. For planning purposes, however, it is also important to know if the four “outcome” variables described on page 6 were associated with the instructional, evaluation, and social and classroom environment variables. It is commonplace among social scientists to recite the mantra, “Correlation is not causation”—in other words, any associations discovered through such exploratory analyses can not be taken to prove the existence of a direct causal relationship. Changing any particular aspect of the social environment of the seminary, including pedagogical strategies, will not in itself guarantee a corresponding improvement in the seminary’s ability to achieve its educational mission. Nevertheless, such associations may help point the seminary community to potentially profitable areas for further study.

Four items (already seen in previous analyses) were used to assess the empowerment of students: (a) “What I am being taught in my classes is usually relevant to the kind of ministry I anticipate being involved in”; and “Thus far, my training at Fuller has succeeded in...” (b) “...helping me understand the specific ways that cultures differ from each other”; (c) “...teaching me how to be more culturally sensitive”; and (d) “...teaching me how to be more critically aware of my own cultural biases.” Since exploratory analyses (not summarized here) showed that the demographic variables of age and number of quarters of study were occasionally associated with other variables of interest, the following analyses will use what is known as a partial correlation procedure to control for the influence of these variables while examining other relationships.

³¹ Overall $F(3, 199) = 8.90, p = 0.00$. Differences between mean scores for Asian-American ($2.64, n = 21$), Hispanic/Latino-American ($2.77, n = 13$) and Caucasian students ($2.83, n = 153$) are non-significant; mean for African-American students ($2.17, n = 16$) differs significantly (Scheffé tests, $p < .05$) from all other groups.

³² Overall $F(3, 199) = 8.43, p = 0.00$. Differences between mean scores for Asian-American ($2.95, n = 21$), Hispanic/Latino-American ($3.14, n = 13$) and Caucasian students ($3.07, n = 153$) are non-significant; mean for African-American students ($2.22, n = 16$) differs significantly (Scheffé tests, $p < .05$) from all other groups.

³³ Overall $F(3, 199) = 7.57, p = 0.00$. Means for African-American ($2.41, n = 16$) and Asian-American students ($2.62, n = 21$) significantly different (Scheffé tests, $p < .05$) from Caucasian students ($3.07, n = 153$). Hispanic/Latino-American students ($3.00, n = 13$) not significantly different from any other group.

Associations with instructional method

Is there any association between the perceived helpfulness of the 18 instructional methods and the four outcome variables? Only three significant correlations emerged, and these were modest in magnitude. Students who rated panel discussions and research papers as helpful were more likely to agree that classes have been relevant to their anticipated ministries.³⁴ Students who rated cultural immersion assignments as helpful were more likely to agree that Fuller had succeeded in teaching them the differences between cultures.³⁵ Moreover, the cultural immersion assignment generated the highest correlations with the other two “success” variables (regarding cultural sensitivity and critical awareness) of all the 18 methods—but these were not sufficiently strong to reach statistical significance.

Associations with evaluation method

Somewhat better results were obtained from an exploration of the associations with how students rated the accuracy of the 11 methods of evaluation. Students who rated term papers integrating readings and research papers as accurately reflecting their learning were more likely to agree that their coursework at Fuller was relevant to their anticipated ministries.³⁶ The value of research papers was also correlated with success at learning cultural differences, while ratings for integrative term papers also correlated with success at learning cultural sensitivity.³⁷

The accuracy ratings of three other methods of evaluation were positively correlated with the third success variable: the more highly a student rated reflection papers, smaller quizzes, and mixed-type exams, the more likely they were to agree that Fuller had succeeded in teaching them to be critically aware of their own biases.³⁸

Associations with general social / classroom environment

Perhaps the most striking associations were found with the variables measuring perceptions of the social environment, whether of the seminary in general or the classroom in particular. Table 11 below shows the results.

There were isolated significant correlations between particular environment variables and particular outcomes. For example, the more respondents perceived the infrastructural shortcomings of Fuller, and the more they agreed that students tend to socialize in culturally homogeneous groups, the less they agreed that their courses were relevant. Similarly, the lack of integrating diversity into coursework was negatively associated with Fuller’s success at teaching cultural differences, and both inappropriate humor and instances of majority students shying away from minority students were negatively associated with the respondents’ ratings of Fuller’s success at teaching cultural sensitivity.

³⁴ For panel discussions, $n = 197$, $r = .21$; for research papers, $n = 269$, $r = .16$.

³⁵ $n = 80$, $r = .29$.

³⁶ For integrative term papers, $n = 249$, $r = .23$; for research papers, $n = 272$, $r = .22$. Both correlations are statistically significant at $p < .001$.

³⁷ For research papers and cultural differences, $n = 272$, $r = .20$, $p < .001$; for term papers and cultural sensitivity, $n = 249$, $r = .18$.

