DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 200 664 UD 021 302

AUTHOR Hawkins, Joseph; Frechtling, Joy
TITLE Short-Term Effects of Human Relations Training (HR-17): A Pre Post Comparison Group Evaluation Study.
INSTITUTION Montgomery County Public Schools, Rockville, Md.
PUB DATE Feb 81
NOTE 70p.; For a related document see UD 021 303.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; Ethnic Groups; *Ethnic Relations; *Ethnic Studies; *Inservice Education; Program Evaluation; Racial Attitudes; *Staff Development; Student Teacher Relationship; Teacher Behavior; Teacher Improvement
IDENTIFIERS Maryland (Montgomery County); Montgomery County Public Schools MD

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to determine the effects on school employees in Rockville, Maryland, of an in-service training program studying ethnic groups in America. The study gathered data on school employees before and after enrollment in the course in order to measure changes in knowledge of ethnic groups, racial attitudes, classroom practices, and relationships with minority students. The study found that the in-service program provided short-term benefits for school employees in the area of knowledge of racial and ethnic groups in American society. In addition, participants reported profiting from the course in the areas of understanding and interacting with minority students. However, no gains were demonstrated in areas such as racial attitudes, general racial behaviors, or classroom behaviors for teachers. A discussion of the methodology of the study and a sample of the survey instrument are included in the report. (Author/APM)

MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Short-Term Effects of Human Relations Training (HR-17): A Pre Post Comparison Group Evaluation Study

FEBRUARY, 1981

EDWARD ANDREWS
Superintendent of Schools

Prepared by the Department of Educational Accountability

MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Rockville, Maryland

SHORT-TERM EFFECTS OF HUMAN RELATIONS TRAINING (HR-17): A PRE POST COMPARISON GROUP EVALUATION STUDY

February, 1981

Edward Andrews
Superintendent of Schools

AUTHORS

Mr. Joseph Hawkins
Dr. Joy Frechtling

PROJECT STAFF

Study Directors:	Mr. Joseph A. Hawkins, MCPS Mr. Dale K. Brown, HRS, Inc.
Statistical Consultants:	Dr. John Larson, MCPS
Data Collectors:	Staff of HRS, Inc.
Secretarial and Clerical Staff:	Mr. Dale Conlan Miss Ginger McLelland Mrs. Patti Chambers

The assistance provided by the Departments of Human Relations and Staff Development of the Montgomery County Public Schools is gratefully acknowledged.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This study examined the results of a mandated in-service training course, HR-17, designed to provide information and experiences for newly hired professional school employees to help them improve their abilities to interact with and understand minority individuals. Data were obtained from two employee groups. The participant group consisted of school employees who enrolled in HR-17 during the spring of 1980. The comparison group consisted of school employees who did not enroll in HR-17 during that time but who were eligible for participation in HR-17. Employees in the comparison group were randomly selected from the pool of available employees required to complete HR-17 but who did not do so during the spring of 1980. Data gathered through pretesting and posttesting of both groups were analyzed to answer the following questions:

1. What cognitive gains can be attributed to participating in HR-17? Do HR-17 course participants make significant gains on measures which test their knowledge of minority groups in American society?

2. What affective changes result from participation in HR-17? Do HR-17 course participants make significant gains on a measure which assesses general racial attitudes?

3. What specific actions are taken by course participants to apply what they learn from HR-17 to the work situation in which they are involved? Do HR-17 course participants make significant gains on a measure which assesses what the school employee is doing on the job to promote better human relations with minorities? Do teacher enrollees change with regard to specific classroom practices or behaviors that might promote a more positive learning environment for black students?

4. How do course participants react to the HR-17 course as determined by self-reports and course evaluation questions?

5. What are the opinions of course participants and nonparticipants about the mandatory nature of HR-17 for new professional employees?

6. What factors are associated with gains made in HR-17? Three factors are examined: (1) motives for enrolling in HR-17, (2) opinions about the mandatory nature of HR-17 for new professional employees, and (3) opinions about the overall worth of the course.

Questions 1 through 5 are the same evaluation questions asked in the two evaluation studies of Human Relations Training Course 18 (HR-18). These questions ask the critical educational and policy question, Do enrollees and nonenrollees differ along the key measures that explicitly attempt to measure what was taught in human relations in-service training course? In light of the similarities across the three studies, this study also examined the outcomes of the separate studies as they related directly to these key evaluation questions to determine if similiar outcomes emerge across the three studies. In areas where findings converge, conclusions can be drawn with greater certainty.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

SHORT-TERM EFFECTS ON COURSE ENROLLEES

The pretest-posttest with comparison group evaluation study of HR-17 found that participation provides short-term benefits for school employees in the area of knowledge of racial and ethnic groups in American society. In addition, participants report profiting from the course in the areas of understanding and interacting with minority students. Specifically, the following findings should be noted:

- Overall, for all enrollees as a group, there was a significant increase from pretest to posttest on the measure of knowledge of racial and ethnic groups in American society. In addition, on the average, enrollees significantly* out-performed nonenrollees on this measure.

- Overall, for all enrollees as a group, there was no significant increase from pretest to posttest on the measure of racial attitudes. In addition, on the average, enrollees and nonenrollees performance on this measure was similar.

- Overall, it appears that participation in HR-17 does little, at least in the short-term, to assist teachers in doing more in the classroom to create a positive learning environment for minority students.

- Overall, most course enrollees indicated through self-reports that HR-17 helped improve their understanding of how minority students and parents react to various cross-cultural situations.

- Overall, most course enrollees indicated through self-reports that they are using what was learned in HR-17 to get along better with minority students.

- Overall, most course enrollees felt that HR-17 should be a voluntary experience for most school employees.

FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH GAINS MADE IN HR-17

Motives for enrolling in HR-17, opinions about the mandatory nature of HR-17, and opinions about the overall worth or value of the course are associated with gains for some HR-17 participants. Specifically, the following significant, positive, associations were found:

- Superior posttest performance on the measures of racial attitudes and general behaviors is associated with the enrollees having philosophic motives or reasons for enrolling in HR-17. A philosophic motive or reason for enrolling in HR-17 would be an enrollee indicating that he

*The use of "significant" or "significantly" within this report denotes statistical significance at or below the conventionally accepted level of alpha = .05.

or she enrolled because of a desire to upgrade human relations skills or because he/she wanted to learn something of assistance in solving human relations problems.

- Superior posttest performance on the measure of racial attitudes is associated with the opinion that HR-17 should be a mandatory experience for new professional employees.

- Superior posttest performance on the measure of racial attitudes is associated with the enrollee having favorable opinions about the overall worth or value of the course, HR-17.*

In the previous human relations studies, it was suggested that there might be "an instructor effect" and that differential gains might be found as a function of teaching styles or skills. While the present study does not directly address this issue through its study design, it nevertheless offers evidence that there are, in fact, differences in course outcomes between sections. While all four sections of HR-17 examined here made significant cognitive gains, definite differences between them were found. Similarly, the sections differed greatly in the degree to which participants reported an improved understanding of minorities. The range was large, from 90 percent in one class to 21 percent in another.

COMPARISIONS ACROSS THE THREE STUDIES

A comparison of the findings of the three studies, the two of HR-18 and the present HR-17 study, found similar outcomes in a number of areas. Specifically, the following consistent outcomes emerge:

Cognitive Outcomes. In both the second study of HR-18 and the study of HR-17, course participants showed significant pre/post gains on measures of knowledge. These significant pre/post gains are recorded for all course participants who enrolled in both HR-18 and HR-17.

Racial Attitudes. Results consistently revealed that across all three studies no significant differences were found between enrollees and nonenrollees for attitudinal outcomes. Course participants consistently failed to demonstrate superior test performance on measures of racial attitudes. Results also consistently revealed in the second study of HR-18 and the study of HR-17 that enrollees showed no significant gains on the measure of racial attitudes.

Classroom Practices. Results consistently revealed that across all three studies no significant differences were found between enrollees and nonenrollees in the area of classroom practices. Course participants did not report doing more in the classroom to promote a more positive learning environment for minority students. Results also consistently revealed that course participants did not report changes with regard to specific classroom practices or behaviors that might promote a more positive learning environment for minority students as a result of participation in either HR-17 or HR-18.

*Generally opinions or course reactions expressed by enrollees about HR-17 are supported by evaluation results gathered through a course evaluation conducted jointly by the Departments of Human Relations and Staff Development.

Improved Understanding of Minority Students. Regardless of which study is examined, the majority of enrollees in each study consistently reported improved understanding of how minority students and parents will react to situations having racial or ethnic overtones as a direct result of participation in either HR-17 or HR-18.

Getting Along Better With Minority Students. Regardless of which study is examined, results consistently revealed that the majority of course participants report that things learned in the course have been used in getting along with black and other minority students.

Mandatory Human Relations. Results across all three studies consistently revealed that course participants, and to some degree nonenrollees, were of the opinion that human relations in-service training should be mandatory for only two specific employee groups, administrators and supervisors and guidance counselors. For all other school employees, course enrollees and nonenrollees consistently indicated that human relations in-service training should be voluntary.

OVERALL CONCLUSIONS

CONCLUSIONS FOR THE EVALUATION OF HR-17

The study of HR-17 demonstrates that participation in HR-17 provides short-term benefits for all course participants in only one area studied: knowledge of racial and ethnic groups in American society. These short-term gains are positively associated with participation in HR-17 as evidenced by the superior test performance of course participants over nonparticipants on the measure of knowledge of racial and ethnic groups in American society. Gains in other areas such as racial attitudes, general racial behaviors, or classroom behaviors for teachers were not demonstrated. Further, the majority of course participants indicate that their participation in HR-17 helped improve their understanding of minority students and parents. Course participants also indicate that things learned in HR-17 are being used to help them get along better with minority students.

In addition, this study suggest that some course outcomes, especially racial attitudes, for course participants are related to their: (1) motives for enrolling in HR-17, (2) opinions about the mandatory nature of HR-17 for new professional employees, and (3) opinions about the overall worth or value of the course (HR-17). There is also evidence which suggests that a definite relationship exists between course outcomes and teacher effectiveness.

CONCLUSIONS DRAWN ACROSS THE THREE EVALUATION STUDIES

The comparison of evaluation outcomes for the two HR-18 studies and the HR-17 study demonstrates that school employees who participate in human relations in-service training, HR-17 or HR-18, do learn factual information as a result of their participation in such training. Course participation in human relations in-service training, however, is not associated with improved racial attitudes, general racial behaviors, or specific classroom behaviors or practices of classroom teachers. Evaluation outcomes also demonstrate that substantial proportions of all school employees who participate in human relations in-service training, HR-17 or HR-18, indicate that they receive benefits from in-service participation in terms of getting along better with minority students and in terms of improved understanding of how minority students and parents react to situations having racial or ethnic overtones. Finally, school employees support mandatory course participation in human relations in-service training, HR-17 and HR-18, for only two employee groups, administrators and supervisors and guidance counselors.

STUDY OVERVIEW

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE OF STUDY

On January 18, 1979, the Montgomery County Board of Education (BOE) approved Resolution Number 60-79 calling for an external evaluation of in-service training programs and activities in human relations. Specifically, the following human relations activities were to be evaluated: (1) HR-18, the Black Experience and Culture in-service training course; (2) HR-17, Ethnic Groups in American Society; and (3) the Multiethnic Convention. In May of 1979, Human Sciences Research Inc. (HSR) was awarded the contract to conduct an evaluation of these activities in a collaborative and interactive relationship with Montgomery County Public School's (MCPS) Department of Educational Accountability (DEA). To date, three seperate reports have been completed and presented to the BOE (an abstract of each report can be found in Appendix A). The reports, completed by DEA and HSR, are the following:

Evaluation Study of Mandatory Human Relations Training (HR-18): Summary of Post Hoc Survey Results, January, 1980.

Summary of Employee Reaction to the First Multiethnic Convention, February, 1980.

Short-Term Effects of Human Relations Training (HR-18): A Pre Post Evaluation Study, July, 1980.

