The Ethics of Pedagogical Innovation in Diversity and Cultural Competency Education

Mario A. Rivera,

Regents' Professor of Public Administration, University of New Mexico

Greggory Johnson III,

College of Education and Social Services, University of Vermont
Richard.Johnson-III@uvm.edu

James D. Ward,

Professor of Political Science, Mississippi University for Women

USA

The Ethics of Pedagogical Innovation in Diversity and Cultural Competency Education

Mario A. Rivera, Richard Greggory Johnson III, and James D. Ward

ABSTRACT

Diversity and cultural competency education has become a significant field in the United States, Canada, Western Europe, and elsewhere, if by different names (cross-cultural or inter-cultural education, for instance, or sensitivity training). The best academic and practitioner literature (Rice 2006, Tilford Group 2004) lays significant emphasis on cognitive development and maturation, along with the development of discrete skills and capabilities. We propose a consonant shift in this kind of undertaking. First of all, our approach would rely on classroom dialogue among participants of all racial and ethnic backgrounds. We would also place much greater emphasis than most on the need to foster reflexive self-awareness and appreciation of difference, summed up in a greater capacity for integrative complexity (Antonio, 2004). There also needs to be critical concern with the self-serving ways in which many institutions use diversity initiatives to mask the inadequacy of their response to social inequity. It is essential, therefore, to incorporate social equity and ethics in the innovative pedagogies of the future.

Key Words: diversity education, cultural competency, identity, perspectivism, pedagogy.

Introduction

      Can diversity or cultural competency properly be taught, as sets of skills or capabilities? What are the ethical implications of current and prospective forms of diversity and cultural competency education and training? These are questions addressed in the present study, based on the scholarship and the classroom teaching and organizational training experience of the authors. Here we provide what are necessarily partial, tentative, and merely indicative answers to these questions. We then go on to propose a dialogic pedagogical framework, and strategies for innovation in the field that we hope are particularly suited to public and nonprofit organizations.

      Cultural competency is essentially defined for purposes of the present study to incorporate diversity competencies (we prefer "competency" to "competence" as the more frequently used term, but they are essentially interchangeable terms). Cultural competency is taken to be an open, accepting, and welcoming attitude toward other group cultures, defined broadly as other racial, ethnic, gender, and affinity groups' normative, communicative, and behavioral values. Openness is ideally coupled with understanding of the substance and nuances of specific group cultural norms and practices, but not exhaustive understanding, since that is beyond the realistic scope of any academic or training course devoted to cultural and diversity competencies. What we deem essential is the movement toward awareness and valuation of difference, in the classroom and prospectively in the workplace and larger society.

Cultural, Multi-cultural, and Diversity Competencies

Cultural competency is a cognitive capacity that some individuals have or attain more fully than others, whether as a matter or life experience or by dint of learning and maturation. For Antonio et al. (2004), it is an indication of integrative complexity, "the degree to which cognitive style involves the differentiation and integration of multiple perspectives and dimensions." It involves a way of perceiving, thinking, and acting that allows the individual to take multi-perspectives on issues while regarding his or her own as but one of those perspectives (Antonio, Chang, Hakuta, Kenny, Levin, and Milem, 2004; see also Tuckman, 1966).

Cultural competency is a capacity that can be strengthened through diversity education or cultural competency training, but not transmitted in formulaic ways, as though a matter of technical course content. Our working definition of cultural (or, as it is sometimes termed, cross-cultural) competency is more encompassing than most, since it deliberately includes diversity competencies. Again, the point at issue is real sensitivity toward other racial, ethnic, gender, and affinity groups, which is often relegated to discussion of diversity, sometimes under the rubric of "diversity competencies." And just as the aim is not anything approaching full understanding of other cultures or groups—a completely unfeasible goal—it is emphatically not about tolerance, or mere tolerance, of others. Tolerance is a de minimus value, if it is a value at all; truly accepting others and valuing their difference are a great deal closer to what would constitute a cultural and diversity competency in this context, and a moral stance as well.

As does the present study, the Tilford Research Group of Kansas State University (2004) identifies cultural competencies with cosmopolitan perspectives that value racial and ethnic diversity; these competencies entail the knowledge, attributes, and skills needed to live and work in a diverse and globalized world. To arrive at this perspective, the Tilford Group evaluated training programs, interviewed specialist multicultural trainers and managers, reviewed literature from a variety of disciplines from social work to education and management, and conducted focus group research with faculty and students at Kansas State. This effort resulted in the identification of some fourteen essential cross-cultural and diversity competencies in three categories. The first category, Knowledge, turns on growth in understanding: Self-understanding, understanding of diverse ethnic and cultural groups, understanding of sociopolitical, historical, and economic factors shaping the lives of other groups, and changing demographics and population dynamics. It needs to be underscored that the type of understanding entailed is, first, built on greater self-understanding and self-awareness, particularly as to ethnicity and race, and then concerned with contextual factors affecting diverse groups, globally. It is not a matter of understanding other groups in any kind of exhaustive way, or in any way tied to characterizations of group traits, which much of diversity training stresses, but which tends toward stereotyping. The second category of competencies involved growth in personal and cognitive attributes, in particular flexibility and adaptability, respect and appreciation for differences in others, and empathy. The third category, skills, refers to cross-cultural and inter-group behavioral and task competencies, namely verbal and nonverbal communications skills, teamwork, conflict resolution, critical thinking, language development (being able to speak and write more than one language), and diversity leadership abilities. The preponderance of the Tilford competencies has to do with personal cognitive growth and maturation—again, not some stock of cross-cultural information or typing.

Consistent with the Tilford cultural-and-diversity competency framework, as well as the typology developed by Rice (2006) for the public sector, for the purposes of this study cultural competencies are taken to be incorporated in (and, reciprocally, incorporate) diversity competencies. For us, the two are virtually indistinguishable, and they amount to a complex of cognitive, attitudinal, and behavioral capacities rather than discrete skills. So conceived, the development by individuals and organizations of cultural competencies can be fostered but not, strictly speaking, imparted in the way that skills may be transmitted in technical training.

In this regard, we also take the view of Anderson and Collins (2004, 1), that diversity is about awareness of and sensitivity to "the intersections of race, social class and gender," about seeing "linkages to other categories of analysis, including sexuality, age, religion, physical disability, national identity and ethnicity," and about appreciating the disparities of power "that produce social inequalities." At the same time, we do not want to suggest that the experiences of sexism, racism, and so on are equivalent, as they are sometimes cast, since they are in no wise reducible to one another as similar experiences. Each and every kind of discrimination is singular in its individual and social impacts, and each is ethically reprehensible in its own ways.

One conceptual as well as ethical shortcoming of many current approaches to diversity and cultural-awareness education and training is their overemphasis on individual racism and bias, and on overcoming such attitudes in oneself and one's organization. However, distinctions must be drawn between individual racism and bias and individually- and group-mediated kinds of institutional racism and bias. "Institutional racism" refers to both intentional and unintentional, overt and covert forms of racial prejudices and barriers, and other forms of oppression, that become manifest in established social and organizational practices, for instance in selection and promotion processes that disadvantage racial and ethnic minorities (Price, 1997). In the same vein, Giddens (1998) sees discrimination and oppression as embedded in social networks and institutional forms of social relations. Braham (1992, 106) suggests that widening the definition of discrimination to include indirect institutional racism would give one a much better understanding of the formidable obstacles faced by racial and ethnic minorities in their everyday lives. As Dominelli (2002, 157) argues, "It is the subtle presence of racism in our normal activities, coupled with our failure to make the connections between the personal, institutional and cultural levels of racism which make it so hard . . . to recognize its existence . . . and combat it effectively."

