

Incorporating Ethnic and Cross-Cultural Diversity in University Teaching

Dan Krejci & William Lester
Jacksonville State University

Abstract

This article focuses on the incorporation of ethnic and cross-cultural diversity in college and university courses. First, we posit a theory that we call the theory of confrontation, which presents categories of behavior that affect the way we react to confrontation. Second, after using a meta-analysis approach, we combined our theory of confrontation with previous studies in order to develop an educational delivery system that takes into account the various types of behavior that affect our students' willingness to learn. This system uses a three point educational delivery method involving case studies, role-playing, and civic engagement (community-based experiences) as a way of augmenting our lectures and to promote ethnic and cross-cultural diversity discourse. In addition, we posit that the lecture can be used as a means to not only set the stage for the other three methods, it can also be used as a way to debrief the students at the end of the semester.

"I have a dream that this nation will rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed . . ." These are the words of Martin Luther King Jr. and they hold out the hope that this nation can ascend to a better place for all Americans. If we are to achieve King's dream, the role that universities play in the achievement of this dream will be crucial. Fundamental to this will be the importance of encouraging and fostering continued ethnic and cross-cultural communication. This encouragement must be planned and intentional. Universities already attempt to increase the ethnic and cross-cultural diversity of their student

bodies, but they also face the challenge of getting a student body, once diversified, to engage in a discourse that covers ethnic and cross-cultural issues.

However, universities face a dilemma that is in many ways of their own creation. Namely, the university curriculum has become so specialized that it is getting more difficult with each passing year to meet the goals of a liberal arts education. Certainly, ethnic and cross-cultural understanding is one of the foundations of a solid liberal arts education. Will we ever roll back the increasing specialization of the university curriculum and allow more courses for the development of a liberal arts education? This is unlikely and may not even be beneficial. However, this is an issue that is beyond the scope of this paper. Rather our focus is on the need for colleges and universities to do a better job inculcating an appreciation of ethnic and cross-cultural diversity within the existing curriculum. This begs the question: How we can accomplish this goal?

Many universities spend an enormous amount of their resources recruiting for diversity of many types in their attempt to increase the diversity of the student and faculty populations. While we applaud these efforts, it is not enough. Students, even at institutions that have diverse populations, demonstrate a tendency to cluster in groups that are often alike ethnically, culturally, and ideologically. Freedom of association is certainly at work in their choices. This likeness is very often exacerbated by the specialized nature of course material that place students in self-selected and often similar environments based upon their choices. This can create

something similar to a groupthink mentality. Dialogue across these various divides can be problematic. Breaking this cycle must be intentional. It requires planning and forethought. Jolting students out of their “comfort zones” is an obligation of the university and is necessary to produce a well-rounded critical thinking individual. In fact, much of democratic theory resounds with the idea that we need a literate and active citizenry in order to keep a well functioning republic (Dewey, 1916; Thelen, 1960). The reasoning behind this is that critical debate allows for understanding of differences and thereby more tolerance. Of course, this works only when civil discourse is engaged in by a variety of participants. Hence, universities should attempt to instill a deep appreciation for a diverse dialogue alongside basic and specialized knowledge. In the normative sense, we should encourage this notion of diversity as a societal good that is worth embracing throughout one’s life. This all leads to the question: How do we get students to engage in a dialogue related to ethnic and cross-cultural diversity while gaining an appreciation for continued exploration? As Lowman (1995) rightly notes, “understanding material is not the same thing as being intellectually excited about it ...” (p. 23).

It is our contention that the purposeful introduction of the topic of ethnic and cross-cultural diversity can not only achieve understanding, but it can actually bring about intellectual excitement in those exposed to the material. However, methods matter a great deal in this regard. We will propose a variety of methods designed to confront the individual with the course information in such a way that we achieve the twin goals of understanding and excitement for the subject material.

Even though some universities have begun an attempt at incorporating ethnic and cross-cultural dialogue, this cannot be

accomplished at the university level; rather it must be focused on the classroom level if it is to succeed. Ethnic and cross-cultural diversity must be a planned part of the curriculum. The purpose of this paper is to provide a guide for incorporating ethnic and cross-cultural diversity into college and university classrooms. In order to accomplish this task, this paper describes our model for teaching ethnic and cross-cultural diversity at the university level.

In the first section, we present our methodology for exploring the subject of ethnic and cross-cultural diversity in university teaching. The second stage is a brief review of the literature that discusses the delivery systems that we posit will aid universities in incorporating ethnic and cross-cultural diversity into the curriculum. Third, we discuss possible obstacles that may prevent students from learning about and engaging in ethnic and cross-cultural discourse. In addition, the third section introduces and discusses the *theory of confrontation*. The fourth section suggests how the college instructor can incorporate these delivery systems into college and university courses. Finally, in our conclusion, we tie these sections together and provide questions and directions for future research.

