

Cultural Diversity in the MSW Learning Space:
Exploring Student Awareness, Acceptance, and Perceptions
Natasha Bragg, Christine Garry, and Minyoung Lim
Indiana University School of Social Work

Abstract

This exploratory study assesses MSW students' awareness, acceptance, and perceptions with regard to cultural diversity in the MSW learning space. Within this study, cultural diversity encompasses racial and ethnic identities. Through a stepwise multiple regression analysis, seven predictor variables were inputted to assess their predictive qualities on the criterion of perceptions of cultural diversity in the MSW learning space. An anonymous, online survey was the method for data collection. Participants from the study consisted of MSW students from a large, public Midwestern university ($N = 146$). Three of the seven factors appeared to be significant predictors of perception: acceptance of cultural diversity, completion of the MSW social justice education course, and students' BSW status. The findings from this study can be attributed to social work education and practice with regard to cultural diversity, especially with regard to students' development of a more critical eye to racial/ethnic diversity's presence in the learning space.

Keywords: cultural diversity; learning space; MSW; racial diversity; stepwise multiple regression

Cultural Diversity in the MSW Learning Space:
Exploring Student Awareness, Acceptance, and Perceptions

The Council on Social Work Education's (CSWE) Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards (2015) mandates the incorporation of nine distinct competencies into baccalaureate and master's-level social work programs to receive accreditation (CSWE, 2015). The present study focuses on the second of these competencies: "engage diversity and difference in practice" (CSWE, 2015, p. 7). "Diversity" is a term that is highly-regarded within the field of social work (Ringstad, 2014). As reported by Ringstad (2014), "diversity and social justice are typically thought of within the social work profession as concepts indicating value, interest, respect, and inclusion of a wide range of views, experiences and realities" (p. 13). This definition regarding diversity helps to illustrate diversity's connection with the social work profession, and within schools of social work.

The ability to work competently with clients across all diverse identities is essential; the National Association of Social Workers (NASW) implores social workers to be open toward client diversity, and to help clients of varying backgrounds make positive changes in their lives (Ringstad, 2014). Our profession should, therefore strive to strengthen student consciousness and understanding of effective practice within all social and cultural groups (Early, Vonk, & Kondrat, 2003). The CSWE mandates that cultural diversity be taught as a central component within social work schools' curriculum, and as such, debates over how this should be effectively circulated throughout the academy (Shepherd, 2003). Moreover, diversity education and training have become common, and more than 60% of colleges and universities (Schneider, 2000) have implemented some form of diversity training or education (King, Gulick, & Avery, 2010).

A variety of pedagogical and theoretical methods have been successfully applied in social work curricula to guide diversity-focused teaching efforts, including critical, postmodern, and developmental perspectives (Abell, Manuel, & Schoeneman, 2015; Drabble, Sen, & Oppenheimer, 2012), and a philosophy of solidarity (Shepherd, 2003). Social diversity and multicultural teaching strategy of displaying diverse perspectives from the backgrounds of race, class, and gender develop students' reflective thinking (King & Shuford, 1996).

The literature surrounding the examination of social work student perspectives outside the focus of cultural diversity extends across a range of subjects, including sexual health (Flaherty, Ely, Akers, Dignan, & Noland, 2012); the value of social policy and welfare education (Dichter & Cnaan, 2010); poverty attitudes (Gasker & Vafeas, 2003); and social work practice in rural settings (Phillips, Quinn, & Heitkamp, 2010).

It is surprising to find a lacuna exists in the scope of research directly investigating social work students' understanding of diversity; however, comparable subjects and topic areas have been explored amongst this group. A hallmark study by Garcia and Soest (1997) explored Master of Social Work (MSW) student-learning of diversity and oppression in an obligatory course on those subjects. Results indicated that many students felt their perception of diversity and oppression had expanded as a result of the course (Garcia & Soest, 1997). Social work students have been found to feel similarly after completing their generalized master's practicum, which they believe bolstered their cultural competence (Early et al., 2003). Cultural sensitivity and awareness has also been promoted amongst BSW students through students' creation of personalized cultural genograms (Warde, 2012). Through the lens of transformational learning theory, developing and sharing cultural genograms as a classroom exercise resulted in students' enhanced ability to understand and appreciate the perspectives of their peers with alternative

cultural backgrounds from their own (Warde, 2012). To a similar effect, religious diversity was explored amongst MSW students in a study by Abell, Manuel, and Schoeneman (2015), specifically focusing on student attitudes and practice skills comfort with Muslim clientele. Students of non-majority ethnic and religious groups were found to have a greater confidence in working with clients of Muslim faith, and they were more likely to believe that religious diversity should be valued in practice (Abell et al., 2015). There is no doubt that diversity is a subject intrinsic to our profession, and it must be discussed in the classroom in multifaceted contexts, as it is a malleable and intersectional term. Ando (2016) writes:

Diversity topics encompass various isms, such as racism, sexism, ableism, and heterosexism, that are based on human differences and social work classes generally include critical discussions of injustices, inequalities, and oppression that are historically and structurally embedded in society. (p. 72)

As it is typical for MSW students to enter into professional social work practice after earning their graduate degree, it is therefore imperative for MSW students to have a clear understanding of what “diversity” consists of, and ultimately, a broad acceptance of human diversity in all forms –as Ando (2016) so aptly notes in the excerpt above. Gauging MSW students' awareness and acceptance of cultural diversity is an insightful measure as to the degree to which this understanding and acceptance have developed so far.

The purpose of the present study is two-fold: 1.) explore the awareness, acceptance, and perceptions of master-level social work students in regard to cultural diversity; 2.) assess participants' perceptions of the university's social work master's program in regard to cultural diversity within IUSSW's academic program.

This study will serve as a baseline to discuss potential implications of students' current perceptions of cultural diversity and similarly, how students perceive standards of cultural diversity are upheld within the learning space of the university's MSW program. If students score low on either scales of awareness, or acceptance of cultural diversity, this might indicate that MSW students may not be prepared for culturally-competent practice in their future careers. Moreover, if there is significant difference between students' scores on awareness, acceptance, and perceptions of cultural diversity within the school space between racial backgrounds or baccalaureate disciplines (e.g. BSW versus non-BSW MSW students), the school might consider reevaluating their pedagogical approach to teaching students the importance of cultural diversity awareness and acceptance within the social work profession as a prerequisite for ethical, value-based, culturally-competent practice. Furthermore, depending on students' perceptions of cultural diversity in the learning space, the school might be inclined to change its own organizational culture surrounding inclusivity and prioritization of cultural diversity, and competency therein.

Literature Review

Diversity

The United States is one of the most ethnically and culturally-diverse nations in the world. Diversity is commonly defined as the representation of minorities within a group or organization (Diversity, 2013), and broadly defined to include cultural and social diversity, including racial/ethnic/cultural groups, LGBT persons, and people with disabilities (Saleh, Annegela-Cole, & Boateng, 2011). The Association of American Colleges and Universities (2005) defines diversity as the following:

Individual differences (e.g., personality, learning styles, and life experiences) and group/social differences (e.g., race/ethnicity, class, gender, sexual orientation, country of origin, and ability, as well as cultural, political, religious, or other affiliations) that can be engaged in the service of learning.

With regard to the above definitions about diversity, many studies employed race for defining diversity (Baker, Schmaling, Fountain, Blume, & Boose, 2016).