In an influential study, Jones (1997) distinguishes individual from institutional racism, relying on a classificatory system for various types of discrimination. For Jones, individual racism can take either a dominative form or an aversive one. Aversive racism involves avoidance of people of other races because of the feelings of discomfiture they evoke, while institutional racism is organizational behavior directed toward entire demographic categories rather than individuals. Jones further describes two variants of institutional racism, individually-mediated and standard-of-practice racial discrimination. The first refers to the substance of institutional policies and practices shaped by individuals who (knowingly or not) are motivated by racial prejudice. The second includes institutional practices that directly or indirectly, wittingly or not, restrict the educational or vocational or economic access and advancement of individuals or groups on the basis of race or ethnicity. For Jones, individual and institutional variants of racial discrimination may be unintentional, but they are no less harmful for lacking willfulness.

Such distinctions may be difficult to make in the classroom, but they are necessary for a nuanced understanding of the way bias actually works in social relations. Attending to the institutional dimensions of discrimination helps counter the often self-serving tendency to limit the subject to individual, fully-conscious, and explicit or overt attitudes and behaviors. Racism, along with ethnic, gender, and other forms of bias, is insidious because it is so often hidden among institutional practices—which are aggregations of individual attitudes, behaviors, and actions, but, in their totality, more than that besides. Individual, group-mediated, and institutional forms of racism and bias may reinforce one another, but they are nonetheless distinct. This is a complex reality, the kind that diversity and cultural education and training generally avoids precisely because it is beyond the reach of typical classroom exercises and curricula. Yet, one must be willing to take on difficult issues when setting out to educate others about these subjects.

Bias and discrimination are indeed complex subjects, involving cultural outlooks that are often entrenched and therefore all but invisible. Cultural forms of institutional discrimination occur when the culture of a minority group is seen as somehow flawed, and when, consequently, its members are pressured to relinquish their own culture in favor of a majority one, even to as extreme an extent as mimicry of personal mannerisms and speech patterns—trying to "pass" as a member of the dominant majority, an impossible proposition. For Halstead (1988), racism is paternalistic in nature when it entails the tacit belief on the part of those in the majority that they have the right to involve themselves in the lives of minorities for the latter's own good, as they define that good. Halstead goes on to argue that claims to color-blindness may seem benign, since they rest on notions of equal regard and treatment, yet they have an adverse impact when they involve ignoring the historic experiences differentiating racial and ethnic minorities from majoritarian groups. Halstead concludes that social inequity and racial injustice ensue when either of two conditions prevails: if people are treated the same when in relevant respects they are different, and if people are treated differently when in relevant respects they are the same.

Racism would find its desired end in the internalization of feelings of inferiority by its victims. In this regard, there is interesting treatment of the commonalities of race and disability in the disability advocacy literature. It turns on the performativity and capacity to control that is associated with Whiteness and being able-bodied. Not fitting those majority norms becomes associated with disability and incapacity or illness. As Deborah Stienstra of the Canadian Centre on Disability Studies, University of Winnipeg, argues (2002), "[R]esearch related to disability should focus on the social, political and economic contexts of how impairment changes into disability." She adds: "Less attention should be paid to how to provide better 'culturally competent' services, and more paid to what causes the inequities that result in the need for differing services, or services at all (Stienstra, 2002, 11; see also McRuer, 2006, on the intersection of homosexuality and disability).

Identity and Identification
Identification with others is key to the discussion, since the idea in the promotion of cultural/diversity competency is to go beyond simple acceptance or tolerance, or even empathy, to a sense of identity, of oneness with the perspectives of others—intellectually, imaginatively, and emotionally. We suggest that there is an arc that carries the individual from awareness to emotive engagement with others. It involves, first and foremost, critical self-awareness, as in awareness of one's own group norms and values, and one's own biases or blinders.

Self-awareness needs carry the subject immediately into the dynamics of difference between her or his own group or groups and those of others, both as presently situated and in terms of history. What is involved at this juncture are historic conflicts, histories of oppression and mistrust that are woven tightly into the fabric of existing differences.

Identity as the assertion of individual autonomy on the basis of respect for one's own culture is the social and political side of a coin whose obverse is ethical, the valuing of other's cultural norms and values through identification, or identity, with them. This capability presupposes a dialectic movement between one's own cultural rootedness and its transcendence One's culture or cultures are constitutive of one's identity, just as one's ethnicity, race, gender, sexual orientation, and even religion or irreligion. Taken together, these and other elements of both diversity and culture constitute the self, one's and others'. Identity is also political in that it is inextricably tied to power, the relative power of individuals and groups. But these very factors, while constituting identity, do not exhaust it. Identity is more than its constituent parts, and this transcendent quality of identity allows one to go beyond who one is toward identification with others, since no one is ever entirely defined by such traits (culture, nationality, race, ethnicity, gender, age, disability, etc.).

Identity, Diversity, and Plurality
Identity is bound up with what Kwame Anthony Appiah (2004) calls the "irreducibly plural nature of human values." And, as Jurgen Habermas argues (1993, 130-131), "identity formation depends upon relations of reciprocal recognition." Anyone denied recognition because of warrantless prejudice is also denied communicative competence—access to community and polity, and therefore personhood, in some sense. Identity is plural, multi-perspective, transactional, social, and dialogical. As Evangelia Tastsoglou of Saint Mary's University, Halifax, suggests, identity must be regarded as "other-referenced, relational and comparative," contextual, historically situated, and "socially constructed and subject to ongoing negotiation and reconstruction (Tatsoglou, 2001, 3)."

It is in this vein that MacDonald and Sanchez-Casal (2002) challenge what they call "essentialism" in traditional feminist pedagogy, in the "centralization" of identity theory in feminist teaching, insisting instead on contextualizing difference relating to gender in communicative discourse. The same can be said of any discourse on difference—there is (or should be) no essentialism to race, ethnicity, gender, or the other qualities here discussed, in the sense that no one is exhaustively defined by any such traits. No one, therefore, should be reductively defined by them, least of all in the classroom (Fuller, 2002). Stasiulis (1990) would counter race or gender or cultural essentialism with relational awareness, with awareness of the "intersectionality"—what may also be called *intercommunality*—of race, ethnicity, and gender in personal identity. This is where most everyone finds herself today, amongst multiply-constructed rather than given qualities of racial, gender, and ethnic identity.

When it comes to sexual orientation and gender identity, to take another instance, there is great diversity among LGBT populations reflecting different life experiences among gay men, lesbians, and bisexuals, and transgender and transsexual people. There are divergences in the political loading of public agendas that relate precisely to questions of sexual orientation versus gender identity, down to questions of issue definition, as well as strategy, tactics, and priorities (Aspinall and Mitton, 2008). The point is that it is simplistic to lump together all who embrace

the acronym LGBT as though they were a single identity group or community of interest in all contexts and circumstances, whether the issue is marriage equality, employment equity, or anything else—since these concerns are differentially weighted by its component subgroups.

