

Culturally Sensitive Pedagogy: Mandela's Way

Sarah J. Noonan

In his autobiography *The Long Walk to Freedom*, Nelson Mandela described his awakening to injustice and development as a freedom fighter (1994). Describing his family, tribal origins, and customs, Mandela took us on joyful excursions into the woods near his home. From his childhood mastery of “warrior” games with his peers to his passage to manhood, Mandela moved through the thrilling, uncertain and painful moments of childhood and eventually gained a fragile foothold of his adulthood. Sharing deeply disturbing stories of his oppression in painstaking detail, he wrote about the gradual and increasingly more brutal assaults on his dignity and personhood.

Mandela's encounters with his oppression, while limited and painful in his youth, awakened his sense of injustice. This awakening occurred over a period of years as he began to see beyond his own life experience. Eager to see what was happening to him and others in the larger context, Mandela set a course of self-education. He talked to people and listened intently to their stories, experiences, and viewpoints, gradually drawn into his activism by his beliefs and experiences. Reading from scholarly literature, he placed his experience in an historical, political and social context. He studied philosophy, religion, political theory and biography to understand his experience, viewing it from multiple perspectives.

As he grew older, the assassins of his dignity were more skilled and brutal. Resorting to withdrawal of privileges and opportunities, deception, forced menial work, banning and “house” arrest, threats against his peace of mind and body, and periodic imprisonment, his oppressors motivated him to rise up against them. He became a freedom fighter!

If Mandela's story had begun with his imprisonment instead of his birth, the reader would not have seen him as the young boy, the ambitious student, the dedicated scholar, the strong father, the ardent lover, the articulate attorney, the inspirational leader, the passionate freedom fighter, the long-suffering political prisoner, and the international symbol of African identity, liberation, and freedom. Our capacity to experience empathy and relate to him as a culturally-complex human being would have been limited.

Because we know him through his “coming of age” story, we feel his powerlessness and rage. He becomes increasingly more human to us through story. Reading about his oppression and awakening, we want to

About the Author

Sarah J. Noonan, Ed.D. Associate Professor, Department of Leadership, Policy and Administration University of St. Thomas School of Education 1000 LaSalle Avenue MOH 217 Minneapolis, Minnesota 55403, sjnoonan@stthomas.edu.

raise our arms as freedom fighters too, shouting “ ‘*Amandla*’! followed by ‘*Ngaethu*’!, a popular ANC [African National Congress] call-and-response meaning ‘Power’! and ‘The power is ours!’ ” (Mandela, 1994, p. 318). Mandela became a freedom fighter when he knew who he was, what he stood for and what he must do.

In some ways a culturally sensitive pedagogy parallels Mandela’s life story and education as a freedom fighter. We become visible to others through story. Entering into dialogue, we share our stories about the important moments in our lives and their meaning. Drawing from scholarly literature, philosophy, religion, cultural studies in the exploration and experience of diversity, we follow Mandela’s path of self-education. We must encounter diverse people and ideologies—moving between the two to understand and interpret their meaning. This process is the heart of a culturally sensitive pedagogy—students, teachers, and subject matter open up to difference and pluralism through guided self-study, which serves as seed work for our personal and social transformation.

A culturally sensitive pedagogy awakens us to diversity, causing us to see the humanness in others and ourselves and lays the groundwork for becoming a freedom fighter. An awareness regarding how culture shapes identity, colors perceptions, and forms an invisible boundary in our thinking and interactions, allows us to detect its insidious effects on our perceptions, judgments, and life opportunities.

The change within us moves us to think about how institutions (family, government, the economic system, education, religion) and dominant cultures preserve the status quo advantaging some “tribes” over others. Moving from understanding to critical understanding (Greene, 1988) and appreciation, we gain ally status when we act on this knowledge. Most advantaged (including ourselves) are not ready to consider this until an awakening to difference on a personal and experiential level occurs. This seed work creates a desire to know the experience of others and compare it to our own—now we see and are seen by others. Gradually Mandela saw the solution to apartheid in dialogue, engagement, negotiation, understanding perspectives, and eventually forging relationships with his oppressors (Mandela, 1994). He was unwilling to move from prisoner to victor to oppressor. He saw the beauty of a vibrant, engaged, and “non-racial” Africa that embraced all of its citizens.

