

SCHOOL TEACHERS' KNOWLEDGE AND SELF-EFFICACY FOR PERFORMING
BEHAVIORS RECOMMENDED FOR WORK WITH DIVERSE STUDENTS:
EXPLORING MICROAGGRESSIONS, CULTURAL HUMILITY, PERCEIVED
RACISM, AND COPING AS PREDICTORS OF SCHOOL CLIMATE

by

Renée LeeHim

Dissertation Committee:

Professor Barbara C. Wallace, Sponsor
Professor Robert E. Fullilove

Approved by the Committee on
the Degree of Doctor of Education

Date 30 June 2021

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education in
Teachers College, Columbia University

2021

ABSTRACT

SCHOOL TEACHERS' KNOWLEDGE AND SELF-EFFICACY FOR PERFORMING BEHAVIORS RECOMMENDED FOR WORK WITH DIVERSE STUDENTS: EXPLORING MICROAGGRESSIONS, CULTURAL HUMILITY, PERCEIVED RACISM, AND COPING AS PREDICTORS OF SCHOOL CLIMATE

Renée LeeHim

There is a need for professional development for teachers that equips them for working with diverse students and creating supportive school climates. This pilot study (N=55) with K-12 teachers sought to identify predictors of a high school climate rating. The teachers were 78.2% (N=43) female, 81.8% U.S. born (N=45), 45.5% White (N=25), 30.9% Black (N=17), 14.5% Latinx (N=8), and 7.3% Asian (N=3). The teachers had moderately high knowledge and closest to moderately high self-efficacy for performing key behaviors deemed essential for working effectively with diverse students. Teachers reported experiencing (pre-pandemic) a school climate closest to moderately supporting, engaging, valuing, fairly disciplining, affirming, reflecting empathy for, and serving as a safe space for students from varied cultural backgrounds. Findings showed that about half the teachers or more had any experience of microaggressions that seemed related to their personal demographics or appearance while in school settings—pre-pandemic. Further, *about three-quarters of teachers or more* had any experience of witnessing microaggressions happening to students in school settings, pre-pandemic.

Teachers had a *moderately high level of cultural humility*—as well as a *high level of ability to perceive racism and oppression*—whether when happening to one's self or others. Further, teachers were *closest to the action stage for taking action to cope and respond to racism and oppression* (i.e., for < 6 months).

As a pilot study with a small sample size, findings are tentative at best. Backward stepwise regression, while controlling for social desirability found significant predictors of the **study outcome variable of a higher rating of school climate** (pre-pandemic), as follows: **Male** sex (B=1.609, P=.001); **Higher** Annual Household Income (B=.478, P=.041); **Higher** Level of Education (B=2.090, P=.000); **Higher** Rating of Mental Health Status (B=.747, P=.000), and **Lower** Stage of Change for Coping and Responding to Racism and Oppression (B=-.387, P=.012)—accounting for 58.1% of the variance [R² = (0.628), Adjusted R²= (0.581)]

The study offered recommendations for using tools from this study in assessing teachers in schools, and then matching teachers or schools to professional development activities. Future research has also been recommended, ideally, post-pandemic, and involving a larger sample.

© Copyright Renée LeeHim 2021

All Rights Reserved

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I believe educators are superheroes. I am grateful to the teachers who not only completed this survey, but also continue to show up and support their students every day. Fortunately, I have had many great teachers contribute to my success, including the following people for whom I would like to express immense gratitude:

Granny: My first teacher, the matriarch of my family, and the woman responsible for cultivating my curiosity and nurturing my love of learning. Simply put, this degree is for you.

Mommy: Your presence in my life incessantly reminds me...”*But still, like air, I’ll rise.*” You singlehandedly make the impossible possible – thanks for your unconditional love, empathy, and sunshine.

Shane: My first—and favourite—best friend. Thank you for your quiet voice and big heart—they make me a better listener.

Simone: I watched in awe as you took your first breath, and every day since then, you continue to amaze me. I look forward to watching how you will harness your intellect, leadership, and activism to change the world.

Dylan: Watching your brilliance blossom in your first year on earth has indeed been a blessing—you embody Black Girl Magic.

Barnes: Thank you for opening your home—and—hearts—to me.

Auntie Charmain and Uncle Ian: You have taught me that love transcends blood and borders—I am fortunate that you are family.

Dr. Barbara Wallace: Your tenacious teachings afforded me a second chance to fight for a life of impact that matters. I hope the life I aspire to achieve will mean our collective community will know true justice and freedom.

Dr. Robert Fullilove: You connect all things professional to the personal. I admire your profound ability to empathically educate and empower all those you teach.

RGHD (+Erin): Together, we are most powerful when we are “calm, centered, and balanced.”

This dissertation represents the culmination of my formal education. My access to a high-quality education is an immeasurable privilege that is too frequently denied to millions of children of color. I promise—with humility and optimism—to use my privilege, power, and passion to continue the mission our Black Revolutionary leaders started: dismantling systems of oppression and racial inequities to ensure adequate education is attainable to all.

R. L.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Chapter I: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Approaches to School Climate	1
Rise in White Supremacy and Broader Societal Trends.....	3
From Cultural Competence to Cultural Humility.....	8
Stereotypes, Implicit Bias, and Prejudicial Behavior	8
Stereotypes, Bias, and Disproportionate Punishment of Black Students	9
Need for Culturally Relevant Pedagogies and Teacher Training.....	11
Critical Race Theory (CRT) and Education Policies.....	16
The Theory of Racism and Microaggressions	18
Statement of the Problem	19
Purpose of the Study.....	20
Research Questions, Survey Parts, and Data Analysis Plan	20
Treatment of the Data	22
Anticipated Findings	22
Delimitations	23
Limitations.....	24
Conclusion.....	25
 Chapter II: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	 26
I. The Theory of Racism, Microaggressions, and Related Research.....	26
II. Critical Race Theory and Relevant Research Findings	30
III. Racial Stereotyping, Identity, Hostile School Climates, and Related Research	33
IV. Need for Structural, Systemic, and Institutional Change: Research and Scholarship Relevant to the School-to-Prison Pipeline.....	36
V. Perceived Racism, Discrimination, Stress and Coping, Health Impacts— And Relevant Research	42
Focus on Youth Coping with Stress and Trauma—Research Findings	43
VI. Research on Transforming Schools Toward Greater Cultural Competence and Improving School Climates	46
Cultural Competence and Cultural Humility.....	46
School Research on Achieving Cultural Competence and Cultural Humility.....	46
Research on Changing the School Climate	48
The Concept of Self-Efficacy and Relevant Research	49
The Stages of Change Concept and Relevant Findings.....	52
Conclusion.....	54
 Chapter III: METHODS	 56
Overview of The Study Design and Procedures.....	56
IRB Approval.....	56
Recruitment of Study Participants.....	57

Additional Study Procedures	58
Study Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria.....	58
Generating Prizes: The Study Incentive for Participation	59
The Study Sample.....	59
Description of Research Instrumentation	61
Part I: Basic Demographics (BD-14)	61
Part II: Personal Health Background (PHB-2)	61
Part III: Single Item Rating of Risk of Providing Socially Desirable Responses (SIR-RPSDR-1)	61
Part IV: Knowledge and Self-Efficacy for 8 Key Behaviors for Teaching Diverse Students (KS-8-BTDS-SCR-16)	62
Part V: Rating the School Climate (RSC-1)	63
Part VI: Rating for Cultural Humility (RCH-1)	63
Part VII: Microaggressions in School Settings Experienced by Personnel and Witnessed Happening to Students (MSS-EBPAWHT-12).....	64
Part VIII: Perceptions of Racism and Oppression Scale (PROS-10)	65
Part IX: Coping and Responding to Racism and Oppression Staging Scale (CRROSS-7)	65
Data Analysis and Management	66
Data Analysis Plan.....	66
Data Management.....	68
Conclusion	68
 Chapter IV: RESULTS	 69
Data Analysis Results by Study Question	69
Results for Research Question #1	69
Part I: Basic Demographics (BD-14)	69
Results for Research Question #2.....	73
Part II: Personal Health Background (PHB-2)	73
Results for Research Question #3.....	74
Part III: Single Item Rating of Risk of Providing Socially Desirable Responses (SIR-RPSDR-1)	74
Results for Research Question #4.....	75
Part IV: Knowledge and Self-Efficacy for 8 Key Behaviors for Teaching Diverse Students (KS-8-BTDS-SCR-16).....	75
Results for Research Question #5.....	80
Part V: Rating the School Climate (RSC-1)	80
Results for Research Question #6.....	81
Part VI: Rating for Cultural Humility (RCH-1)	81
Results for Research Question #7.....	82
Part VII: Microaggressions in School Settings Experienced by Personnel and Witnessed Happening to Students (MSS-EBPAWHT-12).....	82
Results for Research Question #8.....	87
Part VIII: Perceptions of Racism and Oppression Scale (PROS-10)	87

Results for Research Question #9.....	89
Part IX: Coping and Responding to Racism and Oppression	
Staging Scale (CRROSS-7).....	89
Results for Research Question #10.....	91
Pearson’s Correlations	91
Independent T-Tests.....	92
Results for Research Question #11.....	93
Backward Stepwise Regression.....	93
Conclusion.....	96

Chapter V: SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS,

AND CONCLUSION.....	97
Summary of Literature Review	97
Summary of Statement of the Problem	100
Summary of Purpose of the Study.....	100
Summary of the Research Questions.....	101
Summary of Anticipated Findings.....	102
Summary of Research Sample and Procedures	102
Summary of Research Instrumentation	103
Summary of Data Management and Data Analysis	104
Summary of Results of Data Analysis.....	104
Findings #1: As Teachers of Diverse Students, What are Their Characteristics and the Characteristics of their Schools?.....	104
Findings #2: As Teachers of Diverse Students, How Well are They Performing, What are They Experiencing and Witnessing, and What are They Bringing to the Task?.....	105
Knowledge.....	105
Self-Efficacy	106
Ratings of School Climate.....	106
Frequency of Personally Experiencing Microaggressions	106
Frequency of Witnessing Microaggressions Against Students.....	107
Cultural Humility.....	108
Level of Ability for Perceiving Racism and Oppression.....	108
Stage of Change for Taking Action to Cope and Respond to Racism and Oppression	108
Findings #3: What Factors Were Found to be Associated with and Predictive of a High Rating of School Climate?	108
Pearson's Correlations	108
Backward Stepwise Regression.....	109
Discussion of Results	109
Discussion of Findings #1: As Teachers of Diverse Students, What are Their Characteristics and the Characteristics of Their Schools?.....	109
Characteristics of Teachers	109
Characteristics of Schools	111

Discussion of Findings #2: As Teachers of Diverse Students, How Well are They Performing, What are They Experiencing and Witnessing, and What are They Bringing to the Task?.....	111
Comparison of Knowledge Scales and Findings.....	111
Comparison of Self-Efficacy Scales and Findings.....	112
Comparative Findings on Ratings of School Climate.....	113
Comparisons for Microaggressions.....	113
Observations on Cultural Humility.....	114
Comparisons for Level of Ability for Perceiving Racism and Oppression.....	114
Comparisons for Stage of Change for Taking Action to Cope and Respond to Racism and Oppression.....	115
Discussion of Findings #3: What Factors Were Found to be Associated with and Predictive of a High Rating of School Climate?	115
Implications and Recommendations.....	117
Limitations.....	119
Conclusion.....	120

REFERENCES	124
------------------	-----

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Letter of IRB Approval	135
Appendix B: The Study E-Mail.....	136
Appendix C: The Study Text/Tweet	137
Appendix D: Informed Consent and Participant’s Rights	138
Appendix E: Screening Survey	143
Appendix F: The Study Survey	144

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Comparing Survey Completers to Non-Completers via Independent T-Tests.....	60
2	Basic Demographics (BD-14)	70
3	Personal Health Background (M-PHB-5)	74
4	Single Item Rating of Risk of Providing Socially Desirable Responses (SIRRPSDR-1)	75
5	Knowledge and Self-Efficacy for 8 Key Behaviors for Teaching Diverse Students (KS-8- BTDS-SCR-16)	76
6	Rating the School Climate (RSC-1)	81
7	Rating for Cultural Humility (RCH-1)	82
8-A	Personally Experienced Microaggression (MSS-EBPAWHT-12).....	83
8-B	Microaggressions in School Settings Witnessed Happening to Students (MSSEBPAWHT-12).....	86
9	Perception of Racism and Oppression Scale (PROS-10).....	88
10	Coping and Responding to Racism and Oppression Staging Scale (CRROSS-7).....	90
11	Correlations Between Selected Variables and Rating of School Climate	92
12	Independent T-Tests Comparing Dichotomous Groups for Rating of School Climate	93
13	Backward Stepwise Regression Predicting Higher Rating of School Climate	96

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

According to Blitz et al. (2020), historical and structural oppression contribute to concentrated poverty, trauma, and racism within urban communities and society as something critical to understanding school climates in urban schools. School climate refers to the quality and character of school life, while being based on “patterns of people’s experiences of school life and reflects norms, goals, values, interpersonal relationships, teaching and learning practices, and organizational structures” (Cohen et al., 2009, p. 182).

Improving school climates requires educators to embrace color-consciousness, “to learn about the racial reality of people of color and understand the influence of overt and covert forms of racism in the routine experiences of students of color and their families (Blitz & et al., 2020, p. 118). Recommendations to cultivate healthy school climates included trauma-informed methods, which offer “ways to understand the impact of trauma on school climate” and provide “guidance for schools to promote healing and resilience for all members of the school community” (p. 115).

Approaches to School Climate

School teachers of color in urban schools are subject to the “persistence of hostile racial climates—environments that are steeped with racial inequity and racism on both institutional and interpersonal levels” (Kohli, 2016, p. 309). Two themes of interpersonal

racism identified were colorblindness and racial microaggressions. Teachers of color experience manifestations of institutional and individual racism when faced with relentless oppression, increased stress, and retention. Hostile racial climates contributed “to the stress and dissatisfaction” of teachers of color, requiring paradigm shifts in urban schools to promote inclusive, racial justice orientated communities (Kohli, 2016, pp. 327-328).

Cohen et al. (2009) examined prior school climate research concerning educational policies, school improvement practices, and teacher education experiences (p. 181). Four themes emerged from the synthesized research deemed essential to school climate, Safety, Teaching and Learning, Relationships, and Environmental-Structural (p. 184). While a variety of prior research was reviewed to assess school climate, the research did not discuss school diversity, racial or ethnic dynamics, or school integration policies (Cohen et al., 2009).

The historical racialization of public schools centered on whiteness and dehumanizing conditions for communities of color contributes to contemporary racial disparities and racial hierarchies in K-12 schools (Pizarro & Kohli, 2020, p. 970). Further, hostile racial climates of K-12 schools are detrimental to the psychological and emotional well-being of both students and teachers of color. Findings suggest the following:

[The] macro and microaggressions that teachers of Color experience occur on multiple levels simultaneously. Institutional racism is embedded into the structures, policies, and functions of schooling. Layered on top of this is the racism that teachers experience directly.... While witnessing racism can be hurtful and emotionally taxing for any caring teacher, racism can be particularly impactful for teachers of Color who have suffered parallel experiences with racism, and/or feel a racial or cultural connection and commitment to students. (Pizarro & Kohli, 2020, p. 971)

Teachers of color reported the “experience with racial subordination was exhausting and debilitating, and often led to a pushout from the profession,” particularly when having to confront injustices or racial microaggressions (Blitz et al., 2020, p. 976).

Recommendations to improve hostile racial climates in K-12 schools include focusing on the historical context of racial injustices, as well as confronting the psychological, emotional, and physiological toll of racism on students and teachers of color (Blitz et al., 2020).

According to Souto-Manning and Emdin (2020), urban education programs often use terms like “social justice” and “diversity” to espouse a commitment to teachers and communities of color incongruent to the transformative practices and pursuit of justice (p. 27). Further, urban education programs can inflict intergenerational historical trauma detrimental to teachers of color. Findings showed that teachers of color experienced historical trauma in four ways: (1) overwhelming physical and psychological violence; (2) segregation and/or displacement; (3) economic deprivation; and, (4) cultural dispossession” (p. 11). Recommendations included urban education programs actualizing “social justice” and “diversity” through acknowledgment and reconciliation of historical traumas inflicted on teachers of color, including the psychological dominance of whiteness and whiteness as property contributing to past and present systems of oppression (Souto-Manning & Emdin, 2020).

Rise in White Supremacy and Broader Societal Trends

Orelus et al. (2020) point out how the presidency of Donald J. Trump has embraced white nationalism and overt racism, allowing these into mainstream politics,

while contributing to the marginalization and dehumanization of youth of color in American society. Educators are now “forced to face the historical truths of White supremacist ideology stoking fear of ‘others,’ and engage in dialogue, healing, and action toward greater justice (p. 92). The murders of Trayvon Martin, Tamir Rice, and Renisha McBride murders were racially motivated, for example. For, “they were all youth of color murdered by racially paranoid and racist individuals, acting upon White supremacist ideology that allows for apparent dehumanization of others (Orelus et al., 2020, p. 99).

There is also contemporary racial paranoia and racial distrust, which persists despite societal and institutional structures that have legally prohibited racial discrimination” (Orelus et al. 2020, p. 96). Racial paranoia is pervasive in the Trump era, as White individuals’ racism, stereotyping, and ‘othering,’ influences institutions like schools and the media. There are also racially discriminatory behaviors and acts of violence committed against people of color. Racial paranoia is thought to shape individuals and institutions like schools by providing an “understanding the workings of racist behaviors and ideologies” which operate daily in subtle ways that allow the ideology of White supremacy to become normalized (p. 106). The impact of Trump and White supremacist ideology includes increases in racially motivated hate crimes, and racialized police violence committed against Black youth are all contemporary forces which must also be considered (Orelus et al., 2020).

Although focused on college students of color, students of color reported experiencing an increase in racial microaggression and institutional racism on college campuses after the 2016 election of Donald J. Trump (Lewis et al., 2019). Findings showed an increase in reported racial incidents and hate crimes. Specifically, there was a

“258% increase in White supremacist propaganda on college campuses within the past year” (p. 18). Additional trends indicated that racial microaggressions contributed to students of color decreased sense of belonging and safety. Also reported were perceptions of White peers and faculty members being neither neutral or empathic, given the prevalence of microinsults, “othering,” and intellectual inferiority assumptions identified in classroom settings (Lewis et al., 2019, pp. 11-12).

There are serious implications for students of color in schools when discussions of race, racism, and White supremacy are not critically interrogated amongst the White teacher workforce as they “have the responsibility and power to enact a change” (Matias, 2016, p. 206). Further, what is discussed is “transference of abuse by whiteness,” as a concept to explain those who “deny the reality of a raced society and adopt a false colorblind society” (p. 199). Consequently, what is described as the projection of White teachers’ emotional fragilities, hypothetically can be projected onto students and professionals of color in school contexts and people of color more broadly. Individual repression becomes institutionalized, given the entirety of teacher training and teaching pipelines, perpetuating the silencing of race. Ultimately, institutions adopt “whiteness through dispelling ideas of benevolent saviority, adopting false racially coded terminologies, and denying an understanding of the White self by deflecting focus only to ‘the Other’” (Matias, 2016, p. 196).

There are also larger societal impacts that may be linked to the rise in White supremacy in the United States in recent years. For example, as per Emdin (2020), Black students in public schools across the United States are unlikely to attend school with White students given current resegregation trends and White parents’ unwillingness to

enroll their children in schools with minority group populations. In addition, “the alienation and dehumanization of Black youth in schools are the effects of being forced into utopia and dystopia binaries that position Black people as the cause and function of the conditions that ravage their communities” (p. 947). The stigma and misperceptions of urban schools and Black students are viewed through perpetual pessimism and dystopic view of urbaneness that maintains racial dominance, caste systems, and social stratification. Further, “simply by naming a school as urban signals to many (including teachers) that it is a Black school and the academic ability of the young people in the schools is questionable, that one’s safety is in danger, and violence is prevalent” (p. 949). Also, Black and poor communities experience gentrification when displaced by the ‘gentry’ or White affluent people who arrive in their communities to occupy or take over geographic locations previously seen as valueless (Emdin, 2020, p. 951).

Horsford (2019) examined “School Integration in the New Jim Crow: Opportunity or Oxymoron?” (p. 258). The focus is on how the historical legacy of America’s racial caste system has served as a foundational mechanism to inform present-day racialized structures, practices, and policies. Through Critical Race Theory analyses, the identified limitations to current integration research and efforts were identified. Thus, recommended approaches included theoretical frameworks to integrate Black research perspectives as well as critical analysis that deconstruct and identify manifestations of racial, political, economic, and socially embedded forces that impede school integration progress (Horsford, 2019).

Many fields, not just education, have contributed to structural racism by using Eurocentric frameworks. According to Caldwell and Bledsoe (2019), the field of

evaluation must recognize “its historical legacy as an enabler of structural racism” (p. 7). A much-needed goal is to become “more catalytic in reducing—and eradicating—the structural racism that remains persistent in its theory and practices” (p. 7). The power of evaluation lies in the use of data “in politics to frame decisions of policy and funding” (p. 11). Eurocentric frameworks continue to shape public discourse, as “power and privilege make it acceptable for issues to be defined, constructed, and implemented by social scientists who do not understand or value the context or life experiences of people of color” (Caldwell & Bledsoe, 2019, p. 8).

According to Bonilla-Silva (2019), racial justice is based on targeting “the economic motives, entrenched habits, and unconscious urges that sustain racial domination” and requires morally driven politics (p. 15). Because racial justice requires a long-term view, one must also imagine racial utopia and the specifics of a new racial world” (p. 15). Also, it is impossible for there to be mutuality and respect without empathy (p. 2). Further, “because Whites have been at the top of the racial hierarchy, they have displayed “emotional segregation” or a lack of empathy toward people of color” (p. 15). America’s deeply racialized social systems require that racialized emotions “cannot be properly analyzed without a structural understanding of racism” (p. 2). Thus, racialized social systems and power dynamics are similarly reinforced through the power and racialization of emotions and feelings given that “all individuals in racialized societies experience racialized emotions, but not all of their emotions are not considered equally” (p. 6). Also offered were suggestions applicable to educators and leaders in K-12 settings who want to “examine the impact of racialized emotions” and acknowledge the importance of the “multidimensional politics of inequality” (Bonilla-Silva, 2019, p. 11).

From Cultural Competence to Cultural Humility

Contemporary trends include promoting what is ideal in teachers, in contrast to what has been discussed so far: i.e., cultural humility. Many have acknowledged the importance of teacher training encompassing cultural humility (Branson, 2020; Haynes-Mendez & Engelsmeier, 2020; Lund & Liane, 2015; Nomikoudis & Starr, 2016; Tinkler & Tinkler, 2016). In integrating the concept of cultural humility into education, Haynes-Mendez and Engelsmeier (2020) acknowledged the pioneering contributions of Tervalon and Murray-Garcia (1998).

Tervalon and Murray-Garcia (1998) expressed their preference for an Oakland, California advocate's (i.e., L. Brown, MPH) view of cultural competence: i.e., one "defined not by a discrete endpoint"—and, instead as "a commitment and active engagement in a lifelong process that individuals enter into on an ongoing basis with patients, colleagues, and with themselves" (p. 118). The outcome is presented as "cultural humility," as a better description, versus "cultural competence" (p. 118). Further, the recommended process requires "humility," as "individuals continually engage in self-reflection and self-critique as lifelong learners and reflective practitioners" (p. 118). Still, after receiving any cultural competence training, to be avoided is a sense of false security from the training one has received, and, in particular, the use of stereotypes.

Stereotypes, Implicit Bias, and Prejudicial Behavior

Stereotypes have been viewed as a form of an implicit cognition some hold, whereby they associate it to a group with a particular trait (Chin et al., 2020). Stereotypes are like implicit attitudes that may be automatically activated in the mind, which may

lead to implicit bias, as well as prejudicial behavior, along with prejudicial judgments. All of this may occur without even consciously endorsing “the underlying attitude or stereotype” (p. 4). Of note, teachers “with implicit bias are liable to provide biased evaluations of students’ academic performance or potential”—while research shows that “students as young as six can recognize when people hold stereotypes” (p. 5). There is also evidence that shows “Black students are often disciplined for more subjective infractions” such as disrespectful behavior and acting disruptively (p. 5). On the other hand, White students “are often disciplined for more objective infractions” such as “smoking or vandalism (Chin et al., 2020, p. 5).

Stereotypes, Bias, and Disproportionate Punishment of Black Students

Kunesh and Noltemeyer (2019) studied pre-service teachers and the role of stereotypes in the disproportionate suspension and expulsion of Black boys from schools. This follows data indicating that Black boys are “more likely to be suspended and expelled than students of other races” (p. 472). Attribution-based theory frameworks defined stereotypes as “beliefs about the behaviors and traits that purportedly characterize a group of people” which “allow people to predict and explain another individual’s behavior;” and, these are hypothetically based on “attributions that entail stable causes and characteristics” (p. 473). Findings indicated that “some teachers attributed misbehavior of Black male students to more stable causes, which may lead them to alter their behavior toward these students” (p. 481). Negative consequences may be severe, as “suspension is associated with lower academic achievement, grade retention, and higher drop-out rates in middle and high schools” (p. 476).

Further, as per Kunesh and Noltemeyer (2019), “individual students who are suspended or expelled are more likely to be involved with the juvenile justice system the next year, compared with students who are not subject to exclusionary discipline” (p. 476). Also of note was the social desirability measures which indicated that most teachers actively deny racism, yet “some implicit bias against Black individuals, however, is common across Americans of all education levels, ages, sexes, and political affiliations” (p. 480). Consequently, findings suggest that both bias and discrimination may be unconscious or implicit. Bias does not have to be intentional (Kunesh & Noltemeyer, 2019, p. 491).

It has also been noted how, within urban schools “across the country, school safety personnel are uniformed officers who are part of the police force and often engage in discriminatory practices that reflect those in the larger community” (Emdin, 2016, p. 20). Not surprisingly, their presence contributes to harsh disciplinary practices that contribute to disproportionate punishment, suspension, and expulsion experienced by Black students (Parks et al., 2016). Hence, what has been described as the “school-to-prison pipeline” (Parks et al., 2016, p. 210).

While research often highlights the plight of Black boys, Black girls also experience disproportionate punishment, suspension, and expulsion in comparison to White girls in schools (Parks et al., 2016). Also, Black girls receive “more severe sentences in the juvenile justice system” (p. 211). Black girls are victimized with multiple oppressions, including gender-based violence and racialized structures (Parks et al., 2016).

Contemporary zero-tolerance policies in schools have led to Black girls “being culturally policed in schools” (Hines-Datiri & Carter Andrews, 2020). The girls must

contend with “educators’ perceptions of their behavior” being “tainted with stereotypes, implicit biases, and low expectations” (p. 19). One consequence is that society is at risk of having “Black girls’ identities and voices snuffed out by disciplinary policies and ultimately the educational and criminal justice systems” (p. 19). Consider the following analysis by Hines-Datiri and Carter Andrews (2020):

A complex analysis of issues of race, gender, and class reveals that many Black girls living in high-need, low-resourced communities and attending schools with similar issues perform a feminine identity that represents a certain resilience to how poverty has shaped racial and gender oppression. As Monique W. Morris (2016) states, “to be ‘loud’ is a demand to be heard. To have an ‘attitude’ is to reject a doctrine of invisibility and mistreatment” (p. 19). Black girls in all schools, but particularly in urban schools, fight to hold on to feminine identities of resistance, survival, or of goodness in the face of White femininity that renders them invaluable. (p. 8)

Need for Culturally Relevant Pedagogies and Teacher Training

To counter pervasive racism and dominant cultural influences, culturally relevant pedagogies are put forth as practices and methodologies that may have long-term implications for students of color (Ladson-Billings, 2016). Several interventions are also suggested, including “recognizing that students whose educational, economic, social, political, and cultural futures were most tenuous must be helped to be intellectual leaders in the classroom;” and, also recommended was “engaging together in collective struggle against the status quo” (pp. 145-146). Further, online platforms may allow students and Black intellectuals to engage and inspire scholarship; this scholarship may cover transforming the school curriculum, activism, social justice, or the use of art and hip-hop with the intention to “make any real difference in the lives of young people” (p. 146). It is recommended that teachers in training have an opportunity to engage students and

communities across various online platforms and modalities as a means to spur their social activism toward the goal of dismantling perceptions regarding who belongs in White spaces.

White Spaces, according to Anderson (2015), are settings where “Black people are typically absent, not expected, or marginalized,” including neighborhoods, schools, and universities (p. 10). Further, when Black people have to navigate White spaces, they are often forced to conform or adapt within racial hierarchies that can invoke psychological, social, and physical harm. Thus, to exist “while Black” not only assumes that Black skin derives ‘from the ghetto,’ but also denotes that “Black skin is typically equated with lower-class status and White skin with privilege” (p. 19). White spaces signal the perception of not belonging, as they reinforce symbolic racism through stigmatization and stereotypes intended to marginalize Black people (Anderson, 2015).

As a potentially culturally relevant pedagogy, Emdin (2016) has pioneered Reality Pedagogy in order to provide urban school educators with methods to “create a safe space and trusting environments that are respectful of students’ culture” (p. 41). Further, Reality Pedagogy addresses the power dynamics and preconceived notions associated with urban communities and youth of color. In schools, “urban youth are expected to leave their day-to-day experiences and emotions at the door and assimilate into the culture of schools” (p. 42). Reality Pedagogy provides a framework to explore “cultural differences between students and their teachers that make it difficult for teachers to be reflective and effective” (p. 56). In order to achieve goals of transforming schools and meeting the needs of urban youth of color, those “who are the most disenfranchised within” schools

must have their needs met; and, in particular, educators “must create safe and trusting environments that are respectful of students’ culture” (Emdin, 2016, p. 46).

According to Emdin (2016), contemporary urban schools reflect a broader community context that includes systemic racism, discriminatory behaviors, and oppressive practices. Further, the majority of urban schools that educate students of color are often located in socioeconomically disadvantaged communities. The majority of urban educators are White middle-class teachers who rarely consider whether or how they affirm students; and, they are not aware of how they reestablish power dynamics from the larger society within the classroom. The impact is that of silencing students and creating challenges and issues that plague urban education in this country. The achievement gap and higher suspension rates will persist if White teachers do not consciously shift so as to change their contributions to racial biases and power dynamics operating in the classroom (Emdin, 2016).

Using Social Identity Theories, Whitaker (2019) examined social structures and urban teachers’ relationships with their students to situate interpersonal dynamics, particularly when racial identities differed between the teacher and student (p. 2). Further, social categorization theory framed how urban teachers, mainly White novice teachers, were inundated with and often dependent on the perpetuation and subjective narratives about urban schools and students, which allowed them to construct and sustain their teacher identity as saviors (p. 5). “White saviors” were conceptualized within the “Whiteness as Property” frameworks, which implied that White teachers “have the rights of possession, rights of disposition, the right of control, and rights to exclude” (Whitaker, 2019, p. 6).

