

Identity and Multiculturalism: Teaching Multiculturalism to Undergraduate College Students

Kevin A. Harris, PhD, NCC
Assistant Professor of Psychology
The University of Texas of the Permian Basin
Odessa, TX

Ann Marie Smith, PhD
Assistant Professor of Reading Education
The University of Texas of the Permian Basin
Odessa, TX

Abstract

Teaching undergraduate college students is a complex process. From the standpoint of identity development, undergrads are emerging from adolescence, but they are not quite adults yet. When teaching any undergraduate class, considering the identity development of students is relevant, since undergrads vary in their level of development – and usually differ from the developmental level of their professors. When teaching a multicultural class to undergraduates, though, identity development becomes an even more critical issue for the instructor to be aware of – particularly cultural identity development. In teaching an undergraduate multicultural class, we would take these things into account. We propose a framework and outline for planning an undergraduate multicultural course.

Keywords: multiculturalism; identity; teaching; multicultural class; undergraduate college students

“You cannot teach if you don’t learn from those you are teaching.” – Augusto Boal (in Schechner & Chatterjee, 1998, p. 87)

Teaching undergraduate college students is a complex process. From the standpoint of identity development, undergrads are emerging from adolescence, but they are not quite adults yet. When teaching any undergraduate class, considering the identity development of students is relevant, since undergrads vary in their level of development – and usually differ from the developmental level of their professors. When teaching a multicultural class to undergraduates, though, identity development becomes an even more critical issue for the instructor to be aware of – particularly cultural identity development (Casas, Suzuki, Alexander, & Jackson, 2016; Leong, 2014; Ponterotto, Casas, Suzuki, & Alexander, 1995, 2001, 2009). In teaching an undergraduate multicultural class, we would take these things into account.

Psychosocial Identity Development of Undergraduates and Professors

According to Erikson's (1963) theory of psychosocial development, people in Western cultures pass through eight stages as they grow and mature throughout their lifetimes. The two stages that most affect college students are *identity vs. confusion* and *intimacy vs. isolation*. In *identity vs. confusion*, which usually takes place in people ages 11 through 20, adolescents develop a sense of identity. If they receive support from their peers, they learn who they are, developing a sense of fidelity and an integrated image of self. If adolescents do not receive this support, they may feel confused, indecisive, and inadequate (Erikson, 1963, pp. 261-263; Patterson, 2013, p. 28; Turner & Helms, 1995, p. 43). On the other hand, in *intimacy vs. isolation*, which usually takes place in people ages 20 through 40, young adults learn to develop close relationships with others. If they learn to do this successfully, they develop relationships that are appropriately close, loving, and lasting. If they fail to learn to be intimate, they may end up feeling lonely and isolated (Erikson, 1963, pp. 263-266; Patterson, 2013, p. 28; Turner & Helms, 1995, p. 43).

While most college students are struggling with issues of identity/confusion and intimacy/isolation, the majority of college professors are older, and have moved on to the stage of *generativity vs. stagnation*. In *generativity vs. stagnation*, which usually takes place in people ages 30 through 60, adults learn to contribute to society while working towards their own future. If they learn to do this successfully, they become productive members of society and manage to make a decent living, developing a sense of care and concern for their family, society, and posterity. If adults are too self-absorbed, they may fail to contribute to society and develop feelings of stagnation (Erikson, 1963, pp. 266-267; Patterson, 2013, p. 56; Turner & Helms, 1995, pp. 43-44).

Developmentally, then, professors at most academic institutions in the United States are at a different place than most college students. Professors often value hard work and learning for the sake of learning, or for the sake of getting ahead in the world. They are often career-minded, and expect students to be career-minded as well – to be motivated to learn and to think for themselves. According to Ignelzi (2000), many professors have unspoken expectations for students – a “hidden curriculum” (p. 10) of college education. They expect students to exercise critical thinking, be self-directed learners, view themselves as co-creators of culture, read actively, write to themselves and involve teachers in their self-reflection, and take ownership of course concepts.

While some students meet these expectations, many others are busy struggling with issues of identity and intimacy (Cross & Frazier, 2010; Zhang, 2013). Knowledge is not valued for its own sake, but only so far as it is useful or meaningful to the student. Students are often full of idealism and self-doubt. They believe that college is often boring, impersonal, and irrelevant to “real” life. As a result, professors’ knowledge is often unappreciated in many undergraduate classrooms, because it does not connect with where students are at in their development (Kaplan, 1998). College students frequently change majors and career trajectories, causing identity confusion (Johnson, Nichols, Buboltz, & Riedesel, 2002; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991). Professors need to be aware of the identity development of most college students and how it differs from their own development, and adjust their teaching style to create inclusive and effective learning environments. They should view students as capable participants but provide directions and practice for students – especially examples of how the material can apply to their lives. They should establish communities of peer learners, to create a more

intimate and peer-supportive learning environment. They should also support the struggle inherent in the educational journey and the difficulty that many students have as they try to incorporate what they are learning into their developing identities (Baxter Magolda, 2000; Cross & Frazier, 2010).

