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Abstract

The purpose of the study was to examine the level of cultural sensitivity, and exhibition of cultural competence for faculty at liberal arts institutions within higher education. The dependent variables were the perceived and actual developmental level of cultural sensitivity. The main independent variables in this study consisted of: Nationality/ethnic background, Gender, Age range, Educational level, Graduate Professional Preparation, Level of Multicultural Skills, Awareness and Knowledge, Discipline, Work and Life Experiences both in and outside of the Collegiate Environment, Length of Time Spent in Another Culture, and Location of Formative Years. The target population for this study was comprised of full time faculty at three liberal arts institutions. Four hundred and sixty five faculty members were mailed a 50-item survey and an 8-item questionnaire to determine levels of cultural sensitivity, multicultural knowledge, awareness and skills. Data were collected on 91 individuals and the overall response rate was 27%.

The data were analyzed using the Statistical Program for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Content analysis of the Multicultural Competency Questionnaire was conducted to determine the characteristics of an academic model of cultural competence. The findings included four components: preparation in the area of cultural competence in graduate school regardless of the
discipline, on-going cultural competency training and skill development/enhancement once hired as a faculty member, the incorporation of campus events centralizing around the concept of culture for the community, and faculty mentoring.

One-way ANOVAs were performed and found no statistically significant differences between groups on the three areas investigated (perceived, actual developmental and the difference between perceived and actual developmental level). Paired t-tests were performed and found statistically significant differences between the perceived and actual developmental scores for each discipline. Finally the IDI profiles were examined for each of the five disciplines. Recommendations for future research include aligning the results of the Intercultural Development Inventory and the Multicultural Competency Questionnaire for the development of a regression equation; and to conduct this study with part time faculty as well as graduate students who serve as teaching assistants.
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CHAPTER I

Introduction

Campuses across the country are asking questions about how the academy can best fulfill its role in educating both previously included and excluded populations for a rapidly changing society (Smith, et al. 1997). With changing societal demographics, rapid globalization and inequities, many campuses have begun to determine the importance of educating all students for a diverse society. Essentially, the goals associated with liberal arts education are consistent with preparing students for a diverse society. The goals include providing students with a solid foundation for problem solving; helping students understand others and interact effectively; helping students examine their own assumptions and avoid being taken in by specious argument; helping students feel connected with others who have dealt with similar feelings or situations or problems; opening students’ eyes and minds to the fascinations of other cultures and experiences; providing a deeper sense of self and citizenship; and developing valued employees, responsible citizens, and effective leaders (Goldenberg, 2001).

Within the liberal arts environment, students are expected to seek out and synthesize relevant information, to analyze from many perspectives, to draw sound conclusions, and to solve problems successfully, while being guided and mentored by the faculty (Spanier, 2001).

Accordingly, faculty have had to examine their assumptions and roles relative to a multicultural campus and how interaction with students of color, communicates the importance of diversity to all students (Scisney-Matlock &
Matlock, 2001). Accordingly, the more diverse a classroom, the more opportunities faculty have to interact with students of color (Marin, 2000). Thus, the practice of cultural competence amongst faculty is both beneficial and necessary to promote the fundamentals of a liberal arts education.

**Background of the Problem**

Historically, the pursuit of education was not a reality for every citizen within the United States. On the contrary, access to higher education was permitted particularly for Anglo-Saxon men. Often these individuals were representative of the power elite. The power elite is “composed of men whose positions enable them to transcend the ordinary environments of ordinary men and women, in positions to make decisions having major consequences” (Mills, 1954, p. 4). “Higher education operated apparently for the sons of the wealthy and educated, who were on their way to positions in the professions” (Cohen & Brawer, 1997, p. 27).

Following the Civil War, persons of color were granted educational access albeit in segregated facilities. Accordingly, the Supreme Court ruled that segregation did not create a badge of inferiority if segregated facilities were equal and the law was reasonable (Spring, 1997). Hence, historically black colleges and universities emerged. The majority of historically black colleges and universities resulted from the Morrill Act of 1862, which enabled a system of higher education for every state (Johnson, as cited in Goodchild & Wechsler, 1989). Until the historic and controversial Supreme Court decision of Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka in 1954, persons of color had difficulty gaining
access to institutions that were historically White (Spring, 1997). In 1955, the Supreme Court issued its enforcement decree for the desegregation of schools. Nevertheless ensuring the desegregation of the vast numbers of segregated school districts was a major challenge. The Court lacked the machinery for supervising the proclamation. Consequently integration occurred at a slow pace until Civil Rights legislation in the early 1960s (Spring, 1997).

Title VI of the Higher Education Act of 1964 was a significant component of Civil Rights legislation. Title VI established the precedent for using disbursement of government money as a means of controlling educational policies. “It states that no person, on the basis of race, color or national origin can be excluded from or denied the benefits of any program receiving federal financial assistance, and it required all federal agencies to establish guidelines to implement this policy” (Spring, 1997, p. 99). As a result of federal legislation, intentional efforts toward school integration were mandated.

Following legislation that hoped to increase social equality, affirmative action emerged. Affirmative action refers to a set of policies designed to increase the participation of underrepresented groups in settings and positions traditionally dominated by privileged Whites (Kottak & Kozaitis, 1999). “As access to American colleges and universities increased with the advent of affirmative action, the expansion of public higher education, and the changing demographics of the United States, both the raw numbers and the proportion of racial minority students in higher education institutions similarly increased” (Andrew & Russo, 1989; Carter & Wilson, 1997, as cited in Smith, et al., 1997, p. 17). Currently
colleges and universities with affirmative action policies face increased legal and political challenges (Kottak & Kozaitis, 1999). As such, “open access and efforts to achieve equal opportunity are under attack from critics who view inclusionary practices as threats to the best traditions of U.S. higher education” (Rhodas & Valadez, 1996, p. 5).

The University of Michigan was sued by The Center for Individual Rights in Washington, DC in 1997 on behalf of White students claiming that efforts to increase campus diversity by admitting underrepresented populations, such as Black and Hispanic students with lower test scores and grades violated the Constitution. Consequently, this suit followed a similar one against the University of Texas and a referendum in California (Proposition 209) that ended racial preferences in admissions. The two states now forbidden to use race in university admissions are California and Texas (Kottack & Kozaitis, 1999).

Even in the face of debatable legal and political challenges regarding affirmative action policies, many campuses remain concerned about educating all students for a diverse society. This concern can perhaps be described as an institutional value – one from which all students might benefit, and one for which having students from diverse backgrounds is a genuine asset. University programming efforts seek to prevent students of color from experiencing campuses as isolating, hostile, and “chilly.” Yet reports have concluded that diversity education is a flawed process on many college campuses (McEwen, Roper, Bryant & Langa, 1990; Stage & Manning, 1992). Campuses institute multicultural affairs offices or provide a vehicle for students to form “awareness
organizations,” and develop committees/task forces to examine the overall campus climate for students of color; yet, classes or seminars specifically addressing issues experienced by persons of color are offered as an elective to the curriculum. Overwhelmingly, those of the minority population within the higher education environment represent the participation in most diversity programs. Further, predominantly white institutions reached out to students and faculty of color believing that the primary beneficiaries of the traditional education would be Caucasians. Only slowly did white educators begin to discover that there was as much to learn as to teach, and that white Americans also secured unexpected benefits from education in a multicultural environment (ACE, 2000).

Dawson (1987) and Walters (1996), define diversity as the bringing together of different groups working together, living together, and pursuing common goals. However, attaining diversity requires the establishment of university structures that facilitate opportunities for diverse groups to feel that they are an integral part of the total university. Infrastructures within the university should enable both majority and minority students to assume lead and follow roles as they engage in mainline social and academic activities in the university. Predominantly white institutions that fail to embrace the true spirit of diversity inhibit students of color from continuing until degree completion.

At a conference held in March of 1999, students, faculty, and administrators from the tri-campus community at Bryn Mawr, Haverford, and Swarthmore Colleges gathered together with a group of journalists to discuss the status of multiculturalism on college campuses. One of the panelists suggested
that part of the problem on many traditionally White campuses seems to be that the majority of students, faculty, and administrators are oblivious not only to what it means to be White, but to the extent to which their Whiteness dominates the campus culture, thereby making it uncomfortable for many people of color. The panelists further stated, “We need to understand the attendant privileges that come with White skin in this society before we can begin to truly understand what it is like for those who are outside of White culture,” (Rodriguez, Bennefield, & Fields, 1999, p. 20).

Indeed the increase of underrepresented students at PWIs has not resulted positively. In response, campuses institute multicultural affairs offices, or provide a vehicle for students to form “awareness organizations,” and develop committees/task forces to examine the overall campus climate. Additionally, certain classes or seminars specifically addressing issues experienced by persons outside of the dominant culture(s) are offered, yet as an elective. Further, several reports have concluded that diversity education is a flawed process on many college campuses (McEwen, Roper, Bryant, & Langa, 1990; Stage & Manning, 1992). Although minority support groups, orientation programs designed for students of color and mentoring by faculty and staff of color are perhaps effective in the beginning, they fall short of addressing the most complex institutional problems underlying multiculturalism. Specifically, (1) the programs assume that the students of color must adapt to the environment, thus placing the burden to change on students of color; (2) faculty and staff of color, who typically are outnumbered, overworked, and overwhelmed on predominantly white campuses
are being held responsible for the transition of students of color; and (3) the dominant culture do not largely participate in multicultural education (Stage & Manning, 1992).

A 1998 national opinion poll sponsored by the Ford Foundation’s Campus Diversity Initiative reports that over 90 percent of the public believe that diversity is important, and higher education should play an important role in promoting diversity (Smith & Schonfeld, 2000). Valuing diversity means understanding and accepting that other cultures might have a higher regard for certain behaviors, values and ways of interrelating than the dominant culture does. Assessing cultural perspectives and how they interact with those cultures enables organizations to choose policies and practices that minimize cross-cultural barriers. An awareness of the dynamics of cross-cultural interactions and the potential for misjudgment based on a service provider’s past experiences can decrease the frustration felt by both helper and client, or in the case of higher education, faculty member and student. “Institutionalization of cultural knowledge includes the development of mechanisms for determining what is culturally appropriate for specific populations that an organization or institution serves and for providing cross-cultural training and supervision of staff” (Hernandez & Isaacs, 1998, p.8). As the primary point of educational contact with students, faculty have a particularly important role to play in retention efforts, and more specifically, in creating an environment in which all members of a diverse academic community can learn from one another (Spanier, 2001). Therefore, becoming culturally competent can be conceptualized as part of a
developmental process that evolves over time. The concept of cultural competence enables organizations and individuals to assess and set goals as more effective services are provided to diverse individuals who seek assistance.

**Statement of the Problem**

Social integration is defined in the literature in five parts: (1) the degree and quality of peer relationships at an institution; (2) the degree and quality of student and faculty informal interactions outside of class; (3) the frequency of freshman year, non-class contacts with faculty; (4) opportunity for informal socializing; and (5) being able to talk about campus issues and problems (Astin, 1975; Beal & Noel, 1980; Pascarella, Duby & Iverson, 1983). In essence, social integration can be thought of as the extent to which students perceive themselves as being genuine members of a campus community. Thus, a significant portion of Tinto’s model encompasses interactions with faculty and staff and demonstrates the importance of cultural competency. The amount of student/faculty interaction affects whether the student feels a sense of ownership and belonging has developed.

Currently, cultural competency skills are not being taught on a wide scale basis for higher education faculty. Much research identifies strategies and issues concerning diversity and/or multiculturalism, but few seem to offer comprehensive models in providing assistance to students from culturally diverse backgrounds. One intriguing research finding is that when campuses are seriously committed to diversity issues - that is, when commitment to diversity is part of the educational mission and visible to students, educational outcomes like retention,
satisfaction and achievement are positively affected (Smith, 1997). Accordingly, the quality of responding effectively directly affects student progress. A closer examination of the factors that appear to have contributed to disengagement amongst students of color usually reveal barriers most often categorized as institutional, situational, or dispositional. For example, ignorance of students’ background is one of the greatest hindrances in the counselor-student relationship (Locke, 1998). The interactions between faculty and students must be comprehensive and yet specific enough to address the social, academic, and personal development needs of students (Astin, 1993; Tinto, 1993).

Accordingly, research and knowledge about other cultures and tolerance of human diversity have long appeared in descriptions of the knowledge, skills, and attitudes that college-educated people should possess (Bok, 1986, Bowen, 1977; Rosovsky, 1990). Thus, cultural competency is difficult to attain simply through participation in diversity workshops. In order to become more skilled, it is important that higher education faculty understand their own attitudes and beliefs, and how that predetermines their actions with members of their own cultural group compared to members of diverse groups. Such understanding is presented through the study of cultural competence.

The study of cultural competence has been very limited in the academic arena of higher education compared to mental health, social services and in student affairs. Authentic knowledge and understanding of cultural groups and concepts deconstruct the cultural assumptions that potentially hinder the faculty/student relationship, thus resulting in a helping process that is successful
and effective. As such, students interact with both administrators and faculty. A combined curricular and co curricular approach will not only be important and effective for learning in general, and the development of culturally competent higher education personnel, but also effective for developing more multiculturally competent students (Howard-Hamilton, Richardson & Shuford, 1998).

Recent data collected by the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) at UCLA support the view that faculty believe diversity is important but some feel that under prepared students are admitted in the name of diversity (Milem & Hakuta, 2000). The study also determined that faculty members state that departmental values about the importance of a diverse campus environment are held less strongly than institutional values. To the extent that a department has few if any students of color, it should be difficult for faculty to agree that diversity is a high priority. At the same time, as long as the needs of the few students of color are being met, the departments are strongly committed to enhancing the climate for all students.

Locke (1988) proposed that teachers do need to develop certain levels of cross-cultural awareness to be effective in teaching culturally different students. Additionally, Locke noted that skill in teaching culturally different students can be enhanced if teachers become aware of various elements of cross cultural interaction, and if teachers perceive students as individuals as well as members of cultural groups that differ from that of the teacher. Locke emphasized that when teachers are unaware of the culture of their students (and the overall impact of culture on teaching and learning), the interaction with students is more congruent
with the teacher’s culture than with the culture of the students. Wilkerson (1992) further articulated this notion:

“To bring these cultures into the classroom is to confront the ignominious as well as the glorious side of our history. Some faculty fear they will be unable to handle the inevitable conflict, anger, frustration, and confusion of heir students, as well as their own fear, anger, or feelings of guilt. “I am not prepared to be a social worker,” they cry: “I am a scholar and teacher!” This fear is very real and is, in fact, symptomatic of the profound challenge educators face in our times” (p. 61).

As the dissimilarities between the cultural backgrounds of teachers and students increase, the need to better understand the concerns that teachers bring to their work with diverse students will also increase (Marshall, 2001).

The development of cultural competence is an important concept to incorporate into the fabric of the university setting. Yet, instruments designed to measure this skill have not been extensively tested (King & Howard-Hamilton, 2000). Accordingly, there is not a depth of information on understanding cultural groups, particularly as this relates to the higher education environment. This understanding requires dialogue, which often produces anxiety and discomfort due to the nature of the topic. Open, honest conversation requires confronting self-awareness and biases about other cultures, is often painful, and is therefore difficult to occur. Further, the study of cultural competence in higher education has been limited to student affairs professionals. Being that the academic arena
concentrates its efforts primarily on subject matter, educating faculty regarding the importance of cultural competence may be challenging and not willingly received.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of the study was to examine the level of cultural sensitivity, and the exhibition of cultural competence for faculty at liberal arts institutions within higher education. The independent variables that were used in the study were: nationality/ethnic background, gender, age range, educational level, graduate professional preparation, work experiences, life experiences, cultural awareness, contact with persons from various cultures and location of formative years.

Cultural competency involves determining what strengths an individual draws upon when functioning in cross-cultural circumstances. It is defined as “a set of congruent behaviors, attitudes, and policies that come together in a system, agency or among professionals and enables that system, agency or those professionals to work effectively in cross cultural situations” (Cross, Bazron, Dennis & Isaacs, 1989, p. 13). Action is implied by the use of the term competence. Cultural competence therefore is an action-oriented concept. The implication is that all human service providers are capable of becoming culturally competent regardless of their ethnicity or socioeconomic status (Hernandez, 1998).

There is no formula or recipe for understanding a particular cultural group. Each individual is unique. Generalizations about beliefs and practices may be
used as a guide, yet they are not a substitute for individual assessment (DeSpelder, 1997). In order for one to become culturally competent, the individual must examine him or herself introspectively to determine the role that culture has played in his or her as well as his or her perception and/or actions. Skills for cultural competence can be learned. Culturally competent professionals recognize similarities and differences in the values, norms, questions, history and institutions of groups of people that vary by ethnicity, gender, religion, and sexual orientation. Culturally competent professionals recognize sources of comfort and discomfort between themselves and clients of similar or different cultural backgrounds. There is an understanding of biases toward or against certain cultural groups. Finally, there is reliance on scientific evidence and moral reasoning to work effectively in cross-cultural situations (Poole, 1998).

Questions that would shed enlightenment, clarification and understanding on the concept of cultural competence for faculty within higher education at liberal arts institutions include the following:

- What are the characteristics of an academic model of cultural competence?
  - In what ways has your graduate professional preparation contributed to your multicultural competence?
  - In what ways have your work experiences contributed to your multicultural competence?
  - In what ways have your other life experience contributed to your multicultural competence?
Please describe the amount and kind of contact you have had with people from cultural groups different than your own in collegiate settings.

Please describe the amount and kind of contact you have had with people from cultural groups different than your own outside collegiate settings.

Overall, how have these experiences (professional preparation, work and other life experiences, contact with people from other cultural groups) affected your understanding of multicultural competence?

How often do you think about your racial/ethnic background?

Please access your own level of multicultural competence.

Do faculty in any particular discipline demonstrate greater intercultural sensitivity, thereby greater potential for exercising cultural competence?

What is the difference between the perceived level of cultural sensitivity and the actual developmental level of cultural sensitivity for faculty?

Significance of the Study

This research will promote a necessary dialogue into understanding cultural sensitivity, thus cultural competence of faculty at institutions with a liberal arts foundation. Such initial efforts may assist in an atmosphere that fosters the progression and development of all students. Undoubtedly, this research may bring about the development of culturally responsive interventions.
within the higher education arena, thereby, ensuring equity for all students that the university community serves.

Many institutional factors affect whether a college or university creates successful communities where all students learn and develop. For example, counselors from dissimilar cultural environments are deprived of an understanding of basic assumptions, perceptions, motivation, nonverbal language, feelings, differences, basic needs, conflicts, cultural norms and patterns of behavior common to the cultures of students of color. Locke (1998) asserts that the differences existing between members of the dominant culture and members of ethnically diverse cultures are real. Locke further notes that counselors and educators must be aware of these differences and how they complicate interactions between themselves and their students and clients. It is complicated because those working with diverse students (i.e. faculty) must not only understand the rules, regulations, and academic requirements of the institution, but they must also understand the context of their students. The findings of the proposed research may additionally be generalized into other higher education environments that require effective working relationships between individuals from diverse cultures.