Methodology

We conducted a brief review of the literature on such diverse subjects as case studies, role-playing, and civic engagement in order to accomplish our analysis. This analysis enabled us to design a curricular program that promotes student awareness of ethnic and cross-cultural diversity; a program that we hope provides us and other researchers with some intriguing possibilities for future studies. We are hopeful that this three point approach will enable students to experience the

opportunity to acquire a broader worldview, and, in turn, contribute to expanding our pluralistic society through the influx of new ideas, which, in the end, results in an increased ethic of social justice and cross-cultural discourse.

In addition, using observations of student behavior drawn from experiences gained in the classroom and from a combined 60 years of experience working in the public sector, we present a *theory of confrontation*, which provides an explanation of people's behavior when confronted with *X*. *X* is anything that an individual may come face-to-face with be it an encounter, conflict of ideas, a comparison, or any other encounter that has the possibility of affecting a person's behavior. It is through this increased understanding of confrontational behavior that we are able to overcome students' resistance to broadening their ethnic and cross-cultural perspectives. Once confronted, the students will, hopefully, engage in a dialogue that furthers inclusiveness and social justice (for an in depth discourse on justice, see Rawls, 1971).

Literature Review: Delivery Systems

In our literature review, we examined sources that aided in the development of our model for teaching ethnic and cross-cultural diversity to college and university students. We have brought together diverse resources with works from education, nursing, political theory, psychology, public administration, social work, and sociology in order to construct our model. We believe that we have taken solid academic literature from various disciplines and synthesized it in a way that allows us to produce a model for dealing with better outcomes in producing a respect for dialogue about diversity in the college and university classroom.

Overview

In their study of cultural diversity and equity issues as they play out in the mathematics classroom, Cobb and Hodge (2002) noted that the real Herculean task facing educators today is not assisting minority students' assimilation into the so called mainstream. Rather, the task for educators is to change the composition of the stream. Cobb and Hodge (2002) noted that educators should focus on forming a more democratic community, one which comes about through an education that focuses on creating a more inclusive society.

In other words, it appears as if the purpose of ethnic and cross-cultural diversity is not assimilating the minority student into the classroom of the majority, rather the purpose of education is to change the classroom environment into one that is more pluralistic in nature. This changed environment provides students with an education that can be seen as one that is more democratic in nature and, in turn, provides legitimacy to what we teach the students since it provides a broader social perspective. Yet, in order to accomplish this we need an educational delivery system that enables us to increase the pluralistic nature of the classroom.

Augmenting Our Lectures

The delivery system used most often in our universities is the lecture (deWinstanley & Bjork, 2002). According to deWinstanley and Bjork, lectures have the tendency to divide students' attention between what is being provided to them visually (notes on the blackboard or visual presentations using PowerPoint™, video, or other method of visual delivery) and between what is provided to them verbally by the instructor. Students' divided attention may even be a means of escape from a lecture that is not engaging them mentally.

Granted, divided attention may be the result of other factors, yet the fact still remains—we need to diminish the effects of divided attention.

Research focusing on attention (Griffith, 1976; Rabinowitz, Craik, & Akerman, 1982; Tyler, Hertel, McCallum, & Ellis, 1979), has shown that lectures tend to divide our student's attention. As noted by deWinstanley and Bjork (2002), research has found that divided attention has a more profound effect on encoding than it does during retrieval of information (Craik, Govoni, Naveh-Benjamin, & Anderson, 1996; Naveh-Benjamin, Craik, Gravrilesco, & Anderson, 2000; Naveh-Benjamin, Craik, Guez, & Dori, 1998; Naveh-Benjamin, Craik, Perretta, & Tonev, 2000). In other words, divided attention affects what students are able to take in during a lecture and this equates to knowledge gained or lost during the lecture. Yet even with these findings, classroom lectures may not be all bad, especially if used in conjunction with other classroom techniques.

deWinstanley and Bjork (2002) provide a substantial argument for keeping the lecture as a method of teaching—we do agree that it is an essential component of education. However, we posit the idea that the lecture can be enhanced when it is used as a precursor to other methods of delivery—case studies, role-playing, and civic engagement (community-based experiences). In addition, the lecture serves as an effective tool for debriefing the students when each of the aforementioned activities have been completed and all that remains is to recap the lessons learned during the course of the semester. Yet, what is the basis for incorporating other methods of delivery in order to augment the lecture?