Mandela’s education offers a model for our individual and collective leadership development: he engaged in life-long learning, formed sensitive relationships with diverse persons, deeply probed various ideologies, en-

gaged in frequent exchanges of story to make sense of his experience, and shared his knowledge and viewpoint with others. He incorporated the study of himself, others, his life experience and subject matter into the core of his being, accomplishing his self-education. Moving back and forth between difference and pluralist views of diversity, he defined himself by his membership and positions in his family and tribe, yet went beyond them to explore the diversity (pluralism) of others, even his oppressors.

Mandela's prison experience mirrors his life: he resisted the psychic and physical boundaries of his circumstances, held firmly to his personal and cultural identities and "saw" his interactions and exchanges with others (including their ideologies) as his primary opportunity to continue his struggle for social justice and evolve as a human being. Embodying the role of scholar, teacher, and leader, his approach to diversity and learning must be ours. Beginning with the self as a subject worthy of study while continuously exploring cultural differences, we must look inward to know ourselves and outward to know others—a kind of back and forth, continuous exploration.

Like Mandela, we gradually claim our adulthood (and education) by exploring and experiencing difference and embracing pluralism, becoming more fully human, more aware, more knowing, more evolved, more educated, and more just. When students see themselves within their social and cultural environments and enter into "relation" with each other, their preparation for leadership grows. A culturally sensitive pedagogy promotes respect, acceptance, risk, commitment, communication, creativity, and collaboration. These dispositions or qualities describe important aspects of healthy relationships between and among teachers, students and colleagues—qualities that are only acquired when students freely express themselves and learn from each other.

The aim of culturally sensitive pedagogy is to ensure that we: (1) see others and ourselves as unique and culturally-complex human beings; (2) authentically express and interact with others in meaningful ways; (3) recognize the limitations of our worldview based on our knowledge and "position of experience" (Jensen, 2005, p. 41); (4) increase our awareness of "cultural" interpretations, assumptions and biases, which influence our perspectives, judgments, and actions (McDaniel, Samovar, & Porter, 2006); and (5) develop a sense of agency, authorship and activism (Greene, 1988) to be more socially just—defined here as a willingness to consider alternative perspectives and choices, see the detrimental effects of unequal treatment and access to political economic and social resources, and take action in light of this knowledge.

Culturally sensitive pedagogy, a theory and approach related to teaching and learning *about* and *for* diversity, contributes to the development of moral leaders and leadership. When naive views are replaced with cultural sensitivity and sophistication, culturally conditioned defense mechanisms are minimized and replaced with openness to the experience of others, and when social isolation is replaced with sustained engagement with others,

the willingness to become a freedom fighter is more likely. Strategically designing and offering teaching and learning activities likely to accomplish the goals of a culturally sensitive pedagogy increases the likelihood of more “freedom fighters” within our schools. In the next section I offer a definition of diversity to flesh out the meaning of diversity in this context and relate this definition to the central components of culturally sensitive pedagogy.

Defining Diversity

I use the term *diversity* to encompass “difference”, individual variations in physical and psychological make-up and “particular” (Featherstone, 1992, p. vii) cultural adaptations and responses of individuals and groups to their physical and social environments. Two aspects of diversity help to further flesh out this concept: *difference* and *pluralism*. *Difference* distinguishes us singly and collectively from one another, expressed through differing individual and cultural identities including varying perspectives, practices, and products (Kottak & Kozaitis, 2003). Emphasizing distinctness, variation, and contrariness, *difference* refers to both the variety of responses possible and the distance or gap between individuals and culture.