**Limitations of the Study**

Generalizations of the findings will be limited since the overall response rate was small in comparison to the number of surveys and questionnaires mailed, thereby impacting subgroups amongst the disciplines once divided. Furthermore, generalizations of the findings across institution types may be limited since this
study was conducted at liberal arts institutions. However, the population does encompass representation from a public, private and a single sex institution.

**Definitions of Concepts and Terms**

Cultural Competence is defined as “a set of congruent behaviors, attitudes, and policies that come together in a system, agency or among professionals and enables the system, agency or those professionals to work effectively in cross-cultural situations (Cross, Bazron, Dennis & Isaacs, 1989, p.13).

Culture is a shared pattern of learned behavior that is transmitted to others in a group (Pederson, 1994).

Deculturalization refers to the stripping away of a people’s culture and replacing it with a new culture (Spring, 1997, p.1).

Diversity is "otherness," or those human qualities that are different from our own and outside the groups to which we belong, yet are present in other individuals and groups. It is important to distinguish between the primary and secondary dimensions of diversity. Primary dimensions are the following: age, ethnicity, gender, physical abilities/qualities, race and sexual orientation. Secondary dimensions of diversity are those that can be changed, and include, but are not limited to: educational background, geographic location, income, marital status, military experience, parental status, religious beliefs, and work experiences (Diversity At UMCP: Moving Toward Community Plan 1995).

Enculturation is the social process by which culture is learned and transmitted across the generations (Kottak & Kozaitis, 1999, p.287).
Ethnicity is the identification with, and feeling part of, an ethnic group, and exclusion from certain other groups because of this affiliation (Kottak & Kozaitis, 1999, p. 287).

Multiculturalism is the view of cultural diversity in a country as something good and desirable; a multicultural society socializes individuals not only into the dominant culture but also into an ethnic culture (Kottak, & Kozaitis, 1999, p. 289).

Liberal arts education encompasses seeking knowledge for its own sake and disciplining the mind for preparation in a democratic society (Atkinson, 1997).

Student development is formal education designed to enhance the growth and development of individuals encountering life transitions. Its practice helps to explain the complexities of students’ behavior, change and growth (Creamer, et al., 1990).

CHAPTER II

Introduction

The development of culturally competent higher education faculty enhances the learning environment thereby making it conducive, supportive and representative of all its members. Research suggests that students are more effective in an environment that fosters relationships between students and faculty. Further, providing an environment where the role of culture is considered, respected and utilized in the development of college students both in
and outside the classroom, will undoubtedly prepare students to function more effectively in our diverse society.

**Concepts Relevant to Study**

**Culture**

Culture is defined through one’s beliefs and values. The beliefs are what one has to understand and accept. Values are passed down from generation to generation based upon beliefs. Combined, values and beliefs determine the rules for a particular culture. They become what is important and set the guidelines for how a specific culture lives, and define what is normal within their community, family and self. Hernandez and Issacs (1998) view culture as being “omnipresent,” but frequently invisible and particularly to those who are enmeshed within a particular culture. Additionally the authors note that when people fail to regard culture, therein lies potential for ethnocentric opinions, poor intercultural communication, and racist notions. Further studies reveal that the outcome of client success is much higher when culture is held with high regard in the planning and delivery of service. Therefore, the practice of cultural competence skills would be useful in the development of effective working relationships between higher education personnel and students.

The role of culture is a problem solving device and a technical tool that facilitates the helping process and should not be used as an impediment to it. The core of any group’s culture is “primarily a set of techniques for satisfying needs, for problem solving, and for adjusting to the external environment,” (Axelson in Leigh, 1998, p. 30). Culture is not synonymous with “race” or “ethnic group.”
Every society or group that shares and transmits behaviors to its members possesses a culture (Sue, et al., 1998). This behavior includes thoughts, communications, actions, customs, beliefs and values. These patterns may be explicit or implicit and are transmitted via socialization processes.

According to Cross (1995,1996), the argument is that all people are the same on the inside and therefore no accommodation to or understanding of culture is necessary. Indeed people share and require basic needs such as food, shelter and spirituality, yet culture determines the various approaches that people adopt in meeting these needs. Further the potential for lack of visibility with regard to culture often leads people to develop ethnocentric opinions, poor intercultural communication and racist notions (Hernandez, Isaacs, Nesman & Burns, 1998).

Culture is absorbed unconsciously. Cultural learning is based on the unique human capacity to use symbols. Culture is transmitted in society and across generations. Individual members of a given culture share many memories, beliefs, values, expectations, and ways of thinking and acting. Enculturalization unifies people by providing them with common experiences and knowledge (Kottak & Kozaitis, 1999). In an effort to better understand the notion of culture, it may be useful to examine its historical underpinnings.

The Impact of Deculturalization

“Deculturalization refers to the stripping away of a people’s culture and replacing it with a new culture” (Spring, 1997, p.1). The United States rejected the concept of unification to form a multicultural society. Instead, feelings of superiority held by the Protestant Anglo-Saxon culture permeated to produce
“manifest destiny.” This resulted in a justified faith in the superiority of 
Protestant Anglo American culture and U.S. political institutions (Spring, 1997).

History shows that this was the method used by the Anglo-Saxon culture 
after the conquests of the Native Americans. In the mid-1800’s, the 
Presbyterians, Baptists and Methodists believed that their work should begin with 
the conversion of the common full blood Indian. All three religious 
denominations emphasized the importance of changing traditional customs of 
Native Americans while teaching reading and writing. Simply on the notion of 
difference, an entire culture was rejected. Replacing the use of native languages 
with English, destroying Indian customs, and teaching allegiance to the U.S. 
government became the major educational policies of the U.S. government toward 
Native Americans during the latter part of the nineteenth century (Spring, 1997). 
The presumed cultural inferiority of Native Americans permitted the dominant 
culture to collectively practice the oppression of an entire culture.

Further history shows that deculturalization was the method used by 
plantation owners in the institution of slavery. The Anglo-Saxon culture felt it 
justifiable to enslave Negroes because they had not been exposed to Christianity. 
There began to evolve, therefore, the idea that it was the Negro who was the 
barbarian and the race needed the humanizing influences that contact with 
Western civilization would bring. From this point, it was not difficult to 
generalize that the Negro was fit subject for enslavement. Accordingly, by 
nature, temperament, pigmentation, and civilization – or the lack of it – the 
colonists reasoned the Negro’s natural lot was slavery (Franklin, 1967).
The idea of manifest destiny stifled relationships between “Anglos” and Mexican- Americans. In the minds of some White citizens, the United States was destined to rule the continent simply on the basis of its Protestant culture and replication form of governments. Contrary, Mexican Americans represented Catholicism and feudalism. The Mexican Americans were primarily of Spanish and Indian descent, a double jeopardy so to speak in the minds of the Anglo-Saxon culture (Spring, 1997).

Deculturalization continued to play a major role when one examines the fact that Asian Americans were the largest immigrant group affected by the Naturalization Act of 1790, which only allowed whites to become naturalized citizens. According to the Naturalization Act of 1790, the “Founding Fathers” of the United States clearly stated their intentions that the country would be primarily composed of a white population. Particularly this act denied land ownership to Asian immigrants, but moreover it denied U.S. citizenship to immigrants from Africa and Asia and Native Americans. Race was primarily defined according to skin color as interpreted by the U.S. Supreme Court (Spring, 1997).

The attempts of deculturalization were eventually countered in the 1950s and 1960s by the civil rights movement. The strong resistance to deculturalization during the civil rights movement highlights the difficulty within the educational environment. In the educational arena, the concept of separate but equal prevailed until the historic and controversial decision Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka in 1954. In 1955, the Supreme Court issued its enforcement
decree for the desegregation of schools. The desegregation of schools was the result of over a half-century of struggle. The decision however did not bring immediate results, because resistance to court-ordered desegregation was met at the state and local level very heavily (Spring, 1997).

The Impact of Affirmative Action

Affirmative action policy emerged as a result of the desegregation law. Its purpose was designed to give underrepresented members greater access to and support in higher education. On college campuses, affirmative action ideals are translated into combating racism and taking active steps to facilitate the recruitment, retention, and social acceptance of underrepresented populations (Ponterotto, 1990). These ideals were challenged however in the early 1990s citing preferential treatment and reversed discrimination, thereby making it further difficult to ensure equity and permissible to ignore the role of culture within the higher education environment. The legal challenges to affirmative action, which continue in a variety of contexts within higher education, create confusion and uncertainty for colleges and universities throughout the country. Statistics continue to show that members of groups of color (especially African Americans, Latinos and Native Americans) are underrepresented within student and faculty ranks throughout higher education, and significant barriers to equal access to higher education remain—such as disparities in elementary and secondary education opportunities based on the segregation of local school districts (Springer, 2001).
The controversy of affirmative action policies did however shed light and give attention to the need for programmatic efforts related to diversity and multiculturalism. Multiculturalism represents an opportunity to develop and implement a new vision of society in which power and participation are shared equally and broadly and in which there is appreciation for other perspectives and respect for groups different from one’s own in terms of membership, practice, process and values (Schoem, et al., 1993).

The Impact of White Privilege

Perhaps one major reason the concept of multiculturalism has been difficult to understand and welcome within the higher education environment is due to the notion of white privilege. The examination of American history perhaps provides insight as to the origins of white privilege. As a result, racism has hurt both persons of color and Whites alike. However, as Sue (as cited in Locke & Kiselica, 1999) argued, until Whites decide that racism is a salient and urgent issue that they should address on a daily basis, people of color will continue to battle the burden alone. The power of racism results in the inclusion or exclusion, the legitimization or the marginalization of certain individuals (Glauser, 1999). “Oppression, therefore, is not accidental or occasional and hence unavoidable; but instead, restrictive, and confining, producing paralyzing motion in any direction” (Frye, 1995, p. 39). White privilege is a hindrance, and provides a false sense of achievement, blinding the beneficiaries from the root causes of racism.
White privilege enables Whites to perpetuate thoughts and feelings in differential treatment between those who are White and those who are persons of color. “Thereby, darker skin implies more than pigmentation, it implies social inferiority. The visual cue, then, acts as an anchorage point to which all associations are tied” (Allport, 1979, p. 134). Therefore, if members of a group can be thought to have any distinctive sensory characteristics, these may serve as a “condensing rod” for all manner of thoughts and feelings about this group. Peggy McIntosh (1989) described various privileges she experienced frequently as a White person. McIntosh found that these conditions included structuring her home and work life to include people of her race; proof of her race’s contribution to society through educational materials and in print media; the ability to have her voice heard and her opinions be respected in public and private settings; the permission of ignorance about other cultures and their contributions to society; and, a positive reflection in her race in most environments.

Ignatiev (1996) acknowledges that white privilege manifests itself in all aspects of life, particularly in society’s most important institutions, including the criminal justice system, which defines criminals; the schools, which define excellence; and the labor market, which provides preferences for Whites. However, not all privileges are considered negative. On the contrary, there are privileges that should be inherent and experienced by all regardless of one’s skin color. However, the majority of privileges experienced by Whites have resulted in negative consequences for persons of color.
The oppressiveness of white privilege is unconscious. Rarely are persons schooled to see themselves as an oppressor, as an unfairly advantaged person, or as a participant in a damaged culture (McIntosh, 1989). A few conditions intensify obliviousness to unearned privilege. The first, albeit unconscious, is an anticipated benefit of the pervasive privileges to which one has become accustomed. As White people, all have access to white privilege at some level. That is, regardless of what socioeconomic level one observes, Whites are more advantaged than most people of color within the same socioeconomic level.

“White privilege is a benefit of being White and is the foundation of racism,” (Helms, 1992, p. 11).

Immigrants were permitted access to white privilege in exchange for abandoning or appearing to abandon their ethnic roots. The acceptance of whiteness requires White people to learn the rules, customs and principles of the White culture. If one acculturates or appears to do so in public, then one is assimilated or accepted into White environments. Therefore, “acculturation to White culture is a benefit of being White for White people” (Helms, 1992, p. 12). Ignatiev and Garvey (1996, p.10) suggest “the white race is a club that enrolls certain people at birth, without their consent, and brings them up according to its rules.”

Another condition that warrants obliviousness to white privilege is the inherent difficulty, shame in, and fear of admitting to the unearned properties of group membership (Robinson, 1999). Consequently, observations have revealed that White people have difficulty admitting their Whiteness. “When asked about
race, they may respond in terms of their nationality, American or a specific
ethnicity, such as Italian or Irish” (Helms, 1992, p. 11). McIntosh (1989) reveals
“layers of denial” which function to “protect,” “prevent,” and “veil” awareness
and facts of white privilege. In a non-exhaustive list, she presents forty-six “daily
ways” that she personally benefits from this privilege.

Marable (1994) articulates what is meant by this brand of politics:

“Those who benefit directly from these institutional arrangements
have historically been defined as ‘white’…And it is precisely here
within this structure of power and privilege that ‘national
identity’…is located. To be an ‘all-American’ is by definition, not
to be an Asian-American, Pacific-American, American Indian,
Latino, Arab-American, or African American.” At times,
recognition of white privilege does not appear to be a statement of
oblivion to White advantage, but rather a cooperation with what it
represents, and perhaps an acceptance of its rewards (p. 364).

The Impact of White Privilege on Persons of Color

The white privilege of universalizing its characteristics as the “proper
ways to be” has continuously undermined the efforts of persons of color in a
variety of realms. At times, such universal norms have produced self-loathing
among individual members of minority groups, as they internalize the oppression
of the white tradition. Invisible white norms in these cases alienate non-Whites to
the point that they sometimes come to live “outside themselves” (Kincheloe,
1999).
This confusion is an example of the essence of white privilege, allowing certain conditions to persist for some, but not all. Assumptions about who people are and are not create limitations that allow ethnocentric and racist ideas to flourish and permeate. For many persons of color, messages about racial superiority and inferiority permeated every step in their life. White privilege influences the way a person of color sees or does not see oneself, limits expectations of self and others like self. It results in an acceptance of mistreatment, and the belief of such mistreatment. As a result, people of color have come to “believe misinformation about their particular ethnic groups and thus believe that their mistreatment is justified” (Yamato, 1995, p. 73). If this misinformation is believed it is used as a yardstick against every person with the same outward biological features.

White Privilege in Higher Education

Privilege leads Whites to believe that success in the United States comes from learning the dominant culture’s values, and that everyone, including people of color, can earn a reasonable portion of the rewards through merit, and everyone can also earn respect (Locke & Kiselica, 1999). Inferring that submission to the majority culture results in merit awards and respect is a profound example of white privilege.

The word “diversity” means different things to different people. For example, for a student of color, diversity may be perceived only in terms of race and ethnicity while someone else may see it from the perspective of race, gender, geography, sexual orientation or religion. Therefore, a faculty member from the
majority culture on a campus may see the campus as very diverse, while an African American student might perceive a lack of diversity. Ultimately, every individual tends to “play out his or her definition of diversity” (Scisney-Matlock & Matlock, 1997). This speaks to the very core of why many White students, faculty and administrators on predominantly White campuses do not support or see a need for “diversity” programs or scholarly discussions on white privilege.

Assisting White students to view the impact of white privilege is not necessarily an easy task. “It is difficult to convince a working class White student of the ubiquity of white privilege when he or she is going to school, accumulating school debts, working at McDonalds for minimum wage, unable to get married because of financial stress, and holds little hope of upward socioeconomic mobility” (Kincheloe, 1999, p. 167). However, a starting point is mapping the ways privilege makes itself visible and invisible, manifests power, and shapes larger sociopolitical structures in relation to everyday life (Jackson, 1999). Often the bigger problem results in the lack of understanding of privilege on behalf of administrators, faculty, staff and the like who are interacting with students both in and outside the classroom.

In March of 1999, students, faculty, and administrators from the tri-campus community at Bryn Mawr, Haverford, and Swarthmore Colleges gathered together for a conference with a group of journalists to discuss the status of multiculturalism on college campuses. One of the panelists suggested that part of the problem on many traditionally White campuses seems to be that the majority of students, faculty, and administrators are oblivious not only to what it means to
be White, but to the extent to which their Whiteness dominates the campus culture. Such obliviousness produces discomfort for many people of color. The panelists further stated, “We need to understand the attendant privileges that come with White skin in this society before we can begin to truly understand what it is like for those who are outside of White culture” (Rodriguez, Bennefield, & Fields, 1999, p. 20). Teaching diversity content with an emphasis on institutionalized oppression and privilege often propels students onto a journey characterized by considerable anguish as they struggle with issues related to social injustice. Learning about oppression when one had previously experienced the world as a just place (Van Soest, 1996), or re-experiencing the pain of being treated differently based on one’s social identity can be depressing, infuriating, and immobilizing.

**Conceptual Framework**

*Working with Diverse Populations in Higher Education*

Many colleges and universities are striving to become places where diversity is apparent and the ideals of multiculturalism are celebrated. While many graduate student affairs preparation programs have been asked to better prepare their students to work with diverse populations of college students, the student affairs divisions across the country are not the only individuals who interact with students. Just as student affairs practitioners should be prepared to meet and embrace the challenges related to these demographic shifts in assisting a wide variety of college students with meeting their educational and personal goals.
(King & Howard-Hamilton, 2000) so should faculty and other administrative personnel within higher education.

Research indicates that frequent and meaningful contact with faculty members, especially contacts focusing on intellectual or career related issues, seems to increase students’ involvement and motivation (Frost, 1991). According to Mayo, Murguia and Padilla (1995) in a study that surveyed and analyzed the affect of social integration on academic performance among Mexican Americans, African Americans and Native Americans enrolled at a large predominantly White university, the most significant dimension of social integration that affected the academic success of African Americans was their relationship to faculty. Of the four groups surveyed, African American students appear to benefit the most from meeting with instructors outside of class for help or advice. These results are important, for they have the capacity to encourage persistence in college.

Further research on positive outcomes of college and on the diverse needs of students making up today’s student population suggests that a new look at advising is needed. Findings link academic advising directly and indirectly to contact between faculty and students and persistence in college. One essential way to encourage students in advising is to design programs that acknowledge their individual needs. Developmental advisers involve students in the advising relationship and demonstrate that circumstances surrounding individual differences, not stereotypical differences, define students’ needs (Frost, 1991).
The absence of “role models” also may make the path to higher education difficult for students of color. Williams’ (1990) study found that African American students indicated the absence of a role model as a reason for not pursuing higher education. Professors often have difficulty understanding the academic encouragement and directions that students of color seek, thus feel as though they are simply “lowering standards” in order to account for a multicultural campus. Each of these factors results in a genuine lack of cultural understanding of students on part of professors. A lack of cultural understanding on the part of the faculty may make the students skeptical of remaining enrolled (Rendon & Valadez, 1993).

The culture-specific values and experiences that students bring to the educational environment may significantly contribute to individual learning preferences. Students’ individual learning preferences are typically accompanied by culturally determined tools that influence the processing of information, and depending on the fit between teaching and learning styles, facilitate or hinder educational achievement (Sanchez in Aragon, 2000).