Loden (1996) employed two levels for defining diversity: primary and secondary dimensions. Primary dimensions defined diversity with factors such as race, sexual orientation, ethnicity, age, physical abilities, characteristics, and gender (Loden, 1996) and class (Loden, 2012). The secondary dimension was explained as military experience, education, first language, and other characteristics (Loden, 1996). With Loden's list, Baker et al. categorized various characteristics under diversity with primary and secondary dimensions (2016). For primary diversity dimensions, age, class, disability, ethnicity, gender, race and sexuality were listed (Baker et al., 2016). Secondary diversity dimensions were defined as including communication style, education, geography, family status, income, language, military experience, organizational role and level, political beliefs, spiritual beliefs, work experience, and work style (Baker et al., 2016).

Likewise, the term "diversity" is used in different areas, and with multiple definitions associated with it. Even though diversity is broadly employed, it is important to assess "diversity" in the social work field. Race and ethnicity were specifically chosen as an outcome of one of the authors' teaching experiences across social work classrooms, in which the large majority of the students were White. Students of color are sometimes seen as token students, or "native informants" for the rest of the class (Hooks, 1994). The authors then wondered how race and

ethnicity is understood and accepted by future social work students –champions for inclusion, equity, and social justice—in the classroom environment. If our social work classrooms are not culturally (racially-ethnically) diverse, how do we expect social work students to grasp its significance in peoples’ everyday realities?

Diversity in Social Work

The Council on Social Work Education’s (CSWE) 1992 curriculum policy statement required social work course content on women, people of color, gay men and lesbian women, and on the patterns, dynamics, and consequences of oppression related to these, and other vulnerable groups (CSWE, 1992). CSWE (2008) Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards (EPAS) demand that implicit and explicit curriculum in social work needs to address diversity. CSWE (2015) EPAS mandated engaging diversity and difference in practice as one of its competencies (CSWE, 2015). CSWE understands the dimensions of diversity as:

the intersectionality of multiple factors including but not limited to age, class, color, culture, disability and ability, ethnicity, gender, gender identity and expression, immigration status, marital status, political ideology, race, religion/spirituality, sex, sexual orientation, and tribal sovereign status (CSWE, 2015, p.7).

This research focused on cultural diversity. Other research may focus, instead on gender, race, sexual orientation, age, and other differences as part of culture. Several researchers discovered the infusion of diversity in social work curriculum brought positive changes in students with increasing student comfort levels and acceptance of diversity (Herda-Hipps, Westhuis, & Diehl, 2001).

Cultural diversity is defined by Karout et al. (2013) as a type of culture with co-existence of diverse groups such as ethnic, religious, linguistic and other groups, each with their own values and faith systems, traditions, and different ways of life. Cultural diversity brings two advantages: helping people or communities know how to live together, and helping people to interact with each other (Erbaş, 2013).

Social workers tend to take their own cultural biases, values, and beliefs toward their clients from different cultures (Lum, 1999). Therefore, evaluation of the dynamics of cultural differences is needed (Lum, 1999). Erbaş (2013) discovered that people were enabled to achieve experience and knowledge through cultural diversity. To heighten students' recognition of cultural diversity, conversations with peers from other racial and ethnic groups is suggested (Swank, Asada, & Lott, 2001).

In this research, cultural diversity is employed with an inclusive term for difference between ethnicity and race. The underdeveloped ethnic and racial identity understanding of clients can negatively affect rapport-building, and disrupt practitioners' understanding of clients' problems (Bender, Negi, & Fowler, 2010). On the other hand, practitioners who have a broader understanding of ethnic and racial identity are more likely to encompass an integrative awareness of the role of ethnicity/race in their clients' lives (Bender et al., 2010). Therefore, knowledge of cultural diversity about race/ethnicity plays an important role for social workers, and graduate schools' need to develop those aspects in their courses.

Awareness, Acceptance, and Perception

CSWE (1969) has described the development of self-awareness as a "requisite for performance as a social worker" (p. 27). Self-awareness is required as a prerequisite condition

for practitioners (Kondrat, 1999). Competent social work practitioners put a constant effort to develop their self-awareness because they recognize that the comprehensive knowledge of attitudes, values, feelings, and experiences generate success in practice (Counoyer, 2016).

Self-awareness plays a role to minimize social workers' impact of personal, political, or social identity on their attitudes toward clients (Miehls & Moffatt, 2000). As a form of self-awareness, cultural awareness is widely-employed in social work education, and reflects an individual's cultural knowledge, such as language, history, traditions, and cultural heroes (Niemann, Romero, & Arbona, 2000).

Cultural awareness scrutinizes "the cultural backgrounds and identities of practitioners, themselves to raise their awareness of their own cultural values, beliefs, attitudes, assumptions, biases, prejudices, and stereotypes (Nadan, 2016, p. 51)". Acceptance is understood as "an outcome or consequence of attitudes toward people with disabilities; and evaluative response on multiple dimensions" (Vornholt, Uitdewilligen, & Nijhuis, 2013, p. 465).

Among research about acceptance, social acceptance was broadly-defined as "the presence of an egalitarian atmosphere within an organization, created by egalitarian beliefs and interactions among group members, perpetuated by group norms and practices, and felt by both majority and minority group members" (Chen & Hamilton, 2015, p. 587). Moreover, awareness and acceptance of cultural diversity is most significant to make a stable and peaceful society (Erbaş, 2013).

Perception of cultural diversity is defined as accepting and respecting other nations' cultures (Erbaş, 2013). Erbaş (2013) explained that understanding and recognizing others' similarities and differences are necessary, and the perception of cultural diversity is one of the

most important issues in the world. The perception of cultural diversity helps people to expand their awareness, comprehension, points of view, and acknowledgement of different cultures, and then enables people to recognize social problems (Erbaş, 2013).

The above explanations of awareness, acceptance, and perception are important prerequisite concepts for a social worker to understand. The knowledge about cultural diversity is also important for social workers in the United States, as the United States is the most ethnically and culturally-diverse nation in the world. Therefore, this study explores MSW students' awareness, acceptance, and perceptions of cultural diversity. This exploration is useful to orient future social workers to cultural competency.

Methodology

Research Questions

The primary research questions explored in this study were the following:

- 1) What are MSW students' current levels of awareness and acceptance of cultural diversity, as well as their perceptions of the MSW program learning space with attention to cultural diversity?
- 2) Do students' age, race, BSW status, degree of pre-MSW cultural diversity training, MSW social justice course completion, awareness scores, and acceptance scores predict their perceptions of the MSW program learning space with attention to cultural diversity?

Research Design

This study sought to explore the degrees of awareness and acceptance in regard to cultural diversity; it also sought to assess participants' perceptions of the MSW program in regard to cultural diversity within the university's academic program. This was a cross-sectional study, utilizing a sample of convenience. Selection criteria for participants were current

enrollment in an IUSSW MSW program at any of the school's seven campuses. Students were identified through the school's email records of current MSW students. If a student was enrolled in the university's MSW program the day the survey was taken, they were considered eligible for study participation. Students enrolled in the university's online program (which enrolls students based nationally and internationally) were excluded from this study, as the learning environments are different in distance education.

The study was implemented through an online survey [refer to Appendix A], and was distributed to students via their university emails. Email was the selected recruitment method for this study, as it was the most accessible method of reaching hundreds of potential participants at once. Additionally, as the surveys were held online, using email to distribute the surveys was the most convenient method for potential participants to access the link.

Study Participants

The participants were selected through the school of social work's MSW email rosters (which includes MSW email listings across each of the seven campuses), which were utilized for this study's purpose with permission from the assistant dean of the social work school, and each campus's MSW program director. Emails were designed and forwarded to a school administrator with access to the MSW email roster; emails included both an invitation to participate in the study, as well as a hyperlink to access the survey. The school administrator then forwarded the emails to eligible students. If a student was enrolled in the university's MSW program the day the survey was opened, they were considered a current student, and eligible for study participation. Students enrolled in the university's online MSW program were excluded from this study for theoretical reasons previously explained. Participation was both voluntary and anonymous.

