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ABSTRACT

In higher education, there is research to support the importance of educating students on cultural competence and in providing them with experiences with diversity. The literature also reflects the need for a positive campus climate as diversity increases on campuses of institutions of higher education and discusses the methods available for creating a positive campus climate. However, while faculty are identified as a critical component of creating cultural competency, little is written about how the faculty that teaches these students define cultural competency and how they demonstrate cultural competency in the classroom and in their professional relationships with students. This qualitative study explored, from a case study perspective at one faith-based institution of higher education, the ways in which faculty define cultural competency and how they demonstrate cultural competency in the classroom. Through an analysis of university documents and the collection of data from faculty members in interviews, themes were identified about cultural competency. These themes were: awareness and understanding in cultural competency bringing cultural competency into the classroom; living the mission of Jesuit philosophy; the impact of training; and seeking support on issues of cultural competency; and finally, personal experiences that influenced the development of cultural competency. This study began to create a framework for understanding faculty definition and demonstration of cultural competency as well as providing information for possible training development and future research that needs to be conducted.
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A Case Study: Exploring Cultural Competency in Faculty in an Institution of Higher Education

The United States is growing more diverse ethnically and culturally every year. In higher education, there are more than 20 million students in college today. The percentages of college students in 2009 were approximately 12% Hispanic, 7% Asian/Pacific Islander, and 14% Black students. The percentage of White students was 62%. Nonresident students for whom race/ethnicity was not reported, made up 3% of the total enrollment in 2009 (U.S. Department of Education, 2010).

As statistics demonstrated, institutions of higher education are challenged to meet the needs of students by providing a multicultural education to all students. Banks (1993) defined multicultural education as a process for students to experience equality regardless of race, ethnicity, class, gender, or group.

From a global perspective, graduates require a high degree of skills to be successful, and critical learning is best accomplished in an institution that values diversity (Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, & Walter, 1999). Institutions of higher education with greater diversity in student and staff demonstrated a commitment to diversity that has been shown to create stronger commitment from its students and faculty back to the school (Smith, 2000). There are numerous benefits to providing a multicultural education to students in higher education. They include increased productivity, improved problem-
solving skills, positive campus experiences, and reduction of prejudice (Ameny-Dixon, 2004).

Culturally competent education also positively affects student satisfaction with courses, student life, and quality of instruction. Students are more actively engaged in ending racism and promoting social justice when engaged in a multicultural education (Pope and Reynolds, 1997). Offering students training on cultural competence and courses related to cultural competency such as in ethnic, race, and women’s studies positively affect student willingness to become social justice advocates (Astin, 1995). Students who come from diverse backgrounds have a higher level of comfort in environments that value cultural competence and are more likely to have decreased dropout rates. Overall, students from all backgrounds reported a higher level of satisfaction with their education and became stronger in critical thinking skills when offered opportunities to learn and grow from others with different experiences (Antonio et al., 2004).

One way in which cultural competence has been defined is, as “an open, accepting, and welcoming attitude toward other group cultures, defined broadly as other racial, ethnic, gender, and affinity groups’ normative, communicative, and behavior values. Openness is ideally coupled with understanding of the substance and nuances of specific group cultural norms and practices” (Rivera, Johnson, & Ward, 2010, p. 2).

Students gained cultural competency through identification with others and through self-awareness (Rivera et al., 2010). In order for this to happen, a positive campus climate needs to exist, and that was defined as being a school that values
individuals and groups and creates opportunity for interaction between different groups that is based on respect for each other (Harper & Hurtado, 2007).

The ongoing change in student populations clearly requires institutions of higher education to continue to grow and to be able to better serve students from diverse backgrounds. It is also part of the mission of higher education to prepare students to enter a global society with skills and knowledge to be able to successfully work within culturally diverse environments. Therefore, schools and institutions of higher learning have a responsibility for increasing and improving diversity and cultural competency in the delivery of services to students from historically underrepresented populations, as well as to educate all students as to the existence of the challenges historically underrepresented populations face today. The challenge, then, becomes how do faculty members meet this need (Hurtado, 1992).

There are multiple aspects to consider. First, it is necessary to understand what is meant by diversity and the specific definition of historically underrepresented populations. Historically underrepresented populations are any group or individual who has experienced oppression, discrimination, and marginalization and may include any racial and ethnic groups that are not part of the dominant European white culture. Also, gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender (GLBT) individuals who continue to experience homophobia are part of a historically underrepresented population. Ableism, sexism, and ageism are the marginalization of people with disabilities, women, and older and elderly people respectively (Sue, 2006).

With an understanding of the breadth of who experiences oppression, one consideration must be, what are the current experiences of a diverse student body. Many
schools are engaged in campus climate assessments to measure student acceptance and satisfaction on campuses. To understand the campus climate, there is a broad range of tools that are available and are being implemented across the country to measure student experiences and assess what factors are important to cultivate an open and accepting campus. For example, within the California state system, the Campus Diversity Initiative was created to improve experiences of historically underrepresented students in 28 state universities. Students were surveyed and interviewed, documents reviewed, maps created, and a picture of the current state of a campus was painted to create a foundation for change. The goal was to assist schools to be independent in their self-assessment. One outcome of this initiative was the finding that there were not common definitions for cultural competency across the different campuses (Smith, Parker, Clayton-Pedersen, Osei-Kofi, & Richards, 2006).

