

Does Our Understanding Lack Complexity? Faculty Perceptions on Multicultural Education

Deborah Gin

Azusa Pacific School of Theology

ABSTRACT: In this study, 300 full-time faculty in US seminaries affiliated with The Association of Theological Schools were surveyed. Findings showed that multicultural education in the seminary context is not one-dimensional but consists of three types: power and positionality, cultural competence, and classroom techniques. Underrepresented racial/ethnic, and to a lesser extent Asian, faculty tend to engage power and positionality and classroom techniques more frequently than do white faculty. As a national study with input from multiple faculty voices, this study provides a needed breadth of perspective within theological education.

Introduction

Studying faculty perspectives in the classroom, particularly with respect to self-reports of their engagement with multicultural education, holds great significance when we consider how diverse our society is becoming. Various studies in higher education cite multiple benefits of diversity to students and society,¹ including for example, enhanced student engagement, increased ability to hold complex concepts in tension, greater awareness and sensitivity in student-student and student-faculty interactions, progress in cultivating a more inclusive citizenry, and many others. The literature in higher education additionally indicates that faculty of color and white women faculty tend to engage active learning strategies, their students, multicultural pedagogies, the community, and other areas more than do white men faculty.² Yet, national percentages of faculty of color in higher education continue to reveal low representation (i.e., 15.2% of the total full-time instructional faculty in 1999 and 22.2% in 2009).³

And for institutions within The Association of Theological Schools (ATS), white men faculty still comprise 62.6 percent, and white men and women faculty together represent 80.7 percent, of all faculty in ATS member schools. Because faculty in higher education are still overwhelmingly white, it gives us reason to wonder whether faculty as a whole are engaging in multicultural pedagogy and whether students are, then, having an opportunity to engage in such learning.

Changing demographics in seminaries

Janice Edwards-Armstrong, director of leadership education of ATS, describes an ongoing project titled “Preparing for 2040: Enhancing Capacity to Educate and Minister in a Multiracial/Multicultural World.”⁴

Teams from various institutions gather to plan for institutional transformation on many levels (e.g., curriculum changes, infrastructure, understanding of race/ethnicity, and others). In the mid-2000s, ATS also organized a series of consultations with invited faculty from various racial/ethnic groups to learn how seminary education could be made more relevant for their communities. From personal observation as a participant, I noted several important recommendations resulting from the Asian/Asian North American faculty meetings, such as the reduction of the number of required courses in order to make room for students taking more elective courses (e.g., exploration of racial/ethnic identities; ministry in Asian/Asian North American contexts; or other courses that highlight diversity, inclusivity, or multicultural pedagogy) or elevating those courses from elective to required status.

However, it is unclear how fully these recommendations have affected theological education; a mechanism does not currently exist to assess whether faculty are engaging in multicultural education in their classrooms, to verify which faculty are doing the engaging, or to detect the varieties of multicultural pedagogies being engaged. This lack may have far-reaching implications, especially when we consider the numerical growth among seminarians of color. ATS records on race and ethnicity between 1999 and 2010 indicate increases in students of color for nearly every group except white men. For example, between these years, growth ranged between 10.2 percent (1,254 to 1,382) among international female students and 57.1 percent (1,592 to 2,501) among Hispanic male students.⁵

Need for seminary faculty engagement with multicultural education

Churches and US Christianity are also seeing growth in diverse representation. Soong-Chan Rah projects that “by 2050, African, Asian, and Latin American Christians will constitute 71 percent of the world’s Christian population.”⁶ In preparation for these changes, it behooves the community of North American theological education to consider, broadly, the current status of seminary faculty engagement with multicultural education and, more specifically, any patterns of engagement with multicultural education. Thomas F. Nelson Laird’s framework carries some promise for identifying with greater variability the ways in which faculty engage this work. He refers to a course as having greater or less “diversity inclusivity” based on nine elements of a course: purpose/goals, content, foundations/perspectives, learners, instructor(s), pedagogy, classroom environment, assessment/evaluation, and adjustment. Laird argues that when faculty design courses, they engage multicultural education to a greater or lesser extent in *each* of these areas.⁷

In a larger study, I explored seminary faculty engagement with multicultural education, specifically the *predictors* of multicultural education

engagement.⁸ This article reports the findings from one aspect of that study—namely, the *types* of multicultural education seminary faculty engage. Here, I consider two questions: (1) In which aspects of multicultural education are seminary faculty most likely to engage? and (2) Does their engagement in these aspects fall into patterns?

Review of the literature

Multicultural education

In a review of the works of multicultural religious educators, nearly all make reference to three scholars in the field, James A. Banks, Christine E. Sleeter, and Carl A. Grant. Their works are extensive and well-known; thus, in this article, I will only summarize key points.

James Banks. Banks contributes several metaconcepts to this body of literature, addressing a range of aspects of multicultural education.⁹ Of particular import to this study is Banks' explanation of five dimensions of multicultural education: content integration, knowledge construction, prejudice reduction, an empowering school culture, and an equity pedagogy.¹⁰

Content integration is typically what is referenced when faculty imagine how they might incorporate more diversity into their classrooms. According to Banks, it involves the inclusion of examples from multiple, different groups to demonstrate theoretical concepts. *Knowledge construction* deals with epistemological concerns, how knowledge is made as well as the assumptions underlying the knowledge. Here, Banks advocates making explicit the positionality and social location of both the authors being studied and the learner-educators. The dimension of *prejudice reduction* includes ways educators help learners become aware of their socialization, particularly in terms of the presence and influence of members of dominant groups, and how interactions with different others can reduce prejudice but only in situations of equal status. *An empowering school culture* refers to institutional commitment, particularly as it refers to the institution's policies, culture, and practices. *An equity pedagogy* addresses expectations, teaching styles, and the transmission of various types of cultural capital.¹¹

Christine Sleeter and Carl Grant. Also regarded as key contributors to the field, Sleeter and Grant identify five sets of models that maintain the "multicultural education" designation.¹² While they find value in each of the models, their critiques weigh more heavily on the first two. Thus, in the following, I truncate the description of the first two and highlight aspects in the last three that pertain to the present study.