To incentivize participation, student participants were given the option to enter a random drawing to win one of two 15 dollar gift cards to a nationwide retailer. To preserve the anonymity of students' survey responses, a second, separate hyperlink was included in the initial email that took students to a separate survey. In this separate survey, students entered a code that was disclosed to them after completing the survey, along with their email address. The purpose of the code was to ensure that only students who completed the survey were entered into the random gift card drawing. Furthermore, students needed to provide their email address to be notified if they were to be selected.

A total of 648 students were contacted regarding the survey, and 159 students responded. One ($n = 1$) student did not confirm MSW student status, seven ($n = 7$) did not consent to participate; and six ($n = 6$) only answered demographic questions without completing any survey items. After removing these aforementioned responses from the sample, respondents totaled 146 ($N = 146$) leading to a response rate of approximately 23%.

Power analysis. An a priori power analysis for multiple linear regression was conducted through G*Power to calculate an anticipated sample size. Given an alpha of .05 with seven predictor variables, to achieve a power of .95, a sample of 153 participants was needed to detect a medium (.15) effect. After the sample was collected, a post-hoc power analysis through G*Power showed that the actual sample size of 132 produced an observed power of .91 with a medium effect size of .15 with seven predictors in the multiple regression model.

Measures

Key variables and conceptual definitions. The key variables assessed in this study were: 1.) cultural diversity *awareness*; 2.) cultural diversity *acceptance*; and 3.) *perceptions of*

cultural diversity in the learning space. Within a social work context, cultural diversity is broadly defined as:

the existence within a society of various racial, religious, and ethnic groups, as well as other distinct groups, each of which has different values and lifestyles. An appreciation of those variations, rather than efforts to facilitate assimilation, has been the goal of social workers in ethnic-sensitive practice (Barker, 2014, p. 102).

As reflected in the above definition (Barker, 2014), cultural diversity not only encompasses race and ethnicity, but also religion; within cultural diversity, there exist other, more distinct social groups with independent beliefs and behaviors that extend beyond the scope of a broader sense of cultural diversity. For the purposes of the present study, a condensed version of this definition will be used across all three variables addressing particular aspects of *cultural diversity*: an inclusive term for differences between ethnicity and race. Additionally, the variable of *awareness* is conceptualized as students' attitudes toward, and beliefs about, cultural diversity; in this manner, awareness encapsulates students' affective capacity, and aims to gauge students' recognition of their thoughts toward cultural diversity. *Acceptance* is conceptualized as students' behaviors and proficiency with culturally-diverse interactions. Lastly, *perceptions of cultural diversity in the learning space* refers to students' experiences of cultural diversity within the learning space of the school's MSW program. Samura (2017) defines "college space" as "the interaction of existing practices and norms that are established by both, student culture and institutional policies" (p. 44). College space is both physical and social, and thus includes palpable environments, and relationships between people and place (Samura, 2017).

Survey development and pretesting. An extensive literature search did not reveal any previously-developed scales that specifically addressed the variables under assessment in the

present study; however, scales of a similar nature were found that used comparable concepts.

The present study developed a new scale entitled the Awareness, Acceptance, and Perceptions of Cultural Diversity Scale for MSW students (hereby referred to as the AAP-CDS). The AAP-CDS was largely-designed by using modified items (n=21) from the Cultural Awareness Scale (hereby referred to as the CAS) (Rew et al., 2003). Additionally, four items (6, 7, 10, 11, 13, 14, 33, & 34) were modified and applied from the Miville-Guzman Universality-Diversity Scale (M-GUDS) (as published in Fuertes et al. [2000] and developed in Miville et al. [1999]). One item from the Cultural Competence Assessment Instrument (hereby referred to as the CCAI) (Balcazar et al., 2009) was adapted and included as a means of understanding participants' pre-MSW cultural diversity training.

Items were selected from the CAS (Rew et al., 2003) and M-GUDS (Fuertes et al. 2000) measuring constructs similar in nature to the present study's variables and conceptualized definitions. For example, the construct of "general educational experience" within the CAS (Rew et al., 2003, p. 252) is congruent to the present study's variable of student perceptions of cultural diversity in the learning space. The CAS construct of "behaviors towards and comfort with people from different cultural backgrounds" (Rew et al., 2003, p. 252) shares a similar constructional approach to the variable of student acceptance, which is inclusive of behaviors. Lastly, "cognitive awareness" in the CAS (Rew et al., 2003, p. 252) is theoretically symmetrical with the present study's variable of student acceptance, which assesses attitudes and beliefs. A single item (# 21 on the AAP-CDS) was extracted and modified from the CCAI (Balcazar, 2009) to understand the respondents' diversity training history.

General item adaptations and modifications. For items selected from the CAS (Rew et al., 2003) for use within the development of the AAP-CDS, some general modifications were

made across items. Items were changed to reflect social work students from nursing students. Additionally, the term “cultural diversity” was often used as a replacement to more specific in-item categories. For example, item #1 in the CAS (Rew et al., 2003) states, “The instructors at this nursing school adequately address multicultural issues in nursing” (p. 253). For purposes of the AAP-CDS, this item (#38) was rephrased in the following manner: “The instructors in my MSW program adequately address issues surrounding cultural diversity in social work”. It is seen here how the item was changed both to reflect the social work academic setting, and the key construct of cultural diversity.

Pre-testing. Two social work scholars with expertise in both cultural diversity, and teaching within the IUSSW course curriculum were consulted during the development of the AAP-CDS to achieve face and content validity of study variables and correlated conceptualized constructs. One major contribution from one faculty member was delineating race as either Black or White, as that –one instructor argued—is how people are viewed in our society –either with or without color. Further direction was provided by these scholars on how to best approach questions surrounding race and ethnicity in a respectful and sensitive manner. Additionally, two IUSSW MSW students participated in a cognitive interview surrounding the draft of the AAP-CDS. The survey was reviewed by these two IUSSW students. These students provided feedback regarding their suggested rewording of some survey questions, as well as suggestions to remove a few questions from the survey, due to repetition, irrelevant knowledge-seeking, etc. This student feedback was used to further revise the AAP-CDS.

Description of survey. The overall content of survey questions encompassed students' beliefs, values, attitudes, and behaviors surrounding cultural diversity from interpersonal, theoretical, and social work practice-based standpoints. Additional questions referred to students'

classroom experiences focused on the integration of cultural diversity into course content, and how students perceive instructors' pedagogical competency in regard to applying and addressing issues of cultural diversity in the classroom environment. The AAP-CDS contained 26 items (not including pre-survey questions on background and demographic information). Response choices were provided in a six-response option, bimodal Likert scale (1=Strongly agree; 2=Agree; 3=Somewhat agree; 4=Somewhat disagree; 5=Disagree; 6=Strongly disagree).

Items 23 through 29 measured the variable *awareness of cultural diversity* ($n = 7$); its internal consistency reliability resulted in a Cronbach's alpha score of .663. Items 30 through 36 measured the variable *acceptance of cultural diversity* ($n = 7$); its internal consistency reliability score was very low ($\alpha = .193$). Items 37 through 48 measured the variable *perceptions of cultural diversity in the learning space* ($n = 12$); this scale had strong internal consistency reliability ($\alpha = .882$). In this respect, the survey consisted of three scales. The AAP-CDS will be scored in three separate scales; a total scale score will not be utilized for the purposes of the present study, as a conceptualization of how all three variables work conjunctively was not theorized.