What are treated as groups for convenience's sake are usually far from monolithic—that is true of "Latinos," who encompass hundreds of nations, sub-communities, races and ethnicities, cultural groups, and languages, of "African Americans," and of virtually every superficially homogeneous group. Questions of group identity are exceedingly complex, and setting out to master them in single academic or training classes is futile: Any course that sets out to deal definitively with these questions is by virtue of that effort incapable of doing so. What is more feasible is to come to greater appreciation for diversity, to mature in one's attitudes toward others, rather than even attempt to categorize groups of people and their behaviors and norms.

To take still another example, Rockquemore and Brunsma (2002) examine the multi-dimensionality of biracial identity in the United States; the authors consider how biracial individuals construct their identity, which may shift between single identity (e.g., Black), exclusively biracial, "protean" or multiple identity, and "transcendental identity" beyond race. There is also complexity in the "intersectional" kinds of discrimination felt by individuals who combine more than one relevant identity trait, such as a member of a traditionally underrepresented ethnic minority who also has a disability, or a person of color who is also gay (McCall, 2005; Turner 2002).

There is a difference, therefore, in the approach we have taken, beyond incorporating diversity in the concept of cultural competency. As already indicated, we believe that the aim of diversity and cultural competency education should not be to bring classroom participants to anything approaching full understanding of other groups or their cultures—although, obviously, the greater the knowledge and appreciation the better. But one *can* embark on an open-ended effort in that direction, so as to enable participants to reach the point of accepting and celebrating others in their difference, and to come to a willingness to engage them in that very difference.

Particular instances explored in the classroom (for instance, in case studies) can be seen as emblematic of the entire phenomenon of difference. And the overriding aim, contrary to the preponderant emphasis in the field, is not to comprehend others but, rather, to attain greater *self*-comprehension. The lens held to other groups and their cultures also holds a reflection of the viewer. When there is resistance in the classroom, it does not occur principally because the subject is somehow forced to look at others more acceptingly, but because he is made uncomfortable by seeing himself in that lens *qua* mirror. It is often painful to recognize prejudices that one acknowledges need to be overcome, once these are brought to the surface.

In these distinct emphases, we deliberately avoid what we consider to be overreaching in theories and methods that have become standard fare in the diversity and cultural competency field. There is everything from "Expectation" theories and "Communication-Accommodation" theories to dozens of theory-based training methods. There are numerous testing methods in use, such as the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity, and assessment devices such as the Multicultural Awareness-Knowledge-Skills Survey. The Interdisciplinary Cross-Cultural Communication Project of Tulane University's Southern Institute for Education and Research has examined a compendium of these theories, methods, and instruments (see Hill, 2004). To be

sure, these are widely used, and may validated. They may work in the limited sense of bringing employee trainees to appreciate that overt acts such as sexual harassment are unacceptable and prone to sanction—but these sorts of objectives are much narrower than those we espouse.

In our own research and educational endeavors, we espouse aims that are at once more modest and more far-reaching. Our objective is to help bring students to the threshold of insight—to greater self-reflection, above all. Again, the premise is that greater other-awareness is inextricably tied up with greater self-awareness. To put it more succinctly, if somewhat abstractly, in the academic classroom we want students to come to see themselves in others and others in themselves, without getting caught up in prejudices or preordained behaviors. In our scholarship on diversity, cultural competency, and related issues of social equity, our aim is to discern the dimensions and limits of current scholarship and practice, and to work at the margins to make a contribution toward advancement of our common reading of these related concerns.

Dynamics of Difference in the Classroom

The dynamics of difference—of comprehension of difference—unfold in sometimes congenial and sometimes contentious classroom exchanges. The institutional contexts differ for authors Rivera, Johnson, and Ward, as this section will suggest.

For Johnson, it is one of classroom courses at the University of Vermont variously devoted entirely to issues of race and diversity or to Human Resources topics that include but are not limited to diversity and social equity concerns. In treating the subjects of diversity and equity, Johnson asks students to consider and critically discuss racial, ethnic, gender, and socioeconomic class stereotypes, an exercise that typically generates vital discussion, if also occasional resistance, in a largely Anglo-American, Caucasian student cohort. Johnson also has been teaching Race and Racism at the undergraduate level since 2002, a course that would be required of much of the student body (irrespective of major) beginning in 2007. (For the most part, students cannot opt out of this class with substitution of other experiences, though many do creatively attempt to do so, with such activities as going to Jamaica for a week!)

In these graduate and undergraduate courses contentiousness has given way to cordiality over the years, if only partially so. What is more worrisome than the potential for fractious interaction is the fact that students are typically unengaged with the subject matter, unconvinced that it is a subject that should be addressed in their classes. And the argument here, it must be emphasized, is that *engagement* is essential if a student is to come to greater self-awareness and awareness of others. Such a development presupposes dialogue, which cannot be passive.

For author Rivera, the setting is the graduate Master of Public Administration classroom in the School of Public Administration at the University of New Mexico (SPA/UNM), in graduate professional courses whose subject matter includes but is not devoted principally to questions of diversity or social equity. Classes include Comparative Public Administration, Organizational Behavior, and Intergovernmental Administration. UNM is a minority-serving ("Hispanic-serving") institution, and the MPA program is a so-called "majority-minority" program: more than half of SPA students are Hispanic (or Latino), Native American, African-American, and Asian or Asian-American, including international students. What's more, at least two-thirds of the program's MPA students are women, and the program's faculty is itself majority-minority. There is greater ease therefore to the treatment of diversity-related topics such

as immigration or Tribal Nation sovereignty, and less of a need to have stand-alone diversity courses. Nonetheless, a new course in Diversity Management has been instituted as an elective in a newly-restructured Master of Public Administration curriculum.

Classroom makeup makes a difference as research confirms, and it makes a difference as well for the role of the instructor in guiding dialogue in the directions already suggested, toward purposeful exploration of diversity and cultural difference. As may be expected, classroom interaction around issues of race, ethnicity, class, and culture, as well as by extension gender and sexual orientation, differ significantly in classrooms where students of color are in the majority versus those where they are in a small minority. When the majority, there obtains what some scholars call a "critical mass" of students of color. In this instance, these students may be expected to speak their minds more confidently and assertively, whereas in classrooms where they are a small minority, students of color (or women) may be more diffident. Irrespective of numbers, when there is a classroom climate that places positive value on diversity and cultural difference the prospect for productive dialogue markedly improves.

For author Ward, the undergraduate classroom setting is made up of political science courses at the predominantly female and historically White student body at Mississippi University for Women (MUW). MUW began admitting men after a 1982 U.S. Supreme Court decision in *Mississippi University for Women v. Hogan, 458 U.S. 718.* The court ruled against the university's all-female admissions policy "on the ground that it was based on a presumption that female students were inferior and in order to succeed needed an academic environment without competition from males" (Epstein and Walker, 2009).

Today, courses in Public Administration, Urban Politics and Policy, and American Government incorporate but are not specific to issues of diversity, social equity, and social justice. These courses generally reflect MUW's 85 percent female and 15 percent male enrollment; however, classroom racial and ethnic diversity is generally greater, as these courses draw from an overall student body that has grown to be more than 35 percent African American. Thus, there is opportunity to address diversity and cultural competencies across racial as well as gender lines, since there is significant representation, and in a sense therefore critical mass as well, with regard to gender as well as to race.