The first set of models, Teaching the Exceptional and the Culturally Different, focuses on difference, with assimilation as the ultimate goal. Within the Human Relations approach, educators emphasize experiential learning and direct contact with communities that are not familiar to the student, helping the student to develop understanding, minimize stereotyping, and cultivate an attitude of hospitality. Criticism for these two approaches includes keeping difference learning on the periphery or tending to trivialize or exoticize difference, often failing to recognize that oppression also stems from systemic and institutional inequities.¹³

Sleeter and Grant's third approach is Single-Group Studies. Concentrating on a selected group, educators increase students' awareness and appreciation for that group's contributions to history, culture, and identity development. Students from the group being studied often become reeducated about their own community, and students from the dominant group face their own group's realities of oppression and discrimination. Critics identify the possibility of further marginalization resulting from keeping single-group study courses at the elective (rather than core or required) level.¹⁴ Indeed, this problem surfaced during the ATS consultation for Asian/Asian North American faculty as an obstacle to diversifying theological education.

The fourth option, Multicultural Education, includes operating under the assumption that multiple perspectives, diversity of content, analysis of all perspectives, and engaging all learners and learning styles adds to the learning experience. The approach is integrated into every curricular aspect, and the ultimate goal is "social change . . . in the very fabric of . . . society."¹⁵ Criticisms of this approach include the frequent reductionist tendencies of multicultural educators to miss the complexities of overlapping identities, the requirement of this approach for multiple skills and knowledge by educators, and the continued lack of addressing systemic inequities inherent in educational systems and curricula.¹⁶

In the Multicultural and Social Reconstructionist approach, learning extends to engaging in social analysis and exploring experiences of dominance and oppression, ultimately culminating in social change. Pedagogues design their courses around social issues and intentionally address topics of the discipline through the lens of social critique. This approach is considered too radical by some, and critics raise concerns about the ability of educators to guide learners through authentic reconstruction, the skills required by educators to model structural analysis well, considering the tendency of most to analyze events and issues through the lens of the individual, and the viability of teaching an approach that requires radical commitment.¹⁷

Sleeter and Grant align most with the fifth model, advocating for education that cultivates in students the skills necessary to bring about social justice.¹⁸ As critical pedagogues, they call for a revision of the dominant curriculum, such that all students are learning about and basing their learning on the experiences and assumptions of multiple communities, not just those of communities in power, and that the hegemonic assumptions, policies, and practices of dominant systems are dismantled.

Multicultural theological education

Multicultural education in the seminary context has roots that extend back to the beginnings of theological training.¹⁹ In this section, I explore the literature on multicultural theological education, focusing particularly on authors' perceived motivations for such education and their stated purposes and goals.

Motivations for multicultural theological education. Most who advocate for individual and community engagement with multicultural education derive motivation from theological conviction.²⁰ Whether it is about humanity knowing God more wholly by understanding the particularities inherent

in self and in others²¹ or about “growth in Christlikeness,”²² the motivations come from a deep desire to know and be known by God and God’s people.

Others name more tangible motivations. Robert J. Priest and Alvaro L. Nieves await the church’s active participation in the healing of a racialized world, for which the church is also culpable.²³ Barbara Wilkerson specifies impulses driving seminary adoption of multicultural education: helping the US church realize it is not immune to the “exclusively Anglocentric” nature of instruction²⁴ permeating the public educational realm; compelling church ministries, particularly those focused on mission, to go beyond the superficial; and developing skills to address intergenerational and cross-cultural difficulties.²⁵

Purposes/goals of multicultural theological education. Scholars articulate a variety of purposes and outcomes of multicultural theological education, ranging from awareness and appreciation of unlike others to antiracist activism. For example, Wilkerson concludes that the theories of Paulo Freire and of Sleeter and Grant align well with the theological thrust toward the goal of reconciliation.²⁶ Laura B. Lewis, Ronald H. Cram, and James Michael Lee also consider the work of Sleeter and Grant and strongly advocate for the analysis of power asymmetries and other inequitable dynamics embedded in an institution’s culture and curricula.²⁷ It is interesting to note the slight nuances of interpretation between these two articles on the same theoretical framework (i.e., that of Sleeter and Grant): Wilkerson sees the models as providing opportunity for reciprocity, where Lewis and colleagues expand the conversation to critiques of power.

Another body of literature reaches further into a critical pedagogy, examining issues of privilege and race-based inequitable structures. David V. Esterline argues that the essential aim of multicultural theological education is changed lives, where everyone experiences an “antiracist” curriculum.²⁸ Indeed, by “multicultural,” Esterline believes theological education must include the objective of transforming systems of racism or structures that advantage certain groups based on race.²⁹ Lawrence H. Mamiya offers a similar challenge from black church communities, that American society (and theological education) adopt a “strong antiracial discrimination stance.”³⁰ Likewise, while not addressing seminary education per se, Rah questions the future relevancy of an evangelicalism that is nonconversant with the thriving vibrancy of ethnic minority and immigrant communities.³¹

Others call for the transformation of individual and social identity,³² helping Christian communities understand that “all human experience is a social product and process,”³³ a redistribution of power so that all experience it equally in community and harmony,³⁴ listening to the heretofore silenced voices of oppressed communities,³⁵ a consciousness raising of our own social locations and positions of power,³⁶ and the opportunity for all to identify as part of the family of God³⁷ as primary goals of multicultural seminary education.

Data and analysis³⁸

Sample

The population studied in this project is full-time US faculty in graduate-level theological education. Though perceptions of faculty in Canadian and Puerto Rican seminaries need to be explored, these contexts differ from that of the non-Puerto Rican United States. This study, thus, includes faculty in non-Puerto Rican United States (henceforth, US) seminaries only.

To investigate the targeted population, I analyzed a random sample³⁹ of 300 respondents (corresponding to a 23.0% response rate), roughly two-thirds female and one-third male, acquired through the ATS database. The racial composition of the sample was slightly more than one-half white, one-fifth black, one-tenth Asian, one-tenth Latino/Hispanic, slightly less than 5 percent of multiple races, and less than 1 percent each Native American and Pacific Islander. Respondents mainly represented the higher ranks (associate or full professor), more than two-thirds held tenure or extended contracts, and they were evenly distributed among evangelical and mainline Protestant schools, with more than one-tenth from Roman Catholic seminaries. The three most frequently reported discipline categories were theology (26.8%), Bible (19.2%), and ministry (15.8%).

Analysis

Question A: Aspects of multicultural education that faculty engage. This section highlights findings on responses to the single item, "I include multicultural education in my courses" (OverallMC), and to the seventeen other dependent items related to engagement with other aspects of multicultural education. (See Appendix for descriptives on all dependent items.)

Engagement of multicultural education overall. Overall, the sample reported engaging in multicultural education (OverallMC_{mean} = 2.86, between "Occasionally" and "Frequently" but closer to the latter on a four-point scale ranging from "Never" to "Always"); however, overall engagement with multicultural education was indicated among the lowest response means for dependent items. Cross-tabulations by gender and race and by frequency response show that more black/African/African American (henceforth, black) faculty reported always (44.3%) engaging in multicultural education than did Latino/Hispanic (henceforth, Latino/a) faculty (40.6%), faculty of multiple races (36.4%), Asian/Asian American (henceforth, Asian) faculty (25.7%), and white faculty (17.9%).

