# Impact Of Diversity On Approach To Education

Posted on July 16, 2020

## Introduction

Diversity changes health education because patients do not enter a clinical encounter with identical bodies, histories, languages, resources, beliefs, or learning needs. A teaching plan that is technically accurate may still fail when it assumes that everyone reads at the same level, can hear or see the same materials, trusts the institution, has reliable transportation, or can afford the recommended behavior. The original essay correctly argued that nurses must learn about the population, listen to different viewpoints, and adapt health-promotion strategies. Those ideas should be developed without treating culture as a stereotype or assuming that demographic membership automatically determines disease risk or belief. Effective education is individualized, evidence-based, culturally and linguistically responsive, and designed with the patient rather than merely delivered to the patient. This essay examines how diversity changes assessment, communication, teaching methods, conflict resolution, and evaluation in nursing and public-health education.

## Begin with the Learner, Not the Brochure

The first educational task is assessment. Nurses need to know what the person already understands, what decision must be made, which barriers are present, and what outcome matters to the learner. Demographic data can help identify population patterns, but it cannot substitute for a conversation. Two patients of the same age, language, or ethnicity may have different experiences and priorities. Assessment can include preferred language, literacy, disability access, prior knowledge, family involvement, digital access, religious or cultural considerations, and readiness to change. It should also identify immediate constraints such as food insecurity, housing instability, cost, or unsafe working conditions. The National CLAS Standards require effective, understandable, respectful services that respond to cultural health beliefs, preferred languages, health literacy, and other communication needs (Office of Minority Health [OMH], 2026). This standard reframes adaptation as a quality obligation rather than an optional courtesy.

## Use Population Risk Without Turning It into a

# Stereotype

Health educators often use epidemiological data to target prevention. That practice is valuable when it identifies unequal exposure, access, or outcomes, but it becomes harmful when group averages are treated as biological destiny. A higher prevalence of diabetes in a population, for example, may reflect diet environments, income, stress, access to preventive care, discrimination, family history, or several interacting factors. Teaching should explain relevant risk while preserving individual assessment. It should not imply that every member of a group has the same behavior or that culture alone causes disease. Nurses can use local data to choose priorities, then ask patients how those risks apply to their lives. This approach keeps public-health planning responsive while protecting people from stigmatizing assumptions. Diversity requires more accurate reasoning, not merely a longer list of group characteristics.

# Language Access Is a Clinical Safety Measure

A patient cannot make an informed decision when essential information is available only in an unfamiliar language. Qualified interpretation and translated materials reduce misunderstanding and protect confidentiality. The CLAS Standards call for language assistance at no cost, notice of its availability, competent interpreters, and understandable materials in commonly used languages (OMH, 2026). Family members may provide emotional support, but relying on children or untrained relatives to interpret can omit sensitive information and distort medical meaning. Educators should speak directly to the patient, use short segments, pause for interpretation, and avoid unexplained idioms. Translation must also consider cultural and clinical meaning rather than replacing words mechanically. A technically literal handout can fail when its examples, units, or assumptions do not fit the audience. Language access is therefore part of safe care, not a separate administrative service.

# Health Literacy Belongs to Organizations as Well as Individuals

Health literacy is sometimes described as a patient deficit, but current public-health definitions also assign responsibility to organizations. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention defines organizational health literacy as the degree to which organizations equitably enable people to find, understand, and use information and services (CDC, 2024). This means educators should not label a patient “noncompliant” because instructions were complex, forms were confusing, or follow-up was difficult to navigate. Plain language, meaningful headings, visual examples, limited numerical burden, and clear action steps benefit most audiences. Materials should be tested with intended users rather than approved only by professionals familiar with medical terminology. Improving communication does not mean removing necessary detail. It means sequencing information so that the learner can identify the problem, options, next step, warning signs, and source of help.