For the first author, as a college professor, this is not yet much of an issue. He is young enough that he is still dealing with issues of *identity vs. confusion* and *intimacy vs. isolation*. He is still in Erikson's (1963) stage of *identity vs. confusion*, though near the end of this stage, but he anticipates still dealing with issues of *intimacy vs. isolation* for at least a few more years. Thus, psychosocially, he is close to the same developmental level as his students are likely to be.

For the second author, there is a greater developmental difference between her students and her. She is dealing with issues of *generativity vs. stagnation* and focused more intensely on career development and productivity than her younger coauthor. In teaching a multicultural class, she keeps in mind the differences in psychosocial priorities between herself and her students, since they are much more focused on identifying who they are as individuals and creating successful intimate relationships with others than she is.

Cognitive Identity Development of Undergraduates and Professors

Piaget's theory of cognitive development reveals an even more pronounced difference between professors and college students. According to Piaget's theory of cognitive development, children in Western societies begin to develop *formal operational* thinking around puberty. Their thinking becomes systematic, much more flexible, and capable of abstract thought, problem-solving, scientific reasoning, and logic (Barrouillet, 2015, p. 1; Turner & Helms, 1995, pp. 52-56). Many people reach *formal operational* thinking as adolescents, but some do not develop this level of thought until adulthood. Some never reach *formal operational* thinking (Sutherland, 1999, p. 286).

Research by Commons, Richards, and Kuhn (1982), though, suggests that cognitive development does not end with *formal operational* thinking. According to Commons et al. (1982), there are two levels of cognitive development beyond *formal operational* thinking, which they termed *systematic operational* and *metasystematic operational* thinking (p. 1059). While *formal operational* thinking involves an idea, or ordinary thinking, *systematic operational* thinking involves a theory, or a system of thinking, and *metasystematic operational* thinking involves a metatheory, or metasystem of thinking. Commons et al. (1982) reported evidence of *formal*, *systematic*, and *metasystematic* reasoning in college students (pp. 1062-1068). Few undergraduates showed evidence of *systematic* or *metasystematic* reasoning, but considerably more graduates showed evidence of these operations. Commons et al. (1982) concluded that many (though not all) adults may naturally tend to reach *formal operational* thinking, but that post-secondary education is likely responsible for the development of *systematic* and *metasystematic operational* thinking.

This reveals what is perhaps the greatest difference between the identities of college students and their professors – their level of thinking. Many college professors find themselves frustrated teaching undergrads, believing that they are lazy or want the answers handed to them. Likewise, many college students find themselves frustrated with their professors, thinking that they teach on too abstract a level while failing to provide relevant examples. This is because college professors think on a different level than undergraduates. Through years of graduate

education, thinking, and teaching, professors have developed *systematic* and *metasystematic operational* thinking. The thinking of undergraduate college students, on the other hand, is *formal operational* – or often even less developed. Their thinking needs to be developed and nurtured. They need concrete examples of ideas and visual aids. They need professors that teach from the concrete to the abstract – teaching that synthesizes concepts for them, at least until they have learned to synthesize concepts on their own (Sutherland, 1999). Understanding systems of thinking is particularly challenging for them, so they need to be taught how to think systematically.

For the first author as a professor, this has already become an issue. Through his graduate study, he has developed a *systematic operational* style of thinking – and a limited but growing ability to think in *metasystematic operational* terms. He forgets sometimes that most of his students have not yet mastered these styles of thinking; he has to watch himself, to make sure that he does not talk over their heads. He has found that visual aids and bulleted notes are helpful for his students when he is addressing a complex topic. He has also found that experiential learning activities are helpful in getting students to grasp more difficult systemic – *systematic operational* – ideas.

For the second author, this is not as much of an issue. Most of her students are graduate students, ages thirty years old and older, and are working as teachers in the field of education. Her undergraduate students, teacher candidates, are in the final stages of their college career, transitioning into professional lives as they spend time in schools, observing and student teaching. Most of her students are already transitioning into using *systematic operational* styles of thinking, similar to her own *systematic* and *metasystematic* cognitive style.