Response *patterns* by race on this single dependent item also reveal differences. For Asian faculty and for white faculty, the responses follow a normal, bell-shaped distribution. However, for black faculty, Latino/a faculty, and faculty of multiple races (i.e., underrepresented racial/ethnic faculty, henceforth URE), the distributions show a skewed distribution, cresting in the direction of "Frequently" and "Always." See Table 1 for frequency cross-tabulations on the single-item dependent measure.

Comparison of means between underrepresented racial/ethnic faculty and nonunderrepresented (non-URE) faculty reveals that, while for non-URE faculty, the overall engagement item was one of the two items with the lowest mean (2.66 between Occasionally and Frequently), for URE faculty, it was not

TABLE 1. Dependent Variable, OverallMC—Frequency Cross-tabulations by Race and Gender

Race*	Gender	DV: I include multicultural education in my courses (OverallMC)				Total
		Never	Occasion- ally	Frequently	Always	
Asian/ Asian Am	Male	1	3	3	2	9
	Female	2	9	8	7	26
	Total Count	3	12	11	9	35
	Total % of Race	8.6%	34.3%	31.4%	25.7%	100.0%
Black, African/ African Am	Male	0	2	7	11	20
	Female	0	9	16	16	41
	Total Count	0	11	23	27	61
	Total % of Race	0%	18.0%	37.7%	44.3%	100.0%
Latino/ Hispanic	Male	0	1	2	2	5
	Female	2	3	11	11	27
	Total Count	2	4	13	13	32
	Total % of Race	6.2%	12.5%	40.6%	40.6%	100.0%
Multiple Races	Male	0	0	1	2	3
	Female	0	3	3	2	8
	Total Count	0	3	4	4	11
	Total % of Race	5%	27.3%	36.4%	36.4%	100.0%
White	Male	1	13	21	15	50
	Female	10	46	33	12	101
	Total Count	11	59	54	27	151
	Total % of Race	7.3%	39.1%	35.8%	17.9%	100.0%
Total	Male	2	20	34	32	88
	% of Gender	2.3%	22.7%	38.6%	36.4%	100.0%
	Female	14	71	71	49	205
	% of Gender	6.8%	34.6%	34.6%	23.9%	100.0%
	Total Count	16	91	105	81	293
	Total %	5.5%	31.1%	35.8%	27.6%	100.0%

* Counts in the Native American/First Nations and Pacific Islander racial categories were very few (three total) and were omitted to maintain confidentiality.

(3.21, Frequently). Independent sample t-test confirms that the difference in means for this single dependent item is significant [$t(293) = -5.360, p < .001$] and represented a moderate-sized effect (Cohen's $D = .65$).

These findings together suggest that underrepresented racial/ethnic faculty are more apt to engage multicultural education than those in the non-underrepresented racial/ethnic faculty group. Indeed, this item was one of the ten that showed a statistically significant difference ($p < .001$ level) in mean response between the two groups.⁴⁰

Engagement in other aspects of multicultural education. Comparisons of mean responses provide perspective on other aspects of multicultural education engagement. For the entire sample, the item with the highest mean was “Creating a safe climate in my classroom is very important for me” (Safe Climate, 3.77 on a 4-point scale). The two items with the next highest means were “Developing in students the skills necessary to work effectively with people from various cultural backgrounds is a very important purpose of education”⁴¹ (Student Cultural Competence, 3.58) and “I regularly reflect on my decisions about which skills, values, or knowledge students should learn in the classroom” (Reflect Epistemology, 3.38). In addition to Safe Climate and Student Cultural Competence, URE faculty also showed strongest agreement with engaging in Critique Dominant Canon, Teacher Social Location, and Diverse Teaching Methods. (See Appendix for full text of items.)

The item with the lowest mean for the sample was “I include lecture, class discussions, or writing assignments that integrate topics of my discipline with topics related to diversity (justice, equity, power asymmetry, access, . . . genderism/racism/ageism/classism . . .” (Diversity Content, 2.84). The three items with the next lowest means were “I reflect on how my students’ various socio-cultural identities (i.e., gender, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, ability, culture, religion/denomination, etc.) affect their learning” (Reflect Social ID Affect Learn, 2.87), “I adjust aspects of the course (e.g., pace, content, assignments) based on student learning needs”⁴² (Adjust Course, 2.87), and “I employ pedagogical strategies to create equal-status conditions⁴³ (e.g., minimizing feelings of superiority/inferiority among students . . .) for deep interaction” (Equal Status Conditions, 2.90).

It is important to note that for all dependent items, the URE faculty group did not have any means resulting below 3.10 (Agree). For the non-URE faculty group, eight of eighteen dependent items returned means that fell below 3.00. While this may indicate the presence of a social desirability effect, it may also suggest a greater engagement with multicultural education by underrepresented racial/ethnic seminary faculty.

Question B: Patterns of multicultural education engagement. To determine whether faculty engagement with multicultural education falls into identifiable patterns, I performed factor analysis of responses to the seventeen nonoverall dependent items.⁴⁴ As is standard in such analysis, I considered the factor loadings to identify *patterns* of responses by this sample, then to determine individual items that group together to form a “composite” variable. Table 2 presents factor loadings in the pattern matrix. Through examination of the high factor loadings, I named the first three factors Multicultural Education-Power and Positionality, Multicultural Education-Cultural Competence, and Multicultural Education-Classroom Techniques; saved them as variables using regression method; and used them in subsequent analyses in the larger study.⁴⁵

Power and Positionality. Six items loaded high for the construct Power and Positionality. These were “I regularly reflect on my social location and/or positionality” (Teacher Social Location, .903); “I regularly have students explore their social location and/or positionality” (Student Social Location, .719); “I regularly reflect on my potential biases about course-related issues” (Reflect on Biases, .654); “I encourage students to question the dominant curricular canon’s assumptions, paradigms, and characteristics that perpetuate dominance” (Critique Dominant Canon, .638); “I include lecture, class discussions, or writing assignments . . . with topics related to diversity . . .” (Diversity Content, .578); and “I include lecture, class discussions, or writing assignments that incorporate diverse perspectives . . .”⁴⁶ (Diverse Perspectives, .525).