The power of Whiteness and property dynamics are consequential to students in urban schools, including: property (i.e., classroom) and owners (i.e., rights of possession), according to Whitaker (2019). Further, urban teachers are bestowed with the power to make decisions regardless of the deleterious effects they may have on already disenfranchised students (i.e., rights of disposition). This is evidenced by the underrepresentation of Black and Hispanic students in advanced academic tracks (i.e., rights of control) and their overrepresentation in school suspension and expulsion data (i.e., rights to exclude)” (pp. 6-7). Also discussed were intergroup behaviors and organizational role theories, which framed how the “group norms of teacher saviors describe and prescribe pedagogical practices that create a hierarchy between teachers and students, leaving little room for warmth and caring” (p. 1). With regard to conclusions, “the severity of educational inequities demands that teacher educators dedicate more time and curriculum to helping preservice teachers become culturally conscious agents of change” ultimately to take on consciousness and “transformationist” teacher identity in their classrooms (Whitaker, 2019, p. 14).

According to Jackson and Knight-Manuel (2019), students in urban school settings benefit when educators of color counter their own miseducation to then incorporate culturally relevant pedagogies into learning environments that often marginalize students of color with restrictive and racially discriminatory practices and policies. For example, educators of color in urban schools increase the college and career readiness of their Black and Latino students when academic objectives are taught in tandem with sociopolitical consciousness (Jackson & Knight-Manuel, 2019).

Sociopolitical consciousness is an “awareness of and desire to act against societal inequities that disadvantage people of color (p. 66).

Wallace (2003) seeks to spur the development of such a sociopolitical consciousness by advancing a *Pedagogy of Liberation*, while outlining seven steps for teaching the use of interpersonal dialogue to transform personal and cultural paradigms. A multicultural approach is advanced to counter historical and sociocultural influences that codify the pervasive United States’ Culture of Violence and oppression (p. 3). Hence, *institutionalized violence and oppression* is defined as the “presence in organizations, as well as its leadership and members, of patterns of behavior, ways of thinking, and emotional responses to “diverse and different others” who are made to feel unwelcome, unaccepted, and disrespected within the institution” (p. 5). Further, this is “as a result of a multiplicity of factors—such as white privilege, white domination, prejudice, discrimination, racism, sexism, classism, ageism, heterosexism, homophobia, and the perpetuation of invisibility and disregard for people with disabilities” (p. 5). This violence can manifest in both covert and overt forms, which can have varying consequences on oppressed and marginalized individuals or groups. For example, invisible covert violence or symbolic violence is committed when perceptions, language, and behaviors reinforce superiority and inferiority dynamics, domination, and hierarchical authority (Wallace, 2003).

In addition, Wallace (2003) introduces a new Psychology of Oppression, Liberation, and Identity Development, which requires understanding the impact of the U.S. Culture of Violence (Wallace, 2003). What must be transformed are the following: the enactment of domination and hierarchical authority during interpersonal interactions

such that one's self is placed in the superior position, while another (e.g., student of color, another teacher of color) is placed in an inferior position; the projection of “negative and low expectations or stereotypes” as one engages in invisible covert violence, including in the classroom or school setting (p. 10); and, the behavioral enactment through speech of the “perception that one is superior and another inferior,” as in talking down to another as though they are inferior—which “occurs on a daily basis when words are spoken, especially aloud” (p. 13). Ultimately, the goal is to “foster the kind of paradigm shift in the fields of psychology and education” in order for society to “move toward liberation from oppression via praxis and pedagogy that is made and remade by the oppressed and those with whom they engage in transformative dialogue” (Wallace, 2003, p. 39).

Critical Race Theory (CRT) and Education Policies

As per White et al. (2019), Critical Race Theory (CRT) frameworks have explored racial ideologies and racial hierarchies of urban schools where practices and policies have negatively impacted students of color and Black teachers on macro and micro levels. Also, a diverse teacher workforce positively impacts learning outcomes of students of color, specifically with Black teachers' academic contributions. Further, “meaningful progress toward a diverse workforce must include critical examination of prominent education policies and their impact on teachers of color, including the principles of teaching that many strive to enact” (p. 1). Findings suggested policy initiatives to counter contemporary trends of neoliberalism and the privatization of urban schools, in addition to systemic racism and the marginalization of Black teachers and students (White et al., 2019).

The Theory of Racism and Microaggressions

Others have also offered theory and concepts to explain the challenges faced in urban schools where there are common societal dynamics played out between Whites and Blacks, as well as between Whites and other people of color—by extension.

In this regard, the seminal work of Dr. Chester Pierce identified racial microaggressions as “subtle, stunning, often automatic and nonverbal exchanges which are “put downs” of Blacks by offenders (Pierce et al., 1977, p. 66). Dr. Pierce, a Black psychiatrist, found microaggressions were “offensive mechanisms used against blacks [that] often are innocuous,” and had the “cumulative weight of their never-ending burden is the major ingredient in Black-White interactions (Pierce et al., 1977, p. 66). Pierce (1970) put forth the idea that “offensive mechanisms are usually a micro-aggression, as opposed to a gross, dramatic, obvious macro-aggression such as lynching” (Pierce, 1970, p. 266). Thus, “most offensive actions are not gross and crippling. They are subtle and stunning” (pp. 265-266). Pierce elaborated, as follows, while underscoring what contributes to the failure of urban (“ghetto”) schools—as ideas having great relevance to the challenges contemporary schools now negotiate:

Offensive mechanisms serve in other ways as a vehicle for the micro-aggressive episodes that come to total up racism. One of the most grisly of these considerations involves the fact that racism is a lethal disease. The offensive mechanisms which assure that the person in the inferior status is ignored, tyrannized, terrorized, and minimized constitute the fabric from which is cut the cloth of statistics that describes the plight of the ghetto citizen. It is summation of collective micro-offences by the majority that ignores the fact that a massive commitment is needed to make the ghetto school fail. (pp. 267-268)

The work of Pierce (1969, 1970, 1973, 1974) has been pioneering; while Pierce et al. (1977) articulated a Theory of Racism, the concept of microaggression was situated

as arising from within that original theory. The Theory of Racism advanced how socialization in the United States perpetuates belief in the superiority of Whites and inferiority of Blacks. Pierce et al. (1977) explained how the superior and inferior establish “categories of behavior are the critical means of training people to perform and accept such behavior” (p. 65). Next, introducing the concept for which he is esteemed as the originator, Pierce et al. (1977) explained how the “chief vehicle for pro-racist behaviors are microaggressions” (p. 65). Microaggression were defined as “subtle, stunning, often automatic, and nonverbal exchanges which” effectively serve as “put downs” of Blacks “by offenders” (p. 65). Moreover, the resultant “offensive mechanisms used against” Blacks “often are innocuous” while having a “cumulative weight” as a “never-ending burden” (p. 65). The perpetuation of this burden “is the major ingredient” in Black-White interpersonal interactions (p. 65). Further, results include “a near inevitable perceptual clash between” Blacks and Whites “in regard to how a matter is described as well as the emotional charge involved” (p. 65).

Clearly, the classroom and entire school climate cannot escape these dynamics. This justifies the present research focusing on the school climate, as rated by teachers—as well as a focus on teachers’ reporting their own experiences of microaggressions in the school setting; and, also their experiences of witnessing microaggressions against students within the school setting.

Statement of the Problem

The problem that this study addresses is the need to deliver training to school teachers of diverse K-12 students in order to equip them to be effective teachers, while avoiding perpetuating racism,

oppression, and microaggressions against teachers and students within schools with problematic school climates. There is a role for research with teachers on their perceptions of racism, oppression, microaggressions, and school climate that may inform the training of future teachers.

For example, teacher training and preparation may follow Emdin (2016) who identified what is needed to be effective while teaching diverse urban learners, presenting an original Reality Pedagogy approach. Aiyedun (2019) presents data from a case study of a charter school that followed Emdin (2016) in providing professional development to teachers and other school staff, while introducing an assessment tool for pre-versus post-training that was based on the work of Emdin (2016). The present study follows Aiyedun (2019) in the use of this 9-item/9-behavior assessment tool, which has been modified for the present study. The new emergent tool is Part IV: Knowledge and Self-Efficacy for 8 Key Behaviors for Teaching Diverse Students (KS-8-BTDS-16).

Further, the present study will seek predictors of a high rating of school climate for how well the school climate supported, engaged, valued, fairly disciplined, affirmed, reflected empathy for, and was a safe space for diverse students from varied cultural backgrounds—using a new one-item tool (Rating School Climate, RSC-1); this is based on the 9-item/behavior assessed by Aiyedun (2019), while pulled out to constitute a single item on the Rating School Climate (RSC-1) scale, which serves as the study outcome variable.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the present study is to identify significant predictors of a high rating by teachers of diverse K-12 students **of their school climate, as the study**

outcome/dependent variable—as recalled for the period pre-Covid-19 pandemic (i.e., recollection of Fall 2018, Spring 2019, and Fall 2019 school semesters).

Specifically, school climate (i.e., Rating School Climate, RSC-1) will be rated on a 0 to 10-point Likert Scale from lowest level (0) to highest level (10) for the degree to which the school climate supported, engaged, valued, fairly disciplined, affirmed, reflected empathy for, and was a safe space for diverse students from varied cultural backgrounds:

School climate will be predicted by selecting **independent variables from among the many arising from the survey parts indicated in the next section.**

Research Questions, Survey Parts, and Data Analysis Plan

Given an online sample of participants (N=55) who self-identified as a school teacher of diverse K-12 students in the United States and completed an online survey in response to a social media campaign (i.e., CLICK ON: <http://tinyurl.com/K-12-TEACHERS-INVITED> TO TAKE SURVEY (Takes 15 Minutes) on their BEFORE-pandemic school climate for a 3 in 200 chance to win one of three \$100 Amazon gift cards), this study answered the following research questions:

1-What are their demographic characteristics (i.e., age, race/ethnicity, skin color, U.S. born, generation in U.S., household income, level of education, type of school taught in [public, charter, private; and, urban, suburban, rural], demographic composition of school students; position in school; years in position; whether at same school, different school, or unemployed; total years in teaching profession)?

Part I: Basic Demographics (BD-14)

Data Analysis Plan: Descriptive statistics, including means, standard deviations, frequencies, and percentages

2-What is their personal health background, including ratings for their physical health status and mental/emotional health status?

Part II: Personal Health Background (PHB-2)

Data Analysis Plan: Descriptive statistics, including means, standard deviations, frequencies, and percentages

3-What is the extent to which they provide socially desirable answers (controlled in regression analysis)?

Part III: Single Item Rating of Risk of Providing Socially Desirable Responses (SIR-RPSDR-1)

Data Analysis Plan: Descriptive statistics, including means, standard deviations, frequencies, and percentages

4-What is their level of (a) knowledge and (b) self-efficacy for performing each of the recommended 8 behaviors for working with diverse students [i.e., (1) interactions with students reflecting consideration of their CULTURAL background (i.e., race, ethnicity, religion); (2) interactions with students showing effective ENGAGEMENT of students from varied cultural backgrounds; (3) interactions with students showing how all races, ethnicities, religions, and cultures are VALUED—with an appreciation of differences; (4) interactions with students showing fairness and consistency in DISCIPLINING (punishing, correcting) students—so there are no differences by race, ethnicity, religion, or cultural background; (5) interactions with students AFFIRMING (supporting) them, their culture, and the history of their cultural group; (6) interactions with students showing EMPATHY and acceptance of students from diverse cultural backgrounds; (7) interactions with students creating a SAFE SPACE and trusting environment for students from diverse cultural backgrounds; and (8) interactions with students helping to CREATE a more positive school climate]?

Part IV. Knowledge and Self-Efficacy for 8 Key Behaviors for Teaching Diverse Students (KS-8-BTDS-SCR-16)

Data Analysis Plan: Descriptive statistics, including means, standard deviations, frequencies, and percentages

5-How do they rate their school climate for how well it supported, engaged, valued, fairly disciplined, affirmed, reflected empathy for, and served as a safe space for students from varied cultural backgrounds?

Part V: Rating the School Climate (RSC-1)

Data Analysis Plan: Descriptive statistics, including means, standard deviations, frequencies, and percentages

NOTE: Study Outcome Variable

6-How do they rate themselves as teachers, and how do they rate other school staff for the attribute of cultural humility?

Part VI: Rating for Cultural Humility (RCH-1)

Data Analysis Plan: Descriptive statistics, including means, standard deviations, frequencies, and percentages

7-What do they report for having (a) personally experienced microaggressions, and for having (b) witnessed microaggressions happening to students in the school setting?

Part VII: Microaggressions in School Settings Experienced by Personnel and Witnessed Happening to Students (MSS-EBPAWHT-12)

Data Analysis Plan: Descriptive statistics, including means, standard deviations, frequencies, and percentages

8-What is their level of ability for perceiving racism and oppression?

Part VIII: Perceptions of Racism and Oppression Scale (PROS-10)

Data Analysis Plan: Descriptive statistics, including means, standard deviations, frequencies, and percentages

9-What is their stage of change for coping and responding to racism and oppression?

Part IX: Coping and Responding to Racism and Oppression Staging Scale (CRROSS-7)

Data Analysis Plan: Descriptive statistics, including means, standard deviations, frequencies, and percentages

10-What significant relationships were found between **the study dependent/outcome variable of rating of school climate** and selected independent variables?

Data Analysis Plan: Inferential statistics, including via Pearson's correlations and t-tests

11-What were the significant predictors of the **study dependent/outcome variable of a high rating of their school climate**?

Data Analysis Plan: Backward stepwise regression

Treatment of the Data

Data were collected with Qualtrics, while this permitted data being transferred to the latest available version of SPSS—26.0. Further details appear in Chapter III, Methods.

Anticipated Findings

Given the study outcome variable of **higher ratings of their school climate**, it is anticipated that backward stepwise regression analysis, controlling for social desirability, will show significant predictors, as follows:

The **higher the teachers' rating of their school climate (pre-pandemic)**, then the

teachers:

1. will be **White** (versus non-White)
2. will be **female** (versus male)
3. will **yes**, be born in the US (versus no)
4. will have a **higher** age
5. will have a **lighter** skin tone
6. will have a **higher** annual household income
7. will have a **higher** level of education
8. will have a **higher** rating of their physical health status
9. will have a **higher** rating of their mental health status
10. will have a **higher** number of years teaching
11. will have a **higher** knowledge for 8 key behaviors for teaching diverse students
12. will have a **higher** self-efficacy for 8 key behaviors for teaching diverse students
13. will have a **higher** rating for having cultural humility
14. will have a **lower** rating for microaggressions personally experienced in school setting
15. will have a **lower** rating for microaggressions they witnessed happening to students in school setting
16. will have a **lower** level of ability for perceiving racism and oppression
17. will have a **lower** stage of change for taking action to respond to and cope with racism and oppression

Delimitations

Regarding delimitations, the study included school teachers of diverse K-12 students. Participants had to be at least age 23, and report being able to recall and answer questions about their teaching experiences for the *pre-Covid-19 pandemic* period, or the Fall 2018, Spring 2019, and Fall 2019 timeframe. Also, the study only included those participants who completed the entire survey (i.e., having data on the study outcome variable of Rating School Climate [RSC-1]).

Limitations

The main study limitation was the smaller than anticipated sample size (N=55), which reduced the research to a pilot study capable of providing just suggestive findings. This small sample size was largely attributed to the COVID-19 pandemic, the difficulty of recruiting subjects via the exclusive use of an online social media campaign during a pandemic, and the necessity of teachers having to recall the experience of actually being within their school climate for what was a distant pre-pandemic period.

Hence, the COVID-19 pandemic posed numerous challenges, necessitating the use of an online study format without the posting of flyers or any in-person distribution of flyers to recruit teachers into study participation. All teachers should have had access to a computer and internet. However, to the extent that access was limited, this must be kept in mind as a study limitation. It is possible that having families at home during the pandemic and potentially engaging in home-schooling may have limited access to home computers, as well—negatively impacting study participation.

Teachers, in particular, were likely experiencing stress while teaching online, in-person, or via hybrid models in the United States at this time of the pandemic. This high stress may have been a deterrent to study participation. Further, stressed out teachers may have found it especially difficult to recall their experiences for the period pre-COVID-19. The onset of the pandemic necessitated a change in the originally intended study methodology where participants had to engage in recall of their school climates when there was in-person teaching; this change in methodology likely had a significant impact; and the study would likely have been very different if teachers were all in-person, there was no pandemic, and teachers were reflecting on their current school climate and

current observations of microaggressions. Hence, the study participants (and overall study) may have been impacted negatively in several ways, due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Effort was made to ensure the study survey was as short as possible, decreasing the burden of time, especially in light of likely COVID-19 pandemic related stressors in their lives. In sum, a multitude of study limitations must be kept in mind when reviewing the results produced under the circumstances of an ongoing pandemic in the United States.

Conclusion

As the introductory chapter, this section has provided the foundation for the dissertation research by providing a broad overview of relevant research and theory. The chapter provided the statement of the problem, purpose of the study, as well as the research questions with their corresponding survey parts and data analysis plans. The chapter also presented the study delimitations and limitations.

The next chapter, II, review of literature, will cover topics pertinent to the study, while elaborating on research and theory that substantiates the focus of the study. Chapter III, methods, will provide the procedures and methods followed in conducting the study. Chapter IV, results, will provide the results of data analysis. Finally, chapter V, will provide a discussion of the results, as well as study implications and recommendations for future research.

Chapter II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter will expand on some of the literature provided in the introduction, while providing an overview of a body of scholarship and related research on topics relevant to the dissertation research. Specifically, this chapter's review of literature will cover the following topics: 1) the Theory of Racism, Microaggressions, and Related Research; 2) Critical Race Theory and Relevant Research Findings; 3) Racial Stereotyping, Identity, Hostile School Climates, and Related Research; 4) Need for Structural, Systemic, and Institutional Change—Research and Scholarship Relevant to the School-to-Prison Pipeline; 5) Perceived Racism, Discrimination, Stress and Coping, Health Impacts—and Relevant Research; and, 6) Research on Transforming Schools Toward Greater Cultural Competence and Improving School Climates.

I. The Theory of Racism, Microaggressions, and Related Research

The original theory of racism from the Black psychiatrist, Dr. Chester Pierce, has been described, in brief, along with the concept of microaggressions in a body of work. Pierce et al. (1978) drew upon earlier work of Pierce (1969, 1970, 1973, 1974), offering the definition of microaggressions as “subtle, stunning, often automatic and nonverbal exchanges” directed toward people of color (p. 66).

Pierce et al. (1977) conducted research that confirmed the theory of racism and the prevalence of experiences of microaggressions by examining television commercials.

Television commercials were found to perpetuate racial stereotypes by associating Whites with displays of superior knowledge and holding positions of authority, for example. Meanwhile, television commercials depicted Blacks as never initiating any activity among other negative stereotypes. This led Pierce et al. (1970) to view the larger media in the United States as being responsible for microaggressions, with these microaggressions being experienced “daily” through exposure to television programs, movies, radio programs, as well as via billboards, subway posters, and print media (p. 66).

Later, Sue (2010) explained microaggressions as “everyday verbal, nonverbal, and environmental slights, snubs or insults” (p. 3). Sue et al. (2007) identified racial microaggressions as “brief and commonplace daily verbal, behavioral, and environmental indignities, whether intentional or unintentional, that communicate hostile, derogatory, or negative racial slights and insults to the target person or group” (p. 273). While often subtle or invisibly exchanged, racial microaggressions send powerful messages, including the following:

The experience of a racial microaggression has major implications for both the perpetrator and the target person. It creates psychological dilemmas that unless adequately resolved lead to increased levels of racial anger, mistrust, and loss of self-esteem for persons of color; prevent White people from perceiving a different racial reality; and create impediments to harmonious race-relations. (p. 275)

Also identified were three forms of microaggressions: microassaults, microinsults, and microinvalidations (Sue et al., 2007). According to Sue et al., a microassault has been described as “an explicit racial derogation characterized primarily by a verbal or nonverbal attack meant to hurt the intended victim through name-calling, avoidant behavior, or purposeful discriminatory actions” (p. 274). A microinsult involves communications viewed as conveying rudeness and insensitivity, while also serving to

demean a person's identity or racial heritage. Microinvalidations involve communications that serve to exclude, negate, or nullify the person of color's feelings, thoughts, or experience of reality (Sue et al., 2017).

Sue et al. (2007) also identified nine categories of racial microaggressions, including: alien in own land, ascription of intelligence, color blindness, criminality/assumption of criminal status, denial of individual racism, myth of meritocracy, pathologizing cultural values/communication styles, second class citizen, and environmental microaggressions. Interventions suggested for professionals included education and training to identify and intentionally address racial microaggressions (Sue et al., 2007). Further, "there is an urgent need to bring greater awareness and understanding of how microaggressions operate, their numerous manifestations in society, the type of impact they have on people of color, the dynamic interaction between perpetrator and target, and the educational strategies needed to eliminate them" (Sue et al., 2007, p. 273).

Racial microaggressions can occur both systematically and interpersonally, as well as manifest in various ways (Holder & Nadel, 2016, p. 48). Further, research suggests that microaggressions can be detrimental to the health and well-being of individuals from stigmatized groups (Holder & Nadel, 2016).

Microaggressions may be experienced for more than one stigmatized identity. This involves the experience of intersectionality. Intersectionality frameworks are explored in Wallace and Santacruz (2017), including the "challenge of negotiating multiple and intersecting stigmatized identities and systems of oppression given racial, ethnic, gender, socioeconomic, and cultural influences upon diverse LGBT populations

(p. 87). Rooted in Black feminist thought, intersectionality is “the concept of the simultaneity of oppression acknowledges the combined experience of “race, class, sex, and homophobia” (Wallace & Santacruz, 2017, p. 88).

Brown (2019) engaged 29 African American teachers to understand the ways in which they experienced one or more racial microaggressions themes (p. 192). Two of the five themes included the “myth of meritocracy” and “ascription of intelligence” as African American teachers felt the need to “work harder than their non minority colleagues to prove their value, worth, and equality, and to dispel negative stereotypes, or because they were held to different standards” (p. 192). Other themes indicated that the teachers’ felt like second-class citizens, were part of cultural/ethnic insensitive workplaces, and had their language, communication styles, and cultural values pathologized (pp. 188-190). Consequently, teachers reported experiencing tension resulting from being treated as outsiders, pressure to conform to the organizations’ prescribed norm, and feelings of having to prove professional competency and worth (p. 181). Recommendations included future research on African American teachers, “microaggressions in professional settings, and the linkage between institutionalized racism and the production of workplace phenomenon on the formation of toxic/hostile organizational culture” (Brown, 2019, p. 195).

Thus, Pierce’s (1969, 1970, 1973, 1974; Pierce et al., 1977) formative work on racial microaggressions continues to “speak volumes about an important, persistent, and under researched social problem;” this follows from how “little is known about microaggressions, and yet this subtle form of racism has a dramatic impact on the lives of

African Americans (Solórzano et al., 2000, pp. 60-61). This certainly includes academic settings.

II. Critical Race Theory and Relevant Research Findings

Microaggression scholarship can focus upon interpersonal dynamics, however, some researchers theorize microaggressions through a structural lens. Through the use of Critical Race Theory (CRT) analysis, Compton-Lilly (2020) stated that “microaggressions” are “layered and cumulative forms of enacted racism,” that occur “within larger forms of institutional and ideological/historical oppressions and practices” (Compton-Lilly, 2020, p. 1316).

Compton-Lilly (2020) investigated the long-term implications of micro/macroaggressions for students of color in an urban school district through a CRT lens, using a qualitative analysis—since there is little scholarship on microaggressions during the elementary years. Findings showed emergent themes from students “described being “sad” or “mad” and were sometimes left wondering whether they were culpable or stupid” (p. 1330). Recommendations covered the need for schools and teachers to disrupt the longitudinal construction of inequity, given the unrelenting nature of the micro/macroaggressions experienced by students of color (Compton-Lilly, 2020, p. 1344).

Indeed, many have advanced Critical Race Theory (CRT) as a movement of critical race theorists, activists, and legal scholars who build on the work of liberating social movements, transformational theorists, figures, and philosophers. For example, according to Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995), CRT within the field of education builds on the foundational scholarship of W.E.B. Du Bois, Carter G. Woodson, and critical race

legal scholars to examine “persistent problems of racism in schooling” (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995, p. 60).

Further, social inequity and education viewed by Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995) were based on three propositions: (1) race continues to be a significant factor in determining inequity in the United States; (2) U.S. society is based on property rights; and, (3) the intersection of race and property creates an analytic tool through which we can understand social (and, consequently, school) inequity (p. 48). CRT in education requires challenging the systemic inequities of capitalism, and the construction of whiteness as property ingrained through America’s public schools. CRT allows White educators to challenge their racial biases and prejudices, power constructions, and preconceived notions of education, colorblindness, and meritocracy. It also centers education on the realities and experiences of the oppressed, as “the voice of people of color is required for a complete analysis of the educational system” (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995, p. 58).

Dixson (2018) also applied the CRT analysis to approach contemporary phenomena related to urban education reform, racial justice, and activism efforts intended to advance educational equality and equity outcomes. Others have indicated the need to reconsider theoretical approaches to current urban education reform efforts, and recommend that racial discourse goes beyond the lens of Critical Race Theory (Dumas & Ross, 2016, p. 417). Further, it has been asserted that CRT in education “functions much more as a critique of White supremacy and the limits of the hegemonic liberal multiculturalism” (p. 416). Recommendations included analyzing education and social

policies to counter contemporary neoliberal and anti-blackness trends (Dumas & Ross, 2016, pp. 429-430).

Solórzano et al. (2000) engaged in an application of Critical Race Theory (CRT) frameworks to examine racial microaggressions at the collegiate level. As per Solórzano et al. (2000), findings showed that racial microaggressions “in both academic and social spaces have real consequences” (p. 69). The consequences include a “negative racial climate,” as well as somewhat obvious struggles for African American students, which include “feelings of self-doubt and frustration as well as isolation” (p. 69). Discussion of the findings covered how African American students on the campuses they studied “must strive to maintain good academic standing while negotiating the conflicts arising from disparaging perceptions of them and their group of origin” (p. 69). Additional negative consequences included how African American students “must navigate through a myriad of pejorative racial stereotypes that fuel the creation and perpetuation of racial microaggressions” (p. 69). Furthermore, the findings suggested that African American students’ negative experiences on campus with racial stereotypes and racial microaggressions correlated with their academic performance and emotional well-being (p. 69).

Solórzano et al. (2000) elaborated on the impact of racial stereotypes on Black students’ academic achievement. They discussed how stereotypes may interfere with Black students’ abilities to achieve high scores on standardized tests, which are widely believed to measure aptitude or intelligence. In other words, in a high-stakes testing situation, if African American students are reminded of stereotypes that they are seen as

intellectually inferior to Whites, then their test performance is depressed (Solórzano et al., 2000, p. 62).

Solórzano et al. (2000) discussed how “descriptions of racial microaggressions challenge the anti-affirmative action ideology of college as an equal, colorblind, and race-neutral institution” (p. 71). Solórzano et al. (2000) quoted important prior work of Pierce, as follows:

They resonate with the essence of Pierce’s (1970) comment: “It is my fondest hope that the day is not far remote when every black child will recognize and defend promptly and adequately against every offensive microaggression” (p. 280). Thirty years later, Pierce’s vision has not yet come to pass. Indeed, very little is known about who, when, where, and how racial microaggressions are initiated and defended against. Without careful documentation and analysis, racial stereotypes, the threats that they pose and the assaults they justify in the form of racial microaggressions, can easily be ignored or downplayed. Nonetheless, these findings demonstrate that the cumulative effects of racial microaggressions can be devastating. It is our hope that further research into these subtle forms of and responses to racism and sexism will advance examinations of the conditions and concerns of African Americans and other students of color and move educators toward making Professor Pierce’s hope a reality. (pp. 71-72)

The research findings and analysis put forth by Solórzano et al. (2000) are cause for great concern when highlighting the impact of a negative racial climate. They also raise the issue of how racial stereotypes may have an adverse impact on learners.

III. Racial Stereotyping, Identity, Hostile School Climates, and Related Research

In this regard, Steele and Aronson (1995) studied stereotype threat. Stereotype threat involves a state of being where one is “at risk of confirming, as self-characteristic, a negative stereotype” associated with the group to which one belongs (p. 797).

Stereotype threat research findings suggest that Black students’ academic performance is

negatively impaired by stereotype threat. Also, stereotype threat serves to widen the achievement gap, given how societal stereotypes of Black students demean their intellectual capabilities (Steele & Aronson, 1995).

Other research of some potential relevance to what happens to teachers in a racially hostile school climate, there is the work of Purdie-Vaughns et al. (2008). Although they focused on African Americans in corporate workplaces, social identity contingencies were described as “possible judgments, stereotypes, opportunities, restrictions, and treatments that are tied to one’s social identity in a given setting” (p. 615). Given that “one’s identity and contingencies that go with that identity are derived from social context,” when African Americans entered mainstream workplaces, they often took one of two approaches: assimilation and colorblind efforts, or multiculturalism and diversity prioritization (Purdie-Vaughns et al., 2008, p. 615).

Strong, positive Black racial identity, as described by Zirkel and Johnson (2016), includes “strong and positive identification with being Black” that is combined with a racial consciousness of the “historical, social, and cultural context of being Black in the United States, including a critical consciousness about race and racism” (p. 302). Additionally, positive Black racial identity correlates to “greater resilience, coping with discrimination, higher academic performance, greater commitment to education, and improved educational outcomes” (pp. 301-302). Despite the positive outcomes, a review of empirical research and theoretical frameworks were found to either overlook, diminish, or question strong Black racial identity. Rather, much of the frameworks aligned to Du Bois’ historical analyses that Black racial identity or Black psyches often are intended to invoke “contempt and pity” or imply “damage imagery” (p. 303). In addition, research

suggested that when educators express discomfort with “critical racial consciousness” or promote their “own racial identity group to the exclusion of all others,” there are adverse educational outcomes for Black students (p. 305).

Further, if the focus is on inclusion or integration, it highlights and perpetuates oppressive and discriminatory ideals and institutions (Zirkel & Johnson, 2016). This can impede Black students in developing and exploring their own racial identity.

Recommendations included “educators, researchers, and theorists” look in the mirror to examine their “own deeply held beliefs about Black identity and its meaning and implications for education” (Zirkel & Johnson, 2016).