Over 20 years ago, Bowen (1977) listed human understanding as an educational outcome that a college-educated person should possess; he incorporated the “capacity for empathy, thoughtfulness, compassion, respect, tolerance, and cooperation toward others, including persons of different backgrounds.” The process of “meeting students where they are” involves a predetermination of students’ needs, issues and concerns prior to the extension of assistance. Many student development theorists and practitioners refer to the
concept of “support and challenge.” Support refers to structuring experiences so that they provide a degree of familiarity, or are “negotiable” with current abilities and resources. Challenge, on the other hand, refers to the presence of stress-producing (and potentially growth-producing) elements in the learning situation.

The literature suggests support is facilitative of a number of goals of the undergraduate experience, and when combined with an appropriate degree of challenge often promotes development (Creamer, 1990). Therefore, in order for development to occur one must fully understand how prior events have impacted the present situation at hand. Accordingly, culture is the sum total of life patterns passed from generation to generation within a group of people (Lum, 1998). Given the rapidly changing demographics, students of color will continue to arrive on campuses on their own steam (DeHart, 2000).

The Role of Cultural Competence

Cultural competence involves an awareness of one’s assumptions, values and biases. Much of its basis was founded in mental health, counseling and social work. Therefore much of the literature and research exists in those domains as opposed to education. As such, most teachers, counselors and mental health professionals have not been trained to work with other than mainstream individuals or groups. This is attributable to the fact that the historical origins of education, counseling/guidance and mental health have their roots in Euro-American or Western cultures (Sue & Sue, 1990; Wehrly, 1995). Accordingly the attainment of cultural competence must occur on a personal level, professional level and an institutional level (Toporek & Reza, 1994).
Cultural competence is not becoming a member of another culture by a wholesale adoption of another group’s values, attitudes, beliefs; customs or manners of speaking, dress, or behavior. Furthermore, cultural competence does not imply that individuals can be categorized into groups and that little variability within cultural groups exists. Rather, cultural identification incorporates many dimensions and is viewed as only one variable that guides an individuals’ life ways, not a total prescription for a way of life (Row, Behrens, & Leach, 1995). Finally, being culturally competent does not mean knowing everything about every culture. It is, instead, respect for difference, eagerness to learn, and a willingness to accept that there are many ways of viewing the world. The crux of intercultural sensitivity is attaining the ability to construe cultural difference in more complex ways (Hammer, Bennett & Wiseman, 2002).

**Cultural Competence and Persons of Color within Higher Education**

Persons of color are underrepresented among senior administrators and tenured faculty for many of the same reasons why they are underrepresented among students. A close examination of data reveals that whites and males are overrepresented at the higher ranks, and women and persons of color are (with the exception of the Asian American group) proportionally overrepresented at the lowest ranks. Hence, full professors and tenured faculty in general have significantly more power on campus, in terms of influencing administrative policy, selecting colleagues and admitting graduate students (Ponterotto, 1990). On the contrary, African Americans are underrepresented in administration and typically work in student affairs areas that do not have the same status of
academic affairs (Jackson, 2001). The literature further suggests that continuing education for all current personnel appears to be an important step in creating a more hospitable campus environment for underrepresented groups. Such may be accomplished through the practice of cultural competence.

One of the primary challenges of multicultural education is the need to recognize that the power of the dominant culture permeates our analytic frameworks and personal expectations, diminishes our critical awareness to examine the ways of people of all cultures view one another and themselves, and narrows our ability to think broadly and imaginatively (Schoem, et al., 1993). Ongoing commitment is required if cultural competence is to become an integral part of service delivery and policy development. This can happen only if individuals of all cultures who are policy makers, administrators, clients, service providers and advocates accept responsibility for becoming culturally competent (Spring, 1997).

Liberal Arts Education and the Relevancy of Cultural Competence

A liberal education encourages students to seek the affirmation of their most authentic selves. It acquaints students with the cultural achievements of the past and prepares them for the exigencies of an unforeseeable future. Liberal education is to teach the values of both social and individual responsibility (Freedman, 1997). Liberal education seeks to provide students with a solid foundation for problem solving and helping to understand how to interact effectively with others. With the assistance of faculty, students learn to develop their individual skills and much more. Astonishingly, employees are working
with a more diverse set of coworkers than in the past. Effectiveness in the workplace today requires communicating clearly and interacting with a demographically diverse set of coworkers (Goldenberg, 2001). Elements of problem solving and critical thinking encouraged within a liberal arts institution are at the very crux of the ability to be effective in cross cultural situation.

**The Importance of Faculty and Student Interaction**

Although most college students are advised about their courses of study, academic advising as a means of enhancing the positive outcomes of college is rarely explored. Research on positive outcomes of college and on the diverse needs of students link academic advising both directly and indirectly between faculty and students impact persistence. Research also indicates that frequent and meaningful contact with faculty members, especially contact focusing on intellectual or career related issues, seems to increase students’ involvement and motivation. Interactions between faculty and students must be comprehensive and yet specific enough to address the social, academic and personal development needs of students (Astin, 1993; Tinto, 1993). Creating an environment in which students of color can thrive is the responsibility of individual instructors (Szelenyi, 2001). For example, White faculty members, who remain in the majority in most community colleges, often emphasize the learning styles influenced by their cultural background (Townsend, 2000). Townsend suggested that an important step in overcoming these obstacles is to become aware of how culturally determined frameworks shape one’s attitudes toward teaching. It is the responsibility of all faculty to mentor all students, regardless of race or ethnicity.
Negative feelings can easily cause a student to feel marginalized and invalidated at critical time in their lives. One often hears students of color expressing the feeling that they don’t belong at their institution, and often cite their relationships with faculty (Scisney-Matlock & Matlock, 2001).

Faculty and Cultural Competence

The process of achieving the goal of cultural competence is difficult and perplexing for the individuals attempting to implement multiculturalism on their campus, in part because the term multiculturalism means different things to different people. Accordingly, faculty, staff and administrators must agree on a common language and define what multiculturalism means for their particular campus (King & Howard-Hamilton, 2000).

Organizations that are culturally competent incorporate five essential elements at all levels of functioning: (1) valuing diversity; (2) cultural self-assessment; (3) cross-cultural dynamics; (4) institutionalization of cultural knowledge; and (5) adaptation to diversity (Cross et al., 1989). Any organization working in a community comprising people of diverse cultural backgrounds needs to understand the varieties of learned or acquired behaviors, beliefs, attitudes, and assumptions within the various cultural groups within its area of influence.

Although many colleges and universities have taken an increasingly active role in helping foster an appreciation for diversity among members of their communities over the last 20 years, there remains an increase in the number of hostile acts toward persons of color. Faculty, therefore have an opportunity to have an impact on student behavior and attitudes (Milem & Astin, 1993). Further,
it is no small task that faculty, in addition to being prepared to teach core
curriculum, will increasingly need to develop skills for adapting to diverse
classrooms and responding to diverse content that spontaneously emerges in the
classroom. Expectations are increasing for faculty not only to be sensitive to
issues of gender, race, ethnicity, and multiculturalism, regardless of their
academic specialization, but also to treat these issues as part of their teaching
responsibilities (Weinstein & Obear, 1992). For students, faculty members
represent a tremendous intellectual and experiential resource (Scisney-Matlock &
Matlock, 2001). Teaching and learning about cultural diversity integrated with
issues of societal oppression is a hot topic and critical classroom incidents are
inevitable. Faculty can be supported by engaging in practices such as critical
incident debriefing processes with other faculty, self-assessment of their own
sensitivity to diverse populations, related oppressions, and the development of
unique skills to meet the multiple demands (Garcia & Soest, 2000).

Review of Related Research and Literature

Cultural Competence Continuum

Although culture is often described in static terms, understanding it as an
ever-changing variable is important to becoming culturally competent. The
definition of cultural competence exists within a continuum from low to high in
the achievement of competence. Cross and colleagues (1989) described six points
along the cultural competence continuum and the characteristics that an individual
might exhibit at each level of the continuum. The application of the cultural
competence continuum is useful in the examination of the acquisition of skills
within the higher education arena for faculty. Cross and colleagues (1989) continuum is described in the paragraphs to follow.

*Cultural destructiveness* represents the most negative end of the continuum, which encompasses attitudes, policies and practices that are destructive to cultures and to the individuals within those cultures. A system that practices cultural destructiveness assumes that one race or culture is superior and should eradicate or control “lesser” races because of their perceived inferior position. Bigotry allows dominant groups to disenfranchise, control, exploit, or systematically destroy less powerful populations.

*Cultural incapacity* does not intentionally or consciously seek to be culturally destructive, yet the capacity to help people and communities of color is missing. At this position along the continuum, the agency or individual remains extremely biased, believes in the racial superiority of the dominant group, and assumes a paternalistic posture toward the perceived lesser races and cultures. These agencies or individuals may disproportionately apply resources and discriminate against people of color. Other characteristics include discriminatory hiring practices, subtle messages to people of color that they are not valued or welcomed, and generally lower expectations for clients from communities of color.

*Cultural blindness* is at the midpoint of the cultural competence continuum, a system in which its agencies or an individual has expressed the belief of being unbiased as an organization or as an individual. The philosophy that ethnicity, race or culture makes no difference and that all people are the same
characterizes cultural blindness. Culturally blind agencies or individuals are characterized by utilizing approaches traditionally used by the dominant culture because those approaches are believed to be universally applicable. Culturally blind agencies suffer from a lack of information and often are not aware of the avenues through which they can obtain needed information. Although these agencies often view themselves as unbiased and responsive to the needs of persons of color, their ethnocentrism is reflected in attitudes, policies and practices.

*Cultural precompetence* is represented toward the positive end of the continuum. The precompetent agency or individual realizes that it has weaknesses in serving persons of color and attempts to improve some aspects of its services to specific populations. Precompetent agencies are characterized by the desire to deliver high-quality, culturally relevant services. However, a danger as this point along the continuum is either a false sense of accomplishment or failure with regard to a service approach that prevents the agency from moving forward along the continuum. These agencies may believe that the accomplishment of one culturally competent goal or activity fulfills their obligation to communities of color or that an initial failure means that the whole approach is not practical.

*Basic cultural competence* is characterized by acceptance of and respect for difference, continuing self-assessment regarding culture, careful attention to the dynamics of difference, continuous expansion of cultural knowledge and resources, and adaptation of their service models in order to better meet the needs
of communities of color. Within the organization or individual that posses basic cultural competence, there is ongoing dialogue and input from communities of color with the culturally competent agency at all levels of the organization and an external network with other formal and informal support from the communities that they serve.

Advanced cultural competence is at the most positive end of the continuum. Agencies and individuals at this point hold cultures in high esteem. The advanced culturally competent agency seeks to add to the knowledge base of culturally competent practice by developing new approaches that adapt to cultural differences, evaluating and disseminating the results of demonstration projects for examination and feedback from stakeholders, and experimenting with changes in its organizational structures that support the cultural values and beliefs of the people they serve.

Green (as cited in Lynch & Hanson, 1998) describes cultural competence as being

“able to conduct one’s professional work in a way that is congruent with the behavior and expectations that members of a distinctive culture recognize as appropriate among themselves.” It includes 1) an awareness of one’s own cultural limitations; 2) openness, appreciation, and respect for cultural differences; 3) a view of intercultural interactions as learning opportunities; 4) the ability to use cultural resources in interventions; and 5) an acknowledgement of the integrity and value of all cultures” (p. 492).
The process of reflection, debate and exploration in regard to cultural competency is occurring on many campuses. Faculty members across the nation are, in a serious and scholarly manner, struggling to reshape the content and practice of their classroom teaching to expand the horizons of knowledge for all students in a way that reflects the diversity that exists (Schoem, et al., 1993). Similar questions have been asked regarding the cultural competencies that student affairs staff members should demonstrate (Talbot & Kocarek, 1997). Pope and Reynolds (1997) developed a list of 33 cultural competencies for student affairs practitioners based on a review of the multicultural literature in higher education and counseling psychology.

### Characteristics of a Multiculturally Competent Student Affairs Practitioner

#### Multicultural Awareness
- Awareness and value of one’s own cultural heritage
- A belief that differences are valuable and no one group in better than another
- A willingness to take risks
- A belief that discrimination due to one’s cultural status is unjust
- A willingness to examine and change one’s own cultural values
- An acceptance of other world views and perspectives
- A belief that meaningful relationships are possible across cultures
- An awareness of how one’s behavior affects others
- A belief that assumptions about an individual cannot be based solely on one’s group membership
- A belief that cross cultural interactions enhance the quality of life

#### Multicultural Knowledge
- Knowledge of self as it relates to one’s cultural identity
- Knowledge of other cultures and how they are similar or different from one’s own cultural group
- Knowledge about how change occurs for individual values and behaviors
- Knowledge about the ways that cultural differences affect communication
- Knowledge about the how gender, class, race, ethnicity, language, nationality, sexual orientation, age, religion or spirituality, disability, and ability affect individuals and their experiences
• Information about culturally appropriate resources and how to make referrals

**Multicultural Skills**
• Ability to identify and openly discuss cultural differences and issues
• Ability to effectively communicate across cultural differences
• Capability to empathize and genuinely connect with individuals who are culturally different
• Ability to incorporate new learning and prior learning in new situations
• Ability to gain the trust and respect of individuals who are culturally different
• Capability to accurately assess their own multicultural skills
• Ability to differentiate between individual difference, cultural differences, and universal similarities
• Ability to challenge acts of discrimination

The aforementioned characteristics in the three specific categories assist student affairs professionals understand the range of behaviors and attitudes essential for multicultural competence (Pope & Reynolds, 1997). However, a practitioner or educator does not have to master the abilities in one category before moving to the next. Pope & Reynolds believe that multicultural awareness consists of attitudes, beliefs, values, assumptions and self-awareness necessary to serve students who are culturally different from oneself (Howard-Hamilton, 2000).

With this understanding, educators across campus can work together to help students develop these competencies in both curricular and co-curricular settings (King & Howard-Hamilton, 2000). The academic and administrative units cannot function in isolation from each other in the implementation of cultural competence. Thus, “if institutions are to work from a holistic perspective, then there must be some agreement on what outcomes they hope students will achieve as well as what knowledge, skills, and attitudes a college-
Addressing the Needs of Diverse Students

Few college teachers have been trained to manage or treat bias in the classroom. When an attempt is made to weave such issues into courses as a matter of personal choice or as the result of questions stemming from greater student diversity, some will experience something similar to what in the international cross-cultural situation is known as culture shock. Zaharna (as cited in Weinstein & Obear, 1992) argues:

“when “sojourners” enter a new, unfamiliar culture they often find that their usual behaviors meet with atypical responses. Culture shock stimulates self-doubt and confusion and results in self-shock, which is essentially a challenge to one’s core self image. The more representative the instructor is of the socially privileged members of our society, the more probable that he or she will feel like a sojourner in this teaching situation” (p. 40).

Students represent broad demographic categories and exhibit variations in cognitive skills, learning styles, communication patterns, motivational styles and psychological characteristics. At the center of such diversity is an instructor who may possess a high degree of expertise in an academic discipline, but may not be as skilled at promoting an effective alliance among learners or between learners and him or herself (Anderson, 1999). For example, Irvine (1990) identified substantive differences between the responses and interaction patterns of Black
students and White students. The research suggested the teachers’ initiating behaviors and reactions to student behaviors differ when working with Black students, as compared to working with White students. Generally, teachers’ responses (regardless of the race of the teacher) favor or affirm White students and disaffirm Black students. Irvine attributed these conflicting teacher behaviors and results to teachers’ unfamiliarity with the cultural style patterns of their Black students (as cited in Marshall, 2000).

**Multicultural Teaching Concerns Survey**

In an effort to address such differences, Marshall (2001) explored the nature of teacher concerns about working with culturally different students. The primary questions for the study were:

1. Do concerns about teaching culturally different students reflect the prevailing self/task/impact concerns conceptualization?
2. Do concerns about teaching culturally different students reveal unique features that have potential to inform the practice of multicultural teacher education?

*The Multicultural Teaching Concerns Survey (MTCS)* was designed to assess the intensity of concerns about working with diverse student populations across four categories, one being Interpersonal Competence. The population surveyed was both students in their first education course and experienced teachers serving as practicum instructors. The cross-cultural competence items implied two overarching questions: What do culturally diverse students think of me and what do I think of culturally diverse students? Teachers expressed concerns about their
ability to judge students fairly without regard to cultural background, and to be judged fairly by students without regard to cultural background. Chiefly, the items through factor analysis suggest that teachers who work with culturally diverse students have concerns about their ability to relate to these students (Marshall, 2001). Movement towards cultural competence requires drawing oneself out of traditional boundaries in order to recognize a student’s world as it is, not how one in the faculty position would wish for it to be, or most especially, how one thinks it was, and is no longer (Harris, 2000).

Racism in the Classroom

Twenty-five university faculty colleagues from different disciplines gathered to discuss the handling of racism issues in their undergraduate classes. Weinstein & Obear (1992) posed the question “What makes you nervous about raising issues of racism in your classroom?” The responses were grouped into the following headings:

1. Confronting my own social and cultural identity conflicts:
   - Having to become more aware of my own attitudes regarding my group memberships and identifications.
   - Feeling guilty, ashamed or embarrassed for behaviors and attitudes of members of my own group.
2. Having to confront or being confronted with my own bias:
   - Being labeled racist, sexist, and so on
   - Finding prejudice within myself
   - Romanticizing the targeted group
   - Having to question my own assumptions
   - Having to be corrected by members of the targeted group
   - Having to face my own fears of the targeted group
3. Responding to biased comments:
   - Responding to biased comments from the targeted group
   - Hearing biased comments from dominant members while targeted members are present
   - Responding to biased remarks from members of my own social group
4. Doubts and ambivalence about my own competency:
Having to expose my own struggles with the issue
Not knowing the latest “politically correct” language
Feeling uncertain about what I am saying
Feeling that I will never unravel the complexities of the issue
Being told by a student that I don’t know what I’m talking about
Making a mistake

5. Need for learner approval:
   Making students frustrated, frightened, or angry
   Leaving my students shaken and confused and not being able to fix it

6. Handling intense emotions; losing control:
   Not knowing how to respond to angry comments
   Having discussion blow up
   Having anger directed at me
   Being overwhelmed by strong emotions engendered by the discussion
   Feeling strong emotions being stimulated in myself

Student-Professor Interactions

Research on student-professor interactions suggests that professors tend to hold differing expectations for students based on prior achievement, physical attractiveness, gender, socioeconomic status, race and ethnicity. Such differing expectations of students lead to differential treatment in the classroom, which becomes more exaggerated as students become more diverse. Anderson (1999) suggests

“Few faculty are aware of the well-documented teaching strategies that promote an equitable learning environment in the classroom. In such equitable classroom settings, incidents of tension and discomfort are minimized. Any institution could incorporate initiatives as a hedge against potential classroom conflicts” (p. 70).

The call then for multiculturalism is dependent upon faculty acceptance and implementation. Given the emphasis on multiculturalism, college faculty must
become aware of the ways in which the traditional classroom culture excludes or constrains learning for some students and learn how to create environments that acknowledge the cultural diversity that new students bring (Adams, 1992). From an educational perspective, cultural competency may be understood as the development of academic and professional expertise and skills in the area of working with culturally diverse individuals. The application of cultural competence is not as salient in academic affairs as in other areas of the academy. It is useful therefore to examine the underpinnings of cultural competence in various disciplines.