Using Case Studies, Role-Playing, and Civic Engagement

There are two delivery methods that work hand-in-hand with one another to instill empathy for others and this concept of modeling may be more successful than direct teaching only (Goodman, 2000; Smith, 1996). These two methods are the use of stories (read as case studies) and role-playing. Research tends to support the proposition that the use of role-playing and moral dilemmas aid not only children in gaining a view of the world from a different point of view (Barton & Booth, 1990; Clare, 1996; Shaftel & Shaftel, 1982; Upright, 2002; Van Ments, 1999), but also college students (Junn, 1994; Marshall, 1998; Moradi, 2004; Shearer, & Davidhizar, 2003). Upright (2002) noted,

Empathy, the ability to care about others, is a learned process and can be successfully modeled in the elementary classroom. Although there are various methods available for improving empathy and other aspects of moral development, one recommended strategy is the use of *moral dilemmas and role-play* [italics added]. (p. 15)

Using case studies or stories of moral dilemmas in conjunction with role-playing allows our students to read about a particular case and then place themselves in another person's circumstances, whereby they take on the behavior of the other person in order to afford them the opportunity to gain a broader view of ethnic and cross-cultural issues. It is through this process of empathy that students gain valuable insight about various ethnic and cultural perspectives (Schulman & Mekler, 1985). The literature reviewed here focuses not only on teaching children how to deal with moral dilemmas and to perceive another person's feeling, but also literature that addresses the use of case studies, role-playing, and civic engagement

in the collegiate setting. The way our approach differs is that other studies generally incorporate one of these activities into the curriculum; whereas we incorporate all three methods, along with lecturing, into one systematic approach to teaching ethnic and cross-cultural diversity.

It would indeed provide us with a tool that engages students in more active learning than the more passive approach of only providing a lecture to our students. In other words, the addition of these two methods of delivery may reinforce what professors lecture about, and, in turn, the use of the lecture may reinforce the lessons learned from case studies and role-playing. Once this is accomplished, students need to take the next step—civic engagement or the use of community-based experiences.

Hyland and Noffke (2005), in their article that addresses a “portion of a long-term, action-research project investing elementary social studies methods courses for preservice teacher from a social justice framework” (p. 367), noted that

Preservice teachers developed a respect for, knowledge of, and relationship with members of historically marginalized communities through structured assignments that provided opportunities to meet people from such communities. Key themes that emerged from the data about students’ understanding of historically marginalized groups included (a) seeing themselves in relationship to historically marginalized groups, (b) identifying structural inequality with regard to services and voice, (c) developing a sympathetic understanding about people from historically marginalized groups, and (d) identifying the relationship between the inquiry assignments and their future role as teachers. (p. 373)

Hyland and Noffke focused on acclimating student teachers to the diverse and marginalized communities they may

join as teachers. They cite instances where student teachers learned about diverse communities through activities that included hosting parent-principal coffee talks, riding on school buses, providing child-care, assembling food drives, and other activities aimed at immersing the student teacher into the local community. However, these students in training to become teachers are not the only ones who will find that they are working in communities that have been historically marginalized. Therefore, students in other disciplines would benefit from the same or similar educational experiences. The question we have to ask is: How do we involve students in civic engagement or community-based activities? In other words, what possibly motivates students to be involved in these types of activities throughout their college careers?

One of the first things we can do is to incorporate the civic engagement, community-based, or service learning approach to education with the use of case studies and role-playing. In order to do so, it is necessary to operationalize the term “civic engagement.” We use the terms civic engagement and service learning somewhat interchangeably, and prefer Bringle and Hatcher’s (2000) definition of service learning,

Service learning is defined as a ‘course-based, credit-bearing, educational experience in which students (a) participate in an organized service activity that meets identified community needs and (b) reflect on the service activity in such a way as to gain further understanding of course content, a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of civic responsibility.’ (p. 273)

Note that civic engagement can also include activities that do not necessarily benefit the community so much as it benefits the students, however, if the instructor plans well, the engagement with the local

community can be beneficial for both parties (students and the community).

When it comes to these activities at the collegiate level, research seems to indicate that universities cannot just pay lip-service to these approaches, especially the community-based activities. Instead, universities must establish environments that are conducive to promoting public service, and the institution must embrace this concept in such a way that the students perceive the college or university to be serious about the importance of community-based service (Anderson & Moore, 1978).

Ferrari and Bristow (2005) took it a step further and noted that, “school communities need to promote, communicate, and display a helpful environment as a way to facilitate student engagement in community volunteerism at least among first-year and sophomore students” (p. 404). In addition, they note that this may not be possible for upper division students because priorities change at the upper levels due to more rigorous schedules. Yet, we maintain that civic engagement (community service) can continue beyond the first 2 years simply through incorporation in upper division courses. However, at this point we need to offer this caveat: the approaches mentioned in this article do not have to be incorporated in every course in every discipline and may have to be adjusted slightly for others. Faculty in the various disciplines is in the best position to determine which courses would be best served by these methods. Faculty should have the ultimate authority to decide whether or not this is appropriate for their classes. By recognizing this, the university can acknowledge and reinforce academic freedom and classroom autonomy.