As one might surmise, given MUW's demographic breakdown, when facilitating student discussion on certain gender-based issues, there is a frequent tendency for women in the classroom to be assertive, and even to dominate discussion. On some topics, men may choose to simply defer, possibly out of respect for their female classmates, or perhaps out of fear of coming across as biased or naïve. However, as will be suggested in a section that follows, specifically pertaining to Ward's classroom experience at MUW, it appears that his students generally benefit from looking beyond categories of race and gender to the politics of diversity, and to institutional power relations pertaining to the subject.

In the following sections, the specific experiences of the authors are recounted, followed by a common pedagogic framework—a dialogic model—for diversity and cultural education.

Author Johnson

At the University of Vermont, Johnson has taught Human Resources Management (HRM) since 2003, as well as the undergraduate Race and Racism in the United States course required for all students by the University. For three successive years, graduate students taking the HRM course were surveyed at the beginning of the semester, so as to identify social attitudes toward people of color, as well as toward social class. There was, in the vernacular, some "pushback" from some White students—White students were overwhelmingly in the majority, demographically. A large majority of these students reported not understanding the connection between HRM and the survey. Three percent of the total reported feeling uncomfortable about discussing such issues in a graduate seminar and therefore opted out of the survey. However, the remaining ninety-seven percent did complete the survey.

There were two principal questions: (1) Please identify commonly-found social stereotypes for African American Men, Hispanic Men, Asian Men, Native American Men, White Men, and Working Class Men; and (2) Please identify commonly-found social stereotypes for African American Women, Hispanic Women, Asian Women, Native American Women, White Women and Working Class Women. It was made clear in the survey instructions that these were stereotypes of which students were aware, not ones that would be imputed to them personally. The survey findings suggest that 98 percent of the students responding were aware of a number of race, gender, and class stereotypes in the larger society, as their characterizations indicated.

Notwithstanding the caveat about dissociation of responses from personal attitudes, people of color were more often than not described with reference to negative stereotypes, while White counterparts were more often characterized as ambitious and high achievers. For instance, African American men were tagged as "athletic" and as "rappers," Native American men as "spiritual" but also as "drunks," and "uneducated," and Hispanic men as "macho" and "uneducated" and "greasy," with a "high sex drive." In contrast, White men were seen as "CEO's" who were not athletic, "cheaters," and "privileged"—so that negative attributions were balanced by positive ones, which was clearly not the case for men of color. Poor and working class people—across racial lines—were also typed negatively. While gender was included in the survey—with a similar breakdown of associations for women of color and White women— sexual orientation, age, disability, and other possible categories were not addressed. The students surveyed sometimes voiced the view that they themselves did not share the perceptions reported, but that they were aware of them as persistent social stereotypes. Nonetheless, the class was left to contend with jaundiced images of people of color and women in the workplace.

While the original HRM course survey was conducted in 2007, Johnson has consistently found mixed attitudes from the membership of this majority White graduate course. Graduate students in the course seem unconvinced that social equity, as opposed to ethnicity, race, and gender, has a great or necessary connection to the study of Human Resource Management—and their attitudes toward the latter issues remains ambiguous as well. However, as classroom pedagogy and graduate textbooks come to increasingly include questions of social equity, and to connect them to ones of race, gender, and the rest, and to issues of professional and managerial exigency today, this manner of thinking is likely to change.

In contrast to this graduate course, the undergraduate course Race and Racism in the United States has had a higher proportion of students of color, and (perhaps because of the nature of the course) these students have displayed much confidence—a sense of self-efficacy—in their

assertion of counter-views. White students have not generally tried to confront students of color in this class with their own biases, if anything deferring to them in classroom discussion.

Professors dealing with controversial issues of race and racism, sexism, the disenfranchisement of historically oppressed groups, and the like must set ground rules. Johnson has done so with a "Safe Space Policy," which stands as one of the first statements of principle in his Race and Racism class. It reads: *Students will speak and be full participants in this class without fear of verbal or physical abuse from any other student; any student violating this policy will be sent before Judicial Affairs of the University of Vermont.* Johnson not only prominently features this policy statement in his print syllabus, but he also addresses it during the first day of class. This policy allows the students freedom to express their ideas free from any retaliation from other classmates. Some students may not like the policy, but everyone understands—or arrives at an understanding of—the importance of having it govern class discussion. It is not unusual to find similar, if less direct, statements of ground rules in diversity and cultural education and training classes. Clarity in establishing communication norms is essential, however, to ensuring that the quality of classroom exploration and discussion is maintained.

Trumbower (2009) maintains that it is difficult to even begin to discuss issues of religious pluralism in public schools and universities, and this presents a particular type of cultural divide. Trumbower attributes much of the difficulty to the devastating effects that a lack of education and understanding can have, when students lack cultural awareness of faiths other than their own. This, says the author, creates an inhospitable communicative space for students and faculty, which makes it very difficult to have constructive conversations about religious differences, or any differences.

There is also almost instant discord around another sensitive subject in the United States, the putatively unfair privileges enjoyed by racial minorities. When concepts of social justice are applied to interracial and cross-cultural aspects of public policy, workplace politics, national politics, gender politics, and the like, it is interesting to note how many well-meaning students from the dominant culture cry "foul" if they believe that people of color are receiving any advantage. This is a concern that is becoming more salient with controversies surrounding President Obama today. Despite the fact that many of them are patently contrived, by "birthers" and "Tea-Party" stalwarts, for instance, it makes its way into class discussion, seldom productively.

"Safe space" policies are therefore essential for the diversity/cultural education classroom. The need goes beyond the classroom to institutional domains for cross-cultural dialogue. Nevertheless, insisting on classrooms that are amenable to pluralist—multi-perspective--dialogue is a necessary starting point, and a good way to model and leverage larger-scale conversations in universities and public institutions.

Author Rivera
In Rivera's Comparative Public Administration and Organizational Behavior graduate classes at the University of New Mexico (UNM), cultural-competency issues are principally addressed through student presentations of case studies, for instance the following from the *Electronic Hallway* (with corresponding questions noted; cases available from www.hallway.org from the Daniel J. Evans School of Public Affairs at the University of Washington):

1. "Preventing Drilling in the Arctic Wildlife Refuge: The Gwich'in Tribes and their Role in the National Policy Debate"—the impact on the Gwich'in of Alaska of federal policies dating to the seventies affecting their corporative status and sovereignty, and their economy and culture;

2. "Managing a Health Project: HIV/AIDS in Thailand," sometimes coupled with "Science, Discrimination, and the Blood Supply: San José State University's Blood Drive Ban"—close parallels in the role of cultural prejudice on the ability of victims of HIV/AIDS to participate in health services. And

3. "Corporate Values and Transformation: The Microlender Compartamos"—the history of Compartamos as it moved from rural communities in Mexico to Mexico City, where cultural impediments blocked early program implementation.

