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ABSTRACT

Two primary camps of thought guide K-12 education: Color-blind ideology and Multiculturalism (Rattan & Ambady, 2013). Color-blindness implies color does not matter (Neville, Lilly, Duran, Lee, & Browne, 2000). Shifting student demographics in K-12 education and unchanging demographics of a predominately White, female teaching force create a need for better understanding the dynamics affecting teachers and their interaction with the students they teach. This correlational study utilized multiple regression analyses to answer the following research question: How accurately can racial color-blindness be predicted from the linear combination of age, years-of-experience, and political philosophy for K-12 teachers located in an urbanized school district in Northwest Georgia? The participating school district was an urbanized school district in Northwest Georgia, employing 425 certified teachers, counselors, and academic coaches. The demographics considered in this study were: age, years-of-experience, and political philosophy. Magnitude of color-blindness was determined by subjects’ total score on the Color Blind Racial Attitude Scale (CoBRAS; Neville et al., 2000). Multiple regression was used to examine the direction and strength of the linear relationships. There were no significant correlations identified between the predictor variables of age, years-of-teaching experience, and political philosophy and the criterion variable of Racial Color-Blindness. Rejection of the null hypothesis was not possible based on the results of this study. However, comparison of mean scores of the CoBRAS in the current study to that of Atwater (2007) found a striking difference between the two studies. This difference suggests that further research of regional influences on Racial Color-blindness is merited.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Background

Color-blind Racial Ideology (color-blindness), the idea that race should not and does not matter (Neville et al., 2000), is a dominant diversity ideology found in educational systems (Atwater, 2007). Color-blindness has been studied for many years; however, a gap exists in empirical measurement of teachers’ color-blind attitudes (Castro-Atwater, 2008). While holding a color-blind attitude may seem positive, Knowles, Lowery, Hogan, and Chow (2009) found that for many, color-blindness may actually perpetuate existing racial inequalities. Understanding teachers’ color-blind attitudes becomes more important when one considers the growing diversity of students and the lack of diversity among teachers.

The demographics in American schools are changing; in the *Projections of Educational Statistics to 2021*, Hussar and Bailey (2013) reported the 2009 racial/ethnic makeup of students enrolled in public elementary and secondary schools was 54% White, 17% Black, 22% Hispanic, 5% Asian/Pacific Islander, 1% American Indian/Alaska Native, and 1% two or more races. By 2011, the last reported year, the population was 50% White, 15% Black, 26% Hispanic, 1% Asian/Pacific Islander, 1% American Indian/Alaska Native, and 3% identified as two or more races (Hussar & Bailey, 2013). The report indicates that by 2022, White students will make up 45%, while minority students will make up 55% (Black students will remain steady at 15%, Hispanic students will grow to 30%, Asian/Pacific Islander will increase to 5%, while American Indians/Alaska Natives and two or more races will remain steady at 1% and 3% respectively). White middle class students will no longer be the majority in K-12 education (Nadelson et al., 2012). The second largest population groups in public schools in the South and West regions now are students of color and Latinos (Frankenberg, 2012). Although student populations are
becoming more diverse, most of the teaching force and those in teaching preparation programs are White females who have been raised in middle class homes in rural or suburban areas of the country (Assaf, Garaza, & Battle, 2010; Frankenberg, 2012; Henfield & Washington, 2012). Dutro, Kazemi, Balaf, and Lin (2008) found this shift in student demographics has led to cultural mismatch between teachers and students, and the communities they serve. Many teachers now find themselves working with students whose cultural and language backgrounds differ significantly from their own (Atwater, 2007).

Unfortunately, interacting with people from different ethnic backgrounds often elicits negative reactions, such as uneasiness and distress (Holoien & Shelton, 2012). This researcher sought to contribute to the empirical data on teachers’ color-blind attitudes by examining the relationship of color-blindness and the age, race, years-of-experience, grade level, and political worldview of teachers.

Color-blindness seeks to downplay the salience and importance of race by focusing on the commonalities people share (Holoien & Shelton, 2012). Neville et al. (2013) wrote that color-blindness is a sign of being fair-minded and is a strategy designed to manage diversity by reducing racial prejudice. Some who embrace color-blind ideology assert that racism is no longer a significant social problem and thus attention to race is inappropriate (Pahlke, Bigler, & Suizzo, 2012). Proponents of color-blind ideology believe that attention to race via racial labeling or categorizing is inherently objectionable, sometimes even racist, and thus should be eliminated (Pahlke et al., 2012).

Color-blind ideology also posits that equality among groups is best gained by downplaying group distinctions and treating people as unique individuals (Rattan & Ambady, 2013). However, Rattan and Ambady (2013) reported color-blindness can lead to greater bias toward
the target group as well as another out-group. Color-blindness hurts ethnic minorities, as students may be unable to see themselves as validated in the school climate or curriculum (Castro-Atwater, 2008; Holoien and Shelton, 2012). Teachers often unconsciously hold racial or cultural biases and inadvertently bring to the classroom these unconscious biases or conscious beliefs that certain cultural practices are “deficits” to individual growth, resulting in low student expectations of success. Lower academic performance occurs when students’ sense they are being judged or treated in terms of biases or stereotypes commonly held by others (Castro-Atwater, 2008).

Research shows that teachers often hold cultural bias that can spark racialized or cultural Pygmalion effects in the classroom (Castro-Atwater, 2008). Frankenburg (2012) found teaching candidates tend to have negative opinions about people from different backgrounds than themselves. Students of color often sense these biases, and the stereotype threat can hinder student performance and achievement (Castro-Atwater, 2008). Apfelbaum, Norton, and Sommers (2012) found that students exposed to color-blind ideology were less likely to identify overt instances of biases. By ignoring race, color-blindness perpetuates inequalities and underachievement (Dutro et al., 2008). Not only is color-blindness harmful to students, but it is also bad for teachers. According to Frankenburg (2012) color-blindness fails to consider the unequal nature of opportunity provided in some schools, and the ways in which that disadvantages not only students but also teachers. Holoien and Shelton (2012) wrote that ethnic minority co-workers are less engaged the more Whites endorse a color-blind ideology.

**Problem Statement**

The problem is color-blindness has been studied for many years; however, a gap exists in the empirical data concerning teachers’ color-blind attitudes (Castro-Atwater, 2008). To address
this empirical gap in teachers’ color-blind attitudes, this study focused on the relationship between color-blind attitudes of teachers and demographics of age, years-of-experience, and political worldview of teachers in an urbanized school district in Northwest Georgia. Color-blindness is not a new topic and many qualitative studies exist; however, little empirical data exist on color-blindness among teachers (Apfelbaum et al., 2010; Atwater, 2007; Castro-Atwater, 2008).

Research indicates that color-blindness has more negative effects than positive (Castro-Atwater, 2008; Neville et al., 2013; Rattan & Ambady, 2013). Displaying prejudice is no longer politically correct or socially acceptable and people’s discriminatory behavior is so carefully monitored in our multi-cultural society that intentions may be farther from actions than any other attitude (Neville et al., 2013; Talaska, Fiske, & Chaiken, 2008). Schools often encourage teachers and students to approach diversity and equality issues from a color-blind perspective (Pahlke et al., 2012). Neville, Awad, Brooks, Flores, and Bluemel (2013) argued that racial color-blindness is unrealistic and even harmful to disregard another’s race or to not see color in a society that is as racially stratified as the United States. Harm comes in the form of inequalities continuing as status quo, underachievement by people of color, and inability to identify overt instances of biases (Apfelbaum et al., 2012; Castro-Atwater, 2008; Dutro et al., 2008; Neville et al., 2013). The APA Presidential Task force on Preventing Discrimination and Promoting Diversity (2012) stated that racial color-blindness serves to justify and explain away racial inequalities in society and is one type of ideology that is used “to [help] sustain the social hierarchy while maintaining a perspective that provides the cover of innocence” and is an evolving manifestation of racial discrimination.
Teachers’ race and cultural background provides critical-lenses through which to view teaching and those who hold negative, ethnocentric, and/or racial attitudes toward their students often fail to meet the academic and societal needs of the students they serve (Mogadime, 2011; Nadelson et al., 2012). Failure to realize and be mindful of ones’ perceptions on race, class, and ethnicity can lead teachers to mistakenly assign labels and set student expectations based on student’s shortcomings and not on student’s assets (Vescio, Bondy, & Poekert, 2009). Often without knowing, many teachers hold irrational racial biases, lower expectations for minority students, and positive preferences towards students much like themselves (Marx and Wynne, in Castro-Atwater, 2008) resulting in inequitable placement, funding, discipline, and performance. Color-blind racial attitudes make it difficult for teachers to see these shortcomings in themselves.

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of this quantitative correlational study was to address gaps in empirical data concerning color-blindness of teachers by examining the color-blind attitudes of teachers and any significance in the relationship of these attitudes to teacher demographics of: age, teaching experience, and political philosophy. The criterion variable magnitude of color-blindness was determined by the subject’s total score on the Color Blind Racial Attitude Scale (CoBRAS). The predictor variables were teachers’: age, years-of-experience, and political philosophy.

**Significance of the Study**

Marx and Wynne (as cited in Castro-Atwater, 2008) wrote “Many teachers continue to hold racial biases, expectations, and preferences of which they are often unaware” (p. 247); these attitudes negatively impact placement, performance, discipline, and funding for minority students. Frankenberg (2012) recommended more research to understand the racial attitudes of teachers. Identifying the positive and negative consequences of [color-blindness] ideologies in
the various social contexts [such as schools] is important (Ryan, Casas, & Thompson, 2010). Data gathered in this study has added to the limited empirical data (Atwater, 2007). Additionally, data gathered in this study can assist school system administrators in evaluating the need for diversity training within and across their schools. Systems found to have high to moderate levels of color-blindness can use this data to pinpoint specific schools or groups for diversity training. By pinpointing specific needs, training time and cost can be reduced.

**Research Question**

The researcher examined the following research questions:

**RQ1:** How accurately can racial color-blindness be predicted from the linear combination of age, years-of-teaching experience, and political philosophy for K-12 teachers located at an urbanized school district in Northwest Georgia?

**Null Hypotheses**

**H₀1:** There will be no significant relationship between the criterion variable (racial color-blindness) and the linear combination of predictor variables (age, years-of-teaching experience, and political philosophy) for K-12 teachers located at an urbanized school district in Northwest Georgia.

**Definitions**

1. **Color-blindness:** differences associated with race and ethnicity are superficial and unimportant perceivers can and thus should ignore race and ethnicity—people should be judged as individuals without regard to race and ethnicity (Ryan et al., 2010).
2. **Race:** White, Black or African American, American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, or Some Other Race (Humes, Jones, & Ramirez, 2011).
3. **Diversity**: the degree to which an organization is heterogeneous in race and ethnicity (Stevens, Plaut, & Sanchez-Burks, 2008).

4. **Outgroup**: A group that is considered to be different from, and insufficient to, one's own group (www.psychologydictionary.org)

5. **Social Desirable Bias**: the tendency for test takers to report responses that they believe are socially approved rather than responses that reflect their actual beliefs or behaviors. (Warner, R. M., 2013)
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Race still matters in modern-day America. Our individual upbringing not only gives us a template for values and worldview, but it also includes personal biases and misconceptions about other racial/ethnic groups derived from our experiences and family socialization (Adler, 2011). More than 50 years since Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. delivered his famous “I Have a Dream” speech on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial detailing his hope of a day when one would be judged by his or her character and not by the color of his or her skin, race is still the main factor in determining inequalities in America (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 2006).

This chapter opens with a review of critical race theory (CRT) and cognitive dissonance theory, which provides the theoretical framework of this study. The chapter then shifts to the germane data of the literature review on racial inequalities, Color-blind ideology, and political leaning as it relates to diversity, and then concludes with a brief discussion of an alternative diversity model in education—multiculturalism.

Theoretical Framework

Critical Race Theory (CRT)

Background and history. Race as a significant factor in determining inequality in the United States—is easily documented in the statistical and demographic data (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 2006). “Race is already present in every social configuration of life” (Ladson-Billings, 2009, p. 19). Taylor (2009), found “racism to be a normal fact of daily life in the United States’ society that is neither aberrant nor rare” (p. 4). Issues of race and racism are deeply rooted in U.S. society and deeply imbedded in the policies, practices, procedures, and institutionalized systems (Milner, 2008).
“Critical race theory (CRT) began in the mid-1970s with the early work of Derrick Bell (African American) and Alan Freeman (White) both of whom were deeply distressed over the slow pace of racial reform in the United States” (Ladson-Billings, 2009, p. 20). CRT has as its foundation: “a body of legal scholarship, a majority of whose members are both existentially people of color and ideologically committed to the struggle against racism, particularly as institutionalized in and by law” (Bell, 2009, p 40). CRT scholarship is marked by a number of specific insights and observations, including society’s acceptance of racism as ordinary, the phenomenon of White’s allowing Black progress when it also promotes their interest (interest convergence), the importance of understanding the historical effects of European colonialism, and the preference of the experiences of oppressed people (normative) over the “objective” opinions of Whites. (Taylor, 2009, p. 4)

According to Ladson-Billings (2009), Critical race theory begins with the notion that racism is “normal,” not aberrant, in American society, and because it is so enmeshed in the fabric of our social order, it appears as both normal and natural to people in this culture. (Ladson-Billings, 2009, p. 21)

It is so common place that unless people are directly affected by it, they may not even know or believe it is occurring (Tate, 1997). In fact, it is so customary that those who benefit from don’t even recognize that they are benefiting (Taylor, 2009). Taylor (2009) recorded that “Whites cannot understand the world they themselves have made; their political, economic, and educational advantages are invisible to them and many find it difficult to comprehend the non-White experiences and perspective that White domination has produced” (p. 4).
The second observation of CRT is interest convergence, which stresses that “racial equality and equity for people of color will be pursued and advanced when they converge with the interest, needs, expectations, and ideologies of Whites” (Milner, 2008, p. 333). The prospect of Blacks in gaining racial equality only happens when it is also in the best interest of Whites in power (Taylor, 2009). Milner (2008) noted

People in power are sometimes, in theory, supportive of policies and practices that do not oppress and discriminate against others as long as they—those in power—do not have to alter their own ways and systems, statuses, and privileges of experiencing life. (p. 334)

When viewed through the lenses of CRT, the landmark United States Supreme Court case Brown v. Board of Education, 1954 presents a study in interest convergence. Brown is more noted for legally ending the policy of “separate but equal” therefore striking down state supported segregation. However, when seen in its historical context of the Cold War, the United States government had a vested interest in seeing segregation ended. In the ideological warfare of democracy versus communism, the United States was hard pressed to convince emerging Third-World nations of the day that democracy was the best system when the communist press was covering the struggles of people of color most notably, segregation and the treatment of African Americans as second class citizens at best. For American foreign policy, segregation was a blemish that had to be eliminated and as such the Justice Department filed an amicus brief requesting the Supreme Court rule in favor of Brown. The final ruling in Brown helped the United States in its struggle to minimize the spread of communism and provided immediate credibility to America’s struggle with communist countries to win the hearts and minds of emerging Third World people (Bell, 2009; Ladson-Billings, 2009).
In addition to the convergent interest with U.S. foreign policy, *Brown* was also seen as a victory for industrialists, who understood that the South could be transformed from an agrarian society to an industrialized sun belt only when it ended the divisive battle over state supported segregation (Ladson-Billings, 2009). Segregation was read as a barrier obstructing the economic self-interest of U.S. profit makers (Bell, 2009; Ladson-Billings, 2009).