Theory of Confrontation

Attempting to use the aforementioned delivery systems may prove somewhat problematic since students may be resistant to our attempts to increase their awareness of ethnic and cross-cultural diversity issues and improved discourse. To overcome this resistance, we need to understand it and how it may originate. In other words, we need to comprehend how our students may perceive and react to the placement of ethnic and cross-cultural diversity topics into the curriculum. As a way of explanation, we propose our *theory of confrontation*. Starting with a definition of confrontation, we then discuss our assumptions and an explanation of the theory.

The term confrontation is defined as any object (Y) that is placed in the state of being confronted or the state of encountering something (X). Also, the object (Y), through awareness of being confronted, must deal with X . This is not to be confused with conflict, which is defined as a fight, quarrel or antagonism or some opposition between ideas or principles. Conflict needs at least $n = 3$ (the two objects in conflict and the cause of the conflict); whereas confrontation needs only an $n = 2$. There is at a minimum the object (Y) and the something (X) it confronts. Our use of the term confrontation contains no presupposition that we will face only resistance to, support for, or a neutral attitude toward ethnic and cross-cultural differences that is X . Rather, we propose this: students will face the issue of confronting ethnic and cross-cultural diversity issues, and that their reactions (action and non action), based on confronting these issues, are predicated on their perception of this confrontation.

When confronted, individuals can respond in one of three ways: (a) they can view the confrontation favorably or in a

positive manner; (b) they can acknowledge the confrontation, yet remain completely neutral to whatever it is they are confronting; or (c) they can view the confrontation from a negative viewpoint. Couple this with a person's character or personality, which can be characterized as passive or aggressive (not to be confused with the negative sense of the word), and you get some idea of how a person may react when confronted. A person's course of action can be categorized as positive (some good comes of the action or the reaction to the confrontation provides some benefit), neutral (not taking any action, which is actually an action but here it has neither benefit nor cost), or negative (where the confrontation results in some harm either physically, mentally, or it bears some other costs). By combining a person's reactions with their character traits one can get an approximation of how the confrontation will impact them; aggressive-positive; aggressive-negative; passive-positive; or passive-negative.

We would expect an aggressive-positive person, one who operates in a mode that the ordinary person would consider rational, when confronting *X*—with the perception the confrontation is positive and challenging—to be more likely to react in a positive manner or at least remain neutral. We would not expect this rational person to react in a negative manner or hostile manner since he or she views the confrontation from a positive perspective—theoretically it simply would not be considered rational. However, an aggressive-negative person, one who views *X* in a negative and challenging manner, may react in either a neutral manner or take a more hostile approach to dealing with the confrontation.

A passive person, however, may not be prone to take any positive active action unless the confrontation with *X* is positive and challenging. If the passive person views

X either neutrally or negatively then he or she will more than likely remain neutral. If the passive person's viewpoint is negative and he or she feels challenged by the confrontation, then that he or she may feel inclined to withdraw inward more than usual in an attempt to place a greater distance between him or herself and *X*.

Allowing us these assumptions, there are five ramifications we face when incorporating ethnic and cross-cultural diversity in college and university courses: (a) students have different characteristics as defined above and may react differently to the incorporation of ethnic and cross-cultural diversity issues; (b) we need to mitigate negative responses stemming from these different characteristics; (c) we need to provide an education to our students that provides them with a comprehensive view of the world and our methods of delivering this education must address the aforementioned ramifications; (d) these delivery methods need to be effectively incorporated into the curriculum and more specifically into the various university disciplines and subject material; and (e) we need to overcome the resistance some faculty may have against varied approaches because they may perceive this as an invasion of their classroom thus curtailing academic freedom. The remainder of this paper addresses in detail the first four ramifications and provides brief commentary on the last one.

Model: Teaching Ethnic and Cross-Cultural Diversity In the College and University Classroom

Setting the Stage

In order to reach the students in our classrooms, we need to use a varied approach that recognizes the characteristics of our students. We, as instructors, must be able to reach students regardless of their

classification as aggressive-positive, aggressive-negative, passive-positive, or passive-negative. Our model incorporates the use of case studies, role-playing, and civic engagement—approaches which augment and are augmented by the lecture. Yet our model focuses less on the use of the lecture and more on the incorporation of the three other delivery methods.

Students who are passive and pull away from confrontation may feel less threatened by case studies since it only involves the student and the reading of a case whereas the other two methods call for more interaction between the passive students and other members of the class. In other words, the passive student may feel more at ease approaching the study of ethnic and cross-cultural diversity through the reading of case studies and then commenting on them through written assignments. Aggressive-negative students may feel challenged in a classroom and may be less prone to participate in a positive manner, yet when confronting the issues of ethnic and cross-cultural diversity through the process of civic engagement, they may temper their behavior and, in turn, have a more positive experience. Aggressive-positive students may feel challenged by all three approaches, yet they may find that role-playing and civic engagement are the most challenging and rewarding because it provides the student with a positive outlet for demonstrating what they have learned from the case studies. Seemingly, starting with case studies is recommended. This allows the class to segue into role-playing and to end with civic engagement. The case studies serve as the foundation, role-playing serves as a controlled environment for learning, and civic engagement provides a real world flavor to the curriculum. In the sections that follow, we discuss the three approaches, but we begin by discussing the importance of

preparing the learning environment before introducing the models.