Case presentations generate discussion among students of all backgrounds (though it needs to be considered that in UNM classrooms upwards of two-thirds of the students are women, and a substantial majority is comprised of Hispanic, Native American, and international students). Student-led discussions drive the joint exploration of cultural competency, diversity, and social equity questions. These questions are both negative in nature—the persistence of stereotypes, loss of identity, the dissipation of power over resources—and positive ones—the prospects for improved inter-group relations, capacity-building in cultural awareness, and growth in community solidarity.

Using the above-cited Compartamos case study as an example, presentation of the case in the author's Comparative Public Administration class has allowed for consideration of the difficulties presented by American individualism to group-based lending. Insights came from the interaction of students of all backgrounds; in more than one instance, some students had experience with local micro-credit programs, as had the author himself, in his consulting practice. The case, though based in Mexico, was the catalyst for consideration of microlending locally, in New Mexico. What was essential in class dialogue was the movement from some students' experience to that of the case protagonists and in turn to that of other students. Consequently, there were moments of discovery, of the ways that taken-for-granted values may either advance or detain social and policy development, and the ways that public programs may have unintended consequences.

Insight—into what is desirable as a matter of public policy, for instance—comes from guided exploration of the case material, and from the interplay of perspectives between the case study and the cultures and communities of interest found in the classroom. The vitality of dialogue is often due to the diversity of cultures present there. In one instance, the substantial presence of Latino students and the fact that a foreign student—a Mexican national who was well versed in the subject—led the group case presentation, gave her and the group confidence in their framing of key issues. It also helped give them the confidence they needed to lead class interaction, in what turned out to be a remarkable instance of distributed discussion leadership. There was little for the instructor to do but to remark, once or twice, on his own practice relating to microlending.

As does Johnson, Rivera makes clear that civility is not to be compromised in class discussion of these topics, whether they touch directly or indirectly on race, cultural difference, or class. In one instance in an Intergovernmental Relations class, an overzealous Latino student abruptly charged another presenting a case with making a racist remark. This baffled the instructor and class, since the presenter's statement had no bearing whatever on race. To make matters worse,

the Latino student went on to make what everyone took to be an equally baffling, disconnected, and offensive remark about Blacks and crack cocaine. The author admonished him immediately, stopping the class, and later undertook disciplinary action against him. With guidance from the University Judicial Affairs office, the matter was resolved with a letter of apology from the offending student, directed at the instructor and the offended student. While the sanction was very measured, with no lasting effects other than behavior modified and a lesson learned, the message sent was clear: incivility in dialogue would not be tolerated from anyone. This kind of incident, while uncomfortable for all concerned, may be made to model moral sanction in the relatively harmless confines of the classroom, serving up regrettable but nonetheless valuable lesson.

Author Ward

In Ward's undergraduate Public Administration course at Mississippi University for Women, cultural-competency issues are addressed through student presentations and discussions organized around a critical book review. All students in the course are required to read a novel, *Fuhrer's Heart: An American Story* (Ward, 2006), that deals specifically with the issues of diversity, ethics, and social equity. Among other things, the novel addresses the ways—of intrigue—in which mid-level university administrators (department heads and deans) work out ideological differences on diversity, in the process blocking or manipulating information vital to the organization's stated diversity goals, and otherwise playing very pointed games.

The novel thrusts students into the politics of a fictional university's ambitious affirmative action policy, acquainting them with characters representing two opposing views on diversity. Should increasing the number of women and minority faculty members be a priority for the university? Or, should the priority revert back to hiring the most "qualified" candidates, irrespective of race and gender? The university's official policy on diversity corresponds to the first of these positional questions and coincides with one of the two factions. Members of the pro affirmative action faction are depicted as open, and much more transparent, in the novel with regard to their position on diversity. A large majority of those in the opposing faction are not in any way transparent. They tend to remain silent on the issues involved while actually aligning themselves with elements intent on undermining the university's diversity aims.

Students are responsible for critiquing the views of the two groups as well as the actions taken by characters in the novel. The purpose is to generate a facilitated class discussion on the value of diversity and the role of ethics in organizational behavior and decisionmaking. Students are assisted in the assignment by the following questions listed in the class syllabus, under the guidelines for the critical book review:

1. *As dramatized in the novel, discuss how middle-level bureaucrats may impede information flow essential to organizations meeting their stated objectives.*

2. *As dramatized in the novel, discuss the dynamics of organizational behavior and the politics of affirmative action.*

Interestingly, a student's race, gender or political view (conservative versus liberal) is not a good predictor of how she or he will respond. Counterintuitively, during class discussions non-minority students who self-identify as conservative often speak in support of a need for greater diversity. Because the novel probes patterned forms of hidden and institutional racism, students are forced to revisit beliefs about values and traditions that appear nondiscriminatory but in

actuality reinforce the racial status quo. Students of African-American heritage generally respond similarly, indicating recognition of the realities explored in the novel. White students often express a greater appreciation for the role of race and class in institutional politics.

These kinds of response support Lani Guinier's (2000) argument that students react more positively to class discussions on diversity and race when forced to reexamine unconscious biases—to become more critically self-reflective. Guinier suggests that this may be accomplished by confronting three questions. One, what are the rules that identify the winners and losers? Two, who *are* the winners and losers? And three, what story is told by the outcome [i.e., by the final tally of what is won and lost, and who is a winner or loser]" (Guinier, 2000).

By delving deeper into the issue of diversity and asking questions that transcend race and class in the realm of power relations, students are better able to identify with other groups and embrace their commonalities, across boundaries of race, culture, and community. This is true for both minority and non-minority students in the classroom—all seem to benefit from being prompted to both look at race and beyond race relations to the politics of diversity.

Regardless of whether students oppose or favor affirmative action (the two factions in the novel), the exercise leads them to a greater appreciation for diversity. They need not agree on the method by which that diversity may be achieved; instead, they consistently come to value diversity in relation to the imperatives of institutional interest. Whether cultural competency as such can be taught is not resolved by this class exercise. What it aims to do is simply to nurture the capacity of students to more fully embrace and value differences in others.

A Common Model—Dialogue and Critical Mass

In consequence of these experiences, we have elaborated a preliminary teaching model for diversity and cultural competency, one that is adequate to academic classrooms of any demographic composition, and by extension to training classrooms. Following the literature, we characterize it as a *dialogic pedagogy*. Other terms of art for this interactive approach to cultural competency include "interdiscursivity" and "interdiscursive pedagogy," "perspectivism" and "perspectival pedagogy," and "transactionism" and "transactional pedagogy."

The model appears to work roughly as well in cohorts with large and small minority-student numbers (contrasting UNM or MUW to UVM). The dialogic approach appears to work in these different settings because it depends *on the interaction of discussants of varied backgrounds* and not on any set classroom profile. However, it is in fact the case that in the UNM and UVM classrooms there appears to be a greater ease of interaction among students of color and White students, less "pushback," and greater ease in the sustained exploration and development of issues of race, color, and equity, than is the case at UVM. It also seems to help when students do not dwell too directly on issues of race and diversity as such, but rather address them in larger contexts, e.g., those of organizational politics (Ward) or cultural impediments to policy (Rivera) or social equity (Johnson).