Coding. All items with the Awareness, Acceptance, and Perception scales were reverse-coded for more logical data interpretation (therefore, "strongly agree" –originally coded as 1— was reverse-coded into 6; "agree" –originally coded as 2—was reverse-coded into 5, and so forth through "strongly disagree" –originally coded as 6—was reverse-coded into 1). Exceptions to this rule were items 31, 33, 35, and 36 in the Acceptance scale, and items 41 and 45 in the Perceptions scale. All items in the Awareness scale were reverse-coded. After reverse-coding was completed, lower total scale scores indicated lower levels of awareness of cultural diversity and acceptance of cultural diversity, and more negative perceptions of cultural diversity in the learning space. For example, the scales of Awareness and Acceptance both included seven items.

The lowest possible score for either of these scales equate to seven, with the highest possible score amounting to 42. Therefore, a score of seven would indicate the lowest degree of awareness or acceptance of cultural diversity, and a score of 42 would indicate the highest degree of awareness or acceptance of cultural diversity. In terms of perception of cultural diversity in the learning space, the lowest possible score of 7 would indicate the most negative perceptions, and the highest possible score of 72 would indicate the most positive perceptions.

Background. In addition to measuring the constructs of cultural diversity awareness, acceptance, and perceptions of cultural diversity in the learning space, AAP-CDS survey questions gathered respondents' demographic information. These encompassed gender identity, age, sexual orientation, race, ethnicity, religious or spiritual affiliation, international student status, and language preference. In addition to demographic information, school and work-related questions were also requested from participants. These questions included college major, social work-related work experience, MSW campus identification, practice area concentration in the MSW program, full or part-time MSW student status, semester completed in the MSW program, pre-MSW cultural diversity training, and completion status of an MSW course on diversity, human rights, and social justice (if participants had not taken this course, they were asked if they were interested in taking the course in their future MSW curriculum) [refer to Appendix A to review the survey, including demographic information].

Data Collection Procedure

Approval was gained from the university's Institutional Review Board (IRB) to distribute the recruitment email through IUSSW MSW student email rosters with a link included to access the survey, which was hosted by the online survey apparatus, Qualtrics. As the risk of participating in the survey was minimal (though it might cause some cognitive or emotional

discomfort or confusion) the study was accepted as exempt from full IRB review. A reminder email was distributed one week before the survey closed. Data collection extended for an approximate four-week period.

Once the participant logged into the survey, they were asked a question about MSW student status to check their eligibility. If met, the participant then reviewed the Study Information Sheet, which included information about survey anonymity and assurance that choice to participate would not affect the student's standing with the university or the School of Social Work. After reading the Study Information Sheet, participants were then asked to indicate their agreement to participate in the survey. If the participant refused, they were then logged off from the survey link. The survey was anonymous.

The survey took approximately 15 minutes to be completed in-full. To bolster the participation rate, at the end of the survey, there was an option for participants to enter a random drawing for one of two 15 dollar gift cards. If the participant chose to take part in the random drawing, they were routed to a separate link in which they entered a passcode (to ensure the survey had been completed) and their email address. (This second link routed the participant to a second survey page to ensure that participants' emails were not linked with their survey responses. Post-survey follow-up contacts will not be pursued.

Data Analysis

The study's overarching research question was exploratory; thus, we hoped the data provided enough information to address the question as to what MSW students' current acceptance and awareness of cultural diversity are, as well as their perception of the MSW Program learning environment in regard to cultural diversity. Descriptive statistics provided an

overarching picture of students' scores across all three separate scales of the AAP-CDS, and were organized by demographic information for a holistic overview.

A stepwise multiple linear regression analysis was used to determine the second research question as to the effect of students' age, race, BSW status, degree of pre-MSW diversity training, MSW social justice course completion, awareness scores, and acceptance scores in predicting their perceptions of the MSW program learning space with attention to cultural diversity. As this is an exploratory study in which the researchers had no preconceived ideas about the relationship between the variables, a stepwise regression model was chosen (Vogt & Johnson, 2016). For similar purposes, an alpha level of .10 ($\alpha = .05$) was used as the level of significance when interpreting regression results.

As previously described, the AAP-CDS scales (*awareness, acceptance, and perceptions of cultural diversity*) are measured at the continuous levels of measurement. Categorical factors were dummy-coded into dichotomous groups: For *race*, non-white students = 1 (test variable), white students = 0 (reference category); for BSW status, students with BSW degree = 1 (test variable), students with undergraduate college degrees outside of social work = 0 (reference category); for MSW social justice course completion, 1 = course completion (test variable), while 0 = not having completed the course (reference category). Results were analyzed via Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 25.0.

Results

Student Demographics

Of 146 valid student respondents, the mean age was approximately 32 years ($SD = 9.03$, $MIN/MAX = 22/59$). The majority of respondents (89.7%) reported being female, followed by male (7.5%); less than 1.5% were gender queer or nonconforming. Most students were

heterosexual (85.3%), and 10.5% reported being lesbian, gay, or bisexual. White students far outweighed respondents of non-white racial-ethnic identities (19.6%). Almost one-half of the respondents have chosen mental health and addictions as a MSW practice concentration (46.2%), and less than half (38.4%) had completed the required Master of Social work Course on social justice (see Table 1).

Levels of Awareness, Acceptance, and Perception

Students' mean score for awareness was approximately 35 ($SD = 3.28$) across 144 valid responses. In regard to acceptance, students' mean score was close to 32 ($SD = 3.35$) across 144 valid responses. The average perception scores amongst students was 53.83 ($SD = 9.38$) across 142 valid responses. Table 2 presents further descriptive statistics across these three variables.

Predictors of Perception of Cultural Diversity in the Learning Space

A stepwise multiple regression analysis (MRA) was used to determine whether students' age, race, BSW status, degree of pre-MSW diversity training, MSW social justice course completion, and awareness and acceptance scores predicted their degree of perception of cultural diversity in the learning space. Table 3 provides the descriptive statistics, and the correlations between all variables inserted into the model.

Assessing assumptions. Prior to running the regression model, the assumptions of multiple regression analysis (MRA) were evaluated. An availability sample of the MSW student population at a Midwestern school of social work was used, violating the assumption of sample representativeness. The criterion (*perception*) was measured at the interval level of measurement, and was assessed for normality of distribution by a review of histograms, skewness and kurtosis measures, and normal probability plots. To assess skewness and kurtosis, Abu-Bader (2016) recommends dividing the skewness and kurtosis values by their standard errors; the skewness

and kurtosis are considered severe if the resulting values fall outside of ± 1.96 . *Perception* was found to be severely negatively skewed ($\frac{S = -1.25}{SES = .203} = -6.16$), a finding consistent with the kurtosis value, also far exceeding ± 1.96 ($\frac{K = 2.31}{SEK = .404} = 5.72$). Observations of the histograms and normal probability plots for *perception* confirmed its severe skewness. Thus, *perception* data was transformed by reflection, followed by a square root transformation, resulting in skewness and kurtosis values approaching a more normal curve, substantiated by evaluation of its histogram and normal probability plots.

Linearity was evaluated with assessment of the Pearson's correlation coefficient and the scatterplot of each continuous factor (*age*, *degree of pre-MSW diversity training*, *awareness*, and *acceptance*) and the criterion (*perception* –transformed). Results of the Pearson correlation test did not indicate statistically significant linear relationships across all factors and the criterion, however, eyeballing of the scatterplots revealed only minor deviations from the fit line. Significant correlations did exist between *perception* (transformed) and *acceptance* ($r = -.267$, $p < .01$). Linearity is generally a difficult assumption to realize, though it is still worthwhile to evaluate (Abu-Bader, 2016). Homoscedasticity was met after an inspection of the scatterplot of predicated scores against residuals. Multicollinearity was not evidenced between predictors, as results of the Pearson's correlation test did not reveal correlation coefficients greater than .80 ($r > .80$) (Abu-Bader, 2016). These results were consistent with the variance inflation factor (VIF), which indicated low collinearity ($VIF = 1.72$) (Vogt & Johnson, 2016). A Durbin-Watson statistic of $d = 1.719$ did not support autocorrelation as $1.5 < 1.719 < 2.5$.