**Application to the study.** CRT in education explores the inequities in academics and funding as it affects students of color (Tate, 1997). “Perhaps no area of schooling underscores inequity and racism better than school funding; this inequality is a function of institutional and structural racism” (Ladson-Billings, 2009, p. 31). In the simplest of equations, those with “better” property are entitled to “better” schools and this is clearly seen by the variation in quality and quantity of the curriculum in relation to “property values” of the school (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 2006). In nearly every state, property taxes calculations are utilized to fund schools; areas with higher property values will typically have better financially supported schools (Landson-Billings, 2009). Ladson-Billings and Tate (2006) found what students should know—the intellectual property “must be undergirded by “real” property: science labs, computers and other state-of-the-art technologies, and appropriately certified and prepared teachers” (p. 18). Ladson-Billings (2009) wrote:

> CRT takes to task school reformers who fail to recognize that property is a powerful determinant of academic advantage and without a commitment to redesign funding formulas, one of the basic inequalities of schooling will remain in place and virtually guarantee the reproduction of status quo. (p. 32)

Along with inequalities in funding,
CRT sees the official school curriculum as a culturally specific artifact designed to maintain a White supremacist master script where, stories of African Americans, as-well-as other people of color, are muted and erased when they challenge dominant culture authority and power. (Ladson-Billings, 2009, p. 29)

On top of muting the stories of people of color, “CRT also suggests that current instructional strategies presume that African American students are deficient, and as a consequence, classroom teachers are engaged in a never-ending quest for “the right strategy or technique” to deal with (read: control) “at-risk” (read: African American) students” (Ladson-Billings, 2009, pp. 29-30).

Taylor (2009) expressed

There is little agreement on how race is defined or what it means in the training of teachers or classroom practices. Hobbled by the paradox of a largely White teaching staff whose practices, consciously or not, contribute to the racial achievement gap, yet who are unable to see what they are doing? (p. 9)

This researcher sought to explore the “conscious or unconscious” attitudes and actions of teachers in the form of magnitude of racial/cultural color-blindness and the relationship with teacher demographics. Despite legal challenges to address inequalities in education, they still exist. CRT, as it applies to education provides a lens through which to review decisions, particularly in funding, placement, and discipline in an effort to scrutinize policies with a goal of eliminating inequalities. CRT is foundational to the concept that race matters still in education today.
Cognitive Dissonance Theory

**Background and history.** Cognitive dissonance theory was introduced in 1957 by Leon Festinger. His theory on cognitive dissonance postulates that inconsistent cognitions elicit an adverse state of arousal (i.e., dissonance), which in turn produces a desire to reduce the underlying inconsistence and to maintain consonance (Festinger, 1957). Van Wormer and Falkner (2012) defined cognitive dissonance as a “state of tension that occurs whenever a person holds two cognitions (ideas, attitudes, beliefs, opinions) that are psychologically inconsistent” (p. 396). Cognitive dissonance theory seeks to explain the mental uneasiness one feels when confronted with two thoughts that are not compatible with each other. When dissonance is experienced, an uncomfortable or uneasiness develops internally and some action must be taken to return to normal.

As stated by van Wormer and Falkner (2012), the basic principle of cognitive dissonance is that most people tend to think of themselves as good people, feel a sense of loyalty to their community, and loved ones; dissonance is caused by a discrepancy between the way things seem at the time, as perfectly natural, and the way they seem later when viewed from the perspective of contemporary values. The dissonance experience—the questioning of what one knows to be true until challenged by new information is, a natural response to a life of socialization (Gorski, 2009).

When dissonance occurs, we will go to seemingly absurd lengths in order to maintain consistency and not threaten our sense of self or being right (Gehback, 2010). Five methods employed in order to resolve the feeling of dissonance and return to a “normal” state were identified by Ivy, Hill, and Stevens (1978). The methods include (a) simply deny the existence of the source of dissonance—the simplest method; (b) discredit the source if it can be found to be
biased, inexpert, or otherwise unreliable; (c) seek social support by finding others who believe the same way, and in doing so, the new information becomes incorrect and therefore, there will be no need to change one’s beliefs; (d) minimize the importance of the issue; or (e) chose to accept the new information and to change one’s beliefs (Ivy et al., 1978).

We are constantly being bombarded with new information that must be compared to our present beliefs, which then must either be accepted and incorporated into a modified or new set of beliefs or rejected and the current belief system maintained. The central argument is that inconsistency serves as an epistemic cue for errors in one’s system of beliefs, thereby imposing a ubiquitous constraint on thinking and reasoning (Gawronski, 2012) until the inconsistency or dissonance is resolved.

**Application to the study.** As the ethnic and racial demographics in the classroom and institutions of education continue to change, many educators are faced with a new paradigm—an increasingly diverse student population. This exposure to the new and more diverse student population that, brings with them differing cultures, languages, styles, etc. from the mainstream White, middle-class, teaching force and their own lifetime of socialization (Gorski, 2009) is very likely to create intense levels of dissonance.

When this dissonance occurs, teachers must take action to resolve the discomfort created while at the same time contemplate how their choices at resolution may impact the student-teacher relationship. The choices made to resolve the dissonance also impacts their level or magnitude of racial/cultural color-blindness. Unawareness of racial/cultural color-blindness maybe a result of responses to relieve cognitive dissonance such as denial, discrediting the source, minimization of issues of race, or seeking social support (Ivy et al., 1978). When teachers are faced with inequalities that are contrary to their belief system, cognitive dissonance
will arise and action must be taken to resolve the dissonance. Understanding the processes of cognitive dissonance can help achieve a better understanding of individuals’ unawareness of discriminatory practices described in Color-blind ideology and in turn, potentially help address in a more positive manner inequalities found through the lens of CRT.

**Literature Review**

**Introduction**

Despite the continued shifts in the demographics of American public school students, one constant is the demographics of public school faculties. Public school faculties continue to be predominately White, female, middle-class, from suburban and rural areas of the nation (Assaf et al., 2010; Frankenberg, 2012; Henfield & Washington, 2012). This often times creates a cultural mismatch in the classroom between students and teachers (Dutro et al. 2008). Increasingly, teachers now find themselves working with students who have vastly different cultural and linguistic backgrounds than their own (Atwater, 2007). Regrettably, interacting with people from different ethnic, cultural, or linguistic backgrounds often evokes negative reactions (Holoien & Shelton, 2012).

Over the past few decades, public schools in the United States have seen unprecedented growth in the enrollment of students who are culturally, linguistically, and socioeconomically diverse (Nadelson et al., 2012). School systems in the United States that, until recently, have been primarily White and African-American with small immigrant representation, are now seeing precipitous changes in immigrant demographics (Brown & Chu, 2012). White middle-class students no longer compose the majority of K-12 learners (Nadelson et al., 2012). Brown and Chu’s (2012) study of Mexican immigrant children found that children who attended schools with larger populations of low-income children perceived more peer and teacher discrimination
than other children. They explained that children at schools with more Latino children (controlling for socioeconomic status) perceived more peer and teacher discrimination than children at schools with fewer Latino children (Brown & Chu, 2012).

Color-blind Racial Ideology has been studied for many years now and the literature on the topic continues to grow (Castro-Atwater, 2008). The premise of Color-blind ideology is that as a society, we have developed beyond seeing race as a determining factor in how we are treated, and the idea that race should not matter and does not matter (Neville et al., 2000). By focusing on commonalities, color-blindness seeks to downplay the salience and importance of race (Holoien & Shelton, 2012). It is seen as a sign of being fair-minded and is used as a strategy to negotiate diversity by decreasing racial prejudice (Neville et al. 2013). Advocates of color-blindness believe drawing attention to race is at times racist and should be rejected (Pahlke et al., 2012); others who study in this area believe that color-blindness, sometimes called racial color-blindness is a modern day form of politically correct “soft” racism and that it perpetuates existing racial inequalities (Knowles et al. 2009). Neville, Awad, Brook, Flores, and Bluemel (2013, p. 456) argued that color-blindness is “unrealistic and, unattainable; that it is even harmful to disregard another’s race or to not see color in a society that is as racially stratified as the United States,” and that color-blindness strengthens preconceptions of race and disparities.

Rattan and Ambady (2013) proposed that equality among groups is best gained by giving a lower profile to group distinctions and treating people as unique individuals.

Therefore, it is even more imperative that we learn more concerning what educators think about, know about, and believe about their students in their classrooms and how this affects their attitudes and actions towards the students. Teachers, oblivious or not, continue to hold biases, expectations, and preference towards minority students effectuating inequitable funding,
discipline, and placement in educational settings. Two models of ideological diversity have prominence in education to address these inequalities: color-blind ideology and multiculturalism. The literature review that follows will discuss inequalities followed by a focus on color-blind ideology with a limited discussion of multiculturalism.

**Racial Inequalities**

According to Sullivan and Artiles (2011),

African American students are overrepresented in special education as mentally retarded and having emotional disabilities, comparative to White students, and Native Americans are overrepresented with learning disabilities, while Latino and Asian American/Pacific Islanders are proportionately or underrepresented in the high-incident categories. (p. 1527)

Although “Special Education was born of, and owes a debt to, the Civil Rights movement” (Skiba, Simmons, Ritter, Gibb, Cuadrado, & Chong, 2008, p. 264), groups expected to benefit most from the Civil Rights movement are the most disproportionately represented in special education. Furthermore, identification for special education “may lead to segregated placement and may further exacerbate the stakes for groups, such as African Americans and Native Americans, who have historically been denied opportunities by institutional sanctioned segregation” (Artiles, Kozleski, Trent, Osher, and Ortiz, 2010, p. 281). Critiques of the disproportional placement of Black youth in special education began to circulate as early as the 1960s, when people began to notice that schools had devised new ways to subvert the Supreme Court’s 1954 desegregation degree (Laura, 2011). Minority students are often seen by teachers as more demanding and belligerent, especially those with lower socioeconomic upbringings, and are more likely to be recommended for special education evaluation for challenging classroom
behaviors as-well-as for more subjective standards than majority group students (Anyon, 2009). Black boys who attend schools in wealthier communities are actually more likely to be labeled mentally retarded than those attending predominately Black, low-income schools. While minorities are overrepresented in special education, they are underrepresented in Gifted and Talented Education (GATE). Nationally, White students comprise approximately 56% of the total school population but almost 68% of the students in GATE (Erwin & Worrell, 2011).

No one ever wants to talk about the connection between how we think and talk about children and how we treat them in social and academic contexts (Laura, 2011). Teachers may unconsciously hold lower expectations for racial minority students than for students who come from different homes (Hughes, Newkirk, & Stenhjem, 2010). Part of the silence is certainly rooted in the fact that challenging and unlearning what we assume we know is uncomfortable and that finagling around contradictions and tensions is easier than diving into and grappling with them (Laura, 2011). One such area is discipline where minorities are more likely to be referred to the office because of a reputation of deviance (Rocque, 2010).

Rocque’s (2010) study on office discipline and student behavior highlighted that studies during the past 30 years have consistently shown that race is associated with discipline in schools. Furthermore, studies examining the distribution of discipline in schools have consistently found that racial/ethnic minority students are more likely to be disciplined than majority groups; in fact, African Americans are more likely to be referred to the office or suspended than Whites (Rocque, 2010). Laura (2011), asserted that Black students are disciplined more frequently and more harshly than their peers for less serious and more subjective reasons, such as disrespect, disruption, excessive noise, and loitering among others.
The racial disparity in school discipline has been well documented, with some researchers suggesting bias as a cause of this disparity (Rocque, 2010). Hughes et al. (2010) elaborated on this point by saying that teachers may be unaware of their own racial biases and prejudice or the institutional racism pervading society. Holding to the idea that one does not consider race, the main objective in Color-blind ideology, makes it easy to ignore obvious inequalities or to explain them away.

In addition to biases, Rocque (2010) found that cultural barriers lead to misunderstandings between White school officials and minority students. Misinterpretation of behavior/communication styles may lead to the assumption on the part of White teachers and school officials that Black students are misbehaving when in fact there was no such intention (Rocque, 2010).

While the student demographic composition of American schools is seeing increases in minority students, most of the current teaching force—those coming into teaching, and those who teach prospective teachers—are White females who have been raised in middle class homes in rural and suburban communities (Assaf et al., 2010). The gap between teachers’ cultural-socio-economic backgrounds and those of their students is widening. Henderson (2013) revealed:

Numerous teachers are afraid to teach students who are culturally different from them, a code term for lower-class students of Color. They fear them before they even get to know them. The result of this fear is the unfounded belief that most of these students are unruly and not educable. Stated another way, an untold number of teachers believe that it is impossible for them to be optimally effective in urban schools; and thus it is impossible
for them to relate to urban students in general and Black and Hispanic students in particular. (p. 86)

Inequalities in education continue to survive and educators often do not comprehend how these inequalities along with poverty, and environment, effect their students’ education. Special education placement and disciplinary actions continue to affect minorities disproportionately to the dominant group. White students continue to be the dominant group in gifted and talented programs, while minorities are still underrepresented. Race matters. According to Rattan and Ambady (2013), Whites avoid discussing race in order to avoid appearing biased. The unconscious racial biases of educators are part of the complex reasons for these disparities (Togut, 2011).

Teacher Perceptions of Racism

Teachers are as susceptible to biases as anyone else (Gehbach, 2010). “Because teachers, similar to all people, are products of their cultures and upbringing, it is difficult for some of them not to act out their prejudices” (Henderson, 2013, p. 53). Frankenberg (2012) identified recent research on teaching candidates concluding that most tend to have negative attitudes towards others different than themselves. Some teachers believe that students of Color—primarily African American, Hispanics, and Native Americans—are innately inferior to their White peers and hold on to this view even though many of them learned in college or during in-service training there are no pure races; “that we all belong to the same genus and species (Homo sapien); that there are more learning differences within racial and ethnic groups than between them; and that racial differences are largely the result of environmental and cultural conditions” (Henderson, 2013, p. 119).
Teachers may openly deny negative attitudes towards others different than themselves; however, one only needs listen to the conversational language used by teachers, a language filled with cue words that attempt to veil the true identity of the specific group to which a student belongs (Pollack, 2013). These attempts to deny negative racial attitudes towards students should be troubling within education considering the rapidly changing racial and cultural demographic changes occurring in the public schools. Holoien and Shelton (2012) reported interacting with people from different ethnic backgrounds often elicit negative reactions such as anxiety and threat. Research on prejudice indicates that mere contact between members of different racial groups is insufficient to ameliorate the ill-will between them (Gehback, 2010).

Negative racial attitudes are a more salient point considering that White teachers are the dominate group with, 82.9% during the 2007-2008 academic year, in the classroom (Henfield & Washington, 2012). Contact with families and the community is also minimal; although most public school teachers are White, they are less likely to live in their school’s community and, therefore, unlikely to fully understand the context within which the school and student are situated. With this isolation from people of other races/ethnicities, it is not surprising these teachers often report feeling unprepared for teaching in racially diverse settings (Frankenburg, 2012). As a result, “much of the plight of students who are culturally diverse is an outgrowth of their teachers’ failure to understand them” (Henderson, 2013, p. 116).

A gap currently exists between a predominantly White, middle-class, female teaching work-force and an increasingly heterogeneous population of students (Vescio et al., 2009). Teachers’ race and cultural background provides critical lenses through which to view teaching (Mogadime, 2011). To the extent teachers are mostly White and educated, they may reflect the racial attitudes of White, educated Americans (Frankenberg, 2012). Henderson (2013) wrote,
“Beliefs about racial, ethnic, and gender groups are passed on to us by our parents and other family members” (p. 169). Gorski (2009) viewed these beliefs as a product of socialization over a lifetime. It is necessary for teachers to be mindful of their racial and cultural backgrounds, in order to understand how these factors influence their beliefs about education, and to use this insight to engage approaches that support minority students rather than place them at a disadvantage (Henfield & Washington, 2012).

Research shows that teachers who hold negative, egocentric, and/or racist attitudes towards their students often fail to meet the academic and societal needs of the students they serve (Nadelson et al., 2012). Assaf et al. (2010) discovered many teacher candidates come to teacher education programs with stereotypical beliefs and deficit attitudes about students from diverse backgrounds. Additionally, recent analysis of the General Social Study suggested that White teachers’ racial attitudes are similar to the general population (Frankenberg, 2012).