³⁸ For reflection papers, $n = 270$, $r = .17$; for smaller quizzes, $n = 231$, $r = .19$; for mixed-type exams, $n = 237$, $r = .21$. The latter result is significant at $p < .001$.

Table 11. Association of environment and outcome variables

Variable	Courses relevant	Understand cultural differences	Cultural sensitivity	Critical self-awareness
General social environment ^a				
Perceived infrastructural need	-.22	-.15	-.15	-.17
Unease with diversity	-.34	-.23	-.34	-.25
Diverse people welcome	.19	.19	.28	.14
Multiculturalism mostly valued as a PC slogan	-.10	-.12	-.21	-.22
Some students, for cultural reasons, need to be encouraged to speak up	-.11	.001	-.08	-.08
Diversity at Fuller personally valuable	.07	.19	.25	.17
More time on exams for non-English students	.10	.05	-.02	-.03
Have made one good friend of another culture	-.002	.09	.10	.05
Students socialize in culturally homogeneous groups	-.27	-.13	-.12	-.07
For a multicultural environment, attitude more important than course content	-.004	-.02	.04	.07
Classroom environment ^b				
Multicultural orientation in the classroom	.38	.34	.38	.36
Inappropriate humor	-.16	-.08	-.19	-.10
Cultural disrespect	-.15	-.02	-.11	-.08
Majority students shy away from minority students in discussions	-.13	-.14	-.21	-.09
Profs expect minority students to act as experts in their cultures	-.03	.07	.12	.08
Diversity addressed but not integrated into course	-.11	-.17	-.15	-.11

Note 1: Third-order partial correlation coefficients, controlling for age and number of quarters.

Note 2: Coefficients in **bold / italic font** are statistically significant at $p < .01$ or better.

^a $n = 220$. ^b $n = 239$.

Some environment variables, however, were significantly associated with two or more of the outcomes. Students who viewed multiculturalism as a PC slogan were less likely to judge Fuller as successful at teaching cultural sensitivity or critical awareness of

one's own biases. Those who viewed the seminary as welcoming of students of diverse backgrounds were more likely to agree that their training was relevant, and that Fuller had succeeded in teaching them both cultural differences and cultural sensitivity. Similarly, those who personally valued the diversity of Fuller's student body were also more likely to judge the seminary as successful at teaching cultural differences, sensitivity, and critical self-awareness.

The most striking outcomes were for the composite variables of unease and multicultural orientation. The greater the perceived unease with diversity among faculty and students, the lower the outcome scores across the board. Conversely, the more students perceived a positive multicultural orientation in the classroom, the higher the outcome scores—courses were viewed as more relevant, and the seminary was judged as more successful at teaching cultural differences, sensitivity, and critical self-awareness.

Significant associations found for the sample as a whole, however, can still mask group differences. In some cases, the overall association for the sample was accounted for more by one group than another.³⁹ For example, the relationship between valuing the diversity of the student body and the three success measures (cultural differences, sensitivity, critical self-awareness) held more for minority students than majority students. For the latter group, taken by themselves, none of these associations were statistically significant.⁴⁰ Similarly, the significant associations of the two environment variables of inappropriate humor and majority students shying from minority students with the outcome of cultural sensitivity also held far more for minority students than majority students.⁴¹ And while the relationship of Fuller as a welcoming environment to the seminary's success at teaching cultural differences and sensitivity was stronger for minority students,⁴² the converse was true for the relevance of courses: majority students who viewed Fuller as a multiculturally welcoming environment were more likely to view their training as relevant than were minority students.⁴³ Thus, while the general patterns in Table 11 may suggest possible avenues for strategic change, one must bear in mind that any effects such changes may bring will likely benefit one group more than another.

Implications

The purpose of this study has been to identify aspects of campus life, in terms of classroom pedagogy and social environment, which either support or hinder the goal of empowering students of diverse cultures for ministry. It is clear that for at least the group of students who participated in the survey, this type of learning was desired: students across all cultural groups agreed that they wanted Fuller to teach them about cultural

³⁹ In the following examples, only the majority / minority group distinction will be used, since the subgroup sizes for country of origin and first language are too small to make statistical significance likely, making it more difficult to interpret differences.

⁴⁰ The correlations for minority students ($n = 117$) are $r = .27$, $.24$, and $.18$ respectively; for majority students ($n = 99$), the corresponding coefficients are $-.08$, $.11$, and $-.007$.

⁴¹ The coefficients for minority students ($n = 109$) are $r = -.22$ ($p = .018$) and $-.25$ ($p = .009$) respectively; for majority students ($n = 126$), the corresponding coefficients are $-.04$ and $-.03$.

⁴² The coefficients for minority students ($n = 117$) are $r = .24$ and $.28$ respectively; for majority students ($n = 99$), the corresponding coefficients are $.05$ and $.12$, neither of which is statistically significant.