According to Wallace and Santacruz (2017), navigating multiple oppressed identities necessitates deployment of coping mechanisms and strategies to combat microaggressions, discrimination, and biases. Further, intersectionality research suggests that “microaggressions experienced by those who are both sexual minorities and racial/ethnic minorities were linked to depression and perceived stress” (pp. 90-91).

Recommended interventions include teaching racial-cultural skills or practical coping skills for coping in those encounters with others where there is diversity or difference (Wallace & Santacruz, 2017). Hence, it is possible to teach others how to deploy coping responses to the stress of perceiving racism and oppression. It is possible to teach and learn how to recognize and respond to racism, oppression, and White privilege. What emerges as a necessity is learning how to recognize, respond to, as well as cope with microaggressions—doing so is vital to avoid any negative impact on health. Also important is the pursuit of positive identity development (Wallace & Santacruz, 2017).

Rodriguez-Mojica et al. (2020) applied CTR while examining the experiences of preservice teachers of color enrolled in a graduate education program committed to teacher diversity. They used a sample of student teachers of color who described K-12 school settings as “marginalizing or at times hostile” (p. 443). Teachers of color described how “cooperating teachers were supportive, yet used discriminatory, abusive, or deficit language towards them or students in the classroom” (p. 443).

Also discussed was the lived experiences of teachers of color who regularly encountered racial, nativist, and religious hostilities (Rodriguez-Mojica et al., 2020). The reported experiences of hostile school climates was contrary to the espoused diverse social justice missions of K-12 school environments and graduate teacher preparation programs. Findings suggested how educational programs designed to recruit and retain diverse preservice teachers need to acknowledge the reality of “racialized experiences in student teaching” which were “not isolated events; rather, they are the products of a racialized system designed to uphold Whiteness and White supremacy” (Rodriguez-Mojica et al., 2020, p. 454).

IV. Need for Structural, Systemic, and Institutional Change: Research and Scholarship Relevant to the School-to-Prison Pipeline

The above-mentioned educational programs and graduate education training for preservice teachers may need to be informed by other work advanced by Pierce (1969)—given a need to “redo” how institutions operate (p. 556). Specifically, Pierce (1969) argued, as follows:

Conscientious and concerned whites are perplexed. They offer more and more programs. Their delusion prevents them from accepting a crucial consideration, namely that changing attitudes is more important than

providing programs. As a result of this mental block, whites generally fail to see the importance of relating white racism to the total overhaul of America's institutions. So while white America thinks up more programs about jobs, education, and housing, black America is increasingly anxious to redo the process by which institutions operate. Only then can the programs succeed. (Pierce, 1969, p. 556)

There is other scholarship of great note that supports the need to “redo” how institutions operate, or the need for structural, systemic, and institutional change in order to prevent negative harms to children of color in K-12. A penal caste system within schools has been referred to as the school-to-prison pipeline (Alexander, 2012; Annamma et al., 2020; Parks et al., 2016). Scholarship by Alexander (2012) helped to reveal the roots of school push-out and a school-to-prison pipeline. Alexander indicated the following, in this regard:

Throughout the criminal justice system, as well as in our schools and public spaces, young + black + male is equated with reasonable suspicion, justifying the arrest, interrogation, search, and detention of thousands of African Americans every year, as well as their exclusion from employment and housing and the denial of educational opportunity. Because black youth are viewed as criminals, they face severe employment discrimination and are also “pushed out” of schools through racially biased school discipline policies. (p. 199)

Alexander (2012) further contextualizes the harms that children in K-12 schools face by discussing the reality of a modern-day caste system that has contributed to this country's crisis of mass incarceration, persistent racial disparities in the penal system, and pervasive notions of Black criminality. Alexander explained how what “is completely missed in the rare public debates today about the plight of African Americans is that a huge percentage of them are not free to move up at all”—including via the education system (p. 13). Further, it is “not just that they lack opportunity, attend poor schools, or are plagued by poverty,” indeed, they “are barred by law from doing so” (p. 13). Or,

African Americans attempt to negotiate the “major institutions with which they come into contact,” even as these institutions have been “designed to prevent their mobility” (p. 13).

As per Alexander (2012), there is effectively a “current system of control” in the United States that “permanently locks a huge percentage of the African American community out of the mainstream society and economy” (p. 13). The “system operates through our criminal justice institutions, but it functions more like a caste system than a system of crime control” with the lower caste being “permanently barred by law and custom from mainstream society” (p. 13). Alexander (2012) described this as a “new system of racialized social control” that “purports to be colorblind”—while it “creates and maintains racial hierarchy much as earlier systems of control did” (p. 13). Hence, Alexander (2012) calls this the “New Jim Crow” which is like a form of “slavery”—while featuring contemporary “mass incarceration” that operates as a “tightly networked system of laws, policies, customs, and institutions that operate collectively to ensure the subordinate status of a group defined largely by race” (Alexander, 2012, p. 13).

The historical connection to current antiblack educational practices and policies are relevant given the “institutional structures and social processes—that maintain Black subjugation” (Dumas, 2016, p. 14). Antiblackness within educational practices and policies are rooted in the dehumanization of Blacks, and the use of violence as a means to control Black youth. Dumas described the historical connections, but discussing how, during “the years of state-sanctioned slavery, white slaveowners would often beat their Black property for attempting to learn to read” (p. 16). In addition, “for Black people in bondage, learning to read was understood not only as a pathway to economic mobility,

but, perhaps more importantly, as assertion of their own humanity, a resistance to being propertied” (Dumas, 2016, p. 16).

Dumas (2016) argued the need for educators to identify and disrupt antiblackness within educational practices and policies, given the exclusionary practices against and embedded discrimination against Black students. Drawing upon classic historical works of others, Dumas went on to argue that “seeking an education for Black people” serves to “creates spaces to disrupt the exclusion of the Black from the cultural and political regard extended to those who are presumed Human” (Dumas, 2016, p. 17).

Historical dehumanization has been linked to police violence. Pierce (1970) contended that the racially discriminatory practices of the educational system and penal institutions were analogous. Pierce explained how “the education system has succeeded in preparing generation after generation of blacks to accept the docile, passive positions of abused, disenfranchised, second-class citizens” (p. 268). Elaborating further, it was pointed out how it was the “summation of collective micro-offenses by the majority that permits police department after police department to tyrannize black communities” (Pierce, 1970, p. 268).

What emerges is a powerful argument for how the systems, structures, and institutions of the United States—from graduate training programs for preservice teachers in colleges and universities, to K-12 schools, to police departments and the criminal justice system—all reflect antiblack practices and policies. Whites play a role in sustaining the detrimental impact of systems, structures, and institutions upon Blacks, including most vulnerable K-12 students attempting to learn in racially hostile school climates. This follows from Pierce (1969), who described the enduring impact of racism

as pervasive “since virtually all whites are involved” (p. 555). A result is how “the largest public health and mental health problem of the United States is racism” (p. 555). Pierce explained how it is possible for racism to persist, while creating systems, structures, and institutions that are problematic for Blacks, as follows:

Thus, the ingredients of white racism, inculcated into virtually every white child, which do violence to black people are feelings of superiority, exploitation for self-gain, ready degradation, abuse, and dehumanization of people whose skin color is different. Yet the most dangerous ingredient is one which encourages whites to ignore the presence and/or sensibilities of blacks. That is, all decisions can be made without consulting the black community or black individual. (p. 555)

Once Blacks are dehumanized and their sensibilities ignored, with decisions about their lives made without them, school climates may easily prevail in K-12 educational institutions that permit school push-out and a school-to-prison pipeline. As per Coles and Powell (2020), evidence of this may be found in exclusionary discipline practices in school.

Hostile school climates contribute to school suspensions and discipline that disproportionately impact Black male and female students, in particular, in urban schools—within a school-to-prison pipeline (Parks et al., 2016). Coles and Powell (2020) elaborated on how disciplinary practices in schools disproportionately impact students of color, being detrimental to their health and well-being. Thus, “school suspensions are an inherently anti-Black policy” that removes and excludes “Black youth from school, cornering them into unproductive pathways or worse”—as Black youth may even “end up dead” (Coles & Powell, 2020, p. 114).

Also, Coles and Powell (2020) take a historical perspective, asserting that “the discipline found in schools is rooted in historical ideas of Black youth being criminal or

unteachable” (p. 116). They go so far as to assert that it is “irresponsible for educators to ignore” the historical roots of “discipline for Black people while working to understand disproportionality in school discipline” (p. 116). They add that taking “perspectives void of historical context” lead educators to “believe that patterns of Black youth being suspended three to four times more than white students” are “an isolated phenomenon” that is linked to “individual racist teachers or administrators” as “bad apples” (p. 116). Such a view is “not supported by demonstrable facts,” given a nation-wide “pattern” of “systemic disproportionate discipline” (p. 116).

A major report, *The State of America’s Children* (2020) provided evidence that documented the reality of school push-out and a school-to-prison pipeline; for example, for the academic school year 2013-2014, Black students in public-schools were suspended at more than four times the rate of White students. According to Williams et al. (2020), evidence for the 2015–2016 academic school year documented how African American students were the top recipients of school discipline—accounting for 39% of out-of-school suspensions and 33% of expulsions, while only comprising 15% of the K-12 schooling population.

Despite the above cited body of research and scholarship, one might wonder why there is a need to “redo” how institutions operate (Pierce, 1969) or a need for structural, systemic, and institutional change. Hopefully what has emerged is how there is the problem of school push-out (Parks et al., 2016) and a school-to-prison pipeline (Alexander, 2012; Annamma et al., 2020; Parks et al., 2016) which disproportionately impacts Black and other students of color. However, quite compelling is the evidence on the impact of a positive school climate. A positive school climate correlates to higher

student attendance, academic achievement, and emotional health (Larson et al., 2019; Thapa et al., 2013). Hence, it is important to consider the goal of improving school climate (Blitz et al., 2020). Future research on school climate needs to consider school diversity, given how a limitation in prior research is a lack of attention to diversity, racial or ethnic dynamics, or school integration policies (Cohen et al., 2009). In sum, this reality highlights the importance and value of the present research study.

V. Perceived Racism, Discrimination, Stress and Coping, Health Impacts—And Relevant Research

Popularizing the concept of perceived racism, Clark et al. (1999) examined racism through biological, psychological, physiological, and social conditions, as well as via health outcomes among African Americans (p. 808). Racism involves the “beliefs, attitudes, institutional arrangements, and acts that tend to denigrate individuals or groups because of phenotypic characteristics or ethnic group affiliation” (p. 805). Of particular focus is “the subjective experience of prejudice or discrimination of perceived racism” (p. 811). Also discussed is the role of psychological and physiological stress responses. Further, the biopsychosocial conceptual model examined racial stressors in the context of adaptive and maladaptive coping strategies and responses. Central was their presentation of the concept of perceived racism, which accounts for the ability to perceive racism, as well as execute a coping response. The model has informed and advanced empirical investigations, methodologies, and scholarship pertaining to racial stressors, coping mechanisms, and health outcomes (Clark et al., 1999).

Seider et al. (2019) conducted a longitudinal study of Black and Latinx adolescents in five northeastern cities to investigate their relationship and interpersonal

awareness of racism and poverty within their school sites and communities (p. 509). Further, to contextualize students' understanding, the concept of intersectional awareness provided "an understanding of the intersecting effects of multiple systems of power upon individuals and communities" (p. 512). Thus, a student's ability to comprehend the ways in which systems and structures contribute to poverty and racism "can alleviate adolescents' guilt and self-blame for challenges they encounter related to these inequities and simultaneously strengthen their sense of agency and engagement in a collective effort to challenge these inequities" (p. 521). Of particular focus is the manner in which evolution of adolescents' beliefs are influenced by various factors, including personal relationships and experiences, as well as exposure to progressive schooling models and experiential learning to conceptualize systemic inequities (Seider et al., 2019).

Lee and Hicken (2016) investigated the health implications associated with Black Americans' navigating or avoiding forms of racial discrimination or prejudice through "vigilance or vigilant coping styles" (p. 422). Further, adaptive strategies and behavioral tactics associated with Black respectability politics when navigating racially stratified spaces. Identified Black respectability behaviors included "caring about appearance and language, avoiding social situations and places, and the preparation for potential prejudice and discrimination" (p. 425). Data reported suggest that vigilance or Black respectability behaviors implored as a coping mechanism can be detrimental to the mental and physical health of Black adults (Lee & Hicken, 2016).

Focus on Youth Coping with Stress and Trauma—Research Findings

With regard to impacts on youth in urban classrooms, Emdin (2016) has detailed the mental health impact of exposure to contemporary dynamics in schools as resulting in

trauma. Although using a college sample (N=215), 85.1% of minority students reported experiences of racism or oppression, and 85.2% of the group reported their experiences as stressful, and 38.3% as traumatic (Ingram & Wallace, 2018, p. 88). Further, open-ended responses highlighted the prevalence of racial, gender, and cultural prejudice or discrimination within school environments—suggesting how intersectionality was at play for many students, especially female students of color. Emergent themes supported the “nexus of multiple forms of racism” introduced as a conceptual framework, which covered students’ “potential exposure to perceived racism, intersectionality, stress, coping, and varied health outcomes” (pp. 83-84). Survey findings demonstrated a need for schools to adopt recommended interventions to address the psychological, physical, and intellectual well-being of students of color. Qualitative data analysis revealed multiple emergent themes for ways of coping/bouncing back/healing from racism/oppression, while findings suggested students were resilient in coping with stress and trauma. Female students of color also reported the stress of intersectionality as they navigated multiple oppressed identities, such as racism and sexism (Ingram & Wallace, 2019).

Ingram and Wallace (2019) pointed out the following:

With regard to this study’s qualitative findings, first, they fit well within the conceptual framework introduced in this article as having guided the study. This conceptual framework is the nexus of multiple forms of racism (i.e., *institutional racism*, *cultural racism*, *individual racism*, *racial microaggressions*, and *structural racism*, including in the form of *police violence*)—with potential perceived racism, intersectionality, stress, coping, and varied health outcomes.

Confirming institutional racism within this nexus, several Black female students shared illustrative experiences (Ingram & Wallace, 2019). One urged her institution to be “*accountable for the institutionalized racism.*” Another acknowledged this factor, while explaining what she does: i.e., “*work to fight it and change the system.*” Yet, another spoke of

“the climate” at her *“current institution”* as *“very uncomfortable,”* including to the extent that she had *“chosen to leave school.”*... (p. 98)

Hence, there is also support, herein, for the present study focusing on not only perceived racism, but also school climate as key variables.

Others have also investigated awareness of racism among youth. Seider et al. (2019) conducted a longitudinal study of Black and Latinx adolescents in five northeastern cities to investigate their relationship and interpersonal awareness of racism and poverty within their school sites and communities (p. 509). Further, to contextualize students' understanding, the concept of intersectional awareness provided “an understanding of the intersecting effects of multiple systems of power upon individuals and communities” (p. 512).

Thus, a student's ability to comprehend the ways in which systems and structures contribute to poverty and racism “can alleviate adolescents' guilt and self-blame for challenges they encounter related to these inequities and simultaneously strengthen their sense of agency and engagement in a collective effort to challenge these inequities” (Seider et al., 2019, p. 521). Findings highlighted the evolution of adolescents' beliefs over time in the longitudinal study. These beliefs were found to be influenced by various factors, including personal relationships and experiences, as well as exposure to progressive schooling models and experiential learning to conceptualize systemic inequities (Seider et al., 2019).

VI. Research on Transforming Schools Toward Greater Cultural Competence and Improving School Climates

Cultural Competence and Cultural Humility

Tervalon and Murray-Garcia (1998) moved scholarship and research toward a broad conceptualization of cultural competence that clarifies how cultural competence cannot be an end-goal of any training. Rather, achieving cultural competence is a life-long learning process that implicates change on both the level of the individual who must overcome stereotyping, as well as change in institutions that move away from hierarchical domination. Tervalon and Murray-Garcia found the preferred emergent concept to capture what is needed in the term cultural humility. It is through careful interviewing and dialogue that a practitioner can learn about the client's culture and cultural influences on their health directly from the client—as the expert; and, do so with humility for what the practitioner does not know.

The work of Hook et al. (2013) adopted the concept of cultural humility advanced by Tervalon and Murray-Garcia (1998). Hook (2014) acknowledged the importance of engaging with clients with cultural humility. Through research, Hook et al. (2016) found that counselors higher in cultural humility were able to better rebound from any inadvertent engagement in microaggressions during therapy sessions with clients; this highlighted the importance of cultural humility, and the requisite openness to learning about clients' culture from the clients themselves.

School Research on Achieving Cultural Competence and Cultural Humility

Aiyedun (2019) conducted a mixed-methods case study of an urban charter school that had drawn upon the Emdin (2016) book to design professional development and

special trainings. The goal of the school was to actually implement strategies for school transformation toward greater cultural competence for working with diverse urban youth—and for changing the school climate. Implying how Aiyedun (2019) was seeking the goal of cultural competence, with roots in an understanding of cultural humility, were several survey items.

For example, as per Aiyedun (2019), teachers in her study were asked to rate their level of knowledge and self-efficacy (i.e., confidence given their skill/ability level) for specific behaviors, such as the following 6 (of 9) behaviors: FOR—My interactions with students reflecting effective engagement of students from varied cultural backgrounds; FOR—My interactions with students reflecting how all cultures (races, ethnicities, religions) are valued—with an appreciation of differences, while differences are not treated as deficits, dysfunctions, or disadvantages; FOR—My interactions with students reflecting fairness and consistency in how diverse students are disciplined (corrected, or punished)—so there are no differences by cultural background (race, ethnicity, religion) in how students are disciplined; FOR—My interactions with students reflecting my affirming (supporting) them, their culture, and the history of their cultural group; FOR—My interactions with students reflecting a greater empathy and acceptance of students from diverse cultural backgrounds; FOR—My interactions with students helping to create a more positive school climate. What emerges from only these 6 (of 9) items is a focus on many of the cultural competence or cultural humility indicators embedded throughout this chapter's presentation of scholarship and research.

Also, from Aiyedun's (2019) qualitative data, emergent themes suggested the school's impact on teachers and school staff in the realm of cultural competence and

cultural humility. Consider just some of the emergent themes selected for illustrative purposes that arose from Aiyedun's qualitative data analysis:

- Functioning with expanded consciousness, awareness, and self-reflection about race/culture/white privilege during inter-racial and cross-cultural interactions
- Functioning with the new goal of increasing student voice (and that of colleagues)—so all diverse voices are heard
- Functioning with a new awareness of inequities and intention to avoid unfair disciplinary practices when working with urban students of color
- Functioning with new insight, knowledge, and skills from the training—such as being able to have difficult conversations on race/culture as a staff

Research on Changing the School Climate

Of note, Aiyedun's (2019) qualitative data also demonstrated the power of the Emdin (2016) book to structure and guide professional development and special training that had a real transformative impact on the school climate, and upon the school staff.

Consider the following illustrative emergent themes from Aiyedun (2019):

- Appreciating how the Emdin book, trainings, and discussions empowered the voices of teachers and staff of color
- Improving school climate, community, communication, and relationships with colleagues, students, and students' families
- Ending oppression of urban youth of color and their culture, changing disciplinary practices, and ending demeaning verbal interactions with urban youth of color
- Overcoming class bias through the Emdin book and special trainings
- Perceiving the need to make school structures and instruction more responsive to youth culture

The Concept of Self-Efficacy and Relevant Research

Self-efficacy is the belief in one's own ability to successfully cope in specific situational contexts, which according to Bandura (1977), often "determines how much effort people will expend and how long they will persist in the face of obstacles and aversive experiences (p. 194). The theory posits that one's perception of self and subsequent choices involves processing four sources of information: performance accomplishments, vicarious experience, verbal persuasion, and physiological states. Further identified were factors that "assigned a central role, for analyzing changes achieved in fearful and avoidant behavior" (p. 193). Thus, how one enters or sustains efforts in a stress-induced situation can be correlated to their belief in self, particularly their ability to cope or mitigate fear or failure (Bandura, 1977).

As in prior studies (i.e., Aiyedun, 2019), the present study will find use of the construct of self-efficacy. Specifically, self-efficacy is explored as level of confidence to perform key behaviors recommended for teachers of diverse, urban students. Aiyedun (2019) studied teachers in an urban independent school engaging in professional development and special trainings that sought to empower teachers to implement concepts taught by Emdin (2016)—specifically examining their self-efficacy. Through reading Emdin's (2016) book and having facilitated group discussion and assignments, the goal was to have teachers rate themselves for their knowledge and self-efficacy before versus after experiencing the Emdin-based professional development and special trainings. Aiyedun (2019) obtained teachers' and staffs' ratings for their (a) knowledge and (b) self-efficacy for the following: 1-interactions with students from varied cultural backgrounds; 2-effective engagement with students; 3-interactions reflecting all are

valued; 4-interactions reflecting fairness and consistency in how they are disciplined; 5-interactions reflecting affirming them; 6-interactions reflecting greater empathy and acceptance; 7-interactions reflecting appreciation for living in an urban environment; 8-interactions reflecting creating a safe space and trusting environment; and, 9-interactions helping to create a more positive school climate.

Of note, the present study follows Aiyedun (2019) in selecting these same areas (#1–8)—while eliminating item #7 given this study was not exclusive to teachers working in an urban environment. Additionally, the present study created a separate one-item scale asking teachers to rate their school’s climate. As a key finding, Aiyedun found that teachers and school staff provided a significantly higher ($N=47$, $t= -4.726$, $df=46$, $p=.000$) rating for Behavior #9 (i.e., FOR—My interactions with students helping to create a more positive school climate post-training) for their knowledge for how to enact this behavior (mean=8.81, $SD=1.262$), in comparison to their pre-training rating (mean=8.26, $SD=1.31$). Similarly, teachers and school staffs’ level of self-efficacy for their interactions with students helping to create a more positive school climate, findings showed a significant increase ($N=47$, $t= -8.646$, $df=46$, $p=.000$) from pre-training (mean= 7.745, $SD=1.393$) to post-training (mean= 8.511, $SD=1.266$).

Beyond the above focus on just school climate, Aiyedun’s (2019) quantitative data analysis included a focus on conducting multiple paired t-tests comparing teacher’s self-ratings for their (1) knowledge pre-training *versus* post-training, and (2) self-efficacy pre-training *versus* post-training for ratings for all 9-items previously listed above. Findings showed that the Emdin-based professional development and special trainings had a strong positive effect. More specifically, teachers’ self-ratings of their knowledge and self-

efficacy for all 9-behaviors showed a significant increase in mean ratings from pre-training to post-training. Aiyedun (2019) concluded that the intervention of the Emdin-based professional development and special trainings had a significant positive impact. Specifically, “the Bronx charter school achieved the original school goal of undergoing a transformation toward greater cultural competence and changing the school climate—so as to better meet the needs of urban learners from varied cultural backgrounds” (pp. 164-165).

Aiyedun (2019) provided additional results that were suggestive of a differential response to the professional development and special trainings by race of the staff. Independent t-tests were used to compare the mean self-efficacy rating ($=8.934$, $SD=1.254$) for performing the 9-behaviors by the people of color on staff ($N=29$) versus the mean self-efficacy rating ($=7.63$, $SD=1.023$) for White staff ($n=18$). For the period after the Emdin-based professional development and special trainings, the mean self-efficacy rating for staff of color was significantly higher ($t= -.392$, $df=41.55$, $p= .000$) for performing all 9 of the specified behaviors. While the Emdin-based professional development and special trainings had a positive impact on all staff members, there was a greater impact for staff who identified as people of color. Aiyedun (2019) concluded that a challenging reality might be the need to acknowledge how some White teachers and staff may be less ready “for the work of school transformation to meet the needs of urban youth of color; and, their level of readiness is often noticeably lower to engage in difficult conversations about race, culture, privilege, including in small group work” (p. 165).

The Stages of Change Concept and Relevant Findings

Aiyedun's (2019) remarks, above, about White teachers and staff potentially being less ready for the work of school transformation to meet the needs of urban youth of color, point toward the seminal work of Prochaska and DiClemente (1983) on the Stages of Change. Prochaska and DiClemente identified core constructs of the Transtheoretical Model (TTM), including Stages of Change and other behavioral processes that spur behavioral and social changes. The Stages of Change (SOC) are considered key constructs within the Transtheoretical Model of Intentional Behavioral Change (TMI) that can examine behavioral changes through integrative and incremental processes (DiClemente & Velasquez, 2002). Built on the premise that behavioral and social changes are possible, the SOC can be actualized through five stages, as follows: precontemplation (not thinking about changing), contemplation (thinking about changing), preparation (made determination to change and planning to change), action (been taking action to change for less than 6-months), and maintenance (been taking action to change for 6-months or more, possibly for years) (DiClemente & Velasquez, 2002, p. 201).

Having been used in prior studies (e.g., Ingram, 2017; Santacruz, 2014; Tirhi, 2019) and in the present study, the stages of change construct helped form the basis for a key measure to ascertain one's stage of change for taking action to cope with and respond to racism and oppression [i.e., Part X: Coping and Responding to Racism and Oppression Staging Scale (CRROSS-7)]. For example, someone can indicate the length of time they have been actively working on learning how to cope and respond to racism and oppression; and, all options of > 6 months to many years would constitute the

maintenance stage. Thus, the stages of change are utilized in the present study as a core construct.

The choice for utilizing the stages of change is also supported by the work of Aiyedun (2019) who complimented her quantitative data with qualitative data analysis. Identified as an emergent theme that evokes the stages of change of Prochaska and DiClemente (1983), as follows:

- Acknowledging the challenge of training with people in different stages for working on issues of race, culture, and bias

The reality was that the school staff discovered the “training challenge of staff in different stages of racial identity and readiness” to meaningfully engage in “work on issues of race, culture, and bias” (p. 167). Because of this reality, Aiyedun (2019) also found other emergent themes that suggested how some teachers needed greater assistance moving toward an action stage for working toward the goals of becoming a more culturally competent school, overall:

- Asserting the need for readings and special trainings to translate into tangible, concrete action—including strategic planning and implementation
- Recommending the use of an expert to facilitate difficult conversations
- Viewing the need for teachers to receive concrete ways to apply strategies and expand awareness of their practices

These emergent themes followed from how some White teachers and school staff presented in a lower stage of change (e.g., precontemplation, contemplation) or with a lower level of readiness to “engage in difficult conversations about race, culture, privilege, including in small group work” (Aiyedun, 2019, p. 165).

In conclusion, perhaps most relevant to the present study was how teachers and school staff provided qualitative data to support the following theme, which

acknowledged how the professional development and trainings based on the work of Emdin (2016), did in fact result in facilitation real transformation and change:

- Improving school climate, community, communication, and relationships with colleagues, students, and students' families

Conclusion

In conclusion, there is hope that the scholarship and research reviewed in this chapter, much of which was quite disturbing, can build toward progress and lead to a new era of transformation. Indeed, teachers and school staff can potentially transform and help create culturally competent schools with positive school climates that support the needs of diverse students. The conclusion of Aiyedun (2019) emerges as truly inspirational in exclaiming how the Bronx charter school successfully achieved the original goal of undergoing a transformation toward greater cultural competence, while also changing the school climate—"so as to better meet the needs of urban learners from varied cultural backgrounds" (p. 165).

Meanwhile, beyond the hopeful case-study research of Aiyedun (2019) with a small sample of teachers and school staff, this chapter reviewed a body of scholarship and research on the following topics: 1) the Theory of Racism, Microaggressions, and Related Research; 2) Critical Race Theory and Relevant Research Findings; 3) Racial Stereotyping, Identity, Hostile School Climates, and Related Research; 4) Need for Structural, Systemic, and Institutional Change—Research and Scholarship Relevant to the School-to-Prison Pipeline; 5) Perceived Racism, Discrimination, Stress and Coping, Health Impacts—and Relevant Research; and, 6) Research on Transforming Schools toward Greater Cultural Competence and Improving School Climates.

The next chapter, III, will present the methods followed in the dissertation research.

Chapter III

METHODS

As the methods chapter, this section of the dissertation will provide an overview of all methods and procedures followed by the Principal Investigator so as to produce the study findings, which will appear in the subsequent chapter. More specifically, this chapter provides the study design, relevant procedures, subject recruitment, and a description of the study instrument. Finally, the data analysis plan is presented.

Overview of The Study Design and Procedures

The design of the study was cross-sectional while employing an online recruiting modality with a survey hosted on the Qualtrics platform. Qualtrics is the online survey platform deemed acceptable for research at Teachers College, Columbia University. The survey was completed online by a convenience sample of K-12 teachers of diverse students. This section provides an overview of all study procedures.

IRB Approval

Prior to officially beginning the study, first approval was sought from the Institutional Review Board of Teachers College, Columbia University. This formal approval was received on March 20, 2021 under the exempt category as protocol #21-066 (see **Appendix A** for IRB Approval Letter). The IRB protocol expressly stipulated that due to the COVID-19 pandemic, all in-person study activities with human subjects were suspended by Teachers College, Columbia University. Fortunately, the original design of

the study was based on the sole use of online data collection. Online data collection began on March 22, 2021 and ended on April 11, 2021.

Recruitment of Study Participants

Recruitment of study participants was done on Twitter, Instagram, Facebook, WhatsApp, and Teachers College message boards, as well as via email (see Study Email in **Appendix B**). Also, messages based on the study's official text or tweet (see Study Tweet/Text in **Appendix C**) were placed on walls or direct messages were sent asking potential participants to:

CLICK ON: <http://tinyurl.com/K-12-TEACHERS-INVITED> TO TAKE SURVEY (Takes 15 Minutes) on their BEFORE-pandemic school climate for a 3 in 200 chance to win one of three \$100 Amazon gift cards.

Facebook was used extensively to recruit participants. Facebook groups and pages with the nomenclature “K-12 Teachers” were targeted and requests made to join those various groups if appropriate. Once memberships in those various groups were confirmed, the study invite was posted on the walls every two days. On some Facebook pages, the links were posted daily. Additionally, the survey link was posted on the pages of Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU). Additionally, there was outreach to friends and family via Facebook and WhatsApp—wherein the survey link was shared while snowballing followed, as those contacted sent the invitation to others. Emails were also sent out sharing the survey link, including the encouragement to share the invitation with others, further permitting snowballing to occur. Twitter was also used extensively, with a line of “please retweet,” asking anyone who saw the tweet to share the survey link. Several Tweets were sent out every day, or 2-3 times a day with various hashtags, such as #blacktwitter, #research, and #COVID-19. Also, the survey link was shared via

responses to tweets to increase the visibility of the survey link. In addition, several daily tweets were sent directly to “@” specific educators to increase the visibility of the survey link.

Additional Study Procedures

Potential participants who were interested in taking part in the survey and clicked on the link (<http://tinyurl.com/K-12-TEACHERS-INVITED>) were then directed to the Qualtrics platform where the survey was hosted. Next, participants were presented with the Informed Consent, which included the Participant’s Rights form—which had a box they had to click, as a way to indicate their consent to participate in the study (see Informed Consent in **Appendix D**).