Nominal predictor variables (*race*, *BSW status*, and *social justice course completion*) were dummy-coded as follows: *race* (0 = non-white students; 1 = white students); *BSW status* (0 = students without a BSW degree; 1 = students with a BSW degree); *social justice course*

completion (0 = did not complete MSW social justice course; 1 = completed social justice course).

Finally, a minimum sample size of $N \geq 50 + 8m$ (where m = number of factors) is recommended to use multiple regression analysis (Abu-Bader, 2016). Thus, the present sample has an adequate sample size to compute MRA as $140 \geq 50 + (8 \times 7) = 106$.

Results of multiple regression analysis. The results of the stepwise multiple regression analysis revealed that three of the seven factors appeared as significant predictors of *perception* at the .10 alpha level ($\alpha = .10$), per the results of the MRA ($F = 7.09, p < .001$). *Acceptance* was the strongest predictor ($\beta = -.28, p < .01$), accounting for 7.3% of the variance in *perception*. Completion of the MSW social justice course was the second strongest factor ($\beta = -.25, p < .01$), accounting for an additional 3% of the variance in *perception*. Finally, BSW status emerged as the third-strongest predictor of *perception* ($\beta = -.22, p < .05$), accounting for 4.0% of the variance in perception.

These results indicate that though students' perception of cultural diversity in the learning space is not a function of their age, race, pre-MSW diversity training, or awareness of cultural diversity, it does serve as a function of students' completion of an MSW-level social justice course, whether or not they have a BSW degree, and their acceptance of cultural diversity.

Acceptance is negatively associated with perception; similar results were found for those students who completed the social justice course, and those with a BSW degree. Therefore, those students with higher acceptance scores, those who completed the social justice course, and those students with a BSW degree are likely to have more negative perceptions of cultural diversity in the learning space than those students who did not take the course, or who do not have BSW degrees. In this model, perception of cultural diversity in the learning space decreases by -.09

units for every one unit increase in acceptance. Moreover, completing the MSW social justice course reflects a $-.54$ change in perception of cultural diversity in the learning space in comparison with those students who have not completed the course. Similarly, having a BSW degree reflects a $-.47$ change in cultural diversity in the learning space in comparison with those students who do not have a BSW degree. Therefore, going from not taking the social justice course to taking the course decreases perception scores, and moving from not having a BSW degree to having a BSW degree also decreases perception scores.

Overall, the model explains about 14% of the variance in perception ($R = .38$), though the model does not account for almost 85% of variance in perception. Refer to Table 4 for a summary of MRA results.

Discussion

Major Findings

As reported, per the stepwise multiple linear regression that was conducted, three of the seven factors included in the model were significant predictors of perception. The significant factors that were indicated as predictors of perception were as follows: acceptance of cultural diversity, completion of the MSW social justice education course, and students' BSW status. In other words, as acceptance increased, perception of cultural diversity in the learning space decreased. Additionally, completing the MSW social justice education course indicated a decrease in perception when compared to students who had not completed the course. Lastly, when comparing students with a BSW to students who did not have a BSW, having a BSW indicated a decrease in perception scores.

Interpretation of Major Findings

Per the study's results, those students who have higher acceptance scores, those students who have completed the social justice education course, and those students who have BSW degrees are more likely to have more negative perceptions of cultural diversity in the MSW learning space. The model's results imply that with more openness, knowledge, and education toward social justice education, perception of cultural diversity in the MSW learning space decreases –becoming increasingly negative. It can be posited that those MSW students with BSW degrees and those who have completed a graduate-level social work course on diversity, human rights, and social justice will have a more developed critical eye toward racially and ethnically-inclusive atmospheres in their learning space. In other words, as BSW students have honed theoretical and practical knowledge as a result of their undergraduate training, they might be more attuned to whether the learning space incorporates policies and uses classroom practices adoptive of supportive learning environments for students who are non-white (and thus, non-majority) students. The same would be true for MSW students who have taken a specialized course in the social and intrapersonal implications of racial and ethnic identity, in addition to underrepresented social groups. These implications are similar to the findings of Voorhis and Hostetter (2006) in that most incoming MSW students had significant opinions on “social worker empowerment and commitment to client empowerment through social justice advocacy” (p. 114). Furthermore, social work education bolsters MSW students’ responsibility of social justice activism (Voorhis & Hostetter, 2006).

These aforementioned results are highly relevant to cultural diversity-related information being required to be embedded within academic social work curriculum (Shepherd, 2003).

Likewise, these results correlate with the high amount of diversity-related education and trainings that are commonly-held within academic social work settings (Schneider, 2000).

Study Implications

Findings of this study are relevant to research, social work curriculum, and education for students in social work. This study has implications for social work education and practice with regard to cultural diversity. With exploratory research, this study discovered the level of awareness and acceptance of cultural diversity from social work students. This study also serves as a baseline to discuss MSW students' current awareness and acceptance of cultural diversity, and their perceptions of cultural diversity. Through the survey, this research assessed to what extent the learning space of the university's MSW program affected the students' knowledge and attitudes about cultural diversity. Furthermore, the survey tool of this study may be employed in future studies that are based upon awareness, acceptance, and perceptions of cultural diversity.

An examination of the scores of MSW students' awareness and acceptance of cultural diversity may indicate the current circumstances of social work education. With the help of employing tools similar to the one this study used, social work education personnel will be able to reflect the findings of this research in their courses to develop MSW students' awareness, acceptance, and perceptions of cultural diversity. Furthermore, the survey tool of this study may be employed in future studies about awareness, acceptance, and perceptions of cultural diversity.

Limitations

Regarding the demographics questionnaire, adding "asexual" under sexual orientation, and "brown" and "bi-racial" under racial identification would have broadened the inclusivity of the range of groups students might have been able identify with. Furthermore, as ethnicity was asked as a separate question, in retrospect, it would have been useful to leave this as a write-in

question, allowing students the opportunity to state their ethnicity, instead of choosing from a list. In hindsight, we might have gone a step further and asked for students to provide their *racial-ethnic identity*. Racial-ethnic identity is a construct that is interpreted in various ways, but altogether, acknowledges the influences of identity politics, and the intersectionalities between socially-constructed indicators of groupness in terms of race (grounded upon physical characteristics) and ethnicity (often related to nationalism, and more symbolically, family functioning) (Ansell, 2013). Altogether, race and ethnicity are difficult to define, and often change, depending on the context in which they are used and for what purpose. For this reason, it is difficult to design a study that attempts to capture such hallmarks of participants' identities that are equally elusive in definition as significant in social meaning and consequences.

Broadly, we utilized a purposive sample, as we focused on MSW students; however, given our limited time frame and resources, we opted to use a convenience sample of MSW students within our own school of social work. Purposive samples, and samples of convenience are not preferred sampling strategies, as their results cannot be generalized to the larger population (Vogt & Johnson, 2016). Therefore, in the case of this study, findings cannot be reasonably generalized to MSW students outside of this school of social work. It can, however, provide the groundwork for future adaptations of the study using more rigorous sampling strategies with stronger external validity so that statistical inferences might be made for MSW students in certain geographical regions, and possibly even at national levels.