# Cultural Humility Instead of Cultural Mastery

Lists of customs can create the illusion that a professional can master another person's culture. Cultural humility offers a safer approach. Tervalon and Murray-García (1998) describe it as lifelong self-evaluation, attention to power imbalances, and accountable partnership. A nurse can learn common patterns while still asking the individual what matters in this situation. Questions may explore who participates in decisions, how illness is understood, which practices provide comfort, and whether recommended care conflicts with religious or family obligations. The educator must also examine the professional culture of medicine, which can privilege speed, written information, individual autonomy, and technical language. Respect does not require accepting a dangerous claim as true, but it does require understanding why the claim is meaningful and responding without humiliation. Trust is easier to build when the professional admits uncertainty and avoids portraying one worldview as inherently superior.

# Disability and Sensory Access Change the Teaching Method

Diversity includes disability, neurodivergence, sensory differences, cognitive impairment, and temporary limitations caused by illness. A printed leaflet is ineffective for a patient who cannot see it, and a rapid verbal explanation may exclude someone who is deaf, fatigued, or processing information slowly. Accessible education can include large print, high contrast, captions, sign-language interpretation, audio, tactile demonstration, simplified sequencing, and supported decision-making. Educators should ask which format works instead of making assumptions. Family or caregivers may be involved with consent, but the patient should remain central. Accessibility also concerns physical and digital environments. A portal may be technically available yet unusable with a screen reader or unaffordable without reliable internet. Inclusive design improves education for many people beyond the group for whom an accommodation was first developed.

# Age and Life Stage Affect Meaning, Not Just Vocabulary

Children, adolescents, adults, and older people face different developmental tasks and social relationships. Pediatric education may require assent, play, and collaboration with caregivers. Adolescents need privacy and age-appropriate discussion of risk, identity, and autonomy. Adults may balance health recommendations with work and caregiving obligations. Older patients may manage several conditions, medications, sensory changes, or concerns about independence. The response should not be based on age alone; capacity and preference vary widely. Education is most useful when it connects the recommended action with the learner's own goals. A person may be more

motivated by remaining able to work, care for family, practice a faith, or avoid hospitalization than by an abstract statement about long-term risk. Diversity changes the motivational frame as well as the delivery format.

## Social Conditions Determine Whether Advice Is Actionable

Health teaching fails when it recommends choices that are unavailable. Telling a patient to buy fresh food, exercise outdoors, attend frequent appointments, or store medicine safely may ignore income, neighborhood safety, transport, housing, or employment. Nurses should not assume that explaining a benefit creates the capacity to act. Assessment can identify practical barriers and connect patients with social services, community programs, financial assistance, or alternative plans. This is not lowering the standard of care. It is translating a clinical goal into a feasible pathway. Community-level education should likewise examine the environment that shapes behavior. Health promotion can include advocacy for safer spaces, clean water, accessible screening, and workplace protection rather than placing the entire burden on individual willpower.

## Listening and Shared Decision-Making

Different viewpoints are best addressed through structured listening. The educator can ask what the patient has heard, what concerns them most, and what experiences influence the belief. Reflecting the answer shows that it was understood and allows correction of misinterpretation. Shared decision-making is especially important when more than one medically reasonable option exists or when benefits and burdens depend on personal values. The clinician contributes evidence and clinical experience; the patient contributes goals, lived experience, and tolerance for outcomes. Agreement is not always immediate. A respectful conversation may end with a smaller step, a second appointment, or a request for another source. The purpose is not to win an argument but to support an informed and safe choice. Coercive persuasion can produce apparent compliance while damaging trust.

## Teach-Back Reveals Whether Communication Worked

Asking “Do you understand?” often produces a polite yes. Teach-back instead asks the learner to explain the plan in their own words or demonstrate a skill. The technique tests the clarity of teaching, not the intelligence of the patient. If the explanation is incomplete, the nurse reteaches using a different method and checks again. Teach-back is particularly useful for medication schedules, symptom monitoring, equipment, discharge instructions, and follow-up. It should be introduced without embarrassment: “I want to make sure I explained this clearly.” Demonstration, pictures, and

practice can be combined with verbal explanation. Education becomes an iterative process rather than a single transfer of information. The method also gives clinicians data about which parts of a message are repeatedly misunderstood and therefore need redesign.