Once an assessment has been done, a model of creating cultural diversity and cultural competency can be adopted as appropriate. For example, there is the intercultural education model, the multicultural education model, and the antiracist education model. Each has a different focus with goals of impacting the individual or the community. Each is dependent upon the knowledge and expertise of faculty to effectively implement curriculum and classroom changes to increase cultural competency. Research further recommended that models include student participation formally and informally in activities, conversations, classes, and lived experiences (Guo & Zenobia, 2007; Gurin, Dey, Hurtado & Gurin, 2002). Yet few references were found for how faculty are assessed or evaluated in their ability to deliver these models (Guo & Zenobia, 2007).
The models and interventions included a campus that implemented an incentives-based program to enhance the campus climate with monetary awards being attached to individual nominations. Faculty, students, and administrators were chosen based on their ability to create a welcoming and positive campus climate (Luther, Seeberger, Phelan & Simpson, 2011). Other interventions included formal activities like facilitated group dialogue or social justice activities that can be student led (Harris & Nettles, 1996).

Assessing cultural competency and campus climates and creating models of interventions are all positive steps to improving campus climates. However, within the area of campus climate is a number of subcomponents that must be examined. Campus climate studies assess policies and procedures, curricula and content of coursework, student organizations, and availability of support for students from historically underrepresented populations. The campus climate studies are comprehensive and create a powerful framework for change, but the review did not find recommendations for specifically how faculty can be trained and supported to be a part of that change (Hurtado et al., 1999).

Another important area of research has been the exploration of the experience of historically underrepresented students in predominantly white universities. In the case of research in the subject areas of experiences of students and faculty on campus, a large portion of the research was focused on the area of racism and specifically on the oppression of people who are African-American. Baumgartner and Johnson-Bailey (2010) discussed the presence of racism and oppression in the admissions process, retention, and evolution of the curriculum at a southern university. As graduate students from a historically underrepresented population in a predominantly white university, they
experienced overt racism on campus and were able to identify ways in which there was also covert racism. Johnson-Bailey was mentored by the only other African-American student and two white students supported her, but it became apparent that they were the “liberals” of the program, and she found the rest of the student body to be “distant and unwelcoming” (Baumgartner & Johnson-Bailey, 2010, p. 31). Students from historically underrepresented populations in multiple studies still perceive a slow movement towards multiculturalism on campuses (Bruch, Higbee & Siaka, 2007).

Historically underrepresented faculty continue to find themselves marginalized and unfairly represented. They experienced discrimination from faculty with privilege and from students with privilege (Davis, 2010). As recently as 2005, only 5.5% of faculty members in higher education were Black (United States Department of Education, 2005). Again, all faculty from historically underrepresented populations must be included in the discussion of discrimination and oppression on campuses, but the literature most frequently reviews experiences of African-American faculty members. These are indicators that more work needs to be done to achieve healthy diversity and cultural competency on campuses.

Methods of teaching cultural competence in higher education have been identified, which included ways to open successful class dialogues and how to write culturally competent syllabi (Mayo & Lark, 2009). Pope (1997) found that faculty and staff in higher education were not sure about the definitions of cultural competency nor did they know how to create a positive campus climate (Pope & Reynolds, 1997).

There is little significant research regarding assessment of faculty for cultural competency, nor does the literature explore ways in which faculty were most successfully
trained to be able to teach cultural competency to the students. The research is limited to auto-ethnographical studies by faculty members and references in student studies as to the importance of the role of faculty without directly addressing faculty competency (Davis, 2010; Griffin, Pifer, Humphrey, Hazelwood, 2010). There seems to be an assumption that faculty are culturally competent and able to teach students from a multicultural perspective.

The process of defining and assessing cultural competency in higher education was limited by the fact that most studies rely on self-assessment by either students or faculty and administration. A further challenge that complicated the assessment process is due to the complexity of the issue of diversity. It is not possible to say that the experience of a Latino student will necessarily mirror the experience of an African American student although both may identify as belonging to historically underrepresented populations. Furthermore, one student might also identify as gay and also consider their gender status as a group that is oppressed, and therefore he or she would have dual oppression (Engberg & Hurtado, 2011).

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of this case study was to explore how faculty in an institution of higher education defined cultural competency and how they demonstrated cultural competency in the classroom. A qualitative case study approach with in-depth interviews and document analysis was implemented in order to explore components of a theory rather than prove a surmised theory (Creswell, 2007).
Significance of the Study

As higher education institutions are called upon to prepare students to become productive members of a global society, it is important that faculty be able to address multicultural needs of a diverse student body. This piece of improving cultural competence has been overlooked in the research and in the creation of campus climate plans. An understanding of how faculty define and demonstrate cultural competency would be useful for leadership in the application of assessing and then training faculty members in institutions of higher education in how to meet the cultural needs of their students. Data can possibly be used to create teaching techniques and tools employed by faculty in teaching students. Before successful trainings can be developed, a baseline for faculty interpretation and implementation needed to be determined. This study is the preliminary step in creating innovative new ideas for supporting faculty members to provide culturally competent experiences and education, in and out of the classroom, in higher education.

Research Questions

This study sought to explore the following questions: How do faculty in institutions of higher education define cultural competency? How do they demonstrate cultural competency in the classroom?