Cultural Identity Development of Undergraduates and Professors

While the general psychosocial and cognitive identity development of college students and their professors is informative to the educational process, their cultural identity development is also relevant (Casas et al., 2016; Leong, 2014; Ponterotto et al., 1995, 2001, 2009). The cultural diversity found in college classrooms in the United States has been increasing over the last few decades. African Americans, Asian Americans, Latino and Latina Americans, other American ethnic minorities, and international students now account for greater numbers – and proportions – of the undergraduate population than ever before (Osterholt & Dennis, 2014, p. 18; Pope & Wilder, 2005, p. 322). Even in a course that does not particularly emphasize culture in its content, the makeup of its students is often culturally diverse. The cultural identity development of college students is an important pedagogical variable for professors to take into account – particularly because the cultural identities of students are often further developed than those of their professors, and because college students come from an educational system where racial disparities have been well-documented (Gershenson, Holt, & Papageorge, 2016; Harber et al., 2012; Nicholson-Crotty, Grissom, Nicholson-Crotty, & Redding, 2016; Weir, 2016). Caucasian professors, for example, are often unaware of their White privilege and may be insensitive to the positions of their non-Caucasian students (Rainer, 2015). Likewise, female students may feel discriminated against by male professors especially in fields such as science and math (Robnett, 2016).

One of the most comprehensive models of cultural identity development is the Racial/Cultural Identity Development model of Atkinson, Morten, and Sue (1989), that was

developed to apply to the identity development of any ethnic minority group member. Originally called the Minority Identity Development model but renamed in 1990 by Sue and Sue, this model involves a gradual progression from cultural ignorance to an integrative awareness of the effects of culture on one's self and the world (Delgado-Romero, 2001, p. 207). The Racial/Cultural Identity Development model of Atkinson et al. (1989) has five distinct stages: *conformity* (p. 40), *dissonance* (p. 41), *resistance and immersion* (p. 42), *introspection* (p. 43), and *awareness* (or the *synergistic stage*, p. 44). In the *conformity* stage, a person prefers dominant/White cultural values, denies their ethnic minority status, and holds self-deprecating beliefs. In the *dissonance* stage, a person experiences information inconsistent with dominant values, their denial breaks down, and a mistrust of the dominant society develops. In the *resistance and immersion* stage, a person endorses minority beliefs and rejects dominant society, often feeling guilt and anger. In the *introspection* stage, a person realizes their resistance isn't working and develops a more proactive sense of self. Finally, in the *awareness* stage, a person develops a sense of security in their own identity and an appreciation of the positive aspects of their own culture, other minority cultures, and the dominant culture.

White people, on the other hand, go through a slightly different process of cultural identity development. They are part of the dominant majority group, so rather than learning to value their own culture in addition to the dominant culture, White cultural identity development involves learning to value other cultures in addition to their own dominant culture. Helms's (1984, 1995) White racial identity model remains an excellent description of White cultural identity development. According to this model, people pass through two phases in developing a mature White identity: an Abandonment of Racism phase in which they leave behind their old prejudicial views of culture, and a Definition of Positive White Identity phase in which they develop a positive view of themselves. The Abandonment of Racism phase involves three stages: *contact*, *disintegration*, and *reintegration* (Helms, 1995, p. 185). In the *contact* stage, a person is unaware of their race or culture and possesses a kind of naïve curiosity towards other cultures, without any real cultural knowledge. Most White people begin in this stage, and many never mature beyond it. In the *disintegration* stage, a person realizes that racism exists and has benefited them, often feeling anxiety, guilt, or depression. In the *reintegration* stage, a person develops a pro-White bias and feelings of hostility towards non-Whites. After these three stages comes the Definition of Positive White Identity phase, which involves three additional stages: *pseudo-independence*, *immersion/emersion*, and *autonomy* (Helms, 1995, p. 185). In the *pseudo-independence* stage, a person develops a genuine curiosity about race and an identification with Whiteness. In the *immersion/emersion* stage, a person evolves a hyper-vigilance towards racism and actively searches for what it means to be White. Finally, in the *autonomy* phase, a person gains an appreciation for and acceptance of racial and cultural differences, and actively seeks out cross-cultural experiences.

Students often have not had extensive exposure to members of other cultural groups until they reach college. As a result, many White college students start out in the *contact* stage of their identity development, and many minority students start out in the *conformity* stage. Because race tends to be a more salient issue for members of minority groups than for White people, minority students are frequently more mature in their identity development. Just because a person is a minority student, though, does not mean that they are any more aware of cultural issues than a majority group member. It is important that professors refrain from making assumptions about a student's identity development based on their race, but instead focus on finding out where students are in their identity development (Howard-Hamilton, 2000).