Teachers are often driven by the desire to be difference makers (McCreary, 2011) and this desire will, hopefully, drive teachers to examine their personal attitudes towards race and culture and to see how their attitudes impact either positively or negatively their students. Henderson (2013), pointed out that “teaching culturally different students as more difficult than teaching culturally homogeneous students” (p. 121). He further suggested that, “teachers must be able to set aside their negative beliefs about culturally different people, even if those beliefs are vital fibers of their personalities” (Henderson, 2013, p. 168). Race matters, and teachers need to understand how to become change agents to create more inclusive schools (McCreary, 2011).

Four personae of racism. Evelyn Young (2011) wrote of the four personae of racism. She identifies four categories into which one can be classified: conscious perpetrators; unconscious perpetrators; deceived perpetrators/activists; and the enlightened
perpetrators/activist. The conscious perpetrators are those who intentionally commit acts of racism by practicing purposeful, albeit sometimes subtle, discrimination on the basis of race. “Racist jokes and stereotypical remarks based on first impressions are examples” (Young, 2011, p. 1444). However, because of political correctness that permeates society, it is often the words that are not said, the nuances in which comments are made, or an unobvious act of discrimination (Young, 2011), that show one’s true attitudes.

Young’s (2011) second personae is the unconscious perpetrator, who performs acts of hostility or speaks words of denigration with no awareness of malice or foul play. “These perpetrators are everyday people doing everyday activities, going about their routines without a second thought as to how their unquestioned acceptance of life as it is” (Young, 2011, p. 1445), indicates acceptance of the status quo. The unconscious perpetrator through no thought actually encourages the persistence of racism although he or she sees racism as acts of individual perpetration rather than a system of privileges (Young, 2011).

Deceived perpetrator/activist is the third personae of racism identified by Young (2011, p. 1443). “These perpetrators identify themselves passionately with the cause of the racially oppressed, yet in their unrelenting fight for social justice, they are blinded by a false idealism that renders them incapable of seeing themselves as contributors to an oppressive system” (Young, 2011, p. 1443). This person can believe that “as long as one only thinks negatively about people of color but does not act on his or her thoughts, he or she is exempt from being a racist; additionally, denial of complicity in racism is possible because they see themselves as good, open minded people who are accepting of everyone regardless of race, gender, class, religion, or creed” (Young, 2011, pp. 1446-1447). It is nearly impossible for race conscious educators whose appreciation for cultural diversity and fervor for educational democracy to see
that they too could be part of the problem rather than the solution (Young, 2011). Young (2011) went on to say racism blinds those who are most committed to its extinction.

The final personae in Young’s (2011) four personae of racism is the enlightened perpetrator/activist. This person “recognizes the hegemonic nature of racism, and although the goal is to assist others, they realize that no matter how determinately they confront racism and social inequality, they are inevitably tied to a system in which they are simultaneously a product” (Young, 2011, p. 1443). The enlightened perpetrator then “views himself or herself as a racist when he or she balks instead of challenging racism when confronted with it” (Young, 2011, p. 1448).

Most teachers would balk at the notion that they may even remotely be prejudice or hold biases, preferences, and or negative expectations towards minority students. Yet the literature indicates the contrary is true and that these attitudes hurt minority students by furthering already existing inequalities. Teachers may say that students’ color, or language, or culture does not matter and does not affect how they interact with students who are different than them. Adopting Color-blind ideology is one method teachers use to downplay that race does in fact matter.

**Color-blind Ideology**

Color-blindness most often refers to a physical vision impairment more accurately known as color deficiency and affects one’s ability to distinguish the colors red and green or red from green (Bogford, Champagne, & Cuevas, 2007). Color blindness, color-blindness, colorblindness, and colormute are all interchangeable terms that have come to identify not a physical impairment but a non-physical impairment in regards to race and ways in which one recognizes or ignores, conscious or unconscious actions taken that affect minorities or people of
color (Apfelbaum et al., 2012; Atwater, 2007; Castro-Atwater, 2008; Holoien & Shelton, 2012; Knowles et al., 2009). Racial/cultural color-blindness plays off the idea of having difficulty distinguishing color but in this case the implication applies to the color of one’s epidermis.

What is color-blindness as it relates to race or culture? Color-blindness in reference to race is first seen in the dissenting opinion of Supreme Court Justice John Harlan in the landmark case *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896) when he argued that “our Constitution is color-blind, and neither knows nor tolerates classes among citizens” (Plaut, 2010). Color-blindness has been defined as an attitude or ideology in which the race, ethnicity, or culture of students does not or should not matter (Atwater, 2007). This ideology argues that equality among groups is best gained by downplaying distinctions and treating people as unique individuals (Rattan & Ambady, 2013). Color-blindness downplays the salience and importance of race by focusing on the commonalities people share, such as one’s underlying humanity (Holoien & Shelton, 2012).

Pahlke et al., (2012) wrote that at its core, color-blindness holds that recognizing race is a precondition to racism, and that failing to recognize race reduces racism. Ryan, Casas, and Thompson (2010) argued with the idea of color-blindness, suggesting that differences associated with race and ethnicity are superficial and unimportant; perceivers can and should ignore race and ethnicity; people should be judged as individuals without regard to race or ethnicity. Scholars have conceptualized racial color-blindness as a set of attitudes, or ideology that reflects unawareness of various forms of racism (Todd, Spanierman, & Abner, 2010). All of these explanations of color-blindness share a common thread—the concept that race should not matter. Research has highlighted the multiple potential meanings of a color-blind ideology, which allow for color-blindness to be used to maintain, rather than reduce, inequity. Race does matter, simply look at almost any survey one completes, observe where and with whom primary and
secondary students eat lunch with when given the opportunity to sit where they want and one will see race does matter. Race is one of the fastest dimensions through which people categorize others (Rattan & Ambady, 2013).

Reid and Birchard (2010) wrote that color-blindness or the idea that race is no longer a significant determinant of personal outcomes, is one of the “primary components of contemporary racial prejudice” (p. 479).

What’s more, a color-blind racial ideology asserts that because race should not affect personal outcomes, race does not affect personal outcomes; furthermore, the expression of a color-blind racial ideology insulates the individual from the possibility that his or her own attitudes or behavior might be racially discriminatory; consequently, racially discriminatory behavior can continue unchecked. (Reid & Birchard, 2010, p. 479)

According to Bonilla-Silva and Dietrich (2011) color-blind racism is central to racial stratification in the United States. Color-blindness calls for the eradication of race; however, disregards the power and privilege that is connected to race (Sweeney, 2013). Bonilla-Silva & Dietrich (2011) recorded that several major cognitive dimensions of color-blind racism exist, including denial of White privilege, lack of awareness of the implications of institutional racism, rejection of social policies such as affirmative actions, and denial of pervasive racial discrimination in the United States.

Color-blind racial attitudes affect how individuals respond to racial situations as those with higher levels of color-blindness are less likely to be bothered by the racist’s actions (Tynes & Markoe, 2010). They found an even “greater concern is a growing body of research
suggesting that individuals with color-blind racial attitudes may be more likely to engage in discriminatory behavior” (Tynes & Markoe, 2010, p. 2).

**Factors effecting color-blindness.** “The more racism, sexism, classism, and other human relation problems in K-12 schools change, the more they seem to remain the same” (Henderson, 2013, p 37). Prejudice and discrimination are not confined to just the United States but continue to be a social problem world-wide (Stewart, Latu, Branscumbe, Phillips, & Denny, 2012). Neville et al. (2000) developed the Color-Blind Racial Attitude Scale (CoBRAS) to measure levels of color-blindness of ongoing discrimination and identified three factors which the 20 question survey accesses. The CoBRAS measure levels of unawareness of racial privilege, unawareness of institutional discrimination, and unawareness of blatant racial issues. (A more detailed discussion of the CoBRAS can be found in Chapter Three and the survey is located in Appendix B.)

**Unawareness of racial privilege.** Racial privilege is the notion that White subjects accrue advantages by virtue of being constructed as White; these are unearned privileges that Whites, by virtue of their race, have over people of color (Leonardo, 2009). Teachers, who are mostly White females from middle-class homes in rural or suburban areas of the country (Assaf et al., 2010; Frankenburg, 2012; Henfield & Washington, 2012), may not even be aware of the benefits or privileges they enjoy simply by virtue of their skin color (McIntosh, 2009). Privilege is granted even without a subject’s (re)cognition that life is made a bit easier for him/her (Leonardo, 2009). McIntosh (1989) identified 46 different privileges that one may benefit from solely due to being White and referred to these benefits as *White Privilege*. In her seminal work on the topic, McIntosh (1989) described these privileges as an invisible package of unearned
assets that can be counted on and cashed in each day, but about which the benefactor was meant to remain oblivious.

Henderson (2013) defined White privilege as “the social, economic, educational, and other unearned advantages that some White students have over all other students” (p. 27). Leonardo (2009) described it as “privileges granted even without a subjects (re)cognition that life has been a bit easier for him or her and these privileges are also granted despite a subject’s attempt to dis-identify with the White race” (p. 261). White Privilege has also been described as the many ways, “typically invisible to White persons themselves, that White skin color is associated with prestige, privilege, and opportunities unavailable to other persons in society” (Boatright-Horowitz & Soeung, 2009, p. 574).

What are these invisible privileges that even when unknown or unaware benefit Whites? A small sample of the 46 different ways in which Whites benefit solely from their skin color identified by McIntosh (1989, 2009) is provided below:

- I can go shopping alone most of the time, being pretty well assured I will not be followed or harassed (2009, p. 37).
- I can easily buy posters, postcards, picture books, greeting cards, dolls, toys, and children’s magazines featuring people of my race (2009, p. 38)
- I can take a job with an affirmative action employer without having my coworkers on the job suspect that I got it because of my race (2009, p. 38).
- I can choose blemish cover or bandages in “flesh” color and have them more or less match my skin. (2009, p. 39)
- I can go home from most meetings of organizations I belong to feeling somewhat tied in, rather than isolated, out of place, outnumbered, unheard, held at a distance, or feared (2009, p. 38).

One who writes about having White Privilege must ask, “Having described it what will I do to lessen or end it?” (McIntosh, 1989, p. 1). White Privilege or almost any topic on race or racism is not easy to talk about, especially for Whites as they fear appearing racist (Flynn, 2012). Ferber (2012) wrote that those with White Privilege, or any form of privilege, often become angry when confronted by the fact of their privilege. Research has generally suggested that there is a great deal of resistance on the part of most advantaged group members to recognizing privilege, even when they are willing to admit that disadvantages exist (Hastie & Rimmington, 2014; McIntosh, 1989; Peterson & Hamrick, 2009). The ability to see disadvantage while either ignoring or denying advantage has been referred to as half-blindness of privilege by Pratto and Stewart (2012). This half-blindness of privilege contributes to making the topic even more difficult to discuss. In a racialized society, “discussions of race and racism continue to be muted and marginalized” (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 2006, p. 11).

Whites have come to expect and rely on these benefits and over time these expectations have been affirmed, legitimated, and protected by law. These sets of privileges and benefits that accompany the status of being White have “become a valuable asset that Whites sought to protect and those who passed (as White) sought to attain” (Bell, 2009, p. 45). It is not only the case that “Whites are taught to normalize their dominant position in society; they are also susceptible to these forms of teachings because they benefit from them” (Leonardo, 2009, p. 268).
Educators have struggled to teach about race, culture, and power in a meaningful way (Flynn, 2012) and tend to remain silent on issues of racism and ethnocentrism, both in the United States as a whole and within the educational profession in particular (Henze, Lucas, & Scott, 1998). At the college and university, teachers who teach antiracism can have their careers negatively impacted by student evaluations of their teaching efforts and abilities (Boatright-Horowitz & Soeung, 2009). Objections to the idea of White Privilege by dominate group members continue because many seem to want to believe that racism/White Privilege is a problem that belongs to extremists (Shockley & Banks, 2011).

Although most Whites are unaware of the privileges they experience and do not see how it impacts their own lives, people of Color are confronted with the reality of inequality and oppression on a daily basis (Ferber, 2012). Pennington, Brock, and Ndura (2012) found that White racial identities influence teaching children of Color and as teachers become conscious of their own, often unconscious, thoughts and ideas about race and cultural issues, they simultaneously become aware that their ideas on such things may impact their ability and/or inability to teach and reach some students (Shockley & Banks, 2011).

Educators must address sociocultural forces, helping students to see that racism does not occur only in isolated, individual acts, and as such, White teachers should not be afraid to talk about race with students, including students of Color (Flynn, 2012). “White students need to be encouraged to confront their own racist tendencies and acknowledge their privileged statuses, an important first step as they begin to understand diverse viewpoints” (Boatright-Horowitz & Soeung, 2009, p. 575).

**Unawareness of institutional and blatant discrimination.** Unawareness of institutional and blatant discrimination are Factors 2 and 3 of the CoBRAS respectively. The
focus of the CoBRAS is on unawareness that discrimination takes place (Neville et al., 2000) due to the lack of shared experiences between educators and the diverse students with whom they work (Atwater, 2007; Dutro et al., 2008). Teachers and other providers may be unaware of their own racial biases and prejudices or the institutional racism that pervades society; too often educators, police, the judiciary, and other professionals involved with young people think racism is primarily isolated, idiosyncratic, or haphazard actions by individuals who occasionally consciously intend to assert racial hierarchy over others (Hughes et al., 2010) and not systemic.  

Unawareness makes it difficult to recognize and delineate when, where, and how institutional and blatant discrimination occurs or even that one may be the perpetrator. Racial inequality and discrimination in matters such as hiring, housing, criminal sentencing, education, and lending are so widespread as to be uninteresting and un-concerning to most Whites (Taylor, 2009). Discrimination and inequities may occur subtly in school funding, in teachers’ discussion of students, or in the way school discipline is applied. Young (2011) described unconscious perpetrators of racism as “everyday people doing their everyday business, who go about their routines without giving second thought as to how their unquestioning acceptance of life as it is indicates their approval of the status quo” (p. 1445).  

The details of how schools are funded are not in the foremost thoughts of educators in the classroom yet there is mounting evidence suggesting that districts commonly distribute different amounts of funding, even when schools serve the same types of student (Guin, Gross, Deburgomaster, & Roza, 2007), which can affect resources available in the classroom. School funding is often controlled by dominant group members by virtue of being property owners. Since the beginning of free public education in the United States during the nineteenth century, the property tax has been the principal source of support for primary and secondary schools
Money and resources often go to suburban schools or those mostly attended by large White majorities (Gooden, 2012). These disparities and inequalities are many times driven by tax rates set on real, personal, residential, commercial, and agricultural class properties by popularly elected county assessors and by tax reforms passed by legislators in which when reviewed by state courts have been shown as unequal property tax bases provide unequal educational opportunities (Kent & Sowards, 2009). Hartney and Flavin (2013) noted upper income Americans can retreat to suburban enclaves where property values are high avoiding underfunded, poor performing urban schools and where policymakers are more likely to respond to the political preferences of White citizens compared to African Americans. In their study reviewing school funding in the State of Illinois, Verstegen and Driscoll (2009) discovered the school finance system was inequitable and discriminatory against poor children and youth. Illinois is not the only state to have been identified as having inadequate and inequitable school funding issues. In state courts across the nation, funding formulas have been challenged based on state equal protection clauses or other constitutional provisions related to adequate or efficient education (Kent & Sowards, 2009). Engle (2007) described financial inequality in the United States public school systems as being all too common.