Study Inclusion/Exclusion Criterion

Study participants who read and signed the informed consent were then screened with a short questionnaire to assess if they had met the inclusion/exclusion criterion for study participation (see the Study Screening Survey in **Appendix E**).

The inclusion criteria for the study were as follows :

- Are you age 23 or above? ___Yes ___No
- Are you a K-12 school teacher in a public, charter, private school, or alternative school? ___Yes ___No
- Were you working in a K-12 school setting in the Fall of 2018, Spring of 2019, and Fall of 2019—meaning you worked for those three semesters in a school setting **BEFORE the COVID-19 Pandemic**? ___Yes ___No
- Were you teaching **BEFORE the COVID-19 Pandemic** in a school with any diversity among the students, meaning students were from different races, or ethnicities, or religions, or cultures, etc.? ___Yes ___No
- Do you feel able to think back and answer questions about your work in that K-12 school setting **BEFORE the COVID-19 Pandemic**? ___Yes ___No

If participants answered ‘yes’ to all the questions, they were allowed to complete the survey. If participants answered ‘no’ to any of the inclusion questions, they were thanked for their time and informed that they did not qualify to participate.

Generating Prizes: The Study Incentive for Participation

The study used a raffle for a prize as an incentive for study participation. As a means to encourage participation in the survey, participants were offered an opportunity to win one of three Amazon gift cards valued at \$100—while they would have a 3 in 200 chance of winning one of three such cards. Upon completing the survey, participants could elect to enter the lottery for one of three Amazon gift cards by entering their email addresses. After study closure, the participants who entered their email into the lottery had a chance to win one of the three prizes. The Research Group on Disparities in Health (RGDH) utilized the expertise of the webmaster, Dr. Rupananda Misra, to administer the prize application process. Dr. Misra’s administration of the prizes allowed the participants’ privacy to be maintained, as the program used encryption for all email addresses entered into the program. Thus, the Principal Investigator was unable to view any of the email addresses, nor access the program. This process allowed for participant privacy to be maintained in the prize-generating process.

The Study Sample

Study participants (N=55) were a convenience sample of volunteers who completed the study. There were 98 entries, but only 62 were eligible for inclusion. Of the 62, only 55 (study completers) had data for the study outcome variable/dependent variable; thus, seven were eliminated as study non-completers. Of note, there were no

surveys from duplicate IP addresses, which was likely due to a warning page inserted, explaining that anyone who took the survey more than once would be excluded.

When comparing completers (N=55) of the survey who had the primary outcome variable to non-completers (N=7) who lacked that primary outcome data, no significant differences were found. Of note, the N was very small, so the tests were of limited value, however, the only significant difference was that completers had higher income than non-completers. The severe limitation of comparing five non-completers to 55 completers must be kept in mind when examining this one significant finding.

See Table 1.

Table 1. *Comparing Survey Completers (N=55) to Non-Completers (N=7) via Independent T-Tests*

	Has Primary Outcome Variable? Yes= Completer No= Non-Completer	N	M	SD	t-test (significant at p<0.01)		
					T	df	P
Age	Yes	55	38.02	10.133	-.134	60	.894
	No	7	37.43	16.632			
Level of Education	Yes	55	2.98	.527	-.703	58	.485
	No	5	2.80	.837			
Household Income	Yes	55	5.44	.856	-3.782	54.000	.000***
	No	5	5.00	.000			
Skin Color	Yes	55	3.45	1.951	.714	60	.478
	No	7	4.00	4.414			
Years Teaching	Yes	55	10.67	7.907	-1.795	58	.078
	No	5	4.20	4.438			

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001 Bonferroni Adjustment Significance (.05/5 p= 0.01)
Note: All p values above 0.01 are considered non-significant, and only those below 0.01 are considered statistically significant

Description of Research Instrumentation

The study survey instrument consisted of a combination of survey parts adapted from the work of Aiyedun (2019), others developed for use in the present study, as well as standard tools of the Research Group on Disparities in Health (RGDH, Director. Dr. Barbara Wallace, Teachers College, Columbia University). See **Appendix F** for the complete survey with multiple parts, each of which is described in this section.

Part I: Basic Demographics (BD-14)

The Basic Demographics (BD-14) is a standard tool of the Research Group on Disparities in Health (RGDH), having been used in (e.g., Aiyedun, 2019). Questions obtain gender, age, race/ethnicity, skin color, county of birth, annual income, and highest educational level. Teacher's employment history and the demographics of their students were also obtained.

Part II: Personal Health Background (PHB-2)

The PHB-2 has two items, having been shortened from prior versions used by the RGDH, given the pandemic and need for short measures. It uses a Likert scale ranging from 1=very poor to 6=excellent to acquire ratings of physical health, as well as mental/emotional health status, thereby obtaining a mean score, standard deviation (SD), and minimum and maximum scores.

Part III: Single Item Rating of Risk of Providing Socially Desirable Responses (SIR-RPSDR-1)

The SIR-RPSDR-1 has one item used in prior studies (Laryea, 2019), with findings justifying this tool replacing use of the well-known 13-item measure of social

Part VII: Microaggressions in School Settings Experienced by Personnel and Witnessed Happening to Students (MSS-EBPAWHT-12)

The tool was created for use in a prior study (i.e., Liss, 2015) and is now a commonly used measure by fellows of the RGDH (e.g., Lian, 2017) while tailored for each study population. For this study, the tool investigates the prevalence of microaggressions, while using two sub-scales: *Sub-Scale 1: Ratings of Personal Interactions*; and *Sub-Scale 2: Ratings of Interactions You Personally Witnessed Between Students and School Staff in Your School Setting*.

The instructions and scoring for a sample item from the *first sub-scale* follows:

BEFORE THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC (FALL 2018, SPRING 2019, and FALL 2019 SCHOOL SETTINGS)...

When interacting with other teachers, administrators, and school staff, to what extent did **YOU EXPERIENCE** any of the following—and **the experience seemed related to your personal demographics or appearance**:

1. Brief exchanges or brief interactions where **YOU** felt you were receiving messages that were a put down, denigrating, or conveyed something negative (i.e., that seemed related to your personal demographics or appearance):
0-Never/Not At All 1-At Least Once 2-More Than Once 3-A Few Times 4-Many Times

The instructions and scoring for a sample item from the *second sub-scale* follows:

BEFORE THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC (FALL 2018, SPRING 2019, and FALL 2019 SCHOOL SETTINGS)...

To what extent did **YOU WITNESS students** experiencing any of the following during their interactions with other teachers, administrators, or school staff—and **the experience seemed related to their personal demographics or appearance**:

4. A communication directed toward **STUDENTS** that was insulting, or conveyed rudeness and insensitivity, put downs or demeaning language (i.e., that seemed related to their personal demographics or appearance):
0-Never/Not At All 1-At Least Once 2-More Than Once 3-A Few Times 4-Many Times

Data analysis will determine for each sub-scale a mean score, standard deviation, minimum score, maximum score, as well as Cronbach's Alpha for internal consistency.

Part VIII: Perceptions of Racism and Oppression Scale (PROS-10)

As a tool created for use by RGDH, it has been used in numerous studies (e.g., Ingram, 2017; Santacruz, 2014; Tirhi, 2019) to ascertain participants' level of ability for perceiving racism and/or oppression—whether when racism/oppression is happening to one's self or to others. The 5-point Likert scale (1. ___ *Strongly Agree* 2. ___ *Agree* 3. ___ *Undecided* 4. ___ *Disagree* 5. ___ *Strongly Disagree*) corresponds to a 1=very low level of ability, 2=low level of ability, 3=moderate level of ability, 4=high level of ability, and 5=very high level of ability. Of note, items 7-10 are reverse scored.

The scale permits obtaining a mean score, standard deviation, minimum and maximum scores, as well as Cronbach's Alpha for determining internal consistency.

Part IX: Coping and Responding to Racism and Oppression Staging Scale (CRROSS-7)

As a tool created for use by RGDH, it has been used in numerous studies (e.g., Ingram, 2017; Tirhi, 2019), while this study uses a shorter 7-item version. The scale determines the stage of change—as per the work of Prochaska and DiClemente (1983), in which the participant may be found for the behavior of taking action to cope and respond to racism and/or oppression; specifically, participants may be one of the following stages:

- 1-**Precontemplation Stage** (lowest, least mature stage of change, as they are not thinking about taking such action)
- 2-**Contemplation Stage** (they are only thinking about taking action, not having done so as of yet)
- 3-**Preparation Stage** (they have made a determination to take action, and are preparing to do so)
- 4-**Action Stage** (they have been taking action for up to 6-months)
- 5-**Maintenance Stage** (they have been taking action for greater than 6-months, and even for many years, or up to a lifetime of taking action)

Thus, the tool is theory-based (i.e., DiClemente & Velasquez, 2002; Prochaska & DiClemente, 1983), while the 7-items are rated, as follows:

1. *Strongly Agree* 2. *Agree* 3. *Undecided* 4. *Disagree* 5. *Strongly Disagree*

The tool permits determination for stage of change of sample's mean, standard deviation, and minimum and maximum scores on this scale. Of note, the original 5-item version used by Lian (2017) had excellent internal consistency with a Cronbach's Alpha of .901.

Data Analysis and Management

Data Analysis Plan

Given an online sample of participants (N=55) who self-identified as a school teacher of diverse K-12 students in the United States and completed an online survey in response to a social media campaign (i.e. CLICK ON: <http://tinyurl.com/K-12-TEACHERS-INVITED> TO TAKE SURVEY (Takes 15 Minutes) on their BEFORE-pandemic school climate for a 3 in 200 chance to win one of three \$100 Amazon gift cards), this study answered research questions—using the *data analysis plan* indicated:

1-What are their demographic characteristics (i.e., age, race/ethnicity, skin color, U.S. born, generation in U.S., household income, level of education, type of school taught in [public, charter, private; and, urban, suburban, rural], demographic composition of school students; position in school; years in position; whether at same school, different school, or unemployed; total years in teaching profession)?

Part I: Basic Demographics (BD-14)

Data Analysis Plan: Descriptive statistics, including means, standard deviations, frequencies, and percentages

2-What is their personal health background, including ratings for their physical health status and mental/emotional health status?

Part II: Personal Health Background (PHB-2)

Data Analysis Plan: Descriptive statistics, including means, standard deviations, frequencies, and percentages

3-What is the extent to which they provide socially desirable answers (controlled in regression analysis)?

Part III: Single Item Rating of Risk of Providing Socially Desirable Responses (SIR-RPSDR-1)

Data Analysis Plan: Descriptive statistics, including means, standard deviations, frequencies, and percentages

4-What is their level of (a) **knowledge and (b) self-efficacy for performing each of the recommended 8 behaviors for working with diverse students** [i.e., (1) interactions with students reflecting consideration of their CULTURAL background (i.e., race, ethnicity, religion); (2) interactions with students showing effective ENGAGEMENT of students from varied cultural backgrounds; (3) interactions with students showing how all races, ethnicities, religions, and cultures are VALUED—with an appreciation of differences; (4) interactions with students showing fairness and consistency in DISCIPLINING (punishing, correcting) students—so there are no differences by race, ethnicity, religion, or cultural background; (5) interactions with students AFFIRMING (supporting) them, their culture, and the history of their cultural group; (6) interactions with students showing EMPATHY and acceptance of students from diverse cultural backgrounds; (7) interactions with students creating a SAFE SPACE and trusting environment for students from diverse cultural backgrounds; and (8) interactions with students helping to CREATE a more positive school climate]?

Part IV. Knowledge and Self-Efficacy for 8 Key Behaviors for Teaching Diverse Students (KS-8-BTDS-SCR-16)

Data Analysis Plan: Descriptive statistics, including means, standard deviations, frequencies, and percentages

5-How do they rate their school climate for how well it supported, engaged, valued, fairly disciplined, affirmed, reflected empathy for, and served as a safe space for students from varied cultural backgrounds?

Part V: Rating the School Climate (RSC-1)

Data Analysis Plan: Descriptive statistics, including means, standard deviations, frequencies, and percentages

NOTE: Study Outcome Variable

6-How do they rate themselves as teachers, and how do they rate other school staff for the attribute of cultural humility?

Part VI: Rating for Cultural Humility (RCH-1)

Data Analysis Plan: Descriptive statistics, including means, standard deviations, frequencies, and percentages

7-What do they report for having (a) personally experienced microaggressions, and for having (b) witnessed microaggressions happening to students in the school setting?

Part VII: Microaggressions in School Settings Experienced by Personnel and

Witnessed Happening to Students (MSS-EBPAWHT-12)

Data Analysis Plan: Descriptive statistics, including means, standard deviations, frequencies, and percentages

8-What is their level of ability for perceiving racism and oppression?

Part VIII: Perceptions of Racism and Oppression Scale (PROS-10)

Data Analysis Plan: Descriptive statistics, including means, standard deviations, frequencies, and percentages

9-What is their stage of change for coping and responding to racism and oppression?

Part IX: Coping and Responding to Racism and Oppression Staging Scale (CRROSS-7)

Data Analysis Plan: Descriptive statistics, including means, standard deviations, frequencies, and percentages

10-What significant relationships were found between **the study dependent/outcome variable of rating of school climate** and selected independent variables?

Data Analysis Plan: Inferential statistics, including via Pearson's correlations and t-tests

11-What were the significant predictors of the **study dependent/outcome variable of a high rating of their school climate**?

Data Management

Data were downloaded from www.Qualtrics.com. The data were transferred to SPSS and analyzed using SPSS 26.0.

Conclusion

This chapter, methods, presented the procedures followed in this study to permit the acquisition of data and the analysis of data. This includes details from the receipt of IRB approval, the recruitment of participants, the study measure, and plans for data analysis and management.

The next chapter, IV, will present the results of the data analysis.

Chapter IV

RESULTS

This chapter presents the results of data analysis. The organization of the chapter is by research question. Tables are also presented, capturing the results of data analysis.

Data Analysis Results by Study Question

Results for Research Question #1

What are their demographic characteristics (i.e., age, race/ethnicity, skin color, U.S. born, generation in U.S., household income, level of education, type of school taught in [public, charter, private; and, urban, suburban, rural], demographic composition of school students; position in school; years in position; whether at same school, different school, or unemployed; total years in teaching profession)? (BD-14)

Part I: Basic Demographics. The sample (N=55) was 78.2% (N=43) female, 81.8% (N=45) born in the United States, 45.5% (N=25) White, 30.9% (N=17) Black, 14.5% (N=8) Latinx, and 7.3% (N=3) Asian with a mean age of 38.02 years (SD=10.133, min=23, max=63). The skin color mean was 3.45 (SD=1.951, min=1, max=7) for between medium to dark and medium to light skin tone.

Some 92.7% (N=51) were teachers for a mean of 10.67 years (SD=7.91, min=1, max=36), while 87.3% (N=48) had their principal's certification. The level of education mean was category 2.98 (SD=.527, min=2, max=4) for closest to a Master's degree, and the annual household income category mean was 5.44 (SD=.836, min=2, max=7) for between \$50,00 to \$99,000 and \$100,000 to \$199,999.

Before the COVID-19 pandemic (i.e., Fall 2018, Spring 2019, and Fall 2019), 70.9% worked in public schools (N=39), 18.2% in charter schools (N=10), and 9.1% worked in private schools (N=5). Their pre-pandemic school settings were 74.5% (N=41) urban areas, 21.8% (N=12) suburban, and 3.6% (N=2) rural. Of note, 78.2% (N=43) were currently working at the same school during the pandemic as pre-pandemic. Pre-pandemic, reflecting the diversity of the demographics of students in their school, findings showed: Black students made up a mean of 34.06% (SD=28.142, min=0%, max=98%) of their school populations; Latinx students made up a mean of 30.87% (SD=26.06, min=0% max=98%); White students made up a mean of 25.93% (SD=29.507, min=1%, max=95%); Asian students made up a mean of 8.22% (SD=11.123, min=0, max=50%); and Pacific Islander/Native American students made up a mean of 2.16% (SD=4.795, min=0%, max=20%).

See Table 2.

Table 2. *Basic Demographics (BD-14)* (N=55)

	N	%
Gender		
Female	43	78.2
Male	12	21.8
Mean Age (38.02), SD (10.133) min (23), max (63) Age (N=55)		
23-25	5	9.1
26-30	11	19.9
31-35	8	14.5
36-40	10	18.1
41-45	10	18.2
46-50	4	7.2
51-55	3	5.5
56-60	3	7.2
61-65	1	1.8

Table 2 (continued)

	N	%
Race/Ethnicity (N=55)		
1-American Indian/Alaska Native	3	5.5
2-Arab American/Middle Eastern	1	1.8
3-Asian (Asian Indian, Chinese, Filipino, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese, other Asian)	4	7.3
4-Black/African American/Caribbean	17	30.9
5-Latinx/Hispanic/Latino (Puerto Rican, Dominican, Mexican, Cuban, other Spanish)	8	14.5
6-White/Caucasian /European American	25	45.5
7-Other	1	1.8
Mean skin color (3.45), SD (1.951) min (1), max (7)		
Skin Color (N=55)		
1-Very Dark	4	7.3
2-Dark	6	10.9
3-Medium to Dark	6	10.9
4-Medium to Light	12	21.8
5-Light	9	16.4
6-Very Light	3	5.5
7-White	15	27.3
Born in the US (N=55)		
Yes	45	81.8
No	10	18.2
Other Country of Origin (N=55)		
Algeria	1	10
Dominican Republic	1	10
El Salvador	2	20
Guyana	1	10
Ghana	1	10
Iceland	1	10
South Korea	1	10
Peru	2	20

Table 2 (continued)

	N	%
Mean Household Income (5.44), SD (.856)		
<i>min (2), max (7)</i>		
Annual Household Income (N=55)		
1-Less than \$10,000	0	0
2- \$10,000 to \$19,000	1	1.8
3- \$20,000 to \$39,000	1	1.8
4- \$40,000 to \$49,000	1	1.8
5- \$50,000 to \$99,999	25	45.5
6- \$100,000 to \$199,999	24	43.6
7- \$200,000 to \$299,000	3	5.5
Mean Education Level (2.98), SD (.527)		
<i>min (2), max (4)</i>		
Education Level (N=55)		
1-Less than Bachelors	0	0
2-Bachelor's Degree	8	14.5
3-Master's Degree	40	72.7
4-Doctoral Degree	7	12.7
Principal Certification (N=55)		
Yes	7	12.7
No	48	87.3
School Setting Worked Before the Covid-19 Pandemic for Fall 2018, Spring 2019 and Fall 2019 (N=55)		
Public	39	70.9
Charter	10	18.2
Private	5	9.1
Demographics Suggesting Diversity in Schools		
<i>Mean Percentage of White Students</i>		
<i>(25.93), SD (29.507), min (0), max (95)</i>		
<i>Mean Percentage of Black Students</i>		
<i>(34.60), SD (28.142), min (1), max (98)</i>		
<i>Mean Percentage of Latino Students</i>		
<i>(30.87), SD (26.06), min (0), max (98)</i>		
<i>Mean Percentage of Asian Students</i>		
<i>(8.22), SD (11.123), min (0), max (50)</i>		
<i>Mean Percentage of Pacific Islander and Native American Students</i>		
<i>(2.16), SD (4.795), min (0), max (20)</i>		

Table 2 (continued)

	N	%
School Setting Primarily Worked in Before the Covid-19 Pandemic (N=55)		
Urban	41	74.5
Suburban	12	21.8
Rural	2	3.6
Position(s) in School Primarily Worked (N=55)*		
Teacher	51	92.7
Assistant/Vice Principal or Headmaster	2	3.6
Principal/ Headmaster	1	1.8
Other Administration Staff	2	3.6
Mean Number of Total Years Teaching (10.67), SD (7.907) min (1), max (36)		
Length of Time in Position at That School (N=55)		
Less than a year	3	5.5
1-5	31	56.4
6-10	8	14.5
11-15	7	12.7
16-20	5	9
30+	1	1.8
Position at Present Time (N=55)		
Working at Same School	43	78.2
Working at Different School	7	12.7
Not Working at this School	5	9.1

Note: * represents where respondents were able to select multiple answer options

Results for Research Question #2

What is their personal health background, including ratings for their physical health status and mental/emotional health status? (PHB-2)

Part II: Personal Health Background (PHB-2). The mean rating for their overall current physical health status was 4.47 (min=3, max=6, SD=0.858) for *between good and very good*. For example, most rated their physical health status as good (38.2%, N=21), or very good (38.2%, N=21).

The mean rating for their overall mental health status was 4.20 (min=2, max=6, SD=1.026) for *closest to good*. For example, 36.4% (N=20) reported their mental health status as good, while 34.5% (N=19) reported very good.

See Table 3.

Table 3. *Personal Health Background (M-PHB-5) (N=55)*

	N	%
Mean Physical Health Status (4.47), SD (.858)		
min (3), max (6)		
Overall Physical Health Status		
1-Very Poor	0	0
2-Poor	0	0
3-Fair	7	12.7
4-Good	21	38.2
5-Very Good	21	38.2
6-Excellent	6	10.9
Mean Mental Health Status (4.20), SD (1.026)		
min (2), max (6)		
Overall Mental Health Status		
1-Very Poor	0	0
2-Poor	4	7.3
3-Fair	8	14.5
4-Good	20	36.4
5-Very Good	19	34.5
6-Excellent	4	7.3

Results for Research Question #3:

To what extent did they tend to provide socially desirable responses to questions? (SIR-RPSDR-1)

Part III: Single Item Rating of Risk of Providing Socially Desirable

Responses (SIR-RPSDR-1). The social desirability mean was 4.73 (min=0, max=10, SD=2.430) for a *moderate risk of social desirability*. Of note, social desirability is controlled for in the regression analysis.

See Table 4.

Table 4. *Single Item Rating of Risk of Providing Socially Desirable Responses (SIR-RPSDR-1) (N=55)*

	N	%
Mean Social Desirability (4.73), SD (2.430)		
min (0), max (10)		
0-I am not like this at all	1	1.8
1-	5	9.1
2-	4	7.3
3-	13	23.6
4	2	3.6
5-	4	7.3
6-	13	23.6
7-	5	9.1
8-	6	10.9
9-	1	1.8
10-I am like this all the time	1	1.8

Results for Research Question #4

What is their level of (a) knowledge, and (b) self-efficacy for performing each of the recommended 8 behaviors for working with diverse students? (KS-8-BTDS-SCR-16)

Part IV. Knowledge and Self-Efficacy for 8 Key Behaviors for Teaching

Diverse Students (KS-8-BTDS-SCR-16). The first sub-scale—(a) level of **knowledge** for performing the eight key behaviors for teaching diverse students (odd items 1-5)—had a Cronbach’s Alpha of .927 (excellent internal consistency), with a mean of 8.36 (SD=1.242, min=1.75, max=10) for *closest to moderately high knowledge*. The top-two ranked items were:

- 41.8% (N=23) endorsed having a *very high (score=10) knowledge for interactions with students showing fairness and consistency in DISCIPLINING (punishing, correcting) students—so there are no differences by race, ethnicity, religion, or cultural background;*

- 40% (N=22) endorsed having a *high (score=9) knowledge for interactions with students creating a SAFE SPACE and trusting environment for students from diverse cultural backgrounds.*

The second sub-scale—(b) **self-efficacy** for performing the eight key behaviors for teaching diverse students (even items 2-16)—had a Cronbach’s Alpha of .921 (excellent internal consistency) with a mean of 8.199 (SD=1.35, min=2.25, max=10.00) for *closest to moderately high self-efficacy*. The top-two ranked items showed:

- 29.1% (N=16) endorsed having a *moderately high (score=8) level of self-efficacy for interactions with students showing EMPATHY and acceptance of students from diverse cultural backgrounds*
- 29.1% (N=16) endorsed having a *high (score=9) level of self-efficacy for interactions with students AFFIRMING (supporting) them, their culture, and the history of their cultural group.*

See Table 5.

Table 5. *Knowledge and Self-Efficacy for 8 Key Behaviors for Teaching Diverse Students (KS-8-BTDS-SCR-16) (N=55)*

	N	%
Cronbach’s Alpha Knowledge (.927)		
<i>Mean Knowledge for 8 key behaviors (8.36), SD (1.242)</i>		
<i>min (1.75), max (10)</i>		
Cronbach’s Alpha Self-Efficacy (.921)		
<i>Mean Self-Efficacy for 8 key behaviors (8.199), SD (1.35)</i>		
<i>min (2.25), max (10)</i>		
1-My interactions with students reflecting consideration of their CULTURAL BACKGROUND (i.e., race, ethnicity, religion) (Level of Knowledge)		
1-Lowest Level	1	1.8
5-	1	1.8
6-	3	5.5
7-	14	25.5
8-	19	34.5
9-	10	18.2
10-Highest Level	7	12.7

Table 5 (continued)

	N	%
2-My interactions with students reflecting consideration of their CULTURAL BACKGROUND (i.e., race, ethnicity, religion) (Level of Confidence)		
4-Lowest Level	1	1.8
5-	2	3.6
6-	8	14.5
7-	13	23.6
8-	15	27.4
9-	7	12.7
10-Highest Level	9	16.4
3-My interactions with students showing effective ENGAGEMENT of students from varied cultural backgrounds (Level of Knowledge)		
2-Lowest Level	1	1.8
4-	1	1.8
6-	5	9.1
7-	15	27.3
8-	17	30.9
9-	7	12.7
10-Highest Level	9	16.4
4-My interactions with students showing effective ENGAGEMENT of students from varied cultural backgrounds (Level of Confidence)		
3-Lowest Level	1	1.8
4-	1	1.8
5-	4	7.3
6-	5	9.1
7-	14	25.5
8-	10	18.2
9-	12	21.8
10-Highest Level	8	14.5
5-My interactions with students showing how all races, ethnicities, religions, and cultures are VALUED—with an appreciation of differences (i.e., differences are not treated as deficits) (Level of Knowledge)		
2-Lowest Level	1	1.8
5-	1	1.8
6-	1	1.8
7-	10	18.2
8-	11	20.0
9-	17	30.9
10-Highest Level	14	25.5

Table 5 (continued)

	N	%
6-My interactions with students showing how all races, ethnicities, religions, and cultures are VALUED—with an appreciation of differences (i.e., differences are not treated as deficits) (<u>Level of Confidence</u>)		
2-Lowest Level	1	1.8
5-	3	5.5
6-	3	5.5
7-	7	12.7
8-	14	25.5
9-	15	27.3
10-Highest Level	12	21.8
7-My interactions with students showing fairness and consistency in DISCIPLINING (punishing, correcting) students—so there are no differences by race, ethnicity, religion, or cultural background (<u>Level of Knowledge</u>)		
1-Lowest Level	1	1.8
5-	1	1.8
6-	2	3.6
7-	7	12.7
8-	7	12.7
9-	14	25.5
10-Highest Level	23	41.8
8-My interactions with students showing fairness and consistency in DISCIPLINING (punishing, correcting) students—so there are no differences by race, ethnicity, religion, or cultural background (<u>Level of Confidence</u>)		
1-Lowest Level	1	1.8
2-	1	1.8
4-	2	3.6
5-	2	3.6
6-	1	1.8
7-	4	7.3
8-	7	12.4
9-	19	34.5
10-Highest Level	18	32.7
9-My interactions with students AFFIRMING (supporting) them, their culture, and the history of their cultural group (<u>Level of Knowledge</u>)		
1-Lowest Level	1	1.8
6-	5	9.1
7-	6	10.9
8-	19	34.5
9-	11	20.0
10-Highest Level	13	23.6

Table 5 (continued)

	N	%
10-My interactions with students AFFIRMING (supporting) them, their culture, and the history of their cultural group (<u>Level of Confidence</u>)		
1-Lowest Level	1	1.8
5-	3	5.5
6-	4	7.3
7-	10	18.2
8-	16	29.1
9-	9	16.4
10-Highest Level	12	21.8
11-My interactions with students showing EMPATHY and acceptance of students from diverse cultural backgrounds (<u>Level of Knowledge</u>)		
3-Lowest Level	1	1.8
7-	6	10.9
8-	12	21.8
9-	15	27.3
10-Highest Level	21	38.2
12-My interactions with students showing EMPATHY and acceptance of students from diverse cultural backgrounds (<u>Level of Confidence</u>)		
2- Lowest Level	1	1.8
5-	1	1.8
7-	5	9.1
8-	11	20.0
9-	16	29.1
10- Highest Level	21	38.2
13-My interactions with students creating a SAFE SPACE and trusting environment for students from diverse cultural backgrounds (<u>Level of Knowledge</u>)		
3-Lowest Level	1	1.8
5-	1	1.8
6-	2	3.6
7-	1	1.8
8-	13	23.6
9-	22	40.0
10-Highest Level	15	27.3

Table 5 (continued)

	N	%
14-My interactions with students creating a SAFE SPACE and trusting environment for students from diverse cultural backgrounds (<u>Level of Confidence</u>)		
1-Lowest Level	1	1.8
4-	1	1.8
6-	4	7.3
7-	4	7.3
8-	13	23.6
9-	13	23.6
10-Highest Level	19	34.5
15-My interactions with students helping to CREATE a more positive school climate (<u>Level of Knowledge</u>)		
1-Lowest Level	1	1.8
5-	1	1.8
6-	6	10.9
7-	9	16.4
8-	10	18.2
9-	13	23.6
10-Highest Level	15	27.3
16-My interactions with students helping to CREATE a more positive school climate (<u>Level of Confidence</u>)		
3-Lowest Level	1	1.8
4-	1	1.8
5-	2	3.6
6-	3	5.5
7-	11	20.0
8-	9	16.4
9-	13	23.6
10-Highest Level	15	27.3

Results for Research Question #5

How do they rate their school climate for how well it supported, engaged, valued, fairly disciplined, affirmed, reflected empathy for, and served as a safe space for students from varied cultural backgrounds?

Part V: Rating the School Climate (RSC-1). The mean rating of their pre-pandemic school climate was 6.65 (min=2, max=10, SD=2.076) for *closest to a climate*

that moderately supported, engaged, valued, fairly disciplined, affirmed, reflected empathy for, and served as a safe space for students from varied cultural backgrounds.

For example, 20.0% (N=11) endorsed level 7 for a moderate level.

See Table 6.

Table 6. *Rating the School Climate (RSC-1)* (N=55)

	N	%
Mean Rating of School Climate Before the COVID-19 Pandemic (6.65)		
SD (2.076) min (2), max (10)		
Rating of School Climate		
2-Lowest Level	3	5.5
3-	1	1.8
4-	4	7.3
5-	8	14.5
6-	8	14.5
7-	11	20.0
8-	9	16.4
9-	7	12.7
10-Highest Level	4	7.3

Results for Research Question #6

How do they rate themselves for level of cultural humility?

