

Impact Of Diversity On Approach To Education

Posted on July 16, 2020

View this essay online:

<https://academic-master.com/impact-of-diversity-on-approach-to-education/>

Introduction

Diversity changes health education because patients do not enter clinical encounters with identical languages, bodies, family structures, resources, beliefs, disabilities, or previous experiences of healthcare. A teaching plan can be scientifically accurate and still fail if it assumes that every person can read the same material, hear the same explanation, afford the recommended behavior, or trust the institution delivering the message. The National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services describe understandable, respectful care as a quality requirement that should respond to cultural health beliefs, preferred languages, health literacy, and communication needs (Office of Minority Health [OMH], 2026). This approach does not mean assigning a fixed set of traits to every cultural group. Demographic information can identify population patterns, but individual education still begins with assessment. Nurses and health educators need to ask what the learner already knows, which decision must be made, what barriers are present, and what outcome matters to that person. Diversity therefore changes both the content of education and the relationship through which learning occurs.

Assessment Before Teaching

Effective education begins with the learner rather than with a standardized brochure. Assessment can include preferred language, literacy, sensory or cognitive needs, digital access, family involvement, prior knowledge, cultural or religious concerns, and readiness to make a change. It should also identify practical constraints such as food insecurity, transportation, unsafe housing, employment schedules, medication cost, or limited access to follow-up. Two patients who share an age, ethnicity, diagnosis, or language may still require very different teaching strategies. Population data are useful for identifying unequal disease burden or access, but group averages should not be treated as biological destiny or as proof of individual behavior. Kreuter and colleagues (2003) distinguish targeted approaches designed for groups from tailored communication designed for individuals; both can be valuable when used carefully. A nurse may use local diabetes data to choose a prevention priority, for example, while still asking each patient how diet, family history, stress, finances, and daily routines apply personally. Assessment prevents epidemiology from becoming stereotype and makes teaching more clinically relevant.

Language, Health Literacy, and Accessible Communication

Language access is a patient-safety issue because informed decisions are impossible when essential information is delivered in words the patient cannot understand. The CLAS Standards call for language assistance at no cost, competent interpretation, and understandable print and digital materials while discouraging reliance on minors or untrained people as interpreters (OMH, 2026). Health literacy also belongs partly to organizations rather than being treated as a personal deficit. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention defines organizational health literacy in terms of how equitably institutions enable people to find, understand, and use information and services (CDC, 2024). Plain language, short action steps, meaningful headings, visual demonstration, captions, large print, audio, sign-language interpretation, and compatible digital design can improve access for many audiences. Teach-back adds an important check by asking the learner to explain a plan or demonstrate a skill in their own words. Schillinger and colleagues (2003) showed how closing the communication loop can reveal misunderstanding that a simple question such as “Do you understand?” may miss.

Cultural Humility and Shared Decision-Making

Cultural humility is more useful than trying to memorize fixed lists of customs. 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 an individual who participates in decisions, how illness is understood, which practices provide comfort, and whether recommended care conflicts with family or religious obligations. The professional culture of healthcare also deserves examination because it often privileges speed, written information, individual autonomy, technical vocabulary, and punctual appointments in ways that may not fit every patient’s circumstances. Respect does not require accepting inaccurate medical claims, but correction can be offered without humiliation. Shared decision-making is particularly important when more than one reasonable option exists or when benefits and burdens depend on personal priorities. The clinician contributes evidence and clinical experience; the patient contributes goals, lived experience, and tolerance for particular outcomes. Diversity therefore does not weaken scientific standards. It makes the process of applying evidence more precise by placing recommendations within the person’s actual context.

Social Conditions and Community Partnership

Health education becomes ineffective when it recommends actions that are unavailable. Advice to buy particular foods, exercise outdoors, attend frequent appointments, or store medication safely may ignore income, neighborhood conditions, transportation, housing, childcare, or employment. Nurses should not assume that explaining a benefit automatically creates the capacity to act.

Practical assessment can identify alternative plans and referrals for financial, social, or community support. At the population level, education is stronger when communities participate in defining problems and evaluating solutions. The CLAS Standards recommend community needs assessment and partnership in the design, implementation, and evaluation of culturally and linguistically appropriate services (OMH, 2026). Community health workers, patient advocates, schools, faith organizations, and local groups may identify trusted messengers or barriers that professionals overlook. Co-design should begin before materials are finalized rather than being limited to recruiting participants after every decision has been made. This partnership also helps distinguish a genuine cultural concern from an institutional assumption and treats community knowledge as a form of expertise rather than an obstacle to professional authority.

Evaluating Whether Education Works Equitably

A health-education program is not successful merely because many people attended a session or received a handout. Evaluation should ask whether different groups could access the information, understood it, used it, and experienced benefit. Data may be examined by language, disability, location, age, or other relevant characteristics while protecting privacy and avoiding unsafe reporting of very small groups. Qualitative feedback can explain why an intervention that appears effective on average may fail for a particular population. Useful outcomes include comprehension, confidence, decision quality, adherence where appropriate, removal of practical barriers, and clinical indicators connected to the educational goal. If disparities remain, redesign is more appropriate than blaming the audience. Accessibility should also be tested in digital programs because a portal can be technically available yet unusable with a screen reader, unaffordable without reliable internet, or inaccessible to a person who needs interpretation. Diversity therefore makes evaluation more demanding but also more informative: an average improvement can conceal unequal experiences that would remain invisible without disaggregated and patient-centered assessment.

Conclusion

Diversity changes the approach to health education by requiring professionals to move from standardized delivery toward responsive partnership. Nurses can use population evidence without stereotyping, assess each learner's language, literacy, disability access, resources, beliefs, and goals, and choose teaching methods that fit those realities. Qualified interpretation, accessible materials, plain language, teach-back, cultural humility, and shared decision-making improve the likelihood that accurate information becomes usable information (CDC, 2024; OMH, 2026). Social conditions must also be considered because education cannot solve barriers created by cost, unsafe housing, transportation, or inaccessible services. Community partnership extends the same principle to public-health programs by allowing intended audiences to influence design and evaluation rather than simply receive a finished intervention. The most effective educational strategy is therefore not the most elaborate presentation or the one that assumes complete agreement. It is the approach that

helps a particular person or community understand relevant evidence, make an informed decision, and act safely within the real conditions of everyday life while preserving dignity and autonomy.

References

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