Cultural Competence. Three items comprised Cultural Competence. The items with the highest loadings were “Developing in students the skills necessary to work with . . . various cultural backgrounds is . . . very important . . .”⁴⁷ (Student Cultural Competence, .833); “My goal for student learning is . . . knowledge, attitudes, skills necessary for participation in action for justice and equality” (Student Learning Goal, .641); and “Creating a safe climate in my classroom is very important for me” (Safe Climate, .628).

Classroom Techniques. Five of the seventeen dependent items loaded high for the composite factor Classroom Techniques. These were “I adjust aspects of the course . . . based on student learning needs”⁴⁸ (Adjust Course, .672); “I employ pedagogical strategies to create equal-status conditions . . .”⁴⁹ (Equal Status Conditions, .664); “I evaluate student learning using multiple techniques”⁵⁰ (Evaluate Multiple Techniques, .657); “My teaching methods are intentionally diverse to encourage the active participation of all students” (Diverse Teaching Methods, .604); and “I reflect on how my students’ various sociocultural identities . . . affect their learning” (Reflect Social ID Affect Learning, .517).

Conclusions

Key findings and interpretations

In this section, I first address the kinds of multicultural education/diversity inclusivity in which seminary faculty engage. Then, to respond to the question about whether engagement in multicultural education falls into identifiable patterns, I discuss the factors that emerged.

Which faculty engage which pedagogical aspects? Overall, seminary faculty do engage in multicultural education; however, black and Latino/a faculty, as well as faculty of multiple races, far more frequently engage in multicultural education than do Asian and white faculty.

The types of multicultural education that seminary faculty are most likely to engage, however, vary according to group (i.e., URE and non-URE faculty). The three areas of multicultural pedagogy that non-URE faculty are most likely to engage include providing a safe climate for students, building student competence to work effectively with people from other cultures, and reflecting on decisions about what students should learn. Similar to non-URE faculty, URE faculty are most likely to engage in providing a safe climate for

TABLE 2. Dependent Factors Pattern Matrix

	Factor			
	1	2	3	4
I regularly reflect on my social location and/or positional- TEACHER SOCIAL LOCATION	.903	.007	-.121	.067
I regularly have students explore their social location and/or positional- STUDENT SOCIAL LOCATION	.719	.060	.039	-.043
I regularly reflect on my potential biases about course-related issues. REFLECT ON BIASES	.654	-.019	.084	.244
I encourage students to question the dominant curricular canon's assumptions, paradigms, and charac- teristics that perpetuate dominance. CRITIQUE DOMINANT CANON	.638	.109	.068	-.135
I include lecture, class discussions, or writing assignments that integrate topics of my discipline with topics related to diversity (justice, equity, power asymmetry, access . . . genderism/racism/ageism/class- ism, etc.). DIVERSITY CONTENT	.578	.072	.215	-.328
I include lecture, class discussions, or writing assignments that incorporate diverse perspectives (differ- ent races, religions, genders, political beliefs, etc.). ¹ DIVERSE PERSPECTIVES	.525	.108	.157	-.174
I regularly reflect on my decisions about which skills, values, or knowledge students should learn in the classroom. REFLECT EPISTEMOLOGY	.333	.060	.134	.239
Developing in students the skills necessary to work effectively with people from various cultural back- grounds is a very important purpose of education. ² STUDENT CULTURAL COMPETENCE	.048	.833	-.038	.016
My goal for student learning is that they gain the knowledge, attitudes, and skills necessary for partici- pation in action for justice and equality. STUDENT LEARNING GOAL	.169	.641	.022	-.124
Creating a safe climate in my classroom is very important for me. SAFE CLIMATE	-.091	.628	.007	.043

I adjust aspects of the course (e.g., pace, content, assignments) based on student learning needs. ²	ADJUST COURSE	.012	-.064	.672	-.167
I employ pedagogical strategies to create equal-status conditions (e.g., minimizing feelings of superiority/inferiority among students, equitable opportunity to contribute to course discussions/content) for deep interaction. ³	EQUAL STATUS CONDITIONS	.029	.079	.664	-.173
I evaluate student learning using multiple techniques. ³	EVALUATE MULTIPLE TECHNIQUES	-.071	.064	.657	.179
My teaching methods are intentionally diverse to encourage the active participation of all students.	DIVERSE TEACHING METHODS	.029	.124	.604	.128
I reflect on how my students' various sociocultural identities (i.e., gender, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, ability, culture, religion/denomination, etc.) affect their learning.	SOCIAL ID AFFECT LEARNING	.304	.040	.517	-.161
I regularly learn about who my students are in order to improve classroom instruction.	LEARN ABOUT STUDENTS	.197	.020	.412	.243
I am conscious of my differential expectations of individual students in my class (i.e., based on their gender, race, ethnicity, ability status, socioeconomic status, etc.).	DIFFERENTIAL EXPECTATIONS	.205	.014	.318	.160

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring.

Rotation Method: Oblimin with Kaiser Normalization.

¹ Paul D. Umbach, "The Contribution of Faculty of Color to Undergraduate Education," *Research in Higher Education* 47, no. 3 (May 2006): 341.

² Thomas F. Nelson Laird, "Measuring the Diversity Inclusivity of College Courses," *Research in Higher Education* 52, no. 6 (Sep. 2011): 574; Thomas F. Nelson Laird and Mark E. Engberg, "Establishing Differences between Diversity Requirements and Other Courses with Varying Degrees of Diversity Inclusivity," (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University, 2011), 122.

³ Sylvia Hurtado, "Linking Diversity and Educational Purpose: How Diversity Affects the Classroom Environment and Student Development," in *Diversity Challenged: Evidence on the Impact of Affirmative Action*, eds. Gary Orfield and Michal Kurlaender (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Review, 2001), 189.

students and building student competence to work effectively with people from other cultures; however, they are also more likely to incorporate a diversity of teaching methods to encourage active participation by all students, instructor self-reflection on social location and positionality, and encouragement of students to critique the dominant curricular canon's assumptions and paradigms that perpetuate dominance.

Dimensions of multicultural education. Multicultural education engagement does fall into identifiable patterns. While two types of multicultural education were anticipated *a priori*, three distinct dimensions in fact emerged. Results from analyses performed to identify these dimensions were further corroborated by specific alignment of certain *predictors* of each dimension of multicultural education.⁵¹

The Power and Positionality dimension of multicultural education is reminiscent of Banks' Knowledge Construction,⁵² which deals with epistemological concerns (including the asymmetrical power structures that reinforce decisions about what counts as knowledge).