This report presents an evaluation of HR-17, the third and final human relations training activity to be evaluated under Resolution Number 60-79. (See Appendix B for Course Purpose and Objectives.) The purposes of the evaluation were to answer the following questions:

1. What cognitive gains can be attributed to participating in HR-17? Do HR-17 course participants make significant gains on a measure which tests their knowledge of minority groups in American society?

2. What affective changes result from participation in HR-17? Do HR-17 course participants make significant gains on a measure which assesses general racial attitudes?

3. What specific actions are taken by course participants to apply what they learn from HR-17 to the work situation in which they are involved? Do HR-17 course participants make significant gains on a measure which assesses what the school employee is doing on the job to promote better human relations with minorities? Do teacher enrollees change with regard to specific classroom practices or behaviors that might promote a more positive learning environment for minority students?

4. How do course participants react to the HR-17 course as determined by self-reports and course evaluation questions?

5. What are the opinions of course participants and nonparticipants about the mandatory nature of HR-17 for new professional employees?

6. What factors are associated with gains made in HR-17? Three factors are examined: (1) motives for enrolling in HR-17, (2) opinions about the mandatory nature of HR-17 for new professional employees, and (3) opinions about the overall worth of the course.

It is important to note that Questions 1 through 5 are the same evaluation questions asked in the two evaluation studies of Human Relations Training Course 18 (HR-18). These questions are highlighted because for each study answering these questions was clearly the highest priority. They ask the critical educational and policy question, Do enrollees and nonenrollees differ along the key measures that explicitly attempt to measure what was taught in human relations in-service training courses?

Later in this report the findings of the three studies will be discussed in relation to each area raised by these five key evaluation questions. The major objective for making such comparisons is to determine if similar results or outcomes emerge across the three studies. In areas where findings converge, conclusions can be drawn with greater certainty.

HR-17, ETHNIC GROUPS IN AMERICAN SOCIETY

In January of 1979 when the BOE rescinded the mandatory aspects of HR-18, it created with the same resolution a new policy which mandated that all new teachers enroll in a multicultural human relations course. Resolution Number 60-79 states:

> That new teachers must take a comprehensive multicultural human relations course approved by the BOE, or prove that they successfully completed a comparable course before tenure is granted.[1]

In response to the above BOE resolution, the Departments of Human Relations and Staff Development proposed that HR-17 be the vehicle by which new teachers would fulfill the new mandate. HR-17, a 45-hour in-service training course, was first offered to school system employees nearly four years ago and was designed at that time to introduce to employees four American minority groups: Afro-Americans, Hispanic Americans, American Indians, and Asian-Americans. It was, therefore, proposed by the Departments of Human Relations and Staff Development that with slight modifications HR-17 would be able to stand alone in providing new teachers with minimum understanding of the backgrounds of these minority groups in American society and the implications for instruction. The objectives of the modified HR-17 course are listed in the following:

Course Objectives

Upon successful completion of the course, participants will be able to:

1. Demonstrate a knowledge of at least five sociological theories for explaining ethnic identities;

2. Identify at least 15 different ethnic materials and utilize them in their individual classrooms;

---

[1]See Appendix C.

3. Identify at least five different instructional methods and relate them to the ethnic experience in instructional programs;

4. a. Recognize modes/life-styles of at least 10 ethnic groups in American society;
   b. Demonstrate a knowledge of the values peculiar to a particular ethnic group in the framework of the society in which they live;
   c. Utilize the knowledge of values of ethnic groups in designing individual units of work which compare and contrast the values of various groups.

In the fall of 1979, MCPS for the first time offered on a pilot-basis to new teachers the modified HR-17. One section was offered and 34 school employees enrolled. During the spring of 1980, a complete offering of HR-17 was available to new teachers, and nearly 160 employees enrolled. Exhibit 1 shows the exact number of school employees who had completed HR-17 as of the close of the 1979/80 school year.

EXHIBIT 1

Number of Employees Who Enrolled in and Who Completed HR-17 During the 1979/80 School Year

Semester/Section	Number Enrolled	Number Completed Course#
Fall (1979)*	34	33
Spring (1980)	159	152
TOTAL	193	185

*Pilot Course

#Course completion rate is 95.6.

METHODOLOGY

SAMPLE

The respondents for the evaluation of HR-17 consisted of two groups of MCPS full-time professional employees. Group 1, the participant group, consisted of 159 MCPS staff who enrolled in four different sections of HR-17 during the spring of 1980. Group 2, the comparison group, consisted of 122 MCPS professional staff who were required to participate in HR-17 but did not complete the requirement during the spring of 1980.[2] The comparison group was randomly selected from the pool of available employees required to participate in HR-17. The pool of available or potential HR-17 enrollees was generated by MCPS's Department of Personnel Services.

Demographic characteristics for both enrollees and nonenrollees are presented in Exhibit 2. Generally, the data reveal that enrollees and nonenrollees are recently employed (hired) white classroom teachers. Very few of the enrollees or nonenrollees are minority group members, and very few are employed as administrators or support staff.

[2]The reasons why these employees did not enroll in HR-17 during the spring of 1980 is not known; however, it is important to note here that the majority of these employees, (those who responded to the survey) 60 percent, indicated that they were planning to enroll in HR-17 in the future. One could conclude from this that as a group nonenrollees are not hostile to the idea that they are required to complete HR-17 sometime in the near future.

EXHIBIT 2

Demographic Data for HR-17 Enrollees and Nonenrollees

Background Characteristics	Enrollees N	Enrollees %	Nonenrollees N	Nonenrollees %	Total N	Total %
Race						
American Indian	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian-Pacific	3	2	2	4	5	3
Black	11	8	2	4	13	7
White	113	86	42	84	156	85
Hispanic	2	2	1	2	3	2
Work Location						
School-based	126	96	46	92	173	94
Nonschool-based	3	2	2	4	5	3
Length of Employment						
Less than 1 year	28	21	31	62	59	32
1-3 years	80	61	9	18	89	48
4-10 years	17	13	5	10	22	12
Over 10 years	3	2	-	-	3	2
Position Classification						
Teacher	108	82	39	78	148	80
Administrator/Supervisor	1	1	1	2	2	1
Support Staff	2	2	1	2	3	2
Other Professional (Teacher Specialist)	15	11	7	14	22	12

Note: Due to missing data, percentage in some instances will not add to 100.

INSTRUMENTATION, DATA COLLECTION, AND RESPONSE RATES

Data for this study were obtained through a specially designed questionnaire. The questionnaire which was based mainly on the objectives of HR-17 consisted of more than 120 separate items. Topic areas covered included knowledge of blacks, Hispanics, Indians, Asians, and Jews; on-the-job behaviors having to do with minority students; motives for enrolling or not enrolling in HR-17; and good and bad experiences with the course. The complete questionnaire is presented in Appendix D, accompanied by a content analysis of the survey instrument.

HR-17 enrollees completed the questionnaire at the beginning of the course and at the conclusion of the course in class. Nearly 90 percent of all HR-17 enrollees completed both a pre- and postquestionnaire (see Exhibit 3). HR-17 nonenrollees also completed a pre- and postquestionnaire; however, their questionnaires were mailed to their respective employee locations. Fifty-eight percent of the nonenrollees who were mailed prequestionnaires returned them. Only nonenrollees who returned their prequestionnaire were mailed postquestionnaires; 70 percent of these nonenrollees returned their questionnaires. The final response rate for nonenrollees selected to participate in this study is 41 percent. Appendix E presents a discussion of nonresponse bias for nonenrollees. Analysis of data for this report is based on data collected from those school employees who completed both pre- and postquestionnaires.

EXHIBIT 3

Number of Employees in HR-17 Sections and Nonenrollee Group

Employee Group	Number Prettested	Number Posttested	Number with Both Pre- and Posttests	Official[a] Enrollment	Percentage Response Rate
Enrollees	155	146	134	152	88
Nonenrollees	70	50	50	122[b]	41[c]
TOTAL	225	196	184	274	67

[a]For HR-17 enrollees this number reflects those who satisfactorily completed course.

[b]This number reflects original number selected to participate in the study. The number selected is approximately 1/3 of the total number of employees eligible for enrollment in HR-17 (N=395).

[c]Percentage is based on nonenrollees who returned both pre- and posttest questionnaire.

STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE

Statistical significance throughout this report refers to the probability (likelihood or odds) that the results obtained (sources, measures, proportions, etc.) from a sample of observations of known size will occur strictly by chance rather than because there is a systematic effort working to produce the difference. The lower that probability is, the more confidence one has in attributing the observed result to systematic factors rather than chance.

Researchers in education have traditionally accepted the 5 percent level of significance as an acceptable safeguard against accepting results which are due to chance rather than to systematic factors. In other words, when the 5 percent level of significance is used, the researcher is willing to be wrong in attributing results to systematic factors when they are in fact only the result of chance factors, one time out of 20. Any result which is statistically significant at the 5 percent level (referred to as $p < .05$) is, therefore, significant in this report. At times lower probability levels (such as, $p < .02$, $p < .01$, $p < .001$,) will be reported.

DETAILED FINDINGS

Short-Term Effects on Course Enrollees

GAINS MADE IN KNOWLEDGE, ATTITUDES, BEHAVIORS, AND CLASSROOM PRACTICES

Do enrollees make significant gains between pretest and posttest on measures of knowledge, attitudes, and perceptions concerning cross-cultural relations and general cross-cultural behaviors as a result of participation in HR-17? The analyses of gains made on each of these measures are presented on the pages that follow. Enrollee performance on each measure is also compared to the performance of nonenrollees who were pre- and posttested on each of these key measures.

Knowledge of Racial and Ethnic Groups in American Society

Purpose of Scale: To assess total knowledge of racial and ethnic groups in American society

Instrumentation: 35-item objective test of knowledge included as part of the pre- and postquestionnaire (See Appendix D for exact items included.)

Reliability: r = .86

Interpretation: The higher the score, the greater is the respondents' knowledge of factual information about racial and ethnic groups in American society.

Data:

Mean Knowledge Score

Maximum Score: 35

	Pretest			Posttest			
	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	Gain/Loss
Enrollees	16.18	5.12	132	20.48	4.96	132	+4.30*
Nonenrollees	18.08	4.13	50	18.01	3.61	50	-0.07

Main Effects	f-ratio	df	Significance
Participation in HR-17	17.71	1/179	p .0001
Section of HR-17 Enrolled	1.91	1/129	not significant

NOTES: Posttest means are adjusted for pretest performance using Analysis of Covariance.

Findings:

Overall Comparison Between Enrollees and Nonenrollees

At pretesting, on the average, nonenrollees (X=18.08) outscored enrollees (X=16.18) by nearly two points on the measure of knowledge of racial and ethnic groups in American society. The difference between the pretest means is statistically significant in favor of nonenrollees. However, at posttesting, on the average, enrollees outscored nonenrollees. The mean total knowledge posttest score for enrollees was 20.48 compared to 18.01 for nonenrollees. The difference between the posttest means is statistically significant in favor of those employees who participated in HR-17.

Significant Gains

For all enrollees, as a group, there was a significant increase on the measures of total knowledge from pretest to posttest. For nonenrollees, as a group, there was no significant increase on this measure from pretest to posttest. In addition, for all sections studied, there were significant increases on this measure from pretest to posttest. Gains ranged from a little more than six points in one section to a little less than two points in a second, with the others lying in between.

Racial Attitudes

Purpose of Scale: To elicit responses to a set of general racial attitudinal and perceptual questions

Instrumentation: 14-item attitude scale included as part of the pre- and postquestionnaire (See Appendix D for exact items included.)

Reliability: r = .71

Interpretation: The higher the score on this scale, the more positive is the respondents' attitudes concerning cross-cultural relations.

Data:

Mean Racial Attitude Scores

Maximum Possible Score: 14

	Pretest			Posttest			
	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	Gain/Loss
Enrollees	4.18	3.36	132	3.71	3.54	132	-0.47
Nonenrollees	3.88	3.06	50	3.98	3.31	50	+0.10

Main Effects	f-ratio	df	Significance
Participation in HR-17	0.51	1/179	not significant
Section of HR-17 Enrolled	0.66	3/129	not significant

NOTES: Posttest means are adjusted for pretest performance using Analysis of Covariance.