Interestingly, the politics of sexual orientation (questions, e.g., relating to gay marriage policy and law, or "don't ask don't tell" in the U.S. military) appear to be less readily approachable at UNM than at UVM, while UVM, as just indicated, appears less ready to explore race and racism. At UVM there is still not a critical mass of students of color or faculty of color (less than 10 percent of students and just under 12 percent of faculty are people of color, according to the UVM Office of

Institutional Research). This imbalance makes it difficult for a true dialogue around race to occur. Such is not the case at UNM with its substantial Latino and Native American enrollment, or for that matter at MUW, with its significant and growing African American enrollment.

In Antonio et al. (2004, 507), the critical variable for fruitful classroom interaction is at least a minimal presence of students of color amidst White students in the classroom. A significant presence is necessary for more assertive dialogue on the part of racial minorities. Their experimental study confirmed earlier, largely anecdotal, research findings that group interaction "enhances integrative complexity among majority-opinion members" in particular, which is also to say among the majority-group members. Other researchers (for example, Anderson et al., 2005) have similarly found that a "critical mass" of students of color in the classroom, beyond the minimal presence stressed by Antonio and colleagues (Antonio et al. 2004), makes a difference in the quality of those students' participation in class discussion, allowing for much greater "integrative engagement" (Keiner & Burns, 2010). Significant presence has also been found to help women and racial and ethnic minorities in the science classroom to be more confident in participation (for instance in SCALE-UP K-12 science classrooms, Beichner 2006; see also Anderson et al., 2005, and Keiner & Burns, 2010).

As suggested by Johnson's explicit ground rules ("Safe Space") as well as Rivera's working rules, contentiousness must be limited even while vital dialogue is encouraged. Unsupported generalizations, invidious characterizations, assertions of stereotype, and antagonisms are not to be permitted. This is not at all a matter of "political correctness," a hackneyed approach to communications that underestimates students' ability to have intelligent conversations. On the contrary, there is encouragement of exploration of issues, but on the premise that dialogue requires respect for other interlocutors. (See Avery and Steingard 2008, who argue for authentic dialogue in a "zone of understanding," beyond political correctness).

In either kind of setting, the role of the instructor, and in particular the instructor of color, is critical. The instructor, when a person of color, may carry more weight and responsibility than the usual instructor, in establishing ground rules and topics for discussion, down to the selection of materials to be discussed, and in setting the right tone for productive dialogue (Ortiz & Jani, 2010). In our experience, in the critical-mass classroom the instructor may take a lower-profile, allowing discussion to proceed as it may, with the expectation that students will join in, without undue concern for the possibility of sharp disagreement in the discussion of issues .

The Role of the Instructor in Establishing Ethical Dialogue
In the classrooms where those of color are distinctly in the minority, the instructor, particularly the instructor of color, may be in effect the equalizer, pressing issues more volubly, and intervening more to steer discussion toward dialogue. In any event, as Brookfield and Preskill (1999) argue, it is important to keep student and instructor voices in reasonable balance when exploring contentious questions of diversity and social equity. There are alternative roles the instructor can take, as advocate or arbiter or moderator, that suit the demands of the classroom situation (Larson & Schermerhorn Jr., 1989; Blum, 1998).

We agree with Jackson (2008) that one needs to avoid being overly prescriptive in the classroom: Instructors and trainers can effectively act as advocates for equity and justice without preempting discussion or rendering it undemocratic. Milovanovic (1995) insists that, ultimately,

knowledge is "coproduced" by teachers and students, and that they develop together "a language of possibility." Leistyna and Mollen (2008) similarly argue for "a dialogic pedagogy" in jointly constructing meaning. Learning is transactional, and the manner of discovery is ideally one of mutual exploration, as well as mutual accountability. Instructors and students need to answer to each other for the way in which they approach these sensitive subjects, and for the manner of conclusions that they reach together.

We also agree with Robert Nash when he argues that "We need to learn how to communicate in such a way as to find the commonalities in our different views on social justice." However, as Nash goes on to say, "when finding commonality seems impossible, we must agree to stop the conversation rather then end it forever. At which point, we then make a promise to return to the conversation later . . ." In the end, there should be acceptance and respect rather than mere tolerance: Nash refers to this as having a moral conversation. valuing one another in a diverse or multicultural environment. It is both in the manner of dialogue and in the responsible ends of exploration that the study of cultural competency can become an ethical undertaking (Chavez, Guido-DiBrito & Mallory, 2003).

To pick up on an essential earlier proposition, it is feasible for instruction relating to cultural and diversity competencies to bring students (or trainees) to an attitudinal threshold—one that is more about valuing than understanding difference, and more about respect for others than comprehension of others. This aim is more realistic than to set out to impart much knowledge of other cultural and group norms, values, and interests. The stress, as Nash suggests, should be on dialogue as an end rather than means, as an ethical approach to negotiating differences (see also Gardiner, 1996; Pettit, 1989).

Metacompetence

It may, therefore, be proposed (with Carol Falender and Edward Shafranske of Pepperdine University, citing Weinert, 2001) that diversity and cultural competency is a "metacompetence," i.e., an "ability to introspect about one's personal cognitive processes and products [that] is dependent on self-awareness, self-reflection, and self-assessment," which one needs in order "to determine which skills or knowledge are missing, how to acquire these . . . (Falender & Shafranske, 2001, 235)." For these authors, as for us, cultural competency is nothing less "an ethical principle," one that "refers to requisite knowledge, skills, and values for effective performance" in an ever more diverse and global world (Falender & Shafranske, 2001, 232).

Diversity or cultural competency education should be about a more sophisticated and critical self-awareness, akin, as Flood and Romm (1996) argue, to Argyris and Schon's (1974) "Triple-loop Learning." It must not be about narrowly-drawn skills, and it must not be a project born of a patronizing sense of responsibility. When education for diversity and cultural awareness flows from rigid obligation—to meet a legal mandate, or the requirements of defensive management, for instance—it tends to be resisted as an imposition. It then becomes an exercise in tedium. From another standpoint, it does not work as cost-benefit ethics, but as an ethics of freely-espoused, unbounded obligation, as Emmanuel Levinas (1999) has proposed.

Consistent with Flood and Romm, we are proposing that diversity and cultural awareness education should be first about *reflexive awareness*. We are proposing that we cannot and should not try to educate people exhaustively about Blacks, Latinos, Indigenous peoples, LGBT

people, or any other cultural or nationality group. That is impossible. What one simply needs to do is to recognize that others are worthy of respect in their very difference. One may know little, for instance, about transgender people, or be unable to fathom the experience of a person with a severe disability. However, one can move with some immediacy toward recognition of and respect for them, and for any others who stand at a fair distance from one's own experience.

Conclusion and Prospect

If we are limited to respecting only those racial and cultural groups and nationalities we substantially understand, then we will always be caught up in bias. The aim of diversity and cultural education should be nothing more or less than to bring people to reflexive self-awareness and openness toward others. It should be an exercise in moral imagination, and the kind of imaginative turn required for any attitudinal or social change.