Part VI: Rating for Cultural Humility (RCH-1). The mean self-rating for cultural humility was 7.76 (SD=1.63, min=3, max=10) for a *moderately high level of cultural humility*. Some 32.7% (N=18) rated themselves at level 8 for a *moderately high level of cultural humility*.

See Table 7.

Table 7. Rating for Cultural Humility (RCH-1) (N=55)

	N	%
Mean Self-Rating for Cultural Humility (7.76), SD (1.633)		
min (3), max (10)		
Self-Rating for Cultural Humility		
3-Lowest Level	1	1.8
4-	1	1.8
5-	4	7.3
6-	5	9.1
7-	8	14.5
8-	18	32.7
9-	10	18.2
10-Highest Level	8	14.5

Results for Research Question #7

What do they report for having (a) personally experienced microaggressions, and for having (b) witnessed microaggressions happening to students in the school setting?

Part VII: Microaggressions in School Settings Experienced by Personnel and Witnessed Happening to Students (MSS-EBPAWHT-12). The first sub-scale—(a) **personally experienced microaggressions** in school settings pre-pandemic—had a Cronbach’s Alpha =.944 (excellent internal consistency), producing a mean of 1.25 (min=.00, max=4, SD=1.17751) *for closest to at least once as a low level of exposure.*

However, when **combining the categories** for personally experiencing a microaggression in the school setting **for “at least once, more than once, a few times, and many times,”** findings *showed about half the teachers or more* had such experiences. Specifically, when combining categories, the following was found for *any such experiences* that **seemed related to their personal demographics or appearance:**

- 1-Brief exchanges or brief interactions where **YOU** felt you were receiving messages that were a put down, denigrating, or conveyed something negative – **63.3% (N=42)**

- 2-A verbal attack that was hurtful and caused **YOU** mental or emotional pain, whether this involved name-calling, or some act of discrimination performed on purpose – **47.3% (N=26)**
- 3-A nonverbal attack, or some behavior that was hurtful and caused mental or emotional pain for **YOU**, whether this involved someone avoiding contact and interaction, or avoiding communication, or some act of discrimination performed on purpose – **58.1% (N=32)**
- 4-A communication that was insulting to **YOU**, or conveyed rudeness and insensitivity, put downs or demeaning language – **63% (N=34)**
- 5-A communication that excluded **YOU**, cancelled out your existence, made you invisible, or ignored the reality of your thoughts, feelings, and existence as a diverse person – **50% (N=27)**
- 6-How often did **YOU** experience any of the above where you felt the treatment you received was related to **MORE THAN ONE** of your personal demographics or characteristics –such as due to **BOTH** your race/ethnicity, as well as your gender, or sexual orientation or your appearance (i.e., skin color, hair style) – **48.4% (N=31)**

See Table 8-A.

Table 8-A. *Personally Experienced Microaggressions (MSS-EBPAWHT-12) (N=55)*

	N	%
Cronbach's Alpha Personally Experienced Microaggressions (.944)		
Mean Rating for Personally Experienced Microaggressions (1.25), SD (1.178)		
min (.00), max (4)		
1-Received messages that were a put down, denigrating, or conveyed something negative (i.e., that seemed related to your personal demographics or appearance)		
0-Never/Not at All	13	23.6
1-At least Once	12	21.8
2-More than Once	11	20.0
3-Few Times	11	20.0
4-Many Times	8	14.5
2-Verbal attack that was hurtful and caused you mental or emotional pain, whether this involved name-calling, or some act of discrimination performed on purpose		
0-Never/Not at All	29	52.7
1-At least Once	9	16.4
2-More than Once	6	10.9
3-Few Times	8	14.5
4-Many Times	3	5.5

Table 8-A (continued)

	N	%
3-Nonverbal attack, or some behavior that was hurtful and caused mental or emotional pain for you, whether this involved someone avoiding contact and interaction, or avoiding communication, or some act of discrimination performed on purpose		
0-Never/Not at All	23	41.8
1-At Least Once	13	23.6
2-More than Once	6	10.9
3-Few Times	6	10.9
4-Many Times	7	12.7
4-Communication that was insulting to you, or conveyed rudeness and insensitivity, put downs, or demeaning language		
0-Never/Not at All	20	37.0
1-At Least Once	17	31.5
2-More Than Once	8	14.8
3-Few Times	5	9.3
4-Many Times	4	7.4
5-Communication that excluded you, cancelled out your existence, made you invisible, or ignored the reality of your thoughts, feelings, and existence as a diverse person		
0-Never/Not at All	27	50.0
1-At Least Once	12	22.2
2-More than Once	6	11.1
3-Few Times	4	7.4
4-Many Times	5	9.3
6-How often did you experience where you felt the treatment you received was related to more than one of your personal demographics or characteristics –such as due to both your race/ethnicity, as well as your gender, or sexual orientation or your appearance		
0-Never/Not at All	23	42.6
1-At Least Once	16	29.6
2-More Than Once	6	11.1
3-Few Times	5	9.3
4-Many Times	4	7.4

The second sub-scale—(a) **microaggressions witnessed happening to students in school settings pre-pandemic**— had a Cronbach’s Alpha =.959 (excellent internal

consistency), producing a mean of 1.627 (min=.00, max=4, SD=1.133) *for between at least once and more than once as a low moderate level of exposure.*

However, when **combining the categories** for microaggressions witnessed happening to students in school settings pre-pandemic **for “at least once, more than once, a few times, and many times,”** findings showed *about three-quarters of teachers or more* had such experiences. Specifically, when combining categories, the following was found *for any such experiences* witnessed **related to students’ personal demographics or appearance:**

- 1-Brief exchanges or brief interactions where you felt students were receiving messages that were a put down, denigrating, or conveyed something negative – **81.6% (N=35)**
- 2-Verbal attack that was hurtful and caused mental or emotional pain for students, whether this involved name calling, or some act of discrimination performed on purpose – **77.9% (N=42)**
- 3-Nonverbal attack, or some behavior that was hurtful and caused mental or emotional pain for students, whether this involved someone avoiding contact and interaction, or avoiding communication, or some act of discrimination performed on purpose – **74.1% (N=40)**
- 4-Communication directed to students that was insulting to or conveyed rudeness and insensitivity, put downs, or demeaning language – **77.7% (N=42)**
- 5-Communication that excluded students, cancelled out their existence, made them invisible, or ignored the reality of their thoughts, feelings, and existence as a diverse person – **76% (N=41)**
- 6-How often did you witness where you felt the treatment toward students was related to more than one of their personal demographics or characteristics –such as due to their race/ethnicity, as well as their gender, or sexual orientation or their appearance – **79.6% (N=43)**

See Table 8-B.

Table 8-B. *Microaggressions in School Settings Witnessed Happening to Students (MSS-EBPAWHT-12)* (N=55)

	N	%
<i>Cronbach's Alpha Microaggressions Witnessed Happening to Students (.959)</i>		
<i>Mean for Microaggressions Witnessed Happening to Students (1.627), SD (1.133)</i>		
<i>min (.00), max (4)</i>		
1-Brief exchanges or brief interactions where you felt <u>students</u> were receiving messages that were a put down, denigrating, or conveyed something negative		
0-Never/Not at All	10	18.5
1-At Least Once	7	13.0
2-More than Once	21	38.9
3-Few Times	9	16.7
4-Many Times	7	13.0
2-Verbal attack that was hurtful and caused mental or emotional pain for <u>students</u>, whether this involved name calling, or some act of discrimination performed on purpose		
0-Never/Not at All	12	22.2
1-At Least Once	15	27.8
2-More than Once	15	27.8
3-Few Times	7	13.0
4-Many Times	5	9.3
3-Nonverbal attack, or some behavior that was hurtful and caused mental or emotional pain for <u>students</u>, whether this involved someone avoiding contact and interaction, or avoiding communication, or some act of discrimination performed on purpose		
0-Never/Not at All	14	25.9
1-At Least Once	15	27.8
2-More than Once	15	27.8
3-Few Times	4	7.4
4-Many Times	6	11.1
4-Communication directed to <u>students</u> that was insulting to or conveyed rudeness and insensitivity, put downs, or demeaning language		
0-Never/Not at All	12	22.2
1-At Least Once	14	25.9
2-More Than Once	16	29.6
3-Few Times	6	11.1
4-Many Times	6	11.1

Table 8-B (continued)

	N	%
5- Communication that excluded <u>students</u>, cancelled out their existence, made them invisible, or ignored the reality of their thoughts, feelings, and existence as a diverse person		
0-Never/Not at All	13	24.1
1-At Least Once	15	27.8
2-More than Once	17	31.5
3-Few Times	4	7.4
4-Many Times	5	9.3
6- How often did you witness where you felt the treatment toward <u>students</u> was related to more than one of their personal demographics or characteristics –such as due to their race/ethnicity, as well as their gender, or sexual orientation or their appearance		
0-Never/Not at All	11	20.4
1-At Least Once	15	27.8
2-More than Once	18	33.3
3-Few Times	4	7.4
4-Many Times	6	11.1

Results for Research Question #8

What is their level of ability for perceiving racism and oppression?

Part VIII: Perceptions of Racism and Oppression Scale (PROS-10). The scale had a Cronbach's Alpha of .847 (good internal consistency) with a mean of 4.27 (min=3, max=5, SD=.606) for a *high level of ability to perceive racism and oppression—whether when happening to one's self or others*. For example, 88.9% (N=48) *strongly disagree* that racism and oppression “never happens to others.”

See Table 9.

Table 9. *Perception of Racism and Oppression Scale (PROS-10) (N=55)*

	N	%
PROS-10 Cronbach's Alpha (.847)		
Mean PROS-10 score (4.27), SD (.606)		
min (3), max (5)		
1-I am not sure it really exists or happens to people		
1-Strongly Agree	1	1.9
3-Undecided	3	5.6
4-Disagree	3	5.6
5-Strongly Disagree	47	87.0
2-When incidents are talked about, I am not sure what makes something racist or oppressive		
3-Undecided	3	5.5
4-Disagree	10	18.5
5-Strongly Disagree	41	75.9
3-I think it never happens to me		
2-Agree	9	16.7
3-Undecided	18	14.8
4-Disagree	15	27.8
5-Strongly Disagree	22	40.7
4-There are times when I "don't get it," or I can't really tell when it is happening to me		
2-Agree	6	11.1
3-Undecided	10	18.5
4-Disagree	14	25.9
5-Strongly Disagree	24	44.4
5-I think it never happens to others		
3-Undecided	2	3.7
4-Disagree	4	7.4
5-Strongly Disagree	48	88.9
6-There are times when I "don't get it," or I can't really tell when it is happening to others		
1-Strongly Agree	1	1.9
2-Agree	4	7.4
3-Undecided	6	11.1
4-Disagree	15	27.8
5-Strongly Disagree	28	51.9

Table 9 (continued)

	N	%
7-I can usually see or sense when it is happening to me		
1-Strongly Agree	19	35.2
2-Agree	15	27.8
3-Undecided	13	24.1
4-Disagree	5	9.3
5-Strongly Disagree	2	3.7
8-I can usually see or sense when it is happening to others		
1-Strongly Agree	22	40.7
2-Agree	21	38.9
3-Undecided	8	14.8
4-Disagree	2	3.7
5-Strongly Disagree	1	1.9
9-When incidents are talked about, I think “that could happen to me or someone I love”		
1-Strongly Agree	26	48.1
2-Agree	18	33.3
3-Undecided	2	3.7
4-Disagree	8	14.8
10-When incidents are talked about, I can identify with and understand the experience		
1-Strongly Agree	22	40.7
2-Agree	21	38.9
3-Undecided	6	11.1
4-Disagree	4	7.4
5-Strongly Disagree	1	1.9

Note: Items 7-10 are reverse scored.

Results for Research Question #9

What is their stage of change for coping and responding to racism and oppression?

Part IX: Coping and Responding to Racism and Oppression Staging Scale

(CRROSS-7). Findings showed a mean of 4.31 (min=1, max=5, SD=1.286) for *closest to the action stage for taking action to cope and respond to racism and oppression* (i.e., for

< 6 months). Yet, when combining all those who have been *actively learning how to cope with and respond to racism and oppression for greater than 6 months*—up to over 31 years—some 81.7% (N=44) were in a maintenance stage.

See Table 10.

Table 10. *Part IX: Coping and Responding to Racism and Oppression Staging Scale (CRROSS-7) (N=55)*

	N	%
Mean Coping and Responding to Racism and Oppression Stage of Change (4.31), SD (1.286), min (1), max (5)		
1-I don't think they exist, so there is nothing to learn how to cope with or respond to		
1-Pre-Contemplation	0	0
2-Contemplation	0	0
3-Preparation	2	3.7
4-Action	4	7.4
5-Maintenance	48	88.9
2-I never thought about how to cope with or respond to it		
1-Pre-Contemplation	1	1.9
2-Contemplation	0	0
3-Preparation	4	7.4
4-Action	19	35.2
5-Maintenance	30	55.6
3-I have thought about how to cope with and respond to it		
1-Pre-Contemplation	23	42.6
2-Contemplation	22	40.7
3-Preparation	4	7.4
4-Action	1	1.9
5-Maintenance	4	7.4
4-I never took steps to learn more about how to cope with and respond to it		
1-Pre-Contemplation	1	1.9
2-Contemplation	3	5.6
3-Preparation	7	13.0
4-Action	18	33.3
5-Maintenance	25	36.3

Table 10 (continued)

	N	%
5-I am planning to take steps to learn more About how to cope with and respond to it		
1-Pre-Contemplation	17	31.5
2-Contemplation	25	46.3
3-Preparation	8	14.8
4-Action	2	3.7
5-Maintenance	2	3.7
6-I have been actively learning how to cope with and respond to it		
1-Pre-Contemplation	20	37.0
2-Contemplation	23	42.6
3-Preparation	5	9.3
4-Action	6	11.1
5-Maintenance	0	0
7-Learning how to cope with and respond to it is something that I have been actively working on		
0-Never	1	1.9
1-< 1 month	3	5.6
2-< 6 months	6	11.1
3-> 6 months	2	3.7
4-1-3 years	9	16.9
5-4-6 years	6	11.1
6-7-9 years	6	11.1
7-10-20 years	6	11.1
8-21-30 years	2	3.7
9->31 years	8	14.8
Unsure	5	9.3

Results for Research Question #10

What significant relationships were found between the study dependent/outcome variable of rating of school climate and selected independent variables?

Pearson's Correlations. Some 17 continuous independent variables were examined for their association with the *study outcome variable of a higher rating of school climate* (pre-pandemic), using the Bonferroni Adjustment Significance level

(0.05/17 = 0.003, $p < 0.003$). Significant findings showed the **higher the rating of school climate** (pre-pandemic), then:

- the **higher** the teacher's level of education ($r=.502$, $p=.000$)
- the **higher** the teacher's rating of their mental health status ($r=.452$, $p=.001$)
- the **less frequent** were teacher's personal experiences of microaggressions ($r=.453$, $p=.001$)
- the **less frequent** were teacher's experiences of witnessing microaggressions against students ($r=-.447$, $p=.001$)

See Table 11.

Table 11. *Correlations Between Selected Variables and Rating of School Climate*

	Rating of School Climate	
	Pearson's R	P
1.Age	.095	.488
2.Skin Color Tone	-.022	.871
3.Annual Household Income	.310	.021*
4.Level of Education	.502	.000***
5.Years Teaching	.035	.797
7.Rating of Physical Health Status	.098	.475
8.Rating of Mental Health Status	.452	.001**
9.Knowledge for Performing 8 Key Behaviors	.173	.207
10.Self Efficacy for Performing 8 Key Behaviors	.219	.108
12.Rating for Cultural Humility	.329	.014
13.Personal Experiences of Microaggression	-.453	.001**
14.Witnessing Microaggressions Against Students	-.447	.001**
15.Perception of Racism & Oppression (PROS-10)	-.145	.296
16.Coping and Responding to Racism and Oppression Staging Scale (CRROSS-7)	-.150	.278
17.Social Desirability	-.123	.372

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$ Bonferroni Adjustment Significance (.05/17, $p = .003$).

Note: All p values above .003 are considered non-significant; and, only those below .003 are considered statistically significant.

Independent T-Tests. Independent t-tests were used to compare selected dichotomous variables on the study outcome variable of a **higher rating of school climate** (pre-pandemic). None of the group comparisons were significant.

See Table 12.

Table 12. *Independent T-Tests Comparing Dichotomous Groups for Rating of School Climate*

	Rating of School Climate			Independent T-Tests		
	N	M	S	T	df	P
Participant Sex				-1.825	53	.074
Female	43	6.37	1.976			
Male	12	7.58	2.234			
If Participant is White				.000	53	1.000
No	33	6.64	2.177			
Yes	22	6.64	1.965			
If Participant Born in U.S.				.778	53	.440
No	10	7.10	1.729			
Yes	45	6.53	2.149			

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$ Bonferroni Adjustment Significance ($.05/3$, $p = .016$). Note: All p values above $.016$ are considered non-significant; and, only those below $.016$ are considered statistically significant.

Results for Research Question #11

What were the significant predictors of the study dependent/outcome variable of a high rating of their school climate?

Backward Stepwise Regression. Despite the small sample size, the decision was made to follow the data analysis plan to use backward stepwise regression to identify significant predictors of the study outcome variable of a higher rating of school climate (pre-pandemic).

The following 17 independent variables were included as potential predictors in the backward stepwise regression: 1-if White (yes/no); 2-sex (male or female); 3-US born (yes/no); 4-age (continuous variable); 5-skin tone color (continuous variable); 6-annual household income (continuous variable); 7-level of education (continuous variable); 8-rating of their physical health status (continuous variable); 9-rating of their mental

health status (continuous variable); 10-number of years teaching (continuous variable); 11-knowledge for 8 key behaviors for teaching diverse students; 12-self-efficacy for 8 key behaviors for teaching diverse students (continuous variable); 13-rating for having cultural humility (continuous variable); 14-rating for microaggressions personally experienced in school setting (continuous variable); 15-rating for microaggressions they witnessed happening to students in school setting (continuous variable); 16-level of ability for perceiving racism and oppression (continuous variable); and, 17-stage of change for taking action to respond to and cope with racism and oppression.

The problem or limitation in conducting the backward stepwise regression involves not only the issue of a small sample size, but also the problem of potentially over-fitting the model, given the large number of independent variables (i.e., $N=17$). What such a regression model produces may only be considered tentative findings, according to Babyak (2003). This follows from warnings given by Babyak (2004) about potentially having independent variables on the final step of the regression model that may be unimportant variables. The results may be findings that cannot be replicated and might not actually exist in the target population. Fortunately, the use of the $p < .05$ criterion level, which was considered liberal, might serve to outweigh this risk, allowing predictors that are valid and important to remain on the final step of the model. With the limitations that Babyak (2004) outlines, what is also pointed out is that of all the stepwise approaches, it may be that the least risky is a model using the liberal $p < .05$ criterion with a backward stepwise approach.

Mantel (1970) highlighted the following: “One property thus of the stepdown procedure is that it discards only variables which one can afford to discard without seriously impairing the goodness of fit” (p. 623). Backward stepwise regression is viewed as a preferred method when variables are far from being statistically independent. Backward stepwise regression starts with a full model with all the variables in the model at the start; and, then at each step non-significant variables are removed, until only significant predictors are left on the final step.

The variable of social desirability is forced into the model at every step, thereby controlling for teachers’ level of risk for providing socially desirable responses.

With severe limitations of a small sample and many independent variables with potential overfitting of the model, backward stepwise regression was conducted, finding the following. The significant predictors of **the study outcome variable of the teachers’ higher rating of school climate** (pre-pandemic) were found to be, as follows:

- **Male Sex** (B=1.609, P=.001)
- **Higher Annual Household Income** (B=.478, P=.041)
- **Higher Level of Education** (B=2.090, P=.000)
- **Higher Rating of Mental Health Status** (B=.747, P=.000)
- **Lower Stage of Change for Coping and Responding to Racism and Oppression** (B=-.387, P=.012)

The independent variables accounted for 58.1% of the variance [$R^2 = (0.628)$, Adjusted $R^2 = (0.581)$; $F=13.232$ $p=.000$] in the model.

See Table 13.

Table 13. *Backward Stepwise Regression Predicting Higher Rating of School Climate*

Variables	B	SE _B	P
Male Sex	1.609	.450	.001**
Higher Annual Household Income	.478	.228	.041
Higher Level of Education	2.090	.374	.000***
Higher Rating of Mental Health Status	.747	.194	.000***
Lower Stage of Change for Coping and Responding to Racism and Oppression	-.387	.147	.012**

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$, $F = 13.232$ ($p = .000$); $R^2 = (0.628)$, *Adjusted R*² = (0.581) – meaning 58.1.% of variance was explained by this model. $F = 13.232$ $p = .000$

Conclusion

This chapter presented results of data analysis, while answering 11 research questions, and providing data codified in 13 tables. This was in accordance with data analysis plans previously specified. A picture emerged of teachers in diverse school settings (pre-pandemic) where the school climates reflected a moderate level of success with regard to how they supported, engaged, valued, fairly disciplined, affirmed, reflected empathy for, and served as a safe space for students from varied cultural backgrounds. A fuller discussion of the findings will be presented in the next chapter, V. In addition, the final chapter will provide a summary of the study, along with the study's implications and limitations.

Chapter V

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CONCLUSION

This chapter will both summarize and discuss the dissertation research. Also, the implications of the research findings and recommendations for future research will be addressed. Additionally, the limitations of the study will be presented as well as a final conclusion.

Summary of Literature Review

According to Blitz et al. (2020), historical and structural oppression contribute to concentrated poverty, trauma, and racism within urban communities and society as something critical to understanding school climates in urban schools (Blitz & et al., 2020). School climate refers to the quality and character of school life, while being based on “patterns of people’s experiences of school life and reflects norms, goals, values, interpersonal relationships, teaching and learning practices, and organizational structures” (Cohen et al., 2009, p. 182).

School teachers of color in urban schools are subject to the “persistence of hostile racial climates—environments that are steeped with racial inequity and racism on both institutional and interpersonal levels” (Kohli, 2016, p. 309). Hostile racial climates contributed “to the stress and dissatisfaction” of teachers of color, requiring paradigm shifts in urban schools to promote inclusive, racial justice orientated communities (Kohli, 2016, pp. 327- 328).

Further, hostile racial climates of K-12 schools are detrimental to the psychological and emotional well-being of both students and teachers of color—”microaggressions that teachers of Color experience occur on multiple levels simultaneously” (Pizarro & Kohli, 2020, p. 971). The seminal work of Dr. Chester Pierce identified racial microaggressions as “subtle, stunning, often automatic and nonverbal exchanges which are “put downs” of blacks by offenders (Pierce et al., 1977, p. 66).

Horsford (2019) examined “School Integration in the New Jim Crow: Opportunity or Oxymoron?” (p. 258). The focus is on how the historical legacy of America’s racial caste system has served as a foundational mechanism to inform present-day racialized structures, practices, and policies.

Many have acknowledged the importance of teacher training encompassing cultural humility (Branson, 2020; Haynes-Mendez & Engelsmeier, 2020; Lund & Liane, 2015; Nomikoudis & Starr, 2016; Tinkler & Tinkler, 2016). In integrating the concept of cultural humility into education, Haynes-Mendez and Engelsmeier (2020) acknowledged the pioneering contributions of Tervalon and Murray-Garcia (1998).

Tervalon and Murray-Garcia (1998) expressed their preference for an Oakland, California advocate’s (i.e., L. Brown, MPH) view of cultural competence: i.e., one “defined not by a discrete endpoint”—and, instead as “a commitment and active engagement in a lifelong process that individuals enter into on an ongoing basis with patients, colleagues, and with themselves” (p. 118). The outcome is presented as “cultural humility,” as a better description, versus “cultural competence” (p. 118). Further, the recommended process requires “humility,” as “individuals continually engage in self-reflection and self-critique as lifelong learners and reflective practitioners” (p. 118). Still, after receiving any cultural competence training, to be avoided is a sense of false security from the training one has received, and, in particular, the use of stereotypes.

Stereotyping may occur without even consciously endorsing “the underlying attitude or stereotype” (Chin et al., 2020, p. 4). Of note, teachers “with implicit bias are liable to provide biased evaluations of students’ academic performance or potential” (p. 5). There is also evidence that shows “Black students are often disciplined for more subjective infractions” such as disrespectful behavior and acting disruptively (p. 5). On the other hand, White students “are often disciplined for more objective infractions” such as “smoking or vandalism (Chin et al., 2020, p. 5).

Kunesh and Noltemeyer (2019) studied pre-service teachers and the role of stereotypes in the disproportionate suspension and expulsion of Black boys from schools. Negative consequences may be severe, as “suspension is associated with lower academic achievement, grade retention, and higher drop-out rates in middle and high schools”—along with being more likely to be involved with the juvenile justice system (p. 476).

While research often highlights the plight of Black boys, Black girls also experience disproportionate punishment, suspension, and expulsion in comparison to White girls in schools (Parks et al., 2016). Also, Black girls receive “more severe sentences in the juvenile justice system” (p. 211). Black girls are victimized with multiple oppressions, including gender-based violence and racialized structures (Parks et al., 2016).

To counter pervasive racism and dominant cultural influences, culturally relevant pedagogies are put forth as practices and methodologies that may have long-term implications for students of color (Ladson-Billings, 2016). As a potentially culturally relevant pedagogy, Emdin (2016) has pioneered Reality Pedagogy in order to provide urban school educators with methods to “create a safe space and trusting environments that are respectful of students’ culture” (Emdin, 2016, p. 41).

According to Jackson and Knight-Manuel (2019), there are learning environments that often marginalize students of color with restrictive and racially discriminatory practices and policies. There is also the risk of invisible covert violence or symbolic violence being perpetrated when perceptions, language, and behaviors reinforce superiority and inferiority dynamics, domination, and hierarchical authority (Wallace, 2003).

Clearly, the classroom and entire school climate cannot escape these dynamics. This justifies the present research focusing on the school climate, as rated by teachers—as well as a focus on teachers' reporting their own experiences of microaggressions in the school setting; and, also their experiences of witnessing microaggressions against students within the school setting.

Summary of Statement of the Problem

The problem that this study addresses is the need to deliver training to school teachers of diverse K-12 students in order to equip them to be effective teachers, while avoiding perpetuating racism, oppression, and microaggressions against teachers and students within schools with problematic school climates. There is a role for research with teachers on their perceptions of racism, oppression, microaggressions, and school climate that may inform the training of future teachers.

Summary of Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the present study is to identify significant predictors of a high rating by teachers of diverse K-12 students **of their school climate, as the study outcome/dependent variable—as recalled for the period pre-Covid-19 pandemic (i.e., recollection of Fall 2018, Spring 2019, and Fall 2019 school semesters)**—while

including independent variables that encompass their perceptions of racism, oppression, and microaggressions (among others).

Summary of the Research Questions

Given an online sample of participants (N=55) who self-identified as a school teacher of diverse K-12 students in the United States and completed an online survey in response to a social media campaign (i.e. CLICK ON: <http://tinyurl.com/K-12-TEACHERS-INVITED> TO TAKE SURVEY (Takes 15 Minutes) on their BEFORE-pandemic school climate for a 3 in 200 chance to win one of three \$100 Amazon gift cards), this pilot study answered the following research questions:

1-As Teachers of Diverse Students, What Are Their Characteristics and The Characteristics of Their Schools?

Using descriptive statistics, what were the characteristics of the K-12 teachers, including their demographics, background as teachers, and their physical health and mental health status; and, what were the characteristics of the schools in which they taught pre-pandemic?

2-As Teachers of Diverse Students, How Well Are They Performing, What Are They Experiencing and Witnessing, and What Are They Bringing to The Task?

Using descriptive statistics, what were the teachers' ratings of their:

(a) knowledge and self-efficacy for performing behaviors deemed essential for being effective in schools with diverse students from varied cultural backgrounds; (b) ratings of school climate (pre-pandemic); (c) frequency of personally experiencing microaggressions and witnessing microaggressions against students within the school setting; (d) cultural humility; (e) level of ability for perceiving racism and oppression when happening to themselves or others; (f) and stage of change for actively coping and responding to racism and oppression (i.e., *precontemplation stage*/not thinking about actively coping and responding; *contemplation stage*/only thinking about actively coping and responding; *preparation stage*/made determination to start actively coping and responding; *action stage*/been actively coping and responding for < 6 months; *maintenance stage*/been actively coping and responding for > 6 months to years or a lifetime)?

3-What Factors Were Found to be Associated With and Predictive of a High Rating of School Climate?

Using both inferential statistics and backward stepwise regression, respectively: (a) what associations were found between selected independent variables and the study outcome variable/dependent variable of higher rating of their school climate; and (b) what were the significant predictors of a higher rating of their school climate?

Summary of Anticipated Findings

Controlling for social desirability, most noteworthy are anticipated findings from that backward stepwise regression analysis to identify significant predictors of the study outcome variable of **higher ratings of their school climate** (pre-pandemic), as follows:

The **higher the teachers' rating of their school climate (pre-pandemic)**, then the teachers: will be **White** (versus non-White); **female** (versus male); **yes**, born in the U.S. (versus no); have a **higher** age; have a **lighter** skin tone; have a **higher** annual household income; **higher** level of education; have a **higher** rating of their physical health status; have a **higher** rating of their mental health status; have a **higher** number of years teaching; have a **higher** knowledge for 8 key behaviors for teaching diverse students; have a **higher** self-efficacy for 8 key behaviors for teaching diverse students; have a **lower** rating for microaggressions personally experienced in school setting; have a **lower** rating for microaggressions they witnessed happening to students in school setting; have a **higher** rating for having cultural humility; have a **lower** level of ability for perceiving racism and oppression; and, have a **lower** stage of change for taking action to respond to and cope with racism and oppression.

Summary of Research Sample and Procedures

Recruitment of study participants was done on Twitter, Instagram, Facebook, WhatsApp, and Teachers College message boards, as well as via email—within a social media campaign using a core message: CLICK ON: <http://tinyurl.com/K-12-TEACHERS-INVITED> TO TAKE SURVEY (Takes 15 Minutes) on their BEFORE-pandemic school climate for a 3 in 200 chance to win one of three \$100 Amazon gift

cards. Hence, the study used an incentive. Those interested in study participation were directed to the Qualtrics platform where the survey was hosted, and had to provide Informed Consent by clicking a box to confirm they met inclusion criteria: 1) a K-12 teacher of diverse students; 2) age 23 or older; and, 3) able to think back and answer questions about their work in your K-12 school setting **before the Covid-19 pandemic**—*and separate this experience from current teaching experiences during the pandemic.*

Of 98 entries, 62 were eligible for inclusion, while only 55 (study completers) had data for the study outcome variable/dependent variable; thus, seven were eliminated as study non-completers. When comparing completers (N=55) of the survey to non-completers (N=7) who lacked that primary outcome data, no significant differences were found. There were no surveys from duplicate IP addresses, potentially due to a warning they would be eliminated. The final sample was N=55, which was disappointing, reducing the study to a pilot study with severe limitations.