The Cultural Competence dimension focuses on building student knowledge and skills necessary for interacting cross-culturally and providing safe spaces for that exploration. In theological contexts, this dimension of multicultural education is commonly found as a model of teaching and learning for mission and evangelism.⁵³

A third, unexpected dimension emerged: Classroom Techniques. While this type of multicultural education enjoyed some convergence with Power and Positionality, its characteristics lie uniquely in concrete pedagogical methods and strategies that promote diversity inclusivity.

Data indicate that seminary faculty engage more in aspects of two dimensions of multicultural education: Power and Positionality and Cultural Competence. Seminary faculty engage less readily in aspects of Classroom Techniques. And, though aspects of Cultural Competence are engaged by all faculty, URE faculty are more apt to engage pedagogical aspects of Power and Positionality.

What meaning can we make?

Racial group. Literature overwhelmingly indicates that faculty of color and white women faculty engage active learning strategies, their students, multicultural pedagogies, the community, and other areas more than do white men faculty.⁵⁴ Descriptive analysis in this study confirmed that URE faculty and non-URE faculty differed significantly in their responses to survey items. Examples of ways in which faculty engagement differed include the fact that URE faculty were most likely to engage in instructor self-reflection on social location and positionality and in encouragement of students to critique the assumptions of curricular canons and paradigms that perpetuate dominance; whereas, non-URE faculty were most likely to engage in building student competence to work effectively with people from other cultures and in reflecting on decisions about what students should learn.

Complexity of multicultural education. That seminary faculty incline more toward Power and Positionality and Cultural Competence than they do

Classroom Techniques was an interesting finding. Much of theological or seminary activity resides in the realms of the conceptual or immaterial, thus perhaps making the first two dimensions of multicultural education more attractive or palatable to this population. Items that comprise the dimension Classroom Techniques relate to specific classroom techniques that promote diversity inclusivity, such as using a variety of assessment methods in order to provide students with multiple ways of demonstrating their learning,⁵⁵ controlling the participation of students from dominant groups⁵⁶ so that all students have equal opportunity to contribute,⁵⁷ and adjusting course agendas, content, or delivery based on feedback from a diversity of learning styles.⁵⁸ While these are considered pedagogical best practices in any class, such best practices may be unfamiliar to seminary faculty, many of whom did not take courses in teaching/learning while in graduate school nor were socialized to consider themselves as multicultural educators.

Regarding the nontechnical dimensions, it is important to recognize that multicultural education is not monolithic. Multicultural education in seminary settings can incline toward a pedagogy that respects the different Other, with an awareness of how we “assume that our way is the only way that is appropriate . . .”⁵⁹ This Cultural Competence dimension can emphasize mutual celebration and learning from and of the “stranger.”⁶⁰ It can also *lack* a sense of mutuality, the notion that the racial/ethnic student will also inform the instructor. For example, in a discussion on cooperative learning, Deborah L. Bainer and Jeffrey W. Peck describe a technique in which they hint at their pedagogical philosophy not in their direct explanation but in the act of putting quotation marks around a key word, (e.g., “Each member of a small group ‘teaches’ the rest of his or her group . . .,” apparently to indicate that students are not actually engaging in teaching their classmates.⁶¹ While reconciliation is typically the end goal, most cultural analysis in this dimension occurs at the level of the individual or group.⁶² Seminary pedagogues applying this dimension of multicultural education emphasize experiential learning and interaction with unfamiliar others, helping students develop sensitivity and understanding and nurture hospitality (similar to Sleeter and Grant’s Human Relations approach).⁶³

Multicultural education in seminary settings, however, can also focus more on social analysis of systems and unjust structures. Such pedagogies identify and name hegemonic practices and policies that perpetuate dominance, privileging one group or system over others.⁶⁴ Various authors highlight this dimension of Power and Positionality in their writing and classroom approach.⁶⁵ Pedagogies within this dimension range from a recognition and welcoming of the diversity of students’ social locations as points of expertise (e.g., Charles R. Foster’s description of exploring strategies for students to situate their own experiences and histories in the course content),⁶⁶ to incorporating content on diversity topics that relate to the course’s discipline, to challenging racist structures in society and within the church head on, with an awareness of asymmetrical power in knowledge construction.⁶⁷ This dimension of multicultural education is more in agreement with Sleeter and Grant’s Multicultural and Social Reconstructionist approach, in which instructors

design courses around sociohistorical issues and explore experiences of dominance and oppression, ultimately leading to social action and transformation.

Final remarks

This report has contributed a missing piece to the literature. Germinal works exist within the literature that explores theological education;⁶⁸ however, these works either build on historical synthesis or analyze select institutions (i.e., eighteen out of more than 260 ATS institutions, in the case of Foster and colleagues⁶⁹). While their conclusions are profound and revelatory, those pieces can be seen as constrained by the contexts about which they write. This national study, however, presents a more inclusive understanding of the perspectives of faculty who engage in theological education and thus complements the depth of those important works by providing a slice of the breadth that they miss.

Given that projections place the US church in a nonwhite-majority context in the near future, exploration of multicultural theological education becomes paramount. Not only will future seminarians be increasingly racially diverse, but seminary graduates will be ministering in a racially diverse church context as well. Theological educators must, therefore, engage in the preparation of their seminarians to minister in such a context. The Association of Theological Schools has already begun its campaign to address this challenge with the “Preparing for 2040” project. This study also addresses the challenge by considering 300 seminary faculty voices, half of whom are faculty of color. What better way to gain understanding about preparation for a multicultural world than by hearing from a multiracial multitude?

Deborah Gin is associate professor in ministry at Azusa Pacific School of Theology in Azusa, California, and senior faculty fellow in the Center for Teaching, Learning, and Assessment.