The following definitions have been provided to create a framework for exploring these two questions. There are multiple definitions for each term available. The ones that have been included were chosen because they are found throughout the literature and were developed by leaders in the field of cultural competency and diversity.
Definition of Terms

Campus climate. The experience of individuals and groups on a campus and the quality and extent of the interaction between those various groups and individuals. In a healthy climate, individuals and groups generally feel welcomed, respected, and valued by the university. A healthy climate is grounded in respect for others and allows for difficult conversations to take place (Harper & Hurtado, 2007).

Cultural competence. Cultural competence was defined as, “an open, accepting and welcoming attitude toward other group cultures, defined broadly as other racial, ethnic, gender, and affinity groups’ normative, communicative, and behavior values. Openness is ideally coupled with understanding of the substance and nuances of specific group cultural norms and practices” (Rivera et al, 2010, p. 2). Campinha-Bacote (2010) added it is an active process in becoming effective in working with different client cultures to include family, individual and community.

Diversity. Diversity meant understanding that each individual is unique and recognizing individual differences. Differences can be along the dimensions of race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, age, physical abilities, religious beliefs, political beliefs, or other ideologies (Sue, 2006).

Historically underrepresented population. A term that referred to groups who have been denied access and/or suffered past institutional discrimination and includes African Americans, Asian Americans, Hispanics or Chicanos/Latinos, and Native Americans. This is measured by an imbalance in the representation of different groups in common pursuits such as education, jobs, and housing, resulting in marginalization for some groups and individuals and not for others (Sue, 2006). Inclusion is the act of
creating environments in which any individual or group can be and feel welcomed, respected, supported, and valued to fully participate. An inclusive and welcoming climate embraces differences and offers respect in words and actions for all people (Sue, 2006).

**Marginalization.** The process of systematically excluding people from opportunities for advancement socially, politically, and economically based on their membership in a certain group (Sue, 2006).

**Microagression.** The brief interactions that are negative to a person or group of people based on their perceived race, ethnicity, or other membership in a group that has been historically marginalized. (Sue, 2006).

**Multiculturalism.** An acknowledgment that people are culturally diverse and multifaceted, and a process through which the sharing and transforming of cultural experiences allow for new possibilities and positions (Sue, 2006).

**Oppression.** The systematic mistreatment of people based on their membership in a certain group. It restricts opportunities, life chances, beliefs, and self-determination (Sue, 2006).

**Racism.** The belief that a particular race is (or certain races are) superior or inferior to another race or races. As a system, racism is an institutional arrangement, maintained by policies, practices, and procedures—both formal and informal—in which some persons typically have more or less opportunity than others, and in which such persons receive better or worse treatment than others, because of their respective racial identities (Helms, 1992).
White privilege. Refers to any advantage, opportunity, benefit, head start, or general protection from negative societal mistreatment, which persons deemed White will typically have, but others do not (Helms, 1992).

Worldview. The perspective from which one sees the world.

Methodology

This qualitative case study was conducted through in-depth interviews with faculty members at a Jesuit university in the Midwest. In addition, documents related to cultural competency were analyzed to include policies and procedures, syllabi, public records, and websites. Case study design was an appropriate methodology as the purpose of this study was to explore how faculty members in one university define cultural competency and implement cultural competency in the classroom. Case studies are designed to explore “how” questions. The university is a bounded system and there was a finite set of possible participants in the data collection process, another hallmark of the case study (Merriam, 2009).

Sampling was done through recruiting faculty members through e-mail. Faculty participated on a voluntary basis and were asked to engage in a 30-minute to 1-hour interview and then a maximum of three follow-up contacts. Faculty included both male and female professors. The professors taught in graduate and undergraduate programs and across disciplines to include science, healthcare, education, and business.

Role of the Researcher

The researcher is required to suspend personal experiences, beliefs, and opinions in a grounded theory approach (Creswell, 2007). However, it is important to first identify biases and possible opinions that might influence findings. As an American white faculty
member of privilege, this researcher believes that there can be a lack of cultural competency in faculty members of privilege. This researcher also believes that in large part, the diversity and competency trainings faculty are mandated to attend are often not helpful in addressing that lack of cultural competency and do very little to improve cultural competency on campuses. There are not, however, any preconceived ideas as to how faculty members may define and demonstrate cultural competency, and that will assist the researcher in suspending personal beliefs.

**Organization of the Study**

Chapter 1 of this study is the introduction. The issue of cultural competency in higher education is explained and some of the relevant themes in the literature are reviewed. Chapter 2 is the literature review of subjects related to cultural competency in higher education. The topics included campus climate, student perceptions, and faculty perceptions, as well as faculty and cultural competence and the assessment and implementation of cultural competency in higher education.

Chapter 3 reviews the methodology. A qualitative case study was implemented because this study is a preliminary exploration of a topic with little previous research available being conducted in a university, which is a single unit of analysis (Creswell, 2007). There is an assumption that faculty are culturally competent inherent in the mandates to increase diversity and to improve campus climates, but without an understanding from a faculty perspective, it is difficult to determine which direction will be most successful in training and supporting faculty to be culturally competent.

Chapter 4 is the results from the data collection process as reviewed in Chapter 3. Themes and patterns within the data were described. Chapter 5 is the summary and
conclusions drawn from the analysis of data in Chapter 4. Finally, references and appendices are included (Roberts, 2010).