In the Illinois study, the disparities across school districts were egregious with a strong relationship between funding for education and a locality’s ability to pay for education—as locality’s ability-to-pay for education rises, so does funding for school children (Verstegen & Driscoll, 2009). Furthermore, Verstegen and Driscoll (2009) calculated that over half of Illinois’ children have funding below the level established through research as needed to adequately meet state laws and standards—an unjust and disparate system that curtails equal opportunity for children and youth in schools and classrooms.
In a study of decentralized school funding of a west coast school, Vaught (2009) outlined what she called, the Differential School Funding policy, designed to address achievement gaps by providing disproportionate capital dollars into high-end poverty neighborhood schools. Each student is funded as a foundation or base level and then additional money is attached to the student based on other criteria such as being classified as an English Language Learner (ELL), Special Education, Free/Reduced Lunch, and so on, although the funds were designated by student to a particular school; once at the school, school leadership had the authority to spend funds as they determined best for the school (Vaught, 2009).

Even though funds were designed to address achievement gap needs experienced primarily by minority children, Vaught (2009) described the commodification of Black children when she recounts how one high school administrator felt pressured to use these funds to pay for an Advanced Calculus teacher for a class that had been cut from the course offerings when what was really needed was an additional remedial math teacher. White parents, through the Parent-Teacher Organization, pressured the administrator to fund the calculus class. Only when minority parents enlisted the help of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) to apply political pressure, they could not yield on their own, to address this blatant institutional form of discrimination (Vaught, 2009) was the need for a remedial math teacher appropriately addressed.

Teachers are part of the institution of education and have great sway over young people, including other teachers. A remark made by a colleague when asked about the lack of minorities in the gifted program was the seed for this research. Her response was “They’re not smart enough.” Pollack (2013) highlighted that casual, everyday teacher talk (including stories, comments, references, advice, gossip, etc.) about students, families, and communities of Color is
an especially important but overlooked aspect of a school’s culture—an aspect that both reflects and influences people’s underlying beliefs and assumptions about diversity and “difference.”

One only needs to listen to conversations, particularly the intonations with which the comments are made, between teachers during lunch, in the hallways, the work room, team meetings, or anywhere teachers gather, to hear what is thought of students and their families. When race is not explicitly named, other indicators are used to signal the racial identities or social economic status of the children and families being discussed: “rough area,” “low income,” “SPED kids,” and even teachers “imitating speech styles and gestures” (Pollack, 2013, p. 871). “Those kids,” “Why doesn’t that surprise me?” “certain parents,” and “Well, most people that come tonight can’t even read the directions anyway” are additional examples of comments reported by study participants to Pollack (2013, pp. 875-876).

Most K-12 educators in the United States do not share their students’ racial, ethnic, or linguistic backgrounds; this is an important factor in understanding teachers’ attitudes about their so-called “disadvantaged” students (Assaf et al., 2010; Atwater, 2007; Holoien & Shelton, 2012; Pollack, 2013). Narratives that negatively depict people of Color seem to be especially memorable to Whites and the current racial/ethnic makeup of the teaching force as compared to the student population makes this point particularly salient; unfortunately, these narratives are so much a part of the everyday culture of schools that they are often unnoticed, unacknowledged, or seen as harmless (Pollack, 2013). “There is no valid reason for teachers to verbally destroy students” (Henderson, 2013, pp 113).

Racial disparity in discipline has been documented in the school setting, with some researchers suggesting bias as a cause (Rocque, 2010). Hughes et al., (2010) pointed out that teachers and other providers may be unaware of their own biases and prejudices or the
institutional racism that pervades society. Rocque (2010) reported that studies examining the
distribution of discipline in schools have consistently found that racial/ethnic minority students
are more likely to be disciplined than majority groups.

Black students, for example, are disciplined more frequently and more harshly than their peers for less serious and more subjective reasons, such as disrespect, disruptions, excessive noise, threats, loitering, among others (Laura, 2011). The way student groups differ in communication styles may lead to differential treatment on the part of White teachers who do not understand the ways in which poor Blacks (and poor Whites) communicate, and this misinterpretation of behavior/communication styles may lead to the assumption on the part of White teachers that Black students are misbehaving when in fact there was no such intention (Rocque, 2010). “The knee-jerk reaction of numerous teachers to the slightest verbal provocation from students of Color is to send them to the principal’s office or anywhere else out of their sight” (Henderson, 2013, p. 54). Laura (2011) found “what counts as ‘proper’ behavior is filtered through stereotypical representation [dominant group], beliefs, and expectations that school adults held about their children” (p. 91); additionally, she also indicated “Black males are denied the masculine dispensation that casts White males as “naturally naughty,” while they are cast as willfully bad” (p. 92). Excluding environmental factors, other dynamics are at work when it comes to racial inequalities in educational settings (Rocque, 2010).

**Age and years-of-experience.** Atwater (2007) explored the relationship between racial color-blindness and age and years-of-teaching experience. Empirical data on the relationship of color-blindness and years-of-experience outside of Atwater’s study is lacking. Atwater believed that teachers with tenure would be freer with taking “teachable moments” to talk about race in the classroom and to project their own point of view on a more confident footing (S. Atwater,
personal communication, January 29, 2015). Related to this was the feeling that with all jobs, the more experience professionals have on the job, the more comfortable they become with “sticking their neck out” and possibly rocking the boat for their beliefs; as-well-as the number of times the teacher has taken, passed up, or at least witnessed teachable moments about race and culture (S. Atwater, personal communication, January 27, 2015). Tyler and Schuller (1991) wrote that experience can generate changes in attitude towards specific ways of thinking.

The correlation between age and color-blindness was of interest to Atwater (2007). Rhodes, Saunders, and Saunders (2005) explained that basic social attitudes develop in early childhood, with children as young as two being able to identify people by whether they are Black or White. Children are inclined to go along with their parents’ teaching and as such, regrettably, nearly all Americans are at least a little prejudice (Rhodes et al., 2005). Biases, according to Rhodes et al., fostered during the developmental years tends to follow them into their adult years and as they become parents pass the biases on to their children, continuing a cycle of prejudice from one generation to the next. Atwater (2007) hypothesized that teachers under the age of 50 would hold fewer color-blind attitudes if they were raised at a time after the Civil Rights movement and when school segregation was no longer an accepted legal practice possibly breaking the cycle described by Rhodes et al.

**Negative consequences of color-blind ideology.** Color-blindness started off in the endeavors to boost equality (Rattan & Ambady, 2013); however, it can mask the durableness of racism (Swartz, 2009). The majority of White teachers fail to see and disagree with the reality of racism (McCreary, 2011). “Educators who deny the existence of racism in educational settings are less likely to be sensitive to academic needs of [students of Color]” (Henfield & Washington, 2012, p. 158). Not noticing students race, ethnicity, or cultures can be used to avoid answering
questions about racial questions or commenting during crucial developmental periods when students are beginning to notice they are not the same as their other classmates (Atwater, 2007). Embracing color-blind ideology can lead to overlooking the histories, cultures, values, and experiences of racial minority groups (Pahlke et al., 2012). In addition, when race is ignored, recognizing and addressing racism is difficult. White fear of racial minorities has been linked to lower levels of multicultural education, racial awareness, cultural sensitivity, and interracial friendships (Todd et al., 2010). Educators’ life experiences and the environment in which they are reared have a tremendous impact on their belief systems. Teachers who fail to acknowledge their constructed consciousness about race, class, and ethnicity will make mistakes of defining some students by their deficiencies rather than their strengths (Vescio et al., 2009). An important strategy for dealing with the consequences of prejudice behavior is confrontation, the expression of dissatisfaction with prejudicial treatment toward the responsible (Zou & Dickter, 2013).

Educators are on the front line and are in a great position to address issues of race and culture if only they evaluate themselves first.

In an earlier discussion on inequities of funding, the influence of politics or those with political clout was evident in the decision making process. If the politics of parents influence school systems, then the political leaning or political worldview of teachers affect their biases and expectations of students. The next section provides a review of data on political leaning.

**Political Leaning**

In her study of Color-Blind Ideology, Atwater (2007) recommended replication in an area that is less politically liberal and diverse than the San Francisco Bay area. Political lines in America span a continuum of liberalism on the left and conservatism on the right. Recent elections have divided the country into “Red” (Republican) states and “Blue” (Democrat) states.
depending on the voting results of the majority in each state. Political links to the inequities of school funding and “the persistent achievement gap between African American and White students provoke important questions about political representation and the existence of a racial undercurrent in the politics of education policymaking” (Hartney & Flavin, 2013, p. 3).

Many teachers are unaware of the details of the political nature of education and often fail to see that certain groups benefit from current structures while others are oppressed. “Parents and community members should have power in educational decisions that affect them and in the way race plays a systemic role in all of these” (Picower, 2013, p. 174). While educators may not be conscious of the finer details of politics at work, Picower (2013) pointed out that the attitudes indicative of specific political stances influences every teachers’ action.

Those who fall on the conservative end of the political spectrum follow an ideology based on ethnocentrism, intolerance for ambiguity, dogmatism, need for closure, stability, authoritarianism, and traditional values (Strickland, Locker, & McIntosh, 2011; Wetherell, Brant, & Reyna, 2013). Conservatives generally oppose public aid for disadvantaged groups, including welfare, affirmative action, public health care, home mortgage relief, and natural disaster relief (Wetherell et al., 2013). Morgan, Mullen, and Skitka (2010) found that conservatives typically make dispositional attributions for causes of poverty and academic achievement gaps and emphasize personality based explanations (e.g., the poor lack motivation, persistence, or moral integrity).

Those who identify themselves as liberals espouse values of egalitarianism, universalism, progressivism, idealism, tolerance, open-mindedness, self-determination, social justice, and are more likely to identify education as the nation’s most important problem (Hartney & Flavin, 2013; Miretzky, 2013; Strickland et al., 2011; Wetherell et al., 2013). In addition, liberals
typically make situational attributions for poverty and academic achievement gaps with emphasis on social and environmental factors (e.g., poverty is the result of unfair social institutions or difficult economic conditions (Morgan et al., 2010).

To reiterate Picower (2013), every teacher action is shaped by a particular political philosophy. Research on political ideology and discrimination in the United States consistently finds that conservatism is associated with prejudice and discrimination and compared to liberals is more likely to discriminate against out-groups, those not in the dominant group (Wetherell et al., 2013). Miretzky (2013) pointed out that there is evidence that overall, faculty—especially in higher education—skew towards liberalism. Even so, some CRT scholars find liberalism is inadequate for dealing with America’s racial problems because many liberals believe in color-blindness (Gooden, 2012). If color-blindness is inadequate for dealing with America’s racial problems, then what is the alternative? One possibility is multiculturalism.

**Multiculturalism**

Although the main focus of this study is to investigate the potential correlations between selected teacher demographics and racial color-blindness, including a limited discussion on the alternative diversity ideology—multiculturalism—is beneficial. Multicultural ideology grew out of Civil Rights and ethnic group movements of the 1960s and 1970s (Plaut, 2010). While both color-blindness and multiculturalism share the overarching goal of achieving positive intergroup relations and greater social equality (Rattan & Ambady, 2013), previous research on multiculturalism appears to offer more compelling diversity strategies than do approaches grounded in color-blindness (Plaut, Buffardi, Garnett, & Sanchez-Burks, 2011). In the mid-1980s multiculturalism climbed in standing and continues to shape much of educational thought and practice regarding diversity and education (Skerrett, 2008).
Plaut, Thomas, and Goren (2009) asked, “Is it better to ignore or acknowledge group difference?” (p. 444). A common thread through the definitions and goals of multiculturalism is that race and ethnicity should be given attention (as opposed to being ignored) because prejudice develops in part from a lack of knowledge of and respect for other groups (Rosenthal & Levy, 2010). Furthermore, multiculturalism asserts that through learning about different groups and developing an understanding of and appreciation for them, negative attitudes will be reduced (Rosenthal & Levy, 2010). Multiculturalism encourages the recognition and appreciation of distinct cultural groups and their experience and contributions, the maintenance of culture and cultural identities of these groups, and the sense that no one group culture is superior or should be privileged (Plaut, 2010). People who adopt multiculturalism believe individuals should seek to understand, accept, and even celebrate ethnic and cultural group differences (Ryan, Casas, Thompson, 2010).

Multiculturalism in education calls for culturally relevant pedagogy classroom practices that draw meaningfully on cultures, languages, and experiences that students bring to the classroom to increase engagement and academic achievement for students of Color (Dutro et al., 2008). Advocates of multiculturalism have been particularly vocal, arguing for the need for programs ranging from those who attend to teaching the cultures and histories of different groups to those taking a socially transformative approach to issues of ethno-racial inequality (Plaut, 2010). Nadelson et al. (2012) defined multicultural education as a process entailing an inclusive, multidisciplinary approach to teaching that takes into account personal, cultural, and academic influences in which students live.

Embracing multiculturalism also has its potential challenges. Multicultural initiatives can produce skepticism and resentment on the part of some groups, in particular non-minorities
(Stevens et al., 2008). Plaut (2010) argued that multiculturalism, in its most publicly acceptable manifestations, may not have the capacity to address entrenched social inequalities; additionally, it may be interpreted as special treatment of minority groups leading to a source of symbolic threat to majority group members. Plaut, et al. (2011) found that Whites tend to shy from, or even resist, multiculturalism or race consciousness in favor of color-blindness policies and practices in educational settings. Ultimately, the goal of these approaches (multiculturalism and color-blindness) to diversity is to improve intergroup interactions, reduce bias, and benefit intergroup equality.

**Summary**

Critical race theory (CRT) and Cognitive dissonance theory serve as theoretical foundations for this study. Although it has been nearly 50 years since the passage of the Civil Rights Act, race still matters. CRT grew out of legal scholarship and the belief that progress toward equality has been intentionally slowed. This concept began to spread and entered in to the field of education as progress towards equity was also moving forward at a very slow pace in many sectors of the country. CRT in education indicates that students of color are still being treated unequally in many facets of education. This inequity can be seen as a proponent of color-blind ideology.

Cognitive dissonance occurs when one is faced with new information that is contrary to beliefs one already holds. This can occur with educators when they are faced with the reality of the demographic changes taking place in their schools and classrooms. Many teachers are now looking into the faces of students who are very unlike themselves. Their students often are racially or culturally different, have a different socioeconomic makeup, speak different native languages from their teachers, and have differing religious beliefs. These differences introduce
new cognitive information that educators must process and many find themselves in unfamiliar and uncomfortable situations. They are out of their “comfort zone.” According to this theory when this type of dissonance occurs, there are four ways in which to calm this dissonance and return to normal: deny the discomfort, discredit the source of the discomfort, downplay the importance of the source of discomfort, or change their belief system to be more accepting of the new cognitive information. Educators who embrace color-blind ideology may be using it as part of the first three options to resolve their dissonance when faced with changing faces of the school-house and classroom.

Color-blindness was defined as ignoring or downplaying race and differences in students from those of the majority group. Color-blindness helps educators (anyone) to avoid issues of race and to ignore racism that continues to occur even in subtle forms. Color-blind ideology ignores differences and emphasizes similarities among students. Research has shown that many teachers and those training to enter the teaching profession are uncomfortable when interacting with people who are different than them. The teacher’s personal background plays a large part in how successfully they are able to work with minority students.

The extent of color-blindness can be evaluated by using the Color- Blind Racial Attitude Scale (CoBRAS). This twenty question survey assesses color-blindness in three categories or factors: Factor 1 – Unawareness of Privilege; Factor 2 – Unawareness of Institutional Discrimination; and Factor 3 – Unawareness of Blatant Discrimination (Neville et al., 2000). This unawareness is often associated with the lack of shared experiences by the dominant group and minority groups (Neville et al., 2000). Members of the dominant group are many times unaware of the benefits they receive solely based on the color of their skin or their gender. Dominant group members often fail to see institutional discrimination because they are not
affected by the discriminatory acts. Likewise, dominant group members often miss blatant acts of discrimination because they have in many cases become ingrained in their surroundings.