Appendix

Dependent Items – Descriptives

Item	N	Mean	S.D.	Strongly Disagree 1	Disagree 2	Agree 3	Strongly Agree* 4
Creating a safe climate in my classroom is very important for me. SAFE CLIMATE	299	3.77	.523	4 1.3%	2 0.7%	54 18.1%	239 79.9%
My goal for student learning is that they gain the knowledge, attitudes, and skills necessary for participation in action for justice and equality. STUDENT LEARNING GOAL	300	3.23	.768	7 2.3%	41 13.7%	129 43.0%	123 41.0%
Developing in students the skills necessary to work effectively with people from various cultural backgrounds is a very important purpose of education. ¹ STUDENT CULTURAL COMPETENCE	300	3.58	.636	5 1.7%	9 3.0%	92 30.7%	194 64.7%
I regularly reflect on my decisions about which skills, values, or knowledge students should learn in the classroom. REFLECT EPISTEMOLOGY	300	3.38	.592	0 0%	17 5.7%	151 50.3%	132 44.0%
I encourage students to question the dominant curricular canon's assumptions, paradigms, and characteristics that perpetuate dominance. CRITIQUE DOMINANT CANON	300	3.15	.778	4 1.3%	59 19.7%	124 41.3%	113 37.7%
I regularly have students explore their social location and/or positionality. STUDENT SOCIAL LOCATION	300	3.10	.778	5 1.7%	62 20.7%	131 43.7%	102 34.0%
I regularly reflect on my potential biases about course-related issues. REFLECT ON BIASES	300	3.19	.616	2 0.7%	28 9.3%	182 60.7%	88 29.3%
I regularly reflect on my social location and/or positionality. TEACHER SOCIAL LOCATION	298	3.22	.714	3 1.0%	41 13.8%	141 47.3%	113 37.9%
I regularly learn about who my students are in order to improve classroom instruction. LEARN ABOUT STUDENTS	299	3.34	.594	2 0.7%	13 4.3%	165 55.2%	119 39.8%
I am conscious of my differential expectations of individual students in my class (i.e., based on their gender, race, ethnicity, ability status, socioeconomic status, etc.). DIFFERENTIAL EXPECTATIONS	296	3.11	.675	6 2.0%	35 11.8%	176 59.5%	79 26.7%

Faculty Perceptions on Multicultural Education

Item	N	Strongly Disagree 1	Disagree 2	Agree 3	Strongly Agree* 4
	Mean				
	S.D.				
My teaching methods are intentionally diverse to encourage the active participation of all students.	297 3.28 .643	1 0.3%	28 9.4%	154 51.9%	114 38.4%
DIVERSE TEACHING METHODS					
I evaluate student learning using multiple techniques. ²	297 3.26 .649	1 0.3%	31 10.4%	156 52.5%	109 36.7%
EVALUATE MULTIPLE TECHNIQUES					
I include lecture, class discussions, or writing assignments that incorporate diverse perspectives (different races, religions, genders, political beliefs, etc.). ³	300 3.07 .798	(Never) 12 4.0%	(Occasionally) 49 16.3%	(Frequently) 144 48.0%	(Always) 95 31.7%
DIVERSE PERSPECTIVES					
I include lecture, class discussions, or writing assignments that integrate topics of my discipline with topics related to diversity (justice, equity, power asymmetry, access, stereotype/essentializing, genderism/racism/ageism/classism).	299 2.84 .868	(Never) 18 6.0%	(Occasionally) 86 28.8%	(Frequently) 121 40.5%	(Always) 74 24.7%
DIVERSITY CONTENT					
I reflect on how my students' various sociocultural identities (i.e., gender, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, ability, culture, religion/denomination, etc.) affect their learning.	300 2.87 .769	(Never) 7 2.3%	(Occasionally) 90 30.0%	(Frequently) 139 46.3%	(Always) 64 21.3%
REFLECT SOCIAL ID AFFECT LEARNING					
I adjust aspects of the course (e.g., pace, content, assignments) based on student learning needs. ¹	299 2.87 .748	(Never) 4 1.3%	(Occasionally) 94 31.4%	(Frequently) 139 46.5%	(Always) 62 20.7%
ADJUST COURSE					
I employ pedagogical strategies to create equal-status conditions (e.g., minimizing feelings of superiority/inferiority among students, equitable opportunity to contribute to course discussions/content) for deep interaction. ²	297 2.90 .822	(Never) 19 6.4%	(Occasionally) 59 19.9%	(Frequently) 151 50.8%	(Always) 68 22.9%
EQUAL STATUS CONDITIONS					
I include multicultural education in my courses.	298 2.86 .892	(Never) 17 5.7%	(Occasionally) 91 30.5%	(Frequently) 107 35.9%	(Always) 83 27.9%
OVERALLMC					

*Response options in this item category followed these column headers unless otherwise noted in parentheses.

¹ Thomas F. Nelson Laird, "Measuring the Diversity Inclusivity of College Courses," *Research in Higher Education* 52, no. 6 (Sep. 2011): 574; Thomas F. Nelson Laird and Mark E. Engberg, "Establishing Differences between Diversity Requirements and Other Courses with Varying Degrees of Diversity Inclusivity," (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University, 2011), 122.

² Sylvia Hurtado, "Linking Diversity and Educational Purpose: How Diversity Affects the Classroom Environment and Student Development," in *Diversity Challenged: Evidence on the Impact of Affirmative Action*, eds. Gary Orfield and Michal Kurlaender (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Review, 2001), 189.

³ Paul D. Umbach, "The Contribution of Faculty of Color to Undergraduate Education," *Research in Higher Education* 47, no. 3 (May 2006): 341.