⁴³ The coefficient for majority students ($n = 99$) is a statistically significant $r = .29$, but a non-significant $r = .10$ for minority students ($n = 117$).

differences, and ways to be more culturally sensitive and self-aware. It is also clear that there was a gap between what students wanted and how well they thought Fuller had succeeded in supplying it. In some cases, majority students appeared more sanguine than minority students. Black Americans, for example, were most likely of all groups tested to disagree that Fuller was successful in any of the three areas mentioned.

The question, therefore, is, “Are there areas of improvement that could be addressed by strategic planning and further research?” This section attempts to integrate the above findings and suggest some potential next steps.

Implications for pedagogy

The findings related to how helpful students found each of 18 instructional methods probably tell us more about what students share in common than how they differ. While all methods, across all cultural groups, were rated at least “a little helpful,” students appeared unanimous in affirming the real-world application of lecture material to be the most helpful strategy. This was the case even though “lecture from lecture notes” was uniformly rated near the bottom. Interacting with professors outside of class, and the availability of printed lecture notes or outlines, were ranked second and third. At the other end of the scale, students found doing student presentations and being questioned by the professor on assigned readings to be less helpful, and this was true across cultural groups.

Some group differences did emerge. American-born students found music to be more helpful as an instructional method than students born outside the U.S., but both groups ranked it near the bottom, making this finding of questionable use. More interesting was the fact that majority and EFL students found interaction with the professor outside class to be more helpful than minority and OFL students, respectively. Even so, minority students ranked this item third, and OFL students fourth. Taken together, these findings suggest that adopting certain pedagogical strategies should be perceived as more helpful for student learning overall—which will likely entail the use of multiple modalities in place of straight lecture. In the classroom, professors can consider the practical value of making concrete applications of lecture material where possible, distributing outlines, or even using visual presentation software such as PowerPoint. Outside the classroom, field trips and cultural immersion experiences may prove particularly useful. Most importantly, perhaps, faculty need to be available for interaction with students. Further investigation is needed, however, to determine why minority and OFL students found interaction with the professor somewhat less helpful. Since ratings on these variables were made only by students who had actually experienced the method in question, the explanation cannot be simply that minority and OFL students were not approaching their professors. We need to know what it was about such interaction that some respondents may have perceived negatively, in order to make the professor-student relationship as empowering to students as possible.

Similar comments may be made with respect to our methods of evaluating student learning. Again, there was more uniformity than difference in terms of how students rate the accuracy of each of the 11 methods presented. Not surprisingly, multiple choice exams ranked universally near the bottom, though it cannot be known to what extent this was due to poorly constructed exams as opposed to the viability of the method in itself.

Student presentations, already ranked poorly as an avenue of learning, were also ranked low as a method of evaluation.

At the positive end, students across all cultural distinctions uniformly rank “term papers that focus on integrating reading assignments” as the most accurate gauge of their learning in a class (as opposed to “research papers,” which ranked 7th, or “reflection papers,” which ranked 5th). Students also prefer “smaller quizzes spread throughout the quarter”: this ranks second in all groups. Similarly, students tended to endorse the idea that assignments in general should be spread out over the quarter. Such findings may reflect the related issues of time and workload (especially considering the amount of off-campus work in which many students were engaged), albeit somewhat differently. Given their limited resources, students are often ambivalent about reading (and purchasing!) books that are not well-integrated into the learning goals of a course; term papers designed to integrate those readings may help in this regard. Spreading quizzes over the full span of a ten-week quarter relieves some of the time and work strain associated with the typical pile-up of exams and papers during the 11th week, potentially giving a better measure of student learning.

Significant cultural group differences here had to do with essay and mixed-format exams. Minority, NUSB, and OFL students rated such exams as less accurate measures of their learning than did their majority, USB, and EFL counterparts. Essay exams, for example, ranked 2nd for majority, USB, and EFL students, but 4th for minority students and 6th for NUSB and EFL students. As we have already seen, minority, NUSB, and OFL students were significantly more likely to agree with both the statement that “Because of my language skills, I am anxious in exams,” and “I need extra time for essay questions.” This consideration is tempered by the fact that in each case the group averages actually fall short of the point on the scale for “agree.”

As faculty consider the use of exams and quizzes to assess student learning, these findings suggest that (a) students prefer having tests and other assignments spread over the quarter, (b) students do not regard multiple choice exams as accurate measures of their learning, and (c) while essay exams are preferable to multiple choice, in a timed format they may favor students of greater language skill. As the seminary continues to draw students from globally diverse populations, a culturally sensitive pedagogy will have to address questions of the relationship between learning, language, and culture—and how to assess learning in ways that are relatively free of undue cultural bias.