Age and years-of-experience can affect color-blind racial attitudes (Atwater, 2007). The developmental years of a future teacher’s life shape his or her racial and cultural attitudes. These attitudes carry forward with teachers into adulthood and can either be changed or emboldened with years of experience. Greater awareness of racial issues is expected of younger teachers due to the time and society in which their developmental years occurred (Frankenberg, 2012).

Political leaning or ideologies play major roles in education. Whether in the realms of school funding or down to how the classroom teacher sees his or her students, political leanings impact students. Conservative educators are more likely to make dispositional attribution for the causes of academic or classroom problems and, therefore, grade more strictly and be heavier handed with discipline. Liberal educators are more likely to make situational attributions for the causes of academic or classroom problems and may be more likely to seek out alternative ways to assist students and be lighter handed with discipline (Morgan et al., 2010; Wetherell et al., 2013).

The teacher’s perception of students not like themselves is driven by the lack of common experiences. White females from middle class families raised in rural and suburban areas dominate the field of education; whereas, the student population with which they work is becoming more diverse every year (Assaf et al., 2010). Unlike their teachers, most students are increasingly minority, low-income, and from urban areas (Henfield & Washington, 2012). Teacher’s attitudes most often reflect that of the White, educated dominate group (Frankenberg, 2012). These attitudes or perceptions dictate what teachers view as acceptable behavior and can lead to misunderstanding of cultural differences between their students and them.
Although color-blind ideology originated as an effort to increase equality, it can be a way to hide racism. By refusing to acknowledge the differences and attempting to treat everyone the same, cultural, social, and environmental factors that contribute to a person’s development are ignored and the status quo is maintained. This attitude leads to overlooking the histories, cultures, values, and experiences of minority groups. A lack of support among minority group members, who likely face the most negative consequences in intergroup conflicts, might be enough to declare color-blindness unlikely to succeed as a diversity ideology (Rattan & Ambady, 2013).

Multiculturalism is the alternative diversity ideology to color-blind ideology. Multiculturalism embraces differences among racial, ethnic, and cultural groups. Support from both majority and minority group members might seem enough to declare multiculturalism a more effective diversity ideology (Rattan & Ambady, 2013). Teachers who embrace multiculturalism see the value in what each student brings to the table in relation to his or her differences and seeks the way to capitalize on these differences in order to help students achieve academic success. Unfortunately, most educators who claim to embrace multiculturalism never make it beyond the level of celebrating holidays and eating cultural foods on special occasions.

A piece of canvas is only the beginning for it takes on character with every loving stroke. This thing of beauty is the passion of an artist’s heart. By God’s design we are a skin kaleidoscope. We’ve gotta come together. Aren’t we all human after all?
We're colored people, and they call us the human race
Oh, colored people
We're colored people, and we all gotta share this space
Yeah we've got to come together somehow
We're colored people, and we live in a tainted world
Red, yellow, black and white
We're colored people, every man, woman, boy, and girl
Colored people, colored people, colored people, colored people, yeah¹. (McKeehan & Cocchini, 1995, Track 2)

¹ Lyrics were printed with permission. See Appendix L for permission.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODS

Design

The researcher employed a correlation design in this quantitative study. Correlation design studies the relationship between two or more existing variables drawn from a single group of research participants (Rovai, Baker, & Ponton, 2013). The multiple linear regression model is best for determining the effects of predictor variables (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2007). This method is critical to examining the relationships between the magnitude of racial color-blindness and demographic information collected from participants. Correlational studies seek to determine if a correlation exists between variables but does not seek to assign or attribute causation (Rovai, et al., 2013). The predictor variables used in this study are age, years-of-experience, and political philosophy. Age is defined as the individual age of participant at the time of the demographic survey completion. Years of teaching experience will be defined as the total number of years a participant has been a teacher, academic coach, media specialist, or counselor in either a private or public school setting. Political philosophy was defined as conservative or liberal as determined by the participants’ score on the McConochie Conservative-Liberal Multi-Level Attitude Scales (McConochie, 2013). The criterion variable, Color-Blind Racial Attitude was defined as the combined score of the three factors of unawareness on the Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS).

Research Questions

This study examines the following research questions:

RQ1: How accurately can racial color-blindness be predicted from the linear combination of age, years-of-teaching experience, and political philosophy for K-12 teachers at an urbanized school district in Northwest Georgia?
Null Hypothesis

$H_0$: There will be no significant relationship between the criterion variable (racial color-blindness) and the linear combination of predictor variables (age, years-of-teaching experience, and political philosophy) for K-12 teachers located at an urbanized school district in Northwest Georgia.

Participants and Setting

Participants for this study were selected from a sample of convenience. Convenience sampling is utilized for a number of reasons: proximity to the researcher, familiarity with location (Gall, et. al, 2007), and availability of participants (Rovai et al, 2013). Convenience sampling was chosen for the reasons described by both Gall et al. (2007) and Rovai et al. (2013). Participants were employed by an urbanized school district in Northwest Georgia. All participants were certified as teachers, counselors, or academic coaches by the state of Georgia. Gall et al. (p. 145) recommended a minimum sample size of 66 participants plus 15 each for additional variable requiring a minimum sample size of 111 participants (Gall et al., 2007, p. 361).

This study was conducted in an urbanized school district in Northwest Georgia. The participating school district is comprised of seven elementary schools, one middle school, one high school, and one transitional academy (alternative school) providing educational services to between 5,000 and 6,000 students. The student body is approximately 1/3 Black, 1/3 Hispanic, and 1/4 White and other races.

The participating school district employed over 400 certified teachers, counselors, and academic coaches for the 2015-2016 school year. Analysis of the certified personnel data provided by the participating district indicated 82.07% were females, and 17.92% were males. A
further analysis of the demographic data found 92.45% of certified personnel were White, 5.89% Black, 0.94% Hispanic, 0.47% Asian, and 0.23% Pacific Islander.

The study sample included 199 female and 40 male certified personnel in the positions of classroom teacher, counselor, media specialist, and academic coach. All participants were employed by one of nine schools that comprise the district. Demographic breakdown for the participant’s gender, age, and race-ethnicity are located in Table 5 in Appendix I.

**Instrumentation**

**Predictor Variable: Demographics**

Three data sources were employed in this study. First, teacher demographics were collected through an online self-reporting survey (See Appendix A for Teacher Demographic Questionnaire). Demographics collected in this study were: age in years, years-of-experience, grade level taught, individual’s race as defined by the United States Department of Commerce, United States Census Bureau’s 2010 Census, social economic status as a youth, current social economic status, and exposure to minorities prior to entering the field of education.

**Predictor Variable: Political Philosophy**

The McConochie Conservative-Liberal Multi-Level Attitude Scales (MCLMAS) was developed by William A. McConochie, Ph.D. (2013) as an outgrowth of more than 10 years of research in the field of political psychology. Often studies include a single-item self-reporting question concerning political worldviews to identify participants as having a conservative or liberal political worldview. A measurement tool was needed to evaluate whether or not multi-item measures were more accurate than single-item measures. The multi-item scale measures of liberalism and conservatism evolved out of a study of over 64 trait measures hypothesized to differentiate liberal from conservative political worldviews over more than 10 major dimensions
of political discourse (W. A. McConochie, personal communication, February 8, 2015). These worldviews are genetically grounded in the human species and serve two basic in-group functions, specifically protection from threats in the case of the conservative worldview and related traits, and in the liberal worldview, promotion of constructive relationships (W. A. McConochie, personal communication, February 8, 2015). The MCLMAS was developed in 2013 and has not gained wide notoriety at this time. McConochie has conducted a number of studies using these scales and has published his results on his website Politicalpsychologyresearch.com.

McConochie (2013) conducted factor analysis on the multi-item traits for conservatism and liberalism and compared the results to single-item measures of political worldviews and found substantial correlation between the measures. McConochie found that multiple-item measures of worldviews yield extremely reliable measures and higher validity correlations than single-item measures. An alpha coefficient of .93 for the Con-12 (questions 1-12) and an Alpha coefficient of .92 for the Lib-11 (questions 13-23) at the .01 level or better of significance was reported by McConochie.

The MCLMAS is a self-administered 23 question survey used to ascertain the participants’ conservative or liberal political worldview (See Appendix C for McConochie Conservative-Liberal Multi-Item Attitude Scale [MCLMAS]). The instrument is in two sections and takes approximately seven minutes to complete. Section one is the Con-12 and contains questions 1-12, which are favorable to a conservative political worldview. Section two contains the Lib-11—questions 13-23; these questions are favorable to a liberal political worldview. Participants used a five-point Likert type scale where one equals “Strongly Disagree” and five equals “Strongly Agree” to rate each response. Scores on the Con-12 range from 12-60 and 11-
55 for the Lib-11 with higher scores indicating the participants’ political worldview inclinations (See Appendix D for CoBRAS Permission to Use).

Results from these scales were recorded into SPSS by the primary investigator. Responses to the Con-12 were summed together and a median score determined. These same steps were repeated with the Lib-11 section of the MCLMAS. The median for each section was evaluated, with scores from 1.0-2.9 equaling non-endorsement of the specific political worldview, scores of 3.0-3.4 equals neutral, scores of 3.5 to 3.9 equal endorsement of that particular political worldview, and 4.0 to 5.0 equal to a strong endorsement of the particular political worldview. The section, Con-12 or Lib-11 with the highest median score was representative of the participant’s dominant political worldview. Based on these scores, participants were signed a numerical value of 1 = conservative, 2 = moderate, or 3 = liberal.

**Criterion Variable: Color-Blind Racial Attitude Scale**

The second measure is the Color-Blind Racial Attitude Scale (CoBRAS; Neville et al., 2000). The CoBRAS (see Appendix B for CoBRAS), is a 20-question survey on a six point Likert scale that measures three factors of racial attitudes: Factor 1: Unawareness of Racial Privilege; Factor 2: Unawareness of Institutional Discrimination; and Factor 3: Unawareness to Blatant Racial Issues; where the highest scores (120 points) show greater levels of, “blindness” whereas the lowest score shows unawareness (20 points).

The Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS) was developed to address the absence of a scale specifically designed to measure the multidimensional aspects of color-blind racial attitudes (Neville et al., 2000). By creating such a scale, items included in the CoBRAS were based on working definitions of color-blind racial attitudes and their corollaries provided by Schofield (1986) and Frankenberg (2012), the interdisciplinary literature on color-blindness,
consultation with experts on racial attitudes, and informal individual and group discussion with racially diverse undergraduate and graduate students as-well-as members of the community (Neville et al., 2000). Content validity was assessed by giving the original items to five experts in race-ethnic studies or psychological measurement; to help reduce potential response biases, half of the items were worded in a negative direction (Neville, et al., 2000). Reading comprehension was rated as slightly above grade 6 reading level using computer software (Neville, et al., 2000). Results from Neville et al. (2000) suggest that higher scores on each of the CoBRAS factors and the total score are related to greater (a) global belief in a just world, (b) sociopolitical dimensions of a belief in a just world, (c) racial and gender intolerance, and (d) racial prejudice. Cronbach’s alpha for the CoBRAS = .87. The CoBRAS has been used in numerous studies (Chao, Wei, Good, & Flores, 2011; Coleman, Chapman, & Wong, 2012; Steinfeldt & Wong, 2010).

The CoBRAS was self-administered by each participant as part of an online survey and took approximately five minutes to complete. Instructions are provided at the top of the questionnaire (See Appendix A for Teacher Demographic Questionnaire). The Color-blind Racial Attitude Scale surveys were scored by the primary researcher. Questions 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 11, 12, 15, 17, and 20 were first reversed scored (6 = 1, 5 = 2, 4 = 3, 3 = 4, 2 = 5, 1 = 6). This process is to help reduce potential response biases. Responses will be received from the participants and scores will be totaled for an overall color-blind score. Questions 1, 2, 6, 8, 12, 15, and 20 were totaled for Factor 1. Questions 3, 4, 9, 13, 14, 16, and 18 were totaled for Factor 2. Questions 5, 7, 10, 11, 17, and 19 was totaled for Factor 3. Permission to use the CoBRAS was provided by Helen A. Neville, Ph.D. (See Attachment D for permission statement).
The demographic questionnaire, CoBRAS, and MCLMAS were combined into a single online survey using SurveyMonkey® (see Appendix F for Survey).

**Procedures**

After obtaining approval of the Liberty University Institutional Review Board (IRB) (see Appendix G for IRB Approval Letter) and the school system (see Appendix H for Participating District Approval), data collection began. Permission was granted by the participating school system to utilize the system wide email address for a 60-day period. The online survey was initially sent to each principal via email for distribution to the potential participants. The initial attempt to contact participants took place a week before the beginning of the 2015-2016 school year. Two weeks following the initial contact with school principals, the survey was emailed system wide using the system wide email address.

The online survey consisted of 54 total questions divided into three sections: Teacher Demographics, Color-blind Racial Attitude Scale, and MCLMAS (see Appendix F for Recruitment Letter and Survey). Participants completed the demographic questionnaire section, in order to provide demographic data for the study. Each item consisted of standard demographic questions used in research.

After completing the teacher demographic section of the survey, participants completed the Color Blind Racial Attitude Scale (CoBRAS), a 20-question survey utilizing a Likert type scale ranging from 1-6 for each response. Finally, participants completed the MCLMAS questionnaire, a 23-question Likert type scale survey.

The online survey using SurveyMonkey® remained open for a period of four weeks. At the conclusion of four weeks, the primary investigator generated two outputs from SurveyMonkey®: one in Excel and the other in SPSS format. The Excel file was edited to
truncate headings making the data easier to manipulate; specified responses from the CoBRAS were inversed scored (see Attachment B for responses); a total CoBRAS score was created and sub-total scores were created for each of the three factors of unawareness of discrimination. Additionally, response to the MCLMAS surveys were scored. A total Conservative score and mean score as well as, a total Liberal score and mean were created from the responses and were used to assign a political philosophy of either Conservative or Liberal based on the mean score in each category with the higher mean score being used to assign the corresponding philosophy. After all edits were made, the Excel spreadsheet was then uploaded into SPSS for data analysis. All material is secured in a locked cabinet and will be maintained by the primary investigator for a period of three-years.

**Data Analysis**

At the conclusion of the data collection phase, data provided by participants’ completion of the demographic questionnaire, CoBRAS, and MCLMAS surveys were compiled and entered into SPSS by the primary investigator. Descriptive statistics were obtained from SPSS for each variable in this study. After obtaining the descriptive statistics, the box and whisker plot function in SPSS was run to identify outliers from each sample.

Normality was tested by running the test for normality in SPSS. The product of this test provides the results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov for normality. The results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov were utilized due to the sample size of participants in this study. Following the test for normality, Assumption of Bivariate Outliers, Assumption of Linearity, and Assumption of Bivariate Normal Distribution were tested.

Utilizing the scatter plot function of SPSS, assumptions were tested between the predictor variables and criterion variable. Scatter plots were examined for extreme Bivariate Outliers.
Linearity was examined by adding a trend line. Scatter plots were examined for a classic “cigar shape” to verify bivariate normal distribution. Using the ANOVA, a resulting Regression Model was charted. The Regression Model included degrees of freedom (d.f.) within and between groups, $F$-statistics, $F$-critical, and $p$-values to determine if a statistical significance existed. Regression Model Coefficients charted the $t$-stat and $p$-values for each variable. A Correlation Table was created in order to chart correlations between the criterion variable and the predictor variables. The Correlation Table included the Pearson ($r$), d.f. and $p$-values.
CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS

Research Question

The following research question was proposed:

RQ1: How accurately can racial color-blindness be predicted from the linear combination of age, years-of-teaching experience, and political philosophy for K-12 teachers located at an urbanized school district in Northwest Georgia?

Null Hypothesis

The following null hypotheses was proposed:

H₀: There will be no significant relationship between the criterion variable (racial color-blindness) and the linear combination of predictor variables (age, years-of-teaching experience, and political philosophy) for K-12 teachers located at an urbanized school district in Northwest Georgia.