Summary

How do faculty members define cultural competency and how do faculty members demonstrate cultural competency in the classroom? The literature review showed this question has not been fully explored, and as the importance of cultural competency in higher education was revealed, it was clear that this information is necessary to build successful educational programs and create support for faculty in institutions of higher education striving to increase diversity and cultural competency. Through a case study analysis, data were collected to begin to explore how faculty members define and demonstrate cultural competency. A future consequence of these findings is informing the process of how faculty can best be supported to become culturally competent so that they may, in turn, provide the support and education their students need to become culturally competent professionals.
Literature Review

The Ford Foundation’s Campus Diversity Initiative (1998) sponsored a study that collected data from 2,000 registered voters to determine if diversity was important in higher education. The survey reported that 82% believed that it was necessary to increase diversity on campuses and that can create respect for diversity. As the workforce becomes more diverse and the globalization of businesses creates a higher demand for cultural competency, it appears that college campuses are an ideal location to immerse students in diverse experiences and education. Most students, prior to college, have interacted primarily with members of their own racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic groups, and at this particular point in their lives, they are most open to learning about diversity in a positive campus climate (Jakakumar, 2008).

However, defining diversity and understanding cultural competency in higher education is a complex issue. There is the growing problem of diversity as being defined as the racial and ethnic composition of a student body. This can only be addressed when faculty are willing and able to bring cultural competency into the classroom (Quaye, 2012). Therefore, within the framework of all that is known about creating positive experiences for students in gaining appreciation for diversity, there is an inherent expectation that faculty must be themselves culturally competent.

Within a literature review to understand how faculty defined and demonstrated cultural competence in higher education, a review of the literature must be undertaken on
the subjects of campus climate, experiences of historically underrepresented populations on campuses, experiences of marginalized faculty and staff members, and a review of any literature that specifically addresses the process of faculty members defining and gaining cultural competency. Finally, the literature review examines ways in which cultural competency is defined and assessed. This literature review will address each of these areas in order to better understand the boundaries of what might be needed from a faculty perspective, the challenges faculty encounter, and the current state of cultural competency and diversity on campuses today.

This process is a funnel beginning with the macro level perspective of cultural competency in the broad framework of campus climate. Campus climate is defined as the experience of individuals and groups on a campus and the quality and extent of the interaction between those various groups and individuals. In a healthy climate, individuals and groups generally feel welcomed, respected, and valued by the university. A healthy climate is grounded in respect for others, and allows for difficult conversations to take place (Harper & Hurtado, 2007).

Next, in the process of reviewing literature from students and faculty from historically underrepresented populations, there was validation that there continues to be a lack of cultural competency in higher education, and insight began to develop regarding the specifics of experiences that must be improved. There was a personal component in these studies that is important in a qualitative study that seeks to gain understanding of faculty definition and demonstration of cultural competency. Students from historically underrepresented populations were best able to discuss what is needed and what the current reality may be.
The literature review included a section on faculty cultural competency as that is the core of this study. There has been little research done to specifically identify the role and training that faculty have in creating a positive campus climate. Also, as the primary method of assessment of cultural competency for students and faculty alike is the use of self-assessment tools, it was necessary to review how cultural competency is defined and assessed in general from a literature perspective. All of these literature areas provided a complete understanding of what needed to be further explored with regard to the cultural competency of faculty in higher education.

**Campus Climate**

At this time, with an increase in diversity continuing across the country and in institutions of higher education, there is an abundance of research on the subject of campus climate. The primary focus of much of the data related to the actual assessment of the campus climate and included studies analyzing student perceptions, faculty perceptions, models that are most efficacious in bringing about change, and research that supports the need for ongoing assessment past the initial assessment phase (Astin, 1995).

The California Postsecondary Education Commission (1992a) defined campus climate as “the formal and informal environment, both institutionally and community-based, in which individuals learn, teach, work and live in a post-secondary setting” (p. 2). Harris and Nettles (1996) also described campus climate. “The attitudes, behaviors, and precollege characteristics of students combine with the norms, ideologies, and values of their institutions to create a campus climate. Kuh (1993) expanded on the concept of campus climate by describing it as the process by which all institutional constituents experience their university.
Seminal work in the field of campus climate assessment began with Hurtado et al. (1999) in a report that created a framework for future studies and identified climate assessment models. They provided methods for assessing campus climate, principles to guide the effort to improve campus climate, and include examples of successful climate studies.

Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen and Walter (1999) also identified three areas for consideration to improve the campus climate for diversity. First, the environment needed to be understood as it is experienced by different racial/ethnic student groups. Facilitation of opportunities for purposeful and ongoing interactions between or among students, faculty, and staff of diverse backgrounds must occur to improve the climate. They also recommended that interactions take place in a variety of environments across campus, as some environments are segregated on campuses. Finally, the authors recommended an understanding of the educational benefits of diversity. The ways in which diversity affects the quality of student learning, as well as the development of life skills necessary to succeed in society, should be a part of planning initiatives (Hurtado et al., 1999).

The framework for conducting a climate assessment was based on four components, the first of which was historical legacy of inclusion and exclusion. It was important to assess what foundation the university has created historically on issues of diversity and how that foundation impacts current campus climate (Hurtado, et al., 1999). This was done through a review of the school’s written material including policies and procedures and mission statement.
Next was an examination of structural diversity, which was actually identifying the student and faculty and staff statistics to understand the different experiences of members of the university community. Enrollment of students and recruitment of qualified staff needed to be part of the planning and response to the findings of a campus climate assessment. Not only did institutions need to increase numbers of historically underrepresented populations, they must provide white students with opportunities to engage with students of diverse cultures and backgrounds to enhance student growth and learning and development of cultural competency (Hurtado et al., 1999). It was not enough for students to be on a cross-cultural campus; thoughtful and purposeful interactions must be facilitated (Chang, Denson, Saenz, & Misa, 2006).