The instructional and evaluation strategies that faculty adopt should thus strive first to meet general educational goals in a manner that is equitable for a diverse student body. But how much will such pedagogical decisions affect the more specific goal of empowering for multicultural ministry? Correlational analyses suggest that across the student body, there was little to no direct relationship between instructional method and the simple measures used to operationalize success at multicultural training. This should not be surprising, given what is probably tremendous variation in how faculty actually employ any particular method. In other words, the results do not necessarily imply that instructional method is irrelevant—only that the variation in teaching styles would already make it difficult to find any kind of consistent systematic effect.⁴⁴ Here, anecdotal evidence from faculty and students could be helpful: What have individual

⁴⁴Even with statistically significant correlations of larger magnitude, the question of the direction of any inferred causal relationship would still be indeterminate.

professors done in their own classes that seemed to make a difference? What pedagogical strategies, and particularly, *variations* or *changes* in strategy within a single course, seem to have encouraged student empowerment? Such information will help us create a more theory-driven base upon which to base our empirical explorations.

Similar comments could be made with respect to the correlational findings for evaluation methods, though more of the associations tested were actually statistically significant. The results favored research and term papers, though in no case did the rated accuracy of these methods account for more than 5 % of the variation in outcome scores. As with instructional methods, more information is needed about the variations in faculty practice and student experience with respect to evaluation.

In summary, given the expectable diversity of how professors actually teach and evaluate, and how students experience these practices, it is not clear from the present results that any particular pedagogical strategy will reliably aid the faculty overall in reaching the goal of multicultural empowerment. This is not to say that there is no relationship, only that different data, collected under different research design conditions, would be needed to determine what such a relationship might be. A more realistic and proximate goal would be for each faculty member to reassess his/her own practices and educational objectives in light of student feedback regarding (a) how helpful they view the various instructional methods to be, (b) how accurate they perceive each method of evaluation to be, and (c) how potential differences between cultural groups might influence both how we teach and how we evaluate. To the extent that the seminary maintains its commitment to having a culturally diverse student body, such reassessment will likely prove to be vital in the long term.

Implications for campus climate

With respect to the goal of multicultural empowerment, then, there is no clear seminary-wide policy initiative suggested by the data on instructional and evaluation methods. A different conclusion, however, is suggested by an integration of the findings with respect to campus climate.

As we have seen, students overall would appear to agree that Fuller is a place that welcomes students of varied cultures, and that being a part of that diversity has been a valuable experience personally. Most seem to have reached out across ethnic divisions and made at least one friend from another cultural background. The bad news is that there are instances of racist experiences such as inappropriate humor, impatience with or disrespect for students of non-majority backgrounds, and an overall sense of unease with diversity. The more hopeful news was that these experiences also seem to be relatively infrequent, at least as reported by those students who actually participated in the study.

But as the data indicate, there were clear differences between cultural / ethnic groups in how these variables were perceived. Students of minority backgrounds, those born outside the U.S., and those whose first language was not English were more likely to (a) view Fuller as lacking needed resources such as books in other languages, (b) perceive instances of a general unease with diversity, (c) and view multiculturalism as little more than a slogan used for the sake of political correctness. Conversely, though they agree that Fuller welcomes people of diverse backgrounds, they were significantly less likely to agree than their majority, U.S.-born, or EFL counterparts.

And unlike the associations between instructional / evaluation methods and the four measured outcomes, there was a more consistent (and logical) pattern of relationship between the environment and outcome variables. For example, there was a consistent negative relationship between perceived unease with diversity and all four of the outcomes. This variable, as described earlier, assessed whether professors and students alike were uncomfortable engaging other cultural perspectives, plus whether the thoughts and opinions of people from all cultural backgrounds were respected in the classroom. The greater the level of unease students perceived, the less likely they were to agree that Fuller was succeeding in terms of its general and multicultural educational goals.

Conversely, there was a consistent positive relationship between the outcomes and student perceptions of the presence of a multicultural orientation in the classroom. From the faculty side, this includes such concrete classroom behaviors as demonstrating relevant knowledge of other cultures, soliciting the input of minority students, encouraging other cultural points of view, and referring to authors from diverse cultures and/or requiring that students read their books. From the student side, the variable entails showing an active interest in other cultural points of view and having discussions in culturally diverse groups. The greater the perceived presence of such a broad multicultural orientation, the more likely students were to judge Fuller's courses as relevant, as well as successful in meeting the goals of multicultural training.

While such results do not point inexorably in a concrete policy direction, the potential implications are far-reaching. We must transcend the idea that the issue is one of occasional and direct acts of racism committed by a few against a few. The fact that similar patterns in the data can be discerned across different ways of measuring cultural and ethnic differences suggests something more systemic. If, as the data suggest, there are group differences in how the climate is perceived, this pattern may also be self-reinforcing: differences in perception of and response to the social environment may fuel misunderstanding and widen the gap between groups.