Cultural Competence in Mental Health

Historically, children, adolescents and families of color have been unserved, underserved, or inappropriately served by most public and private sector human services systems within the United States. When programs that support personal growth and development fail to serve children and adolescents of color, the result is a self-perpetuating cycle of relying on programs that are based on social control. Further, when youth are not served appropriately by mental health professionals either because of lack of services or because services have been designed based on the majority culture’s perspective (Hernandez, Isaacs, Nesman & Burns, 1998) the cycle continues to spiral downward.

In the 1990s, the concept of cultural competence in service delivery systems became a major component of most federal and state system reform initiatives focused on children and families. For example, cultural competence has been viewed as a core principle of mental health system of care development
under the Child and Adolescent Service System Program, a child mental health initiative funded by the National Institute of Mental Health. However, despite the infusion of cultural competence as a concept into state policies, planning activities, and service delivery practices, implementation of service modifications has proved to be difficult and slow moving (Stroul, 1993).

**Cultural Competence in Social Work**

In the field of social work, there has been an emphasis on understanding of and sensitivity to ethnic and cultural differences within the context of oppression of and racism toward people of color. The culture of the client is an important factor in his or her psychosocial well being (Lum, 1999). A starting point is the fostering of cultural self-awareness. The social worker becomes culturally effective with the client when the worker develops cultural awareness through exploration of his or her own ethnic identity, cultural background, and contact with ethnic others. Next the social worker must develop a knowledge acquisition perspective and a set of skills in order to work with multicultural clients. Skill development applies knowledge acquisition to actual practice with clients from a culturally competent perspective. Finally, cultural competency must constantly uncover new facts about multicultural clients through an inductive learning process.

The social worker attempts to establish a relationship that will enable the person from a contrasting culture to experience acceptance and understanding as a necessary but not always sufficient condition of being helped (Leigh, 1998).
Leigh further explains the paradigm shift from the client being the stranger in the helping relationship to that of the social worker:

“The social worker has the responsibility to learn about the other cultures first by crossing the cultural boundaries if an effective relationship is to be established. The social worker takes on the role of stranger, and the client becomes the cultural guide and teacher of his or her own culture. Common ground must be established, and it is the social worker that must make the first effort to achieve common ground” (p. 39).

**Cultural Competence in Counselor Education**

The counseling profession defines competence by the ability to work with diverse clients. The overwhelming majority of instruments designed to measure competence are based on the conceptual framework outlined in the American Psychological Association (APA) counseling guidelines authored by Sue, Arredondo & McDavis (1992). During this time the Association for Multicultural Counseling and Development devised a framework of cultural competencies in an effort to train “culturally competent counselors.”

Sue & Sue (1990) identified three characteristics related to the ideal culturally competent counselor: (1) a culturally skilled counselor is one who is actively in the process of becoming aware or her own values, biases, preconceived notions, personal limitations, assumptions about human behavior, and so forth; (2) a culturally skilled counselor is one who actively attempts to understand the world view of his or her culturally different client without negative judgments; and (3) a culturally skilled counselor is one who is in the process of actively developing
and practicing appropriate, relevant, and sensitive interventions strategies and skills in working with his or her culturally different clients. Sue, Arrendondo and McDavis (1992) furthered the characteristics of the culturally competent counselor with the three dimensions of cultural competency: (1) beliefs and attitudes about racial and ethnic individuals that facilitate effective cross cultural counseling, plus a positive orientation toward multiculturalism; (2) knowledge and understanding of his or her own world view, cultural groups, and sociopolitical influences and (3) intervention techniques and strategy skills in working with persons of color.

The Dimensions of Personal Identity Model

One method that can be used as a paradigm to see people more completely, as well as an educational tool is the Dimensions of Personal Identity Model. It provides a reference point for recognizing the complexity of all persons. The three-dimension model highlights different identity-based affiliations, memberships, and subcultures (Arrendondo, Toporek, Brown, Jones, Locke, Sanchez & Stadler, 1996). The “A” dimension is a listing of characteristics that serve as a profile for all people (age, culture, ethnicity, gender, language, physical disability, race, sexual orientation and social class). Accordingly the “A” characteristics are more visible and requires that the culturally competent individual view the person holistically, rather than the individual’s sole characteristics. The “C” dimension is comprised of historical moments. It’s grounding is in historical, political, sociocultural and economic contexts which affect one’s personal culture and experiences. Accordingly, the
“B” dimension is comprised of educational background, geographic location, income, marital status, religion, work experience, citizenship status, military experience and hobbies/recreational interests. What occurs to individuals relative to their B dimension in influenced by some of the characteristics in the A dimension and the major legacies of the C dimension. From an institutional perspective, the PDI model can assist leaders to become more aware of how the culture of their organization may alienate, marginalize or lose people of color, if cultural competency is not valued and practiced (Arrendondo, Toporek, Brown, Jones, Locke, Sanchez & Stadler, 1996).

Instruments Measuring Cultural Competence

The majority of the instruments developed to measure cultural competence exist for the counseling profession. Various instruments include but are not limited to: (1) Cross Cultural Inventory (LaFromboise, Coleman & Hernandez, 1991); (2) Multicultural Counseling Awareness Scale (Ponterotto, et al., 1996); (3) Multicultural Counseling Inventory (Sodowsky, et al., 1994); (4) Multicultural Awareness, Knowledge and Skills Survey (D’Andrea, Daniels & Heck, 1991); and (5) Multicultural Competence in Student Affairs (Pope & Reynolds, 1997). These instruments do not lend themselves to faculty from varied disciplines working with diverse students. There is further debated about whether diversity encompasses competence or vice versa. Upon closer examination, cultural competence goes beyond understanding and valuing cultural differences in the work force by focusing on fundamental shifts in organizational structures, policies, attitudes and practices (Cross, et al., 1989).
For students of color, who at times perceive the campus environment as hostile and unfriendly, barriers to their successful navigation of the system can hinder both academic performance and overall satisfaction with their experiences. Resourcefulness often has more to do with pointing students in the right direction and helping them find others who can facilitate their successful transition through the college years (Scisney-Matlock & Matlock, 2001).

Summary

Overall, the literature suggests that understanding culture and historical underpinnings can assist leaders to become more aware of how the culture of their organization may alienate, marginalize or lose people of color if cultural competence is not valued or practiced (Arrendondo et al., 1996). Diverse peoples have identifiable cultures that influence expected behaviors of members of that culture and diverse cultures influence the general climate of the institution (Lee, 1998). Therefore, the relationship between culture and climate is an important one because it sets the stage for future progress toward diversity in higher education (Lee, 2002).

Perhaps the most subtle and alienating phenomenon is that most American students attend traditional public schools and have similar classroom experiences, yet many nonmainstream students experience the college and university culture as very different from their respective home community cultures (Collett & Serrano, 1992). What then are the implications for administrators, faculty, teaching assistants, faculty developers and students of bringing multiculturalism to the fore of the postsecondary endeavor? Border and Chism (1992) contend that
administrators at all institutions can determine reward structures that continue to support and maintain an openness to change and experimentation, encourage the re-tooling of their faculties as well as the transformation of departmental curricula, and provide effective support systems for undergraduates.

“Instructors are then challenged to examine their individual teaching styles – taking their own inadvertent bias into consideration – to expand their breadth of their knowledge of the diverse cultures represented in their student bodies and to question the depth and breadth of knowledge of their own disciplines. Professors and teaching assistants also are asked to explore the current research on student interactions and student success as it relates to teacher behaviors and student learning” (p. 104).

As instructors broaden their repertoire of skills, greater numbers of students, both majority and underrepresented students will benefit from an enriched experience (Anderson & Adams, 1992).
CHAPTER III

Research Methodology of the Study

Introduction

The purpose of this study is the examination of cultural sensitivity and the exhibition of cultural competency by faculty at liberal arts institutions within higher education. The independent variables that were used in the study were: nationality/ethnic background, gender, age range, educational level, graduate professional preparation, work experiences, life experiences, cultural awareness, contact with persons from various cultures and location of formative years. As its foundation, this study employed the Intercultural Development Inventory (Bennett & Hammer, 1993) and the Multicultural Competency Questionnaire (King & Howard-Hamilton, 2001). The research methodology is described in five sections: 1) research design, 2) population, 3) instrumentation, 4) data collection and 5) data analysis. The following research questions were addressed:

• Research Question 1: What are the characteristics of an academic model of cultural competence? Developed from the responses to the following questions:
  • In what ways has your graduate professional preparation contributed to your multicultural competence?
  • In what ways have your work experiences contributed to your multicultural competence?
  • In what ways have your other life experience contributed to your multicultural competence?
• Please describe the amount and kind of contact you have had with people from cultural groups different than your own in collegiate settings.
• Please describe the amount and kind of contact you have had with people from cultural groups different than your own outside collegiate settings.
• Overall, how have these experiences (professional preparation, work and other life experiences, contact with people from other cultural groups) affected your understanding of multicultural competence?
• How often do you think about your racial/ethnic background?
• Please access your own level of multicultural competence.

• Research Question 2: Do faculty in any particular discipline demonstrate greater intercultural sensitivity, thereby greater potential for exercising cultural competence?
• Research Question 3: What is the difference between the perceived level of cultural sensitivity and the actual developmental level of cultural sensitivity for faculty?

**Research Design**

A combined quantitative descriptive research approach and qualitative approach was utilized in the collection and analysis of data. Descriptive research, which involves making careful descriptions of educational phenomena, was utilized for the Intercultural Development Inventory. A qualitative approach was
utilized in conjunction with the Multicultural Competency Questionnaire.

Content analysis is “a research technique for the objective, systematic, and quantitative description of the manifest content of communication” (Gall, Borg & Gall, 1996, p. 357).

**Population**

The population for the study was comprised of faculty across disciplines at three liberal arts institutions. The first institution in the study was Meredith College, the largest women’s institution in Southeast located in Raleigh, North Carolina. The second institution in the study was the University of North Carolina at Asheville, a coed public institution located in the mountains in the western region of the state. Both Meredith College and the University of North Carolina at Asheville are predominantly white institutions. The final institution in the study was Dillard University, a coed historically Black university, located in New Orleans, Louisiana.

Initially, upper level academic affairs administrators at the selected institutions were contacted for professional advice on obtaining the names of full time faculty members at each institution. As a result of the contact, a list from each institution detailing the faculty’s name and discipline/department area was provided to the researcher. A total of 137 faculty from Meredith College, 210 faculty from the University of North Carolina at Asheville and 118 faculty from Dillard University were selected as the population for the study. Four hundred and sixty-five (n = 465) IDI surveys and Multicultural Competency Questionnaires were mailed to 234 women and 231 men at the three liberal arts institutions.
institutions. The overall response rate was 27%. The n value fluctuated as a result of missing data.

**Instrumentation**

**Intercultural Development Inventory**

The study employed the usage of the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) and the Multicultural Competency Questionnaire. The foundation of the Multicultural Competency Questionnaire is presented further in this chapter. The IDI (Bennett & Hammer, 1993) is based on the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (Bennett, 1986). Bennett’s *Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity* (DMIS) captures cultural elements and provides a theory based explanation for the varying degrees of individual and organizational effectiveness one observes in intercultural endeavors. It is based on a model of cognitive development relevant to personal construct theory and as such requires self-awareness as a prerequisite for advancing through the developmental stages (Greenholtz, 2000). The DMIS assumes that construing cultural difference can become an active part of one’s worldview, eventuating in an expanded understanding of one’s own and other cultures and an increased competence in intercultural relations (Hammer, Bennett & Wiseman, 2002).

The first three (of the six) stages in the DMIS are “ethnocentric,” which dictates that one’s own culture is experienced as central to reality, with other cultures measured against one’s own and, as a result, found to lack substance or significance. The latter three stages are “ethnorelative” and are based on the realization that one’s own culture is merely a representation of one of many equally valid worldviews.
The “ethnocentric” stages are:

- Denial: the reality of other cultures is either not perceived at all or is denied by the erection of psychological or physical barriers to contact.
- Defense: The existence of cultural difference is acknowledged, but other cultures are denigrated as being inferior in comparison with one’s own.
- Minimization: One’s own culture is viewed as being universal, with apparent cultural differences explained as cosmetic, surface variations.

The “ethnorelative” stages are:

- Acceptance: Other cultures are accepted as complex and valid alternative representations of reality.
- Adaptation: One becomes sufficiently comfortable with cultural difference to shift in and out of alternative viewpoints.
- Integration: One’s experience of self expands to include the worldviews of other cultures.

The DMIS has been induced from Bennett’s intensive observation of empirical data over a twenty-year span on the ways in which people confront cultural difference and the predictable changes and patterns that emerge as their experience of cultural difference becomes more sophisticated (Greenholtz, 2000).

The Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) is a 50 item, paper and pencil, self-assessment inventory that empirically measures five orientations toward cultural difference based on Milton Bennett’s (1986, 1993) Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS). The IDI focuses on how individuals interpret their world in terms of dealing with cultural differences between
themselves and people from other social/cultural groups (Hammer, in Fowler & Mumford, 1999).

The Denial scale measures the most basic form of ethnocentrism and reflects an orientation that assumes no real differences between people from different cultures. The Defense Scale measures a form of ethnocentrism that refers to a more explicit recognition of difference coupled with more overt attempts at erecting defenses against them. Differences are considered to be threatening at this stage. A variation of Defense is the Reversal scale, where an adopted culture is experienced as superior to the culture of one’s primary socialization. Reversal is like Defense in that it maintains a polarized, “us and them” worldview. The final stage of ethnocentric orientations is the Minimization scale, in which elements of one’s own cultural worldview are experienced as universal and efforts to over generalize similarities between self and other. This behavior often results in trivializing cultural differences that are valid (Hammer, in Mumford & Fowler, 1999).

The first of three ethnorelative orientations is the Acceptance scale, which involves a fundamental acknowledgement that differences are important; they do exist and should be respected. The second, the Adaptation scale measures an individual’s deeper understanding of other cultural values and practices from the perspective of the other culture, as well as an ability to evaluate situations from different cultural viewpoints. The final ethnorelative orientation is the Integration scale in which one’s experience of self is expanded to include the movement in and out of different cultural worldviews. One form of Integration is measured in
this stage as Encapsulated Marginality, which indicates a worldview that incorporates a multicultural identity with confused cultural perspectives (Hammer, in Mumford & Fowler, 1999).

Reviewed by a panel of cross-cultural experts, the IDI through statistical analyses (factor analysis, reliability analysis, correlation analysis), is a robust measure of intercultural sensitivity, which is generalizable not only across cultural groups, but also across gender and social status differences (Hammer, in Fowler & Mumford, 1999). DeVellis (1991) recommends that a scales’ reliability should be .70 or higher. The five factors of the IDI, denial/defense, reversal, minimization, acceptance/adaptation and encapsulated marginality were examined for the purposes of establishing reliability. The reliability results were: DD scale (14 items, alpha = .85), R scale (9 items, alpha = .80), M scale (10 items, alpha = .85), AA scale (14 items, alpha = .84) and EM scale (5 items, alpha = .80) (Hammer, Bennett & Wiseman, 2002).

Content validity was addressed through in-depth interviews conducted with persons from a variety of cultures. Construct validity of the IDI was examined by the scores for the five factors in comparison with the theoretically related variables of Worldmindedness and Intercultural Anxiety. Finally the DD, R, M and AA scale scores were incorporated into a formula that produced a standardized (z score) “total IDI score” with a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 15 (Hammer, Bennett & Wiseman, 2002). The scale scores are also presented with detailed information to determine where the respondent is in terms of resolving issues associated with a particular scale.
When interpreting the Intercultural Development Inventory, the respondents are provided with three profiles consisting of resolved issues, transition issues and unresolved issues. A profile in the “resolved” third scale indicates that one has successfully dealt with issues that might otherwise have been impeding intercultural development. This profile suggests that one is generally interested in cultural differences, and may seek out interaction with culturally different people, thereby not inclined to polarize cultures into “us and them.”

A profile in transition indicates that one is still dealing with issues around simplifying or polarizing cultural difference, and that one’s worldview is somewhat ethnocentric. Experiences with cultural differences may be somewhat negative, with a tendency toward disinterest in cultural difference and/or tendency toward avoidance of interaction with culturally different people. There may be a tendency to view the world as “us and them” when “us” is superior.

Finally, a profile in the unresolved category indicates a fairly ethnocentric worldview, with a tendency to experience simplifying and/or polarizing cultural difference. Experiences with culture may be quite negative or avoided when possible.

**Multicultural Competency Questionnaire**

To provide a qualitative perspective and further insight on the concept of cultural sensitivity and the exhibition of cultural competence in addition to the usage of the Intercultural Development Inventory, the study employed the Multicultural Competency Questionnaire, developed by Patricia M. King and
Mary Howard-Hamilton. The Multicultural Competency Questionnaire provided the respondents with eight open-ended questions in an effort to assess insight about graduate preparation, work experiences, and other life experiences directly related to cultural competency. Further, assessing the amount of intercultural contact both within the collegiate setting and outside is inquired in the questionnaire. Finally, the questionnaire provided the respondents an opportunity to determine one’s perceived level of cultural competence. Questionnaires are used extensively in educational research to collect information that is not directly observable (Gall, Borg & Gall, 1996).

In the Multicultural Competency Questionnaire, multicultural competency is defined as “the awareness, knowledge, and skills necessary to work effectively and ethnically across cultural differences” (Pope & Reynolds, 1997). Multicultural Knowledge is having an informed understanding of cultures that are different from one’s own culture, including knowledge of their histories, traditions, values and practices. Multicultural Skills are what individuals use to engage in effective and meaningful interactions with those who are from different cultural backgrounds than self. Multicultural Awareness involves consciousness of how people’s attitudes, beliefs, values, assumptions, and self-awareness affect the ways they interact with those who are culturally different from themselves. Overall the Multicultural Competency Questionnaire provided additional insight regarding one’s personal assessment of cultural competency and was utilized in concert with the Intercultural Development Inventory.
Data Collection

The method for data collection was mail distribution and return. The Intercultural Development Inventories were purchased for the study from the Intercultural Communication Institute. Each survey had a preexisting code listed at the bottom of the page. Copyright regulations do not permit the inclusion of the Intercultural Developmental Inventory (sample IDI items are provided in Appendix A). A letter granting permission from the authors to use the Intercultural Development Inventory is located in Appendix B. A copy of the Multicultural Competency Questionnaire is located in Appendix C. Permission was additionally granted from the authors of the Multicultural Competency Questionnaire via email communication located in Appendix D. Final approval to conduct the study was granted from the Institutional Research Board (Appendix E).

A packet including a cover letter describing the study (Appendix F), the Intercultural Development Inventory, the Multicultural Competency Questionnaire, and a self-addressed return envelope was mailed by the United States Postal Service to each full time faculty member at Meredith College and Dillard University. Participants were asked to complete and return both the survey and questionnaire to the researcher. Two hundred and fifty five surveys and questionnaires were mailed on November 16, 2002. It was advised by the leadership at the University of North Carolina at Asheville to proceed with the mailing once faculty returned to campus following the Winter Break. Accordingly, the identical distribution procedure aforementioned resulted in 210
surveys and questionnaires being mailed to full time faculty at the University of North Carolina at Asheville on January 13, 2003.