As stated earlier, no matter the type of student, it is very important to prepare the student for what is being done before introducing *X*. The goal is to produce students that function in the wider community with an appreciation for ethnic and cross-cultural dialogue and understanding. In this sense, the classroom represents a small community made up of individuals and possibly identifiable groups. As an imprecise microcosm of society, the classroom itself becomes an excellent place to instill democratic values. These values must be learned and ethnic and cross-cultural dialogue is an essential part of this democratic learning.

Intentional inclusion of this material will aid in the development of a democratically functioning citizen (Dewey, 1916; Thelen, 1960). We highly recommend that the course syllabus have an a statement outlining various goals for ethnic and cross-cultural diversity for the course, and assignments (reading assignments, research papers, and examinations) and activities need to incorporate issues of cultural diversity. The need for a learned and civil discourse needs to be upfront, and as such, it should be an intentional and oft stated goal of the course. However, the syllabus is only the starting point.

Once the explanation as to why ethnic and cross-cultural dialogue is important is complete, the instructor must ensure that the ground rules of expected behavior are clearly delineated to the students. The system for accomplishing this must be introduced and adhered to throughout the course (Sharan & Sachar, 1988). Procedures can vary from classroom to classroom, but there must be consistency for the students to flourish. Given these precursors to implementing the model, the

stage is now set for a successful learning experience.

Case Studies

Certainly, the use of case studies is nothing new in education. They have been very successful pedagogical tools for some time. We are not trying to put some new twist on their use, but are instead calling for their very overt and confrontational use in promoting ethnic and cross-cultural dialogue and understanding. The case study approach allows the instructor to craft scenarios that are full of theory and real world activity. In fact, case studies allow the student to see how important theory is to the real world. Case study applications regarding ethnic and cross-cultural dialogue can be used across diverse disciplines. For example, case studies can be used to exemplify how ethnic and cross-cultural differences impact medical research or business practices. Certainly a topic like ethics, combined with issues of ethnic and cross-cultural differences, would likely spark a lively and beneficial discourse for almost every discipline.

To be effective, the case studies must involve the reader in the decision-making process, be complex, contain uncertainty, and have the opportunity for compromise (Watson, 2002). By accomplishing the aforementioned, the student who prefers an individualistic experience can benefit from being challenged by the difficult issues presented in case studies while grappling with them in their own minds. For this person, the confrontation with *X* has only just begun because the student's experience is limited to his or her own internal dynamics. Therefore, for case studies that involve developing solutions to solve a problem set forth by the case study, it is important to note that the final course of action or solution should be left open-ended

thereby avoiding the "one size fits all" scenario.

One final caveat regarding case studies—the onus for either developing sound case studies scenarios or for finding solid case study scenarios is firmly on the instructor. Case studies dealing with ethnic and cross-cultural issues are plentiful yet generally focused on a particular discipline (e.g. Adler, & Gielen, 2001; Dwairy, 1998; Leininger, & McFarland, 2002; Low, Taplin, & Scheld, 2005; Pedersen, Draguns, Lonner, & Trimble, 2002; Stillman, 2005; Young, 1999). No matter what the fundamental nature of the student, there must be a confrontational expansion of the student's learning environment. This necessitates placing the student in a group.

The Group Process

We recommend that the group not be pieced together randomly, but with purpose. Under normal circumstances we highly recommend that case studies not be used in the first two weeks of the semester. This provides an opportunity for the instructor to evaluate each student's classroom behavior, which can provide an optimal mixture of students within each case-study group. You do not want too many aggressive types stifling the learning process of the passive students. The criteria for choosing group members are certainly up to the instructor, but as with everything in this model, grouping should be intentional. At no time should the students be allowed to self-select their group or else those with similarities will coalesce into closed groups.

Once formed, the individuals in each group should be encouraged to have both a structured and open-ended conversation about who they are with other members of the group. The structure is provided by the instructor through written rules and through the instructor monitoring each group. This is

important to group dynamics with the interaction beginning the process of empathetic behavior. This empathy is an invaluable tool for expanding ethnic and cross-cultural understanding (Thelen, 1960). In fact, the group dynamic itself can be an effective teacher of ethnic and cross-cultural dialogue completely apart from the case study. At this point in group development and after the introduction to the case study, it is now time to lead the group into role-playing based upon the case study.