Summary of Research Instrumentation

The study survey instrument consisted of some tools used previously (Aiyedun, 2019) with some modifications for this study, other new short tools developed for this study, and some standard tools used by the Research Group on Disparities in Health (RGDH). The survey parts were, as follows:

Part I: Basic Demographics (BD-14)

Part II: Personal Health Background (M-PHB-2)

Part III: Single Item Rating of Risk of Providing Socially Desirable Responses (SIR-RPSDR-1)

Part IV: Knowledge and Self-Efficacy for 8 Key Behaviors for Teaching Diverse Students (KS-8-BTDS-SCR-16)

Part V: Rating the School Climate (RSC-1)

Part VI: Rating for Cultural Humility (RCH-1)

Part VII: Microaggressions in School Settings Experienced by Personnel and Witnessed Happening to Students (MSS-EBPAWHT-12)

Part VIII: Perceptions of Racism and Oppression Scale (PROS-10)

Part IX: Coping and Responding to Racism and Oppression Staging Scale (CRROSS-7)

Summary of Data Management and Data Analysis

Data were downloaded from www.Qualtrics.com. The data were transferred to SPSS and analyzed using SPSS 26.0.

Summary of Results of Data Analysis

Findings #1: As Teachers of Diverse Students, What Are Their Characteristics and the Characteristics of Their Schools?

Regarding the characteristics of the pilot study sample of K-12 teachers (N=55), they were 78.2% (N=43) Female, 81.8% U.S. born (N=45), 45.5% White (N=25), 30.9% Black (N=17), 14.5% Latinx (N=8), and 7.3% Asian (N=3) with a mean age of 38.02 years (SD=10.133, min=23, max=63). Some 92.7% (N=51) were currently teachers, having taught for a mean of 10.67 years (SD=7.91, min=1, max=36), while 87.3% (N=48) had their principal's certification. Their mean level of education was *closest to a Master's degree* (mean category=2.98, SD=.527, min=.527, min=2, max=4), and their mean annual household income was *between \$50,00 to \$99,000 and \$100,000*

to \$199,999 (mean category=5.44, SD=.836, min=2, max=7). Their current physical health status was *between good and very good* (mean=4.47, min=3, max=6, SD=0.858), and their mental health status was *closest to good* (mean=4.20, min=2, max=6, SD=1.026).

As for the characteristics of the schools in which they taught (pre-pandemic), the majority were public schools (70.9%, N=39), followed by charter schools (18.2%, N=10), and private schools (9.1%, N=5). Further, the majority of schools were urban (74.5%, N=41), followed by suburban (21.8%, N=12), and rural (3.6%, N=2). The schools were demographically diverse, as over a third of the school populations were Black (M=34.06%, SD=28.142, min=0%, max=98%), just under a third were Latinx (M=30.87%; SD=26.06, min=0% max=98%), a quarter were White (M=25.93%, SD=29.507, min=1%, max=95%), less than 10% Asian (M=8.22%, SD=11.123, min=0, max=50%); and about 2% Pacific Islander/Native American (M=2.16%, SD=4.795, min=0%, max=20%).

Findings #2: As Teachers of Diverse Students, How Well are They Performing, What are They Experiencing and Witnessing, and What Are They Bringing to the Task?

In considering findings, such as self-ratings on a number of scales to be discussed in this section, it should be kept in mind that the sample of teachers had a *moderate risk for providing socially desirable responses* (M=4.73, min=0, max=10, SD=2.430).

Knowledge. In terms of how well they were performing as teachers of diverse students, the sample possessed *closest to a moderately high knowledge* for performing eight key behaviors for teaching diverse students (i.e., identified in Aiyedun, 2019, while based on the work of Emdin, 2016), given a mean score 8.36 (SD=1.242, min=1.75,

max=10, Cronbach's Alpha=.927, excellent internal consistency). Particular strengths possessed by the teachers included *very high* (score=10 by 41.8%, N=23) self-ratings for having *knowledge of how to show fairness and consistency in disciplining students without difference by race, ethnicity, religion or cultural background*; and, *high* (score=9) self-ratings for *knowledge of how to create a safe space and trusting environment for students from diverse cultural backgrounds*.

Self-Efficacy. How well they were performing as teachers of diverse students was also reflected in their having *closest to moderately high self-efficacy* for performing the eight key behaviors for teaching diverse students, given a mean score of 8.199 (SD=1.35, min=2.25, max=10.00, Cronbach's Alpha=.921, excellent internal consistency). Here, the particular strengths possessed by teachers included *moderately high* (score=8 by 29.1%, N=16) self-ratings for *self-efficacy for showing empathy and acceptance of students from diverse cultural backgrounds*; and, *high* (score=9 by 29.1%, N=16) self-ratings for *self-efficacy for affirming (supporting) students, their culture, and the history of their cultural group*.

Ratings of School Climate. Teachers reported experiencing (pre-pandemic) a school climate *closest to moderately supporting, engaging, valuing, fairly disciplining, affirming, reflecting empathy for, and serving as a safe space for students from varied cultural backgrounds*.

Frequency of Personally Experiencing Microaggressions. Regarding what they personally experienced as *microaggressions that seemed related to their personal demographics or appearance* in school settings pre-pandemic, teachers reported *closest to "at least once" as a low level of exposure* (M=1.25, min=.00, max=4, SD=1.178,

Cronbach's Alpha .944, excellent internal consistency). However, when **combining the frequency categories for “at least once, more than once, a few times, and many times,”** findings *showed about half the teachers or more* had such experiences. For example: 63.2% (N=42) had experienced denigrating messages; 47.3% (N=26) a verbal attack; 58.1% (N=32) a nonverbal attack that caused mental or emotional pain; 63% (N=34) a communication that was insulting; 50% (N=27) a communication that excluded them or cancelled out their existence; and, 48.4% (N=31) due to more than one of their personal demographics or characteristics.

Frequency of Witnessing Microaggressions Against Students. For what they were witnessing as *microaggressions happening to students in school settings pre-pandemic that seemed related to students' personal demographics or appearance* teachers reported *between “at least once” and “more than once” as a low moderate level of exposure* (M=1.627, min=.00, max=4, SD=1.133, Cronbach's Alpha=.959, excellent internal consistency). However, when **combining the categories** for microaggressions witnessed happening to students in school settings pre-pandemic **for “at least once, more than once, a few times, and many times,”** findings *showed about three-quarters of teachers or more* had such experiences. For example: 81.6% (N=44) had witnessed students receiving denigrating messages; 77.9% (N=42) had witnessed students experiencing a verbal attack; 74.1% (N=40) had witnessed students experiencing a nonverbal attack that caused mental or emotional pain; 77.7% (N=42) had witnessed students experiencing a communication that was insulting; 76% (N=41) had witnessed students experiencing a communication that excluded the student or cancelled out their

existence; and, 79.6% (N=43) had witnessed students experiencing microaggressions that seemed related to more than one of the student's personal demographics or characteristics.

Cultural Humility. For what teachers were bringing to the task of teaching diverse students, they indicated a *moderately high level of cultural humility* (M=7.76, SD=1.63, min=3, max=10).

Level of Ability for Perceiving Racism and Oppression. Also, as to what they were bringing to the task of teaching diverse students, the sample of teachers had a *high level of ability to perceive racism and oppression—whether when happening to one's self or others* (M=4.27, min=3, max=5, SD=.606, Cronbach's Alpha=.847, good internal consistency).

Stage of Change for Taking Action to Cope and Respond to Racism and Oppression. Further, in terms of what they were bringing to the task of teaching diverse students, the sample of teachers was *closest to the action stage for taking action to cope and respond to racism and oppression* (i.e., for < 6 months). However, 81.7% (N=44) were in a maintenance stage when combining those who have been *actively learning how to cope with and respond to racism and oppression for greater than 6 months—up to over 31 years*.

Findings #3: What Factors Were Found to be Associated with and Predictive of a High Rating of School Climate?

Pearson's Correlations. Regarding any associations between selected independent variables and the study outcome variable of a higher rating of their school climate (pre-pandemic), Pearson's Correlations (i.e., 17 comparisons, Bonferroni Adjustment Significance level, $0.05/17 = 0.003$, $p < 0.003$) showed: the higher the rating

of school climate, then the **higher** the teacher's level of education ($r=.502$, $p=.000$), the **higher** the teacher's rating of their mental health status ($r=.452$, $p=.001$), the **less frequent** were teacher's personal experiences of microaggressions ($r=-.453$, $p=.001$), and, the **less frequent** were teacher's experiences of witnessing microaggressions against students ($r=-.447$, $p=.001$).

Backward Stepwise Regression. As a pilot study with a small sample size, findings are tentative at best. Backward stepwise regression, while controlling for social desirability found significant predictors of the **study outcome variable of a higher rating of school climate** (pre-pandemic), as follows: **male** sex ($B=1.609$, $P=.001$); **higher** annual household income ($B=.478$, $P=.041$); **higher** level of education ($B=2.090$, $P=.000$); **Higher** Rating of Mental Health Status ($B=.747$, $P=.000$), and **lower** stage of change for coping and responding to racism and oppression ($B=-.387$, $P=.012$). The independent variables accounted for 58.1% of the variance [$R^2 = (0.628)$, Adjusted $R^2 = (0.581)$; $F=13.232$ $p=.000$] in the model.

Discussion of Results

Discussion of Findings #1: As Teachers of Diverse Students, What are Their Characteristics and the Characteristics of Their Schools?

Characteristics of Teachers. The sample can be compared for many characteristics to findings reported by Aiyedun (2019), which is appropriate, given the use of measures taken from that early work. Also, both studies used small samples; Aiyedun (2019) had $N=47$ charter school staff members, including teachers, administrators and other staff, while the present pilot study sample of K-12 teachers had $N=55$. Aiyedun's (2019) sample had a mean age of 36.6 years (min=21, max=65, SD

=8.4), and this study had a mean age of 38.02 years (min=23, max=63, SD=10.133). The present study sample was 78.2% Female, while Aiyedun (2019) similarly had 83% Female. Aiyedun (2019) found 93.6% were born in the United States, and in the present study 81.8% (N=45) were born in the United States. Regarding racial composition, the present study sample was 45.5% White, 30.9% Black, and 14.5% Latinx—while Aiyedun’s (2019) sample was 31.9% White, 27.7% Black, and about 27.7% Latinx.

In this study, their mean level of education was *closest to a Master’s degree* (mean category=2.98, min=.527, min=2, max=4, SD=.527), as also found in Aiyedun (2019) where the mean education level was also a Master’s degree (min= High School, max =Master’s degree, SD=0.9). Further, in this study, the mean annual household income was *between \$50,00 to \$99,000 and \$100,000 to \$199,999* (mean category=5.44, SD=.836, min=2, mac=7). Similarly, Aiyedun (2019) found the charter schools’ staff had an annual household income mean in the range of \$100,000 - \$199,000 (min=1, max=8, SD=\$50,000)—while that sample included administrators with higher salaries. In this study, 92.7% (N=51) were teachers with a mean of 10.67 years (min=1, max=36, SD=7.91) teaching, while Aiyedun (2019) found a lower number of mean years in their profession of 6.2 years (min=3, max=10, SD=2.3).

D’Mello (2021) conducted a study with K-12 teachers at the one-year mark of the COVID-19 pandemic in the United States (late March to April 2020), while investigating predictors of their stress. In that study, data were collected on teachers’ self-ratings of their overall physical and mental/emotional health status while using the same questions/tool as in the present study. Thus, of interest is how D’Mello (2021) reported K-12 school teachers’ overall physical health status before the pandemic as *between good*

and very good physical health (M=4.55, min=2, max=6, SD=.839). In the very same manner, this study found K-12 school teachers' pre-pandemic rating for their overall current physical health status to be *between good and very good* (M=4.47, min=3, max=6, SD=0.858). In addition, D'Mello (2021) found that K-12 teachers' overall mental health status to be between *good and very good mental health status* (M=4.44, min=2, max=6, SD=.869). And, similarly, in the present study, the mean rating for their overall mental health status was *closest to good mental health* (M=4.20, min=2, max=6, SD=1.026).

Characteristics of Schools. As for the characteristics of the schools in which they taught (pre-pandemic), the majority were public schools 70.9% (N=39), followed by charter schools (18.2% (N=10)), and private schools 9.1% (N=5). This, too, was similar to what D'Mello (2021) who found a majority 76.7% (N=122) teaching in a public school, yet 16.4% (N=26) were in private, and 10.1% (N=16) in charter. Further, in the present study, the majority of schools were urban 74.5% (N=41), followed by suburban 21.8% (N=12), and rural 3.6% (N=2). D'Mello (2021) found a distribution with 57.9% (N=92) in an urban school, 39% (N=62) in suburban, and 3.1% (N=5) in rural.

Discussion of Findings #2: As Teachers of Diverse Students, How Well are They Performing, What are They Experiencing and Witnessing, and What Are They Bringing to the Task?

Recall the recommendation to considering this study's findings, in light of the sample of teachers having a *moderate risk for providing socially desirable responses* (M= 4.73, min=0, max=10, SD=2.430). Aiyedun's (2019) sample also had *moderate social desirability* (M=7.66; SD=2.09, min=3, max=12), while using a different measure.

Comparison of Knowledge Scales and Findings. For the original nine key behaviors assessed in the Aiyedun (2019) study for knowledge, the scale used had a

similar Cronbach's Alpha=.927 (excellent internal consistency) to the present study with Cronbach's Alpha=.927 (excellent internal consistency). In terms of how well they were performing as teachers of diverse students, in this study, the sample possessed *closest to a moderately high knowledge* for performing eight key behaviors for teaching diverse students, given a mean score of 8.36 (SD=1.242, min=1.75, max=10). Aiyedun (2019) compared the staff's knowledge for performing the nine key behaviors of focus for pre-staff-training to post-staff training; and, all nine of the pre-staff-training ratings were approximately the score of seven (*moderate knowledge*), and all nine of the post-staff-training ratings were approximately the scores of eight (*moderately high knowledge*), as significant differences ($p=.000$). Thus, the moderately high knowledge found in the present study is highly comparable to the findings of Aiyedun (2019).

Comparison of Self-Efficacy Scales and Findings. Of note, for the original nine key behaviors assessed in the Aiyedun (2019) study for self-efficacy, the scale used had a Cronbach's Alpha=.967 (excellent internal consistency). In this study, the scale measuring self-efficacy to perform the eight key behaviors had a similar Cronbach's Alpha=.921 for excellent internal consistency. In this study, regarding how well they were performing as teachers of diverse students showed them having *closest to moderately high self-efficacy* for performing the eight key behaviors with a mean score of 8.199 (SD=1.35, min=2.25, max=10.00). The Aiyedun (2019) mean self-efficacy ratings for each of the nine behaviors of focus in that study were about seven (*moderate self-efficacy*) pre-staff-training and about eight (*moderately high self-efficacy*) post-staff training, while mean scores were significantly higher post-staff training ($p=.000$).

Comparative Findings on Ratings of School Climate. This study found teachers reported experiencing (pre-pandemic) a school climate *closest to moderately supporting, engaging, valuing, fairly disciplining, affirming, reflecting empathy for, and serving as a safe space for students from varied cultural backgrounds*. This study's findings were with a diverse sample of K-12 teachers: i.e., 45.5% White, 30.9% Black, 14.5% Latinx, and 7.3% Asian. Hence, this study's findings are quite different from what others are referring to when noting teachers of color in urban schools are subject to the "persistence of hostile racial climates—environments that are steeped with racial inequity and racism on both institutional and interpersonal levels" (Kohli, 2016, p. 309).

Comparisons for Microaggressions. On the other hand, the diverse teachers in this study did personally experience *microaggressions that seemed related to their personal demographics or appearance* in school settings pre-pandemic—with a frequency *closest to "at least once" as a low level of exposure* ($m=1.25$, $min=.00$, $max=4$, $SD=1.178$; Cronbach's Alpha=.944, excellent internal consistency). A study conducted by Lee (2021) with Black, Latinx, and Asian college and university undergraduate and graduate students found a Cronbach's Alpha=.847 for good internal consistency, using the same scale. Lee (2021) also found a slightly higher mean frequency of experiences of microaggression of 1.82 ($min=0$, $max=4$, $SD=0.913$) for between "at least once" to "more than once." This may follow from Lee (2021) being composed of all adults of color. This study's data confirmed the reality of teachers experiencing microaggressions, as discussed by others (Pizarro & Kohli, 2020; Blitz et al., 2020).

Others have discussed the microaggressions experienced by students (Lewis et al., 2019). Compton-Lilly (2020) observed how there is little scholarship on

microaggressions during the elementary years. Filling a gap in the literature with this pilot study's data, teachers reported witnessing *microaggressions happening to students in school settings pre-pandemic that seemed related to students' personal demographics or appearance* teachers reported *between "at least once" and "more than once" as a low moderate level of exposure* (m=1.627, min=.00, max=4, SD=1.133; Cronbach's Alpha = .959, excellent internal consistency).

Observations on Cultural Humility. Tervalon and Murray-Garcia (1998) have emphasized the importance of the concept and skill of cultural humility, which permits meaningful engagement with those who are culturally diverse. Thus, it is an important finding that teachers were bringing to the task of teaching diverse students, a *moderately high level of cultural humility* (M=7.76, SD=1.63, min=3, max=10). However, this might be viewed with skepticism as a self-rating by a sample at *moderate risk for providing socially desirable responses*.

Comparisons for Level of Ability for Perceiving Racism and Oppression.

Further, with regard to what they were bringing to the task of teaching diverse students, the sample of teachers had *a high level of ability to perceive racism and oppression—whether when happening to one's self or others* (m=4.27, min=3, max=5, SD=.606; Cronbach's Alpha=.847, good internal consistency). Lee (2021) used the same scale with a sample of Black, Latinx, and Asian adults, finding this scale had a similarly good internal consistency (Cronbach's Alpha = 0.874). Lee found a somewhat lower moderate to high level of ability for perceiving racism and oppression (m=3.67, min=2.5, max=5, SD=0.739). This might reflect the Lee sample being younger in age than the teachers

with a mean age of 26.62 years (min=18, max=59, SD=6.752); recall, the teachers' mean age of 38.02 years (SD=10.133, min=23, max=63).

Comparisons for Stage of Change for Taking Action to Cope and Respond to Racism and Oppression. Further, in terms of what they were bringing to the task of teaching diverse students, the sample of teachers was *closest to the action stage for taking action to cope and respond to racism and oppression* (i.e., for < 6 months) with a mean of 4.31 (min=1, max=5, SD=1.286). Lee (2021) found a nearly identical mean stage of change for coping and responding to racism closest to the action stage (m=.4.29, min=1, max=5, SD=1.159). However, 81.7% (N=44) were in a maintenance stage when combining those who have been *actively learning how to cope with and respond to racism and oppression for greater than 6 months*—up to over 31 years. With a much larger sample (N=338), Lee found that a similarly high 71.8% (N=245) were in a maintenance stage when combining the same exact categories from greater than six months to over 31 years.

Discussion of Findings #3: What Factors Were Found to be Associated with and Predictive of a High Rating of School Climate?

It was not surprising for this study to find that the higher the rating of school climate, then the **higher** the teacher's level of education ($r=.502$, $p=.000$), the **higher** the teacher's rating of their mental health status ($r=.452$, $p=.001$), the **less frequent** were teacher's personal experiences of microaggressions ($r=-.453$, $p=.001$), and, the **less frequent** were teacher's experiences of witnessing microaggressions against students ($r = .447$, $p=.001$). These associations were not surprising. Noteworthy, were the results of the backward stepwise regression, controlling for social desirability, which found significant

predictors of the **study outcome variable of a higher rating of school climate** (pre-pandemic), as follows: **male** sex ($B=1.609$, $P=.001$); **higher** annual household income ($B=.478$, $P=.041$); **higher** level of education ($B=2.090$, $P=.000$); **Higher** Rating of Mental Health Status ($B=.747$, $P=.000$), and **lower** stage of change for coping and responding to racism and oppression ($B=-.387$, $P=.012$). In particular, the predictor of a higher mental health status was anticipated, while the lower stage of change for coping and responding to racism and oppression was not—harkening back to the Chapter IV discussion of the problems of a small sample and many independent variables; i.e., the findings produced may not be replicated and might not actually exist in the target population.

As a diverse sample with 45.5% White, 30.9% Black, and 14.5% Latinx teachers, the rating of school climate was *closest to moderately supporting, engaging, valuing, fairly disciplining, affirming, reflecting empathy for, and serving as a safe space for students from varied cultural backgrounds*. It makes sense that a school climate that is rated higher for having the above favorable interactions with students from varied cultural backgrounds would be associated with teachers having a higher mental health status. Where a school climate is highly rated, then it is likely to be free of the common experiences of teachers of color who are contending with manifestations of institutional and individual racism, relentless oppression, and increased stress—as found in hostile racial climates (Kohli, 2016).

Implications and Recommendations

There are a number of implications and recommendations that arise from the study findings, as follows:

- It is important to build on the pilot study findings by engaging in a replication of the study, post-pandemic, in order to obtain a larger sample and avoid the use of a retrospective recall methodology—where teachers had to reflect on a period of time as much as one year to 18 months in the past. This is vital, given the severe limitations of having such a small sample size, and peculiar circumstances of conducting research with teachers during a pandemic.
- Future research could also follow Aiyedun (2019) in introducing a specific intervention for teachers' professional development (e.g., one based on the work of Emdin 2016, for example). However, in line with this study's findings, the tool, Coping and Responding to Racism and Oppression Scale (CRROSS-7) could be used to screen teachers who score low—such as for being in a precontemplation or contemplation stage for taking action to cope and respond to racism and oppression. The CRROSS-7 could be used as a brief screening tool for then matching those who score low to professional development activities to improve their skills coping with diverse students. Professional development activities may also improve the ability to cope with school climates that are hostile or oppressive, or may be characterized by high frequency occurrences of microaggressions—whether against teachers or students.
- The scale for witnessing microaggressions against students could be administered to teachers by a school district, and those schools with a high frequency of such

observations could be targeted for special professional development interventions, in order to reduce the frequency of such experiences.

- Similarly, the simple one-item rating for school climate scale could also be administered to teachers across a school district, and those schools rated poorly and likely to be hostile climates could be targeted for interventions, including professional development activities for teachers; and, organizational consultants with expertise in cultural competence might also be brought in to work with the school to improve school climate.
- The simple tool for self-rating cultural humility could also be administered to teachers so as to identify those low in cultural humility, in order for them to be matched to special professional development activities.
- Indeed, from what has been mentioned above, the short tools in this study might be used as a package for assessing the state of a school or schools within a district, within the activity of a professional consultancy. The results of administering the package of measures could involve creating profiles of schools, and ranking those within a district so as to indicate those in greatest need of targeted professional development activities. In the aftermath of the COVID-19 pandemic, it could be vital for there to be such school assessment activities, so superintendents know where to target funds to help the most distressed schools suffering from the worst school climates.
- A future mixed methods study is also recommended, as qualitative data could elaborate upon quantitative data findings. This would also follow Aiyedun (2019) who obtained rich qualitative data that permitted school staff to share their voices on

their experiences teaching diverse students. Indeed, often qualitative data permits teachers to voice recommendations that reflect their being ever so close to the phenomena under scrutiny.

Limitations

It is one thing to conduct an extensive literature review and to design a study, and yet another to have to modify the study in response to a global and national pandemic of the kind which disrupts schooling and daily life—as did COVID-19. The result was having to ask teachers to recall their school climates pre-pandemic, and to answer a series of questions that rely on their ability to recall, creating study limitations. Also, teachers are social beings who congregate in faculty lounges and might readily see and respond to a posted flyer, inviting them to participate in an online study; yet with schools closed and learning online, or social distancing for those engaged in hybrid learning, such study recruitment was not possible. Further, among all the groups in society, teachers have been among the most stressed from the pandemic; and, switching to online learning with monumental tasks involving the use of new technology via new curricula also negatively impacted teachers. Thus, the teachers of the pre-pandemic period—with more time and willingness to participate in a study—were not the same as the stressed-out teachers coping with the pandemic at the time of data collection. All of these factors, collectively, created limitations for this study.

Thus, a main study limitation was the smaller than anticipated sample size (N=55), which reduced the research to a pilot study capable of providing just suggestive findings, which may not be replicable, nor represent the population. Also, all teachers

should have had access to a computer and internet. However, it is possible that having families at home during the pandemic and potentially engaging in home-schooling may have limited access to home computers, as well—negatively impacting study participation. Effort was made to ensure the study survey was as short as possible, decreasing the burden of time, especially in light of COVID-19 pandemic related stress.

In sum, a multitude of study limitations must be kept in mind when reviewing the results produced under the circumstances of an ongoing pandemic in the United States.

Conclusion

The problem that this study addressed was the need to deliver training to school teachers of diverse K-12 students in order to equip them to be effective teachers, while avoiding perpetuating racism, oppression, and microaggressions against teachers and students within schools with problematic school climates. There is a role for research with teachers on their perceptions of racism, oppression, microaggressions, and school climate that may inform the training of future teachers.

This pilot study (N=55) with K-12 teachers sought to identify predictors of a high rating of school climate. The teachers were 78.2% (N=43) female, 81.8% U.S. born (n=45), 45.5% White (N=25), 30.9% Black (N=17), 14.5% Latinx (N=8), and 7.3% Asian (N=3). The teachers had moderately high knowledge and closest to moderately high self-efficacy for performing key behaviors deemed essential for working effectively with diverse students. Teachers reported experiencing (pre-pandemic) a school climate closest to moderately supporting, engaging, valuing, fairly disciplining, affirming, reflecting empathy for, and serving as a safe space for students from varied cultural

backgrounds. Findings showed that about half the teachers or more had any experience of microaggressions that seemed related to their personal demographics or appearance while in school settings—pre-pandemic. Further, *about three-quarters of teachers or more* had any experience of witnessing microaggressions happening to students in school settings, pre-pandemic.

Teachers had a *moderately high level of cultural humility*—as well as a *high level of ability to perceive racism and oppression—whether when happening to one's self or others*. Further, teachers were *closest to the action stage for taking action to cope and respond to racism and oppression* (i.e., for < 6 months).

Regarding any associations between selected independent variables and the study outcome variable of a higher rating of their school climate (pre-pandemic), Pearson's Correlations (i.e., 17 comparisons, Bonferroni Adjustment Significance level, $0.05/17=0.003$, $p < 0.003$) showed: the higher the rating of school climate, then the **higher** the teachers' level of education ($r = .502$, $p = .000$), the **higher** the teachers' rating of their mental health status ($r = .452$, $p = .001$), the **less frequent** were teacher's personal experiences of microaggressions ($r = -.453$, $p = .001$), and, the **less frequent** were teacher's experiences of witnessing microaggressions against students ($r = -.447$, $p = .001$).

As a pilot study with a small sample size, findings are tentative at best. Backward stepwise regression, while controlling for social desirability found significant predictors of the **study outcome variable of a higher rating of school climate** (pre-pandemic), as follows: **male** sex ($B = 1.609$, $P = .001$); **higher** Annual Household Income ($B = .478$, $P = .041$); **higher** Level of Education ($B = 2.090$, $P = .000$); **higher** Rating of Mental Health Status ($B = .747$, $P = .000$), and **Lower** Stage of Change for Coping and Responding to

Racism and Oppression ($B=-.387$, $P=.012$)—accounting for 58.1% of the variance [$R^2 = (0.628)$, Adjusted $R^2 = (0.581)$].

The study offered recommendations for how some of the short tools from this study might find practical application in assessing teachers in schools, and then matching teachers or schools to professional development activities. Future research has also been recommended, ideally, post-pandemic, and involving a larger sample.

There is a need for professional development for teachers that equips them for working with diverse students and creating supportive school climates. This pilot study ($N=55$) with K-12 teachers sought to identify predictors of a high rating of school climate. The teachers were 78.2% ($N=43$) female, 81.8% U.S. born ($N=45$), 45.5% White ($N=25$), 30.9% Black ($N=17$), 14.5% Latinx ($N=8$), and 7.3% Asian ($N=3$). The teachers had moderately high knowledge and closest to moderately high self-efficacy for performing key behaviors deemed essential for working effectively with diverse students. Teachers reported experiencing (pre-pandemic) a school climate closest to moderately supporting, engaging, valuing, fairly disciplining, affirming, reflecting empathy for, and serving as a safe space for students from varied cultural backgrounds. Findings showed that about half the teachers or more had any experience of microaggressions that seemed related to their personal demographics or appearance while in school settings—pre-pandemic. Further, *about three-quarters of teachers or more* had any experience of witnessing microaggressions happening to students in school settings, pre-pandemic.

Teachers had a *moderately high level of cultural humility*—as well as a *high level of ability to perceive racism and oppression*—whether when happening to one's self or

others. Further, teachers were *closest to the action stage for taking action to cope and respond to racism and oppression* (i.e., for < 6 months).

Regarding any associations between selected independent variables and the study outcome variable of a higher rating of their school climate (pre-pandemic), Pearson's Correlations (i.e., 17 comparisons, Bonferroni Adjustment Significance level, $0.05/17=0.003$, $p < 0.003$) showed: the higher the rating of school climate, then the **higher** the teacher's level of education ($r=.502$, $p=.000$), the **higher** the teacher's rating of their mental health status ($r=.452$, $p=.001$), the **less frequent** were teacher's personal experiences of microaggressions ($r=-.453$, $p=.001$), and, the **less frequent** were teacher's experiences of witnessing microaggressions against students ($r=-.447$, $p=.001$).

As a pilot study with a small sample size, findings are tentative at best. Backward stepwise regression, while controlling for social desirability found significant predictors of the **study outcome variable of a higher rating of school climate** (pre-pandemic), as follows: **male** sex ($B=1.609$, $P=.001$); **higher** annual household Income ($B=.478$, $P=.041$); **higher** level of education ($B=2.090$, $P=.000$); **higher** rating of mental health Status ($B=.747$, $P=.000$), and **lower** stage of change for coping and responding to racism and oppression ($B=-.387$, $P=.012$)—accounting for 58.1% of the variance [$R^2 = (0.628)$, Adjusted $R^2 = (0.581)$].

The study offered recommendations for how some of the short tools from this study might find practical application in assessing teachers in schools, and then matching teachers or schools to professional development activities. Future research has also been recommended, ideally, post-pandemic, and involving a larger sample.