Our resulting sample resulted in a limited number of responses from non-white students, with approximately 20% indicating a non-white racial or ethnic identity. It would have been revealing to know the demographic characteristics of IUSSW social work students across all campuses surveyed in this study, but that information was not readily available. In future studies,

it would be recommended these demographics are acquired and included in the description of study participants as a means of comparison to the sample. According to the CSWE (2016), White, non-Hispanic students amounted to approximately 55% of full-time MSW students in the United States in 2016. Using this statistic as a guideline, either non-White students were underrepresented in our study, or they have a sub-average enrollment at IUSSW in comparison to nationwide MSW enrollments.

We must also acknowledge the occurrence of systematic error within the study. Though the anonymity of an online survey reduces its potential for occurrence, the possibility of social desirability bias in survey responses is worth discussing. As professional social workers are supposed to engage in ethnically and culturally-sensitive practice (Barker, 2014; NASW, 2008), participants might have answered certain questions in a way that would reflect positively on them as social work students (Rubin & Babbie, 2017). In other words, students' responses might have been less reflective of their true beliefs and experiences toward cultural diversity, and more so grounded upon what they feel they are expected to believe as future social work professionals.

Lastly, we must address the very low internal consistency reliability of the acceptance scale (Cronbach's $\alpha = .193$). As acceptance was the strongest predictor of perception scores, with such a poor internal consistency score, we may not be accurately relating the impact of acceptance on perceptions of cultural diversity in the learning space. It is suggested that the low Cronbach's alpha for the acceptance scale might be due to four of the seven items being negatively worded (and reverse scored).

References

- Abell, M. L., Manuel, J., & Schoeneman, A. (2015). Student attitudes towards religious diversity and implications for multicultural competence. *Journal of Religion and Spirituality in Social Work, 34*(1), 91-104.
- Abu-Bader, S. H. (2016). *Advanced and multivariate statistical methods for social science research*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Ando, S. (2017). Teaching note –inclusion of diversity content in MSW curriculum using a diversity event. *Journal of Social Work Education, 53*(1), 72-78.
- Ansell, A. E. (2013). *Race and ethnicity: The key concepts*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Association of American Colleges and Universities. (2005). *Making excellence inclusive: Diversity, inclusion and institutional renewal*. Retrieved from August 8, 2008, from http://www.aacy,irg/inclusive_excellence/index.cfm
- Baker, D. L., Schmaling, K., Fountain, K. C., Blume, A. W., & Boose, R. (2016). Defining diversity: A mixed-method analysis of terminology in faculty applications. *The Social Science Journal, 53*(1), 60-66.
- Balcazar, F., Suarez-Balcazar, Y., Taylor-Ritzer, T., Rodakowski, J., Willis, C., & Portillo, N. (2009). Cultural competence assessment instrument. University of Illinois at Chicago. Retrieved from <http://ccbmdr.ahslabs.uic.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/2014/04/CCAI.pdf>
- Barker, R. L. (2014). *The social work dictionary* (6th ed.). Washington, DC: NASW Press.

Bender, K., Negi, N., & Fowler, D. N. (2010). Exploring the relationship between self-awareness and student commitment and understanding of culturally responsive social work practice. *Journal of ethnic & cultural diversity in social work, 19*(1), 34-53.

Chen, J. M., & Hamilton, D. L. (2015). Understanding diversity: The importance of social acceptance. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 41*(4), 586-598.

Council of Social Work Education (CSWE). (1998). *Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards (EPAS)*. Retrieved September 25, 2009, from <http://www.cswe.org><http://www.cswe.org>

Council of Social Work Education (CSWE). (2008). *Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards (EPAS)*. Retrieved September 25, 2009, from <http://www.cswe.org><http://www.cswe.org>

Council of Social Work Education (CSWE). (2012). *Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards (EPAS)*. Retrieved September 25, 2009, from <http://www.cswe.org><http://www.cswe.org>

Council on Social Work Education [CSWE]. (2015). *Council on social work education: 2015 educational policy and accreditation standards for baccalaureate and master's social work programs*. Retrieved from https://www.cswe.org/getattachment/Accreditation/Accreditation-Process/2015-EPAS/2015EPAS_Web_FINAL.pdf.aspx

Council on Social Work Education [CSWE]. (2016). *2016 statistics on social work education in the United States: A summary of the CSWE annual survey of social work programs.*

Retrieved from <https://www.cswe.org/CMSPages/GetFile.aspx?guid=6e8bc9e7-ebd6-4288-bc7a-d2d427d68480>

Cournoyer, B. R. (2016). *The social work skills workbook.* Cengage Learning.

Dichter, M. E., & Cnaan, R. A. (2010). The benefits of learning social welfare: Lessons from student perspectives. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work, 30*, 210-224.

Diversity. (2013). In *Merriam-Webster.com*. Retrieved from <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/diversity>

Drabble, L., Sen, S., & Oppenheimer, S. Y. (2012). Integrating a transcultural perspective into the social work curriculum: A descriptive and exploratory study. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work, 32*, 204-221.

Early, T. J., Vonk, M. E., & Kondrat, M. E. (2003). Translating concept into act for multicultural practice: Comparison of students' and field instructors' perceptions of diversity training effectiveness. *Advances in Social Work, 4*(1), 34-45.

Emami, A., & Safipour, J. (2013). Constructing a questionnaire for assessment of awareness and acceptance of diversity in healthcare institutions. *BMC Health Services Research, 13*(145), 1-10.

Erbaş, İ. (2013). Perception of Cultural Diversity. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies, 2*(11), 186.

- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Buchner, A., & Lang, A.-G. (2009). Statistical power analyses using G*Power 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analyses. *Behavior Research Methods, 41*, 1149-1160.
- Flaherty, C., Ely, G. E., Akers, L. S., Dignan, M., & Noland, T. B. (2012). Social work student attitudes toward contraception and the HPV vaccine. *Social Work in Health Care, 51*(4), 361-381.
- Frippant, D., & Marquis, N. (2010). Web survey in the social sciences: An overview. *Population, 65*(2), 285-311.
- Fuertes, J. N., Miville, M. L., Mohr, J. J., Sedlacek, W. E., & Gretchen, D. (2000). Factor structure and short form of the Miville-Guzman Universality-Diversity Scale. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 33*, 157-169.
- Garcia, B., & Soest, D. V. (1997). Changing perceptions of diversity and oppression: MSW students discuss the effects of a required course. *Journal of Social Work Education, 33*(1), 119-120.
- Gasker, J. & Vafeas, J. (2003). Starting where the student is: Adapting social justice curricula to poverty attitudes. *The Journal of Baccalaureate Social Work, 9*(1), 93-112.
- Herda-Hipps, P., Westhuis, D. J., & Diehl, D. S. (2001). Student responses to human diversity course and teaching diversity. *Journal of Comparative Social Welfare, 17*(1), 25-35.
- Hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York, NY: Routledge.

- Karout, N., Abdelaziz, S. H., Goda, M., AlTuwaijri, S., Almostafa, N., Ashour, R., & Alradi, H. (2013). Cultural diversity: A qualitative study on Saudi Arabian women's experience and perception of maternal health services. *Journal of Nursing Education and Practice*, 3(11), 172.
- King, E. B., Gulick, L. M., & Avery, D. R. (2010). The divide between diversity training and diversity education: Integrating best practices. *Journal of Management Education*, 34(6), 891-906.
- King, P. M., & Shuford, B. C. (1996). A multicultural view is a more cognitively complex view: Cognitive development and multicultural education. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 40(2), 153-164.
- Kondrat, M. E. (1999). Who is the “self” in self-aware: Professional self-awareness from a critical theory perspective. *Social Service Review*, 73, 451–477. doi:10.1086/514441
- Loden, M. (1996). *Implementing diversity* (p. 16). Chicago, IL: Irwin
- Loden, M. (2012). Primary & secondary diversity dimensions . Retrieved from <http://www.loden.com/Site/Dimensions.html>
- Lum, D. (1999). Culturally competent practice: A framework for growth and action. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Miehls, D., & Moffatt, K. (2000). Constructing social work identity based in the reflexive self. *British Journal of Social Work*, 30, 339–348. doi:10.1093/bjsw/30.3.339

Miville, M. L., Gelso, C. J., Pannu, L. W., Touradji, P., Holloway, P., & Fuertes, J. (1999).