Findings:

Overall Comparisons Between Enrollees and Nonenrollees

At pretesting, on the average, enrollees (X=4.18) had higher scores on the measure of racial attitudes than did nonenrollees (X=3.88). The difference between the pretest means, however, is not statistically significant. At posttesting, on the average, nonenrollees (X=3.98) scored higher on the measure of racial attitudes than did enrollees (X=3.71). The slight difference between the posttest means is not statistically significant.

Significant Gains

There were no significant gains on this measure for any of the groups examined.

General Behavior

Purpose of Scale: To assess what the school employee is doing on the job to promote better cross-cultural relations.

Instrumentation: 13-item checklist of behaviors included as part of the pre- and postquestionnaire. (See Appendix D for exact items included.)

Reliability: r = .76

Interpretation: The higher the score on the behavior scale, the more behavior the employee reports performing to promote better cross-cultural relations.

Data:

Mean Behavior Scores

Maximum Possible Score: 13

	Pretest			Posttest			
	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	Gain/Loss
Enrollees	5.36	3.34	132	5.54	2.76	132	+0.18
Nonenrollees	4.48	2.41	50	4.82	2.35	50	+0.36

Main Effects	f-ratio	df	Significance
Participation in HR-17	3.33	1/179	not significant
Section of HR-17 Enrolled	1.52	3/129	not significant

NOTES: Posttest means are adjusted for pretest performance using Analysis of Covariance.

Findings:

Overall Comparisons Between Enrollees and Nonenrollees

At pretesting, on the average, enrollees (X=5.36) had higher behavior scores than did nonenrollees (X=4.48). The mean behavior posttest score for enrollees was 5.24 compared to 4.82 for nonenrollees. The difference between means is not statistically significant.

Significant gains

There was a significant increase on this measure of general behavior from pretest to posttest for one HR-17 section. For all other sections studied, no significant increases were found.

Classroom Practices

Do teacher enrollees change with regard to specific classroom practices or behaviors that might promote a more positive learning environment for minority students (see Appendix D, Questions 25-27, Part IV of the questionnaire)?

It appears that HR-17 does little, at least in the short term, to assist teachers in doing more in the classroom to create a positive learning environment for minority students.[3] However, it should be noted that a substantial number of both enrollees and nonenrollees are in part employing special practices at the outset of the course. For example, at pretesting 68 percent of all enrollees indicated that they included information about minority history, culture, and contributions to American life in their regular curriculum; however, at posttesting 67 percent indicated that this was true (see Exhibit 4 on the next page). This change from pretest to posttest is not significant nor are the other two reported changes (Practice 2 and 3) significant. It should be noted, however, that for each practice reported it is clear that more enrollees report that they were conducting the classroom practice than do nonenrollees. For example, 77 percent of all enrollees use pictures, displays, or other materials in the classroom, including pictures of both whites and nonwhites; while in contrast, 72 percent of all nonenrollees report this practice. Sixty-seven percent of all enrollees include information about minority history, culture, and contributions to American life in the regular classroom; however, fewer nonenrollees (54 percent) report this practice.

[3]This particular finding, however, may not necessarily persist overtime (in the long run). One could argue that teachers need a certain amount of time to adjust to, and incorporate new skills into their repertoire of teaching skills/techniques. And, after such an adjustment period teachers not reporting an immediate use of newly learned skills may in fact begin using the skills learned in HR-17. In other words, HR-17 might in the long run assist teachers in doing more in the classroom to create a positive learning environment for minority students.

EXHIBIT 4

Percentage of Teachers Enrolled and Nonenrollees Indicating That They Were Conducting Certain Classroom Practices To Promote a Positive Learing Environment for Minority Students

Classroom Practices*		Enrollees N=108	Nonenrollees N=39	Chi-Square Results: Enrollees vs. Nonenrollees	Chi-Square Results: Comparisons Across Sections	Change From Pre- to Post-test #
Practice 1	Pre	68.2%	56.0%	n.s.	n.s.	not significant for any group
	Post	67.4	54.0	n.s.	n.s.	
	Change	-0.8	-2.0			
Practice 2	Pre	47.0	40.0	n.s.	n.s.	not significant for any group
	Post	51.5	42.0	n.s.	n.s.	
	Change	+4.5	+2.0			
Practice 3	Pre	78.0	66.0	n.s.	n.s.	not significant for any group
	Post	76.5	72.0	n.s.	n.s.	
	Change	-1.5	+6.0			

Practice 1. Including information about minority history, culture, and contributions to American life in the regular curriculum

Practice 2. Creating a special display for teaching purposes having to do with the history or culture of one or more racial, ethnic, cultural, or religious groups

Practice 3. Using pictures, displays, or other materials in the classroom that include pictures of both whites and nonwhites

Significance here is determined through use of the McNemar Test. This test detects significant changes in proportions of subject from one category to another. In this case, enrollees and nonenrollees change from yes to no, and no to yes on the three classroom practices in question.

ENROLLEE REACTION TO THE HR-17 COURSE

How do enrollees react to the HR-17 course as determined by self-reports and course evaluation questions? A number of dimensions were examined, and the results are discussed in the sections that follow.

Understanding of Minority Students

Data from posttesting of course participants reveal that most enrollees, 56.7 percent, feel that HR-17 improved their understanding of how minority students and parents react to various cross-cultural situations (see Appendix D, Question 38, Part V of the questionnaire). However, when responses to this question are analyzed taking into consideration the section of the course enrolled, statistically significant differences are found across the four sections (Chi-square results: $X^2=33.81$; df=6; p .0001). For example, nearly 90 percent of the employees who enrolled in one section indicated that their understanding improved as a result of attending HR-17; however, the other three sections responded differently. For example, 21 percent of the employees enrolled in a second section indicated that their understanding improved.

Using What Was Learned in HR-17

Overall, the data collected from course participants at the conclusion of the course reveal that the majority of the course participants, 57 percent, report using what was learned in HR-17 to get along better with minority students (see Appendix D, Questions 33-36, Part V of the questionnaire). However, data reported in Exhibit 6 show that less than half of the course participants report using what was learned in the course to get along with co-workers (39 percent), white students (36 percent), and people outside of MCPS (40 percent).

When responses to Questions 33 through 36 are analyzed by section, statistically significant differences are found for each question. Some sections report greater uses of what was learned in HR-17 than do others. For example, 70 percent of the enrollees in one section report using what was learned in HR-17 to get along better with co-workers and people outside of MCPS; while only 9 percent of the enrollees in a second section report the same.

EXHIBIT 5

Percentage of Enrollees Indicating That Things Learned in HR-17 Are Being Used

Things learned in HR-17 have been used in getting along with:	All Enrollees (N=132)	Chi-Square[a] Results
Co-workers	39%	15.31***
Minority Students	57%	15.26***
White Students	36%	10.90**
People Outside of MCPS	40%	8.98**

**p < .01; ***p < .001.

[a]These chi-square (X^2) results determine if percentages reported by enrollees differ significantly across sections. Degrees of freedom = 3.

Course Evaluation By Enrollees

Course participants evaluated three important aspects of the HR-17 course (on a scale of 1 to 4, 1 being very poor and 4 being very good): (1) teacher effectiveness, (2) teaching methods, and (3) course content. Course participants rated teacher effectiveness the highest; the mean evaluation score is 3.00, the range is 1.20-4.00. Course participants rated the aspects of teaching methods and course content lower than teacher effectiveness. The mean evaluation score for teaching methods is 2.68 (range is 1.20-4.00), while the mean evaluation score for course content is 2.56 (range is 1.14-4.00). In addition, analysis of mean evaluation scores by section show significant variation across the four different sections.

MANDATORY VS. VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION

What are the opinions of school employees about the nature of participation in the HR-17 course (see Appendix D, Questions 15 through 24, Part IV of the questionnaire)? Should course participation be a mandated experience or should it be a voluntary experience? Do the opinions of course participants and nonparticipants differ? Do opinions change over time for course participants and nonparticipants, that is, from pretesting to posttesting? Analysis of school employees' opinions, presented in Exhibit 6, about the mandatory nature of HR-17 revealed the following:

Overall, the majority of school employees felt that HR-17 should be a mandatory experience for two target employee groups, guidance counselors and administrators and supervisors. It should be noted that, generally, opinions expressed at pretesting about the nature of participation in the HR-17 course are similar to those expressed at posttesting. For example, at pretesting, 58 percent of the employees expressed the opinion that for guidance counselors HR-17 should be a mandated experience. In comparison, at posttesting, 59 percent expressed the same opinion. The majority of employees, however, felt that HR-17 should be a voluntary experience for all other school employees.

Overall, analysis of school employees' opinions by enrollee/nonenrollee status revealed that the opinions of course participants and nonparticipants do not differ at pretesting or at posttesting. Both groups are of the opinion that HR-17 should be a mandated experience for guidance counselors (enrollees, 58 percent; and nonenrollees, 66 percent) and administrators and supervisors (enrollees, 55 percent; and nonenrollees, 60 percent). The majority of each group, however, felt that HR-17 should be a voluntary experience for all other school employees. Some variation as a function of particular course section was found, however, with one group stating that the course should not be mandated for any employee.

Overall, course participants and nonparticipants were not in favor of HR-17 being required for new professional employees. At posttesting 34 percent of the course participants indicated that HR-17 should be a manadatory course for new professional employees, and slightly more nonenrollees indicated the same (42 percent). Only one group felt that mandatory participation for new professional employees was desirable.

EXHIBIT 6

Percentage of Enrollees and Nonenrollees Indicating That HR-17 Should Be a Mandatory Course for Eight Target Employee Groups at Pretesting and Posttesting

Eight Target Employee Group	All Employees (N=134) %	Change	Non-Enrollees (N=50) %	Change	Chi-Square Results: Enrollees vs. Nonenrollees	Chi-Square Results: Enrollees Only Comparisons Across Sections
Administrators	52	-3	52	8	n.s.	n.s.
	55		60		n.s.	10.82*
Teachers	41	-5	50	- 4	n.s.	n.s.
	36		46		n.s.	8.05*
Guidance Counselors	59	-1	54	12	n.s.	n.s.
	58		66		n.s.	9.19*
Clerks and Secretaries	30	-3	28	- 6	n.s.	n.s.
	27		22		n.s.	12.43+
Building Services	23	-2	16	4	n.s.	n.s.
	21		20		n.s.	n.s.
Cafeteria Workers	27	-7	18	4	n.s.	n.s.
	20		22		n.s.	
Bus Drivers	30	-4	28	0	n.s.	n.s.
	26		28		n.s.	n.s.
New Professional Staff	39	-5	52	-10	n.s.	n.s.
	34		42		n.s.	14.53*

*$p < .05$; +$p < .01$

FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH GAINS MADE IN HR-17

In each of the HR-18 evaluation studies, it was determined that course outcomes were not related to motives for enrolling in HR-18, opinions about the mandatory nature of the course for school staff, or opinions about the overall worth of the course. These same factors were examined in the present evaluation study to determine if there was an association with cognitive, attitudinal, and behavioral gains made in HR-17. In each case analyses revealed that these factors were significantly associated with gains in areas addressed by HR-17. These outcomes are, therefore, discussed in the following sections.

Motives for Enrolling HR-17

All of the enrollees who completed HR-17 in the spring of 1980 were required to take the course; however, when questioned about the reasons for enrolling in HR-17, enrollees did select other reasons other than the obvious, that is, to fulfill a Board of Education requirement (see Appendix D, Questions 23-32, Part V of the questionnaire). Some enrollees indicated that they enrolled in HR-17 because they wanted to upgrade their human relations skills or because they wanted to learn something that would help them solve problems faced on the job. Therefore, based on the most important reason for enrolling in HR-17, enrollees were divided into two groups or categories. If enrollees indicated that they enrolled because they wanted to upgrade human relations skills or because they wanted to learn something that would help them solve problems, they were placed in the philosophic group. Enrollees not selecting this type of reason as the most important reason for enrolling were placed in the pragmatic group. Data reveal that when enrollees were classified by motive for enrolling in HR-17, philosophic versus pragmatic, no differences in the size of cognitive gains were found (see Exhibit 7). However, performance differences on the measures of racial attitudes and general behaviors do emerge as a function of motive for enrolling. In both cases, superior posttest performance[4] on the measures of racial attitudes and general behaviors is associated with the enrollee having philosphic reasons or motives for enrolling HR-17.