REFERENCES

- Aiyedun, F. (2019). *A case study of a charter school seeking to transform toward greater cultural competence for working with diverse urban students: Using Christopher Emdin's Reality Pedagogy approach as a stimulus and guide* (Publication Number 13902437) [Ed.D., Teachers College, Columbia University]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.
- Alexander, M. (2012). *The new Jim Crow: Mass incarceration in the age of colorblindness*. New Press.
- Amiot, M. N., Mayer-Glenn, J., & Parker, L. (2020). Applied critical race theory: educational leadership actions for student equity. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 23(2), 200-220. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2019.1599342>
- Anderson, E. (2015). "The White Space." *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity*, 1(1), 10-21. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2332649214561306>
- Annamma, S., Handy, T., Miller, A. L., & Jackson, E. (2020). Animating discipline disparities through debilitating practices: Girls of Color and inequitable classroom interactions. *Teachers College Record*, 122(5).
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191-215. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0033-295x.84.2.191>
- Benson, T. A., Salas, S., & Siefert, B. (2020). Irreconcilable differences: Black teachers' lives and K-12 schools. *The Urban Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-020-00591-x>
- Blitz, L. V., Yull, D., & Clauhs, M. (2020). Bringing sanctuary to school: Assessing school climate as a foundation for culturally responsive trauma-informed approaches for urban schools. *Urban Education*, 55(1), 95-124. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085916651323>
- Bonilla-Silva, E. (2014). *Racism without racists: Color-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in America* (4th ed.). Rowman & Littlefield.
- Bonilla-Silva, E. (2019a). Toward a new political praxis for Trumpamerica: New directions in Critical Race Theory. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 63(13), 1776-1788. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764219842614>
- Bonilla-Silva, E. (2019b). Feeling race: Theorizing the racial economy of emotions. *American Sociological Review*, 84(1), 1-25. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122418816958>

- Bonilla-Silva, E. (2020). Color-blind racism in pandemic times. *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity*, 2332649220941024. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2332649220941024>
- Branson, D. C. (2020). Student trauma, the hidden curriculum, and cultural humility: This trio needs a team approach. In T. Simon George (Ed.), *Addressing multicultural needs in school guidance and counseling* (pp. 82-105). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-7998-0319-5.ch005>
- Brown, E. (2019). African American teachers' experiences with racial micro-aggressions. *Educational Studies*, 55(2), 180-196.
- Caldwell, L. D., & Bledsoe, K. L. (2019). Can social justice live in a house of structural racism? A question for the field of evaluation. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 40(1), 6-18. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1098214018815772>
- Chin, M. J., Quinn, D. M., Dhaliwal, T. K., & Lovison, V. S. (2020). Bias in the air: A nationwide exploration of teachers' implicit racial attitudes, aggregate bias, and student outcomes. *Educational Researcher*, 0(0), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189x20937240>
- Clark, R., Anderson, N. B., Clark, V. R., & Williams, D. R. (1999). Racism as a stressor for African Americans: A biopsychosocial model. *American Psychologist*, 54(10), 805-816. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066x.54.10.805>
- Cohen, J., McCabe, L., Michelli, N. M., & Pickeral, T. (2009). School climate: Research, policy, practice, and teacher education. *Teachers College Record*, 111(1).
- Coles, J. A., & Powell, T. (2020). A BlackCrit analysis on Black urban youth and suspension disproportionality as anti-Black symbolic violence. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 23(1), 113-133. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2019.1631778>
- Collins, P. H. (2015). Intersectionality's definitional dilemmas. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 41(1), 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-073014-112142>
- Compton-Lilly, C. (2019). Microaggressions and macroaggressions across time: The longitudinal construction of inequality in schools. *Urban Education*, 55(8-9), 1315-1349. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085919893751>
- Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against Women of Color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43(6), 1241-1299. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1229039>
- Cruz, D., Rodriguez, Y., & Mastropaolo, C. (2019). Perceived microaggressions in health care: A measurement study. *PLoS ONE*, 14.

- Cruz, R. A., Manchanda, S., Firestone, A. R., & Rodl, J. E. (2020). An examination of teachers' culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 43*(3), 197-214. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0888406419875194>
- Delale-O'Connor, L. A., Alvarez, A. J., Murray, I. E., & Milner, I. V. H. R. (2017). Self-efficacy beliefs, classroom management, and the cradle-to-prison pipeline. *Theory Into Practice, 56*(3), 178-186. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2017.1336038>
- DiClemente, C., & Velasquez, M. M. (2002). Motivational interviewing and the stages of change. In W. R. Miller & S. Rollnick (Eds.), *Motivational interviewing: Preparing people for change* (2nd ed., pp. 201-216). Guilford. <https://clio.columbia.edu/catalog/3271825>
- Dixson, A. D. (2018). "What's going on?": A Critical Race Theory perspective on Black Lives Matter and activism in education. *Urban Education, 53*(2), 231-247. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085917747115>
- D'Mello, L. (2021). *An online investigation into school teachers' experiences of stress and coping strategies while teaching during the Covid-19 pandemic: Exploring the prevalence of depression, anxiety, and post-traumatic stress disorder*. Doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Du Bois, W. E. B. (1935). Does the Negro need separate schools? *The Journal of Negro Education, 4*(3), 328-335. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2291871>
- Dumas, M. J., & Ross, K. M. (2016). "Be real Black for me." *Urban Education, 51*(4), 415-442. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085916628611>
- Duncan, K. E. (2020). 'That's my job': Black teachers' perspectives on helping Black students navigate white supremacy. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 1-19*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2020.1798377>
- Edwards, F., Lee, H., & Esposito, M. (2019). Risk of being killed by police use of force in the United States by age, race-ethnicity, and sex. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 116*(34), 16793-16798. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1821204116>
- Emdin, C. (2016). *For white folks who teach in the hood...and the rest of y'all too: Reality pedagogy and urban education*. Beacon Press.
- Emdin, C. (2020). A ratchetdemic reality pedagogy and/as cultural freedom in urban education. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 52*(9), 947-960. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2019.1669446>

- Galovski, T. E., Peterson, Z. D., Beagley, M. C., Strasshofer, D. R., Held, P., & Fletcher, T. D. (2016). Exposure to violence during Ferguson protests: Mental health effects for law enforcement and community members. *Journal of Traumatic Stress, 29*(4), 283-292. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/jts.22105>
- Gordon, K., & Fefer, S. (2019). Discipline history and demographics: Which factors relate to school climate perceptions among high school students? *School Psychology Forum, 13*(1), 16-28.
- Goyer, J. P., Cohen, G. L., Cook, J. E., Master, A., Apfel, N., Lee, W., Henderson, A. G., Reeves, S. L., Okonofua, J. A., & Walton, G. M. (2019). Targeted identity-safety interventions cause lasting reductions in discipline citations among negatively stereotyped boys. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 117*(2), 229-259. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspa0000152>
- Haynes-Mendez, K., & Engelsmeier, J. (2020). Cultivating cultural humility in education. *Childhood Education, 96*(3), 22-29. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00094056.2020.1766656>
- Hines-Datiri, D., & Carter Andrews, D. J. (2020). The effects of zero tolerance policies on Black girls: Using critical race feminism and figured worlds to examine school discipline. *Urban Education, 55*(10), 1419-1440. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085917690204>
- Holder, A. M. B., & Nadal, K. L. (2016). Systemic and workplace microaggressions and the workplace: Recommendations for best practices for institutions and organizations. In E. L. Short & L. Wilton (Eds.), *Talking about structural inequalities in everyday life: New politics of race in groups, organizations, and social systems* (pp. 47-63). Information Age Publishing, Inc. <http://site.ebrary.com/id/11172168>
- Horsford, S. D. (2019). School integration in the New Jim Crow: Opportunity or oxymoron? *Educational Policy, 33*(1), 257-275. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904818810526>
- Horsford, S. D., Alemán, E. A., & Smith, P. A. (2019). Our separate struggles are really one: Building political race coalitions for educational justice. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 18*(2), 226-236. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15700763.2019.1611868>
- Horsford, S. D., Stovall, D., Hopson, R., & D'Amico, D. (2019). School leadership in the New Jim Crow: Reclaiming justice, resisting reform. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 18*(2), 177-179. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15700763.2019.1611872>

- Hussar, B., Zhang, J., Hein, S., Wang, K., Roberts, A., Cui, J., Smith, M., Bullock Mann, F., Barmer, A., and Dilig, R. (2020). *The Condition of Education 2020* (NCES 2020144). https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_clr.asp
- Ingram, L., & Wallace, B. C. (2018). "It creates fear and divides us": Minority college students' experiences of stress from racism, coping responses, and recommendations for colleges. *Journal of Health Disparities Research and Practice, 12*(1), 80-112.
- Jackson, I., & Knight-Manuel, M. (2019). "Color does not equal consciousness": Educators of color learning to enact a sociopolitical consciousness. *Journal of Teacher Education, 70*, 65-78. <https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A568973256/AONE?u=new30429&sid=AONE&xid=19f6a47c>
- Knowles, R. T., & Hawkman, A. M. (2020). Anti-racist quantitative research: Developing, validating, and implementing racialized teaching efficacy and racial fragility scales. *Urban Review, 52*(2), 238-262. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-019-00526-1>
- Kohli, R. (2016). Behind school doors: The impact of hostile racial climates on urban Teachers of Color. *Urban Education, 53*(3), 307-333. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085916636653>
- Kunesh, C. E., & Noltemeyer, A. (2019). Understanding disciplinary disproportionality: Stereotypes shape pre-service teachers' beliefs about Black boys' behavior. *Urban Education, 54*(4), 471-498. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085915623337>
- Lacoe, J. (2020). Too scared to learn? The academic consequences of feeling unsafe in the classroom. *Urban Education, 55*(10), 1385-1418. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085916674059>
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2006). From the achievement gap to the education debt: Understanding achievement in U.S. schools. *Educational Researcher, 35*(7), 3-12. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3876731>
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2016). "#Literate Lives Matter." *Literacy Research: Theory, Method, and Practice, 65*(1), 141-151. <https://doi.org/10/gf9mzg>
- Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. F. I. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Teachers College Record (1970), 97*(1), 47.
- Lane, K., Williams, Y., Hunt, A. N., & Paulk, A. (2020). The framing of race: Trayvon Martin and the Black Lives Matter movement. *Journal of Black Studies, 51*(8), 790-812. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021934720946802>

- Larson, K. E., Bottiani, J. H., Pas, E. T., Kush, J. M., & Bradshaw, C. P. (2019). A multilevel analysis of racial discipline disproportionality: A focus on student perceptions of academic engagement and disciplinary environment. *Journal of School Psychology, 77*, 152-167. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2019.09.003>
- Lee, H. (2021). *Black, Latinx, and Asian college students' experiences of hate, microaggressions, stress, perceived racism and oppression, and coping strategies: Identifying Predictors of a high prevalence of microaggressions*, Doctoral Dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University].
- Lee, H., & Hicken, M. T. (2016). Death by a thousand cuts: The health implications of Black respectability politics. *Souls: A Critical Journal of Black Politics, Culture, and Society, 18*(2-4), 421-445. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10999949.2016.1230828>
- Lewis, J. A., Mendenhall, R., Ojiemwen, A., Thomas, M., Riopelle, C., Harwood, S. A., & Browne Hunt, M. (2019). Racial microaggressions and sense of belonging at a historically white university. *American Behavioral Scientist, 1*-26. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764219859613>
- Lipscomb, A. E., & Ashley, W. (2020). Surviving being Black and a clinician during a dual pandemic: Personal and professional challenges in a disease and racial crisis. *Smith College Studies in Social Work, 1*-16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00377317.2020.1834489>
- Lisle-Johnson, T., & Kohli, R. (2020). Critical Black women educators: Resisting the racial and ideological marginality of K–12 teaching through critical professional development. *Theory Into Practice, 59*(4), 348-357. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2020.1773181>
- Lund, D. E., & Lee, L. (2015). Fostering cultural humility among pre-service teachers: connecting with children and youth of immigrant families through service-learning. *Canadian Journal of Education, 38*(2), 1-30. <https://doi.org/10.2307/canajeducrevucan.38.2.10>
- Mantel, N. (1970). Why stepdown procedures in variable selection. *Technometrics, 12*(3), 621-625. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00401706.1970.10488701>
- Marcucci, O. (2020). Implicit bias in the era of social desirability: Understanding antiblackness in rehabilitative and punitive school discipline. *The Urban Review, 52*(1), 47-74. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-019-00512-7>
- Matias, C. E. (2016). “Why do you make me hate myself?”: Re-teaching whiteness, abuse, and love in urban teacher education. *Teaching Education, 27*(2), 194-211. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10476210.2015.1068749>

- McMillan Cottom, T. (2020). Where platform capitalism and racial capitalism meet: The sociology of race and racism in the digital society. *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity*, 6(4), 441-449. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2332649220949473>
- Metzl, J. M., & Hansen, H. (2014). Structural competency: Theorizing a new medical engagement with stigma and inequality. *Social Science Medicine*, 103, 126-133. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2013.06.032>
- Mosley, D. V., Hargons, C. N., Meiller, C., Angyal, B., Wheeler, P., Davis, C., & Stevens-Watkins, D. (2021). Critical consciousness of anti-Black racism: A practical model to prevent and resist racial trauma. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 68(1). <https://doi.org/10.1037/cou0000430>
- Nadal, K. L. (2018). *Microaggressions and traumatic stress: Theory, research, and clinical treatment*. American Psychological Association.
- Nomikoudis, M., & Starr, M. (2016). Cultural humility in education and work: A valuable approach for teachers, learners and professionals. In J. Arvanitakis & D. J. Hornsby (Eds.), *Universities, the citizen scholar and the future of higher education* (pp. 69-84). Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137538697_6
- Orelus, P. W., Malott, C., & Hafner, A. H. (2020). Youth of Color living and learning in the age of racial paranoia: What social justice educators need to know. *Taboo: The Journal of Culture & Education*, 19(1), 91-108. <https://escholarship.org/content/qt2r94s019/qt2r94s019.pdf?t=qdxo5u>
- Parks, C., Wallace, B. C., Emdin, C., & Levy, I. P. (2016). An examination of gendered violence and school push-out directed against urban Black girls/adolescents: Illustrative data, cases and a call to action. *Journal of Infant, Child, and Adolescent Psychotherapy*, 15(3), 210-219.
- Pérez Huber, L., & Solórzano, D. G. (2015). Racial microaggressions as a tool for critical race research. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 18(3), 297-320. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2014.994173>
- Pickett, L. A. (2020). Three trains running: The intersectionality of race-based trauma, African American youth, and race-based interventions. *Urban Review*, 52(3), 562-602. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-020-00575-x>
- Pierce, C. M. (1969). Violence and counterviolence: The need for a children's domestic exchange. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 39(4), 553-568. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1939-0025.1969.tb02451.x>

- Pierce, C. M. (1970). Offensive mechanisms. In F. B. Barbour (Ed.), *The Black seventies* (pp. 265-282). P. Sargent.
- Pierce, C. M. (1973). Pushing us towards a police state. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 43(4), 528-530. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0097697>
- Pierce, C. M. (1974). Psychiatric problems of the Black minority. *American Handbook of Psychiatry*, 2, 512-523.
- Pierce, C. M., Carew, J. V., Pierce-Gonzalez, D., & Wills, D. (1977). An experiment in racism: TV commercials. *Education and Urban Society*, 10(1), 61-87. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001312457701000105>
- Pierre, C. L., Burnside, A., & Gaylord-Harden, N. K. (2020). A longitudinal examination of community violence exposure, school belongingness, and mental health among African-American adolescent males. *School Mental Health*, 12(2), 388-399. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12310-020-09359-w>
- Pizarro, M., & Kohli, R. (2020). "I stopped sleeping": Teachers of Color and the impact of racial battle fatigue. *Urban Education*, 55(7), 967-991. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085918805788>
- Prochaska, J. O., & DiClemente, C. C. (1983). Stages and processes of self-change of smoking: Toward an integrative model of change. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 51(3), 390-395. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.51.3.390>
- Purdie-Vaughns, V., Steele, C. M., Davies, P. G., Dittmann, R., & Crosby, J. R. (2008). Social identity contingencies: How diversity cues signal threat or safety for African Americans in mainstream institutions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94(4), 615-630. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.94.4.615>
- Reardon, S. F., Weathers, E. S., Fahle, E. M., Jang, H., & Kalogrides, D. (2019). *Is separate still unequal? New evidence on school segregation and racial academic achievement gaps* (CEPA Working Paper No. 19-06). <http://cepa.stanford.edu/wp19-06>
- Rodriguez-Mojica, C., Rodela, K. C., & Ott, C. (2020). "I didn't wanna believe it was a race issue": Student teaching experiences of preservice Teachers of Color. *The Urban Review*, 52(3), 435-457. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-019-00546-x>
- Rudenshine, S., McNeal, K., Schulder, T., Ettman, C. K., Hernandez, M., Gvozdieva, K., & Galea, S. (2021). Depression and anxiety during the COVID-19 pandemic in an urban, low-income public university sample. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, 34(1), 12-22. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/jts.22600>

- Santacruz, E. (2014). *Young men who have sex with men in the eras of online social networking and HIV/AIDS: An online investigation into factors related to engagement in risk and protective behavior* (Publication Number 0055 E 10339) [Ed.D., Teachers College, Columbia University]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses.
- Seaton, E. K., Yellow Horse, A. J., Yoo, H. C., & Vargas, E. (2020). Health implications of Black Lives Matter among Black adults. *Journal of Racial and Ethnic Health Disparities*, 7(6), 1241-1248. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40615-020-00749-z>
- Seider, S., Clark, S., Graves, D., Kelly, L. L., Soutter, M., El-Amin, A., & Jennett, P. (2019). Black and Latinx adolescents' developing beliefs about poverty and associations with their awareness of racism. *Developmental Psychology*, 55(3), 509-524. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0000585>
- Solórzano, D., Ceja, M., & Yosso, T. (2000). Critical Race Theory, racial microaggressions, and campus racial climate: The experiences of African American college students. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 69(1/2), 60-73. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2696265>
- Solórzano, D. G. (1997). Images and words that wound: Critical Race Theory, racial stereotyping, and teacher education. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 24(3), 5-19. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23478088>
- Solórzano, D. G., & Yosso, T. J. (2001). From racial stereotyping and deficit discourse toward a critical race theory in teacher education. *Multicultural Education*, 9(1), 2-8.
- Souto-Manning, M., & Emdin, C. (2020). On the harm inflicted by urban teacher education programs: Learning from the historical trauma experienced by Teachers of Color. *Urban Education*, 1-33. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085920926249>
- The State of America's Children 2020*. (2020). <https://www.childrensdefense.org/the-state-of-americas-children-2020/>
- Steele, C. M., & Aronson, J. (1995). Stereotype threat and the intellectual test performance of African Americans. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69(5), 797-811. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.69.5.797>
- Sue, D. W. (2010). *Microaggressions in everyday life: Race, gender, and sexual orientation*. Wiley.

- Sue, D. W., Capodilupo, C. M., Torino, G. C., Bucceri, J. M., Holder, A. M. B., Nadal, K. L., & Esquilin, M. (2007). Racial microaggressions in everyday life: Implications for clinical practice. *American Psychologist*, *62*(4), 271-286. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.62.4.271>
- Tervalon, M., & Murray-Garcia, J. (1998). Cultural humility versus cultural competence: A critical distinction in defining physician training outcomes in multicultural education. *Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved*, *9*(2), 117-125. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/hpu.2010.0233>
- Thapa, A., Cohen, J., Guffey, S., & Higgins-D' Alessandro, A. (2013). A review of school climate research. *Review of Educational Research*, *83*(3), 357-385. www.jstor.org/stable/24434163
- Tinkler, A. S., & Tinkler, B. (2016). Enhancing cultural humility through critical service-learning in teacher preparation. *Multicultural Perspectives*, *18*(4), 192-201. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15210960.2016.1222282>
- Wallace, B. C. (2003). A multicultural approach to violence: Toward a psychology of oppression, liberation, and identity development. In B. C. Wallace & R. T. Carter (Eds.), *Understanding and dealing with violence: A multicultural approach* (pp. 3-39). Sage Publications.
- Wallace, B. C., & Santacruz, E. (2017). LGBT psychology and ethnic minority perspectives: Intersectionality. In R. Ruth & E. Santacruz (Eds.), *Addictions and substance abuse in the LGBT community: New approaches* (pp. 87-108). Praeger Publishers.
- Weiner, J. M., Cyr, D., & Burton, L. J. (2019). Microaggressions in administrator preparation programs: How Black female participants experienced discussions of identity, discrimination, and leadership. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, *16*(1), 1-27. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1942775119858655>
- Whitaker, M. C. (2019). Us and them: Using social identity theory to explain and re-envision teacher-student relationships in urban schools. *The Urban Review*, *52*(4), 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-019-00539-w>
- White, T., Woodward, B., Graham, D., Milner, H. R., & Howard, T. C. (2019). Education policy and Black teachers: Perspectives on race, policy, and teacher diversity. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *71*(4), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487119879895>
- Williams, J. A., Lewis, C., Starker Glass, T., Butler, B. R., & Hoon Lim, J. (2020). The discipline gatekeeper: Assistant principals' experiences with managing school discipline in urban middle schools. *Urban Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085920908913>

- Wilton, L. S., Bell, A. N., Vahradyan, M., & Kaiser, C. R. (2020). Show don't tell: Diversity dishonesty harms racial/ethnic minorities at work. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 46(8). <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167219897149>
- Wong, G., Derthick, A. O., David, E. J. R., Saw, A., & Okazaki, S. (2014). The what, the why, and the how: A review of racial microaggressions research in psychology. *Race and Social Problems*, 6(2), 181-200. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12552-013-9107-9>
- Zirkel, S., & Johnson, T. (2016). Mirror, mirror on the wall. *Educational Researcher*, 45(5), 301-311. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189x16656938>

Appendix A

Letter of IRB Approval



Teachers College IRB

Exempt Study Approval

To: Renee LeeHim
From: Myra Luna Lucero, Research Compliance Director
Subject: IRB Approval: 21-066 Protocol
Date: 03/20/2021

Thank you for submitting your study entitled, "*SCHOOL TEACHERS' KNOWLEDGE AND SELF-EFFICACY FOR PERFORMING BEHAVIORS RECOMMENDED FOR WORK WITH DIVERSE STUDENTS: EXPLORING MICROAGGRESSIONS, CULTURAL HUMILITY, MENTAL HEALTH, TRAUMA, STRESS AND COPING AS PREDICTORS OF SCHOOL CLIMATE*;" the IRB has determined that your study is **Exempt** from committee review (Category 2) on 03/20/2021.

Due to COVID-19 quarantine, all in-person study activities with human subjects are suspended. Following guidance from New York State and Teachers College, the Institutional Review Board will announce when in-person research can resume and what steps to take at that time.

Please keep in mind that the IRB Committee must be contacted if there are any changes to your research protocol. The number assigned to your protocol is **21-066**. Feel free to contact the IRB Office by using the "Messages" option in the electronic Mentor IRB system if you have any questions about this protocol.

Please note that your Consent form bears an official IRB authorization stamp and is attached to this email. Copies of this form with the IRB stamp must be used for your research work. Further, all research recruitment materials must include the study's IRB-approved protocol number.

As the PI of record for this protocol, you are required to:

- Use current, up-to-date IRB approved documents
- Ensure all study staff and their CITI certifications are on record with the IRB
- Notify the IRB of any changes or modifications to your study procedures
- Alert the IRB of any adverse events

You are also required to respond if the IRB communicates with you directly about any aspect of your protocol. Failure to adhere to your responsibilities as a study PI can result in action by the IRB up to and including suspension of your approval and cessation of your research.

You can retrieve a PDF copy of this approval letter from Mentor IRB.

Best wishes for your research work.

Sincerely,
Dr. Myra Luna Lucero
Research Compliance Director
IRB@tc.edu

Appendix B

The Study E-Mail

ARE YOU A K-12 SCHOOL TEACHER?
**Do you teach students who are diverse, or from varied
races, ethnicities, religions, or cultures? If, yes, then
VOLUNTEER TO COMPLETE A 15-MINUTE ONLINE SURVEY!**

The Research Group on Disparities in Health within the Department of Health and Behavior Studies at Teachers College, Columbia University, in New York, New York is conducting a study. We are looking for K-12 school teachers in public, charter, or private schools who feel able to answer questions about cultural humility, microaggressions, and school climate—for **before Covid-19, or for the period from Fall 2018, to Spring 2019, to Fall 2019**. Teachers will also be asked some personal questions about their history of working in schools, health status, and about any stressful experiences they have had in school settings.

- Participation in this survey is limited to the first 200 volunteers
- Completing the online survey takes about 15 minutes
- Those who complete the survey will have a 3 in 200 chance of winning 1 of 3
- \$100 Amazon gift cards
- Please click on the link below to view the informed consent, learn
- about your rights as a participant and proceed to the survey.
- We also invite you to forward this email to others who may be willing to volunteer, or send them a text message, or tweet out the message, below:

CLICK ON: <http://tinyurl.com/K-12-TEACHERS-INVITED> TO TAKE SURVEY (Takes 15 Minutes) on their BEFORE-pandemic school climate for a 3 in 200 chance to win one of three \$100 Amazon gift cards.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION!

If you have any questions or would like to have additional information about the study, please contact:

Renée LeeHim, M.A., Doctoral Candidate, Department of Health and Behavior Studies, Teachers College, Columbia University, Box 114, 525 W. 120th Street, New York, NY 10027; rld2127@tc.columbia.edu

BARBARA C. WALLACE, Ph.D., Director, Research Group on Disparities in Health, Professor of Health Education, Clinical Psychologist, Department of Health and Behavior Studies, Teachers College, Columbia University, Box 114, 525 W. 120th Street, New York, NY 10027; bcw3@tc.columbia.edu; Study Contact Number: 267-269-7411

Appendix C

The Study Text/Tweet

CLICK ON: <http://tinyurl.com/K-12-TEACHERS-INVITED> TO TAKE SURVEY (Takes 15 Minutes) on their BEFORE-pandemic school climate for a 3 in 200 chance to win one of three

Appendix D

Informed Consent and Participant's Rights

Teachers College, Columbia University

525 West 120th Street

New York NY 10027

212 678 3000

INFORMED CONSENT

IRB Protocol Number 21-066

Protocol Title:

School Teachers' Knowledge and Self-Efficacy for Performing Behaviors Recommended
for Work with Diverse Students: Exploring Microaggressions, Cultural Humility,
Mental Health, Trauma, Stress, and Coping as
Predictors of School Climate

Principal Researcher: Renée LeeHim, M.A.

Teachers College, Columbia University

413-695-7986; Rdl2127@tc.columbia.edu

INTRODUCTION You are invited to participate in this research study called the “*School Teachers’ Knowledge and Self-Efficacy for Performing Behaviors Recommended for Work with Diverse Students: Exploring Microaggressions, Cultural Humility, Mental Health, Trauma, Stress, and Coping as Predictors of School Climate.*” You may qualify to take part in this research study if you: 1) are a K-12 teacher of diverse students; 2) are age 23 or older; and, 3) feel able to think back and answer questions about your work in your K-12 school setting **before the Covid-19 pandemic**—*and separate this experience from your current teaching experiences during the pandemic.* Approximately 200 people will participate in this study and it will take about 15 minutes of your time to complete.

WHY IS THIS STUDY BEING DONE? This study is being done to learn about those factors contributing to a school’s climate; and, to also learn what teachers recommend to reduce experiences of stress or trauma for diverse students and diverse teachers in K-12 schools.

WHAT WILL I BE ASKED TO DO IF I AGREE TO TAKE PART IN THIS STUDY? If you decide to participate in the study, you will answer a series of questions in an online survey. The questions will cover the following: your personal background, work experiences; ratings of your health, your behavior, and the school climate; ratings for cultural humility, and experiencing and witnessing microaggressions in schools; your experiences of trauma, depression, anxiety, racism, oppression; and, your recommendations for reducing stress and trauma for diverse students and diverse teachers in K-12 schools.

WHAT POSSIBLE RISKS OR DISCOMFORTS CAN I EXPECT FROM TAKING PART IN THIS STUDY? The risks of study participation include the possibility that you may feel some discomfort from taking the survey or some stress due to some of the questions. However, your participation in this study is completely voluntary, and you can stop at any time.

WHAT POSSIBLE BENEFITS CAN I EXPECT FROM TAKING PART IN THIS STUDY? There is no direct benefit to you for participating in this study.

WILL I BE PAID FOR BEING IN THIS STUDY? You will not be paid to participate. However, when you complete the survey you will be invited to enter your email address and to hit a “submit” button—so that you are officially entered into a drawing for a chance to receive a prize (i.e., 1 of 3 bar coded Amazon gift certificates for \$100). You do not have to enter the lottery drawing to complete the survey. Once you submit your email address, then it will automatically be entered into a private and secure data base that even the principal investigator cannot access. Once 200 people have completed the entire survey, you will have a 3 in 200 chance of winning 1 of 3 \$100 bar coded Amazon gift certificates. The www.Amazon.com gift certificates will be sent to three randomly chosen e-mail accounts using a secure online program. This occurs without in any way linking your identity to the survey results. The principal investigator is not able to view any of the e-mail addresses to which the gift certificates are sent. Only the 3 winners will be contacted.

WHEN IS THE STUDY OVER? CAN I LEAVE THE STUDY BEFORE IT ENDS?

The study is over when you have completed the online survey. However, you can leave the study at any time even if you have not finished.

PROTECTION OF YOUR CONFIDENTIALITY The study does not involve collecting any of your personal identifying information, such as your name or address, allowing you to remain anonymous. (NOTE: Recall, as per what is above, you can elect to enter your e-mail address to enter the drawing for a chance to receive a prize. However, this occurs without in any way linking your identity to your survey answers, and the principal investigator cannot view any e-mail addresses.) Teachers College, Columbia University has determined that www.Qualtrics.com provides a secure platform for the online survey you will take. The survey data files will also be saved on the primary researcher's password protected computer. Regulations require that research data be kept for at least three years.

For quality assurance, the study team, and/or members of the Teachers College Institutional Review Board (IRB) may review the data collected from you as part of this study. Otherwise, all information obtained from your participation in this study will be held strictly confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission or as required by U.S. or State law.

HOW WILL THE RESULTS BE USED? The results of this study will be published in journals and presented at academic conferences. This study is being conducted as part of the doctoral dissertation of the principal investigator.

WHO CAN ANSWER MY QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS STUDY?

If you have any questions about taking part in this research study, you should contact the primary researcher, Renée LeeHim, at 413-695-7986 or at rdl2127@tc.columbia.edu. You can also contact the sponsor/supervisor of this research study, Dr. Barbara Wallace, at bcw3@tc.columbia.edu or 267-269-7411.