If a professor is at a later stage of cultural identity development than are his or her students, this gives the professor opportunities to engage these students in cultural dialog and encourage their cultural identity development. Too often, professors are no more mature in their cultural identity development than are their students. If professors and students are at comparable levels of cultural identity development, this may enable them to communicate well when discussing cultural issues, but if both are in early stages of cultural development, then cultural issues are likely to be ignored. If both professor and students are in early stages of cultural development, the professor may ignore, discount, or pathologize issues of cultural diversity while implicitly or explicitly endorsing the values and attitudes of the dominant majority. An even greater danger (and increasingly common) is a professor who is less mature than his or her students in cultural identity. More culturally mature students may find themselves offended, marginalized, and ignored by such a professor, who may appear to them to be narrow-minded, or ignorant. Professors must be aware of their own cultural identities, and seek to develop them further. They should also work to develop culturally responsive curricula in their classrooms. A culturally responsive curriculum involves coursework that emphasizes a human need or interest, professors who collaborate with students, and students who work together as communities of learners. Both students and professors must believe in people and their ability to be transformed. Finally, students must be treated equally and invited to address any practices or policies which they suspect may be prejudicial or unfair (Howard-Hamilton, 2000).

For the first author, in his own cultural identity development as a White heterosexual American male who grew up in the Midwest, he has changed considerably over the past few years. He has evolved a vigilance towards racism and actively searched for what it means to be White. He has developed an appreciation for and an acceptance of racial and cultural differences, and he actively seeks out cross-cultural experiences. He sees himself in cultural identity development somewhere between Helms's (1984, 1995) stages of *immersion/emersion* and *autonomy* (though admittedly this is difficult to determine from the inside looking out). If this is correct, this means that his cultural identity is further developed than most of the students he teaches. He must keep in mind their level of development when teaching them, and not assume that they are narrow-minded bigots just because they make statements that are developmentally immature. He can also use himself as a teaching tool, self-disclosing his own experiences with and awareness of culture, and modeling for his students how a multiculturally aware White person speaks about issues of race and ethnicity.

For the second author, after moving to Texas four years ago, she has observed many instances of prejudice against Mexican immigrants. Like the first author, she works in a Hispanic Serving Institution, and many of her Latino students have shared their experiences as Latinos and Latinas living in Texas. Acknowledging that her education in English Language learning was lacking, she educated herself on bilingual education, bilingualism, and translanguaging, or the act bilingual and multilingual people go through in order to communicate effectively within multilingual worlds (Garcia, 2008; Garcia & Kleifgen, 2010; Garcia & Kleyn, 2016).

Designing an Undergraduate Multicultural Class

Multiculturalism is often emphasized as an important value to instill in college students (e.g., Fuentes & Shannon, 2016; Hughes & Romeo, 1999; Sperling, 2007; Warren, 2006). Often, though, the multicultural education of undergraduates consists of only one elective course that

students are not required to take, and many college professors treat cultural issues as peripheral rather than central to education – or inadvertently train students to hold White, middle-class, Western biases (Ganapathy-Coleman & Serpell, 2008; Hall, Lopez, & Bansal, 2001). In his own college education, the first author has found that many of his fellow students simply learned to say what is multiculturally correct rather than internalizing the importance of multiculturalism. The second author, who grew up two decades after the first author, has found that her peers continue to avoid interrogating their own White-ness and seem to view this process as unnecessary. Research strongly suggests that experiential activities, such as counseling classes and group experiences, can help students to internalize the importance of multicultural issues (e.g., Cook, Lusk, Miller, Dodier, & Salazar, 2012; Kim & Lyons, 2003; Villalba & Redmond, 2008). Accordingly, a multicultural class for undergraduate students would not only serve to supplement the curricula of most programs, but would also be a great personal development opportunity for students.

Here, we propose teaching an undergraduate multicultural class which is modeled after a series of campus intergroup dialog groups described in Zúñiga (2003), a five-session race discussion group developed by the Study Circles Resource Center (Flavin-McDonald & McCoy, 1997), and a series of experiential activities presented in an article by Kim and Lyons (2003), Pedersen's (2004) text *110 Experiences for Multicultural Learning*, and Pope, Pangelinan, and Coker's (2011) text *Experiential Activities for Teaching Multicultural Competence in Counseling*. The class has four goals: (1) to explore and develop the multicultural beliefs and attitudes, knowledge, and skills of undergraduate students; (2) to foster dialog about issues of race and culture; (3) to foster the cultural identity development of students; and (4) to generate felt change in the cultural awareness of students through experiential techniques. Students can come from any undergraduate level, though it will be preferable for a multicultural class to be composed of juniors and seniors. Ideally, the students will be from multiple ethnic and racial backgrounds, though this will not always be possible given the demographic makeup of many undergraduate programs.