Role-playing and the Group Process

Role-playing allows students to sample the viewpoint of another individual within their unique context. Case studies can provide the basic fodder for the role-playing assignments. The problem is delineated (case study), acted out, and then discussed.

Role-playing has both a personal and a social dimension. First, the individual brings his or her own characteristics, values, facts (self-defined), and emotions into the role. The exercise allows all of this to be confronted on an individual level. However, the social dimension to role-playing is just as important.

The social group can aid the student in exploring these challenged preconceptions. The group might cause an individual to be confronted with something that the individual had not considered before interaction with the group. The group allows individuals to work collectively to develop decent solutions to problems and to provide varied solutions to problems (Shafteel & Shafteel, 1967). Of course, the reverse can also be true of the role-playing experience. An individual might have preexisting beliefs validated and strengthened by the exercise.

Often, role-playing is conducted without any systematic planning. We overcome this by borrowing from a study conducted by Shafteel and Shafteel—a study

in which they set forth nine phases (we reduce them to seven) to successful role-playing. The first four phases set forth the preparation requirements; the fifth phase involves performing the activity, while the sixth and seventh phases facilitate student and instructor evaluations.

In phase one the students are introduced—through the use of case studies—to the situation under study. You must ensure in this phase that the problems encountered in the case studies are explicitly conveyed to the students. Phase two engages the students in an analysis of the various roles in the case study, and the assigning of roles to the group members. The analysis portion of this phase should include an examination of the basic backgrounds of the individual roles, and how they can be combined with the ethnicity, and cultural influences of the students involved in the role-playing. After the analysis is completed, students are chosen for the various roles. In the third phase, the instructor sets the stage for the role-playing activity by ensuring the class has thoroughly read the case study, particularly if the case study has not been previously discussed in class. The preparation of the observers by the instructor takes place in phase four. This can be as simple as advising the students about what to look for in the presentations. Finally, the fifth stage is the enactment of the role-playing activity. Preference here is given to a role-play that has been well thought out and grappled with by the group—taking time to struggle with the assignment allows the student the opportunity for a deeper and more meaningful reflection on the activity.

Phase six is the discussion of the role-playing evaluation process. During this phase the instructor should be more of a guide. Group dynamics must be allowed to play out or else the purpose of using a group is compromised. This is not to say that the

instructor must be quiet, the instructor intentionally needs to guide the discussion and analysis without dominating it. The seventh and final phase allows for a more overt instructor role. This is where the problem is related visibly to the real world and general principles are brought to the forefront. We have no difficulty with this being a point where normative points (value judgments) are given heavy consideration by both the instructor and the students. After all, the whole point of the exercise is to make better people and develop citizens who have an appreciation for ethnic and cross-cultural diversity. Those who do not have appreciation for ethnic and cross-cultural diversity are supposed to be confronted by this process in order to foster change. This last phase is the instructor's final opportunity to influence this change.

Allowances should be made for dissenting opinions within groups. Disagreement should not be treated as failures, but should be expected. It is important to communicate this to the groups at the very beginning or else members will be more likely to acquiesce to the group and not let their true opinions be known. Allowance for a minority report or an alternative role-play enactment should be given. Requiring a written report of the group's findings and alternatives can allow a dissenting voice to have a hearing. It is the hope of this exercise that those participating will be confronted and change for the better. This could be a wholesale change or be a strengthening of values and attitudes that were already in place.

Civic Engagement

This brings us to our final point in the theory of confrontation. Ultimately, we want to produce a student that has been confronted with ethnic and cross-cultural diversity issues who has changed for the

better. We do not want to "just instruct," we want there to be a nurturing effect. In other words, we want to assist our students in developing empathy and for this empathy to result in the desire to gather data about ethnic and cross-cultural issues, which, in turn, hopefully elicits a deeper and more reflective viewpoint when grappling with these important issues. The evidence of this will be a student's increased desire to engage in social action as well as an increase in cultural competency (Levine & Perpetua, 2006; Oliver & Shaver, 1966, 1974; Woods & Atkins, 2006). Yet, in order to reinforce what has been learned from case studies and role-playing, we need to involve the student in community-based experiences or what some term civic engagement or service learning.

After reviewing the research of others in the area of civic engagement and service learning (Bringle & Hatcher, 1996, 1999, 2000; Bringle & Kremer, 1993; Hyland & Noffke, 2005; Poulin, Silver, & Kauffman, 2006; Scott, 2004), we recommend that instructors find a project that involves their classes in the local community, especially those communities that have been marginalized. As student teachers have gained experience and knowledge of various cultures through this method, we too note that the method can be adapted to various disciplines. We leave it to the various disciplines to design their own programs of community-based experiences, yet we suggest that the disciplines model the programs in anticipation with what their students may experience in their chosen professions. Ultimate success is defined as a student with a broader and more accepting view of ethnic and cross-cultural diversity. How will we measure success in this area?