Opinions About the Mandatory Nature of HR-17

About one-third of the enrollees who completed HR-17 in the spring of 1980 were of the opinion that for new professional employees HR-17 should be a mandatory experience. The remaining enrollees, the majority, were of the opinion that for new professional employees HR-17 should be a voluntary experience. Is this particular opinion associated with cognitive, attitudinal, and behavioral gains made in HR-17? Data reveal that when enrollees are classified into two groups, voluntary versus mandatory, based on their opinion about the mandatory nature of HR-17 for new professional employees, no difference in the size of cognitive or behavioral gains was found (see Exhibit 7). However, performance difference on the measure of racial attitudes does emerge as a function of opinion about the mandatory nature of HR-17. Superior posttest performance on the measure of racial attitudes is associated with the enrollee who is in favor of HR-17 being a mandatory experience for new professional employees.

---

[4]Posttest performance is adjusted for pretest performance using Analysis of Covariance. This condition applies to all means reported in Exhibit 9.

EXHIBIT 7

Factors Associated With Posttest
Gains Made in HR-17 for Course Enrollees

Scores	Motives for Enrolling PRAGMATIC	PHILOSOPHIC	Course Enrollment VOLUNTARY	MANDATORY	Evaluation of Course FAVORABLE	UNFAVORABLE
	N=84	N=48	N=87	N=45	N=65	N=64
Knowledge	19.84	20.66	20.27	19.89	20.55	20.11
Attitudes	3.26	4.67*	3.30	4.68*	4.42*	3.25
Behaviors	5.31	6.19*	5.48	5.93	5.74	5.58

*Contrast between posttest means is significant at or below the .05 level.

NOTE: Motives for Enrollee: PRAGMATIC-Enrollee indicates that the most important reason for enrolling is to fulfill BOE requirements, earn credits, or qualify for tenure.

PHILOSOPHIC-Enrollee indicates that the most important reason for enrolling is to improve human relation skills.

Course Enrollment: VOLUNTARY-Enrollee is of the opinion that HR-17 should be voluntary for new professionals.

MANDATORY-Enrollee is of the opinion that HR-17 should be mandatory for new professionals.

Evaluation of Course: FAVORABLE-Overall course reaction or evaluation by the enrollee is favorable.

UNFAVORABLE-Overall course reaction or evaluation by the enrollee is unfavorable.

Opinions About the Overall Worth of the Course

An earlier discussion of course evaluation and how enrollees reacted to numerous aspects of the HR-17 revealed that in general enrollees hold distinct opinions about the overall worth of the course, HR-17. Based on these opinions, it is possible to divide enrollees into two groups, group one being enrollees with favorable opinions about the overall worth of the course, and group two being enrollees with unfavorable opinions about the overall worth of the course. Data reveal that when enrollees were classified into these two groups, favorable versus unfavorable, no difference in the size of cognitive or behavioral gains was found (see Exhibit 7). However, differences on the measure of racial attitudes do emerge. Superior posttest performance on the measure of racial attitudes is associated with the enrollees having favorable opinions about the overall worth or value of the course. In other words, the enrollees who react to course content, course teaching methods, and teacher effectiveness in a positive way are also likely to make significant gains in the posttest measure of racial attitudes.

ADDITIONAL COMPARISONS: Summarizing the Study Outcomes of Three Studies

It has been nearly two years since the Montgomery County Board of Education rescinded the mandatory nature of HR-18. During these two years, the Montgomery County Public Schools' Department of Educational Accountability and Human Sciences Research, Inc., have completed four separate evaluation studies of in-service training programs and activities in human relations. A summary of three of the four studies is found in Appendix A. Three of the studies, the two HR-18 studies and the current study of HR-17, attempted to essentially evaluate or assess the same areas. The common areas studied are summarized in the questions that follow:

1. Do courses participants learn information from in-service training in human relations?

2. Is course participation in HR-17 or HR-18 associated with improved racial attitudes or perceptions?

3. Does course participation in HR-17 or HR-18 impact general behaviors (those designed to develop good human relations)?

4. Does course participation in HR-17 or HR-18 impact specific classroom behaviors of teachers?

5. How do course participants react to the courses as determined by self-reports?

6. What are the opinions of course participants and nonparticipants about the mandatory nature of human relations training programs?

The two HR-18 studies and HR-17 study each provide data to answer these key evaluation questions raised above.[5] These questions are highlighted because for each of the three evaluation studies answering these questions was clearly the highest priority. These questions ask the critical educational and policy question, Do enrollees and nonenrollees differ along the key measures that explicitly attempt to measure what was taught in the human relation in-service training courses?

---

[5]The major objective for making such comparisons is to determine if similar results or outcomes emerge across the three studies. A specific trend emerging across all three studies provide greater evidence that human relations in-service training works in a given area than does an inconsistent outcome across all three studies. For example, the statement that the racial behavior of former course participants is superior to the racial behavior of noncourse participants is a much stronger statement when this specific finding is found consistently across all three studies than when it is found in just one of the three studies. The conclusion that course participation does influence racial behavior is much safer to draw when the finding is consistent across all three studies.

Six specific evaluation outcomes, consistent across each of the three studies, should be highlighted; each is discussed in the following:

Cognitive Outcomes. In both the second study of HR-18 and the study of HR-17, course participants showed significant pre/post gains on measures of knowledge.[6] These significant pre/post gains are recorded for all course participants who enrolled in both HR-18 and HR-17.

Racial Attitudes. Results consistently revealed that across all three studies no significant differences were found between enrollees and nonenrollees for attitudinal outcomes. Course participants consistently failed to demonstrate superior test performance on measures of racial attitudes. Results also consistently revealed in the second study of HR-18 and the study of HR-17 that enrollees show no significant gains on the measure of racial attitudes.

Classroom Practices. Results consistently revealed that across all three studies no significant differences were found between enrollees and nonenrollees in the area of classroom practices. Course participants did not report doing more in the classroom to promote a more positive learning environment for minority students. Results also consistently revealed that course participants do not report changes with regard to specific classroom practices or behaviors that might promote a more positive learning environment for minority students as a result of participation in either HR-17 or HR-18.

Improved Understanding of Minority Students. Regardless of which study is examined, the majority of enrollees in each study consistently reported improved understanding of how minority students and parents will react to situations having racial or ethnic overtones as a direct result of participation in either HR-17 or HR-18.

Getting Along Better With Minority Students. Regardless of which study is examined, results consistently revealed that the majority of course participants report that things learned in the course have been used in getting along with black and other minority students.

Mandatory Human Relations. Results across all three studies consistently revealed that course participants, and to some degree nonenrollees, were of the opinion that human relations in-service training should be mandatory for only two specific employee groups, administrators and supervisors and guidance counselors. For all other school employees, course enrollees and nonenrollees consistently indicated that human relations in-service training should be voluntary.

---

[6]The first study of HR-18 was a post hoc evaluation; therefore, a discussion of gains is not applicable.

Based on the above discussion, the following conclusions can be drawn:

- School employees who participated in human relations in-service training courses HR-17 or HR-18 learned factual information as a result of their participation.
- Participation in human relations in-sevice training courses, HR-17 or HR-18, was not associated with improved racial attitudes, general racial behaviors, or specific classroom behaviors of teachers.
- Substantial proportions of all school employees who participated in human relations in-service training courses, HR-17 or HR-18 indicate that they felt they received benefits in terms of getting along better and having improved understanding of how minority students and parents react to situations having racial or ethnic overtones.
- School employees supported mandatory participation in human relations in-service training courses, HR-17 and HR-18, for two employee groups, guidance counselors and administrators and supervisors.

2365A

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Summary of Evaluation Studies of In-service Training Programs and Activities in Human Relations Conducted Jointly by Human Sciences Research and the Montgomery County Public Schools' Department of Educational Accountability

Summary of Findings for Evaluation Study of Mandatory Human Relations Training (HR-18): Summary of Post-Hoc Survey Results, January, 1980.

This study examined the results of a mandated in-service training program, HR-18, designed to provided information and experiences for school employees to help them improve their abilities to interact with and understand minority individuals. Data were obtained from two employee groups. The participant group consisted of school employees who enrolled in HR-18 over a four-year period during which HR-18 was a mandatory experience for Montgomery County Public Schools employees. The comparison group consisted of school employees who did not enroll in HR-18 during that time. Respondent samples for this study were drawn randomly after stratification of the participant and nonparticipant populations on the dimensions of race and position classification. Data gathered through a mail survey were analyzed to:

1. Determine how enrollees and nonenrollees differ on the measures of black history, racial attitudes, student comparisons, and general behaviors.

2. Determine how teacher enrollees and nonenrollees differ with regard to specific classroom behaviors that might promote a more positive learning environment for black students.

3. Elicit enrollees' reactions to the HR-18 course via self-reports and course evaluation questions.

4. Elicit employees' motives for enrolling or not enrolling in HR-18.

5. Compare enrollees' and nonenrollees' opinions about the mandatory nature of the HR-18 course.

6. Characterize the type of school employee who enrolled in HR-18 when enrollment was mandatory. To do this, former course enrollees and nonenrollees are compared on such demographic characteristics as race, sex, age, position classification, and employment location.

The findings for Phase I of the Evaluation of HR-18 (mandatory) are subject to two constraints:

- No data are available on the knowledge or behaviors of participants prior to HR-18 enrollment. Without this data, for both enrollees and nonenrollees, it is not possible to disentangle prior differences from the effects of the HR-18 course. As a result, it is not possible to attribute an unequivocal cause effect relationship between the course and any enrollee/nonenrollee differences which are

found. In the present study, therefore, one can examine how participants and nonparticipants currently differ; but the degree to which participation in HR-18 directly caused such differences can only be inferred.

- A retrospective analysis of the differences which exist between course participants and nonparticipants, when the course has been completed from 2 to 42 months prior to data collection, is a particularly severe test for any course. One can only question whether the results reported below would be more or less favorable than those obtained from using the same methodology to assess other in-service training courses or courses offered to college and public school students.

Additional information will be available later in this school year when pre- and posttest data are available on the enrollees who took the course in the 1979 fall term. These data will add to our understanding of the degree to which differences between enrollees and nonenrollees can be attributed to the course; and they will also permit us to obtain shorttime gain information more comparable to that usually used to assess in-service training courses.

Overall Conclusions:

Overall, the study found statistically significant differences between school employees who have participated in HR-18 in one area only: knowledge of black history and culture. Differences in other areas such as racial attitudes general behavior, or characterizations of black students were noted only for certain subgroups of employees. Nonetheless, substantial proportions of all respondent groups who took HR-18 indicated through self-reports that they felt they received benefits from the course in terms of getting along with others, especially in getting along better with black students, and that they used what was learned in the course.

The study, although limited in scope, demonstrated that participation in HR-18 provides benefits for some school employees, especially in the area of knowledge of black culture and history. Further, some employee groups appear to receive additional benefits from the course in areas which go beyond the cognitive to the attitudinal and behavioral dimensions.

However, while all other groups studied demonstrated enrollee/nonenrollee differences in at least some areas, white teachers who took the course did not differ significantly from white teachers who did not take the course in any of the areas measured in the study. Thus, while it can be inferred that the course does have its intended impacts for certain groups, there is no objective evidence of course impacts, on the average, on white teachers who took the course under mandatory conditions. This outcome must be balanced against the finding that many white teachers, nonetheless, report subjective feelings of having benefited from the course.

Specific Findings:*

- Overall, those who did and those who did not enroll in HR-18 do not differ from each other on the measures of racial attitudes. However, when position classification is taken into account support staff who did and those who did not enroll in HR-18 do differ from each other on the measure of racial attitudes.