The first two weeks of the class will focus on creating an environment for dialog (Zúñiga, 2003, p. 12). On the first day, we will address issues of confidentiality. We will let the class know that we will be discussing sensitive and controversial issues and instruct class members not to discuss what they hear in class with anyone outside the class. We will also point out that while students are supposed to respect each other's confidentiality, this cannot be guaranteed. We will let students know what to expect from the class. Students will be told that the class will not only involve reading, writing, discussion, and personal reflection on racial and cultural issues, which students are likely to expect, but that the class will also involve participation in games and other experiential activities, which students may not expect from an academic class. We will point out to students the risks and benefits of taking this class. Risks include having to self-disclose, talking about a sensitive topic, feeling shame because they said something culturally insensitive, and learning that they may have racist attitudes. Benefits include learning about their own multicultural attitudes and abilities, developing greater self-awareness, and becoming more mature in their cultural identity. Finally, we will go over basic rules for the class. Personal attacks will be forbidden, asking questions and participation will be strongly encouraged, discussing class topics with classmates outside of class time will be strongly discouraged, and students will be asked to tolerate conflict, since this is likely to arise during the group. The students will then be invited to set up other ground rules as necessary.

During the first few days, the students and instructor will get to know each other and

begin to discuss our different opinions about culture. All class discussions will promote the class as a safe and comfortable place for the discussion of personal racial and cultural issues. Students will be assigned a number of readings on multiculturalism for them to complete during the semester. They will be asked to keep a journal of their experiences during the semester. Additionally, students will take assessment instruments and do reflective writing assignments to appraise their current level of cultural identity and comfort with experiential group techniques. Meanwhile, the instructor will be using himself or herself as an example, self-disclosing as appropriate about his or her own experiences and awareness of culture, and (in the case of the first author) his cultural identity development as a White heterosexual American male who grew up in the Midwest experiencing White male privilege, or (in the case of the second author) her cultural identity as a White heterosexual American female who grew up in the Midwest experiencing gender discrimination in work, educational, and social arenas. Kiselica (1998, p. 5) suggests that such instructor self-disclosure helps to facilitate students' cultural identity development in multicultural classes. Hopefully, this will also encourage students to open up and self-disclose their own views and experiences.

We will participate in experiential activities as well. During the first few days, we will do a few ice-breaker activities from Pope et al. (2011) and Pedersen (2004), like *Cultural Bingo* (Pedersen, 2004, pp. 27-28) or *Multicultural Bingo* (Pope et al., 2011, pp. 10-11), taking a not-for-credit *Diversity Quiz* (Pope et al., 2011, pp. 37-38), *Drawing a House* (Pedersen, 2004, pp. 25-26), and creating *My Culture Drawings* (Pope et al., 2011, pp. 43-44). Then, late during the first week or early during the second, the class will play a game called *Bafa Bafa* (Kim & Lyons, 2003, p. 404). For this game, the group will be divided into two mock-cultures – Alpha and Beta. Each subgroup will learn the rules of their mock-culture as specified by the instructions, send observers to observe the other mock-culture's behavior, and then send emissaries to interact with the other mock-culture. Participants will then discuss what it was like to become part of a mock-culture and then learn the rules of a different one.

The third through sixth weeks of the class will focus on situating the dialog – on learning about the differences as well as the commonalities of students' cultural experiences (Zúñiga, 2003, p. 13). Students will be given reading assignments on theories of racial and cultural identity development, and in class they will be asked to reflect upon and discuss their own state of cultural identity development. Class dialog will focus on race relations and racism – on group members' experiences, perceptions, and beliefs about race and ethnicity (Flavin-McDonald & McCoy, 1997, pp. 5-8).

The class will participate in more experiential activities from Kim and Lyons (2003), including *Multicultural Jeopardy* (p. 405) and *Step Forward, Step Back* (p. 404). In *Multicultural Jeopardy*, a trivia game, questions will be phrased in the form of answers and players will supply the answers in the form of questions. Answers will relate to cultural knowledge, and many will be taken from the take-home readings. In the game called *Step Forward, Step Back*, students will generate a list of cultural roles (e.g., African American male, Mexican American female), write each role on a piece of paper, and randomly draw their roles out of a hat (or, if the group is diverse, students can simply assume their own cultural roles). The instructor will represent the "Institutional System" and will tell each person to take one or more steps forward or backward based on their cultural role. Minority persons will be asked to step back, while dominant group members will be asked to step forward; for example, an African American female student might be asked to take two steps back because she is part of two disadvantaged groups. Participants will then discuss the physical spaces between them, and their

meaning in the larger cultural context.

Experiential activities for this portion of the course will also be drawn from Pedersen (2004) and Pope et al. (2011). Activities from Pope et al. (2011) will include *Diversity: Passive Tolerance vs. Active Insistence* (p. 12), *Multicultural Simulation Project* (p. 19), *"I'm Different, You're Different, We're the Same!"* (p. 25), *An Introduction to the Discussion of Race: Why Are Counselors Comfortable Using a Color-Blind Approach?* (p. 33), *Identities in Interaction: A Role-Play* (p. 99), *"Pieces of Me": Cultural Identity Development Exploration* (p. 101), *Create Yourself as a Cultural Being* (p. 109), *My Cultural Awareness Lifeline* (p. 111), and *Racial-Cultural Dyadic Role-Play* (p. 124). Activities from Pedersen (2004) will include brief 30-minute warm-up exercises such as *World Picture Test* (p. 13), *Capturing Cultural Bias* (p. 15), *Role-Playing Cultural Stories* (p. 23), *Finding Common Ground in an Argument* (p. 30), and *Western and Non-Western Perspectives* (p. 38), and a handful of longer one-hour experiences such as *A Classroom Debate* (p. 88), *The Plural Versus the Singular Cultural Perspective* (p. 94), and *Stereotypes of Different Groups I and II* (pp. 113 and 115).