At the same time, these subjects must be grounded and contextualized in domains of social justice. In a comprehensive Canadian study of teacher-candidate education in diversity, cultural sensitivity, and social justice, Goodreau and Fredua-Kwarteng (2010) found a number of systemic shortcomings, most of which were also found in the United States. Teacher candidates commonly failed to understand "their own worldviews and beliefs about race, culture, and ethnicity." Many were in programs that took an "additive approach" instead of an integrative one turning on social justice. The researchers found that there was a failure at "due reflection" on the part of candidates, as well as failures at contextualization and internalization "of values and knowledge about cultural diversity," and therefore a failure to "experience any transformation." Instead, candidates typically exhibited "resistance to infusion of equity and social justice" into teacher preparation programs. These programs, finally, usually built on a "depoliticized and uncritical framework" that rendered vacuous any consideration of race and equity. Much the same criticism has been leveled at cross-cultural education in medical schools (see, for example, the perspective taken by "insurgent" multiculturalists in that context, in Wear, 2003).

There is very often discordance between the perfunctory way that these subjects are treated in the classroom and the apparent gravity of the efforts that institutions make to take on issues of racism, bigotry, and discrimination. Similarly, institutional professions of commitment are frequently belied by lack of institutional follow-though in actual practice.

What may help bring people around, to approach this moral and ethical threshold, to move toward something close to Antonio's *integrative complexity*, is the introduction in coursework of enough material congruent with the moral convictions of participants so that *cognitive dissonance* (Festinger, 1957) is prompted if they try to keep to biased attitudes. The idea that others should be treated respectfully and equitably is consistent with virtually all religious morals and secular systems of ethics. If the instructor can summon up this shared moral value in classroom discussion, and bring discussion around to the notion that it is indeed a shared value, then it becomes a matter of noting that such equitable regard should be there for all others, irrespective of ascribed identity traits. The inconsistency between universally-espoused values of fairness and respect, on the one hand, and, on the other, prejudice and discrimination, is bound to make for cognitive dissonance. So, too, is the incongruity between the institutional commitments represented by diversity initiatives, including training, and the lack of real commitments to diversity and social justice on the part of many of the institutions that sponsor

them. This incongruity can be explored in the classroom, with the expectation of dissonance and subsequent movement toward at least attempts at a resolution of value conflicts.

The next classroom challenge would be to help participants address these incongruities through social and institutional critiques, and to address value conflicts by way of the most expansive and generous of moral stances available to them. It seems to us that this is the kind of effort that diversity and cross-cultural education should entail, rather than the small and self-serving agendas more typically brought to the task.

What we are proposing, in summary, is that diversity and cultural competency education needs to be turned on its head, with the overriding priority being cognitive development, critical self-reflection, moral maturation, and dialogue rather than the imparting of any given skills. Our aim is aligned with Westley's central theoretical proposition, in this same symposium, of *disruptive innovation* through "discontinuous and cross-scale change." We find close kinship between Westley's innovation principle and the "creative destruction" at the core of Joseph Schumpeter's (1942) theory of economic innovation. With Schumpeter, and Westley, we argue for a change strategies that grow out of and build on, but would leave behind, established systems of generative action—in our case not economic forms but pedagogical ones, which we have examined (however partially) in this essay but oppose in their general thrust.

Our proposal grows out of but fundamentally challenges the field. Diversity and cultural competence education should be about educating individuals about the ways they regard themselves and others, and interact with others. It should be about inter-communality and ethical dialogue. Diversity and cross-cultural education is not, properly, about discrete skill sets. It should not take as a point of departure stereotyped categorizations and characterizations of others, however well-meaning these may be, since any stereotyping is objectionable on its face. And it should not be motivated by defensive kinds of risk management, meant to shield institutions from sanction or criticism. Rather, diversity and cultural education should be bound up with risk-taking, and exposure, bringing individuals and organizations to thresholds of essential change. This is the prospect we see for ethical innovation in diversity and cultural competency education.

About the Authors:

Mario Rivera. Widely published on the subjects of diversity, social equity, public sector innovation, and public ethics, lead author Mario Rivera is Regents' Professor of Public Administration at the University of New Mexico; he is former Editor-in-Chief of the *Journal of Public Affairs Education* and current Senior Associate Editor *The Innovation Journal.*

Richard Greggory Johnson III is Associate Professor, College of Education and Social Services, Educational Leadership and Policy Studies/Department of Education, at the University of Vermont, and Co-Executive Editor of the Black Studies & Critical Thinking Series, Peter Lang Publisher; he also is widely published in the areas of diversity and social equity. Corresponding author for the present article, he may be reached at Richard.Johnson-III@uvm.edu.

James D. Ward is Professor of Political Science at Mississippi University for Women and author of numerous refereed journal articles and book chapters on social equity, diversity and public management; he is an associate member of the National Academy of Public Administration's Standing Panel on Social Equity in Governance.

References

Anderson, G., Daugherty, E.J.B. & Corrigan, D.M. (2005). The search for a critical mass of minority students: Affirmative action and diversity at highly selective universities and colleges. *The Good Society*, 14(3), 51-57.

Anderson, M. L. & Collins, P.H. (2004). *Race, class and gender* (6th ed.). Boston, MA: Thomson/Wadsworth.

Antonio, A.L., Chang, J.J., Hakuta, K., Kenny, D.A., Levin, S. & Milem, J.F. (2004). Effects of racial diversity on complex thinking in college students. *Psychological Science*, 15(8), 507-510. Retrieved from http://www.stanford.edu/~aantonio/psychsci.pdf

Appiah, K.A. (2004). *The ethics of identity*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Argyris, Chris, and Donald Schon. (1974). *Theory in practice: Increasing professional effectiveness.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Aspinall, P.J. & Mitton, L. (2008). Kinds of people and equality monitoring in the UK. *Policy and Politics*, 36(1), 55–74.

Avery, D.R. & Steingard, D.S. (2008). Achieving political trans-correctness: Integrating sensitivity and authenticity in diversity management education. *Journal of Management Education*, 32(3), 269-293.

Beichner, R. J. (2006). Instructional technology research and development in a US physics education group. *European Journal of Engineering Education*, 31(4), 383-393.

Blum, L. (1998). Can we talk?: Interracial dialogue in the classroom. *Change*, 30(6), 26-37.

Braham, P., Rattansi, A., and R. Skellinton. (1992). *Racism and antiracism: Inequalities, opportunities and policies.* London: Sage Publications.

Brookfield, S. D. & Preskill, S. (1999). *Discussion as a way of teaching: Tools and techniques for democratic classrooms* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Chavez, A. F., Guido-DiBrito, F., & Mallory, S. L. (2003). Learning to value the "other:" A framework of individual diversity development. *Journal of College Student Development,* 44(4), 453-469.

Dana, R. H., & Allen, J. (2008). *Cultural competency training in a global society*. New York: Springer.

Dewey, P. & Wyszomirski, M.J. (2004, August). *International Issues in Cultural Policy and Administration: A Conceptual Framework for Higher Education*. Paper presented at the International Conference on   Cultural Policy Research, Montreal, Quebec. Retrieved from http://neumann.hec.ca/iccpr/PDF_Texts/Dewey_Wyszomirski.pdf

Dominelli, L. (2002). *Anti-oppressive Social Work: Theory and practice.* London: Palgrave MacMillan.

Doyle, A.M. (2006). Naming and reclaiming indigenous knowledges in public institutions: Intersections of landscapes and experience. *Advances in Knowledge Organization*, 10, 435-442. Ergon. Würzburg.

Epstein, L. and Walker, G.W. (2009). Constitutional Law for a Changing America. Washington, D.C.: CQ Press, p. 655.