Concurrently, a follow up letter (Appendix G) to the faculty at Meredith College and Dillard University who had not responded was mailed on January 13, 2003. According to Dillman and Salant (1994) follow-up mailings can increase response rates. After receiving the follow up letter, ten respondents requested another survey and questionnaire. On February 10, 2003 a follow up letter was mailed to the faculty of the University of North Carolina at Asheville. On March 7, 2003 a total of 125 full time faculty members across the three institutions had responded to the study. Of the 125 returned mailings, 91 surveys and 77 questionnaires resulted in usable data for the study. The remaining 34 surveys and questionnaires were returned completely blank.

Data Coding

Returned surveys and questionnaires were dated and highlighted by the name of the person on the master list for each respective institution. The data from the surveys were entered into the Intercultural Development Inventory software according to the following categorical discipline areas across institutions: Humanities (English, theatre/drama, music, speech communication, foreign languages, religion, health, physical education, dance, philosophy, art and interior design); Natural Sciences (math, biology, chemistry, physics, atmospheric science, astronomy, computer science and human environmental science); Education (teaching); Social sciences (sociology, criminal justice, political science, history, urban studies, politics, social work, public health and
psychology); and Business (accounting, management, economics, finance, international business, and marketing). The data compiled from the Multicultural Competency Questionnaire was analyzed into emergent themes. Both the inventory and questionnaire were analyzed accordingly to the research questions under investigation.

**Measurement of Variables**

The dependent variables in the research study were the level of intercultural sensitivity and exhibition of cultural competency for faculty at liberal arts institutions. The independent variables that were used in the study were: nationality/ethnic background, gender, age range, educational level, graduate professional preparation, work experiences, life experiences, cultural awareness, contact with persons from various cultures and location of formative years.

**Data Analysis**

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) and the NCS Pearson Scan Tool employed by the Intercultural Development Inventory were used in analyzing the data from the survey instrument. Statistical procedures were used to develop figures and charts of demographic data, to perform one ways ANOVAs and t-tests. All measures were analyzed at the .05 level of significance.

The essence of a content analysis is the coding of the document’s messages into categories. Each category should represent a discrete variable that is relevant to the research objectives (Gall, Borg & Gall, 1996). The Multicultural Competency Questionnaire is comprised of eight questions, separated by three
areas: awareness, knowledge and skills. The analysis included developing a frequency count of the occurrences within each coding category to determine themes. Statements that did not apply to any given category were assigned a theme of its own. Consequently, information generated from the Multicultural Competency Questionnaire was complied and analyzed in relation to the theory and knowledge associated with cultural competency. A description of the data analysis performed for each research question follows:

• What are the characteristics of an academic model of cultural competence for faculty? (content analysis)

  • In what ways has your graduate professional preparation contributed to your multicultural competence? (content analysis)

  • In what ways have your work experiences contributed to your multicultural competence? (content analysis)

  • In what ways have your other life experience contributed to your multicultural competence? (content analysis)

  • Please describe the amount and kind of contact you have had with people from cultural groups different than your own outside collegiate settings. (content analysis)

  • Overall, how have these experiences (professional preparation, work and other life experiences, contact with people from other cultural groups) affected your understanding of multicultural competence? (content analysis)
• How often do you think about your racial/ethnic background?
  (content analysis)

• Please access your own level of multicultural competence.
  (content analysis)

• Do faculty in any particular discipline demonstrate greater intercultural sensitivity, thereby greater potential for exercising cultural competence?
  (ANOVA)

• What is the difference between the perceived level of cultural sensitivity and the actual developmental level of cultural sensitivity for faculty?
  (Matched paired t-tests)

**Summary**

This chapter explained the research design, the instrumentation, population, the reliability and validity of the study instruments, data collection, coding of data, measurement of variables, and the steps involved in analyzing the data. A full discussion of the results of the cultural sensitivity and exhibition of cultural competence for faculty at liberal arts institutions within higher education is reported in chapter four.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

Introduction

This chapter presents the findings from the data that were collected regarding the level of cultural sensitivity and the exhibition of cultural competence of faculty at three liberal arts institutions within higher education. The first section of the analysis provides descriptive data on the population by institution. Next, the descriptive demographics of the faculty respondents on both the Intercultural Development Inventory and the Multicultural Competency Questionnaire is presented. The descriptive data encompasses the independent variables under investigation, including graduate professional preparation, nationality/ethnic background, gender, age range, educational level, work experiences, life experiences, cultural awareness, contact with persons from various cultures and location of formative years.

Further, this chapter provides the analysis of research questions one, two and three based on the findings from the Multicultural Competency Questionnaire and the Intercultural Development Inventory. The analysis involves examining cultural competence from an academic perspective, determining the differences between the perceived level of intercultural sensitivity and the actual developmental level of intercultural sensitivity and determining if any particular discipline demonstrated greater cultural competence. A summary of the study findings constitutes the last section of the chapter.
Demographic Profile of Population by Institution

The findings presented in this section were compiled from Common Data Sets from each of the three institutions in Fall 2002 used by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) in its annual Faculty Compensation Survey. The numbers in the population within the Common Data Set by institution may differ from the total number in the population that were invited to participate in the research study. The difference may be attributed to faculty turnover, sabbaticals, and those with faculty status, yet are not serving in an instructional capacity. It is possible that some changes occurred between the time the Common Data Set information was compiled and the time this study was conducted. The findings presented include the independent variables under investigation of gender, educational level of attainment, and minority group or international status for the population of the study.

The final section of demographic data in this chapter encompasses the analysis of the remaining independent variables under investigation compiled specifically from the respondents on the Intercultural Development Inventory and the Multicultural Competency Questionnaire. The independent variables of graduate professional preparation, nationality/ethnic background, age range, work experiences, life experiences, cultural awareness, contact with persons from various cultures and location of formative years in relation to cultural sensitivity and exhibition of cultural competence are presented.

In an effort to demonstrate the representation of the respondents to the population, descriptive data is presented in tabular form by institution. The
results of the Common Data Set information for full time faculty at each institution are presented in Column A, while the results of the respondents on the Intercultural Development Inventory are presented in Column B. The n value represents the number of faculty that were invited to participate in the research study.

Table 4.1 presents the demographic profile of full time faculty and respondents to the research study at Meredith College. Accordingly, of the 137 surveys and questionnaires mailed, 52 full time faculty responded, 40 females and 12 males respectively. One person of color and one international person were encompassed in the respondent pool as well. Thirty respondents possess a terminal degree and six respondents possess a Master’s degree. The educational attainment of the remaining 16 respondents is unknown.

### Table 4.1
**Demographic Profile of Full Time Faculty and Respondents at Meredith College**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Column A</th>
<th>Column B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meredith College n=137</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Full Time Instructional Faculty</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Who Are Female</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Who Are Male</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Who Are Members of Minority Groups</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number who are International</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number with Doctorate, first professional or other terminal degree</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.2 presents the demographic profile of full time faculty and respondents to the research study at the University of North Carolina at Asheville. Accordingly, of the 210 surveys and questionnaires mailed, 49 full time faculty responded, 23 females and 26 males respectively. One person of color and two international persons were encompassed in the respondent pool as well. Twenty-four respondents possess a terminal degree and four respondents possess a Master’s degree. The educational attainment of the remaining 21 respondents is unknown.

| Total number whose highest degree is a Master’s but not a terminal master’s | 23 | 6 |
| Total number whose highest degree is a Bachelor’s | 0 | 0 |
| Total Number whose highest degree is unknown or other | 0 | 16 |

Table 4.2
Demographic Profile of Full Time Faculty and Respondents at the University of North Carolina at Asheville

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Column A</th>
<th>Column B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The University of North Carolina at Asheville n=210</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Full Time Instructional Faculty</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Who Are Female</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Who Are Male</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Who Are Members of Minority Groups</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number who are International</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.3 presents the demographic profile of full time faculty and respondents to the research study at Dillard University. Accordingly, of the 118 surveys and questionnaires mailed, 23 full time faculty responded, 11 females and 12 males respectively. Ten persons of color and three international persons were encompassed in the respondent pool as well. Twelve respondents possess a terminal degree and seven respondents possess a Master’s degree. The educational attainment of the remaining 4 respondents is unknown.

| Total Number with Doctorate, first professional or other terminal degree | 153 | 24 |
| Total number whose highest degree is a Master’s but not a terminal master’s | 23 | 4 |
| Total number whose highest degree is a Bachelor’s | 3 | 0 |
| Total Number whose highest degree is unknown or other | 0 | 21 |

Table 4.3
Demographic Profile of Full Time Faculty and Respondents
at Dillard University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Column A</th>
<th>Column B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dillard University n=118</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Full Time Instructional Faculty</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Who Are Female</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Who Are Male</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Who Are Members of Minority Groups</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number who are International</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number with Doctorate, first professional or other terminal degree</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number whose highest degree is a Master’s but not a terminal master’s</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Demographic Profile of Respondents

The final section of demographic data in this chapter encompasses the analysis of the remaining independent variables under investigation compiled specifically from the respondents on the Intercultural Development Inventory and the Multicultural Competency Questionnaire. The independent variables of graduate professional preparation, nationality/ethnic background, age range, work experiences, life experiences, cultural awareness, contact with persons from various cultures and location of formative years in relation to cultural sensitivity and exhibition of cultural competence are presented.

Nationality/Ethnic Background

Sixty-seven faculty responded to the survey item regarding nationality/ethnic background. Thirty-seven point four percent of the respondents identified as Caucasian and 17.6% identified as American. Thirteen-point two percent of the respondents identified as African American and 5% identified various ethnicities such as Dutch, Greek, Cuban-Irish, French Algerian and Caucasian/Native American. The remaining twenty-four respondents (26.4%) did not complete the item regarding nationality/ethnic background. The racial breakdown is shown in Figure 4.1.
Figure 4.1 Nationality/Ethnic Background of Respondents

Gender, Discipline, Age Range and Educational Attainment of Respondents

Table 4.4 provides the demographic data for the respondents across four of the independent variables. Ninety-one faculty members responded to the survey item regarding gender and academic discipline. The gender breakdown of the faculty was 59.3% female and 40.7% male. Additionally, thirty-three percent of the faculty identified as humanities, 28% of the faculty identified as natural sciences. Fifteen point four percent identified as social sciences, 13.2% education and 9.9% identified as teaching within the discipline of business.

Eighty-two respondents reported their age range. Thirty-four percent of the respondents are between the ages of 41-50, while 26.8% are between the ages of 51-60. Twenty percent of the faculty reported their age range between 31-40, and 13.4% of the faculty reported their age range as 61 and over. Three percent reported being between the ages of 22-30 and 1.2% reported falling between the age range of 18-21.
Eighty-eight respondents reported their educational level. Seventy-nine percent reported having a PhD or equivalent, 18.2% hold an M.A. degree or equivalent, 1.1% respectively holds either a high school diploma or another educational degree.

Table 4.4
Gender, Discipline, Age Range and Educational Attainment of Respondents (in percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>18-30</th>
<th>31-50</th>
<th>51+</th>
<th>PhD or equiv</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>59.3 F</td>
<td>40.7 M</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H=Humanites, NS= Natural Sciences, SS=Social Sciences, E=Education, B=Business
Age Range in years: 18-30; 31-50; 51+
Educational Attainment: PhD or equivalent; Master’s; Other

Location of Formative Years and Amount of Time Spent in Another Culture of Respondents

Eighty-one respondents identified a country in which their formative years were spent. Ninety-three percent spent their formative years in North America, 4.9% spent their formative years in Africa and 2.5% of the respondents identified the location of their formative years as “other.”

Seventy-nine of the respondents shared the amount of time spent in another culture. Twenty-five percent of the respondents have never lived in another culture; 16.5% have lived in another culture either less than three months; 8.9% have lived in another culture 3-6 months and 8.9% have lived in another culture 7-11 months. Twelve percent have resided in another culture 1-2 years,
7.6% have lived in another culture 3-5 years; and 3.8% have lived in another culture between six and ten years.

Table 4.5  
Location of Formative Years and Amount of Time Spent in Another Culture of Respondents (in percentages)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n</th>
<th>North America</th>
<th>Africa</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>&gt;3 months</th>
<th>3-6 months</th>
<th>7-11 months</th>
<th>1-2 years</th>
<th>3-5 years</th>
<th>6+ years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Questions

Multicultural Competency Questionnaire

The Multicultural Competency Questionnaire developed by King & Howard-Hamilton (2001) is comprised of eight open ended questions assessing multicultural competence in three categories: Multicultural Knowledge--as having an informed understanding of cultures that are different from one’s own culture, including knowledge of their histories, traditions, values, practices, etc.; Multicultural Skills--what individuals use to engage in effective and meaningful interactions with those who are from different cultural backgrounds than their own; and Multicultural Awareness -- consciousness of how people’s attitudes, beliefs, values, assumptions, and self-awareness affect the ways they interact with those who are culturally different from themselves. Finally, the respondents were asked to assess their level of knowledge, skills, awareness and overall multicultural competence. The findings presented are based on the responses from the Multicultural Competency Questionnaire. Additional comments that were
made that do not correspond to the eight questions asked are provided in Appendix H.

**Multicultural Competency Question 1**

- **In what ways has your graduate professional preparation contributed to your multicultural competence?**

  Graduate study prepares persons for professional work. It is comprised of varied experiences. The two themes that emerged relevant to graduate professional preparation were immersion and coursework. Various disciplines required and encompassed culture as a foundation and framework within one’s chosen field of study. Examples cited included but are not limited to anthropology, sociology, literature, language and psychology. The respondents shared that such coursework provided knowledge of universal principles of behavior that applied to all cultures. For example, one respondent illustrated this notion in that “music around the world reflects the culture of the people creating it.” On the contrary, there were respondents that did not share the same philosophy. Other disciplines, though not explicitly cited did not incorporate coursework relevant to culture, as illustrated by one respondent, “none, not at all.”

  Certain experiences that facilitated knowledge encompassed fieldwork, diverse instruction, class assignments, fellowships, traveling and study abroad with a diverse group of persons. Often immersion experiences dictated an unexpected circumstance as illustrated by a respondent:
“I became aware that because I had a southern accent, I was viewed as less intelligent. I quickly lost the accent. I found students from New York who projected total confidence and were very assertive. I learned to imitate this confidence and assertiveness, which is not part of my upbringing.”

In essence, immersion experiences ushered the development of skills that assisted in the ability to function effectively cross culturally. Learning about self-first, the ability to listen for different assumptions behind a person’s behavior, listening, non-verbal communication, open-mindedness, tolerance of differences, learning how to work with others and learning another language emerged in relation to skill development. Example of skill development are illustrated, “I learned to do research on political movements and diversity within the African American population. Learning from diversity within your own group is excellent preparation for expecting diversity within other groups.” Skill development in regard to cultural competence was enhanced by interactions and environmental factors that occurred while pursuing graduate study:

“My graduate preparation was in a time and place (Iowa, 1970s) during which there was very little discussion and contact with other cultures.”
“I grew up in west Tennessee and Mississippi before integration. I earned a M.A. from the University of Wisconsin, where I had the opportunity to become close friends with three Black students from the South. We found each other more compatible than Yankees.”

The development of cultural competence during graduate professional preparation was largely impacted by coursework and immersion within other cultures. Accordingly, these experiences affected the respondents’ world around them and therefore were illustrated in their work occurrences.

**Multicultural Competency Question Two**

- **In what ways have your work experiences contributed to your multicultural competence?**

  The workplace environment can significantly impact one’s level of cultural competence. In particular, campus communities provide a rich landscape for diverse peoples, traditions and cultures. Themes that emerged relevant to cultural competence in work experiences included the environment in which one works within, interaction with other cultures and opportunities afforded due the nature of one’s work.

  The depth of experiences can vary based upon the environment as illustrated by one respondent, “although I work at a small historically Black college, I interact daily with people from different cultures. These interactions have enhanced my knowledge base about the differences in traditions, and customs among cultures sharpened my skills in affecting communication with
others from cultures unlike my own, and increased my awareness of difference.” Working and teaching students from various racial/ethnic backgrounds compelled the respondents to utilize different approaches to study, work, form interpersonal relationships and develop sensitivity. One respondent shared how culture impacted the campus environment:

“When MLK (Martin Luther King, Jr) Day first became a holiday, many staff continued to work on that day. This was resented by an African American co worker who felt it showed insensitivity.”

Other campus experiences however provided limited cultural exchanges, “there is no emphasis or opportunity to exchange knowledge at my work site.” Additional themes that emerged relevant to the work environment that enhanced cultural competence included advising students from diverse cultures, teaching and studying the fundamentals of other cultures, events on campus, advising clubs/organizations, and employing persons of diverse backgrounds.

Accordingly, the second theme distinguishes interaction as a means of exemplifying cultural competence. Being a faculty member provides one with the opportunity to interact with students, colleagues, administrators and other professionals on a regular basis. Interactions created greater awareness of cultural differences and similarities. Chiefly, interaction impacted knowledge, awareness and skills as exemplified by one respondent:
“I have taught individuals from other cultures and through developing a relationship(s) with those individuals I was able to learn about their culture.”

Through interaction respondents learned that cultural competence is also developed by listening and not judging quickly, tone, humor, treating others with respect, asking questions, being tolerant of differences, collaboration, compromise, self-reflective in cross cultural situations and asking questions to understand another’s background and worldview. Further skill development while interacting with persons from different backgrounds and cultures facilitated knowledge and awareness that was perhaps unanticipated. This resulted in a “teachable moment” as illustrated by the respondents admitting making mistakes and being unaware of such until being told.

The final theme that emerged in relation to work experiences were the opportunities faculty members were afforded that enhanced their level of cultural competence. Perhaps the most prevalent response identified was travel. The respondents also shared additional opportunities for developing cultural competence that related directly to the campus community that included anti-racism workshops, multicultural awareness programs, education on Caucasian and African American culture, student discussions, advising clubs and organizations and various panel discussions on campus. Faculty experienced conflicts in regard to participating, particularly lack of time or too few opportunities offered on campus. The pursuit of culturally different experiences had to be initiated in these
cases on one’s own. Chiefly, the environment, interaction and opportunities comprised the major facets in the development of cultural competence relevant to work experiences. Work experiences undoubtedly affected other areas within one’s existence, particularly as demonstrated in question three, which makes inquiry regarding overall life experiences.

**Multicultural Competency Question Three**

- In what ways have your other life experiences contributed to your multicultural competence?

The environment in which we reside has a profound affect on our understanding and building one’s cultural framework. Living in another country was identified as having a significant impact on one’s cultural perspective. As such, living in another culture broadened perspectives and often left respondents thirsting for more and/or additional opportunity for cultural exchange. However, such geographical changes often resulted in a paradigm shift that resulted in the ability to function in two distinct cultures as illustrated by two respondents:

“I grew up Black in a Black working class segregated Chicago neighborhood after WWII. I was educated in the public schools through high school, except for 2 years in an upper class Jewish university lab school. I learned to navigate socially in communities and schools that were very different. I used academic skills and sports to be accepted in each setting. By 17, I was experienced and comfortable in crossing back and forth across
race, social class, ethnic and regional (North and South) inequalities/differences.