- No overall enrollee/nonenrollee difference was found in the analysis of respondents' comparisons of school-related characteristics of black and white students. However, A&S employees who enrolled tend to see greater similarity between black and white students than do A&S employees who did not enroll.

- There is no detectable difference between enrollees and nonenrollees in general, nor among teachers in particular, in terms of the frequency with which they report performing specific behaviors related to the objectives of HR-'8. However, black teachers are more likely to perform certain specified classroom behaviors than are white or other race (American Indians, Asian Americans, and Hispanics) teachers, regardless of enrollment in HR-18.

- A majority of black and other race employees who took HR-18 (67 and 62 percent, respectively) feel they gained insight and understanding into the reactions of black students and parents to racially tinged situations as a result of the course. Forty-six percent of the white respondents also report benefits of this type. Those least likely to report this result are white teachers (42 percent).

- A vast majority of black respondents (between 70 and 100 percent) report using what was learned in HR-18 to get along better with certain other groups such as black students, other minority students, white students, co-workers, and people outside of MCPS. This is true for only slightly fewer other race staff. White teachers and support staff are least likely to report such utilization of HR-18. However, 50 percent of white teachers report some use of HR-18 content in getting along better with black students. The extent to which these benefits generalize beyond relations with black students is more limited among white teachers than among other employee groups.

- When asked whether HR-18 should be mandatory or voluntary for each of several employee groups, the majority of black respondents felt that HR-18 should be mandatory for all MCPS employee groups. The majority of white respondents feel that HR-18 should be voluntary for all employee groups. Other race respondents feel, in the main, that teachers, A&S employees, guidance counselors, and bus drivers should be required to experience HR-18. White teachers are the least likely of all groups to recommend mandatory participation in HR-18 for any employee group.

---

*All differences reported here are statistically significant at the conventionally accepted level of alpha=.05.

- In general, black enrollees, among the three racial groups, gave the highest evaluative ratings to the substantive and methodological aspects of HR-18. The lowest ratings on these dimensions came from white employees in general and from white teachers in particular.

Summary of Findings for Summary of Employee Reaction to the First Multiethnic Convention, February, 1980.

This report examines how school system employees reacted to the first Multiethnic Convention. The Multiethnic Convention is a MCPS in-service training activity designed to improve staff awareness of the positive effects of ethnic diversity in MCPS and to increase knowledge about the historical, sociological, and psychological aspects of the cultures that make up American society. The convention is held prior to the first day of school in September, and it is attended by all full-time MCPS employees.

Data for this study were obtained through a specially designed survey questionnaire. The purposes of the survey were to assess (1) the impacts of the convention on the employees, in job-relevant terms, as perceived by the employee and (2) the process aspect of the convention in terms of perceived quality of the convention presentations. A total of nearly 2,500 questionnaires were mailed to employees during the fall of 1979, and 801 (33 percent) questionnaires were returned. This was not considered sufficient to generalize to the total MCPS work force, but it was considered as being useful in making global statements about school employees reaction to the Multiethnic Convention.

Analyses of questionnaire data dealing directly with assessing the impacts of the convention of the employee, in job-relevant terms, revealed the following:

- On the average, nearly one-half of the respondents stated that convention topics helped them to understand minority students and/or co-workers; and to a certain degree convention topics were an aid in helping them provide a better education to minority students.

- The convention was partly responsible for a positive change in attitudes or opinions about minority groups. On the average, about one-fifth of the respondents reported that their attitudes or opinions about a minority group "became more favorable" as a result of attending the convention.

- Attendance at the convention may be associated with certain behaviors that promote better race relations. Thirty-four percent of the respondents indicated that they have discussed their own racial, ethnic, or cultural or religious heritage with students or co-workers since attending the convention.

- The majority of the respondents (50 to 60 percent) indicated that they attended convention topics which aided them in better dealing with culturally different students or co-workers in which they have daily contact in MCPS.

Analyses of questionnaire data dealing directly with assessing the process aspect of the convention, in terms of perceived quality of the presentations, revealed the following:

- The overwhelming majority of respondents indicated that the overall quality of convention topics was "good."

- Respondents generally agreed that the convention was a "worthwhile" way to sepend the day. Forty-one percent of the respondents indicated that the convention, in general, was a "very worthwhile" way to spend the day; and thirty-five percent of the respondents indicated that the convention was a "somewhat worthwhile" way to spend the day.

- Convention attendees who evaluated the convention generally indicated that in terms of logistics (i.e., Did the convention run smoothly? or Were convention presenters prepared?) the convention was satisfying.

- Overall, convention attendees who evaluated the convention felt that presenters were qualfied. Fifty-eight percent of the respondents felt that the presenter or person in charge of their first convention topic was "very well qualified." Opinions expressed about other topics evaluated follow a similar pattern.

Summary of Findings for Short-Term Effects of Human Relations Training (HR-18): A Pre Post Evaluation Study, July, 1980.

The present report examines the effects of HR-18 in the absence of the BOE requirement for all staff to complete the course. This second study overcomes some of the methodological problems inherent in the first study design and allows firmer conclusions to be drawn regarding course impact. Specifically, the previous evaluation of mandatory HR-18 was limited by the fact that it was a post hoc survey and that no data were available on the knowledge or behaviors of participants prior to HR-18 enrollment. Without these data, for both enrollees and nonenrollees, it was not possible for the study to disentangle prior differences in staff knowledge, attitudes, and behavior from the effects of the HR-18 course itself. In the present evaluation of HR-18, it was possible to gather data from a small sample of school employees both before and after participation in the course in the fall, 1979.

In addition, in the present study, it is possible to examine HR-18 under two different enrollment conditions: voluntary enrollment and mandatory enrollment.[1] Although the sample size is limited, the circumstances prevailing when the fall courses were delivered allow a comparison to be made of course outcomes for voluntary enrollees and mandatory enrollees taught under the same conditions.

The respondents for the present report consisted of 43 school employees who enrolled in the two HR-18 classes during the fall of 1979. The total enrollment for these two classes was 49 school employees; however, only those school employees who had been administered both pre- and postcourse measures were included in the study (see Appendix C for a summary of the background characteristics of the enrollees). Data for this report were obtained through the same specially designed questionnaire used for the previous evaluation of HR-18 (see Appendix D for the complete questionnaire and scoring documentation). Enrollees in the fall 1979 course completed the questionnaire at the beginning of the course and at the conclusion of the course in class. The data gathered were analyzed to determine:

1. What cognitive gains can be attributed to participating in HR-18? Do enrollees make significant gains on the measure of black history and culture?

2. What affective changes result from participation in HR-18? Do enrollees make significant gains on the measures of racial attitudes and black characterizations?

---

[1]The fall 1979 HR-18 enrollee population was composed of both employees who were required to take HR-18 and those who were not required to take it. According to information obtained from the MCPS Personnel Department, nearly 80 percent of the fall 1979 enrollees enrolled in HR-18 under "no BOE requirement" or under "no required school system contingency." Those school employees (20 percent) who enrolled because it was required did so because the previous BOE mandate had not been met or because enrollment in HR-18 was required as part of a planned in-service training program. Appendix B provides a breakdown of official reasons for enrolling in the fall 1979 HR-18 course and an explanation of how fall enrollees were classified as either voluntary or mandatory course participants.

3. What specific actions are taken by course participants to apply what they learn from the course to the work situation in which they are involved? Do enrollees make significant gains on the measure of general behavior? Do teacher enrollees change with regard to specific classroom behaviors or practices that might promote a more positive learning environment for black students?

4. How do enrollees react to the HR-18 course as determined by self-reports and course evaluation questions?

5. What are the opinions of voluntary and mandatory enrollees about the mandatory nature of the HR-18 course?

6. For each of these question do the findings differ as a function or enrollment condition, voluntary vs. mandatory?

In addressing these questions, the major emphasis has been placed on examining the changes in test scores from pretesting to posttesting. The highest priority is placed on reporting the growth made by enrollees on the key measures of black history, racial attitudes, black characterizations, general behaviors, and classroom practices (for teachers only).

However, it must be noted that since the enrollees in the fall course are a limited sample caution must be used in generalizing from the study findings. We cannot say that the results for this small group of participants are representative of likely course impacts for all school system employees. In addition, the scores of white teachers[2], enrollees and nonenrollees, previously gathered in the post hoc survey will also be presented for comparative purposes. These scores provide a background against which to examine the change scores reported here and allow a link to be made between the two HR-18 studies. However, these comparisons scores should be interpreted cautiously since:

- The post hoc study collected data on school employees only one time. The opportunity to ascertain whether or not nonenrollees changed over time without any formal intervention did not exist.

- The post hoc survey data were collected approximately 6 months earlier than that for the pre-post study.

- The samples for the post hoc evaluation and the pre-post evaluation of HR-18 differ greatly. Specifically, the sample for post hoc study was drawn randomly after stratification of the participant (enrollees) and nonparticipant (nonenrollees) populations on the dimensions of race and position classification. The post hoc HR-18 sample was large (800+ employees, 553 of whom were nonenrollees) and representative of the total full-time MCPS work force. In contrast, the sample for the pre-post evaluation of HR-18 was relatively small (n=43) and not representative of the total full-time MCPS work force.

---

[2]Only comparisons between white teachers are presented because 63 percent of the fall 1979 HR-18 participants were white teachers.

- The pre-post study data was collected after the first Multiethnic Convention. The degree to which this event influenced the pre-post study outcomes is unknown; however, it must be noted that this significant event could possibly be responsible for producing differences between the post hoc survey population and the pre-post study population.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

SHORT-TERM EFFECTS ON COURSE ENROLLEES

The pre-post evaluation of HR-18 found that participation provides at least short-term benefits for school employees, especially in the areas of knowledge of black history and culture, general behavior, and classroom practices. Specifically, the following findings should be noted:

- Overall, for all enrollees as a group, there was a significant increase[3] from pretest to posttest on the measure of knowledge of black history and culture.
- Overall, for all enrollees as a group, there was no significant increase from pretest to posttest on the measures of racial attitudes and characterization of black students.
- Overall, for all enrollees as a group, there was a significant increase from pretest to posttest on the measure of general behavior.[4]
- Overall, teachers report that HR-18 assisted them in doing more in the classroom to promote a better understanding of black students and black culture.
- Overall, comparisons made between voluntary and mandatory enrollees indicate similar gains for the two groups of participants.
- Both voluntary course participants and mandatory course participants generally felt that HR-18 should be a voluntary experience for most school employees.

While these findings are similar to those of the post hoc evaluation of HR-18, two important differences must be stressed. First, the present evaluation because it employed both pre- and postcourse assessment clearly demonstrated at least short-term course effects. Second, significant impacts in the areas of knowledge, behavior, and classroom practices were found in the present study for white teachers; whereas the previous study suggested that white teachers did not profit from the HR-18 in regard to these dimensions.

---

[3]Significant increases reported within this report are statistically significant at the conventionally accepted level of alpha=.05 and are reported on tables as p .05, p .02, p .01, or p .001.

[4]The measure of general behavior assesses what the school employee is doing on the job to promote better race relations.

Two hypotheses can be offered to explain these differences for white teachers. First, the groups differed in terms of the time intervals between course participation and testing. The fall 1979 participants were tested immediately after course participation. The participants in the post hoc survey had taken the course from one to four years prior to being tested for the study. It is possible that forgetting affected the scores of the previous enrollees and that their poorer performance is mainly attributable to length of time since enrollment.

Second, differences in teacher effectiveness may also play a role. Staff included in the post hoc survey had been taught by many different instructors, not all of whom can be expected to have been equally effective. It is possible that the instructors of the fall 1979 course, consisting of only two sections, were especially effective and that the higher test scores for the 43 students reflect the skill of these particular teachers.

The impact of the differences in teacher effectiveness--alone or in combination with other variables--cannot at this time be untangled; however, it was possible to explore the impact of the other factor, the length of time since participation.

To determine the impact of the length of time since participation, comparisons were made between performance of the fall participants (white teachers only) and that of formerly enrolled white teachers, classified by year of completing HR-18. Overall, these analyses revealed no consistent pattern of differences on the key dependent measures of black history and culture, racial attitudes, black characterizations, general behavior, and classroom behavior. Such findings indicate that it is not possible to attribute the performance differences found for white teachers solely to the length of time since course enrollment; forgetting, in and of itself, does not appear to explain the findings.