ENDNOTES

1. For example, Patricia Gurin, "Selections from *The Compelling Need for Diversity in Higher Education: Expert Reports in Defense of the University of Michigan*," *Equity & Excellence in Education* 32, no. 2 (1999); Patricia Gurin et al., "Diversity and Higher Education: Theory and Impact on Educational Outcomes," *Harvard Educational Review* 72, no. 3 (Fall 2002); Sylvia Hurtado et al., "Enacting Diverse Learning Environments: Improving the Climate for Racial/Ethnic Diversity in Higher Education," *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report* 26 (1999); Patricia Marin, "The Educational Possibility of Multi-Racial/Multi-Ethnic College Classrooms," in *Does Diversity Make a Difference? Three Research Studies on Diversity in College Classrooms*, eds. Geoffrey Maruyama et al. (Washington, DC: American Council on Education; American Association of University Professors, 2000). For full text, see <http://www.acenet.edu> or <http://www.aaup.org>; Geoffrey Maruyama and Jose F. Moreno, "University Faculty Views About the Value of Diversity on Campus and in the Classroom" (Washington, DC: American Council on Education; American Association of University Professors, 2000); Jeffrey F. Milem, "Increasing Diversity Benefits: How Campus Climate and Teaching Methods Affect Student Outcomes," in *Diversity Challenged: Evidence on the Impact of Affirmative Action*, eds. Gary Orfield and Michal Kurlaender (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Review, 2001); Daryl G. Smith, *Diversity Works: The Emerging Picture of How Students Benefit* (Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities, 1997); Daryl G. Smith and Natalie B. Schonfeld, "The Benefits of Diversity: What the Research Tells Us," *About Campus* 5, no. 5 (Nov.–Dec. 2000).
2. Anthony Lising Antonio, Helen S. Astin, and Christine M. Cress, "Community Service in Higher Education: A Look at the Nation's Faculty," *The Review of Higher Education* 23, no. 4 (Summer 2000); Marcia J. Belcheir, "What Predicts Perceived Gains in Learning and in Satisfaction" (Boise, ID: Boise State University, 2001); Mari Luna De La Rosa, "Making a Difference: Diverse College Faculty and Factors Influencing Student Engagement" (dissertation, Claremont Graduate University, 2005); Shouping Hu and George D. Kuh, "Being (Dis)Engaged in Educationally Purposeful Activities: The Influences of Student and Institutional Characteristics," *Research in Higher Education* 43, no. 5 (October 2002); Sylvia Hurtado, "Linking Diversity and Educational Purpose: How Diversity Affects the Classroom Environment and Student Development," in *Diversity Challenged: Evidence on the Impact of Affirmative Action*, eds. Gary Orfield and Michal Kurlaender (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Review, 2001); Maruyama and Moreno, "University Faculty Views"; Milem, "Increasing Diversity Benefits"; Thomas F. Nelson Laird, "Measuring the Diversity Inclusivity of College Courses," *Research in Higher Education* (2011); Thomas F. Nelson Laird and Mark E. Engberg, "Establishing Differences between Diversity Requirements and Other Courses with Varying Degrees of Diversity Inclusivity," (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University, 2011); KerryAnn O'Meara, "Motivation for Faculty Community Engagement: Learning from Exemplars," *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement* 12, no. 1 (2008); Julie J. Park and Nida Denson, "Attitudes and Advocacy: Understanding Faculty Views on Racial/Ethnic Diversity," *The Journal of Higher Education* 80, no. 4 (July/August 2009); Paul D. Umbach, "The Contribution of Faculty of Color to Undergraduate Education," *Research in Higher Education* 47, no. 3 (May 2006); Amy Wade and Ada Demb, "A Conceptual Model to Explore Faculty Community Engagement," *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* (Spring 2009).
3. Digest of Education Statistics, 2011.
4. Personal communication, May 11, 2010.
5. ATS, 2010–2011 Annual Data Tables, "Head Count Enrollment by Race or Ethnic Group, Degree, and Gender, 2010."

Faculty Perceptions on Multicultural Education

6. Soong-Chan Rah, *The Next Evangelicalism: Releasing the Church from Western Cultural Captivity* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Books, 2009), 13.
7. Thomas F. Nelson Laird, "Measuring the Diversity Inclusivity of College Courses," *Research in Higher Education* 52, no. 6 (Sep. 2011).
8. Contact the author for findings related to the larger study.
9. James A. Banks, "Multicultural Education: Historical Development, Dimensions, and Practice," in *Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education*, eds. James A. Banks and Cherry A. McGee Banks (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2004); "Multicultural Education: Dimensions and Paradigms," in *The Routledge International Companion to Multicultural Education*, ed. James A. Banks (New York: Routledge, 2009).
10. Banks, "Multicultural Education: Historical Development, Dimensions, and Practice."
11. Ibid.
12. Christine E. Sleeter and Carl A. Grant, *Making Choices for Multicultural Education: Five Approaches to Race, Class, and Gender*, 4th ed. (New York: J. Wiley & Sons, 2003).
13. Ibid.
14. Ibid.
15. Sleeter and Grant, *Making Choices for Multicultural Education*, 158 (see n. 12).
16. Sleeter and Grant, *Making Choices for Multicultural Education* (see n. 12).
17. Ibid.
18. Ibid.
19. Contact the author for historical survey of seminary education through the lens of multicultural pedagogy or diversity inclusivity.
20. For example, Laura B. Lewis, Ronald H. Cram, and James Michael Lee, "Curriculum and Multicultural Religious Education," in *Multicultural Religious Education*, ed. Barbara Wilkerson (Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press, 1997); David I. Smith, *Learning from the Stranger: Christian Faith and Cultural Diversity* (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2009); Barbara Wilkerson, ed., *Multicultural Religious Education* (Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press, 1997).
21. Carol A. Jenkins and Dale Kratt, "Sociological Foundations of Multicultural Religious Education," in *Multicultural Religious Education*, ed. Barbara Wilkerson (Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press, 1997).
22. Elizabeth Conde-Frazier, S. Steve Kang, and Gary A. Parrett, *A Many-Colored Kingdom: Multicultural Dynamics for Spiritual Formation* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2004), 7.
23. Robert J. Priest and Alvaro L. Nieves, eds., *This Side of Heaven: Race, Ethnicity, and Christian Faith* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007).
24. Wilkerson, *Multicultural Religious Education*, 32, (see n. 20).
25. Wilkerson, *Multicultural Religious Education* (see n. 20).
26. Ibid.
27. Lewis, Cram, and Lee, "Curriculum and Multicultural Religious Education" (see n. 20).
28. David V. Esterline, personal communication, March 28, 2011.
29. David V. Esterline, "Multicultural Theological Education and Leadership for a Church without Walls," in *Shaping Beloved Community: Multicultural Theological*

Education., eds. David V. Esterline and Ogbu U. Kalu (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2006).

30. Lawrence H. Mamiya, "A Black Church Challenge to and Perspective on Christianity and Civil Society," in *Christianity and Civil Society*, ed. Rodney L. Petersen (Newton, MA: The Boston Theological Institute, 1995), 45.

31. Rah, *The Next Evangelicalism* (see n. 6).

32. Virgilio Elizondo, "Benevolent Tolerance or Humble Reverence? A Vision for Multicultural Religious Education," in *Multicultural Religious Education*, ed. Barbara Wilkerson (Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press, 1997).

33. Lewis, Cram, and Lee, "Curriculum and Multicultural Religious Education," 329, emphasis in original, (see n. 20).

34. Elizabeth Conde-Frazier, "From Hospitality to Shalom," in *A Many-Colored Kingdom: Multicultural Dynamics for Spiritual Formation*, eds. Elizabeth Conde-Frazier, S. Steve Kang, and Gary A. Parrett (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2004).

35. Pui-lan Kwok, "The Global Challenge," in *Christianity & Civil Society*, ed. Rodney L. Petersen (Newton, MA: The Boston Theological Institute, 1995).

36. Mark Hearn, "Positionality, Intersectionality, and Power: Socially Locating the Higher Education Teacher in Multicultural Education," *Multicultural Education Review* 4, no. 2 (2012).

37. Elizondo, "Benevolent Tolerance or Humble Reverence?" (see n. 32); Esterline, "Multicultural Theological Education and Leadership" (see n. 29).

38. This section reports data and analysis in abridged fashion. For full data results and analyses, please contact the author.

39. "Random sample" refers to the method of sampling of white faculty; faculty of color were oversampled in order to ensure representation in the study. All faculty of color from ATS member schools were included in the initial invitation.