The seventh through twelfth weeks of the multicultural class will focus on exploring conflicts and multiple perspectives (Zúñiga, 2003, p. 14). Students will be given a homework assignment to have some kind of a cross-cultural encounter – to immerse themselves in a situation in which they will be directly and deeply exposed to someone from a different culture. Several guest speakers will speak to the class about various cultural issues. Students will also be asked to dialog about “hot” topics. The instructor will propose at least three topics for discussion from Flavin-McDonald and McCoy (1997): dealing with race and the nature of the problem (p. 9-14), actions to make progress on race relations (pp. 15-18), and public policies to help deal with race relations (pp. 19-24). Students will also brainstorm for topics they wish to discuss, and will then choose several: one for each class day during the seventh through eleventh weeks of the semester on which a guest speaker is not scheduled. The twelfth week will be reserved for processing the topics that are discussed.

During these six weeks of class, students will take part in more experiential activities, including *Actions Speak Louder Than Words* (Kim & Lyons, 2003, pp. 406-407). In this game, the instructor will suggest to the class a number of different non-verbal gestures. Students will suggest their own gestures, as well. Then students will take turns demonstrating these gestures, while the remainder of the class discusses the different possible meanings of these gestures.

For this portion of the course, experiential activities will again be drawn from Pope et al. (2011) and Pedersen (2004). Activities from Pope et al. (2011) will include *Examining the Inner Circle: Unpacking White Privilege* (p. 145), *The People in My Life: A Personal Reflection of Power and Privilege* (p. 150), *What Kinds of Privilege and Oppression Do I Experience?* (p. 165), *The Token Activity* (p. 169), *Take a Walk in My Shoes* (p. 185), *Out of Your Comfort Zone* (p. 212), *Family Dinner and Photo* (p. 296), *Using Art and Discussion to Explore Myths and Realities About the First Thanksgiving* (p. 275), and *Twenty Questions With a Twist: Uncovering Social Class Assumptions* (p. 332). Activities from Pedersen (2004) will include brief 30-minute warm-up exercises such as *Fantasy Walk in the Woods* (p. 42), *Describing Cultural Identity* (p. 56), *Interpreting a Projective Picture* (p. 58), *Drawing Symbols of Your Culture* (p. 60), and *Geometric Symbols of Cultural Values* (p. 62). This course will also utilize a handful of longer one-hour experiences from Pedersen (2004) such as *Being "Abnormal"* (p. 131), *Gift Giving Across Cultures* (p. 139), and *Culture-Centered Genogram* (p. 156).

Throughout the class, students will also participate in narrative writing, reflecting on texts and class discussions. Autobiography is often used in multicultural teacher education courses to

help pre-service teachers explore their own and others' cultural identities (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990, p. 2; Li, 2007, p. 37). It is important that pre-service teachers not only come to an understanding of their own positions of power, and how culture positions others, but also become sensitive to their students' cultural backgrounds identities through culturally sensitive teaching (Gay, 2003, p. 167). Autobiography, journal writing, and respectful class discussion can enhance college students' cultural awareness and sensitivity.

Homework assignments will also be assigned from Pedersen (2004). These assignments will include *A Personal Cultural History* (p. 240), *Analyzing a Transcript* (p. 244), *A Culture-Centered Interview Guide* (p. 246), *Adapting to the Culture of a University* (p. 259), the *Interpersonal, Intercultural, Psychopathological (IIP) Questionnaire* (p. 274), and *Writing an Ethnography* (p. 298).

Finally, the last few weeks of class will focus on moving students from dialog to action – on action planning and alliance building (Zúñiga, 2003, pp. 14-15). Students will be asked to brainstorm how they can move from words to action in their community (Flavin-McDonald & McCoy, 1997, pp. 25-34), and to come up with one or more community projects that will allow them to carry forward into the community the cultural dialog which they begin during the class. Participants will discuss what they have learned in the group, and termination will be addressed.