Given the correlational nature of the data, we cannot simply conclude that how students evaluate Fuller's ability to give them the multicultural training they say they desire was a direct consequence of how they perceived the seminary's social environment with respect to race and culture. It is possible, for example, that their perceptions of the environment were themselves shaped by Fuller's training. Positive perceptions of a multicultural orientation may have led to a similarly positive evaluation of Fuller's success, or reasoning in the other direction, an overall positive evaluation of one's training could have created a "halo effect" that influenced what respondents remembered of the social environment. The same could be said for the relationship between the perception of unease and a negative evaluation. In all likelihood, both ways of interpreting the results contain some element of truth.

Either way, the results suggest some general ways for the seminary community to begin to embody the principles of Fuller's *Statement on Racial Justice and Intercultural Life*, the document whose implementation provides the initial impetus for this study. The items within each of the scales, derived in part from the qualitative results of the first phase of this research, provide some clues to behavioral and attitudinal changes that may prove beneficial to the seminary's mission. In that vein, the following is a list of questions for reflection and/or discussion, extrapolating from the findings of this report.

- How comfortable are faculty and students in accepting and responding to the perspectives of those from another culture? If there is discomfort, how is it expressed?
- What do students of various cultural backgrounds actually experience as welcoming? From the negative side, what constitutes inappropriate humor or other behaviors experienced as hurtful?
- How can we make the diversity that already exists more personally valuable to each member of the student body?
- What can be done to encourage students to continue to reach out to each other in friendship across ethnic and cultural boundaries? What can be done in classroom settings to ensure that students of all backgrounds are welcomed as participants in discussion groups?
- What can be done to encourage and empower faculty to explore alternative cultural perspectives in ways that are relevant to each course taught, and to engage such perspectives in the classroom and in required assignments?

This is only a partial list of questions to explore; serious dialogue on these and related matters will hopefully help us determine some concrete steps that will begin to fulfill the spirit of the *Statement*.

Limitations of the study

The limitations of the present research were typical of studies of this type, and counsel us to caution in our interpretations and applications. First, we must acknowledge frankly that the variables that were herein referred to as “outcomes” were not technically outcomes at all, but measures of attitudes that we can only hope accurately represent the result of prior training. If the seminary really wishes to know what legitimate outcomes to measure in terms of empowering students in their future ministries, a commitment to longitudinal research will be necessary. Nevertheless, if creating a positively multicultural social environment is indeed a worthy goal, then how students retrospectively evaluate their experiences at Fuller will still be relevant. Subjective measures of how successful the students themselves perceive their training to be should continue to be used, even when more “objective” measures can be identified.

A second and crucial matter is that of representativeness. The characteristics of the sample do not match the larger demographic profile; compared to the student body as a whole, for example, women and psychology students were overrepresented. Though the sample size in itself was generally more than adequate for statistical purposes, only slightly more than one-third of the questionnaires distributed were actually returned. This is a typical response rate for this type of study, but it raises the question of whether the views and opinions of the respondents fairly represent the student body as a whole. This becomes even more pertinent when making group comparisons, where some of the generalizations had to be made with fewer than 20 representatives of a particular ethnic group. Future questionnaire studies will somehow need to ensure a better response rate.

With these limitations in mind, we turn to a summary of the comments received from our external consultants and the students who participated in focus group discussions. The intent of both of these activities was to provide a check on the findings and their interpretation, from both inside and outside the seminary.

Consultant Commentary

In the third stage of the research, a draft report of the findings, including the tables and implications above, was sent to six external consultants for comment. The committee is grateful for the insightful responses received.

A number of comments were given at a broader conceptual level, addressing the assumptions and theories that might undergird both this and future studies. De La Torre raised the question of the definition of “diversity” itself. Should it include diversity of denominations, or sexual orientation? Could a campus be considered “diverse” if there are students of different nationalities and ethnicities present, but the percentages are out of step with the demographics of Southern California (as in the underrepresentation of Latino/a students)? De La Torre further suggested that international students be considered as a category in their own right, since by virtue of their ability to study in the United States, many of them represent the more economically privileged class in their own countries of origin.

In a similar fashion, Anderson raised questions about the varying use of the term “multicultural” in the study. First, there is the distinction between a “multicultural environment” and a “multicultural institution” (Ramsay’s term for the latter would be a “multicultural organization”). The former means that there are students of various cultures present; the latter means that the institution itself is committed to multiculturalism in such a way that institutional power is actually shared among people from diverse backgrounds.