## Community Partnership and Co-Design

Population education is stronger when communities participate in defining the problem and evaluating the solution. The CLAS Standards recommend assessing community needs and assets and partnering with the community to design, implement, and evaluate culturally and linguistically appropriate practices (OMH, 2026). Community health workers, faith leaders, patient advocates, schools, and local organizations can identify trusted channels and practical barriers. Partnership should not be limited to recruiting participants after professionals have already made every decision. Co-design can shape the question, message, location, schedule, and outcome measures. It also helps distinguish a genuine cultural concern from an institutional assumption. Community members should be compensated and credited where appropriate because their knowledge is a form of expertise.

## Responding to Misinformation and Deep Disagreement

Health educators increasingly encounter misinformation, historical mistrust, and polarized claims. Immediate correction may be necessary when a dangerous action is imminent, but ridicule usually strengthens defensiveness. A useful response identifies the specific claim, asks what evidence would be persuasive, explains what is known and uncertain, and provides a credible source. The professional should acknowledge documented reasons for mistrust, including discrimination or unethical research, rather than treating skepticism as ignorance. When a belief is connected to identity, the conversation may require time and a trusted messenger. Clear boundaries remain important: respectful care does not require endorsing false information or abandoning safeguarding duties. The educator can preserve dignity while stating the clinical recommendation and consequences honestly.

## Evaluate Equity, Not Only Attendance

A program is not successful merely because many people received a brochure or attended a session. Evaluation should ask whether different groups could access the education, understood it, used it, and experienced benefit. Data can be examined by language, disability, location, and other relevant characteristics, while protecting privacy and avoiding categories too small for safe reporting. Qualitative feedback may reveal why an intervention worked for one group and failed for another. Outcomes should include trust, comprehension, decision quality, behavior where feasible, and barriers removed. If disparities remain, the appropriate response is redesign rather than blaming the audience. Diversity makes evaluation more demanding because an average improvement can

conceal unequal results.

# Conclusion

Diversity changes health education by requiring professionals to move from standardized delivery toward responsive partnership. Nurses must use population evidence without stereotyping, provide language and disability access, design for health literacy, understand social constraints, and ask how each patient interprets illness and care. Cultural humility, shared decision-making, teach-back, and community co-design turn education into a reciprocal process. Differing viewpoints cannot always be resolved in one encounter, but they can be addressed with careful listening, transparent evidence, and respect for autonomy and safety. The best teaching method is not simply the most creative presentation. It is the method that enables a particular person or community to understand relevant information and use it within the realities of their life.

# References


Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2024). *What is health literacy?* https://www.cdc.gov/health-literacy/php/about/index.html

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2024). *Culture and language*. https://www.cdc.gov/health-literacy/php/develop-materials/culture.html

Kreuter, M. W., Lukwago, S. N., Bucholtz, R. D., Clark, E. M., & Sanders-Thompson, V. (2003). Achieving cultural appropriateness in health promotion programs: Targeted and tailored approaches. *Health Education & Behavior, 30*(2), 133–146. https://doi.org/10.1177/1090198102251021

Office of Minority Health. (2026). *National standards for culturally and linguistically appropriate services in health and health care*. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. https://thinkculturalhealth.hhs.gov/clas/standards

Schillinger, D., Piette, J., Grumbach, K., Wang, F., Wilson, C., Daher, C., Leong-Grotz, K., Castro, C., & Bindman, A. B. (2003). Closing the loop: Physician communication with diabetic patients who have low health literacy. *Archives of Internal Medicine, 163*(1), 83–90. https://doi.org/10.1001/archinte.163.1.83

Tervalon, M., & Murray-García, J. (1998). Cultural humility versus cultural competence: A critical distinction in defining physician training outcomes in multicultural education. *Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved, 9*(2), 117–125. https://doi.org/10.1353/hpu.2010.0233