Little research is available on the effectiveness of multicultural classes on changing the cultural views of undergraduate students. General research on group counseling suggests that groups are more effective in creating attitude and behavior change in people than are individual interventions (Bednar & Kaul, 1994; Yalom & Leszcz, 2005), and considerable research indicates that experiential activities such as those described above help students to become more multiculturally aware (Kim & Lyons, 2003; Kiselica, 1998; Villalba & Redmond, 2008). Also, the specific multicultural approaches outlined in Kim and Lyons (2003), Zúñiga (2003), Flavin-McDonald and McCoy (1997), Pedersen (2004), and Pope et al. (2011) all appear to have the potential to be highly successful with college students. We are optimistic, therefore, that a multicultural class such as we have described here would be effective in fostering the multicultural development of undergraduates.

References

- Atkinson, D., Morten, G., & Sue, D. W. (1989). *Counseling American minorities: A cross-cultural perspective*. Dubuque, IA: Brown.
- Barrouillet, P. (2015, December). Theories of cognitive development: From Piaget to today. *Developmental Review*, 38, 1-12.
- Baxter Magolda, M. B. (2000). Teaching to promote holistic learning and development. In M. B. Baxter Magolda (Ed.), *Teaching to promote intellectual and personal maturity: Incorporating students' worldviews and identities into the learning process* (pp. 88-98). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bednar, R. L., & Kaul, T. J. (1994). Experiential group research: Can the canon fire? In A. E. Bergin & S. L. Garfield (Eds.), *Handbook of psychotherapy and behavior change* (4th ed., pp. 631-663). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Casas, J. M., Suzuki, L. A., Alexander, C. M., & Jackson, M. A. (2016). *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Commons, M. L., Richards, F. A., & Kuhn, D. (1982). Systematic and metasystematic reasoning: A case for levels of reasoning beyond Piaget's stage of formal operations. *Child Development, 53*, 1058-1069.
- Connelly, M., & Clandinin, J. (1990). Stories of experience and narrative inquiry. *Educational Researcher, 19*(5), 2-12.
- Cook, K., Lusk, A., Miller, L. C., Dodier, O. E., & Salazar, A. M. (2012). Understanding unearned privilege: An experiential activity for counseling students. *Journal of Creativity in Mental Health, 7*(3), 289-303. doi: 10.1080/15401383.2012.710167
- Cross, T. L., & Frazier, A. D. (2010). Guiding the psychosocial development of gifted students attending specialized residential STEM schools. *Roeper Review, 32*(1), 32-41. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02783190903386868>
- Delgado-Romero, E. (2001). Counseling a Hispanic/Latino client – Mr. X. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 23*(3), 207-221.
- Erikson, E. H. (1963). *Childhood and society*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton.
- Flavin-McDonald, C., & McCoy, M.L. (1997). *The busy citizen's discussion guide: Facing the challenge of racism and race relations* (3rd ed.). Pomfret, CT: Topsfield Foundation.
- Fuentes, M. A., & Shannon, C. R. (2016). The state of multiculturalism and diversity in undergraduate psychology training. *Teaching of Psychology, 43*(3), 197-203. doi: 10.1177/0098628316649315
- Ganapathy-Coleman, H., & Serpell, R. (2008). Challenging western hegemony through systematic study of cultural diversity: An undergraduate course on child development and culture. *Intercultural Education, 19*(2), 97-104.
- Garcia, O. (2008). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Somerset, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Garcia, O., & Kleifgen, J. (2010). *Educating emergent bilinguals: Policies, programs and practices for English language learners*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Garcia, O., & Kleyn, T. (2016). *Translanguaging with multilingual students: Learning from classroom moments*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Gay, G. (2003). *Becoming multicultural educators*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Gershenson, S., Holt, S. B., & Papageorge, N. W. (2016, June). Who believes me? The effect of student-teacher demographic match on teacher expectations. *Economics of Education Review, 52*, 209-224. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2016.03.002>
- Hall, G. C. N., Lopez, I. R., & Bansal, A. (2001). Academic acculturation: Race, gender, and class issues. In D. B. Pope-Davis & H. L. K. Coleman (Eds.), *The intersection of race, class, and gender in multicultural counseling* (pp. 171-188). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Harber, K. D., Gorman, J. L., Gengaro, F. P., Butisingh, S., Tsang, W., & Ouellette, R. (2012). Students' race and teachers' social support affect the positive feedback bias in public schools. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 104*, 1149-1161. Doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0028110>
- Helms, J. E. (1984). Towards a theoretical explanation of the effects of race on counseling: A Black and White model. *The Counseling Psychologist, 12*(4), 153-165. doi: 10.1177/0011000084124013
- Helms, J. E. (1995). An update on Helms's White and people of color racial identity models. In J. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (pp. 181-198). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Howard-Hamilton, M. F. (2000). Creating a culturally responsive learning environment for African American students. In M. B. Baxter Magolda (Ed.), *Teaching to promote intellectual and personal maturity: Incorporating students' worldviews and identities into the learning process* (pp. 81-87). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Hughes, D., & Romeo, G. C. (1999). Enhancing multiculturalism for nontraditional students. *College Student Journal*, 33(3), 407-414.
- Ignelzi, M. (2000). Meaning-making in the learning and teaching process. In M. B. Baxter Magolda (Ed.), *Teaching to promote intellectual and personal maturity: Incorporating students' worldviews and identities into the learning process* (pp. 5-14). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Johnson, P., Nichols, C., Buboltz, W., & Riedesel, B. (2002). Assessing a holistic trait and factor approach to career development of college students. *Journal of College Counseling*, 5(1), 4-14.
- Kaplan, R. (1998). The scientist/professor and undergraduate education. *Teaching of Psychology*, 25(3), 173-176. doi:10.1207/s15328023top2503_1
- Kim, B. S. K., & Lyons, H. Z. (2003). Experiential activities and multicultural counseling competence training. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 81(4), 400-408.
- Kiselica, M. S. (1998). Preparing Anglos for the challenges and joys of multiculturalism. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 26, 5-21.
- Leong, F. T. L. (2014). *APA handbook of multicultural psychology*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Li, X. (2007). Multiculturalize teacher identity: A critical descriptive narrative. *Multicultural Education*, 14(4), 37-44.
- Nicholson-Crotty, S., Grissom, J. A., Nicholson-Crotty, J., & Redding, C. (2016). Disentangling the causal mechanisms of representative bureaucracy: Evidence from assignment of students to gifted programs. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 26(4), 745-757.
- Osterholt, D. A., & Dennis, S. L. (2014). Assessing and addressing student barriers: Implications for today's college classroom. *About Campus*, 18(6), 18-24. Doi: 10.1002/abc.21140
- Pascarella, E., & Terenzini, P. (1991). *How college affects students: Findings and insights from twenty years of research*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Patterson, A. V. (2013). Emerging adulthood as a unique stage in Erikson's psychosocial development theory: Incarnation vs. impudence (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <https://uta-ir.tdl.org/uta-ir/handle/10106/11059>
- Pedersen, P. B. (2004). *110 experiences for multicultural learning*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Ponterotto, J. G., Casas, J. M., Suzuki, L. A., & Alexander, C. M. (1995). *Handbook of multicultural counseling*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ponterotto, J. G., Casas, J. M., Suzuki, L. A., & Alexander, C. M. (2001). *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ponterotto, J. G., Casas, J. M., Suzuki, L. A., & Alexander, C. M. (2009). *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Pope, J., & Wilder, J. (2005). Now that I'm out in the field: Student teaching and valuing diversity. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 32(4), 322-328.