Tracking former students for a period of time after graduation, for the purpose of course assessment regarding the results of civic engagement, would be

helpful. Whatever assessment instrument we choose to use, the goal should be to find out what level of societal involvement has been achieved by our former students. Of course, it would be important to compare this group of students with students who have not confronted *X* in order to ascertain how *X* has changed their involvement patterns over time. We believe that future studies will validate that those receiving *X* will have been changed in such a way that greater societal involvement is the result. At the end of the day, this involvement is a former student's individual choice. It is simply monitored for a time. However, is there anything that can be done to increase a student's propensity for civic engagement on the issues of ethnic and cross-cultural diversity? We do not recommend that this be an explicit part of every class, some courses do not easily lend themselves to civic engagement and whether civic engagement is made part of any class is the call of each discipline's faculty members. Yet, we do recommend that when designing our courses we need to give serious consideration to incorporating civic engagement, yet at the same time, we need to apply careful planning.

We tend to shy away from the restrictiveness that could creep into civic involvement that is tied to a specific class. Frankly, some instructors would turn this type of requirement into a pipeline for their pet organizations. We cannot underscore enough the importance of allowing some latitude in a student's choice of civic engagement to meet the departmental or university requirements. We believe that involvement should be the result of the student's classroom experience and not a requirement in all classes. However, this does leave open the door for a university or departmental requirement for public service that would occur as a capstone to a university education. We want our students

to become active and engaged citizens who value ethnic and cross-cultural diversity in our nation's discourse.

Conclusion

The focus of this paper was on the incorporation of ethnic and cross-cultural diversity issues and dialogue into our college and university curriculum. In addition, we present our theory of confrontation as a way of introducing the reader to the possible student obstacles (read as behavior) that may thwart our efforts to promote cultural diversity and the discourse surrounding this topic. In our discussion of this theory, we provided a definition of confrontation as well as four categories of behavior that people operate from when faced with confrontation. We defined confrontation and separated it from the term conflict. Using a meta analysis that is multidisciplinary in nature, we developed an educational delivery method using a three point approach to teaching ethnic and cross-cultural diversity issues as a way to augment our lectures. This educational delivery system calls for college and university instructors to use case studies, role-playing, and civic engagement (community-based experiences) to promote ethnic and cross-cultural discourse in the university classroom.

We emphatically stress that the approach we posit is not *the panacea* but a *panacea* for the ills universities face in the teaching environment and it is a step in the right direction. We can no longer allow our students to fail to engage these important issues because we will not adjust methods or teaching approaches. Educational delivery systems that are multidimensional in their approach to teaching the subject matter will prove to be more fruitful than one-dimensional approaches in addressing ethnic and cross-cultural diversity issues. The

important thing to note is that we need to have a starting point for the discourse—this article serves that purpose. In addition, we note that researchers need to address how these different categories of behavior—the passive and aggressive behaviors posited in this article—work in various classroom environments and how these categories of behavior interact with each of these delivery systems. Furthermore, research needs to be done in effective training for teachers to teach ethnic and cross-cultural diversity. What affects teachers' classroom behavior and teachers' reaction to incorporating these methods into their courses? What issues of academic freedom (e.g. course content, activities, and texts) do we need to address? These are just some of the questions that stem from this paper.

References

- Adler, L. L., & Gielen, U. P. (Eds.). (2001). *Cross-cultural topics in psychology* (2nd ed.). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Anderson, J. C., & Moore, L. F. (1978). The motivation to volunteer. *Journal of Voluntary Action Research*, 7, 120-125.
- Barton, B., & Booth, D. (1990). *Stories in the classroom*. Markham, ON: Pembroke Publishers Limited.
- Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (1996). Implementing service learning in higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 67, 221-239.
- Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (1999). Reflection in service learning: Making meaning of experience. *Educational Horizons*, 77, 178-185.
- Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (2000). Institutionalizing of service learning in higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 71, 273-290.
- Bringle, R. G., & Kremer, J. F. (1993). Evaluation of intergenerational service-learning project for undergraduates. *Educational Gerontology*, 19, 407-416.
- Cobb, P., & Hodge, L. L. (2002). A relational perspective on issues of cultural diversity and equity as they play out in the mathematics classroom. *Mathematical Thinking and Learning*, 4, 249-284.
- Clare, L. (1996). Using moral dilemmas in children's literature as a vehicle for moral education and teaching reading comprehension. *Journal of Moral Education*, 25, 325-341.
- Craik, F. I. M., Govoni, R., Naveh-Benjamin, M., & Anderson, N. D. (1996). The effects of divided attention on encoding and retrieval processes in human memory. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 125, 159-180.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy in education*. New York: Macmillan.
- deWinstanley, P. A., & Bjork, R. A. (2002). Successful lecturing: Presenting information in ways that engage effective processing. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 89, 19-31.
- Dwairy, M. A. (1998). *Cross-cultural counseling: The Arab-Palestinian case*. New York: The Haworth Press.
- Ferrari, J. R., & Bristow, M. J. (2005). Are we helping them serve others? Student perceptions of campus altruism in support of community service motives. *Education*, 125, 404-413.
- Goodman, J. (2000). Moral education in early childhood: The limits of constructivism. *Early Education & Development*, 11, 37-54.
- Griffith, D. (1976). The attentional demands on mnemonic control processes. *Memory and Cognition*, 14, 484-494.