Psychological climate was the assessment of the perceptions of racial and ethnic tension and perceptions of discrimination. To create a positive psychological climate, peers and faculty must willingly support policies that supported tolerance and participated in cross-cultural relationships (Cress, 2008). Faculty must be willing to engage in a process of self-reflection and address issues of oppression as they occur in the classroom. Currently, white students continue to believe there is equality for historically underrepresented students on campuses, while students from historically underrepresented populations were aware of the ongoing oppression and segregation (Garcia & Van Soest, 2000).

The behavioral dimension assessed the social interaction across race and ethnicity, campus involvement, and classroom diversity. Actual incidents were recorded and quantified. Positive informal interactions between students and faculty assisted in
helping students feel engaged in their institutions. Extracurricular activities have been found to promote positive cross-cultural experiences for students (Hurtado et al., 1999).

When these elements have been assessed, a clear picture emerges that can provide a foundation for creating change in the campus climate. Campus climate was relevant to cultural competency of faculty because it was the foundation on which faculty are attempting to provide culturally competent education. Faculty cultural competency can be viewed as a component of campus climate that must be included in the planning process of developing a diversity plan for a university.

Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen and Walter (1999) included twelve recommendations for creating a response to the findings of a campus climate assessment. They were:

1. Affirm the goal of achieving a campus climate that supports racial and cultural diversity as an institutional priority.

2. Systematically assess the institutional climate for diversity in terms of historical legacy, structural diversity, psychological climate, and behavioral elements to understand the dimensions of the problem.

3. Guided by research, experiences at peer institution, and results from the systematic assessment of the campus climate for diversity, develop a plan for implementing constructive change that includes specific goals, timetables, and pragmatic activities.

4. Implement a detailed and ongoing evaluation program to monitor the effectiveness of and build support for programmatic activities aimed at improving the campus climate for diversity.
5. Create a conscious effort to rid the campus of its exclusionary past, and adopt proactive goals to achieve desegregation that included increasing opportunity for previously excluded groups.

6. Involve faculty in efforts to increase diversity that are consistent with their roles as educators and researchers.

7. Create collaborative and cooperative learning environments where students’ learning and interaction among diverse groups can be enhanced.

8. Increase students’ interaction with faculty outside class by incorporating students in research and teaching activities.

9. Initiate curricular and cocurricular activities that increase dialogue and build bridges across communities of difference.

10. Create a student-centered orientation among faculty and staff.

11. Include diverse students in activities to increase students’ involvement in campus life. Ensure that programming for diversity involves general support services as well as coordinated activities and support programs for students of color.

12. Increase sensitivity and training of staff who are likely to work with diverse student populations.

This framework is included to provide an example of the work that has been done and of the method in which campus climates can be improved. While these are sound recommendations for creating a positive campus climate, there is a lack of detail for faculty beyond inclusion, training, and more involvement with students beyond the classroom.
Experiences from Students from Historically Underrepresented Populations

This section of literature review follows as a subset of the campus climate assessment as it addresses the psychological climate on campuses. Students from historically underrepresented populations continued to experience marginalization and oppression in forms that include overt and blatant to less obvious microaggressive acts (Bruch et al., 2007). Students reported that campuses were not addressing the acts of marginalization they were experiencing, and faculty often ignored issues that presented within the classroom (Guo & Jamal, 2007).

An increase in the numbers of students from historically underrepresented populations created a new set of challenges. Students may continue to feel marginalized and students and faculty and staff with privileged backgrounds may struggle with issues related to affirmative action as there is a perception that diversity is increasing on campuses and no longer requires intervention at the admissions level. Bruch (2007) and colleagues found that 37% of students participating in a study assessing student perceptions of multiculturalism said that there was unfairness in the college’s affirmative action admission policies. In recent litigation, the Supreme Court has brought the issue to national attention again when two white students protested being denied admission to University of Texas based on alleged preferential admission policies for students from historically underrepresented populations. Next year, another case related to affirmative action may entirely eliminate affirmative action admission policies in higher education (Barnes, 2013). These cases demonstrated the perception that racism is no longer an issue on campuses.
Astin (1995) analyzed outcomes of a national study of 217 institutions of higher education and concluded that students believe that racial discrimination was no longer a problem on campuses. Furthermore, there are now allegations of reverse discrimination as white students report their perspectives are not valued or included when examining campus climates. (Bruch, Higbee, & Siaka, 2007). For students who do not experience discrimination, racism does not exist. In fact, students with privilege claim to be “color-blind” and to respond negatively when the subject of racism and oppression of historically underrepresented populations is brought into classroom discussions (Gay, 2011).

It was critical that campuses make all students feel valued. When students felt that they were genuinely valued as individuals, they were more likely to become active and productive members of the academic community (Hurtado, 1992). One study focused on the importance of the student-faculty relationship as an indicator for historically underrepresented students’ success in higher education. The stronger and more positive a relationship was, the more successful students from historically underrepresented populations have been (Baszile, 2008). Student experiences were always included in the assessment of a campus climate.