If you have questions or concerns about your rights as a research subject, you should contact the Institutional Review Board (IRB) (the human research ethics committee) at 212-678-4105 or email IRB@tc.edu. Or you can write to the IRB at Teachers College, Columbia University, 525 W. 120th Street, New York, NY 10027. Box 151. The IRB is the committee that oversees human research protection for Teachers College, Columbia University.

PARTICIPANT'S RIGHTS

- I have read the Informed Consent Form and have been offered the opportunity to discuss the form with the researcher.
- I have had ample opportunity to ask questions about the purposes, procedures, risks and benefits regarding this research study.
- I understand that my participation is voluntary. I may refuse to participate or withdraw participation at any time without penalty.
- The researcher may withdraw me from the research at his or her professional discretion. I understand that if I take the survey more than once I will be eliminated from the study.
- If, during the course of the study, significant new information that has been developed becomes available which may relate to my willingness to continue my participation, the researcher will provide this information to me.
- Any information derived from the research study that personally identifies me will not be voluntarily released or disclosed without my separate consent, except as specifically required by law.
- I should receive a copy of the Informed Consent Form document. (I understand that I can download it).

By signing electronically, you agree to be in the study and confirm that you are a K-12 teacher of diverse students who is age 23 or above.

Provide your electronic signature:

Date: _____

Appendix E

Screening Survey

We are looking for K-12 school teachers in public, charter, or private schools who are willing to answer questions about cultural humility, microaggressions, and school climate—for **before Covid-19**, or for the period from Fall 2018, to Spring 2019, to Fall 2019. Teachers will also be asked some personal questions about their history of working in schools, health status, and about experiences they have had in school settings. This includes questions about what they may have been witnessed in school settings,

Please answer the following questions to see if you qualify to study participation:

- Are you age 23 or above? ___Yes ___No
- Are you a K-12 school teacher in a public, charter, private school, or alternative school? ___Yes ___No
- Were you working in a K-12 school setting in the Fall of 2018, Spring of 2019, and Fall of 2019—meaning you worked for those three semesters in a school setting **BEFORE the Covid-19 pandemic**? ___Yes ___No
- Were you teaching **BEFORE the Covid-19 pandemic** in a school with any diversity among the students, meaning students were from different races, or ethnicities, or religions, or cultures, etc.? ___Yes ___No
- Do you feel able to think back and answer questions about your work in that K-12 school setting **BEFORE the Covid-19 pandemic** ? ___Yes ___No
- Are you able to devote **about 15 minutes answering survey questions** about your experiences teaching **BEFORE the Covid-19 pandemic**? Yes ___ No ___

[If they answered YES to all of the above questions → they access the survey.
If they answered NO to any of the above questions → they receive this message:

“Thank you for your time, but, unfortunately, you are not eligible for study participation. Feel free to invite others who may qualify to participate in this study. Please send them the study link that you used to access this survey. THANK YOU!

Appendix F

The Study Survey

Survey for Teachers of Diverse Students in K-12

Instructions: Please answer the following questions by either selecting your desired answer or by providing an answer in the text box. **Thank you.**

Part I: Basic Demographics (BD-14)

FOR RESEARCH QUESTION #1. What are their demographic characteristics (i.e., age, race/ethnicity, skin color, U.S. born, generation in U.S., household income, level of education, type of school taught in [public, charter, private; and, urban, suburban, rural], demographic composition of school students; position in school; years in position; whether at same school, different school, or unemployed; total years in teaching profession)?

[Same as tool used in Aiyedun, 2019—while # 8-14 were added to account for this study solely focusing on teachers (versus all school staff in Aiyedun, 2019). See Aiyedun, F. (2019) *A case study of a charter school seeking to transform toward greater cultural competence for working with diverse students: Using Christopher Emdin's Reality Pedagogy approach as stimulus and guide*. Doctoral Dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University. The tool is based on a standard approach (with minor tailoring for each study population) to acquiring background demographics in studies conducted by the Research Group on Disparities in Health (RGDH), Director, Barbara Wallace, PhD.]

1-I am: Female Male Transgender Other
(Explain _____)

2-My age is: _____ [DROP DOWN MENU 24 – 80]

3-My race/ethnicity is as follows: (Please mark all that apply)

- American Indian / Alaska Native
 Arab American / Middle Eastern
 Asian (Asian Indian, Chinese, Filipino, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese, other Asian)
 Black / African American / Caribbean
 Latinx / Hispanic / Latino (Puerto Rican, Dominican, Mexican, Cuban, other Spanish)
 Native Hawaiian / Pacific Islander
 White / Caucasian / European American
 Other group(s) (Please specify _____)

4-My skin color is. SCORE 7 TO 1: NOTE: Data analysis will determine mean score, standard deviation, minimum score and maximum score for this item. (7=high score, 1=low score in subsequent data analysis)

- 7 Very Dark 6 Dark 5 Medium to Dark
 4 Medium to Light 3 Light 2 Very Light 1 White

5-Were you born in the United States? Yes No

If answered “No, “My place of birth or country of origin is _____”

Country Drop Down Menu: _____

6-My yearly household income is:

NOTE: Data analysis will determine mean score as a category 1 to 9; and, a standard deviation, minimum score and maximum score for this item.

- 1 ___ Less than \$10,000
- 2 ___ \$10,000 to \$19,000
- 3 ___ \$20,000 to \$39,000
- 4 ___ \$40,000 to \$49,000
- 5 ___ \$50,000 to \$99,999
- 6 ___ \$100,000 to \$199,999
- 7 ___ \$200,000 to \$299,000
- 8 ___ \$300,000 to \$399,000
- 9 ___ \$400,000 or More
- 10 ___ I do not know

7- My highest education level is: SCORE 1, 2=NO GRADUATE EDUCATION; SCORE 3, 4 = YES GRADUATE EDUCATION

NOTE: Data analysis will determine mean score as a category 1 to 4; and, a standard deviation, minimum score and maximum score for this item.

- 1 ___ Associate Degree
- 2 ___ Bachelor's Degree
- 3 ___ Master's Degree
- 4 ___ Doctoral Degree
- 5 ___ Other (e.g., Principal Certification. Please explain _____)

8-Specifically, for the period **BEFORE THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC for FALL 2018, SPRING 2019 AND FALL 2019**—the school setting I primarily worked in was:

- ___ Public
- ___ Charter
- ___ Private
- ___ Other (explain)

9-The school setting I primarily worked in **BEFORE THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC** was:

- ___ Urban
- ___ Suburban
- ___ Rural

10-For that school setting I primarily worked in BEFORE THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC—my best estimates of the composition or demographics of the school are:

For percent White: __ [DROP DOWN MENU 0 to 100]

NOTE: Data analysis will determine mean percent of White students in the school, a standard deviation, minimum percentage and maximum percentage for White students.

For percent Black: __ [DROP DOWN MENU 0 to 100]

NOTE: Data analysis will determine mean percent of Black students in the school, a standard deviation, minimum percentage and maximum percentage for Black students.

For percent Latino/Hispanic: __ [DROP DOWN MENU 0 to 100]

NOTE: Data analysis will determine mean percent of Latino students in the school, a standard deviation, minimum percentage and maximum percentage for Latino students.

For percent Asian: __ [DROP DOWN MENU 0 to 100]

NOTE: Data analysis will determine mean percent of Asian students in the school, a standard deviation, minimum percentage and maximum percentage for Asian students.

For percent Pacific Islander/Native American: __ [DROP DOWN MENU 0 to 100]

NOTE: Data analysis will determine mean percent of PI/NA students in the school, a standard deviation, minimum percentage and maximum percentage for PI/NA students.

11-My position(s) in that school I primarily worked in was (were) (select all that apply):

Teacher

Assistant/Vice Principal or Headmaster

Principal/Headmaster

Other Administration staff (explain) _____

Other (explain) _____

12-My length of time in that position at that school was:

less than a year

or about how many years? [DROP DOWN MENU 1-70]

13-At the present time:

I am working in the same school

I am working at this time in a different school

I am not working at this time

14-For my ENTIRE K-12 career, I have been teaching (there or at other schools) for the following number of years: _____ [DROP DOWN MENU 1-70]

NOTE: Data analysis will determine mean score, a standard deviation, minimum score and maximum score for this item.

Part II: Personal Health Background (PHB-2)

FOR RESEARCH QUESTION #2. What is their personal health background, including ratings for their physical health status and mental/emotional health status?

[This is an abbreviated version tailored for this study's focus, while using a scale created by Professor Barbara Wallace, Director of the Research Group on Disparities in Health (RGDH) and commonly used in research conducted by the RGDH. It provides several variables commonly used in further data analyses, as well as Body Mass Index (BMI) a common marker for overall health status.]

NOTE: Data analysis will determine mean score, standard deviation, minimum score and maximum score for: 1-physical health status and 2-mental/emotional health status.

SCORE 1-6

1-I rate my overall physical health status as

1-Very Poor	2-Poor	3-Fair	4-Good	5-Very Good	6-Excellent
--------------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	--------------------	--------------------

2-I rate my overall mental/emotional health status as

1-Very Poor	2-Poor	3-Fair	4-Good	5-Very Good	6-Excellent
--------------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	--------------------	--------------------

PART III: Single Item Rating of Risk of Providing Socially Desirable Responses (SIR-RPSDR-1)

FOR RESEARCH QUESTION #3. What is the extent to which they provide socially desirable answers (controlled in regression analysis)?

[Note: This is a relatively new single item scale created for first time use by Dr. Barbara Wallace in studies in 2018 conducted by the Research Group on Disparities in Health [RGDH], and for ongoing use by the RGDH. For example, this tool was used by Laryea (2019). See: Laryea, E. (2019). *An online mixed-methods study assessing nurses' attitudes, knowledge, skill/ability, and perceived barriers with regard to adherence to the national pressure ulcer advisory panel's clinical practice guidelines*. Doctoral dissertation. Teachers College, Columbia University. Note: Laryea (2019) found that the new one item measure of social desirability was one of two significant predictors of nurses' higher personal skill/ability rating for managing patients' pressure ulcers. This was noteworthy, as the well-known 13-item measure of social desirability [(i.e., Crowne, D., & Marlowe, D. (1960) A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 24(4), 349-354.] similarly was found to be the sole significant predictor of nurses' ratings for a higher personal skill/ability for managing patients' pressure ulcers. Hence, there is value in reducing the burden of time on study participants and using in this study the new one item measure of social desirability, especially, given the stress of the pandemic.]

NOTE: Data analysis will determine mean score, standard deviation, minimum score and maximum score for this sub-scale (i.e., more likely to say what people want to hear, etc.)

SCORE 0-10

1-I sometimes say things that I think will please people, or what I think they want to hear—versus the honest truth, which might be difficult or painful for other people to hear and accept, or might lead them to judge me harshly...

I rate myself on a scale of 0 to 10, as follows:

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<i>0-I am not like</i>										<i>10-I am like</i>
<i>this at all</i>										<i>this all the</i>
										<i>time</i>

Part IV. Knowledge and Self-Efficacy for 8 Key Behaviors for Teaching Diverse Students (KS-8-BTDS-16)

FOR RESEARCH QUESTION # 4. What is their level of (a) **knowledge and (b) self-efficacy for performing each of the recommended 8 behaviors for working with diverse students** [i.e., (1) interactions with students reflecting consideration of their CULTURAL background (i.e., race, ethnicity, religion); (2) interactions with students showing effective ENGAGEMENT of students from varied cultural backgrounds; (3) interactions with students showing how all races, ethnicities, religions, and cultures are VALUED—with an appreciation of differences; (4) interactions with students showing fairness and consistency in DISCIPLINING (punishing, correcting) students—so there are no differences by race, ethnicity, religion, or cultural background; (5) interactions with students AFFIRMING (supporting) them, their culture, and the history of their cultural group; (6) interactions with students showing EMPATHY and acceptance of students from diverse cultural backgrounds; (7) interactions with students creating a SAFE SPACE and trusting environment for students from diverse cultural backgrounds; and (8) interactions with students helping to CREATE a more positive school climate]?

[Survey part adapted from Aiyedun (2019), while based on the work of Emdin (2016). The scale provides data on participants' level of (a) **knowledge and (b) self-efficacy for performing each of the recommended 8 behaviors for working with diverse students, as listed above.**]

(A) FOR KNOWLEDGE SCALE (ODD ITEMS) - SCORE 0-10.

1-I rate my level of knowledge for doing this as:

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

0 = Lowest level

10=Highest level

NOTE: Data analysis will determine mean score, standard deviation, minimum score and maximum score for this sub-scale; and Cronbach's Alpha for internal consistency.

(B) SELF-EFFICACY SCALE (EVEN ITEM) – SCORE 0-10

I rate my level of confidence for doing this, given my skill/ability as:

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

0 = Lowest level

10=Highest level

NOTE: Data analysis will determine mean score, standard deviation, minimum score and maximum score for this sub-scale; and Cronbach's Alpha for internal consistency.

Please think ***ABOUT BEFORE THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC (FALL 2018, SPRING 2019, and FALL 2019 SCHOOL SETTINGS)***, and answer the following questions:

For the following behaviors, I rate myself:

FOR: My interactions with students reflecting **consideration of their CULTURAL BACKGROUND** (i.e., race, ethnicity, religion)...

1-I rate my level of knowledge for doing this as:

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
 0 = *Lowest level* 10 = *Highest level*

2-I rate my level of confidence for doing this, **given my skill/ability** as:

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
 0 = *Lowest level* 10 = *Highest level*

 FOR: My interactions with students showing **effective ENGAGEMENT of students from varied cultural backgrounds**

3-I rate my level of knowledge for doing this as:

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
 0 = *Lowest level* 10 = *Highest level*

4-I rate my level of confidence for doing this, **given my skill/ability** as:

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
 0 = *Lowest level* 10 = *Highest level*

 FOR: My interactions with students showing how **all races, ethnicities, religions, and cultures are VALUED—with an appreciation of differences** (i.e., differences are not treated as deficits)

5-I rate my level of knowledge for doing this as:

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
 0 = *Lowest level* 10 = *Highest level*

6-I rate my level of confidence for doing this, **given my skill/ability** as:

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
 0 = *Lowest level* 10 = *Highest level*

 FOR: My interactions with students showing **fairness and consistency in DISCIPLINING (punishing, correcting) students—so there are no differences by race, ethnicity, religion or cultural background**

7-I rate my level of knowledge for doing this as:

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
 0 = *Lowest level* 10 = *Highest level*

8-I rate my level of confidence for doing this, **given my skill/ability** as:

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
 0 = *Lowest level* 10 = *Highest level*

FOR: My interactions with students **AFFIRMING (supporting) them, their culture, and the history of their cultural group**

9-I rate my level of knowledge for doing this as:

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
0 = Lowest level 10 = Highest level

10-I rate my level of confidence for doing this, **given my skill/ability** as:

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
0 = Lowest level 10 = Highest level

FOR: My interactions with students showing **EMPATHY and acceptance of students from diverse cultural backgrounds**

11-I rate my level of knowledge for doing this as:

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
0 = Lowest level 10 = Highest level

12-I rate my level of confidence for doing this, **given my skill/ability** as:

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
0 = Lowest level 10 = Highest level

FOR: My interactions with students **creating a SAFE SPACE and trusting environment for students from diverse cultural backgrounds**

13-I rate my level of knowledge for doing this as:

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
0 = Lowest level 10 = Highest level

14-I rate my level of confidence for doing this, **given my skill/ability** as:

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
0 = Lowest level 10 = Highest level

FOR: My interactions with students **helping to CREATE a more positive school climate**

15-I rate my level of knowledge for doing this as:

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
0 = Lowest level 10 = Highest level

16-I rate my level of confidence for doing this, **given my skill/ability** as:

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
0 = Lowest level 10 = Highest level

I rate my level of ability for **CULTURAL HUMILITY**, as follows:

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
 0 = *Lowest level* 10 = *Highest level*

Part VII: Microaggressions in School Settings Experienced by Personnel and Witnessed Happening to Students (MSS-EBPAWHT-12)

FOR RESEARCH QUESTION # 7. What do they report for having (a) personally experienced microaggressions, and for having (b) witnessed microaggressions happening to students in the school setting?

[Using a scale previously used in Liss (2015) and created for use by the Research Group on Disparities in Health. See Liss, A. R. (2015). *Microaggression experiences, stress, and coping for lesbian, bisexual, or queer-identified women seeking the goals of childbirth and/or co-parenting: An online survey of experiences with maternal health care*. A doctoral dissertation. Teachers College, Columbia University. A version of this tool was also used in Lian (2017). For this study, a second set of 6 questions was added that asked what they witnessed happening to students in schools.] hence, the revised tool for this study has 2 sub-scales: Sub-Scale 1: Ratings of Personal Interactions Sub-Scale 2: Ratings of Interactions You Personally Witnessed Between Students and School Staff in Your School Setting.]

Sub-Scale 1: Ratings of Your Experiences During Your Personal Interactions in Your School Setting.

NOTE: Data analysis will determine mean score, standard deviation, minimum score and maximum score for this sub-scale; and Cronbach's Alpha for internal consistency.

SCALE FOR PERSONAL INTERACTIONS: SCORE 0 TO 4

0- *Never/Not At All* 1- *At Least Once* 2- *More Than Once* 3- *A Few Times* 4- *Many Times*

BEFORE THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC (FALL 2018, SPRING 2019, and FALL 2019 SCHOOL SETTINGS)...

When interacting with other teachers, administrators and school staff, to what extent did **YOU EXPERIENCE** any of the following—and **the experience seemed related to your personal demographics or appearance**:

When interacting with other teachers, administrators and school staff, to what extent did **YOU EXPERIENCE** any of the following—and **the experience seemed related to your personal demographics or appearance**:

1. Brief exchanges or brief interactions where **YOU** felt you were receiving messages that were a put down, denigrating, or conveyed something negative (i.e., that seemed related to your personal demographics or appearance):

0- *Never/Not At All* 1- *At Least Once* 2- *More Than Once* 3- *A Few Times* 4- *Many Times*

2. A verbal attack that was hurtful and caused **YOU** mental or emotional pain, whether this involved name-calling, or some act of discrimination performed on purpose (i.e., that seemed related to your personal demographics or appearance):

0- *Never/Not At All* 1- *At Least Once* 2- *More Than Once* 3- *A Few Times* 4- *Many Times*

3. A nonverbal attack, or some behavior that was hurtful and caused mental or emotional pain for **YOU**, whether this involved someone avoiding contact and interaction, or avoiding communication, or some act of discrimination performed on purpose (i.e., that seemed related to your personal demographics or appearance):

0- Never/Not At All 1- At Least Once 2- More Than Once 3- A Few Times 4- Many Times

4. A communication that was insulting to **YOU**, or conveyed rudeness and insensitivity, put downs or demeaning language (i.e., that seemed related to your personal demographics or appearance):

0- Never/Not At All 1- At Least Once 2- More Than Once 3- A Few Times 4- Many Times

5. A communication that excluded **YOU**, cancelled out your existence, made you invisible, or ignored the reality of your thoughts, feelings, and existence as a diverse person (i.e., that seemed related to your personal demographics or appearance):

0- Never/Not At All 1- At Least Once 2- More Than Once 3- A Few Times 4- Many Times

6. How often did **YOU** experience any of the above where you felt the treatment you received was related to **MORE THAN ONE** of your personal demographics or characteristics—such as due to **BOTH** your race/ethnicity, as well as your gender, or sexual orientation or your appearance (i.e., skin color, hair style, etc.):

0- Never/Not At All 1- At Least Once 2- More Than Once 3- A Few Times 4- Many Times

Sub-Scale 2: Ratings of Interactions You Personally Witnessed Between Students and School Staff in Your School Setting

NOTE: Data analysis will determine mean score, standard deviation, minimum score and maximum score for this sub-scale; and Cronbach's Alpha for internal consistency.

SCALE FOR INTERACTIONS YOU PERSONALLY WITNESSED—STUDENTS & STAFF: SCORE 0 TO 4

0- Never/Not At All 1- At Least Once 2- More Than Once 3- A Few Times 4- Many Times

BEFORE THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC (FALL 2018, SPRING 2019, and FALL 2019 SCHOOL SETTINGS)...

To what extent did **YOU WITNESS students** experiencing any of the following during their interactions with other teachers, administrators, or school staff—and **the experience seemed related to their personal demographics or appearance:**

1. Brief exchanges or brief interactions where you felt **STUDENTS** were receiving messages that were a put down, denigrating, or conveyed something negative (i.e., that seemed related to their personal demographics or appearance):

0- Never/Not At All 1- At Least Once 2- More Than Once 3- A Few Times 4- Many Times

2. A verbal attack that was hurtful and caused mental or emotional pain for **STUDENTS**, whether this involved name-calling, or some act of discrimination performed on purpose (i.e., that seemed related to their personal demographics or appearance):

0- Never/Not At All 1- At Least Once 2- More Than Once 3- A Few Times 4- Many Times

3. A nonverbal attack, or some behavior that was hurtful and caused mental or emotional pain for **STUDENTS**, whether this involved someone avoiding contact and interaction, or avoiding communication, or some act of discrimination performed on purpose (i.e., that seemed related to their personal demographics or appearance):

0- *Never/Not At All* 1- *At Least Once* 2- *More Than Once* 3- *A Few Times* 4- *Many Times*

4. A communication directed toward **STUDENTS** that was insulting, or conveyed rudeness and insensitivity, put downs or demeaning language (i.e., that seemed related to their personal demographics or appearance):

0- *Never/Not At All* 1- *At Least Once* 2- *More Than Once* 3- *A Few Times* 4- *Many Times*

5. A communication that excluded **STUDENTS**, cancelled out their existence, made them invisible, or ignored the reality of their thoughts, feelings, and existence as diverse **STUDENTS** (e.g., that seemed related to their personal demographics or appearance):

0- *Never/Not At All* 1- *At Least Once* 2- *More Than Once* 3- *A Few Times* 4- *Many Times*

6. How often did you witness any of the above where you felt the treatment toward **STUDENTS** was related to **MORE THAN ONE** of their personal demographics or characteristics –such as due to **BOTH** their race/ethnicity, as well as their gender, or sexual orientation or their appearance (i.e., skin color, hair style, etc.):

0- *Never/Not At All* 1- *At Least Once* 2- *More Than Once* 3- *A Few Times* 4- *Many Times*

Part VIII: Perceptions of Racism and Oppression Scale (PROS-10)

FOR RESEARCH QUESTION # 8. What is their level of ability for perceiving racism and oppression?

[Using a scale previously used in many studies, as it was created for use by the Research Group on Disparities in Health. See Ingram (2017), for example.]

NOTE: Data analysis will determine mean score, standard deviation, minimum score and maximum score for this scale; and, Cronbach's Alpha for internal consistency.

STANDARD SCORING: 1 TO 5; ITEMS # 7-10 ARE REVERSE SCORED

1. *Strongly Agree* 2. *Agree* 3. *Undecided* 4. *Disagree* 5. *Strongly Disagree*

Directions: We are interested in learning about your perceptions of racism and oppression.

For Your Information: Racism and oppression are potentially stressful, negative, harmful experiences where the injured party is sent the message they are “less than,” “unequal,” or “inferior.” For racism, injury is suffered due to one’s race or ethnicity (Asian, Black, Hispanic, etc.). For oppression, injury is suffered due to one’s characteristics (female, poor, gay/lesbian/transgender, illegal immigrant, immigrant status, race, religion, ethnicity, etc...). Racism/oppression may include: prejudice, discrimination, harassment, violence, exclusion, disadvantage, or lack of access to opportunity-whether while driving, eating out, walking around, shopping, voting, hailing down a taxi, interacting with police, searching for employment, seeking health care,

applying for a bank loan/mortgage, searching for housing, negotiating the criminal justice system, working, traveling, vacationing, or seeking out literally any opportunity, etc.

Please answer the following questions.

In terms of experiences of RACISM AND OPPRESSION....

1-I am not sure it is really exists or happens to people.

1. *Strongly Agree* 2. *Agree* 3. *Undecided* 4. *Disagree* 5. *Strongly Disagree*

2-When incidents are talked about, I am not sure what makes something racist or oppressive.

1. *Strongly Agree* 2. *Agree* 3. *Undecided* 4. *Disagree* 5. *Strongly Disagree*

3-I think it never happens to me.

1. *Strongly Agree* 2. *Agree* 3. *Undecided* 4. *Disagree* 5. *Strongly Disagree*

4-There are times when I “don’t get it,” or I can’t really tell when it is happening to me.

1. *Strongly Agree* 2. *Agree* 3. *Undecided* 4. *Disagree* 5. *Strongly Disagree*

5-I think it never happens to others.

1. *Strongly Agree* 2. *Agree* 3. *Undecided* 4. *Disagree* 5. *Strongly Disagree*

6-There are times when I “don’t get it,” or I can’t really tell when it is happening to others.

1. *Strongly Agree* 2. *Agree* 3. *Undecided* 4. *Disagree* 5. *Strongly Disagree*

7-I can usually see or sense when it is happening to me.

1. *Strongly Agree* 2. *Agree* 3. *Undecided* 4. *Disagree* 5. *Strongly Disagree*

8-I can usually see or sense when it is happening to others.

1. *Strongly Agree* 2. *Agree* 3. *Undecided* 4. *Disagree* 5. *Strongly Disagree*

9-When incidents are talked about, I think “That could happen to me or someone I love.”

1. *Strongly Agree* 2. *Agree* 3. *Undecided* 4. *Disagree* 5. *Strongly Disagree*

10-When incidents are talked about, I can identify with and understand the experience.

1. *Strongly Agree* 2. *Agree* 3. *Undecided* 4. *Disagree* 5. *Strongly Disagree*

ITEMS # 7-10 ARE REVERSE SCORED

Part IX: Coping and Responding to Racism and Oppression

Staging Scale (CROSS-7)

FOR RESEARCH QUESTION # 9. What is their stage of change for coping and responding to racism and oppression?

[This is a short 7 item version of the original Coping and Responding to Racism and Oppression Staging Scale (CRROSS-13) created by Professor Barbara Wallace, as used in Ingram (2017) and many other studies conducted by the Research Group on Disparities in Health. This study follows Tirhi (2019) in use of the shorter 7 item version.]

NOTE: Data analysis will determine mean score, standard deviation, minimum score and maximum score for this scale.

SCORE 1 to 5 for

1. Strongly Agree 2. Agree 3. Undecided 4. Disagree 5. Strongly Disagree

ALSO CODING OF RESPONSES DETERMINES IF THE PARTICIPANT FALLS INTO ONE OF THE FOLLOWING STAGES OF CHANGE:

(1=LOWEST, LEAST MATURE STAGE OF CHANGE—WHILE 4 AND 5 ARE THE HIGHEST, MOST MATURE STAGES OF CHANGE):

1=PRECONTEMPLATION;

2=CONTEMPLATION;

3=PREPARATION;

4=ACTION;

5=MAINTENANCE

Now, for the next set of questions, think about how you cope or respond to any experiences of racism and/or oppression:

1. I don't think they exist, so there is nothing to learn how to cope with or respond to.

1. Strongly Agree 2. Agree 3. Undecided 4. Disagree 5. Strongly Disagree
[score of 1 or 2 or 3 as 1=precontemplation stage]

2. I never thought about how to cope with or respond to it. **[score of 1 or 2 or 3 as 1=precontemplation stage]**

1. Strongly Agree 2. Agree 3. Undecided 4. Disagree 5. Strongly Disagree

3. I have thought about how to cope with and respond to it. **[score of 1 or 2 or 3 as 2=contemplation stage]**

1. Strongly Agree 2. Agree 3. Undecided 4. Disagree 5. Strongly Disagree

4. I never took steps to learn more about how to cope with and respond to it. **[score of 1 or 2 as: 2=contemplation stage]**

1. Strongly Agree 2. Agree 3. Undecided 4. Disagree 5. Strongly Disagree

5. I am planning to take steps to learn more about how to cope with and respond to it.

1. Strongly Agree 2. Agree 3. Undecided 4. Disagree 5. Strongly Disagree
[score of 1 or 2 as: 3=preparation stage]

6. I have been actively learning how to cope with and respond to it. **[score of 1 or 2 as: 4=action stage]**

1. Strongly Agree 2. Agree 3. Undecided 4. Disagree 5. Strongly Disagree

- 7-Learning how to cope with and respond to it is something that I have been actively working on:

never in my life < 1 month < 6 months > 6 months 1-3 years
 4-6 years 7-9 years 10-20 years 21-30 years >31 years
 unsure

[score > 6 months as: 5 = maintenance stage]

-----**END OF SURVEY**-----

THANK YOU!

SHARE WITH OTHERS THE LINK THAT LED YOU TO THIS STUDY!

Click [here](#) to take the *Survey for Teachers of Diverse K-12 Students* (Takes 15 Minutes) on their *BEFORE-pandemic* school climate for a 3 in 200 chance to win one of three \$100 Amazon gift cards.

If you need immediate assistance, please refer to the following contact information.

You can download this page with contact information for counseling resources, OR SKIP TO THE LINK, BELOW, FOR ENTERING YOUR EMAIL INTO THE LOTTERY DRAWING FOR A CHANCE TO RECEIVE A PRIZE (i.e., 1 of 3 bar coded Amazon gift certificates for \$100 each)

1-For Free Texting Crisis Help:

<https://www.crisistextline.org/>

- **You text 741741** when in crisis as a service available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. You will reach a live trained Crisis Counselor who will respond quickly. The Crisis Counselor helps to move you from a hot moment to a cool calm and safe state, using effective active listening and suggested referrals—all using the Crisis Text Live’s secure platform.
- If you have a phone plan with AT&T, T-Mobile, Sprint, or Verizon, texting to 741741 is free of charge.

2-Contact a Crisis Intervention Hotline for Immediate Help and Referrals:

https://www.allaboutcounseling.com/crisis_hotlines.htm

Examples of Crisis Intervention Hotlines:

- If you are in immediate danger, call 911
- National Suicide Hotline: 800-SUICIDE (800-784-2433)
- National Suicide Prevention Lifeline: 800-273-TALK (800-273-8255)
- Grief Recovery Helpline: 800-445-4808

3-Seek Out Top Rated, Low-Cost Online Counseling Services: <https://www.e-counseling.com/tlp/therapy-1/?imt=1>

- Please see a list of the top rated online counseling services—with the average weekly cost as low as \$60.

4-Seek Out Affordable Online Counseling:

<https://www.betterhelp.com/about/>

- Access affordable and convenient online counseling with professionals.

5-Seek Help from the Study Sponsor by E-Mail or Phone: bcw3@tc.columbia.edu or 267-269-7411 (i.e., the study contact number)

- You may contact the study sponsor, Dr. Barbara Wallace, receiving help with referrals. Dr. Wallace is a licensed psychologist with experience working with the study population.

Please click [here](#) to have a 3 in 200 chance of winning 1 of 3 \$100 gift certificates for use on Amazon.com.