- Hyland, N. E., & Noffke, S. E. (2005). Understanding diversity through social and community inquiry: An action-research study. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 56, 367-381.
- Junn, E. N. (1994). "The party": Role playing to enhance multicultural understanding. *College Teaching*, 42, 109-110
- Leininger, M., & McFarland, M. R. (2002). *Transcultural nursing: Concepts, theories, research, and practice* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Levine, M. A., & Perpetua, E. M. (2006). International immersion programs in baccalaureate nursing education: Professor and student perspectives. *Journal of Cultural Diversity*, 13, 20-26.
- Low, S., Taplin, D., & Scheld, S. (2005). *Rethinking urban parks: Public space & cultural diversity*. Austin, TX: The University of Texas Press.
- Lowman, J. (1995). *Mastering the techniques of teaching* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Marshall, P. L. (1998). Toward developmental multicultural education: Case study of the issues exchange activity. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 49, 57-65.
- Moradi, B. (2004). Teaching about diversities: The shadow/role-play exercise. *Teaching of Psychology*, 31, 188-191
- Naveh-Benjamin, M., Craik, F. I. M., Gravilescu, D., & Anderson, N. D. (2000). Asymmetry between encoding and retrieval processes: Evidence from divided attention and calibration analysis. *Memory and Cognition*, 28, 965-976.
- Naveh-Benjamin, M., Craik, F. I. M., Guez, J., & Dori, H. (1998). The effects of divided attention on encoding and retrieval processes in human memory: Further support for asymmetry. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 24, 1091-1104.
- Naveh-Benjamin, M., Craik, F. I. M., Perretta, J. G., & Tonev, S. T. (2000). The effects of divided attention on encoding and retrieval processes: The resiliency of retrieval processes. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 53, 609-625.
- Oliver, D., & Shaver, J. P. (1966). *Teaching public issues in high school*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Oliver, D., & Shaver, J. P. (1974). *Teaching public issues in high school* (2nd ed.). Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.
- Pedersen, P. B., Draguns, J. G., Lonner, W. J., & Trimble, J. E. (Eds.). (2002). *Counseling across cultures* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Poulin, J., Silver, Silver, P., & Kauffman, S. (2006). Field notes: Serving the community and training social workers: Service outputs and student outcomes. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 42, 171-184
- Rabinowitz, J. C., Craik, F. I. M., & Akerman, B. P. (1982). A processing resource account of age differences in recall. *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, 36, 325-344.
- Rawls, J. (1971). *A theory of justice*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Schulman, M., & Mekler, E. (1985). *Bringing up a moral child: A new approach for teaching your child to be kind, just, and responsible*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

- Scott, J. B. (2004). Rearticulating civic engagement through cultural studies and service learning. *Technical Communications Quarterly*, 13, 289-306.
- Shaftel, F., & Shaftel, G. (1967). *Role-playing of social values: Decision making in the social studies*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Shaftel, F., & Shaftel, G. (1982). *Role-playing in the curriculum*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Sharan, S., & Shachar, H. (1988). *Language and learning in the cooperative classroom*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Shearer, R., & Davidhizar, R. (2003). Using role play to develop cultural competence. *Journal of Nursing Education*, 42, 273-276.
- Smith, D. (1996). Developing a more interactive classroom: A continuing odyssey. *Teaching Sociology*, 24, 64-75.
- Stillman, R. J., II. (2005). *Public administration: Concepts and cases* (8th ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Thelen, H. (1960). *Education and the human quest*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Tyler, S. W., Hertel, P. T., McCallum, M. C., & Ellis, H. C. (1979). Cognitive effort and memory. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Learning and Memory*, 5, 607- 617.
- Upright, R. L. (2002). To tell a tale: The use of moral dilemmas to increase empathy in the elementary school child. *Early childhood Education Journal*, 30, 15-20.
- Van Ments, M. (1999). *The effective use of role-play: Practical techniques for improving learning*. London: Kogan Page.
- Watson, R. P. (Ed.). (2002). *Public administration: Cases in managerial role-playing*. New York: Longman.
- Woods, M. J., & Atkins, M. (2006). Immersion in another culture: One strategy for increasing cultural competency. *Journal of Cultural Diversity*, 13, 50 -54.
- Young, C (Ed.). (1999). *The accommodation of cultural diversity: Case studies*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.