COMPARISONS BETWEEN SCORES OF FALL 1979 PARTICIPANTS AND NONENROLLEES FROM THE POST HOC SURVEY

Comparisons between white teachers (fall 1979 enrollees vs. nonenrollees) revealed that on the average the enrollees' posttest scores on the measures of knowledge of black history and culture, racial attitudes, black characterizations, and general behaviors were higher than the nonenrollees' scores on these same four measures. The difference on the measure of general behavior, however, was the only difference that was statistically significant. On the remaining measure, classroom behaviors, comparisons made between enrollees and nonenrollees revealed that nonenrollees report doing more to promote a positive learning environment for black students. This difference is statistically significant.

APPENDIX B

PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES FOR HR-17, ETHNIC GROUPS IN AMERICAN SOCIETY

Audience

All Employees (with priority given to new staff on A-D professional salary schedule)

Description

This course is designed to provide both historical and practical information that will allow for the consideration and inclusion of ethnic factors in the classroom. It will provide basic information about different American ethnic minority groups and present ways to interpret their experiences as well as strategies and materials for teaching about minority cultures. The ethnic groups to be discussed include American Indians, Asian Americans, black Americans, various Hispanic cultures, Eastern and Southern Europeans, and various religious minorities.

Objectives

Upon successful completion of the course, participants will be able to

1. demonstrate a knowledge of at least five sociological theories for explaining ethnic identities;
2. identify at least 15 different ethnic materials that can be utilized in their individual classrooms;
3. identify at least five different instructional techniques for including ethnic experiences in instructional programs;
4. recognize modes/life-styles of at least 10 ethnic groups in American society;
5. demonstrate a knowledge of the values peculiar to a particular ethnic group in the framework of the society in which they live;
6. utilize the knowledge of values of ethnic groups in designing individual units of work which compare and contrast the values of various groups.

Coordinating Office

Department of Human Relations

APPENDIX C

BOE Resolution No. 60-79
January 18, 1979

Resolution No. 60-79 Re: H.R. 18

On motion of Mrs. Zappone seconded by Mr. Barse, the following resolution was adopted with Mr. Barse, Mrs. Greenblatt, Mrs. Wallace, and Mrs. Zappone voting in the affirmative; Mr. Ewing, Dr. Shaw, and Mrs. Spencer voting in the negative: (Mr. Naimon abstaining):

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Board of Education takes great pride in the progress we have made in achieving equal educational opportunity for all; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education is primarily committed to creating an academic atmosphere which encourages and permits all children to attain their full potential; and

WHEREAS, We are particularly grateful to the staff of MCPS for their continuing contributions to this progress; and

WHEREAS, H.R. 18 was created as one element of the 33 Black Action Steps to help attain these goals; and

WHEREAS, The concerns which gave rise to the creation of H.R. 18 may be addressed by the use of

1. Human Relations workshops during the in-service day
2. Minicourses
3. Effective evaluations of staff
4. Orientation for new staff
5. Curricula review
6. Multicultural courses; and

WHEREAS, The inequities of the implementation of a mandatory H.R. 18 have raised serious issues regarding contractual obligations between the teachers of MCPS and the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, The current implementation of H.R. 18 requires a significant financial commitment (approximately $5 million) which would require diverting funds intended for direct classroom expenditures; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education indicated by Resolution No. 887-78 its intent to rescind the mandatory aspects of H.R. 18; and

WHEREAS, The Board has considered the report of the H.R. 18 Assessment Team, testimony given to the Board at the public hearing on January 16, informal dialogue with various community groups including the Minority Relations Monitoring Committee, as well as numerous messages by mail and telephone from concerned citizens; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education supports a voluntary Black Experience and Culture course (H.R. 18) to be offered to all employees of MCPS; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board requires one and one-half in-service days annually to be devoted to issues concerning the EDUCATION OF MINORITY CHILDREN in MONTGOMERY COUNTY; these in-service days shall be: one professional day or its equivalent prior to the first day of school in September and one of the two half days of release time provided in the fall or spring semester; and be it further

Resolved, That staff will purchase or develop a series of television minicourses on BLACK HISTORY AND CULTURE as well as HISPANIC, NATIVE AMERICAN, and ASIAN AMERICAN HISTORY AND CULTURE and other minority groups which will be made available for staff development at each school; and be it further

Resolved, That the orientation program for new staff shall include the topic EDUCATION OF MINORITY CHILDREN IN MCPS; and be it further

Resolved, That new teachers must take a comprehensive multicultural human relations course approved by the Board of Education, or prove that they have successfully completed a comparable course, before tenure is granted; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board ask the Minority Relations Monitoring Committee, composed of citizens and staff, to:

1. Develop parameters for a multicultural course appropriate for staff development.

2. Review the K-12 curricula to determine whether the current curriculum includes sufficient emphases on the history and cultures of minorities in the county and their contributions to our society.

3. Review the evaluation procedures for staff to insure that sufficient means are available to counsel staff who exhibit behaviors which are contrary to Board policy and which undermine positive human relations.

and be it further

Resolved, That this committee shall report to the Board of Education in the summer of 1979; and be it further

Resolved, That the Curriculum Department continue and expand its efforts to infuse black history and culture as well as the history and culture of other minorities into the K-12 program; and be it further

Resolved, That the Department of Educational Accountability prepare a request for proposal to be approved by the Board of Education for an external evaluation and audit of H.R. 18: and be it further

Resolved, That should the external evaluation of H.R. 18 demonstrate that the course has a strong, positive effect, the Board will address the matter again; and be it further

Resolved, That the superintendent may direct an employee experiencing proven difficulties in racial, cultural, sex, and/or religious insensitivity to take a comprehensive human relations course; continued insensitivity will not be tolerated by the Board of Education and may result in further disciplinary action including dismissal; and be it further

Resolved, That in accordance with the intent of the Board Resolution No. 887-78, dated December 18, 1978, that the mandatory aspects of the MCPS in-service course entitled H.R. 18 and the specific wording of previous resolutions which caused such mandates (Resolution #315-75 dated April 16, 1975; Resolution #334-77 dated May 10, 1977; Resolution #649-78 dated September 13, 1978, and such other resolutions dealing with this aspect of this subject) are herewith rescinded effective with the adoption of this resolution.

APPENDIX D.

Content Analysis of the HR-17 Survey Questionnaire,
Specifications for Creation of Scores and the Survey Instrument

Table D-1 shows that the HR-17 questionnaire is made up of four subtests. The method(s) used for computing each of these subtests or scales are explained below. Reliability coefficients* were calculated for each subtest or scale, and they are also reported in Table 1. Coefficients were calculated using the SPSS--Reliability Program. The lowest reliability coefficient was 0.71; this coefficient was reported for the subscale "Racial Attitudes." The highest reliability coefficient was 0.93; this coefficient was reported for the subtest "Course Evaluation."

SCORE CONSTRUCTION

Total Knowledge Score (Part I, Items 1-6, 9, 10, 13-18, 20-27, 29, 32-41). A score is assigned to each respondent by summing across all correct knowledge answers.

General Behavior Score (Part IV, Items 1-13). This score is based on the total count of "Yes" responses across all items. A high score would indicate that a respondent is doing a great deal to improve cross-cultural relations and understanding.

Racial Attitude Score (Part II, Items 1-14). This score is created using the following scale: 1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree and 5=Strongly Disagree. A score is assigned by summing the desired response across all items. The desired response for each item is circled on the attached questionnaire. The higher the total score, the "better" the score.

Course Evaluation Score (Part V, Items 1-22). This score is created using the following scale: -2=Very Poor -1=Poor 1=Good and 2=Very Good. A score is assigned by summing responses across all items. It should be noted that the course evaluation score reflects three subscores. They are Teaching Methods (Items 12-14, 16, and 18); Course Content (Items 8-10 and 19-22); and Teacher Effectiveness (Items 5-7, 15, and 17). The reliability coefficients for these subscores are Teaching Methods, 0.73; Course Content, 0.95; and Teacher Effectiveness, 0.90.

---

*Reliability refers to "the extent to which a test is consistent in measuring whatever it does measure, dependability, stability, trustworthiness, and relative freedom from errors of measurement. Reliability is usually expressed by some form of reliability coefficient . . . ." (B. C. Mitchell, A Glossary of Measurement Terms). When the coefficient approaches zero, the test scores obtained are inaccurate and unreliable. When the coefficient approaches one, there is little error of measurement, the test is stable, and chances are good that if the same population were retested using the same instrument they would earn similar scores to those earned on the first testing.

TABLE D-1
Subtest Content Analysis of the HR-17 Questionnaire

Subtests	Items	Objective/Purpose	Reliability
Knowledge of Racial and Ethnic Groups in America	Part I, 6, 9, 10, 13-18, 20-27, 29, 32-41	To assess total knowledge of ethnic groups in American society	0.86
Racial Attitudes	Part II, 1-14	To elicit responses to a set of general racial attitudinal and perceptual questions	0.71
General Behavior	Part IV, 1-13	To assess what the school employee is doing to promote better cross-cultural relations	0.76
Course Evaluation	Part V, 1-22	To assess course participants reaction to specific aspects of the course	0.93

32714

(1/1 = 1)

PART I

(1/2-5)

For each of the following questions, choose the best, most accurate answer by marking the box next to that answer.

1. Contributions made by Japanese-Americans to the war effort during World War II included:

(1/6)
- (1) ☐ fighting in the U.S. military
- (2) ☐ helping to relieve manpower shortages on farms in the U.S.
- (3) ☐ cutting down on the cost of internment by raising some of their own food
- (4) ☐ all of the above

2. When white settlers first came to North America, Native Americans (Indians) in eastern North America were in which one of the following stages?

- (1) ☐ agricultural
- (2) ☐ hunting and gathering
- (3) ☐ technological

3. Of the following groups, which came to the U.S. primarily as political refugees?

- (1) ☐ Asian-Pacific Islanders
- (2) ☐ Chinese-Americans
- (3) ☐ Cuban-Americans
- (4) ☐ none of the above

4. The analogy most often used by sociologists to describe the ethnic and cultural diversity of America today is:

- (1) ☐ "big enchilada"
- (2) ☐ "melting pot"
- (3) ☐ "tossed salad"

5. Group or community welfare and survival, even at the expense of individual success, is a strong traditional value among:

- (1) ☐ American Indians
- (2) ☐ Asians
- (3) ☐ Jews
- (4) ☐ all of the above

6. Which of the following terms includes the largest number of people?

(1/11)
- (1) ☐ Chicano
- (2) ☐ Latino
- (3) ☐ Puerto Rican

7. Which of the following concepts best accounts for the less rapid assimilation of Afro-Americans than of Irish-Americans?

(1) ☐ inferior intelligence
(1/12) (2) ☐ social skills
(3) ☐ skin color

8. According to the 1970 Census, Jewish-Americans had an average annual income which was:

(1) ☐ 70% above the national average
(2) ☐ 35% above the national average
(3) ☐ equal to the national average
(4) ☐ 35% below the national average

9. Which of the following American minority groups had ancestors with highly developed civilizations and advanced culture before coming to America?

(1) ☐ Afro-Americans
(2) ☐ Chinese-Americans
(3) ☐ Hispanic-Americans
(4) ☐ two of the above
(5) ☐ all of the above

10. Vine Deloria, Jr., is widely recognized as a leading:

(1) ☐ anthropologist
(2) ☐ Indian tribal chieftan
(3) ☐ Indian writer and spokesman
(4) ☐ none of the above

11. The list of commonly accepted values of Jewish-Americans would include:

(1) ☐ the value of community
(2) ☐ the value of education
(3) ☐ the value of social justice
(4) ☐ all of the above
(5) ☐ none of the above

12. In order for discrimination to occur:

(1) ☐ one group must have more power than another.
(1/17) (2) ☐ one group must be genetically different from another.
(3) ☐ there must be a clearly recognizable difference in skin color.
(4) ☐ all of the above.