Pluralism, a term describing a “condition of society in which numerous distinct ethnic, religious, or cultural groups coexist within one nation” (Pickett, 2000, p. 1351), adds numerical understanding to diversity: we are “large” in number and amount. A pluralist holds more than one office much like we “hold” more than one identity, creating individual and societal value from our multiple identities. Preceding diversity in the dictionary and sharing a part of the Latin root word “*diversus*” (meaning contrary), the word “diversify” means to use a variety of approaches and investments to “limit losses” (p. 527). As a whole these definitions may help to flesh out a contemporary and inclusive view of diversity: we are “large in number and amount”, distinctly different individually and collectively, multiethnic and culturally complex, members of many valuable family, tribal, and social communities, and citizens in a richly diverse world.

A culturally sensitive pedagogy engages learners in the *education, exploration* and *experience* of diversity to enhance their ability to relate and interact with members of diverse communities, develop multicultural competence, and become allies in the struggle for social justice. Emphasizing *difference* and its effects, a culturally sensitive pedagogy increases awareness of and empathy for others. Exploring how privilege, power, and position allows some individuals and groups advantage and visibility, while others exclusion and invisibility, peels away the layers of comfort to ensure a more “critical seeing” (Eisner, 1991). The effects of *difference* are integral to an understanding of diversity. When students explore the impact of cultural differences on their own terms, they achieve a greater sense of agency and activism regarding the twin goals of achieving social justice and building community.

A *pluralistic* education causes us to experience and appreciate the opportunities for personal and social transformation accomplished through meaningful interactions and exchanges of cultural knowledge. The joining of cultures makes a hybrid third culture out of our encounters and exchanges, diversifying our knowledge and opportunities for creativity and adaptation. If the reduction of oppression is not reason enough, the benefits of pluralism are readily apparent.

A culturally sensitive pedagogy emphasizing *pluralism* focuses on the cultural transmissions and fusions that lead to innovation, change, growth, learning, and technological advances. Avoiding stagnation and “the risk of loss”, cultural interactions and exchanges contribute to our survival and development. This “theory” of diversity (*difference* and *pluralism*) guides my approach to a culturally sensitive pedagogy. Acquiring general knowledge of culture as well as culture-specific knowledge of “particularities” of difference, distinguishes this approach from general cultural studies. An education for diversity requires us to conceive of diversity as an encompassing concept of difference and pluralism with attention to the particularities. Pedagogical possibilities emerge from the above concept of diversity and goals of a culturally sensitive pedagogy.

Pedagogical Possibilities

I offer ideas related to teaching and learning designed to “educate for diversity”, promote the goals of social justice and contribute to the development of democratic, inclusive leaders. Beginning with dialogue and continuing with subject matter, theory and method, and growth, I briefly describe some “pedagogical possibilities” drawn from my teaching experience and literature related to multicultural education, critical pedagogy, cross-cultural and intercultural awareness and communication.

Dialogue

A rock bottom beginning step to opening the classroom and students to diversity can't be accomplished without genuine, dialogical engagement with each other. “It involves a commitment to the process of communicative interchange itself, a willingness to ‘see things through’ to some meaningful understanding or agreements among the participants” (Burbules, 1993, p. 8). In this process we begin to see the limitations of our experience and the boundaries of our knowledge. Moving beyond our limited worldview through these interactions and as a result of our encounters with *difference* and our self-education, we change.

Dialogue as inquiry fosters “a spirit of tolerance and respect for a range of views, with the intention of addressing some sort of question or problem, and with the *hope* that these differences can be reconciled into an, at least, partial and provisional commonalities” (Burbules, 1993, p. 118). Yet in a post-modern world, perhaps the goal of dialogue is not to solve but to merely understand:

Partners in dialogue proceed interactively, cooperatively, not toward a specific common goal, but in a *process* of mutual engagement directed toward shared understanding. I am drawn to *this* sort of dialogue with *this* person because in *this* process I seen an opportunity to supplement and refigure my own understandings (and presumably my partner is motivated similarly). (p. 115)

A structured way to draw students into dialogue and avoid the natural distancing that takes places when students feel vulnerable is to provide for safe, not intimate yet not distant, gradual contact with others. I help to establish trust within the group by asking students to complete a series of “diversity exercises” designed to establish rapport and provide students with an opportunity to be seen and accepted by his or her peers. For example, I adapted a “Wheel of Influence” exercise from Clemons, Heckman and Lamb (1998, pp. 187–190) to introduce the concept of personal culture using the following directions:

Using a list of cultural difference categories (gender, class, socioeconomic status, race/ethnicity, etc.), think about how each of these factors influences your core values, beliefs, communication style and leadership. Represent the weight of some or all of these factors on a pie graph, dividing the circle into portions roughly representing its influence. Label each sector and be prepared to describe at least one influential factor in your life with your small group. Share a personal story to illustrate its importance on your beliefs and/or actions. The pie graph is one way to represent your personal culture to others.

This simple exercise increases the level of trust and authentic engagement among students. We try a new exercise at the beginning of each class meeting and gradually the need for them falls away as students establish emotional connections with each other and take greater responsibility for their education.

The emotional factors in dialogue require us to form a bond through mutual empathy, commitment, and trust (Burbles, 1993, p. 36). Rodriguez’s (2002) Sociotransformative Constructivism (sTc) model (Rodriguez, Zozaiwicz, & Yerrick, 2005), combines a theory of learning with the goals of social justice and includes dialogue as one of four components:

STC [sTc] draws from multicultural education as a theory of social justice and from social constructivism as a theory of learning to explain how power issues imbue the historical, institutional, and sociocultural codes that mediate teaching and learning. Therefore, the more teachers, students, and researchers are aware of how these codes operate to sustain the status quo, the better prepared they will be to engage in socially transformative action. (§ 15)

The four sTc components (dialogic conversation, authenticity, metacognition and reflexivity) offer strategies to increase cultural sensitivity and social justice. In dialogue, students must be willing to be influenced by the “Other” and capable of understanding “what is said” and “who is speaking” (a critical reading) (§ 15). Authentic work attracts students to learning because of its relationship to their lives and metacognition helps them to critically reflect on their learning. The fourth component, reflexivi-

ty, is defined as: “a critical process by which we explore how our social location (e.g., in terms of ethnic and cultural background and socioeconomic status), ideological location (e.g., belief systems and values), and academic location (e.g., education level and skills) affect our perceptions of what is worth learning” (§ 15). Dialogue helps us begin the exploration of diversity and later draws us back to make sense of our experience along with the other factors in the sTc model.

Subject Matter

A culturally sensitive pedagogy causes students to explore and experience the subject matter of their coursework and their cultural diversity *simultaneously*. Historical events, contemporary issues, global challenges, influences of technology and innovation all serve as spring boards to explore *difference* and *pluralism* situated contextually. A key to understanding this approach is to see diversity as both focused course of study (for example, a course called Multiculturalism and American Education) and as a topic of study embedded within each course much like critical thinking or ethical reasoning. Cultural knowledge and sensitivity increase through both direct and circuitous routes. Using an issues approach, students gain an ability to deal with cognitive complexity.

The subject matter, our history and present experience, causes students to explore how our perceptions, judgments, interactions, and participation in human institutions (family, religious, educational, economic, and governmental systems) are socially constructed and open to interpretation. Wounding, loss, reparations, healing and change, ever-present themes in our national and global history and current experience, inevitably leads to discussions of cultural differences and its effects. Students from historically marginalized populations gain visibility and all students become more conscious of taken-for-granted privilege in this process, allowing us to see the “justice” in social justice.

Taking a more circuitous route, students indirectly explore diversity by reading biography, novels, and poetry, experiencing diversity through the life journeys of others. For example, consider how *Night*, a memoir by Nobel Peace Prize winner Elie Wiesel, serves as a vehicle for exploring difference. A compelling narrative of his horrifying ordeal in the concentration camps and eventual liberation, Wiesel describes the most terrifying years of his life that changed him forever, beginning with his first night in a concentration camp:

Never shall I forget that night, the first night in camp, which has turned my life into one long night, seven times cursed and seven times sealed. Never shall I forget that smoke, Never shall I forget the little faces of the children, whose bodies I saw turned into wreaths of smoke beneath a silent blue sky. Never shall I forget the flames which consumed my faith forever. Never shall I forget the nocturnal silence which deprived me, for all eternity, of the desire to live. Never shall I forget those moments which murdered my God and my soul and turned my dreams into dust. Never shall I forget these things, even if I am condemned to live as long as God Himself. Never. (Wiesel, 1958/1982, p. 32)

Central questions regarding faith, meaning, purpose, God, violence, love, leadership, community, religion, peace, and the human condition are exposed in *Night*. Wiesel's memoir invites us to question our history and current condition and ask: What exists within in us individually and collectively to create this horror? What causes people to lose all sense of morality and humanity? What justifications and constructions enabled some to see others as non-human? What historical and current conditions lead to ethnic cleansing? Why did "leaders" and even holocaust victims and survivors ignore the warnings of those who knew about the atrocities, do nothing or fail to believe the report of atrocities?

While organized courses help students to enter the territory of diversity by laying out various theories drawn from an interdisciplinary knowledge base, periodic excursions or "encounters" deepen their understanding. Because intercultural sensitivity is developmental (Chen & Starosta, 2006) periodic sustained episodes and brief encounters are needed for continued momentum and growth. These "mini-lessons" embedded within courses are in need of a direct injection of background theory to balance the experiential with the theoretical. Preparing for these "encounters" requires us to think strategically about what theory might illuminate their experience and deepen their understanding.

Theory and Method

Drawing theory and methods from a variety of disciplines (psychology, sociology, anthropology, linguistics, philosophy, etc.), allows students to use these disciplines as a lens to investigate the influence of culture on their perceptions, judgments, decisions, emotions, choices, and actions. For example, drawing from critical theory, once dominant ideologies and privilege are "unmasked" and challenged, there is tremendous opportunity for learning (Brookfield, 2005). Feminist, race, or queer theory challenges hegemonic assumptions, constructions, and ideologies. Oppressive acts, the outcome of decisions regarding who is human and which cultures are valued, are based on narrow views regarding gender role and sexual orientation, color, ethnicity, religious expression or rigid class systems, limiting human development.

Applying cultural theory invites us to understand people through the principle of transference, particularly when it is combined with other social sciences:

He [she] has to try imagine what is must be like being born and brought up in that society, that culture, and in those individual communities. How would I look at the world if I had grown up in that total environment? Naturally knowledge of the external circumstances is a necessary condition for achieving this: circumstances of life, customs, traditions, rituals, legends, and so forth. Yet this knowledge is by no means sufficient. The effort of imagination must follow till the subject's conduct is understood, till one can say: Yes in fancying being he [she], what he [she] does appears to me as the same thing to—at least one of the things it is reasonable to do. (Vendler, 1984, p. 212)

As cultural anthropologists, students examine “cultural syndromes”: “shared patterns of beliefs, attitudes, self-definitions, norms, roles, or values organized around a theme” (Triandis, 2006, p. 23) such as “work” or “family”. Using knowledge of cultural syndromes, students analyze and compare various cultures to determine the likelihood of compatibility or conflict. As psychologists, students might explore how cultural adjustment and shock theories related to the psychological experience of sojourners traveling abroad may apply at home as a result of their encounters with members of diverse cultures.

Weaving in and out of the “big stories” of the disciplines and traditions and the “little stories” of our lives (Palmer, 1998, p. 74), students use theory to analyze and interpret their personal experience. Experiential and inquiry-based learning approaches deepen understanding, self-knowledge and cultural awareness.