Ramsay uses different terminology, but makes a similar point: there is a developmental progression from an institution being exclusionary at one end to being truly committed to anti-racist multiculturalism. Toward that end, she suggests the use of critical race theory, which would make the study of power discrepancies central. The willingness to address such issues of the distribution of institutional power raises a host of questions. How much time and money is Fuller willing to commit to becoming a truly multicultural institution—and without such willingness, will students continue to view “multiculturalism” as nothing more than a politically correct slogan (De La Torre)? How would this affect faculty and staff load—and is this a potential reason for the unease with diversity noted in the study (Anderson)? And how, if at all, is the goal of being a more thoroughly multicultural institution embodied in hiring and promotion criteria (Anderson)?

A second ambiguity noted by Anderson is that the nature of the training goal needs to be clarified. Is Fuller seeking to empower its students to minister in settings that are themselves multicultural, or is it seeking to empower a diversity of students to minister effectively in a diversity of environments which may themselves be monocultural? The distinction is subtle but important, for each requires its own expertise.

The consultants also responded with specific comments about specific findings. The finding which invited the most comment was that interacting with the professor outside of class seemed important to all students, but that majority and EFL students found this interaction more helpful than minority or OFL students did. As Trimiew commented, “As a seminary professor and seminary student, it has been my experience that the willingness of most faculties to enter into the world and micro-societies of

culturally diverse students is usually much less successful and enriching than classroom interactions. Such interactions are, however, very important pedagogical exercises.” Further study, particularly qualitative study, of this is needed. In particular, as Roberts notes, more needs to be known about what cultural norms may stand behind such differences in student experience. Do minority and OFL students find interaction with the professor less helpful because of cultural norms of deference? If so, it may be the professor who needs to initiate or invite the interaction. Furthermore, it is likely that students may seek out faculty who are more similar to them in terms of cultural background. The implication: “hire faculty of color” who actually teach theology and ministry from outside the Euro-American mainstream (De La Torre).

Other suggestions regarding pedagogy included exploring further the potential of cultural immersion assignments. These provide the kind of affective learning needed to complement cognitive, content-oriented learning that typically happens in the classroom (Roberts). Such assignments, however, need to be designed carefully in a way congruent with the culture in which one is being immersed (De La Torre).

Parallel suggestions were made for faculty development. Ramsay recommends using outside facilitators to work with faculty and administrators to discover how their own racial identities influence their interactions with students. Similarly, De La Torre suggests that faculty be assigned to read and discuss a book that specifically addresses discrimination in academia.

Consultants made a number of recommendations aimed at helping Fuller become a more inclusive, empowering, and truly multicultural institution:

- Professors must read the work scholars of color within their own areas of study (De La Torre). It is recognized that it may be “virtually impossible” for faculty to stay current with all the work being done across cultures in her/his field, but that regular consultation and conversation with colleagues inside and outside the institution could help (Anderson).
- Provide more time for OFL students on exams given in English (De La Torre). The reluctance to do so may reflect the extent to which a Euro-American majority has failed to consider the power discrepancies that are systemically taken for granted (Ramsay).
- Professors need to be more sensitive about the potential negative effects of using students as cultural experts in the classroom, and more study is needed to determine why and in what way this is detrimental (Roberts).
- Adopt a zero-tolerance policy for racist comments (De La Torre). Some of the findings of the study suggest that speaking up in the classroom may be unsafe for some students; instances of racism in the classroom need to be dealt with surely.
- Purchase more foreign language books for the library (De La Torre).

Recommendations were also made for further study, whether in terms of further analysis of the current data, or the gathering of new data. Overall, as Roberts suggested, the research needs to go deeper, delving beneath the evaluation of pedagogical practices to the sometimes invisible norms that make such practices effective or ineffective with students of different cultures. More specific recommendations included the following:

- Conduct more group analyses, either by analyzing student responses by school, or by making NUSB and OFL students into one group and comparing them to USB and EFL students (Yu);

- Present more of the qualitative data from Stages 1 and 2, and gather further qualitative data (Trimiew);
- Gather data not just from students, but alumni and faculty (Trimiew); in particular, gather more information about pedagogical practices from faculty which they can intentionally share and discuss with one another (Anderson);
- Study contexts other than the classroom (Roberts);
- Engage outside consultants to examine the catalog and course syllabi (Trimiew);
- Study how corporate worship on campus either supports or discourages the sense of Fuller's being a welcoming and multicultural environment (Anderson).

Student Commentary

In the fourth and final stage of the study, student focus groups were convened to ensure an opportunity for an array of student voices to be heard in response to the report and its conclusions. Their candid comments reflected considerable pain in their experiences as students at Fuller, suggesting the sobering likelihood that the voices of disempowered and disenfranchised students were not adequately represented in the study.

As described earlier, three focus groups were convened. It should be noted that the original intent was to convene several more. Students, however, seemed reluctant to participate, whether due to scheduling demands, or the perceived power discrepancies referred to above. In the end, three groups consented to meet to discuss the report: one African-American group, one group of Latino/a students, and one group of Korean students. Each group was led by a non-faculty facilitator.