13. The primary reason given by most blacks who prefer pluralism to assimilationism is that:

(1) ☐ blacks and whites will never be truly equal in this society so it is better to develop a strong black culture
(2) ☐ pluralism allows development of a cultural identity and focuses on problems and strengths unique to that culture (1/18)
(3) ☐ "separate but equal" is the only viable solution
(4) ☐ none of the above

14. Which of the following is likely to offend or frighten a Vietnamese child?

(1) ☐ beckoning with a crooked finger
(2) ☐ touching a child on the head
(3) ☐ speaking loudly to the child
(4) ☐ all of the above

15. Which of the following actions did Allport include in his list of five levels of intensity with which racial prejudice is acted out?

(1) ☐ antilocution
(2) ☐ extermination
(3) ☐ physical attack
(4) ☐ all of the above

16. Which of the following historical events is most likely to be cited by a Native American (Indian) activist in the 1980's as having a major impact on the Native American today?

(1) ☐ Battle of Bushy Run (French and Indian Wars)
(2) ☐ Battle of the Little Big Horn
(3) ☐ Battle of Wounded Knee

17. Asian-Americans have recently been discriminated against in:

(1) ☐ obtaining high status positions
(2) ☐ duty assignment in the military
(1/22) (3) ☐ membership in social clubs
(4) ☐ two of the above
(5) ☐ all of the above

18. The terms "phylactery" and "yarmulke" are associated with which of the following cultural groups?

(1) ☐ Central European (Poles and Slavs)
(2) ☐ Jews
(1/23)
(3) ☐ Rosicrucians
(4) ☐ all of the above

19. Which of the following statements could best be described by the term "stereotype"?

(1) ☐ Indians are stoic, stolid and devoid of humor
(2) ☐ every Indian tribe has a raindance
(3) ☐ Indians are the most economically disadvantaged minority
(4) ☐ two of the above
(5) ☐ none of the above

20. According to Marden and Meyer, the American minority that most resembles the WASP prototype is:

(1) ☐ American Jews
(2) ☐ Black Americans
(3) ☐ Japanese-Americans

21. About what proportion of American Indians still live on reservations?

(1) ☐ 75 percent
(2) ☐ 50 percent
(3) ☐ 25 percent
(4) ☐ 5 percent

22. The number of slaves in Georgia went from 349 in 1750 to 15,000 in 1773 mainly because of:

(1) ☐ new laws that allowed the importation of greater numbers of Africans
(2) ☐ the spread of the plantation system of agriculture
(3) ☐ increased demand for slaves to help with children and household duties

23. Which of the following is traditionally of highest value in Asian cultures?

(1) ☐ strong marriage partner ties
(1/28)
(2) ☐ primacy of the individual
(3) ☐ submissiveness to authority

24. When an organization with 100 employees advertises itself as "an Equal Opportunity Employer," but only one of its employees is non-white, this is most likely an example of:

(1) ☐ misanthropy
(1/29) (2) ☐ personal bigotry
(3) ☐ institutional (structural) discrimination

25. The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) was organized in:

(1) ☐ 1909
(2) ☐ 1921
(3) ☐ 1944
(4) ☐ 1954

26. In reference to Japanese-Americans, the term "middleman minority" means that:

(1) ☐ Japanese-Americans frequently play a middleman role in business
(2) ☐ Japanese-Americans act as liaisons between the Japanese government and the U.S. government
(3) ☐ Japanese-Americans have risen above other minorities and are caught between the white dominant group and the less successful minority groups
(4) ☐ don't know

27. The Moslem religious observance during which the faithful abstain from eating or drinking between sunrise and sunset is called:

(1) ☐ Q'uran
(2) ☐ Ramadan
(3) ☐ Sunni
(4) ☐ none of the above

28. Which of the following "personality traits" is thought to be associated with prejudice?

(1) ☐ personal insecurity
(2) ☐ unhappiness with one's own social status
(3) ☐ rigid, intense, precise personality
(4) ☐ all of the above

29. In Vietnamese, the family name is written:

(1) ☐ first
(1/34) (2) ☐ in the middle
(3) ☐ last

30. The island of Borinquen is most closely associated with which of the following groups?

(1)☐ native Hawaiians
(1/35) (2)☐ Filipinos
(3)☐ Puerto Ricans

31. The largest linguistic minority in America today is:

(1)☐ Hispanic-Americans
(2)☐ Korean-Americans
(3)☐ Vietnamese-Americans
(4)☐ none of the above

32. Chinese laborers in the gold mines and on the railroads came to the U.S. intending to:

(1)☐ settle in America with their families
(2)☐ earn money so that they could travel to countries other than China or the U.S.
(3)☐ earn money to support their families and eventually return to China

33. Which of the following is, by definition, a feature of a stereotype?

(1)☐ a stereotype is always at least partly true (kernel of truth)
(2)☐ a stereotype is always negative
(3)☐ a stereotype is an overgeneralization
(4)☐ two of the above
(5)☐ none of the above

34. One renowned program aimed at increasing the aspirations and self-esteem of young blacks is PUSH/EXCEL, founded by:

(1)☐ Andrew Young
(2)☐ Rev. Jesse Jackson
(3)☐ Martin Luther King, Jr.
(4)☐ Coleman Young

35. According to an Urban Institute report published in 1978, which of the following ethnic groups in America had the highest average I.Q. at that time?

(1)☐ German-Americans
(1/40) (2)☐ Italian-Americans
(3)☐ Polish-Americans

36. When a public school history teacher routinely discusses events of importance to Christians, but fails to discuss events important to other religious groups, this is *most often* due to:

(1)☐ ethnocentrism
(1/41) (2)☐ anti-Semitism
(3)☐ antilocution

37. Jews of Spanish origin are referred to as Sephardim. Jews of Northern European origin are referred to as:

(1)☐ Ashkenazim
(2)☐ Diasporim
(3)☐ Sephardim
(4)☐ none of the above

38. The term "acquisitive domination," meaning subjugation by military or political action, applies most clearly to which of the following American minority groups?

(1)☐ Japanese-Americans
(2)☐ Mexican-Americans
(3)☐ Polish-Americans
(4)☐ none of the above

39. Which of the following is an accurate description of Jewish-Americans?

(1)☐ Jewish-Americans are all very religious
(2)☐ Jewish-Americans all have a common cultural background
(3)☐ Jewish-Americans are all direct blood descendants of "the House of David"
(4)☐ none of the above

40. According to a major study conducted in 1940, which of the following represented problems in raising the status of blacks to equality with whites at that time?

(1)☐ residential segregation
(2)☐ occupational discrimination
(3)☐ unequal education
(4)☐ all of the above

41. Most Chinese who immigrated to the U.S. in the mid-1800's did so to:

(1)☐ escape religious persecution
(1/46) (2)☐ attend American schools
(3)☐ improve their economic lot
(4)☐ all of the above

PART II

Read each of the following statements and mark the box which indicates how strongly you agree or disagree with each of them.

	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	Neither Agree Nor Disagree (3)	Disagree (4)	Strongly Disagree (5)	
(1/47)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	1. Our free enterprise system makes it possible for anyone with enough drive and ambition to "pull himself up by his own bootstraps."
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	2. It is unfair to majority group children to put minority and foreign-born students in the same classes with them.
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	3. Where minority and foreign-born students are concerned, this nation's public schools have become social work agencies more than educational institutions.
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	4. Whatever extra work there is that comes from multi-cultural education, the benefits to students are worth it.
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	5. On the average, schools with high proportions of minority and foreign-born students (10% or more) are likely to have more discipline problems than those that are largely white.
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	6. Since Polish and Italian immigrants were able to blend into mainstream American culture so quickly, there must be some basic fault among Hispanic-Americans that prevents them from being absorbed or assimilated.
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	7. Public school systems in America should not be expected to spend precious time and money on cross-cultural or multi-cultural education.
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	8. The rewards an educator gets from helping minority students to overcome barriers to learning are well worth the effort required.
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	9. The reduction of overt racial violence over the past ten years indicates that the needs of minority groups are being met.
(1/56)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	10. Primary responsibility for the success of minority children in America's public schools should be placed on the shoulders of the parents, not the teachers.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
(1/57)	☐ (1)	☐ (2)	☐ (3)	☐ (4)	☐ (5)	11. Total assimilation of black Americans into "mainstream" American culture will probably not occur within the lifetimes of black children born today.
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	12. If minorities want to be equal to whites, they've got to learn to think and act like whites.
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	13. The reduction of overt racial violence over the past ten years indicates that minority groups no longer have much to be dissatisfied about.
(1/60)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	14. English as a second language and other programs in cross-cultural education are a waste of school system resources.

PART III

In handling cross-cultural situations in the schools, there is often no clear-cut right or wrong way to proceed. Read the following situations and choose the best course of action, in your opinion. Use only the information that is provided in the description to make your decision.

1. A student of Polish ancestry mentions to his history teacher that he has heard that the Jamestown settlement in Virginia included Polish people as indentured servants. He would like to know if this is true or not. Which of the following would be acceptable as a course of action by the teacher?

(1)☐ Tell the student, "That would be a good topic for a paper for extra credit."
(2)☐ Tell the student, "I'll try to find out the answer for you."
(1/61) (3)☐ Tell the student, "Go back to the person who told you that and find out more about it."
(4)☐ Any of these would be acceptable.

2. In handling a group of disruptive black students, which of the following would be the preferred long-term strategy for a white teacher or school administrator?

(1)☐ Exercise strict discipline to show that he or she is "color blind"
(2)☐ Talk with individual group members to identify underlying reasons
(1/62) for such behavior, then act on that basis
(3)☐ Explain frankly and openly that he or she sympathizes with the black cause and resents being victimized in this way

3. In an honors group discussion in a local high school, the subject of Islamic religious practices is raised. One member of the group is a recent emigrant from the Middle East. Which of the following is the best course of action for the teacher?

(1)☐ Ask that student to talk about Islam
(2)☐ Ask that student not to talk until the other students have described
(1/63) their perceptions and knowledge of Islam
(3)☐ Ask if anyone in the group knows anything about Islam

4. A particular class of 30 has only two black students. In a class discussion, the subject of the life of the slave comes up. Should the teacher:

(1)☐ apologize to the black students in case they might be offended?
(1/64) (2)☐ ask for volunteers to describe a slave's life?
(3)☐ call on one of the black students to describe a slave's life?

5. A newly arrived Cambodian refugee student enters the classroom. The teacher, who has talked with the family's sponsor and knows something about their background, asks the student some questions. Some answers, however, contradict what the sponsor has said. Which of the following is the *first* thing the teacher should do?

(1) ☐ Confront the student with the contradictions and try to get at the truth.
(1/65) (2) ☐ Phrase the questions differently to see if the same answers are given.
(3) ☐ Tell the sponsor that the student isn't being truthful.

6. A Native American teenager has recently moved to Montgomery County to live with relatives for several months. She had formerly lived on an Indian reservation in South Dakota. Her school records show that she was well adjusted, both academically and socially. However, in her new school, she rarely enters into discussions in class or between classes. Should the teacher:

(1) ☐ Call on the girl frequently to involve her in class discussions?
(2) ☐ Ask some girls in the class to devote some time to teaching
(1/66) the girl how to get along better with her peers?
(3) ☐ Do nothing, assuming that this is a natural form of behavior for this particular girl?

7. A Jewish boy has recently entered an eighth grade class. At the beginning of his second week in class, the teacher overhears some classmates teasing him rather harshly about his "beanie." Which of the following would be the best course of action for the teacher?

(1) ☐ Ignore the situation so as not to embarrass the boy
(2) ☐ Face the issue directly and have him explain the meaning
(1/67) of the yarmulke to his classmates
(3) ☐ Schedule a class discussion of cultural differences and bring up the issue in that context

8. You have asked the class to divide into groups and to have each group prepare a presentation on a particular event in American history. The four blacks in the class immediately form their own group. As a racially aware teacher you:

(1) ☐ assign one white student to their group so that their viewpoint won't be one-sided
(2) ☐ do nothing, since you allowed students to choose their own groups
1/68) and you expect each group to think of a creative presentation to share.
(3) ☐ decide to assign groups and put one black student in each group for a fair representation.