Descriptive Statistics

Multiple regression and correlation analyses were conducted to assess the relationship between Colorblind Racial Attitudes and various predictor variables. Table 1 summarizes the descriptive statistics. An examination of mean scores of the total Colorblind Score and each factor—Unawareness of Racial Privilege ($m = 26.68$), Unawareness of Institutional Discrimination ($m = 26.42$), and Unawareness of Blatant Racial Issues ($m = 16.02$), found a “moderate” level unawareness when compared to the mid-range score for the total score and each factor. A more exact breakdown of each score can be found in Figures 1-4.
Table 1  

**Descriptive Statistics of Criterion and Predictor Variables (n = 199)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criterion</td>
<td>Colorblind Score</td>
<td>71.13</td>
<td>16.467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.68</td>
<td>7.582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.42</td>
<td>7.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.02</td>
<td>5.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictor</td>
<td>Years-Teaching-Exp.</td>
<td>13.40</td>
<td>9.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Worldview</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age 18-24 (n = 12)</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age 25-34 (n = 51)</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age 35-44 (n = 55)</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age 45-54 (n = 60)</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age 55-64 (n = 19)</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age 65-74 (n = 2)</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Colorblind Scores range from 20-120, with higher scores indicating higher levels of unawareness of racial issues. Factors 1, 2, and 3 are subsets of the overall Colorblind Score. Factor 1 – Unawareness of Racial Privilege and Factor 2 – Unawareness of Institutional Discrimination score range from 7-42. Factor 3 – Unawareness of Blatant Racial Issues scores range from 6-36. As with the total Colorblind Score, higher scores indicate greater levels of unawareness of racial issues.
Figure 1. Colorblind Score Histogram

Figure 2. Factor 1 - Unawareness of Racial Privilege Histogram
Figure 3. Factor 2 - Unawareness of Institutional Discrimination Histogram

Figure 4. Factor 3 - Unawareness of Blatant Racial Issues
Results

Data Screening

A standard multiple regression analysis was used to test the null hypotheses. Each variable (Colorblind Score, Years-of-Teaching-Experience, Age, and Political Worldview) was inspected for data discrepancies, outliers, and normality. Forty (40) responses were found to be incomplete and were deleted, no other data errors or discrepancies were identified in line with the techniques recommended by Warner (2013). To detect potential outliers, box and whiskers plots were used on each of the predictor and criterion variables (Warner, 2013). The predictor variable Political Worldview had two respondents identified as outliers however, examination of these two respondents determined their scores to be legitimate. Respondent number 70 was identified as an outlier for the predictor variable Years-of-Teaching Experience. This respondent reported nearly 40 years of teaching experience. As some teachers decide to stay beyond the normal 30 years for retirement, this response was also found to be acceptable and was not deleted. The total $N$ for the sample was 239; 40 participants were dropped for not completing the on-line questionnaires, consequently the sample $N = 199$. Normality was assessed through the use of histograms for each criterion and predictor variable and no violations were identified (Warner, 2013).

Tested Assumptions

Assumptions of linearity, homoscedasticity, and extreme bivariate outliers must be met for multiple regression analysis. Scatter plots were used to test the assumption of linearity between the predictor and criterion variable and no curvilinear plots were identified (Warner, 2013). The assumption of linearity was met. Homoscedasticity assumption, the variable in scores between on criterion variable and each predictor variable, was scrutinized by means of
scatter plots (Warner, 2013). No violations were identified. Examination for extreme bivariate outliers using scatter plots between predictor and criterion variable (Warner, 2013) failed to identify violations. Figure 5 provides the scatter plot matrix for all predictor and criterion variables.

Figure 5. Scatter Plot Matrix of all Predictive and Criterion Variable Combinations.

A standard multiple regression analysis was conducted on the predictor variables of Age, Years-of-Teaching Experience, and Political Worldview and the criterion variable of Colorblind Score. Examination of the multiple regression output failed to produce any significance between the criterion and predictor variables. Consequently, the researcher was not able to reject the null hypothesis. Accordingly, no significant relationships were indicated between the criterion
variable (Colorblind Score) and predictor variables (Age, Years-of-Teaching Experience, and Political Worldview), $F(7,191) = .515, p = .823$. The correlation coefficient for the prediction mode was $R = .136$, adjusted $R^2 = -.017$, $R^2 = .019$, the implication was that approximately 2% of the variance can be accounted for by the linear combination of the measures, a small effect size. Additionally, each of the three predictor variables were inspected to ascertain how much each influenced the prediction of the criterion variable. Each predictor’s contribution was established by judging their slopes using a $t$-ratio. All three predictors, individually, were not significant predictors for the overall Colorblind Score within the prediction model. Table 3 provides data concerning the contribution of the predictor variables for the overall Colorblind Score.

Correlation were generated using a Pearson Product Moment Correlation analysis. (Pearson and zero-order correlation will match.) No significant relationships between the predictor variables and the criterion variable, Colorblind Score, were indicated.

**Null Results Interpretation**

Warner (2013) wrote “when a study yields a nonsignificant result, it is not correct to conclude the null hypothesis is correct; it is inappropriate to interpret the outcome of an individual study as evidence that the null hypothesis is correct unless other explanations can be ruled out, and in practice, it is very difficult to rule out many of the possible alternative explanations for a nonsignificant outcome” (p. 100).

Possible alternative explanations such as effect size and number of cases ($N$) must be closely examined. The effect size, measured in terms of $R$ and $R^2$ as an indicator of the linear relationship strength between the criterion and predictive variables, was small. The sample size met recommended minimums based on Warner (2013) of $N > 104 + k$ ($104 + 3 = 107$) and $N >$
50 + 8k (50 + 24 = 74) with a total sample size N = 199. Ruling out these other possible alternative explanations, it was concluded the null hypothesis is accepted.

Table 2

*Contributions of Predictor Variable for Colorblind Score (n = 199)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years-Teaching Experience</td>
<td>.285</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>1.498</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Leaning</td>
<td>1.946</td>
<td>11.964</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>-1.63</td>
<td>.871</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>-.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 18-24 (n = 12)</td>
<td>5.297</td>
<td>6.240</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.849</td>
<td>.397</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 25-34 (n = 51)</td>
<td>3.220</td>
<td>3.879</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.830</td>
<td>.407</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 35-44 (n = 55)</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>3.315</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.926</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 55-64 (n = 19)</td>
<td>-2.142</td>
<td>4.513</td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td>-.475</td>
<td>.636</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>-.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 65-74 (n = 2)</td>
<td>7.759</td>
<td>12.283</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.632</td>
<td>.528</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Statistics in the columns are represented as unstandardized regression coefficients (B), associated standard errors (SE), standardized regression coefficient betas (β), significant test of each variable (t), associated p values (Sig.), and zero-order and partial correlations explained.

Excluded variable: Age 45-54.

Additional Analysis

Additional regression analysis was conducted using each of the three CoBRAS Factors as the predictor variable. All of the same procedures were followed for each regression analysis as with the Colorblind Score analysis. Mean scores for each CoBRAS Factor can be found in Table
1. Figures 2-4 provide a histogram for each Factor. Figure 5 includes data for assumption testing on each Factor.

The first standard aggression analysis ran utilized Factor 1 – Unawareness of Racial Privilege as the predictor variable (see Table 3). The overall model was not significant, \( F(7,191) = 1.109, p = .359 \). However, a close examination of the regression coefficients did indicate a significant correlation with Age 18-24, \( p = .032 \) and Age 25-34, \( p = .031 \). This result may be due to the small number of cases \( n = 12 \) and \( n = 51 \) respectively.

Table 3

*Contribution of Predictor Variable – Factor 1 – Unawareness of Racial Privilege*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>( B )</th>
<th>( SE )</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
<th>( t )</th>
<th>( Sig. )</th>
<th>( Order )</th>
<th>( Partial )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years-Teaching Experience</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 18-24 (n = 12)</td>
<td>6.129</td>
<td>2.843</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>2.156</td>
<td>.032*</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 25-34 (n = 51)</td>
<td>3.834</td>
<td>1.767</td>
<td>.221</td>
<td>2.169</td>
<td>.031*</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 35-44 (n = 55)</td>
<td>2.384</td>
<td>1.510</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>1.579</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 55-64 (n = 19)</td>
<td>-1.011</td>
<td>2.056</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>-.492</td>
<td>.623</td>
<td>-.072</td>
<td>-.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 65-74 (n = 2)</td>
<td>2.414</td>
<td>5.596</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.431</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at \( p < .05 \)

Factor 2 – Unawareness of Institutional Discrimination and Factor 3 – Unawareness of Blatant Racial Issues overall regression analysis resulted in nonsignificant results for both Factors. The overall model for Factor 2 – Unawareness of Institutional Discrimination, resulted
in $F(7,191) = 1.830, p = .084$, while the overall model for Factor 3 – Unawareness of Blatant Racial Issues resulted in $F(7,191) = .552, p = .794$. The researcher was unable to attribute the nonsignificant results to other possible explanations and therefore cannot reject the null hypothesis for these multiple regressions.
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Discussion

Almost daily, stories on racial issues appear in the news and on social media. Often many fail to understand the significance of the underlying issues that facilitate the conflict or clash because for most, they are not affected or are unaware of the issues faced by people (including students) of color on a routine basis. It was this unawareness that the current study set out to address. The purpose of this multiple regression correlational study was to address the gaps in empirical data concerning the racial color-blindness of teachers by examining their color-blind racial attitudes and the potential relationships of these attitudes and selected teacher demographics—specifically, the teacher’s age, years-of-teaching experience, and political worldview. It was hypothesized that a relationship exists between the age, years-of-teaching experience, and political worldview and the racial color-blind attitudes of teachers.

The null hypothesis, no relationship exists between the color-blind racial attitude score and the age, years-of-experience, and political worldview could not be rejected based on the analytical outcomes of the current study. The multiple regression analysis failed to identify a significant predictive relationship between age, years-of-teaching experience, and political worldview (criterion) variables and the color-blind racial attitude score (predictor) variable. The same result, failure to reject the null hypothesis, held true for each of the three color-blind racial attitude factors—Factor 1 – Unawareness of Racial Privilege, Factor 2 – Unawareness of Institutional Discrimination, and Factor 3 – Unawareness of Blatant Racial Issues were run as the predictor variable in the multiple regression analysis. No significant predictive relationship was identified necessitating a failure to reject the null hypothesis.
A closer examination of the multiple regression analysis when using Factor 1 as the criterion did find a significant result between the predictor variables: Age 18-24 \((p = .032)\) and Age 25-34 \((p = .031)\) and the criterion variable. The results in this particular analysis may have been the results of a small case number for these two variables—Age 18-24 \((n = 12)\) and Age 24-25 \((n = 51)\). These results were not significant enough to warrant rejecting the overall analysis when results were examined with all predictor variables.

**Conclusions**

Although this study was unable to reject the null hypothesis—no predictive relationships exist between the criterion variable color-blind racial attitude score (including the three factors) and the predictor variables of age, years-of-teaching experience, and political worldview, the results do contribute to empirical data in the area of color-blind racial attitudes of teachers. The contributions become more evident when comparing the mean scores on the Color-blind Racial Attitude Scale (CoBRAS) between Atwater (2007) and the current study (See Table 4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4</th>
<th>Comparison of CoBRAS Mean Scores Atwater vs. Current Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Atwater (2007) (n = 49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoBRAS Score</td>
<td>52.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1 – Unawareness of Racial Privilege</td>
<td>5.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2 – Unawareness of Institutional Discrimination</td>
<td>12.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3 – Unawareness of Blatant Racial Issues</td>
<td>9.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

McIntosh (2009) wrote that recipients of racial privilege may not be aware of the benefits or privileges they enjoy simply by virtue of their skin color. The mean score of the current study indicates that the participants are moderately unaware of racial privilege. More significant was
that participants in the current study scored nearly 17 points higher on Factor 1 – Unawareness of Racial Privilege than did those who participated in the Atwater (2007) study. Young (2011) wrote that unconscious perpetrators of racism or those “who go about their daily routines without giving second thought as to how their unquestioning acceptance of life as it is, indicate their approval of the status quo” (p.1445). Huges, Newkirk, and Slenhjem (2010) pointed out that teachers and other providers may be unaware of their own biases and prejudices or the institutional racism that pervades society. It is alarming that the participants in the current study once again score higher in Factor 2 – Unawareness of Institutional Discrimination, almost doubling the mean score (refer to Table 3). The data in Table 3 also displays the difference between the two studies on the mean score for Factor 3 – Unawareness of Blatant Racial Issues. Here again, participants in this study scored higher on Factor 3 by 14-points. Unconsciousness and unquestioning (Young, 2011) issues like disparity in discipline (Rocque, 2010) or what the dominate group considers proper behavior (Laura, 2011) are blatant racial issues that are often unquestioned and accepted as life as it is (Young 2011).

Although the current study was unable to find significant predictive relationships between the chosen predictor variables, differences clearly exist.

Implications

While the current study did not find any overall significant relationship between the predictor variables of age, years-of-teaching experience, and political worldview of teachers and Color-blind Racial Attitude Scores, when the mean color-blind scores of the current study and that of Atwater (2007) conducted in the San Francisco Bay Area are compared, it is evident that a nearly 20-point difference in mean scores exists between regions. Participants in the San Francisco Bay Area of California seemed to be more aware of issues facing non-White
minorities than their counterparts in the Northwest Georgia area. This finding leads to the question, does locales such as urban verses urbanized or rural, West Coast versus Southeast, East versus West, or North versus South have an impact on the understanding of racial issues facing our students and our society?

**Limitations**

This study was limited to a sample of convenience from an urbanized school district in Northwest Georgia. Application of the findings may not be applicable to other populations. Participants’ responses were voluntary. The volunteer nature of participant participation limits data to only those who are interested in participating in the study. The CoBRAS questions may be uncomfortable to some participants and may, in turn, affect their ability to answer some questions truthfully.

The racial and cultural demographics in American classrooms are changing with the exception of one position—the teacher. Teachers continue to be majority White, female, and from middle-class families making them much different than many students in their classroom, especially in urban settings. Faced with these differences, teachers seek diversity models to help them cope. Color-blindness and Multiculturalism are the two most common models adopted by teachers. While both models seek to address issues of inequalities, both have their shortcomings.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

The starting point of this study was the work of Atwater (2007) conducted in the San Francisco Bay Area of California. Atwater (2007) recommended studying a less diverse and less politically liberal area of the country. With this in mind, the current study, with modifications to age groups—expanding the number of groups, used similar predictor variables to evaluate the possible existence of correlations with the criterion variable of color-blind racial attitude scores.
The current study was unable to reject the stated null hypothesis. However, when the mean color-blind scores were compared between the two studies, it became apparent that a notable difference did exist between regions (urban vs. urbanized or Westcoast vs. Southeast.) Based on this difference, regional studies using the Color-blind Racial Attitude Scale (CoBRAS) could be studied if racial color-blindness is significantly impacted by region.

The results of the current study also indicated a very significant (197 of 199 who completed the political leaning questionnaire) liberal political leaning among participants. This may have been related to the measurement device used to assess political philosophy. Self-reporting of political leaning should be included along with other measurement tools to assess the political leaning.

A cursory examination of correlations between social-economic status and color-blind attitude scores indicated that future research on racial color-blind attitudes is warranted. Furthermore, correlations between social-economic status and the three factors of racial color-blind attitudes deserves more investigation.
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APPENDICES

Appendix A: Teacher Demographic Questionnaire

**Directions:** Please complete the following questions concerning basic demographic data. This data will be anonymous.

1. **Gender:**  Male     Female

2. **What is your age?**
   - a. 18 to 24
   - b. 25 to 34
   - c. 35 to 44
   - d. 45 to 54
   - e. 55 to 64
   - f. 65 to 74
   - g. 75 or older

3. **Race/Ethnic Group:** Please circle as appropriate
   - a. **White** (A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, the Middle East, or North Africa.)
   - b. **Black or African American** (A person having origins in any of the Black racial groups of Africa.)
   - c. **Native American or Alaskan Native** (A person having origins in any of the original peoples of North and South America (including Central America) and who maintains tribal affiliation or community attachment.)
   - d. **Asian** (A person having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, or the Indian subcontinent including, for example, Cambodia, China, India, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, Pakistan, the Philippine Islands, Thailand, and Vietnam.)
   - e. **Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander** (A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Hawaii, Guam, Samoa, or other Pacific Islands.)
   - f. **Some Other Race**
Note: Definitions are those used by the U.S. Census Bureau for the 2010 Census.