“Spending time in WASP culture made me understand and see that we all are not the same in terms of food, music, attitudes, etc. Similarly, I’ve learned a certain degree of biculturalism to survive in two distinct worlds.”

Other skills identified by the respondents in other life experiences in the contribution to cultural competence varied from “I have had little contact with other cultures in my other life experiences” and “none or not at all” to listening and hearing, the development of a thirst for that which is different, curiosity, open mindedness, the ability to dialogue with others and observation.

The second theme that emerged in the contribution to cultural competence in other life experiences was relationship oriented such as marrying a person from another culture, or living in a community as the minority and thereby having friends of another culture. One respondent illustrated that her life was impacted significantly when she adopted a child from another culture. Overall the responses to other life experiences contributing to cultural competence focused primarily on geographical location and relationships. Accordingly either the presence or absence of the sum total of these experiences impacted the respondents’ level of cultural competence exhibited within the collegiate environment.
Multicultural Competency Question Four

- Please describe the amount and kind of contact you have had with people from cultural groups different than your own in collegiate settings.

Amount of Contact within the Collegiate Setting

Seventy-five faculty responded to the questionnaire item regarding the amount of contact with persons of different cultures within the collegiate setting. Of those responding, 51% interacted daily, 29% interacted weekly, 13.6% interacted monthly, 4.8% interacted bi-monthly and .7% interacted yearly (see Figure 4.2)

Nature of Contact with Persons of Different Cultures

The respondents further described the kind of intercultural contact they had within the collegiate setting, from very little, to interacting with colleagues and students, developing relationships, discussion, social interaction, working as a consultant in foreign universities, committee work, meetings, seminars and
political engagement, celebrating religious holidays that are culturally based, interacting with subordinates, sharing meals with persons from various cultures, teaching at an HBCU and teaching abroad, research collaboration, advising students of diverse backgrounds, sporting events and interacting with visiting professors.

Multicultural Competency Question Five

➢ Please describe the amount and kind of contact you have had with people from cultural groups different than your own outside the collegiate settings.

Amount of Contact outside the Collegiate Setting

Seventy-two faculty responded to the question regarding the amount of contact they have had with people from cultural groups different from self outside the collegiate setting. Thirty-two percent of the respondents have contact with persons different from their own culture weekly, 19.7% have contact monthly with persons of a different culture than self, 18.3% report that daily contact is had with persons of a different culture than self, while 16.9% report having contact bi-monthly with persons of a different culture than self. The remaining portion, 12.7% report as having yearly contact with persons of a different culture than self (see Figure 4.3).
The respondents further described the kind of intercultural contact they had outside of the collegiate setting, from very little or none to correspondence and interaction with friends; interaction with a spouse who is of a different culture; athletic competitions; friendships; professional conference attendances; overseas travel; living in a diverse neighborhood; growing up as a minority in a majority White neighborhood; community service; volunteering; sharing meals; social events; shopping in the grocery store; church familial contacts; hosting a foreign exchange student; and living in a large city.

Multicultural Competency Question Six

- **Overall, how have these experiences affected your understanding of multicultural competence?**

Three overarching themes emerged relevant to one’s understanding of
multicultural competence: willingness to learn/self-inspection, broadened understanding/knowledge and life enhancement. The first theme, willingness to learn requires self-inspection regarding behavior, ideas and outlook relevant to experiences with persons of various cultures. Experiences reinforced passion for human understanding, objectivity, negotiating different cultural contexts, welcoming and seeking out cultural encounters.

Further experiences were broadened understanding/knowledge of various cultures, which is the second theme identified as affecting one’s understanding of cultural competence. Contacts made with culturally diverse persons facilitated the concept that respect is essential and the realization that differences are priceless. However, challenges that emerged as a result of broadened understanding/knowledge in regard to persons of various cultures included continued misunderstanding and the realization that the pursuit of knowledge is inexhaustible as illustrated by two respondents:

“My multicultural experiences make me more tolerant and understanding. I feel I have just scratched the surface and desire more contact, especially through travel.”

“I realize everyday how much I do not understand and assumptions that I’m constantly making about people whose culture is different from my own.”
Time and energy however are essential ingredients in one’s understanding of multicultural competence. The respondents shared experiences that affected their understanding of multicultural competence in the final theme as “life enhancement.” It is important to note however that still others within the sample shared “none, not at all” or very limited in response to this question. Learning about other cultures compelled respondents to better appreciate one’s own culture as well as better understand the benefit of exploring others.

Additional elements under the themes of willingness to learn/self-inspection, broadened understanding/knowledge and life enhancement as it relates to life experiences that have molded cultural competence included respect for others, increased tolerance, realizing that more similarities than differences exist, the adoption of cultural traditions and open-mindedness.

**Multicultural Competency Question Seven**

- **How often do you think about your racial/ethnic background?**

  Sixty-two respondents reported how often they think about their racial/ethnic background. Thirty five percent consider their racial/ethnic background weekly, 30.6% consider racial/ethnic background daily, 12.9% consider racial/ethnic background monthly, 11.3% consider racial/ethnic background yearly and 9.7% consider racial/ethnic background bi-monthly.
Multicultural Competency Question Eight

- Please access your own level of multicultural competence on a scale from 1 (early) to 5 (advanced) in the areas of knowledge, skills, awareness and overall multicultural competence.

Level of Multicultural Knowledge

Sixty-nine faculty responded to the assessing their level of multicultural Knowledge. Thirty six percent reported slightly below advanced, 30.4% reported middle level of multicultural knowledge on the scale, 18.8% reported advanced in the area of multicultural knowledge, roughly 10% reported slightly above an early level of multicultural knowledge and just above 4% reported an early level of multicultural knowledge.
Sixty-nine faculty responded in assessing their level of multicultural skills. Thirty-seven percent reported middle as their level of multicultural skills, 27.5% as slightly below advanced in their level of multicultural skills, and 17.4% of the respondents reported slightly above an early level of multicultural skills. Thirteen percent of the respondents reported possessing an advanced level of multicultural skills, while 4.3% of the respondents reported having an early level of multicultural skill development (see Figure 4.6).
Sixty-nine respondents reported their level of multicultural awareness on a scale of one (early) to five (advanced). Forty percent reported having a slightly lower than advanced awareness, while 26% reported having an average amount of multicultural awareness. Accordingly, 24.6% of the sample reported as having an advanced multicultural awareness and 5.8% reported having slightly higher than early awareness. The remaining sample, 2.9% reported having early multicultural awareness (see Figure 4.7).

![Figure 4.7 Level of Multicultural Awareness](image_url)

**Overall Level of Multicultural Competence**

The final component of question 8 asks the respondents to assess their overall level of multicultural competence. Sixty-nine faculty in the sample responded and assessed their overall level of multicultural competence. Thirty seven percent of the faculty reported having slightly below advanced multicultural competence, 33.3% of the faculty reported having an average level of multicultural competence, and 17.4% of the faculty reported having an advanced level of multicultural competence. Approximately 5.8% respectively reported
having either an early level of multicultural competence or a slightly above early awareness (see Figure 4.8).

![Figure 4.8 Overall Level of Multicultural Competence](image)

Research Questions

Analysis of Research Question 1

**What are the characteristics of an academic model of cultural competence?**

The characteristics of an academic model of cultural competence from the content analysis conducted on the Multicultural Competency Questionnaire found the following components: preparation in the area of cultural competence in graduate school regardless of the discipline, on-going cultural competency training and skill development/enhancement once hired as a faculty member, the incorporation of campus events centralizing around the concept of culture for the community, and faculty mentoring (See Figure 4.9). The model demonstrates what a campus would resemble with the incorporation of cultural competence. On-going campus activities would occur throughout a person’s graduate/professional preparation and continue to exist within the campus.
framework. Once an individual graduated and assumed a faculty appointment, he or she would be assigned a faculty mentor. Concurrently, the faculty mentee and mentor would be provided with on-going training, support and development in the area of cultural competence. The faculty mentorship experience would provide a forum for faculty to challenge one another, discuss issues and support one another. The intent is that the faculty mentee would eventually evolve and become a mentor to a new faculty appointment. The components of the model are further presented.
On-going campus activities, events, dialogue series, lectures, etc. centralizing around Culture

Graduate School/Professional Preparation with the incorporation of Cultural Competence in Discipline/Area of Study

Faculty Appointment

Faculty Mentor/Mentee Relationship

On-going training, support and development in the area of Cultural Competence
A finding in the data as a characteristic of an academic model of cultural competence is preparation in the area of cultural competence in graduate school regardless of the discipline. A limited number of faculty in the study had culture as a component relevant to graduate study and the respondents had limited experiences with persons from diverse cultures prior to their collegiate experience. This is particularly relevant, as many of the respondents did not share experiences of growing up in neighborhoods with diverse persons. If each discipline incorporates the concept of culture as it relates to the area under investigation, more faculty will come to the collegiate environment with some exposure and preparedness to work more effectively with students of diverse backgrounds. These experiences can occur during graduate school preparation.

A second characteristic of an academic model of cultural competence based on the data is the incorporation of training for faculty in the area of cultural competence upon a faculty appointment. The responses to the Multicultural Competence Questionnaire suggests that the faculty who majored in disciplines where cross cultural training was a significant component of coursework and field experiences, demonstrated a stronger comfort level of interacting with students of different cultures. Additionally, it is essential for faculty to better understand their own cultural context before attempting to understand the culture of others. Accordingly, it is appropriate to consider for instance, the differences in the perceived level and the actual developmental level on the IDI which highlights such behavior and tendency. In each academic discipline, the ninety-one respondents exhibited a gap between their perceived level of cultural competence
and their actual developmental level of cultural competence. Table 4.6 presents this difference.

Table 4.6  
Comparison of Academic Discipline Means between Perceived and Actual Developmental IDI Score n=91

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Perceived</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>122.90</td>
<td>101.40</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>125.57</td>
<td>104.30</td>
<td>21.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>123.21</td>
<td>100.24</td>
<td>22.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences</td>
<td>120.62</td>
<td>94.06</td>
<td>26.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>125.93</td>
<td>104.51</td>
<td>21.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Essentially, the table demonstrates that overall the faculty perceive themselves to be much more culturally sensitive than they actually are. On average the difference for each discipline is approximately 22 points. This is significant, as all individuals sampled perceive themselves to be functioning at the acceptance/adaptation stage, when in reality all are functioning at the minimization stage. Further discussion of the differences across disciplines in relation to the perceived and actual developmental IDI score will be presented in the analysis of research question two later in this chapter.

The minimization stage was exhibited throughout the responses to the Multicultural Competency Questionnaire for each of the five disciplines. At minimization, people are aware of other cultures and may exhibit extensive surface knowledge of them, but the context of this knowledge is one’s own cultural frame of reference. Consequently, people experience their own reality as a universal standard. The developmental goal at minimization is to achieve
cultural self-awareness. At the minimization stage, people do not recognize that they have cultural and institutional privilege. Thirty-seven percent of the respondents on the Multicultural Competency Questionnaire expressed having a greater than average level of cultural competence, while 33% responded as possessing an average level. Approximately 17.4% responded as having an advanced level of cultural competence. If in fact faculty are operating at the minimization stage and perceive operating at the acceptance/adaptation stage, the difference could significantly impact the institutional climate as far as interaction with students, particularly with students of color both in and outside of the classroom.

The respondents shared that the collegiate environment offers limited opportunities for discussion and engagement in the formal sense as it relates to culture. Although 51% of the respondents shared that they have daily interaction with persons from a culture other than their own in the collegiate setting, such interaction is limited in both duration and frequency. Therefore, a third characteristic found in the data as an academic model of cultural competence is the incorporation of panel discussions, lectures, dialogue series, etc. This would not only provide faculty with exposure and an opportunity to engage, but also provide an atmosphere that creates a more welcoming climate for all students, particularly students of color at predominantly white institutions.

Further, while it is important to recognize that many of the faculty spent time living in another culture, and were provided these experiences via their work environment, few of these experiences have assisted faculty in relating cross
culturally to students of color within their respective institutions. If any knowledge or further development of skills to function cross culturally were attempted, it was pursued on an individual’s time and energy, and not that of the institution. Further, the amount of contact with persons of diverse cultures outside the collegiate environment was even less for faculty overall. This became apparent in the data through the sharing of life experiences as they related to culture.

The majority of experiences that faculty had cross culturally were in the workplace environment, however these experiences were passive and resulted in limited interaction with colleagues and occasionally with students in the classroom. Few interactions emerged as a result of dialoguing. It was however stated that for several respondents, there is no emphasis or opportunity to exchange knowledge at the work site.

Skills that were identified by the respondents regarding interactions with others in the development of cultural competence to be effective included: active listening skills, use of tone of voice, treating others with respect, asking questions, being understanding of differences, collaboration and compromise. When the respondents actively utilized the various skills expressed, the opportunities arose in the form of a “teachable moment” where all parties involved acquired a higher degree of knowledge. In fact, more respondents on the Multicultural Competency Questionnaire possessed more awareness than knowledge and even less experience in the area of skill development.
A fourth finding in the data as a characteristic of an academic model of cultural competence is the establishment of a faculty-mentoring program. A faculty-mentoring program would provide faculty with the opportunity to further dialogue with one another regarding issues that arise with diverse populations in the classroom and opportunities to challenge one another in the area of skill development. It would also provide the opportunity for faculty members to hold each other accountable for growth and development in this area. Therefore the establishment of a faculty mentoring may prove useful in relation to cultural competency within higher education.

*Analysis of Research Question 2*

**Do faculty in any particular discipline demonstrate greater intercultural sensitivity, thereby greater potential for exercising cultural competence?**

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) is a statistical procedure that compares the amount of between groups variance in individuals’ scores with the amount of within groups variance. A one-way ANOVA was used to determine if there were statistically significant differences between the disciplines in the perceived IDI score. The p-value of .122 as shown in Table 4.7 is greater than the alpha level of .05, resulting in no difference between groups on the perceived IDI score. Therefore failure to reject the null hypothesis occurred (see Table 4.7 for details).
A one-way ANOVA was used to determine if there were statistically significant differences between the disciplines in the actual developmental IDI score. The p-value of .308 as shown in Table 4.8 is greater than the alpha level of .05, resulting in no difference between groups on the perceived IDI score. Therefore failure to reject the null hypothesis occurred (see Table 4.8 for details).

A one-way ANOVA was used to determine if there were statistically significant differences between the disciplines in the gap that exists between the perceived and actual developmental IDI score. The p-value of .508 as shown in Table 4.9 is greater than the alpha level of .05, resulting in no difference between groups on the perceived IDI score. Therefore failure to reject the null hypothesis occurred.
Table 4.9
Differences between disciplines on the gap between the perceived and actual developmental IDI score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>330.442</td>
<td>.833</td>
<td>.508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>8527.925</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8858.367</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Research Question 3

What is the difference between the perceived level of cultural sensitivity and the actual developmental level of cultural sensitivity for faculty?

Paired t-tests analyses were used to determine whether differences existed between the perceived and actual developmental IDI scores across disciplines. A 95% confidence interval was used in the data analysis. The probability less than .05 was identified as significant for the study.

Differences between perceived and actual developmental level for the discipline of Business

When analyzing the perceived and actual developmental level of cultural sensitivity on the Intercultural Developmental Inventory for faculty in the discipline of business, a statistically significant difference was found. The mean difference for the perceived and actual developmental IDI score as 21.5, with a t-value of 7.143. At the 95% confidence interval, the null hypothesis was rejected at .000. See Table 4.10 for details.
Table 4.10
Differences between perceived and actual developmental level of cultural sensitivity for faculty in the discipline of business

Paired Samples Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Differences between perceived and actual developmental level for the discipline of Education

When analyzing the perceived and actual developmental level of cultural sensitivity on the Intercultural Developmental Inventory for faculty in the discipline of education, a statistically significant difference was found. The mean difference for the perceived and actual developmental IDI score as 21.2, with a t-value of 8.325. At the 95% confidence interval, the null hypothesis was rejected at .000. See Table 4.11 for details.

Table 4.11
Differences between perceived and actual developmental level of cultural sensitivity for the discipline of education

Paired Samples Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1 PERCEIVE - DEV</td>
<td>21.2638</td>
<td>8.84816</td>
<td>2.55424</td>
<td>15.6419 - 26.8856</td>
<td>8.325</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Differences between perceived and actual developmental level for the discipline of Humanities

When analyzing the perceived and actual developmental level of cultural sensitivity on the Intercultural Developmental Inventory for faculty in the discipline of humanities, a statistically significant difference was found. The mean difference for the perceived and actual developmental IDI score as 23.06, with a t-value of 15.978. At the 95% confidence interval, the null hypothesis was rejected at .000. See Table 4.12 for details.

Table 4.12
Differences between perceived and actual developmental level of cultural sensitivity for the discipline of humanities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1 PERCEIVE - DEV</td>
<td>23.0623</td>
<td>7.90567</td>
<td>1.44337</td>
<td>20.1103</td>
<td>26.0144</td>
<td>15.978</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Differences between perceived and actual developmental level for the discipline of Natural Sciences

When analyzing the perceived and actual developmental level of cultural sensitivity on the Intercultural Developmental Inventory for faculty in the discipline of natural sciences, a statistically significant difference was found. The mean difference for the perceived and actual developmental IDI score as 26.06, with a t-value of 10.046. At the 95% confidence interval, the null hypothesis was rejected at .000. See Table 4.13 for details.
Table 4.13
Differences between perceived and actual developmental level of cultural sensitivity for the discipline of natural sciences

Paired Samples Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Differences between perceived and actual developmental level for the discipline of Social Sciences

When analyzing the perceived and actual developmental level of cultural sensitivity on the Intercultural Developmental Inventory for faculty in the discipline of social sciences, a statistically significant difference was found. The mean difference for the perceived and actual developmental IDI score as 28.74, with a t-value of 4.291. At the 95% confidence interval, the null hypothesis was rejected at .001. See Table 4.14 for details.

Table 4.14
Differences between perceived and actual developmental level of cultural sensitivity for the discipline of social sciences

Paired Samples Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Analysis of Profiles related to actual developmental score across disciplines

When interpreting the Intercultural Development Inventory, the respondents are provided with three profiles consisting of resolved issues, transition issues and unresolved issues as related to the IDI scales. The unresolved scale ranges from 1-2.33; the transitional scale ranges from 2.33-3.66; and the resolved scale ranges from 3.66 – 5.0. The analyses of the three profiles are presented for each discipline.

IDI Profile for the discipline of Business

The faculty in the discipline of business are unresolved in the minimization scale. The minimization score is 2.15 (See Appendix I). This unresolved profile within the minimization scale indicates a worldview that highlights cultural commonality and universal issues. There may be a strong commitment to the idea that people from other cultures are basically “like us,” or that people of other cultures should share the same set of “universal” values that one may possess as the respondent. This profile further reflects difficulties in identifying important cultural differences that influence cultural relations. Finally, the faculty in the business discipline are in transition possessing a score of 3.28 in the dimension of Acceptance/Appreciation, in terms of comprehending and accommodating a worldview to complex cultural difference.