- Pope, M., Pangelinan, J. S., & Coker, A. D. (2011). *Experiential activities for teaching multicultural competence in counseling*. Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- Rainer, J. (2015). Understanding and challenging white privilege in higher education as a means of combatting and neutralizing racism. *Multicultural Learning and Teaching*, 10(2), 149-161. doi: 10.1515/mlt-2015-0011
- Robnett, R. D. (2016, March). Gender bias in STEM fields: Variation in prevalence and links to STEM self-concept. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 40, 65-79. doi: 10.1177/0361684315596162
- Schechner, R., & Chatterjee, S. (1998). Augusto Boal, city councillor. *TDR: The Drama Review*, 42(4), 75-90.
- Sperling, R. (2007). Service-learning as a method of teaching multiculturalism to White college students. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 6(4), 309-322. doi: 10.1080/15348430701473454
- Sue, D. W., & Sue, D. (1990). *Counseling the culturally different: Theory and practice* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: John Wiley.
- Sutherland, P. (1999). The application of Piagetian and neo-Piagetian ideas to further and higher education. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 18(4), 286-294.
- Turner, J. S., & Helms, D. B. (1995). *Lifespan development* (5th ed.). Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace.
- Villalba, J. A., & Redmond, R. E. (2008). Crash: Using a popular film as an experiential learning activity in a multicultural counseling course. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 47(4), 264-276.
- Warren, C. S. (2006). Incorporating multiculturalism into undergraduate psychology courses: Three simple active learning activities. *Teaching of Psychology*, 33(2), 105-109. doi: 10.1207/s15328023top3302_5
- Weir, K. (2016). Inequality at school. *Monitor on Psychology*, 47(10), 42-47. Retrieved from <http://www.apa.org/monitor/2016/11/cover-inequality-school.aspx>
- Yalom, I. D., & Leszcz, M. (2005). *The theory and practice of group psychotherapy* (5th ed.). New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Zhang, L. (2013, February). Psychosocial development and the Big Five personality traits among Chinese university students. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 23, 163-167. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2012.07.015>
- Zúñiga, X. (2003). Bridging differences through dialogue. *About Campus*, January-February, 8-16.