(2/1 = 2)
(2/2-5)

PART IV

In the past four months, which, if any, of the following things have you done on your own, and not in connection with an in-service or other course: (Check all that apply.)

(1)
(2/6) ☐ 1. Visit a library or resource center to get material concerning a particular racial, ethnic, cultural or religious group.

☐ 2. Call, visit or write the MCPS Department of Human Relations for information concerning a particular racial, ethnic, cultural or religious group.

☐ 3. Invite people of another racial, ethnic, cultural or religious group into your home.

☐ 4. Discuss methods for improving cross-cultural communication.

☐ 5. Discuss a student's racial, ethnic, cultural or religious heritage with that student.

☐ 6. Discuss your own racial, ethnic, cultural or religious heritage with students or co-workers.

☐ 7. Discuss problems of cross-cultural education as it applies to your job.

☐ 8. Prepare a lesson, display or presentation on some aspect of a particular racial, ethnic, cultural or religious group—your own or another group.

☐ 9. Enroll in an in-service course in MCPS to learn about a particular group or number of groups.

☐ 10. Enroll in a course outside of MCPS to learn more about one or more racial, ethnic, cultural or religious groups.

☐ 11. Review a textbook, movie or other teaching aid to look for undesirable stereotypes or other derogatory material about minority groups.

☐ 12. Attempt to make certain teaching materials or subjects more relevant to minority students by relating them to students' ethnic, racial, cultural or religious heritage.

☐ 13. Develop a personal plan, in writing, for bringing multi-cultural considerations into your job.

(-) 14. What other things have you done on your job to improve or practice your skills in understanding and communicating with people from other cultures, or in educating students about different cultures?

_____

_____

_____

In your opinion, should a course like HR-17 on ethnic groups in American society be mandatory or voluntary for the following groups?

	Voluntary (1)	Mandatory (2)	(Mark one box for each group.)
(2/19)	☐	☐	15. MCPS Administrators
	☐	☐	16. MCPS Teachers
	☐	☐	17. MCPS Guidance Counselors
	☐	☐	18. Other MCPS Professional Staff
	☐	☐	19. Clerical and Secretarial employees of MCPS
	☐	☐	20. MCPS Building Services Personnel
	☐	☐	21. MCPS Cafeteria Workers
	☐	☐	22. MCPS Bus Drivers
	☐	☐	23. Other MCPS Supporting Services Personnel
	☐	☐	24. Professional staff who are new to MCPS

If you are a teacher in MCPS, please answer the following questions. If you are NOT a teacher, put an X in the box below and skip the next three questions.

(-) ☐ I am NOT a teacher.

25. Do you include information about minority history, culture and contributions to American life in your regular curriculum? For example, talking about Jewish inventors, Asian authors or poets, Hispanic contributions to music, the role of blacks in settling the western United States.)

(2/29) (1)☐ Yes
(2)☐ No

26. Have you ever created a special display for teaching purposes having to do with the history or culture of one or more racial, ethnic, cultural or religious groups?

(2/30) (1)☐ Yes
(2)☐ No

27. Do the pictures, displays or other materials you use in the classroom include both whites and non-whites?

(2/31)
(1) ☐ Yes
(2) ☐ No

If you have already enrolled in and completed HR-17, continue with the questions on the next page.

If you have never enrolled in HR-17, or are just now beginning that course, which of the following best describes your situation?

(1) ☐ I am currently enrolled in HR-17.
(2) ☐ I definitely plan to take HR-17 in the future.
(3) ☐ I probably will take HR-17 at some time.
(2/32)
(4) ☐ I don't know whether or not I'll ever take HR-17.
(5) ☐ I probably will not take HR-17.
(6) ☐ I definitely will not ever take HR-17.

Now turn to Question 1 in Part VI.

PART V

(For those who have completed HR-17; others turn to Part VI.)

Mark one box in each row to show your opinion of those aspects of HR-17 described below.

Very Good	Good	Poor	Very Poor	Not Applicable	
(2/33) ☐ (1)	☐ (2)	☐ (3)	☐ (4)	☐ (5)	1. Adequacy of the room in which the class was held?
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	2. Location of the building where class was held, in terms of convenience to you?
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	3. Availability of parking?
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	4. Time of day at which the class was held?
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	5. Qualifications of the male member of the teaching team?
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	6. Qualifications of the female member of the teaching team?
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	7. Overall quality of instruction?
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	8. Value of the historical content of the course to you in performing your job?
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	9. Value of the sociological concepts presented in the course to you in performing your job?
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	10. Value of the psychological concepts presented in the course to you in performing your job?
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	11. Size of class, i.e., number of people enrolled?
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	12. The quality of games, simulations or in-class group exercises used as teaching techniques?
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	13. The quality of group discussions among class members?
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	14. The value to you of the outside reading materials that were assigned?
(2/47) ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	15. The ability of the instructors to guide group discussions in productive directions?

	Very Good	Good	Poor	Very Poor	Not Applicable	
(2/48)	☐ (1)	☐ (2)	☐ (3)	☐ (4)	☐ (5)	16. The ability of instructors to set aside their own opinions and values, and to accept other people's opinions and values?
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	17. Opportunity for you to participate in discussions?
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	18. The value of "team assignments" as a teaching method for this type of course, that is, where several students work as a group on an assignment?
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	19. The overall effect of HR-17 on your ability to relate to minority students?
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	20. The overall effect of HR-17 on your knowledge of minority history?
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	21. The overall effect of HR-17 on your knowledge of sociology as it relates to multi-cultural education?
(2/54)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	22. The overall effect of HR-17 on your understanding of what racism is?

Listed below are some reasons people have given for enrolling in HR-17 when they did. Read the list and put numbers beside those that apply to you. Place the number 1 (one) next to the reason that was most important to you; place a 2 (two) next to the reason (if any) that was second most important for you; and a 3 (three) for your third most important reason (if any). You do not need to number more than three reasons.

(2/55)
___ 23. To fulfill a Board of Education requirement.
___ 24. To qualify for tenure.
___ 25. To qualify for a salary increase.
___ 26. To acquire 3 credit hours toward a degree.
___ 27. To help solve problems I was experiencing on the job.
___ 28. To upgrade my skills in human relations.
___ 29. To upgrade my skills in relating to minority students.
___ 30. I enrolled only because the entire staff of my school was required to attend at the same time.
___ 31. My supervisor directed me to attend.
(2/64) ___ 32. Other *(Please describe.)* _____

_____

_____

Have you been able to use any of the things you learned as part of HR-17 in getting along better with:

	Yes (1)	No (2)	
(2/65)	☐	☐	33. the people you work with?
(2/66)	☐	☐	34. minority students?
(2/67)	☐	☐	35. white students?
(2/68)	☐	☐	36. people outside of MCPS?

37. How would you compare the value of HR-17 to you in doing your job compared to other in-service courses you have taken?

(1) ☐ I have never taken another in-service course.
(2) ☐ HR-17 is the best in-service course I've taken.
(3) ☐ HR-17 is better than most other in-service courses.
(2/69) (4) ☐ HR-17 is about average when compared with other in-service courses.
(5) ☐ HR-17 is not as good as most other in-service courses.
(6) ☐ HR-17 is the worst in-service course I've taken.

38. Do you think your understanding of how minority students and parents react to various cross-cultural situations has improved as a result of attending HR-17?

(1) ☐ Yes
(2/70) (2) ☐ No
(3) ☐ Not sure

PART VI

1. Which of the following best describes you?

	(1) ☐	American Indian or Native American
	(2) ☐	Asian-Pacific American
(2/71)	(3) ☐	Black (not Hispanic)
	(4) ☐	White (not Hispanic)
	(5) ☐	Hispanic

2. Which of the following categories best describes your job?

	(01) ☐	Administrative and supervisory
	(02) ☐	Building services—general maintenance
	(03) ☐	Building services—physical plant
	(04) ☐	Bus driver
(2/72-73)	(05) ☐	Cafeteria worker
	(06) ☐	Clerical
	(07) ☐	Secretary
	(08) ☐	Supporting services
	(09) ☐	Teacher
	(10) ☐	Teacher specialist

33. Do you work in a school building?

(2/74)	(1) ☐	Yes
	(2) ☐	No

4. How long have you been employed by MCPS?

	(1) ☐	Less than 1 year
	(2) ☐	1 - 3 years
(2/75)	(3) ☐	4 - 10 years
	(4) ☐	Over 10 years

5. Which, if any, of the following in-service courses for MCPS employees have you enrolled in? *(Check all that apply.)*

(2/76)	☐	HR-10. Hispanic Culture
(2/77)	☐	HR-17. Ethnic Groups in American Society
(2/78)	☐	HR-18. Black Experience and Culture
(2/79)	☐	HR-19. Survey of Asian Culture

APPENDIX E.

Nonresponse Bias for Nonenrollees in the Comparison Group

The comparison group consisted of MCPS professional staff who were required to participate in HR-17 as part of their employment contract but did not do so during the spring of 1980. The exact reasons why they did not enroll during the spring semester is unknown. One hundred and twenty-two newly hired professionals were randomly selected to makeup the comparison group from the pool of available employees required to participate in HR-17 but who did not do so during the spring semester. The pool of available or potential HR-17 enrollees was generated by MCPS Department of Personnel Services. Approximately 400 names appeared on the potential HR-17 enrollee list.

During the same week that course participants were pretested in their first class meeting of HR-17, the nonenrollees in the comparison group were mailed a pretest to their respective school locations. Seventy (n=70), or 57 percent, of the questionnaires were returned. The balance, the 52 employees who did not return their questionnaires, represents what is commonly referred to in survey research literature as "nonrespondents." If these 52 employees had returned their questionnaires, the survey outcomes for nonenrollees could have been different from what is reported in this report. Therefore, the fact must be recognized that these nonrespondents do have the potential to bias the survey results. This bias could go in either direction. Nonrespondents, for example, could have been more knowledgeable about racial and ethnic groups in America, or they could have had better racial attitudes. The exact direction of the bias is not possible to determine without further testing and follow-up of nonrespondents. Further testing of nonrespondents was not possible; however, it was possible to (1) compare the demographic characteristics of respondents and nonrespondents and (2) determine how many of the nonenrollees who did not return their questionnaires subsequently enrolled in HR-17. Both of these steps allow us at least to determine if nonrespondents differ greatly from nonenrollees who responded.

The follow-up of nonrespondents revealed the following:

- A check of demographic characteristics comparing respondents and nonrespondents revealed that the two groups did not differ significantly from one another on any key demographic variable. The variables checked were position classification, sex, race, employment location, and length of employment at MCPS.

- A check of HR-17 enrollment lists compiled by the Department of Staff Development reveals that nearly a third of the nonrespondents either completed the HR-17 course during the summer of 1980, or they are currently enrolled in HR-17 (fall semester 1980).

- The background check on demographic characteristics also revealed that 25 percent, 13 employees, of the nonrespondents had been terminated byu MCPS during the spring of 1980 (see Table E-1).

The above findings reveal that in reality only 23, or 18 percent, of the original 122 nonenrollees selected to participate in the study are true "nonrespondents."

True nonrespondents, in the sense that these 23 school employees probably have negative opinions about HR-17 evidenced by their unwillingness to participate in the study, and if they had responded to the survey could have altered the outcomes for nonenrollees. Nonetheless, there is no way to confirm the degree or direction of nonresponse bias, and the fact that so many of the nonrespondents later enrolled in HR-17 suggests that the bias would probably not seriously alter the outcomes for nonenrollees.

TABLE E-1
Number of School Employees Classified as Respondents and Nonrespondents

Total Number of School Employees Selected for Comparison Group	122
Total Number of Respondents	70
Number with both pre- and postquestionnaires	50
Number with pretest only	22*
Total Number of Nonrespondents	52
Number refusing	23
Number terminated during the spring of 1980 by MCPS	13
Number who later enrolled in HR-17	16

*Seven respondents returned their questionnaires too late to be included in the data analyses. Also several of these employees either resigned or left the school system temporarily on long-term sick leave during the spring of 1980.

3417A