Falender, C. & Shafranske, E. (2007). Competence in competency-based supervision practice: Construct and application. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 38(3), 232–240.

Festinger, L. (1957) *A theory of cognitive dissonance*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press

Flood, R.A. & Romm, N.R.A. (1996). *Diversity management: Triple Loop Learning*. Chichester: J. Wiley.

Foldy, E.G. (2004). Learning from diversity: A theoretical exploration. *Public Administration Review*, 64(5), 529-538.

Fuller, K. (2002). Eradicating essentialism from cultural competency education. *Academic Medicine,* 77(3), 198-201.

Gardiner, M. (1996). Alterity and ethics: A dialogical perspective. *Theory, Culture and Society*, 13(2), 121–144.

Giddens, A. 1998. *The Third Way: The renewal of social democracy.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Goodreau, J. & Fredua-Kwarteng, E. (2007). *Integrating equity and social justice into teacher preparation.* Retrieved from http://www.oise.utoronto.ca/research/cld/images/preparation % 20lit%2 .

Guinier, L. (2000). Reframing the affirmative action debate in a post-Initiative 200 environment. Retrieved from http//www.researchchannel.org/asx/uw_affirm_guinier_250k.asx.

Habermas, J. (1992). *Justification and application: Remarks on discourse ethics*. Translated by Ciaran Cronin. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Halstead, M. (1988). *Education, justice and cultural diversity*: *An examination of the Honey Affair, 1984-85.* London: Falmer Press.

Hill, L. (2004, May). *Working Paper: Interdisciplinary Cross-Cultural Communication Project*. A Project of the Southern Institute for Education and Research, Tulane University, New Orleans, LA. Retrieved from http://www.southerninstitute.info/discuss/wp-content/uploads/2007/07/working-paper-web-version-7-25-2007.doc. Paper and a transcript of a June 2004 roundtable discussion of the paper by leading national experts and practitioners may be accessed at: http://discuss.southerninstitute.info.

Jackson, L. (2008). Dialogic pedagogy for social justice: A critical examination. *Studies in Philosophy and Education,* 27 (2-3), 137-148.

Jones, J. M. (1997). *Prejudice and racism* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Co.

Keiner, L.E. & Burns, T.E. (2010). Interactive engagement: How much is enough? *The Physics Teacher*, 48(2), 108-111.

Krejci, D. & Lester, W. (2007, February). *Incorporating Ethnic and Cross-Cultural Diversity in the Political Science Curriculum*. Paper presented at the Fourth Annual APSA Conference on Teaching and Learning in Political Science, Charlotte, NC. Retrieved from http://www.apsanet.org/tlc2007/TLC07Krejci.pdf

Larson, L.L. & Schermerhorn, Jr., J.R. (1989). Alternative instructor roles in cross-cultural business and management training. *Journal of Teaching in International Business*, 1(1), 7-21.

Leistyna, P. & Mollen, D. (2008). Teaching social class through alternative media and by dialoging across disciplines and boundaries. *Radical Teacher*, 81(1), 20-27.

Levinas, E. (1999). *Otherwise than being: or beyond essence*. Duquesne: Duquesne University Press.

MacDonald, A.A., & Sanchez-Casal, S. (Eds.). (2002). *Twenty-first-century feminist classrooms: Pedagogies of identity and difference*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

McCall, L. (2005). The complexity of intersectionality. *Signs* 30(3), 1771-1800.

McRuer, R. (2006). Crip Theory: Cultural signs of queerness and disability. New York: New York University Press 2006.

Milovanic, D. (1995). Dueling paradigms: Modernist v. postmodernist thought. *Humanity and Society*, 19(1), 1-22. Retrieved from http://www.critcrim.org

Nash, R.J. (2010). What is the best way to be a social justice advocate: Communication strategies for effective social justice advocacy. *About Campus*, 15(2), 11-19.

Ortiz, L. & Jani, J. (2010). Critical race theory: A transformational model for teaching diversity. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 46(2), 175-193.

Pettit, P. (1989). Consequentialism and respect for persons. *Ethics*, 100(1), 116-126.

Price, A. J. (1997). *Human resource management in a business context.* London: International Thomson Business Press.

Rice, M. F. (2006, October). *Promoting Cultural Competency in Public Administration and Public Service Delivery: Utilizing Self-assessment Tools and Performance Measures*. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration, Minneapolis, MN. Published under the same title in 2007 in the Journal of Public Affairs Education, 13(1), 41-57.

Rockquemore, K. A., & Brunsma, D. L. (2002). Socially embedded identities: Theories, typologies, and processes of racial identity among black/white biracials. *Sociological Quarterly*, 43(3), 335–356.

Schiek, D., von Ossietzky, C. & Monnet, J. (2008). Broadening the norms and the scope of sex-discrimination law. Retrieved from http://www.e-quality.nl/assets/e-quality/dossiers/EU%20Gender%20Equality/Paper%20Dagmar.doc

Schumpeter, J. A. (1942 original publication, republication 1975). *Capitalism, socialism and democracy.* New York: Harper.

Stasiulis, D. (1990). Theorizing connections: gender, race, ethnicity, and class. In P. S. Li (Ed.), *Race and ethnic relations in Canada* (pp. 269-305). Toronto: Oxford University Press.

Stienstra, D. (2002). The intersection of DISABILITY and Race/Ethnicity/Official Language Religion. Prepared for the "Intersections of Diversity" Seminar, Canadian Centre on Disability Studies, University of Winnipeg, March 8, 2002. Available: http://www.disabilitystudies.ca/Documents/Resaerch/Completed%20research/Intersection%20of%20disability/Intersection%20of%20disability.doc

Tastsoglou, E. (2001). Re-appraising immigration and identities: A synthesis and directions for future research: A study commissioned by the Department of Canadian Heritage for the Ethnocultural, Racial, Religious, and Linguistic Diversity and Identity Seminar. Halifax, Nova Scotia, November 1-2, 2001. Available: http://canada.metropolis.net/events/ethnocultural/publications/tastsoglou_e.pdf

Tilford Group (2004). *Multicultural competency development: Preparing students to live and work in a diverse world*. Manhattan, KS: Kansas State University.

Tuckman, B.W. (1966). Interpersonal probing and revealing and systems of integrative complexity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 3(6), 655-664.

Trumbower, J. (2009). Teaching religion in religiously pluralistic contexts: Sensitivity, academic rigor, and justice. In R. G. Johnson III (Ed.). *A 21st century approach to teaching social justice: Educating for both advocacy and action (pp. 129-   138).* New York: Peter Lang Press.

Turner, C.S.V. (2002). Women of color in academe: Living with multiple marginality. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73(1), 74-93.

Ward, J.D. (2006). *Fuhrer's Heart: An American Story.* Philadelphia, PA: Xlibris Corporation.

Wear, D. (2003). Insurgent Multiculturalism: Rethinking how and why we teach culture in medical education." *Academic Medicine*, 78 (6), 549-554.

Weinert, F. E. (2001). Concept of competence: A conceptual clarification. Defining and selecting key competencies. In D. S. Rychen & L. H. Salganik (Eds.), *Defining and selecting key competencies* (pp. 45-65). Seattle, WA: Hogrefe & Huber.