IDI Profile for the discipline of Education

The faculty in the discipline of education are in transition on both the minimization as well as the acceptance/adaptation scale. The minimization score
Both transitional profiles indicate that the respondents are still dealing with issues around acceptance and adaptation to cultural difference, as well as quite possibly assuming a universality of values, norms, beliefs and/or practices.

IDI Profile for the discipline of Humanities

The faculty in the discipline of humanities are in transition in the minimization scale, but will make more progress when the similarity cluster and the tendency to assume that people from other cultures are “basically like us” is resolved and moves into the transitional stage (See Appendix K).

IDI Profile for the discipline of Natural Sciences

The faculty in the discipline of natural sciences are transitional in both the minimization and acceptance/adaptation stages (2.61 and 3.14 respectively). The group is just beginning to transition from the unresolved area. This transition may account for the overall actual developmental score of 94.6 out of a possible 115. As issues related to a tendency to assume that other cultures are similar and applying one’s own cultural values to other cultures is resolved, the respondents will progress to the resolved dimension (See Appendix L).

IDI Profile for the discipline of Social Sciences

The faculty in the discipline of social sciences are in the transitional stage in the minimization scale. The score of 2.83 is being impeded as a result of the
tendency to assume that other cultures are basically like those of the respondents (2.55 on the similarity cluster). As both the similarity and universalism clusters move through transition, the minimization scale will be resolved (See Appendix M).

**Summary**

Content analysis of the Multicultural Competency Questionnaire was conducted to determine the characteristics of an academic model of cultural competence. The findings included four components: preparation in the area of cultural competence in graduate school regardless of the discipline, on-going cultural competency training and skill development/enhancement once hired as a faculty member, the incorporation of campus events centralizing around the concept of culture for the community, and faculty mentoring essential to characteristics of an academic model of cultural competence.

One-way ANOVAs were performed to determine statistically significant differences between groups on the perceived, actual developmental and gap between the perceived and actual developmental. The statistical procedures found no differences between groups on the three areas investigated. Therefore, no faculty in any particular discipline demonstrated greater intercultural sensitivity, thereby the potential to exercise greater cultural competence.

Paired t-tests were performed to determine if there were statistically significant differences between the perceived and actual developmental score for each discipline. A total of five paired t-tests were performed for business, education, humanities, natural sciences and social sciences. There were
statistically significant differences between the perceived and actual developmental scores for each discipline. Finally the IDI profiles were examined for each of the five disciplines. Further explanations of all findings follow in Chapter 5. A summary of how these findings contribute to the understanding of faculty cultural competence and its relation to the culture of the higher education environment is provided.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

A diverse campus results in diverse classrooms. As such the more opportunities faculty will have to interact with students of various backgrounds and ethnicities. In order to be effective, faculty must be equipped to communicate cross-culturally in a skillful manner. Accordingly, effective cross-cultural engagement will improve the quality of experience that diverse students as well as majority students will encounter within the higher education environment. Cross-cultural competence can be learned and is an action-oriented concept.

This study examined cultural sensitivity and the exhibition of cultural competence for faculty at three liberal arts institutions within higher education. The focus of the study embodied the factors, personal, professional and institutional that contribute to the understanding and exhibition of cultural competence within the collegiate environment. Research questions were designed to examine faculty levels of cultural competence as well as multicultural knowledge, awareness and skills. The data from the present study generated the characteristics of an academic model of cultural competence, found statistically significant differences between the perceived and actual developmental score on the Intercultural Development Inventory for faculty and furthermore found that no particular discipline demonstrated greater cultural sensitivity than another. The findings of the study were presented in Chapter 4. This chapter will offer
conclusions, implications and recommendations for further study based on the research questions presented in Chapter 3.

**Nature of the Study**

The majority of the population that responded to the study were Caucasian. This was not necessarily surprising to the researcher, as two of the institutions sampled were predominantly White and the majority of the faculty at these institutions self-identified as White. As such, the study was expanded to incorporate one historically Black institution for two major justifications. Primarily, it was imperative to have larger representation from underrepresented populations, particularly African American and Latino individuals, consequently, a historically Black institution was incorporated in the study to include faculty of color that are sparsely representative or reflective at predominantly white institutions. Second, even though HBCUs have a larger number of faculty of color, these institutions are not retaining and graduating its students of color as effectively as necessary. The overall response rate for the three institutions was 27%. Various reasons are presented as possibilities relevant to the study.

Potential difficulty lied in developing a study that relied solely upon faculty response. Faculty bear heavy work loads, teaching, advising, conducting research, serving on committees, attending campus events, participating in professional organizations and maintaining current knowledge in their chosen field of study. Finding the time to complete a study is nonetheless challenging.

Besides the possibility that faculty had difficulty carving out the time to complete the inventory and questionnaire, it is important to consider the premise
that inquiring about one’s competence regarding cultural exchange may be uncomfortable and difficult for individuals to articulate. The reluctance to share such information on a topic that evokes such an emotion may have contributed to the low response rate and even some respondents skipping over questions. Further there is the potential that some faculty are simply not interested in cultural competence. Consequently, it is imperative to note however that 34 surveys and questionnaires were returned in the self-addressed stamped envelope completely blank.

The primary respondents to the study were female, 59.3%. Dillard University’s gender as far as full time faculty presents little variance (57 males and 61 females); UNCA’s male faculty population is larger than its female population (male 127 and female 83). However, the sample was influenced by Meredith’s female faculty population of 90 in comparison with the 48 male faculty members at the college.

The largest number within an academic discipline that responded to the study was in the field of humanities. This may be attributed to the fact that for the institutions sampled for the study, many disciplines existed under the umbrella of humanities. The next largest discipline to respond across the three institutions was natural sciences. It is interesting to note that more faculty within social sciences and education did not respond to the study as these are the fields that typically provide the most training in the form of coursework and field experiences in working across cultures effectively.
The majority of the faculty who responded to the study reported being between the ages of 41-50, with the next highest percentage being between the ages of 51-60. Historically, this is the group that came of age during the civil rights era in this country. This may have impacted their willingness to participate. Furthermore over 79% reported possessing a PhD or equivalent. Additionally, nearly 92% of the sample spent their formative years in North America. Thus, even though there is diversity within the United States, there remains an American national culture. As such, many of the respondents expressed similar cultural experiences, in light of the fact that approximately 66% of the respondents have spent time living in another culture besides the United States for some length of time.

**Interpretations of the Findings**

The following research questions were used to determine the level of cultural sensitivity and the exhibition of cultural competence for faculty at liberal arts institutions within higher education.

**Question Number One**

*What are the characteristics of an academic model of cultural competence for faculty?*

The major findings of question one are presented in the context of themes emerging from the Multicultural Competency Questionnaire. The findings include: preparation in the area of cultural competence in graduate school regardless of the discipline, on-going cultural competency training and skill development/enhancement once hired as a faculty member, the incorporation of
campus events centralizing around the concept of culture for the community, and faculty mentoring.

Although some of the respondents shared that graduate preparation assisted in the ability to effectively function cross culturally, countless others did not experience a similar component during their graduate study. Accordingly, as it is imperative that professors are thoroughly trained and educated within their major course of study, all disciplines must be held accountable in providing some training and experiences for their students in the area of cultural competency.

As the diversity of students entering the collegiate environment increases, institutions must be held responsible in educating not simply for a diverse environment, but alternatively, educating and assisting persons to function effectively within a diverse environment. The respondents rated themselves higher in the area of multicultural awareness in comparison to multicultural knowledge. The lower multicultural knowledge scores demonstrated the respondents’ awareness that there is still so much to learn in the arena of multicultural competence regarding other cultures.

If in fact institutions ensure that all students (undergraduate and graduate) are provided with coursework and experiences with the inclusion of culture, it will then be necessary to continue to provide additional experiences centered around culture once a person assumes a faculty appointment. The respondents shared that very little occurs on campus in training persons effectively in the area of cultural competence. Cultural competence is skill-based and can be learned. Diversity workshops typically provide an overview highlighting similarities, but
rarely provide an opportunity for a person to examine himself or herself introspectively to determine the role that culture has played in his or her life as well as his or her perception of and/or actions. If biases exist and are left unnoticed, unrecognized or unacknowledged, the result could impact students in a negative manner. The result tends to be interacting with persons based solely upon one’s own cultural experience, without considering another person’s cultural experiences. The need to better understand the experiences of individuals is critical.

Institutions can assume this responsibility of providing on-going training in the area of cultural competence for faculty, by providing opportunities for the necessary development of skills to function effectively in the classroom, thereby creating a more inclusive environment. Accordingly, the respondents scored average on their level of multicultural skills. Hence, the respondents perceive as possessing multicultural awareness, a fair amount of multicultural knowledge, but even less multicultural skills to function effectively cross culturally. Training in the area of cultural competence could further expand to include culturally relevant teaching strategies as well.

It was determined through content analysis that an academic model of cultural competence includes campus events and activities centralizing on the concept of culture. The respondents on the Multicultural Competency cited work experiences as providing the most significant opportunities to interact with persons from various cultures, however, the interactions emphasized were unstructured and unplanned. Additionally, the contact with persons of other
cultures outside of the collegiate setting was not significant. Merely 32% of the respondents reported having weekly contact with persons of a different culture than self. Structured opportunities provided by the institution would enable a vehicle for dialogue, creating awareness and further development of skill.

The final characteristic of an academic model of cultural competence found in the data incorporate a faculty-mentoring component. Faculty have a variety of daily activities and responsibilities associated with their role. There were faculty members within the study that expressed having a significant amount of experience both in interacting and functioning cross culturally. In few cases, there were faculty members whose level of cultural sensitivity was greater than that of the discipline to which assigned. If institutions can make a genuine commitment to incorporate a faculty-mentoring program that highlights the complicated issues of culture, the result could promote a hospitable climate for everyone. Therefore, when faculty are dealing with issues of culture that play out both in and outside of the classroom, institutional measures such as the faculty mentoring program will be in place to be proactive in developing solutions, to diffuse reactionary measures. Furthermore, a faculty-mentoring program may provide a more defined and demonstrated sense of comfort enabling faculty to discuss more difficult and challenging issues, essential in creating an environment that is emancipated of institutional racism and white privilege.
Question Number Two

Do faculty in any particular discipline demonstrate greater intercultural sensitivity, thereby greater potential for exercising cultural competence?

There were no significant differences between the five disciplines on the level of intercultural sensitivity on the Intercultural Development Inventory on either the perceived, actual developmental nor the difference between the two scores. Although the literature suggests that persons in various disciplines such as those within social sciences, education and mental health are comprised of coursework and field experiences encompass issues relevant to culture, the data in this study did not support this supposition as a viable difference between disciplines.

Since the overall application of cultural competence is not as salient in academic affairs as in other areas of the academy, it is therefore useful to examine the underpinnings of cultural competence in various disciplines. Accordingly, this was not apparent in the findings of this study. For example, the faculty in business scored 101.40 in minimization, while the faculty in education scored 104.30 in minimization as well. These two disciplines are extremely different both in training and application, yet no differences are observed in the present study. Further, although the faculty in natural sciences scored the lowest developmentally (94.96), their perceived score of 121.02 was synonymous with those of the other four disciplines. Accordingly, while the preparation for practice within natural sciences is based on inquiry and different from the other four, the
perception is such that the persons in natural sciences perceive themselves to be just as culturally sensitive as any other discipline that was in this study.

In response to this phenomenon, perhaps usage of the Dimensions of Personal Identity (DPI) can assist leaders from an institutional perspective to become more aware of how the culture of their organization may alienate, marginalize or lose people of color, in particular students, if cultural competency is not valued or practiced. This study showed that no matter the discipline, not one is statistically significant in comparison with the others. The implications of this phenomenon are discussed later in this chapter.

**Question Number Three**

*What is the difference between the perceived level of cultural sensitivity and the actual developmental level of cultural sensitivity for faculty?*

There were statistically significant differences found amongst the five disciplines on the disparity between the perceived intercultural sensitivity level and the actual developmental level on the Intercultural Development Inventory. The mean difference amongst the five disciplines was 22 points. In essence all five disciplines are functioning at the minimization stage but perceive self to be functioning at the acceptance/adaptation stage. This is important information for institutions to consider. At the minimization stage, people experience their own culture as a universal reality that is accessible to all others. For example, on campuses, there is recognition and acceptance of superficial cultural differences such as eating customs, and cultural celebrations, while holding that all human beings are essentially the same.
Cultural competence prevails in an atmosphere where examination of self introspectively determines the role that culture has played in one’s perception and/or actions. Cultural competence is stifled when individuals are not recognizing both similarities and differences in the values, norms, questions, history and institutions of groups of people. Cognitive dissonance creates a polarized environment. At the minimization stage, differences are not recognized and valued and as a result, uniformity prevails. When uniformity prevails the result is an environment that does not foster the progression and development of all students.

Implications for Practice

The findings of this study lend support to prior research on cultural competency. The development of cultural competence is an important concept to incorporate into the fabric of the institutional setting, yet instruments designed to measure this skill have not been extensively tested within the institutional environment, and most specifically across disciplines. Accordingly, there is not a depth of information on understanding cultural groups in higher education. Faculty generally are trained to be skilled in their academic discipline, not in the exhibition of cultural competence. Such training and understanding requires dialogue, which often produces anxiety and discomfort. It is essential for faculty to understand how interacting from one’s cultural perspective without the consideration of another’s both limits and hinders learning. Awareness needs to begin with self-awareness and exploration.
Open, honest conversation requires confronting self-awareness and biases about other cultures, is often painful and is therefore difficult to occur. However, if the institution provides the necessary intentional structure, the institutional factors that affect whether a student feels comfortable and progresses will undoubtedly be addressed. Faculty must not only understand the rules, regulations and academic requirements of the institution, but must also understand the context of their students. This can be accomplished through the practice of cultural competence.

It is imperative for faculty to understand the impact of their cultural self-awareness or lack thereof on the environment. If faculty perceive themselves to be operating in a manner that is conducive for all students, stagnation is occurring. Perhaps diversity initiatives being offered are not appropriately matched to the skill development of faculty. For instance, if basic tolerance efforts are being launched and certain faculty are operating at the adaptation stage, no challenges are being offered for the faculty to strengthen cultural competence. If acceptance activities are being offered and faculty are operating at the denial stage, the result may be faculty retreating even more to a polarized state. This impacts the students tremendously. Institutions cannot promote that diversity is welcomed when it is not accepted, appreciated, valued nor cultivated.

This research has several implications for higher education:

1. A significant disparity exists between the actual developmental level of cultural competence and the perceived level for faculty within each discipline. The average difference is approximately 22
points. Campuses engaged in the assessment of cultural competence for faculty can utilize the information as a benchmark for programmatic purposes.

2. The development and practice of cultural competency skills for faculty occur regardless of their graduate professional preparation, and in some cases lack thereof.

3. There is an institutional understanding that creating an institution that incorporates cultural competence is long-term, on-going, complicated, and does produce discomfort.

4. Faculty should continue to challenge, support and mentor one another in multicultural awareness, knowledge and skills.

Movement toward cultural competence requires self-assessment, reflection and action. For students of color who at times perceive the campus environment as hostile and unfriendly, barriers to their successful navigation of the system can hinder both academic performance and overall satisfaction with their experiences. The exhibition and practice of cultural competency amongst faculty can assist students of color in both navigating and eventually removing barriers that impede one’s ability to persist.

Faculty at liberal arts institutions are afforded opportunities to engage and interact with students both in and outside of the classroom. When individuals working at the institution, particularly faculty who engage regularly with students are culturally competent, the progression toward authentic inclusiveness is accomplished.
Recommendations for Future Research

This study examined the levels of cultural sensitivity and the potential to exhibit cultural competency for faculty at liberal arts institutions within higher education. Replication of this study is strongly recommended with the incorporation of other considerations.

It is recommended that the sample size be increased for more generalizable results. Accordingly, this might increase potential disparity amongst disciplines. Some disciplines represented were comprised of as few as 8 faculty members, while one other represented as many as 30. Perhaps greater numbers within the disciplines will produce different results.

The second recommendation for replication is that the results of the Intercultural Development Inventory and the Multicultural Competency Questionnaire be more closely aligned, thereby expanding and providing specific information on a person’s self awareness on the questionnaire in comparison with the perceived score on the inventory. Accordingly, such efforts would make it possible to develop a regression equation to examine which explanatory variable is the best indicator of one’s perceived and actual developmental level.

Replication of this study in other institutions public, private, non liberal arts, single sex, and predominantly white and historically black institutions is encouraged. The sample in this study was limited to persons with full time faculty status. Furthermore, it is suggested to conduct this study with part time faculty as well as graduate students who serve as teaching assistants. Often within large institutions, teacher assistants instruct entry-level courses that occur during the
first and second year in college. If decisions are made regarding persistence for students of color, it is at this time.

Finally for replication purposes, it is suggested to question why someone would not choose to participate in the study. Under most circumstances, a person not returning the information would occur, however, persons in this study actually returned the survey and questionnaire completely blank. It may be useful to determine a person’s unwillingness to participate and determine if reasons are relevant to the concepts under investigation.

**Conclusion**

Quite often the solution to making students of color feel more integrated academically is to recruit more faculty of color. Recruiting more faculty of color does not necessarily mean greater involvement of these persons in the lives of students of color. However, skills for cultural competence can be learned and exhibited by anyone regardless of race or ethnicity. Faculty have primary contact with students and thereby can instruct and relate to students more effectively if equipped with the necessary awareness, knowledge and skills to function cross culturally. It is a question of educational equity in that all students have opportunity, fairness, and access to reach academic excellence and that the institution is ensuring that student needs are being met successfully.
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Appendix A
Sample Items of the Intercultural Development Inventory

D/D Scale: Indicates a worldview that simplifies and/or polarizes cultural difference (13 scale items, alpha=.85)

Denial Cluster: Tendency to avoid cultural differences
Disinterest in cultural difference:
Ex: Too much attention is directed toward other cultures.

Avoidance of interaction with cultural differences
Ex: It is best to form relationships with people of your own culture.

Defense Cluster: Tendency to view the world in terms of “us” and “them,” where “us” is superior
Ex: Our culture’s way of life should be a model for the rest of the world.

R Scale: Indicates a worldview that reverses “us” and “them” polarization, where “them” is superior (9 scale items, alpha=.80)
Ex: If only our culture was more like other cultures, the world would be a better place.

M Scale: Indicates a worldview that highlights cultural commonality and universal values (9 scale items, alpha=.83)
Ex: Our common humanity deserves more attention than our cultural difference

A/A Scale: Indicates a worldview that can comprehend and accommodate to complex cultural differences (14 scale items, alpha=.84)

Acceptance Cluster: Tendency to recognize patterns of cultural difference in one’s own and other cultures
Ex: I am often aware of cultural differences in how decisions are made.

Adaptation Cluster: Tendency to shift perspective and behavior according to cultural context
Cognitive frame shifting
Ex: I can look at the world through the eyes of a person from another culture.