40. Contact the author for dependent variable descriptives and comparison data, by race and gender.

41. Laird, "Measuring the Diversity Inclusivity," 574 (see n. 7); Laird and Engberg, "Establishing Differences," 122 (see n. 2).

42. Ibid.

43. Hurtado, "Linking Diversity," 189 (see n. 2).

44. I performed a Principal Axis factor (PAF) analysis, with Varimax rotation, on all seventeen dependent items. The rotation failed to converge after twenty-five iterations. After considering the factors as unique, yet related at a metalevel (i.e., they are different *kinds* of multicultural pedagogy), I performed PAF analysis again on all seventeen dependent items, this time with Oblimin rotation. The analysis yielded much clearer factor loadings on three of four factors. I ran reliability analysis on these three factor-scales and found them to have acceptable relatedness (Power and Positionality, Cronbach's alpha = .880; Cultural Competence, alpha = .756; Classroom Techniques, alpha = .812).

45. For additional, typically reported, factor analysis results, contact the author.

46. Umbach, "The Contribution of Faculty of Color," 341 (see n. 2).

47. Laird, "Measuring the Diversity Inclusivity," 574 (see n. 7); Laird and Engberg, "Establishing Differences," 122 (see n. 2).

48. Ibid.

Faculty Perceptions on Multicultural Education

49. Hurtado, "Linking Diversity," 189 (see n. 2).
50. Laird, "Measuring the Diversity Inclusivity," 574 (see n. 7); Laird and Engberg, "Establishing Differences," 122 (see n. 2).
51. Contact the author for findings from the larger study, on *predictors* of multicultural education.
52. Banks, "Multicultural Education" (see n. 9).
53. For example, Judith E. Lingenfelter and Sherwood G. Lingenfelter, *Teaching Cross-Culturally: An Incarnational Model for Learning and Teaching* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2003); Smith, *Learning from the Stranger* (see n. 20); R. Albert Mohler Jr., "Thinking of the Future: Evangelical Theological Education in a New Age," in *Theological Education in the Evangelical Tradition*, eds. D. G. Hart and R. Albert Mohler Jr. (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1996).
54. For example, Antonio, Astin, and Cress, "Community Service in Higher Education" (see n. 2); Belcheir, "What Predicts Perceived Gains in Learning and in Satisfaction" (see n. 2); De La Rosa, "Making a Difference" (see n. 2); Ada Demb and Amy Wade, "Reality Check: Faculty Involvement in Outreach and Engagement," *The Journal of Higher Education* 83, no. 3 (2012); Hu and Kuh, "Being (Dis)Engaged in Educationally Purposeful Activities" (see n. 2); Hurtado, "Linking Diversity and Educational Purpose" (see n. 2); Maruyama and Moreno, "University Faculty Views" (see n. 1); Milem, "Increasing Diversity Benefits" (see n. 1); Laird, "Measuring the Diversity Inclusivity of College Courses" (see n. 2); Laird and Engberg, "Establishing Differences between Diversity Requirements and Other Courses" (see n. 2); O'Meara, "Motivation for Faculty Community Engagement" (see n. 2); Park and Denson, "Attitudes and Advocacy" (see n. 2); Umbach, "The Contribution of Faculty of Color to Undergraduate Education" (see n. 2); Wade and Demb, "A Conceptual Model to Explore Faculty Community Engagement" (see n. 2).
55. Laird, "Measuring the Diversity Inclusivity," 574 (see n. 7); James A. Banks, *Educating Citizens in a Multicultural Society* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2007).
56. Carole L. Lund, "The Nature of White Privilege in the Teaching and Training of Adults," *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, no. 125 (2010): 23.
57. Hurtado, "Linking Diversity and Educational Purpose," 189 (see n. 2).
58. Laird, "Measuring the Diversity Inclusivity," 574 (see n. 7).
59. Lingenfelter and Lingenfelter, *Teaching Cross-Culturally*, 20–1 (see n. 45).
60. Smith, *Learning from the Stranger* (see n. 20).
61. Deborah L. Bainer and Jeffrey W. Peck, "Effective Teaching and Multicultural Religious Education," in *Multicultural Religious Education*, ed. Barbara Wilkerson (Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press, 1997), 309.
62. For example, Jean S. Phinney et al., "Ethnic Identity, Immigration, and Well-Being: An Interactional Perspective," *Journal of Social Issues* 57, no. 3 (Fall 2001).
63. Sleeter and Grant, *Making Choices for Multicultural Education* (see n. 12).
64. For example, Esterline, "Multicultural Theological Education and Leadership" (see n. 29).
65. For example, J. Kameron Carter, *Race: A Theological Account* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008); Laurie M. Cassidy and Alexander Mikulich, eds., *Interrupting White Privilege: Catholic Theologians Break the Silence* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2007); Elizabeth Conde-Frazier, "Prejudice and Conversion" in *A Many Colored Kingdom: Multicultural Dynamics for Spiritual Formation*, eds. Elizabeth Conde-Frazier, S. Steve

Kang, and Gary A. Parrett (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2004); Miguel A. De La Torre, *Reading the Bible from the Margins* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2002); Michael O. Emerson and Christian Smith, *Divided by Faith: Evangelical Religion and the Problem of Race in America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000); Edward Gilbreath, *Reconciliation Blues: A Black Evangelical's Inside View of White Christianity* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2010); Hearn, "Positionality, Intersectionality, and Power" (see n. 36); Willie James Jennings, *The Christian Imagination: Theology and the Origins of Race* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2010); Kwok, "The Global Challenge" (see n. 35); Priest and Nieves, *This Side of Heaven* (see n. 23); Rah, *The Next Evangelicalism* (see n. 6); Cornel West, *Race Matters* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2001).

66. Charles R. Foster, "Diversity in Theological Education," *Theological Education* 38, no. 2 (2002): 29.

67. For example, Esterline, "Multicultural Theological Education" (see n. 29); Mary E. Hess and Stephen D. Brookfield, "'How Can White Teachers Recognize and Challenge Racism?' Acknowledging Collusion and Learning an Aggressive Humility," in *Teaching Reflectively in Theological Contexts: Promises and Contradictions*, eds. Mary E. Hess and Stephen D. Brookfield (Malabar, FL: Krieger, 2008); Elaine A. Robinson, *Race and Theology* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 2012).

68. For example, Virginia Lieson Brereton, *Training God's Army: The American Bible School, 1880–1940* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1990); Charles R. Foster et al., *Educating Clergy: Teaching Practices and Pastoral Imagination* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2006).

69. Foster et al., *Educating Clergy*.