Experiential Learning and Investigations of Self and Other

Role plays, case studies, simulations, life writing (White, 2004), narratives, journaling, community experiences, interviews, films, novels, skits, street theater, dramatic re-enactments, art, and music offer plenty of ways to experience and explore diversity. A mixture of group learning activities and reflective exercises contribute to student awareness of his or her cultural roots. Although there are many books with multicultural training programs and activities, I found Karim’s (2003) compilation of “cultural skill sets” related to leadership behavior particularly useful because the skill sets identify the various dimensions of cultural sensitivity and “suggest” experiential approaches regarding their acquisition. Cultural skill sets include: (1) Cognitive complexity and critical thinking (exhibits a well-developed perspective regarding how culture might affect behavior, including counterpoint views and actions); (2) Perspective multidimensionality (understands different worldviews and perspectives); (3) Interpretive multiplicity (interprets ideas and concepts in a variety of ways); (4) Contextual analysis (uses a variety of historical and cultural narratives to understand the bigger picture); (5) Affective resilience (manages emotional states, shows sensitivity toward others); (6) Tolerance for ambiguity (displays tolerance for the unknown and a willingness to engage despite lack of complete information); (7) identity integration (aware of cognitive, behavior, and emotional reactions and the influence of cultural learning, knows who he or she is); and (8) Cultural empathy (recognizes, understands, and acknowledges the identities of cultural different persons without denying his or her identity) (Karim, 2003, ¶ 18–25).

To help students achieve cultural skill set goals, I ask them to write and share a personal narrative about their “corner of the world, culture, and color” (the three Cs of their identity), an activity designed by Singleton and Linton (2006, p. 175). This exercise helps students see themselves and others as culturally complex and fascinating individuals. They often grow in

“identity integration” and “cultural empathy” (see the above list) after listening to and sharing their personal stories.

Excerpts from Sam Rocha’s narrative illustrates how naming the layers that form his cultural identity helps him to know himself and achieve visibility with his peers:

I was born in Brownsville, Texas; located about five minutes from the Mexican border. My nationality if *Unitedstatesian*, and I live in the continental Americas—America. My first language is English and at the end of second grade my family moved to Mexico where I learned to speak Spanish. Both of my parents are of Hispanic descent, my father a Mexican-American, and my mother a Spaniard-American. In our home we spoke Spanish sparingly, mostly in times of joking and anger; sometimes we used our *Hispanicness* sparingly too . . .

I am brown. But despite the simplicity in that statement of color, I have been profiled to be from Mexico, Honduras, Argentina, Colombia—all fairly predictable—and Italy, Greece, Spain, Nepal, Portugal, and India. So I find that the content of my skin color is less than specific, in fact I find that my characteristics, including my color, are not quite so easy to speak of in specific terms—but conversely, I am not white . . . (Rocha, 2006, pp. 10–12)

Experiential exercises combined with reflective essays and activities contribute to a growing awareness regarding how culture shapes identity and worldview. Higher levels of cultural awareness and increased sensitivity signify student growth.

Growth

Students experience an identity transformation when they move from an “ascribed or assigned identity” to an “achieved and adopted identity” (Kim, 2006, p.416). Changes in student openness and increased comfort in discussing *difference*, higher levels of disclosure in dialogue, and evidence of substantive personal reflection document his or her growth. Fusing past and present experience, students realize the importance of self-knowledge and continued exploration of cultural differences. An excerpt from Sam Rocha’s narrative reveals his awakening to and affirmation of his cultural identity and his growth as a developing leader.

No longer does my own identity exist separate and removed apart from who I “am,” rather I am asked and even required to bring my self into my work. Because of my youth and the newness of this setting, I only propose that I continue living in this environment and maintain the regimen of self-discovery that I am learning. I feel that in many ways this task is the most relevant to communication, i.e. how can I communicate effectively when I have yet the ability to honestly identify who I am?

Therefore, I pledge to keep on living with my own personal lens to look through and I am excited that in doing so, I will continually discover more of who I am. Such self-discovery will lead to a genuinely autonomous process of becoming, rather than others dominating who I can become and who I am.

Like Mandela, Sam takes his first step as a freedom fighter—he fights for his identity, wishing to be seen. As a conscious effort, we choose who we are and who we are becoming, emerging and developing as culturally evolved and authentic individuals.