Behavioral code shifting
Ex: I can change my behavior to adapt to other cultures

EM Scale: Indicates a worldview that incorporates a multicultural identity with confused cultural perspectives (5 scale items, alpha=.80)
Ex: I do not feel like I have a culture.
Appendix B

Subject: follow up
Date: Mon, 9 Sep 2002 02:24:08 -0400
From: Milton Bennett MiltonBennett@compuserve.com
To: Stephanie Helms smhelms@bellsouth.net
CC: Mitch Hammer docmitch@email.msn.com

Hi Stephanie,

Sorry to not get back sooner. A bit hectic here. We are happy
to offer you the research rate for using the IDI. There are a few
restrictions on how you write about the IDI in your dissertation,
but they have not been a problem for other students. See you on
the 14th!
Regards, Milton

-----------------------------Begin Original Message-----------------------------

Message text written by Stephanie Helms

My name is Stephanie M. Helms and I am a graduate student at North
Carolina State University. I wrote to each of you during mid August
requesting permission to use the IDI in my dissertation and to be
considered for funding as well. I am writing to follow up on my
request to determine if a decision has yet been made. I am scheduled
to attend the IDI qualifying seminar on the 14th. Please provide
feedback as time permits. Thank you.

Stephanie

-----------------------------End of Message-----------------------------
Appendix C

Multicultural Competency Questionnaire

In this project, we are defining multicultural competency as “the awareness, knowledge and skills necessary to work effectively and ethically across cultural differences.” These three aspects are defined below. Please refer to these definitions as you answer the following questions.

Multicultural Knowledge: having an informed understanding of cultures that are different from one’s own culture, including knowledge of their histories, traditions, values, practices, etc.

Multicultural Skills: skills that individuals use to engage in effective and meaningful interactions with those who are from different cultural backgrounds than their own.

Multicultural Awareness: awareness of how people’s attitudes, beliefs, values, assumptions, and self-awareness affect the ways they interact with those who are culturally different from themselves.

1. In what ways has your graduate professional preparation contributed to your multicultural competence? To answer this question, please give examples to illustrate how your professional preparation experiences (class assignments, internship responsibilities, etc.) contributed to the development of your competence in each area.

   Knowledge:

   Skills:

   Awareness:

2. In what ways have your work experiences contributed to your multicultural competence? Please give examples to illustrate how these experiences contributed to your learning in each area.

   Knowledge

   Skills:

   Awareness:
3. In what ways have your other life experiences contributed to your multicultural competence. Please give examples to illustrate how these experiences contributed to your learning in each area.

Knowledge:

Skills:

Awareness:

4. Please describe the amount and kind of contact you have had with people from cultural groups different than your own in collegiate settings (please circle the appropriate number).

1 – yearly
(once/yr)
2 – bi monthly
(6 times/yr)
3 – monthly
(12 times/yr)
4 – weekly
(52 times/yr)
5 – daily
(365/yr)

What kind of intercultural contact do you typically have in such situations?

5. Please describe the amount and kind of contact you have had with people from cultural groups different than your own outside collegiate settings.

1 – yearly
(once/yr)
2 – bi monthly
(6 times/yr)
3 – monthly
(12 times/yr)
4 – weekly
(52 times/yr)
5 – daily
(365/yr)

What kind of intercultural contact do you typically have in such situations?

6. Overall, how have these experiences (professional preparation, work, and other life experiences, contact with people from other cultural groups) affected your understanding of multicultural competence?
7. How often do you think about your racial/ethnic background?

1 - yearly (once/yr)  
2 - bi monthly (6 times/yr)  
3 - monthly (12 times/yr)  
4 - weekly (52 times/yr)  
5 - daily (365/yr)

8. Please access your own level of multicultural competence using the scale given below:

1 early  
2 middle  
3  
4  
5 advanced

Multicultural Knowledge  
Multicultural Skills  
Multicultural Awareness  
Multicultural Competence (overall)

Comments:
Appendix D

Subject: RE: request
Date: Thu, 7 Nov 2002 17:39:50-0500
From: “Howard-Hamilton, Mary Frances” mhowham@indiana.edu
To: “Stephanie Helms” smhelms@bellsouth.net

Stephanie, you have our permission to reprint the assessment.

Dr. Mary F. Howard-Hamilton
Associate Professor and Higher Education/Student Affairs Program Director
Higher Education and Student Affairs
4268 W.W. Wright School of Education
201 North Rose Avenue
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana 47405-1006
(812) 856-8393
(812) 856-8394 (fax)
email: mhowham@indiana.edu
From: Debra A. Paxton, Regulatory Compliance Administrator  
North Carolina State University  
Institutional Review Board

Date: November 13, 2002

Project Title: The Examination of Cultural Sensitivity and Exhibition of Cultural  
Competence for Faculty as a Retention Tool for Students of Color within  
Higher Education

IRB#: 289-02-11

Dear Ms. Helms:

The research proposal named above has received administrative review and has been  
approved as exempt from the policy as outlined in the Code of Federal Regulations  
(Exemption: 46.101.b.2). Provided that the only participation of the subjects is as described  
in the proposal narrative, this project is exempt from further review.

NOTE:  
1. This committee complies with requirements found in Title 45 part 46 of The Code of  
Federal Regulations.  
For NCSU projects, the Assurance Number is: FWA00003429; the IRB Number is:  
IRB00000330

2. Review de novo of this proposal is necessary if any significant alterations/additions are  
made.

Please provide a copy of this letter to your faculty sponsor. Thank you.
Appendix F

November 13, 2002

Dear Faculty Member:

My name is Stephanie M. Helms and I am a student at North Carolina State University working on my doctoral degree in higher education administration. I am particularly interested in retention of students of color. There is a large body of research that describes methods for retaining students, but very few offer the consideration of culture as a viable tool in the development of retention models. Each of us has a worldview that is related to participation in one or more groups. Our worldview serves as our foundation for our interaction with persons from different cultures. As a faculty member at a liberal arts institution, you are afforded with the opportunity to interact with students both in and outside of the classroom regularly. Research suggests that student success and persistence is directly related to faculty involvement. This is particularly true for students of color. This study is my initial effort to discover what relationships exist between retention and cultural competency for faculty at liberal arts institutions. Accordingly, the study of cultural competency as a tool for the development of sound retention models may benefit not only students of color, but all those who matriculate.

My study is descriptive, not evaluative. I wish to capture people’s basic orientations toward cultural difference. Participation in this study is voluntary. If you decide to participate in this study, here is what will happen:

1. You will be asked to complete the Intercultural Development Inventory. The IDI is a 50-item inventory examining people’s basic orientations toward cultural difference.
2. You will be asked to complete the Multicultural Competency Questionnaire. The questionnaire examines multicultural knowledge, skills and awareness. It is comprised of 8 items.
3. The approximate completion time for both the inventory and questionnaire is 35 minutes.
4. Please do not include any identifying information (i.e. name, address, phone number, email address, etc) on either the Intercultural Development Inventory or the Multicultural Competency Questionnaire.
5. After completion of the inventory and questionnaire, please return the materials in the self-addressed stamped envelope provided.
6. Please return the completed inventory and questionnaire by February 7, 2003

All data collected for this study will be maintained in a confidential manner. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me, Stephanie M. Helms, (919) 773-9743, smhelms@bellsouth.net. Thank you in advance for your participation.

Sincerely,

Stephanie M. Helms
Appendix G

January 13, 2003

Dear Faculty Member:

My name is Stephanie M. Helms and I am a student at North Carolina State University working on my doctoral degree in higher education administration. As a faculty member at a liberal arts institution, you are afforded with the opportunity to interact with students both in and outside of the classroom regularly. Research suggests that student success and persistence is directly related to faculty involvement. This is particularly true for students of color. My dissertation research interest is the retention of students of color. There is a large body of research that describes methods for retaining students, but very few offer the consideration of culture as a viable tool in the development of retention models. Your experience, ideas and beliefs are essential to this research and in assisting in the matriculation of students who enroll within higher education.

In November 2002, you were asked to complete the Intercultural Development Inventory and the Multicultural Competency Questionnaire as part of my dissertation study. I am writing to follow up on the request. If you have not completed the inventory and questionnaire, I ask that you please do so at this time and return the completed materials to me. If you have elected not to participate, please return the materials as well. This study is my initial effort to discover what relationships exist between retention and cultural competency for faculty at liberal arts institutions. Accordingly, the study of cultural competency as a tool for the development of sound retention models may benefit not only students of color, but all those who matriculate. Please return the completed inventory and questionnaire in the self-addressed stamped envelope that was provided to you by February 1, 2003. If you are unable to locate the inventory, please notify me by either phone or email at the contact information listed below.

All data collected for this study will be maintained in a confidential manner. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me, Stephanie M. Helms, (xxx) xxx-xxxx, or smhelms@bellsouth.net. Thank you in advance for your participation.

Sincerely,

Stephanie M. Helms
Appendix H

Additional Comments from the Multicultural Competency Questionnaire

"Too blunt a tool."

"I have gained my understanding by travel. I think the most important thing we can do for multicultural education is to somehow get students to travel!"

"Interesting study!"

"I just live in a white reality most of the time. I miss out on the richness being with Native Americans, Blacks and Latinos would bring. That's too bad."

"I think the greatest influence on my multicultural competence was my mother, whose interpretation of Christianity stressed love and tolerance. My present Quaker beliefs continue these attitudes. Quakers believe there is "that of God in every person" and thus all people are valued."

"I had some issues with some of the questions on the Intercultural Development Inventory. I felt that for several of the questions, whatever the response was open to misinterpretation. One example: my view is that people from one culture are neither more nor less polite than those of another culture. But rather the notions of politeness differ — what's polite to one may be impolite (or neutral) to another. How to answer? It's a matter of how one defines politeness rather than a matter of degree. There were several similar dilemmas for me."

"Wow. Never thought about this much. Feel very prepared and multiculturally competent to interact with anyone born in the eastern US. Have limited awareness of cultural competency from around the world. I am finding it difficult to assess my competency or answer these questions. I never think about it."
IDI PROFILE for INTERCULTURAL SENSITIVITY

Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity

DIMENSIONS

Intercultural Development Inventory

SCALES

Ethnocentrism

Denial
Defence
Minimization
Acceptance
Adaptation
Integration
Exaggerated
Constructive
Marginality
Marginality

Ethnorelativism

Your Overall Developmental Intercultural Sensitivity

PROFILE (DS)  55  70  85  100  115  130  145

Your Overall/Received Intercultural Sensitivity

PROFILE (PS)  55  70  85  100  115  130  145

148
WORLDVIEW PROFILE

DD SCALE: Indicates a worldview that simplifies and/or polarizes cultural difference.

R SCALE: Indicates a worldview that reverses "us" and "them" polarization, where "them" is superior.

M SCALE: Indicates a worldview that highlights cultural commonality and universal issues.

AA SCALE: Indicates a worldview that can comprehend and accommodate complex cultural differences.

EM SCALE: Indicates a worldview that incorporates a multicultural identity with confused cultural perspectives.
**IDI PROFILE for DEVELOPMENTAL ISSUES**

**DD SCALE:** Indicates a worldview that simplifies and/or polarizes cultural difference.

**DENIAL CLUSTER:** Tendency to withdraw from cultural difference.

- Disinterest in cultural difference.
- Avoidance of interaction with cultural difference.

**DEFENSE CLUSTER:** Tendency to view the world in terms of "us and them," where "us" is superior.

**R SCALE:** Indicates a worldview that reverses "us" and "them" polarization, where "them" is superior.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unresolved</th>
<th>In transition</th>
<th>Resolved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>4.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>4.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**IDI PROFILE for**

**M SCALE:** Indicates a worldview that highlights cultural commonality and universal values.

**SIMILARITY CLUSTER:** Tendency to assume that people from other cultures are basically “like us.”

**UNIVERSALISM CLUSTER:** Tendency to apply one’s own cultural values to other cultures.

**AA SCALE:** Indicates a worldview that can comprehend and accommodate complex cultural difference.

**ACCEPTANCE CLUSTER:** Tendency to recognize patterns of cultural difference in one’s own and other cultures.

**ADAPTATION CLUSTER:** Tendency to shift perspective and behavior according to cultural context.

* Cognitive frame-shifting.

* Behavioral code-shifting.

**EM SCALE:** Indicates a worldview that incorporates a multicultural identity with confused cultural perspectives.
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DD SCALE: Indicates a worldview that simplifies and/or polarizes cultural difference.

R SCALE: Indicates a worldview that reverses "us" and "them" polarization, where "them" is superior.

M SCALE: Indicates a worldview that highlights cultural commonality and universal issues.

AA SCALE: Indicates a worldview that can comprehend and accommodate complex cultural differences.

EM SCALE: Indicates a worldview that incorporates a multicultural identity with confused cultural perspectives.
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DEVELOPMENTAL ISSUES

DD SCALE: Indicates a worldview that simplifies and/or polarizes cultural difference.

- Denial Cluster: tendency to withdraw from cultural difference.
  - Disinterest in cultural difference.
  - Avoidance of interaction with cultural difference.

Defense Cluster: tendency to view the world in terms of "us and them," where "us" is superior.

R Scale: Indicates a worldview that reverses "us" and "them" polarization, where "them" is superior.
IDI PROFILE for

M SCALE: Indicates a worldview that highlights cultural commonality and universal values.

SIMILARITY CLUSTER: tendency to assume that people from other cultures are basically "like us."

UNIVERSALISM CLUSTER: tendency to apply one's own cultural values to other cultures.

AA SCALE: Indicates a worldview that can comprehend and accommodate to complex cultural difference.

ACCEPTANCE CLUSTER: tendency to recognize patterns of cultural difference in one's own and other cultures.

ADAPTATION CLUSTER: tendency to shift perspective and behavior according to cultural context.
  * Cognitive frame-shifting
  * Behavioral code-shifting

EM SCALE: Indicates a worldview that incorporates a multicultural identity with confused cultural perspectives.
WORLDVIEW PROFILE

**DD SCALE:** Indicates a worldview that simplifies and/or polarizes cultural difference.

**R SCALE:** Indicates a worldview that reverses "us" and "them" polarization, where "them" is superior.

**M SCALE:** Indicates a worldview that highlights cultural commonality and universal issues.

**AA SCALE:** Indicates a worldview that comprehends and accommodates complex cultural differences.

**EM SCALE:** Indicates a worldview that incorporates a multicultural identity with confused cultural perspectives.
IDI PROFILE for DEVELOPMENTAL ISSUES

DD SCALE: Indicates a worldview that simplifies and/or polarizes cultural difference.

DENIAL CLUSTER: Tendency to withdraw from cultural difference.

- Disinterest in cultural difference.
- Avoidance of interaction with cultural difference.

DEFENSE CLUSTER: Tendency to view the world in terms of "us" and "them," where "us" is superior.

R SCALE: Indicates a worldview that reverses "us" and "them" polarization, where "them" is superior.
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M SCALE: indicates a worldview that highlights cultural commonality and universal values.

SIMILARITY CLUSTER: tendency to assume that people from other cultures are basically "like us."

UNIVERSALISM CLUSTER: tendency to apply one's own cultural values to other cultures.

AA SCALE: indicates a worldview that can comprehend and accommodate to complex cultural differences.

ACCEPTANCE CLUSTER: tendency to recognize patterns of cultural difference in one's own and other cultures.

ADAPTATION CLUSTER: tendency to shift perspective and behavior according to cultural context
* Cognitive frame-shifting.
* Behavioral code-shifting.

EM SCALE: indicates a worldview that incorporates a multicultural identity with confused cultural perspectives.
IDI PROFILE for
INTERCULTURAL SENSITIVITY

Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity

DIMENSIONS

SCALES

Your Overall Developmental Intercultural Sensitivity

PROFILE (DS)

Your Overall Perceived Intercultural Sensitivity

PROFILE (PS)
WORLDVIEW PROFILE

**DD SCALE:** Indicates a worldview that simplifies and/or polarizes cultural difference.

**RS SCALE:** Indicates a worldview that reverses "us" and "them" polarization, where "them" is superior.

**MS SCALE:** Indicates a worldview that highlights cultural commonality and universal issues.

**AA SCALE:** Indicates a worldview that can comprehend and accommodate to complex cultural differences.

**EM SCALE:** Indicates a worldview that incorporates a multicultural identity with confused cultural perspectives.
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DEVELOPMENTAL ISSUES

**DD SCALE:** Indicates a worldview that simplifies and/or polarizes cultural difference.

**DENIAL CLUSTER:** Tendency to withdraw from cultural difference.

* Disinterest in cultural difference.
* Avoidance of interaction with cultural difference.

**DEFENSE CLUSTER:** Tendency to view the world in terms of "us and them," where "us" is superior.

**R SCALE:** Indicates a worldview that reverses "us" and "them" polarization, where "them" is superior.
IDI PROFILE

M SCALE: Indicates a worldview that highlights cultural commonality and universal values.

SIMILARITY CLUSTER: tendency to assume that people from other cultures are basically "like us."

UNIVERSALISM CLUSTER: tendency to apply one's own cultural values to other cultures.

AA SCALE: Indicates a worldview that can comprehend and accommodate complex cultural difference.

ACCEPTANCE CLUSTER: tendency to recognize patterns of cultural difference in one's own and other cultures.

ADAPTATION CLUSTER: tendency to shift perspective and behavior according to cultural context.

* Cognitive frame-shifting.

* Behavioral code-switching.

EM SCALE: Indicates a worldview that incorporates a multicultural identity with confused cultural perspectives.
WORLDVIEW PROFILE

DD SCALE: Indicates a worldview that simplifies and/or polarizes cultural difference.

RS SCALE: Indicates a worldview that reverses "us" and "them" polarization, where "them" is superior.

MS SCALE: Indicates a worldview that highlights cultural commonality and universal issues.

AA SCALE: Indicates a worldview that can comprehend and accommodate to complex cultural differences.

EM SCALE: Indicates a worldview that incorporates a multicultural identity with confused cultural perspectives.
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**DD SCALE:** Indicates a worldview that simplifies and/or polarizes cultural difference.

**DENIAL CLUSTER:** tendency to withdraw from cultural difference.
- Disinterest in cultural difference.
- Avoidance of interaction with cultural difference.

**DEFENSE CLUSTER:** tendency to view the world in terms of "us and them," where "us" is superior.

**R SCALE:** Indicates a worldview that reverses "us" and "them" polarization, where "them" is superior.
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M SCALE: Indicates a worldview that highlights cultural commonality and universal values.

SIMILARITY CLUSTER: tendency to assume that people from other cultures are basically "like us."

UNIVERSALISM CLUSTER: tendency to apply one's own cultural values to other cultures.

AA SCALE: Indicates a worldview that can comprehend and accommodate complex cultural difference.

ACCEPTANCE CLUSTER: tendency to recognize patterns of cultural difference in one's own and other cultures.

ADAPTATION CLUSTER: tendency to shift perspective and behavior according to cultural context.
  * Cognitive frame-shifting.
  * Behavioral code-shifting.

EM SCALE: Indicates a worldview that incorporates a multicultural identity with confused cultural perspectives.