4. How would you describe your/your family’s socioeconomic status as you were growing up?
   a. Below the poverty level
   b. Poor
   c. Lower-Middle Class
   d. Middle Class
   e. Upper-Middle Class
   f. Wealthy

5. How would you describe your current socioeconomic status?
   a. Below the poverty level
   b. Poor
   c. Lower-Middle Class
   d. Middle Class
   e. Upper-Middle Class
   f. Wealthy

6. What current position do you currently hold?
   a. Classroom Teacher
   b. Academic Coach
   c. Media Specialist/Librarian
   d. School Counselor
   e. Para-Professional
   f. Certified Teacher employed as a para-professional
7. Years-of-experience in Education (if you have not completed your first year, please enter the number 0 zero): ____

8. Grade Level Currently Working With (if assigned to the alternative school, please choose the level that BEST describes your students):
   a. K-3
   b. 4-6
   c. 7-8
   d. 9-12

9. Prior to entering the education field, how would you rate your interaction with minorities?
   a. Never/Rarely
   b. Occasionally (special events, class, etc.)
   c. Regularly (work, religious affiliations, etc.)
   d. Often (co-workers, family, friends, etc.)
   e. Always (neighbors, family, friends, etc.)
Appendix B: Color-blind Racial Attitudes Scale Scoring Information

Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale SCORING INFORMATION


**Directions.** Below is a set of questions that deal with social issues in the United States (U.S.). Using the 6-point scale, please give your honest rating about the degree to which you personally agree or disagree with each statement. Please be as open and honest as you can; there are no right or wrong answers. Record your response to the left of each item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. _____ Everyone who works hard, no matter what race they are, has an equal chance to become rich.

2. _____ Race plays a major role in the type of social services (such as type of health care or day care) that people receive in the U.S.

3. _____ It is important that people begin to think of themselves as American and not African American, Mexican American or Italian American.

4. _____ Due to racial discrimination, programs such as affirmative action are necessary to help create equality.

5. _____ Racism is a major problem in the U.S.

6. _____ Race is very important in determining who is successful and who is not.

7. _____ Racism may have been a problem in the past, but it is not an important problem today.

8. _____ Racial and ethnic minorities do not have the same opportunities as White people in the U.S.

9. _____ White people in the U.S. are discriminated against because of the color their skin.

10. _____ Talking about racial issues causes unnecessary tension.

11. _____ It is important for political leaders to talk about racism to help work through or solve society’s problems.

12. _____ White people in the U.S. have certain advantages because of the color of their skin.

13. _____ Immigrants should try to fit into the culture and adopt the values of the U.S.

14. _____ English should be the only official language in the U.S.

15. _____ White people are more to blame for racial discrimination in the U.S. than racial and ethnic minorities.

16. _____ Social policies, such as affirmative action, discriminate unfairly against White people.

17. _____ It is important for public schools to teach about the history and contributions of racial and ethnic minorities.
18. _____ Racial and ethnic minorities in the U.S. have certain advantages because of the color of their skin.

19. _____ Racial problems in the U.S. are rare, isolated situations.

20. _____ Race plays an important role in who gets sent to prison.

The following items (which are bolded above) are reversed score (such that 6 = 1, 5 = 2, 4 = 3, 3 = 4, 2 = 5, 1 = 6): item #2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 11, 12, 15, 17, 20. Higher scores should greater levels of “blindness”, denial, or unawareness.

Factor 1: Unawareness of Racial Privilege consists of the following 7 items: 1, 2, 6, 8, 12, 15, 20

Factor 2: Unawareness of Institutional Discrimination consists of the following 7 items: 3, 4, 9, 13, 14, 16, 18

Factor 3: Unawareness to Blatant Racial Issues consists of the following 6 items: 5, 7, 10, 11, 17, 19

Results from Neville et al. (2000) suggest that higher scores on each of the CoBRAS factors and the total score are related to greater: (a) global belief in a just world; (b) sociopolitical dimensions of a belief in a just world, (c) racial and gender intolerance, and (d) racial prejudice. For information on the scale, please contact Helen Neville (hneville@uiuc.edu).
Appendix C: McConochie Conservative-Liberal Multi-Item Attitude Scale (MCLMAS)

TSN: _____________

For circle one number to indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each item below, using this code:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral or between 3 &amp; 4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section I – Con-12

1 2 3 4 5 1. What my leaders tell me is the truth is the truth.
1 2 3 4 5 2. People in other states are more likely to carry infectious diseases than people in my state.
1 2 3 4 5 3. People in other towns or cities are more likely to carry infectious diseases that people in my town or city.
1 2 3 4 5 4. It is smart for my preferred political leaders to lie and cheat if necessary to win elections and hang onto political power.
1 2 3 4 5 5. It is wise strategy for leaders of my preferred political party to keep those citizens away from the polls who might vote against us.
1 2 3 4 5 6. It is okay for my political candidates to run down and discredit their opponents during campaigns for office.
1 2 3 4 5 7. I like movies about keeping other nations in their place by defeating them in war.
1 2 3 4 5 8. In business, as in sports, profit and winning is more important than sportsmanship or fairness.
1 2 3 4 5 9. In political campaigns, winning justifies lying and conniving.
1 2 3 4 5 10. In political campaigns, belittling your opponent, even with lying, is justified if it will help you win.
1 2 3 4 5 11. In times of war, it is worthwhile to use propaganda to demonize enemies.
1 2 3 4 5 12. Even in times of peace, it is more important to dominate other nations than to make friends with them.

Section II – Lib-11

1 2 3 4 5 13. I worry about the welfare of future generations.
1 2 3 4 5 14. I feel a sense of obligation to protect the environment for other species and for future generations of humans.
1 2 3 4 5 15. I enjoy traveling, visiting with strangers and learning about people different from myself.
<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>16. I would enjoy traveling to foreign lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>17. I believe scientists have much to teach us about how to improve our nation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>18. I think government should fund research to figure out how to improve our nation and our government.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>19. I sometimes think about how our community and government could be much better.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>20. My opinions and ideas about improving our nation are as important as those of our leaders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>21. I prefer to decide for myself what is best for our nation, rather than simply trusting our leaders to decide.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>22. I am more inclined to trust rather than fear a stranger from a foreign land.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>23. I like stories and movies about exploring and discovery.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: Scales developed by William McConochie at Politicalpsychologyresearch.com and reproduced by permission.)
Appendix D: CoBRAS Permission to Use

Color-Blind Racial Attitude Scale (CoBRAS) Permission

Neville, Helen A  
Dear Dr. Neville,

My name is Dudley Freeman and I'm currently an education doctoral student at Liberty University. I writing to request permission to use the CoBRAS in my dissertation study on the magnitude of Color-blindness among teachers and predictability based on demographics. My interest in this dynamic was perked by research conducted by Dr. Sherri Atwater (2007) and her recommendation for future studies. I originally contacted Dr. Atwater and she made the referral. I would like to thank you in advance for your consideration of my request and welcome any suggestions to help further my knowledge and understanding of the topic of Color-blindness and use/application of the CoBRAS.

Sincerely,

Dudley D. Freeman, Ed. S.

Neville, Helen A  
Thu 6/13/2013 8:44 AM
To: Freeman, Dudley Darand;

Thank you Dudley for your interest in the CoBRAS. Your project sounds really interesting. Yes, of course you can use the CoBRAS. Dr. Atwater's work is very interesting. I am also attaching an in-press article that summarizes some of the issues in the field. I hope you find it helpful.

Best of luck with your research and please let me know about your findings.

Peace --Helen

Helen A. Neville, Ph.D.
Chair, Counseling Psychology Program
Professor, Educational Psychology and African American Studies

Freeman, Dudley Darand
To: Neville, Helen A  
Dear Dr. Neville,

Thank you for such a quick turn around on my request. More importantly thank you for granting me permission to utilize the CoBRAS as a measurement tool in my study.
Would this scale be appropriate: 20 - 54 = "Low"; 55 - 89 = "Moderate"; and 90 - 120 = "High". If I understood Table 2 in the construction and validation article correctly, mean scores between 58.21 and 70.65 were considered moderately color-blindness. If there is a better grouping please let me know. Thank you again for your support in this journey.

Sincerely,
Dudley
Appendix E: MCLMAS Permission to Use

McConochie Conservative-Liberal Multi-Item Attitude Scale (MCLMAS) Permission

To: William McConochie <tstmastr@riousa.com>;

Dear Dr. McConochie,

Thank you for responding so quickly. I believe you are correct that this is a tool I can use. I do have a few follow up questions. First, may I have your permission to use the survey in my study? Second, does the survey have a name? I read the paper you included about the instruments validity. My third question is how is the instrument scored and interpreted to identify a person as “liberal” or “conservative”? Finally, can scores be used to identify degrees of liberal versus conservative and if so what cutoffs would you recommend?

Sincerely,

Dudley D. Freeman

William McConochie <tstmastr@riousa.com>
Mon 10/21/2013 1:18 PM
Hi, Dudley:

1. Yes, you can use the scale(s) in your research.

2. I haven’t thought of a name for the scales, so you could simply call them McConochie’s four muli-item worldview scales. I realize this is a bit messy, as there are four scales. They have different numbers of items, so perhaps we could call them “McConochie’s Con-12, Lib-11, Con-10 and Lib-10 multi-item worldview scales.”

3. For scoring, compute the mean item score for each scale by adding the item scores and dividing by the number of items in the scale. For norms, you can tentatively refer to those in my paper. You can compute your local norms by determining the mean and standard deviations for each scale on your population.

4. Regarding interpreting scores, I suggest you run Pearson Product Moment correlations between my scales and whatever other variables you are measuring in your study and studying and commenting on the results, as I have done and reported in the paper I sent you.

5. As to which scales to use, that is up to you. You can use all four, or the first two (Con-12 and Lib-11) or the last two (Con-10, Lib-10).

6. Please note the corrected copy of the scales, attached. It omits the repeated last item in the copy I sent the other day.

7. I suggest that you also use in your study a single-item measure for each of the various worldviews, Liberal, Conservative, Green, Independent, etc.
100

8. Regarding interpreting scores per se, I simply explain that a mean item score reflects the degree of agreement or disagreement with the items that make it up, e.g. a score between 3.0 and 3.4 reflects a neutral stance. A score of 3.5 to 3.9 or above reflects endorsement. A score of 4.0 or higher reflects strong endorsement, etc.

9. You might also want to compute the z-score for a person's mean score and comment on how it places him/her on the continuum of scores for others who self-identify as liberal or conservative on the single-item worldview scale. Compute the z-score using the mean and s.d. for all in your group, or for only all liberals or all conservatives as defined by your single-item worldview measure, e.g. Liberal. Thus, on the Con-12 test a person with a mean item score of 1.68 would have a z-score at the 50th percentile for all persons in my study. 1.68 is the mean score on this scale for the entire study group. The mean score for just conservatives, as defined by all with a single item Conservatism score of 4 or 5, would be higher than 1.68.

10. By comparing your scores on the multi-item scales with those scores on the single-item scales, you can make additional decisions about how to interpret multi-item scales. You may find some puzzling results. For example, you might have 50 persons in your sample who on the single-item Conservatism scale mark 4 or 5, Agree or Strongly Agree. Yet all of these persons, or 40 of them, may have a mean item score of less than 3 on the Con-12 scale. You could explain this by interpreting the Con-12 scale items as reflecting relatively “politically incorrect” or “private” conservative attitudes.

11. Another interesting way to interpret scores is to compare the mean item scores for liberals and conservatives on each multi-item scale, using the single-item scales to identify “strong liberals” and “strong conservatives”, those with scores of 4 or 5 on those scales. I find that both groups are rather close together, when comparing means on literally dozens of political attitude scales (see my later papers on the PPRI web site).

Let me know if you need more comments. Best regards, Bill
P.S. Remember to send me a copy of your study results paper! :-)

William A. McConochie, Ph.D.
DBA Emotional Education Services, TestMaster, Inc., and
Political Psychology Research, Inc.

Licensed Psychologist #225 (Oregon)
71 E.15th Ave., Eugene, Or. 97401
541-686-9934

Bill
Appendix F: Recruitment Letter and Survey

A Correlational Study of Teacher Demographics and Racial Color-blindness

Research Consent

You are invited to be in a research study of the correlational relationships between racial color-blindness and teacher demographics. You were selected as a possible participant because you are employed as a teacher, counselor, or academic coach in Rome City Schools. I ask that you read this form and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to be in the study. This study is being conducted by Dudley D. Freeman, an employee of Rome City Schools and a doctoral candidate at Liberty University.

Background Information:

The purpose of this study is to examine if relationships exist between the demographics of age, years of experience, political worldview and racial color-blindness of teachers. Color-blindness will be evaluated in the terms of overall color-blindness, unawareness of racial privilege, unawareness of institutional discrimination, and blatant racial issues.

Procedures:

If you agree to be in this study, I would ask you to take the approximately 20-minute survey found below.

Risks and Benefits of being in the Study:

The risks of this study are no more than would be encountered in everyday life. There are no direct benefits to participants in this study.

Compensation:

There will be no compensation for participating in this study.

Confidentiality:

The records of this study will be kept private. In any sort of report I might publish, I will not include any information that will make it possible to identify a subject. Research records will be stored securely and only the researcher will have access to the records. All documents will be stored in a secure cabinet for a period of three-years, after that time all documents will be destroyed by shredding. There are no anticipated uses for the data after completion of the dissertation.

Voluntary Nature of the Study:

Participation in this study is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with Liberty University. If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time without affecting those relationships.

Contacts and Questions:
The researcher conducting this study is Dudley D. Freeman. You may ask any questions you have now. If you have questions later, you are encouraged to contact him at dfreeman@rcs.rome.ga.us or 706-844-2420. You may also contact Dr. David S. Benders, Dissertation Chair, at dsbenders@liberty.edu. If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study and would like to talk to someone other than the researcher, you are encouraged to contact the Institutional Review Board, 1971 University Blvd., Suite 1837, Lynchburg, VA 24515 or email at irb@liberty.edu.

You may print this document for your records.

1. Are you currently a certified teacher (even if employed as a paraprofessional), academic coach, media specialist, or school counselor?

Yes

No

Please complete the following questions concerning basic demographic data.

Teacher Demographics Questionnaire

2. What is your gender?

Female

Male

3. What is your age?

18 to 24

25 to 34

35 to 44

45 to 54

55 to 64

65 to 74

75 or older

4. Which race/ethnicity best describes you? (Please choose only one.) NOTE: Definitions are those used by the U.S. Census Bureau for the 2010 Census.
Native American or Alaskan Native (A person having origins in any of the original peoples of North or South America [including Central America] and who maintain tribal affiliation or community attachment.)

Native Hawaiian / Pacific Islander (A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Hawaii, Guam, Samoa, or other Pacific Islands.)

Black or African American (A person having origins in any of the Black racial groups of Africa.)

Asian (A person having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, or the Indian subcontinent including, for example, Cambodia, China, India, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, Pakistan, the Philippine Islands, Thailand, and Vietnam.)

White / Caucasian (A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, the Middle-East, or North Africa.)

Some Other Race (including mixed race.)

*5. How would you describe your/your family’s socioeconomic status as you were growing up?

Below the poverty level.