Exploring and embracing our differences leads to a love of our “particularities” as well as an appreciation of the gifts of plurality. Like close-up snapshots and photographs from space, a close inspection of cultural differences offers a detailed and individual perspective, while a distant view reveals the symmetry and connectedness of human experience. Following Mandela’s way, professors and future educational leaders alike must evolve as freedom fighters, working for social justice and expanding the capacity of everyone to authentically contribute to the common good. We accomplish this work by pursuing the experience and goals of a culturally sensitive pedagogy with our students. I invite my colleagues to join me at the diversity table and enter the dialogue.

References

- Brookfield, S. (2005). *The power of critical theory: Liberating adult learning and teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Burbles, N. (1993). *Dialogue in teaching: Theory and practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Chen, G., & Starosta, W. (2006). Intercultural awareness. In L. Samovar, R. Porter, & E. McDaniel, (Eds.) *Intercultural communication: A reader* (11th ed.) (pp. 357–365). Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Clemons, J., Heckman, C. & Lamb, S. (1998). The Wheel of influence: A training exercise in client-centered multiculturalism. In Singelis, T. (Ed.), *Teaching about culture, ethnicity, and diversity: Exercises and planned activities* (pp. 187–190). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Eisner, E. (1991). *The enlightened eye: Qualitative inquiry and the enhancement of educational practice*. New York: Macmillan Publishing.
- Featherstone, M. (1992). *Cultural theory and cultural change* (Ed.). London, Sage Publications.
- Greene, M. (1988). *The dialectic of freedom*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Jensen, I. (2006). The practice of intercultural communication: Reflections for professionals in cultural meetings. In L. Samovar, R. Porter, & E. McDaniel, (Eds.). *Intercultural communication: A reader* (11th ed.) (pp. 39–48). Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Karim, A. (2003). A developmental progression model for intercultural consciousness: A leadership imperative. *Journal of Education for Business* (79:1), 344–346. Retrieved July 28, 2006, from Academic Search Premier database.
- Kim, Y. (2006). Unum and pluribus: Ideological underpinning of interethnic communication in the United States. In L. Samovar, R. Porter, & E. McDaniel, (Eds.). *Intercultural communication: A reader* (11th ed.) (pp. 153–163). Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Kottak, C., & Kozaitis, K. (2003). *On being different: Diversity and multiculturalism in the North American mainstream* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.
- Langer, L. (1997). Social suffering and Holocaust atrocity. In V. Kleinman, & M. Lock, *Social suffering* (pp. 46–65). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

- Mandela, N. (1994). *The long walk to freedom: The autobiography of Nelson Mandela*. New York: Little, Brown & Company.
- McDaniel, H., Samovar, L., & Porter, R. (2006). Understanding intercultural communication: An overview. In L. Samovar, R. Porter, & E. McDaniel, (Eds.) *Intercultural communication: A reader* (11th ed.) (pp. 6–15). Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Palmer, P. (1997). *The courage to teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Pickett, J. (Ed.) *American heritage dictionary of the English language* (4th ed.). (2000). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Rocha, S. (2006). *My personal growth plan: A chronology of self-discovery*. Unpublished manuscript. University of St. Thomas, Minneapolis. Minnesota.
- Rodriguez, A., Zozaiwicz, C., & Yerrick, R. (2005). Using prompted praxis to improve teacher professional development in culturally diverse schools. *School Science and Mathematics* (105:7), 352–411. Retrieved July 28, 2006, from Academic Search Premier database.
- Samovar, L., & Porter, R. (2001). *Communication between cultures* (4th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Thomson Learning.
- Singleton, G., & Linton, C. (2006). *Courageous conversations about race: A guide for achieving equity in schools*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Triandis, H. (2006). Culture and conflict. In L. Samovar, R. Porter, & E. McDaniel, (Eds.) *Intercultural communication: A reader* (11th ed.) (pp. 22–31). Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Vendler, Z. (1984). Understanding people. In R. Shweder, & R. LeVine, (Eds.) *Culture theory: Essays on mind, self, and emotion* (pp. 200–213). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- White, F. (2004). *Life writing: Drawing from personal experience to create features you can publish*. Sanger, CA: Quill Driver Books.
- Wiesel, E. (1958/1982). *Night* (S. Rodway Trans.). New York: Bantam Books.