However, students who experienced marginalization felt that they are not heard, and continued to experience discrimination (Bruch et al., 2007). Deo (2012) found that racism does still exist in America and on college campuses, but it adapts and changes to fit the current political climate. While the blatant historical racism of the period before and during the 1960s has improved, segregation on campuses continues within groups and organizations still divided by racial and ethnic lines. For students from historically
underrepresented populations, joining segregated organizations can create a safety on campuses that might otherwise not feel welcoming, and, therefore, help to ensure success (Deo, 2012). There is a continued experience of separation and discrimination in a more subtle form. Civil rights activist and lawyer Derrick Bell claimed that there will never be racial equality and that every black person is one incident away from experiencing a racially motivated incident (Bell, 1997).

When cultural competency is addressed directly on campuses, students from historically underrepresented populations can continue to suffer. Faculty must be cautious that they are not expecting the students from historically underrepresented populations to serve as expert resources for students who are privileged. Also, when students are encouraged to engage in self-reflective exercise, as is often recommended for improved cultural competency, the activity must be viewed from the perspective of the student who has been historically underrepresented for an understanding of how that activity might create more damage (Baszile, 2008). Baszile, a faculty member in higher education wrote, “There are surely days when I think I just might lose my mind as I try to confront the resistance of privileged White students without locking the few students of color into a teaching role that compromises their learning and at the same time be as aware as I can of my own racialized behavior” (2008, p. 372).

Baszile (2008) shared her personal account of internalized racism when she was asked to create a self-reflective journal on her student teaching process in her own education. In hindsight, years later, she was able to see how she experienced trauma in her attempt to set aside her experiences as a Black woman to try to conform with what she felt should be her professional self.
The literature in this section has primarily reflected the findings on the specific issue of racism as a form of oppression. Additional literature identified the challenges that students with disabilities face in higher education. As laws have changed, allowing more students with disabilities to access higher education, there must be educational approaches and a campus climate that meets their needs. Students with disabilities were not receiving the services and support that they are entitled to have in order to be successful (Konur, 2006).

Chonody, Siebert, and Rutledge (2009) found a large number of students still view people who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered (LGBT) with a negative worldview. Reasons for this have been found to include religion, geographic location, age, and lack of campus programs and educational opportunities to improve the experience of LGBT students.

A review of the literature for student experiences of diversity on campuses is relevant to the study of faculty’s cultural competence because it is a measure of the level of cultural competence faculty is providing. If faculty are culturally competent, students will receive an education and campus experiences that are more supportive to different cultures and that increase understanding of the lived experiences of students from historically underrepresented populations.

**Experiences from Faculty from Historically Underrepresented Populations**

Despite claims of cultural competency and improvement in diversity for faculty from historically underrepresented populations, the literature told a different story. Faculty continued to experience marginalization and oppression that mirrors that of students from historically underrepresented populations in that it ranges from blatant
discrimination to microagressions. Davis (2010) stated that underrepresentation and marginalization of Black faculty in predominantly white institutions continues to exist. Faculty faced racism from students, administration, and other faculty members and 82% of Black faculty have experienced direct discrimination (Davis, 2010). In a study to determine to which race and gender of faculty would students best respond, Basow, Codos, and Martin (2013) found that students were assessed as learning the most when they had white male professors. The students assessed were predominantly white and did not report a preference for white male professors. However, when tested by computer simulated faculty of various races and ethnicities and both genders, students had the best outcomes with the white male professor (Basow, Codos, & Martin, 2013).

Faculty from historically underrepresented populations reacted to oppression on campus a variety of ways. Departure was often the ultimate remedy faculty can take, but prior to that decision, faculty can depart emotionally by no longer putting effort and care into their work, or by excessive absences and lack of participation whenever possible. (Griffin et al., 2011). Faculty are subject to institutional as well as personal oppression. They are asked to serve as an expert resource for minority issues, to represent their ethnic and racial communities on committees, and to provide support for students from historically underrepresented populations regardless of interest or background. They have been personally questioned as to their presence on campus as it is seen as undesirable.

One participant in the research by Griffin et al. (2011) shared an experience during her interview process when a white male faculty member stated, ‘Well, you’ll do fine anyway, you don’t really have to work that hard because you’re a black woman. It’s handed to you” (p. 34). In another instance, a black faculty member was mistaken for the
janitor when he walked into a classroom to guest lecture and he was asked to move the
furniture (Griffin, et al., 2011, p. 509). Experiences like these were common amongst
faculty from historically underrepresented populations and caused faculty to feel
excluded, isolated, and undervalued, which negatively impacts the building of a positive
campus climate.

Luna, Medina, and Gordon (2010) specifically focused on the marginalization of
women of color in higher education. Women faculty members shared their experiences of
not only being held accountable for their racial and ethnic backgrounds, but also for their
roles as women in society. This manifested in the balance of service versus research.
Often women faculty are asked to contribute so much to the community on committees
and in mentoring students that they are not afforded the same opportunities to conduct
research (Luna, et al., 2010).

From a legal perspective today, the primary lawsuits in higher education pertain
to affirmative action in claims made by white faculty members alleging reverse
discrimination. Faculty members have made discriminatory statements and been legally
protected on the basis of freedom of speech. Female faculty members continued to report

**Faculty Members and Cultural Competency**

The literature supported the need for cultural competency and education in higher
education, but in an attempt to bring cultural competency into the classroom, white
pedagogy can actually impede the delivery of culturally competent education by
encouraging an inappropriate focus on aspects of culture that can trivialize or dismiss the
real issues. For example, many campuses now have activities that are designed to
celebrate different cultures through identifying cultures by dress and food and customs. It creates the impression that participants can be culturally competent because they have learned a culture from this perspective. The opposite is also occurring when faculty are encouraging a “melting pot” worldview in higher education that encourages acculturation instead of appreciation for differences (Sayles-Hannon, 2009).