The students were asked to read the report and respond to the following questions. First, how were the conclusions and suggestions of the report congruent with their own experiences at Fuller? Second, how were they *not* congruent? The third and final question was the most general: What one or two key messages about the multicultural environment would you want the faculty and administration at Fuller to understand?

Responses varied markedly in tone and emphasis. Some comments were addressed directly to the findings of the report, either in direct agreement or disagreement, with anecdotal elaboration. Others used the report as a springboard into discussing their own experiences of racism at Fuller.⁴⁵

In response to some of the survey findings, students pointed to constructive steps professors could take to support student learning, particularly where English was not a student's first language:

- Use handouts to help students follow the lecture, and don't lecture in tangents.
- Don't lecture too quickly.
- Use "real world" applications of lecture material. (*Note:* Here, De La Torre raises the important question of "whose real world" is referenced.)
- Encourage EFL students to share their class notes with OFL or international students.
- Make assignments and instructions clear.
- Use smaller quizzes spread throughout the quarter.
- Recognize the added difficulty of essay exams for OFL students when time constraints are imposed.

⁴⁵ With only occasional exceptions, student comments will not be distinguished by group.

- Use devotions at the beginning of class to create a receptive learning environment.
- Assign students to culturally diverse small groups so they can get to know one another through the process of working together.

Comments from the Korean student group also provided important insight into the matter of student interactions with professors outside of class. They affirmed that inherited Confucian norms created some reticence in approaching professors. Yet when professors *invited* interaction, they were eager to accept, and such person-to-person contact enhanced their learning. Such comments support Roberts' observations, and suggest yet another way that faculty can help create a more supportive learning environment.

Many of the student's comments evinced significant anger and pain. As one student remarked, "Fuller is not doing a good job with issues of culture and race in any real significant way." Parallel comments included:

- "The class curriculum is designed and catered to fill the needs of a Western, white, European North American audience."
- "There is no safe place to be open and honest."
- "We are always brushed to the side."
- "Not only are we not part of the syllabus, we are not even part of the lecture."
- "The professors can do whatever they want with no accountability."
- "There is no cultural sensitivity on this campus from the leadership, from the professors, or from the people who hire."
- "As minority students we are aware that the 'good old boy club' is still alive and well here at Fuller, and it tears the minority students down every day... Many minorities know that no matter how hard they work they will never be considered for the TA position or other positions because they are minorities and they don't look like the professor."
- "Fuller uses the term 'diversity' as a marketing tool and it is an insult and frustrating when people arrive here and find that not only is there no real diversity, but there is no real attempt at attaining diversity."

Such comments implied two general themes:

Racism is probably more widespread at Fuller than the report would suggest

As suggested above, questions of pedagogy may be secondary to matters of climate. As noted by our external consultants, a primary question to be addressed is the extent to which institutional power is vested in ways that disenfranchise certain groups of students, whether knowingly or unknowingly. Because it may be expressed in many ways, institutional racism may be more widespread than the report would suggest. As one student commented: "What is written in this report is no way representative of what is happening on this campus between students and professors."

Perhaps the most egregious example given of this was of an adjunct faculty who addressed one minority group in the course as "you people." The incident was reported to the administration twice, but no action was taken, and the students were told that their only option was to endure. As one student remarked, "What we are getting here at Fuller is not what is being advertised."

Students also noted more subtle behaviors by faculty that they found offensive. Majority and minority students are treated differently. Faculty make more eye contact with majority students, wait longer for them to respond, and interrupt less often when they do respond. Majority student comments are quoted more often than those of minority students. Professors probe majority student answers more thoroughly, and use a tone of voice that conveys greater interest. By contrast, professors were perceived to use a more patronizing tone with minority students.

Some participants agreed that minority students were “put on the spot” in classroom discussions to represent their own race as if they were experts (in the face of a lack of faculty expertise). Some respondents viewed this as at least recognition by the faculty member that multicultural issues were involved—which was seen as preferable to complete denial or ignorance on the part of the professor. But as other students noted, this practice “leaves the minority student drained,” such that majority students have the more positive and productive experience.

The experience of racism includes the unintended ways in which students are meant to feel excluded or invisible. Professors may give more credence to the thoughts and opinions of majority students, even when the topic of discussion is cultural diversity. Lectures and required readings are strictly Eurocentric, and students have to petition to take courses taught by faculty of color.

The experience of invisibility includes other symbolic indications that the challenges of being an international or OFL students are not recognized or are taken for granted. It is already difficult to be a successful full-time student, due to the heavy demands placed upon a student’s time and energy. This is doubly challenging for OFL and international students.