Appreciating similarities and valuing differences: The Miville-Guzman Universality Diversity Scale. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 46*, 291-207.

Nadan, Y. (2016). Teaching Note—Revisiting Stereotypes: Enhancing Cultural Awareness

Through a Web-Based Tool. *Journal of Social Work Education, 52*(1), 50-56

National Association of Social Workers. (2008). *Code of ethics*. Washington, DC: Author.

Niemann, Y. F., Romero, A., & Arbona, C. (2000). Effects of cultural orientation on the

perception of conflict between relationship and education goals for Mexican American college students. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 22*(1), 46-63.

Osteen, P. J., Vanidestine, T. J., & Sharpe, T. L. (2013). Multicultural curriculum and MSW

students' attitudes about race and diversity. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work, 33*, 111-128.

Phillips, A., Quinn, A., & Heitkamp, T. (2010). Who wants to do rural social work? Student

perceptions of rural social work practice. *Contemporary Rural Social Work, 2*(1), 51-65.

Qualtrics [Online survey apparatus]. Provo, UT: Qualtrics Labs, Inc.

Rew, L., Becker, H., Cookston, J., Khosropour, S., & Martinez, S. (2003). Measuring cultural

awareness in nursing students. *Journal of Nursing Education, 42*(6), 249-257.

Ringstad, R. (2014). Political diversity among social work students. *Journal of Social Work*

Values and Ethics, 11(2), 13-22.

Rubin, A., & Babbie, E. R. (2017). *Research methods for social work* (9th ed.). Boston, MA:

Cengage.

- Saleh, M. F., Anngela-Cole, L., & Boateng, A. (2011). Effectiveness of diversity infusion modules on students' attitudes, behavior, and knowledge. *Journal of Ethnic And Cultural Diversity in Social Work, 20*(3), 240-257.
- Samura, M. (2017). A tale of two settings: Rethinking methods and approaches for diversity research. *Humboldt Journal of Social Relations, 39*(39), 43-50.
- Schneider, C. G. (2000). Diversity requirements. *Liberal Education, 86*, 2-3.
- Shepherd, J. (2003). Learning from the experts: Teaching diversity content and the politics of solidarity through a cultural immersion experience. *The Journal of Baccalaureate Social Work, 9*(1), 41-58.
- Soest, V. D. (1996) Impact of social work education on student attitudes and behavior concerning oppression, *Journal of Social Work Education, 32*(2), 191–203. ^{[[[}SEP]
- Swank, E., Asada, H., & Lott, J. (2001). Student acceptance of a multicultural education: Exploring the role of a social work curriculum, demographics, and symbolic racism. *Journal of Ethnic and Cultural Diversity in Social Work, 10*(2), 85-103
- Vogt, W. P., & Johnson, R. B. (2016). *The Sage dictionary of statistics and methodology: A nontechnical guide for the social sciences*. (5th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Voorhis, R. M. V., & Hostetter, C. (2006). The impact of MSW education on social worker empowerment and commitment to client empowerment through social justice advocacy. *Journal of Social Work Education, 42*(1), 105 – 121.

- Vornholt, K., Uitdewilligen, S., & Nijhuis, F. J. (2013). Factors affecting the acceptance of people with disabilities at work: a literature review. *Journal of occupational rehabilitation*, 23(4), 463-475
- Warde, B. (2012). The cultural genogram: Enhancing the cultural competency of social work students. *Social Work Education*, 31(5), 570-58.
- Warner, R. M. (2008). *Applied statistics: From bivariate through multivariate techniques*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

*Appendix A: Survey***Awareness, Acceptance, and Perceptions of Cultural Diversity for MSW Students (AAP-CD)**

I am a current master of social work (MSW) student enrolled at Indiana University School of Social Work (IUSSW).

- Yes
- No

[If “no” option is selected, participant will be taken to the end of the survey, and no additional questions will be asked.]

Q-1 What is your gender identity?

- Female
- Male
- Trans male/Trans man
- Trans female/Trans woman
- Gender queer/gender non-conforming
- Different identity (please state): _____
- I prefer not to say

Q-2 Do you consider yourself to be:

- Heterosexual or straight
- Lesbian
- Gay
- Bisexual
- Sexually fluid
- Other (please state): _____
- I prefer not to say

Q-3 What is your age?

Q-4 What race(s) do you identify with?

- Black or African American
- White
- Other (please state): _____

Q-5 Please indicate your ethnicity (e.g. which group do you feel part of based upon a shared ancestry, color, language, and/or religion). Please select all that apply to you.

- Black or African American
- Hispanic
- Latina/Latino
- Puerto Rican
- American Indian

- Alaska Native
- Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
- Caribbean
- Middle Eastern
- Arab or Arab American
- African (please state country): _____
- Asian Indian
- Chinese
- Korean
- Japanese
- Filipino
- Vietnamese
- Guamanian or Chamorro
- Samoan
- Western European
- Eastern European
- Other (please state): _____
- I identify with no ethnicity
- I prefer not to say

Q-6 What is your spiritual or religious affiliation?

- Islam
- Judaism
- Christianity
- Hinduism
- Sikhism
- Chinese Traditional
- Agnosticism
- Atheism
- Other (please state): _____
- I prefer not to say

Q-7 Are you an international student?

- Yes
- No

Q-8 Is English your primary language?

- Yes
- No

↳ **Q9** What other language(s) do you regularly speak? (Please list):

The following series of questions will ask about your educational history and current standing in the MSW program.

Q-10 What was your major in college? (In other words, in what discipline did you earn your undergraduate degree?) Please select two (2) disciplines if you double-majored.

- Social work (BSW)
- Psychology
- Sociology
- Anthropology
- Gender Studies
- Political Science
- History
- Philosophy
- Natural Science (e.g. biology, chemistry, physics, etc.)
- English Literature
- Cultural Studies (e.g. African American Studies)
- Modern Language
- Human Resources
- Business of Marketing
- Other (please state): _____

Q-11 Have you had any work experience in a social work-related field prior to starting the MSW program?

- Yes
- No

↳ **Q12** Are you continuing to work in a social work related field during your MSW program?

- Yes
- No

↳ **Q13** As of today, how much experience have you had working in a social work related field?

- less than 6 months
- 6-11 months
- 1 -2 years
- 3-5 years
- 6-10 years
- 11-15 years
- 15+ years

Q-14 On what campus are you completing your MSW program?

- IUPUI (Indianapolis)
- IU East (Richmond)
- IU Northwest (Gary)
- IU South Bend
- IU Bloomington
- IU Fort Wayne
- IU Southeast

Q-15 Have you decided on a practice area concentration (e.g. children, youth, & families; health)?

- Yes
- No

↳ **Q16** What practice area have you chosen as your concentration in the MSW program?

- Children, Youth & Families
- Health
- Leadership
- Mental Health & Addictions
- Schools

Q-17 I am a:

- Full-time student
- Part-time student

Q-18 In the MSW program, I hold:

- Advanced Standing (I completed a BSW in the past five years)
- Regular Standing student

Q-19 As of today, how many semesters have you completed in your MSW program?

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9

The following three questions will ask you about your experience in diversity training.

Q-20 Which of the following types of training did you receive on cultural diversity prior to your MSW coursework at IUSSW? (Please check all that apply.)