Poor

Lower-Middle Class

Middle Class

Upper-Middle Class

Wealthy

* 6. How would you describe your current socioeconomic status?

Below the poverty level.

Poor

Lower-Middle Class

Middle-Class

Upper-Middle Class

Wealthy
7. What current position do you currently hold?

Classroom Teacher
Academic Coach
Media Specialist/Librarian
School Counselor
Para-Professional
Certified Teacher employed as a para-professional

8. Years of Experience in Education (If you have not completed your first year, please enter the number 0 zero).

9. Grade level in which you currently work (if assigned to alternative school please choose the level that BEST describes your students):

K-3
4-6
7-8
9-12

10. Prior to entering the education field, how would you rate your interaction with minorities?

Never/Rarely
Occasionally (special events, class, etc...)
Regularly (work, religious affiliations, etc...)
Often (co-workers, family, friends, etc...)
Always (neighbors, family, friends, etc...)

Directions: Below is a set of questions that deal with social issues in the United States (U.S.). Using the 6-point scale, please give your honest rating about the degree to which you personally agree or disagree with each statement. Please be as open and honest as you can; there are no right or wrong answers.

Color-Blind Racial Attitude Scale Survey

1 - Strongly Disagree 2 3 4 5 6 - Strongly Agree
11. Everyone who works hard, no matter what race they are, has an equal chance to become rich.
1 - Strongly Disagree 2 3 4 5 6 - Strongly Agree

12. Race plays a major role in the type of social services (such as type of health care or day care) that people receive in the U.S.
1 - Strongly Disagree 2 3 4 5 6 - Strongly Agree

13. It is important that people begin to think of themselves as American and not African American, Mexican American, or Italian American.
1 - Strongly Disagree 2 3 4 5 6 - Strongly Agree

14. Due to racial discrimination, programs such as affirmative action are necessary to help create equality.
1 - Strongly Disagree 2 3 4 5 6 - Strongly Agree

15. Racism is a major problem in the U.S.
1 - Strongly Disagree 2 3 4 5 6 - Strongly Agree

16. Race is very important in determining who is successful and who is not.
1 - Strongly Disagree 2 3 4 5 6 - Strongly Agree

17. Racism may have been a problem in the past, but it is not an important problem today.
1 - Strongly Disagree 2 3 4 5 6 - Strongly Agree

18. Racial and ethnic minorities do not have the same opportunities as White people in the U.S.
1 - Strongly Disagree 2 3 4 5 6 - Strongly Agree

19. White people in the U.S. are discriminated against because of the color of their skin.
1 - Strongly Disagree 2 3 4 5 6 - Strongly Agree

20. Talking about racial issues causes unnecessary tension.
1 - Strongly Disagree 2 3 4 5 6 - Strongly Agree

21. It is important for political leaders to talk about racism to help work through or solve society's problem.
1 - Strongly Disagree 2 3 4 5 6 - Strongly Agree
* 22. White people in the U.S. have certain advantages because of the color of their skin.

1 - Strongly Disagree 2 3 4 5 6 - Strongly Agree

* 23. Immigrants should try to fit into the culture and adopt the values of the U.S.

1 - Strongly Disagree 2 3 4 5 6 - Strongly Agree

* 24. English should be the only official language in the U.S.

1 - Strongly Disagree 2 3 4 5 6 - Strongly Agree

* 25. White people are more to blame for racial discrimination in the U.S. than racial and ethnic minorities.

1 - Strongly Disagree 2 3 4 5 6 - Strongly Agree

* 26. Social policies, such as affirmative action, discriminate unfairly against White people.

1 - Strongly Disagree 2 3 4 5 6 - Strongly Agree

* 27. It is important for public schools to teach about the history and contributions of racial and ethnic minorities.

1 - Strongly Disagree 2 3 4 5 6 - Strongly Agree

* 28. Racial and ethnic minorities in the U.S. have certain advantages because of the color of their skin.

1 - Strongly Disagree 2 3 4 5 6 - Strongly Agree

* 29. Racial problems in the U.S. are rare, isolated situations.

1 - Strongly Disagree 2 3 4 5 6 - Strongly Agree

* 30. Race plays an important role in who gets sent to prison.

The next set of questions assess your political views. Please select the option that indicates how strongly you agree or disagree with each statement. There are a total of 23 statements in this section.

McConochie Conservative-Liberal Multi-Item Attitude Scale

1 - Strongly Disagree 2 – Disagree 3 - Neutral or between 3 & 4 4 - Agree 5 - Strongly Agree

* 31. What my leaders tell me is the truth, is the truth.

1 - Strongly Disagree 2 – Disagree 3 - Neutral or between 3 & 4 4 - Agree 5 - Strongly Agree

* 32. People in other states are more likely to carry infectious diseases than people in my state.
1 - Strongly Disagree 2 - Disagree 3 - Neutral or between 3 & 4 4 - Agree 5 - Strongly Agree

* 33. People in other towns or cities are more likely to carry infectious diseases than people in my town or city.

1 - Strongly Disagree 2 - Disagree 3 - Neutral or between 3 & 4 4 - Agree 5 - Strongly Agree

*34. It is smart for my preferred political leaders to lie and cheat if necessary to win elections and hang onto political power.

1 - Strongly Disagree 2 - Disagree 3 - Neutral or between 3 & 4 4 - Agree 5 - Strongly Agree

*35. It is wise strategy for leaders of my preferred political party to keep those citizens away from the polls who might vote against us.

1 - Strongly Disagree 2 - Disagree 3 - Neutral or between 3 & 4 4 - Agree 5 - Strongly Agree

*36. It is okay for my political candidates to run down and discredit their opponents during campaigns for office.

1 - Strongly Disagree 2 - Disagree 3 - Neutral or between 3 & 4 4 - Agree 5 - Strongly Agree

*37. I like movies about keeping other nations in their place by defeating * them in war.

1 - Strongly Disagree 2 - Disagree 3 - Neutral or between 3 & 4 4 - Agree 5 - Strongly Agree

* 38. In business, as in sports, profit and winning are more important than sportsmanship or fairness.

1 - Strongly Disagree 2 - Disagree 3 - Neutral or between 3 & 4 4 - Agree 5 - Strongly Agree

* 39. In political campaigns, winning justifies lying and conniving.

1 - Strongly Disagree 2 - Disagree 3 - Neutral or between 3 & 4 4 - Agree 5 - Strongly Agree

*40. In political campaigns, belittling your opponent, even with lying, is justified if it will help you win.

1 - Strongly Disagree 2 - Disagree 3 - Neutral or between 3 & 4 4 - Agree 5 - Strongly Agree

*41. In times of war, it is worthwhile to use propaganda to demonize enemies.

1 - Strongly Disagree 2 - Disagree 3 - Neutral or between 3 & 4 4 - Agree 5 - Strongly Agree

*42. Even in times of peace, it is more important to dominate other nations than to make friends with them.

1 - Strongly Disagree 2 - Disagree 3 - Neutral or between 3 & 4 4 - Agree 5 - Strongly Agree

*43. I worry about the welfare of future generations.
1 - Strongly Disagree 2 – Disagree 3 - Neutral or between 3 & 4 4 - Agree 5 - Strongly Agree

*44. I feel a sense of obligation to protect the environment for other species and for future generations of humans.

1 - Strongly Disagree 2 – Disagree 3 - Neutral or between 3 & 4 4 - Agree 5 - Strongly Agree

*45. I enjoy traveling, visiting with strangers, and learning about people different * from myself.

1 - Strongly Disagree 2 – Disagree 3 - Neutral or between 3 & 4 4 - Agree 5 - Strongly Agree

* 46. I would enjoy traveling to foreign lands.

1 - Strongly Disagree 2 – Disagree 3 - Neutral or between 3 & 4 4 - Agree 5 - Strongly Agree

* 47. I believe scientists have much to teach us about how to improve our nation.

1 - Strongly Disagree 2 – Disagree 3 - Neutral or between 3 & 4 4 - Agree 5 - Strongly Agree

*48. I think the government should fund research to figure out how to improve our nation and our government.

1 - Strongly Disagree 2 – Disagree 3 - Neutral or between 3 & 4 4 - Agree 5 - Strongly Agree

* 49. I sometimes think about how our community and government could be much better.

1 - Strongly Disagree 2 – Disagree 3 - Neutral or between 3 & 4 4 - Agree 5 - Strongly Agree

* 50. My opinions and ideas about improving our nation are as important as those of our leaders.

1 - Strongly Disagree 2 – Disagree 3 - Neutral or between 3 & 4 4 - Agree 5 - Strongly Agree

* 51. I prefer to decide for myself what is best for our nation, rather than simply trusting our leaders to decide.

1 - Strongly Disagree 2 – Disagree 3 - Neutral or between 3 & 4 4 - Agree 5 - Strongly Agree

* 52. I am more inclined to trust, rather than fear, a stranger from * a foreign land.

1 - Strongly Disagree 2 – Disagree 3 - Neutral or between 3 & 4 4 - Agree 5 - Strongly Agree

* 53. I like stories and movies about exploring and discovery.
Appendix G: IRB Approval Letter

IRB Approval Letter

June 12, 2015

Dudley D. Freeman
IRB Exemption 2240.061215: A Correlational Study of Teacher Demographics and Racial Colorblindness

Dear Dudley,

The Liberty University Institutional Review Board has reviewed your application in accordance with the Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP) and Food and Drug Administration (FDA) regulations and finds your study to be exempt from further IRB review. This means you may begin your research with the data safeguarding methods mentioned in your approved application, and no further IRB oversight is required.

Your study falls under exemption category 46.101(b)(2), which identifies specific situations in which human participants research is exempt from the policy set forth in 45 CFR 46:101(b):

(2) Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless:

(i) information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; and

(ii) any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.

Please note that this exemption only applies to your current research application, and any changes to your protocol must be reported to the Liberty IRB for verification of continued exemption status. You may report these changes by submitting a change in protocol form or a new application to the IRB and referencing the above IRB Exemption number.

If you have any questions about this exemption or need assistance in determining whether possible changes to your protocol would change your exemption status, please email us at irb@liberty.edu.

Sincerely,

Fernando Garzon, Psy.D.
Professor, IRB Chair
Counseling

(434) 592-4054

Liberty University | Training Champions for Christ since 1971
June 15, 2015

Mr. Dudley D. Freeman

Dear Mr. Freeman:

RE: Approval to Conduct Dissertation Research within [redacted]

I have reviewed the Liberty University Institution Review Board (IRB) letter dated June 12, 2015 concerning your dissertation study: A Correlational Study of Teacher Demographics and Racial Colorblindness, based on their approval of your research, I approve your request to conduct your research using volunteer employees from within [redacted].

At the conclusion of your research and publication of your dissertation, I request that a copy be provided to this office.

You may start your research at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,

[redacted]

Superintendent
Appendix I: Participant Demographic Data Tables

Table 5

*Participant Gender*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>239</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6

*Participant’s Age*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 - 24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 34</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 44</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 54</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 - 64</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 - 74</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>239</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7

*Participants Race-Ethnicity*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native American/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>89.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Other Race (including Mixed race)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>239</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix J: Permission to Publish McConochie Conservative-Liberal Multi-Item Attitude Scales

William McConochie

Wed 6/8 Freeman, Dudley Darand; Bill

Hello, Dudley: Congratulations on completing your dissertation research. You may publish my scale(s) as part of your dissertation with the understanding that you will reference them to my PPRI web site and to me as their author.

Best regards,

Bill
Appendix K: Approval to Publish Color-Blind Racial Attitude Scales (CoBRAS)

RE: CoBRAS Use Publication Permissions

Neville, Helen A 

Wed 7/6/2016 11:55 PM

To: Freeman, Dudley Darand <ddfreeman2@liberty.edu>;

Dudley,

I provide approval to include the CoBRAS items in your dissertation. Please let me know if you need something else from me to facilitate this process.

Congratulations!

Helen A. Neville, PhD | Professor | Educational Psychology and African American Studies | Chair, Counseling Psychology Program
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Licensee:
Dudley Freeman
51 Hickory Street
Rome, GA 30161

Licensor:
Capitol CMG Publishing
P.O. Box 5085
Brentwood, TN 37027

A. Song Title: see Schedule A

B. Territory:
Product Title: Correlational Study of Teacher Demographics and Racial Color-Blindness
Format: Lyric Reprint in Book

C. Per Copy Fee:
Number of copies: 5000 copies
Payment Schedule: Flat
Total Royalty Paid: $26.00

Print License

Grant of Rights:
Subject to the following, Licensor, as defined above, does hereby grant to Licensee, as defined above, the non-exclusive and non-assignable right, privilege and authority to use the words and/or music of Licensor’s copyright (hereinafter called the “Composition”), as stated in Schedule A.

Licensor grants to Licensee the non-exclusive authority to use the Composition for the purpose of manufacturing and selling or otherwise marketing the same in print form within North America, and for distribution throughout the world.
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1. This license does not include and Licensor hereby reserves exclusively to itself any right or authority to:

   (a) Make any change in the original lyrics, basic melody or in the fundamental character of the music of the Composition;

   (b) Use the title or subtitle of the Composition as the title of Licensee’s product;
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If Licensee licenses any other composition for this product upon terms more favorable than we have been granted herein, including but not limited to royalties, fees and/or advances, then Licensor shall have the benefit of such more favorable terms.
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**Warrantees:**

1. Licensor hereby warrants, covenants and represents that it possesses full right and authority to grant the rights and license herein described.
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4. Licensor warrants that only it has the right to grant this license, and this license is given and accepted without any other representation, warranty or recourse, expressed or implied, except for Licensor's agreement to repay the consideration paid for this license if the aforesaid warranty should be breached. In no event shall the total liability of Licensor exceed the total amount of consideration received by Licensor hereunder.

5. Licensor acknowledges the royalty payable amount, shown in Section C, is paid in full. This license is limited to the number of copies outlined in Section C above.

6. Licensor owns or controls some or all of the Composition and is licensing that percentage, excluding public domain arrangements. The percentage controlled is given in the Schedule A.

7. This agreement shall be binding upon the heirs, legal representatives, successors and assigns of each of the parties.

8. This instrument sets forth the entire agreement between the parties hereto and cannot be modified except by written instrument agreed to by both parties.

9. Licensee hereby acknowledges that names and trademarks [Capitol CMG, Sparrow Records, ForeFront Records, Motown Gospel, Credential Records, Star Song Records, Straightway Records, WorshipTogether.com] and any other trademarks and logos owned and licensed by Licensor are Licensor's exclusive property and that Licensee does not have and will not acquire any proprietary rights to them by reason of this agreement and their use and incorporation within the Web Site, which shall in the case of trademarks and/or logos be subject to Licensor's prior written consent.

10. Licensee shall not sub-license or assign the rights granted herein or any of the rights licensed hereunder without Licensor's prior written consent.

Schedule A

Song ID: 18686
Song Title: Colored People
Writer(s): George Cocchini, Toby McKeehan
Label Copy:
Copyright © 1995 Achtobr Songs (BMI) (adm. at CapitolCMGPublishing.com) / Tigerback Music (BMI) All rights reserved. Used by permission.
Capitol CMG Percent Control: 65%

Please note that Capitol CMG only controls a portion of the song you've requested. Please contact the other publishers, as shown in the copyright notice, to obtain their permission as well.
Gary Wright AKA Tigerback Music

Wed 7/13 Freeman, Dudley Darand

You have my permission to use some of the "Colored People" (DC Talk) lyric for your dissertation. George Cocchini

On Thursday, July 14, 2016 7:40 AM, "Freeman, Dudley Darand"

Thank you. Does this also include publication? Once the dissertation is approved, it will be digitally accessible but I will have no way of knowing when and how it is used.

Gary Wright AKA Tigerback Music

Thu 7/14 Freeman, Dudley Darand

As long as it's non-profit. If there's any charge for viewing, you have to compensate.