Due to a lack of financial support, for example, many international students must work full-time, which adds to the difficulty of meeting Fuller’s academic standard. And why, as the study notes, do students tend to socialize in culturally homogeneous groups? As one of the focus groups discussed, it is not for lack of desire to make and maintain friends of other cultures. But to do so requires effort and intentionality. Given their added burdens, it is simply easier for OFL and international students to socialize with others of their same language and culture. A related issue is that there are too few bilingual staff in the various offices of the seminary, making it more difficult for OFL students to complete required transactions on campus.

It must be noted, however, that racism on the Fuller campus is not limited to how faculty and administration treat students. Minority students report feeling majority students shying away from them in group discussions. Minority faculty are disrespected by some majority students, who make fun of their accents or make an issue out of pointing out their typographical errors. Students even note the ways in which minority faculty are treated with less respect by the administration and by their majority faculty peers. Minority staff members, one group reported, have also had to endure faculty meetings where racial jokes were told, as if minority individuals were not present.

Some students do not feel safe in the classroom, particularly in discussions of culture

The study notes a general unease in the classroom regarding diversity. At times, this unease leads to hurtful experiences that leave students feeling unsafe. Some minority

students, for example, have pointed out in class when another student's remark was perceived as offensive. But in the instances reported, the professor did not address the offending comment, and the minority student was made to apologize. Needless to say, the minority students were left feeling not only abandoned, but potentially "blacklisted." As one group commented, "A repercussion for being vocal creates a culture of silence. If you are vocal, your letters of recommendation will not be as shiny as others', or the TA position that you want won't be available to you. Most minority students sit in the back of the class and say very little or nothing to keep from getting trampled." Another student from a different focus group remarked that minority students are reluctant to speak up in class because they fear "retribution in the classroom."

But it is not only minority students who feel unsafe. Both majority and minority students "are afraid to engage in dialogue because they don't want to be perceived as racists." This is exacerbated by the fact that "there is not enough time to work through a conversation to resolution" in the classroom, and professors are seen as being too busy to offer mentoring relationships. The result is the perception that "there is nowhere to have a safe conversation" about issues of race, culture, and diversity.

Conclusion

There is still much to learn about the practices that best serve theological education in a multicultural environment such as is found at Fuller. Students—again, across all cultural groups—want their seminary experience to prepare them for ministry in ways that are multiculturally informed. The present study suggests some pedagogical strategies that may benefit students across cultures even if such practices do not directly constitute multicultural training. The study also points to the importance of the tone and tenor of the community in embracing the diversity that is already here. Fuller is already host to students from many countries and cultures, and in that sense is culturally diverse. As our consultants have noted, however, such numeric diversity cannot be an end in itself. There is much to be done if the seminary wishes to move from being a multicultural environment to being a truly multicultural institution that empowers people of all cultures.

The research has yielded mixed results. The results of the survey, taken by themselves, seem to indicate that Fuller is already succeeding in some ways in the quest to become a more truly multicultural institution. But it remains an open question as to whether these results truly represent all student voices. The focus group discussions would suggest that this is not the case, and that students who already feel marginalized were not adequately represented.

Even if, however, one assumes that implicitly and explicitly racist interactions are not the norm in the classroom, our commitment as a seminary to racial justice means that such behaviors must be recognized as unacceptable. If we wish to empower our students for ministry, then those who hold institutional power must take active responsibility for shaping the classroom and campus into safer environments for people of all cultures.

The reality of our frailty and fallibility means that there will always be a need for further growth and learning, and the process is likely to generate significant discomfort. To quote consultant Sam Roberts: "The study raised for me one of the paradoxes that groups are likely to experience as they seek greater levels of racial inclusivity: without

self-conscious intentionality, members of different groups are less likely to effect genuine levels of inclusivity. Yet it is precisely the self-conscious intentionality that engenders so much mutual pain and unease between the groups.”

The movement toward the developmental goal of being a fully multicultural institution will pose significant challenges. It is hoped that this study will contribute to the ongoing conversation that will be needed to encourage and sustain such growth.

Assessment and Outcome

The research project has succeeded in providing several concrete and helpful suggestions for improving classroom pedagogy, which will be shared with faculty. As the report makes obvious, however, more questions have been raised, and much work remains to be done. Further research is still needed to determine to what extent the comments by students in the focus groups generalize to other minority, international, and OFL students. Numerous suggestions for further study have also been made by our consultants. The original grant proposal anticipated that the funded activities would be only the beginning of a long process of study and change. The results have only deepened that perception. The next step is faculty discussion, as described below. From there, the JFMCC will consult with the Provost’s office to determine what further research should be done.

Dissemination

Internal and external channels of dissemination are planned for this report. Internally, the entire report will be made available online to the seminary community. An abbreviated version will be prepared for distribution to the faculty, to be discussed at a meeting of the entire Joint Faculty of the seminary. Externally, another condensed version of the report will be prepared for publication in *Theological Education*. The Project Director will co-author the article with Candace Shields and Kirsten Oh, the graduate students who helped organize and facilitate the student focus groups.