- a required college course that focused on diversity
- an elective college course that focused on diversity
- in various college classes
- during my college fieldwork practicum
- Continuing Education (CEUs), such as post-college workshops or courses
- reading on my own about this topic
- work-related (e.g. an in-service or presentation on cultural diversity)
- community or religious training
- I have no formal training on diversity

Q-21 Have you completed S-600, “Diversity, Human Rights, and Social Justice” as part of your MSW coursework at IUSSW?

- Yes
 - No
- ↳ **Q-22** Are you very interested, somewhat interested, slightly interested, slightly uninterested, somewhat uninterested, or very uninterested in the opportunity to take S-600, “Diversity, Human Rights, and Social Justice” as part of your MSW coursework?
- Very interested
 - Somewhat interested
 - Slightly interested
 - Slightly uninterested
 - Somewhat uninterested
 - Very uninterested

The following section will ask you about your opinion on cultural diversity regarding race and ethnicity. Please mark whether you (1) *strongly agree*; (2) *agree*; (3) *somewhat agree*; (4) *somewhat disagree*; (5) *disagree*; or (6) *strongly disagree* for each statement listed below.

23. I think my beliefs are influenced by my culture.
24. I think my behaviors are influenced by my culture.
25. I often reflect on how culture affects others’ beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors.
26. I believe social workers’ own cultural beliefs influence their practice decisions.
27. I think MSW students’ cultural values influence their classroom behaviors (e.g. asking questions, participating in groups, offering comments).
28. I often feel a sense of kinship with persons from different cultural groups.
29. Becoming aware of the experiences of people from culturally diverse groups is very important to me.
30. When I have an opportunity to help someone, I am more likely to offer assistance to individuals of certain cultural backgrounds.
31. I am less patient with individuals of certain cultural backgrounds.
32. I feel comfortable working with people of all cultural groups.
33. I typically feel somewhat uncomfortable when I am in the company of people from cultural backgrounds different from my own.
34. I have become more comfortable interacting with people from diverse cultural groups as a result of my MSW coursework.
35. Getting to know someone of another race, culture, or ethnicity is generally an uncomfortable experience for me.
36. I am only at ease with people of my own culture, ethnicity, or race.
37. The instructors in my MSW program adequately address issues surrounding cultural diversity in social work.
38. This school of social work provides opportunities for activities related to cultural diversity.
39. Since entering the MSW program, my understanding of issues surrounding cultural diversity has increased.
40. My experiences in the MSW program have helped me become knowledgeable about the bio-psycho-social concerns associated with culturally diverse groups.
41. I have noticed that my MSW instructors call on students from minority cultural groups when issues related to their group come up in class.
42. My MSW program instructors seem comfortable discussing issues surrounding cultural diversity in the classroom.

43. My MSW program instructors seem interested in learning how their classroom behaviors may discourage students from certain cultural groups.
44. I believe the classroom experiences at this social work school help MSW students become more comfortable interacting with people from different cultures.
45. I believe some aspects of the classroom environment at this social work school may alienate students from culturally diverse backgrounds.
46. I feel that MSW program instructors respect differences in individuals from culturally diverse backgrounds.
47. My MSW program instructors model behaviors that are sensitive to issues of cultural diversity.
48. My MSW program instructors use examples and/or case studies that incorporate information from various cultural and ethnic groups.

For the following questions, please provide your response.

Q-49 What are two to three (2-3) things IUSSW is doing well regarding cultural diversity?

Q-50 What are two to three (2-3) things IUSSW can improve on regarding cultural diversity?

Thank you for your participation in this survey. If you are interested in entering the random drawing for one of two \$15 Target gift cards, follow the link for the drawing in the email alerting you to this survey. Once you follow the link, you will be prompted to enter your email and the following code: SW9876.

Table 1
Participant demographic profile: Descriptive statistics and frequencies (N=146)

Variables	<i>n</i>	% (Valid %)	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Age	142	(100.00%)	22	59	31.94	9.03
Gender						
Female	131	89.7%				
Male	11	7.5%				
Trans male/Trans man	1	0.7%				
Gender queer or non-conforming	2	1.4%				
Different identity	1	0.7%				
Total	146	100%				
Sexuality						
Heterosexual/straight	122	(85.3%)				
Lesbian	4	(2.8%)				
Gay	1	(0.7%)				
Bisexual	10	(7.0%)				
Sexually fluid	3	(2.1%)				
Other	3	(2.1%)				
Total	143	(100%)				
Racial-Ethnic Identity						
non-White	28	(19.6%)				
White	115	(80.4%)				
Total	143	(100%)				
MSW Practice Area Concentration						
Children, Youth, & Families	20	(16.8%)				
Health	18	(15.1%)				
Leadership	14	(11.8%)				
Mental Health & Addictions	55	(46.2%)				
Schools	12	(10.1%)				
Total	119	(100%)				
Social Justice Education						
Completed course	56	38.4%				
Did not complete course	90	61.6%				
Total	146	100%				
Enrollment Status						
Full-time	62	(42.8)				
Part-time	83	(57.2)				
Total	145	(100%)				
Undergraduate Degree						
BSW degree	54	37.0				
Other bachelor degree	92	63.0				
Total	146	100.0				
Number of Diversity Trainings per-MSW¹						
0	3	2.1				

1	30	20.5				
2	27	18.5				
3	30	20.5				
4	30	20.5				
5	12	8.2				
6	6	4.1				
7	7	4.8				
8	1	.7				
Total	146	100.0	0	8	3.06	1.75

¹Types of diversity trainings prior to MSW: required college course; elective college course; various college classes; college fieldwork practicum; continuing education units; personal reading; work-related; community or religious training

Table 2
Descriptive statistics for Student Scores on the Awareness, Acceptance, and Perception Scales

Variables	<i>n</i>	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Awareness	144	25	42	34.92	3.28
Acceptance	144	23	40	31.99	3.35
Perception	142	15	72	53.83	9.38
Perception ^a	142	1	8	4.25	1.04

^a Reflection, square root transformed

Table 3
Descriptive Statistics and Correlations Between the Variables (N = 132)

	M	SD	Perception	Age	Race	BSW status	Awareness	Acceptance	Diversity training	Social Justice course
Perception ^a	4.27	1.06	1.00	.121	-.005	-.116	.122	-.271**	.069	-.169*
Age	32.05	9.02	.121	1.00	-.278**	-.156*	.076	-.021	-.150*	-.013
Race	.79	.41	-.005	-.278**	1.00	-.007	-.049	-.195*	.155*	.053
BSW status	.39	.49	-.116	-.156	-.007	1.00	-.166*	-.045	-.040	-.352***
Awareness	34.95	3.23	.122	.076	-.049	-.166*	1.00	.101	.130	.047
Acceptance	32.16	3.20	-.271**	-.021	-.195*	-.045	.101	1.00	.025	-.004
Diversity Training	3.01	1.71	.069	-.150*	.155*	-.040	.130	.025	1.00	-.086
Social Justice course	.37	.49	-.169	-.013	.053	-.352***	.047	-.004	-.086	1.00

^a Reflection, square root transformed, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 4
 Multiple Regression Analysis – Predictor of Perception of Cultural Diversity in the Learning Space^b ($N = 132$)

Model	Factor	R	R^{2a}	β	t	p	F	P
1	Acceptance	.27	.07	-.28	-3.43	<.01	10.27	<.01
2	Acceptance Social Justice Course	.32	.10	-.25	-2.81	<.01	7.33	<.01
3	Acceptance Social Justice Course BSW Status	.38	.14	-.22	-2.46	<.05	7.09	<.001

^a Adjusted $R^2 = .12$

^b Square root of *Perception*