Rivera et al., (2010) found that faculty must be able to facilitate classroom dialogue between participants from diverse backgrounds, and that one key component for doing so would be engaging in a process of self-awareness first. Their research cited ways in which faculty will fail in properly providing culturally competent training if they themselves have not engaged in reflexive awareness (Rivera et al., 2010).

In further research, Howard-Hamilton et al. (1998) discussed the readiness of faculty to teach cultural competency. Faculty were not necessarily comfortable or knowledgeable about issues of diversity and may also not be comfortable with conflict in the classroom. Therefore, faculty may not actually be demonstrating cultural competency in the classroom.

Pope and Reynolds (1997) developed a list of characteristics that would be helpful for student affairs personnel to have in creating cultural competency on campuses. They align well with criteria that would be important for faculty. The three areas were in awareness, knowledge, and skills. Awareness would be defined as being open to change and that differences are positive. It includes the need for self-awareness. Knowledge refers to understanding privilege and oppression and the experiences of people from historically underrepresented populations. Skills would be the ability to engage in
conversations while being empathetic and being able to build trust with people from historically underrepresented populations.

In a study at the University of North Carolina School of Nursing, Leiper, Van Horn, Hu and Upadhyaya (2008) developed a training program in cultural competency for faculty and graduate students that received positive feedback from participants. Their findings indicated the importance of including faculty in determining what to offer in a training and in having faculty participate as presenters of material. While this is a useful concept, it again reiterates the use of self-assessment as the primary way in which faculty are identified as being culturally competent.

“Funds of Knowledge Research and Teaching” is a method of teaching from a culturally competent curriculum and relies on the cultural knowledge and experiences of the students from their homes, which allows for creation of a critical thinking process in the classroom (Gay, 2011). This method is empowering to students and removes the professor from being the expert resource.

There is the question of how faculty are motivated to become culturally competent. Goodman (2000) identified three main factors for faculty seeking cultural competence. The factors are personal experiences or relationships, which she referred to as empathy; moral values or spiritual values, which lead to a need for faculty members to strive for equality; and finally, a form of self-interest in that the greater good or society will benefit if there is more equality (Goodman, 2000). If these three can be equally engaged, there is an increased likelihood of success.

Gopal (2011) first advocated for an evaluation of faculty knowledge and sensitivity to be followed by case studies, dialogue, self-reflection, and activities to
increase competence. She cautioned, however, that this is an ongoing process and programs must be re-evaluated and adapted to meet the changing needs of faculty in their professional development (Gopal, 2011).

Diversity workshops and trainings were often not useful and seen to be confrontational and unauthentic. Often, the faculty that would most benefit from these trainings do not attend or participate. Trainings must be incorporated into regularly scheduled meetings like department meetings, as opposed to being separate optional diversity trainings (Griffin, et al., 2011).

In a personal account of facing the need to gain a higher level of cultural competency, Cooper, Massey and Graham (2006) explored Massey’s experience of becoming a white faculty member at a predominantly black university. Cooper and Graham agreed to mentor Massey as they believed their experiences as black faculty members could provide Massey with guidance in her goal of understanding whether or not a white faculty member can teach black students and whether or not a faculty member with privilege can teach something she has not experienced (Cooper et al., 2006).

Quaye (2012) conducted a case study with two white faculty members who taught cultural competency in higher education and was able to identify the ability of white faculty members to challenge white students from the perspective of shared privilege. The study did not examine the impact of white faculty members facilitating conversations on diversity for students from historically underrepresented populations.

These studies demonstrated a willingness of faculty in higher education to bring cultural competency in the classroom, but both studies are small case studies with little generalizability.
Defining and Assessing Cultural Competency

There were many definitions of cultural competency to be found in the literature. The one adopted for this study was defined as, “an open, accepting, and welcoming attitude toward other group cultures, defined broadly as other racial, ethnic, gender, and affinity groups’ normative, communicative, and behavior values. Openness is ideally coupled with understanding of the substance and nuances of specific group cultural norms and practices” (Rivera et al., 2010, p. 2).

Another definition most commonly found in the health care literature as it related to cultural competency is cultural competence. Cultural competence is defined as a set of congruent behaviors, attitudes, and policies that come together in a system, agency, or among professionals and enables that system, agency, or those professionals to work effectively in cross-cultural situations (Cross, Bazron, Dennis, & Isaacs, 1989; Isaacs & Benjamin, 1991).

According to Sue (2006), a necessary component of becoming culturally competent meant understanding that being white represented a reality that advanced the privilege and status of White Euro-American males while disadvantaging others. Many whites prefer to not think or talk about being white and deny its importance because it is an assumed fact and taken for granted.

Helms (1992) developed the White Racial Identity Model to identify the stages a white person experiences on the path from being racist to having a healthy white racial identity, which leads to cultural competency (Helms, 1992). Helms’ White Racial Identity Model provided a framework for its definitions and worldview of the existence
of racism and it provided a framework for how cultural competence can be measured (Sue, 2006). The six stages of development are:

1. Contact Status: People are oblivious to and unaware of racism and believe everyone has equal chances of success.

2. Disintegration: A person is conflicted over irresolvable racial moral dilemmas, such as believing they are not racist yet not wanting a child to marry a minority group member.

3. Reintegration: A stage of regression when the person believes more strongly in white racial superiority and that minorities are to blame for their own problems.

4. Pseudo-Independent: A person moves to this stage because of a painful or insightful encounter and begins to attempt to understand differences. It is still more of an intellectual exercise than an experiential one.

5. Immersion/Emersion: Begins to question what does it mean to be white. There is a willingness to confront one’s own biases and become more active in combating racism and oppression.

6. Autonomy: Awareness of one’s own whiteness with reduced feelings of guilt. Knowledgeable about racial, ethnic, and cultural differences and values diversity. Development of a nonracist white identity becomes increasingly strong.

While a framework for cultural competency is important, the challenge becomes the fact that most instruments to assess cultural competency are self-assessment instruments as is the case with Helms’ model. It is difficult to externalize a measuring process for an individual’s cultural competency (King & Howard-Hamilton, 2003). This
is why an important part of this study was to explore patterns of classroom demonstration to validate the level of self-assessment as culturally competent.

In preparing student teachers for secondary school professions, Dee (2012) explored the issue of assessing student teachers. This could be extrapolated to the area of faculty assessment. Lee found that most students preferred to be assessed based on course content and pedagogy, but not on the personal self-reflection process. She discussed ways in which student teacher evaluations could include assessment of cultural competency that included diversity components in the Teacher Work Sample, an assessment process for student teachers (Dee, 2012). The need for self-reflection to be culturally competent in the classroom is reiterated by Fishman and McCarthy (2005) who further found that faculty need to be able to contextualize the experiences of students from historically underrepresented populations (Fishman & McCarthy, 2005).

Summary

The research substantiated the importance of the topic of cultural competency in higher education. There was a clear picture of the breadth and depth of all that must be included in the consideration of a successful campus climate. Faculty cultural competency was often identified as necessary, but the primary method of validation for cultural competency has been through the self-assessment process. This study became important because before there is exploration as to whether or not a faculty member considers herself or himself to be culturally competent, there must be understanding about what exactly that means to him or her. The two focuses of this study—definition and demonstration—provide a foundation for future assessment, intervention, and
improvement of how institutions of higher education might improve their campus climate and increase cultural competency.
Methodology

The methodology chapter begins with a description of the research design and why it was chosen for this study. Methods for sampling, data collection procedures, data analysis, trustworthiness, and limitations of the study are included in this chapter. The purpose of this study was to explore how faculty in an institution of higher education define cultural competency and how they demonstrate cultural competency in the classroom.

It is important to first consider which type of research will be most appropriate; qualitative, quantitative, or mixed method. All three methods rely on a framework for collecting information that requires the researcher to make decisions about how data will be evaluated. All three also require an analysis or summary of outcomes, and all three are held to standards of reliability or trustworthiness, ethics, and scientific rigor (Dobrovolny & Fuentes, 2008).

However, it is the differences in the three methods that clearly lead to a decision to follow a qualitative research design. Quantitative research is usually conducted to test or substantiate a hypothesis. Data are numerical and the sample size is usually quite large. Mixed methods has a quantitative element, and so requires adherence to the quantitative design of testing or substantiating a hypothesis. (Dobrovolny & Fuentes, 2008). As little is known about how faculty defines cultural competency and how they demonstrate it in the classroom, it would not be an appropriate method to explore this topic in a quantitative design. Therefore, qualitative research was chosen.
Qualitative Approach

Qualitative research is used to inquire about meanings that people assign to experiences in their world. Data are generally collected within a natural setting that does not include a laboratory or completion of data collection instruments. The researcher is an integral part of the data collection process and data are collected in multiple ways (Creswell, 2007). It is used as a method of exploration and fits well when exploring complex problems that people encounter in their worlds. Qualitative research helps to give direction in areas where little is known or in which there is little previous research and no guiding theories. Qualitative research can begin to provide understanding about people’s interpretation of their world (Creswell, 2007; Merriam, 2009).

A qualitative approach was chosen because the issue of cultural competency in faculty in higher education needs to be explored, and studies of exploration are best conducted as qualitative research. Cultural competency is a complex issue and requires extensive interviewing to gain an understanding of the process by which faculty have defined and demonstrated it. Interviewing is a participatory and collaborative process between the researcher and the participant and provides rich, thick data (Creswell, 2007). Furthermore, as little research could be found that discussed faculty roles in cultural competency, no preliminary hypothesis could be formed so this study did not meet the paradigm of a quantitative project (Dobrovolny & Fuentes, 2008).

Qualitative design was also chosen because it closely matches the framework in which this study was based. The researcher comes from a social work background, which inherently values the “stories” and interactions with individuals. Social work has a strengths-based perspective, a strong commitment to improving social justice issues, and
an ethical framework that requires the social worker to engage with individuals at a personal level as well as impacting issues at the higher or macro level. Qualitative research matches this framework with its purpose of understanding how people define and experience their worlds and incorporates a holistic methodology (Creswell, 2009; Stake, 1995).

**Case Study Design**

A case study design was implemented, which is appropriate as it is a method that seeks to find meaning as it pertains to an issue in society. The researcher directly collects the data and the data analysis process is “richly descriptive” (Merriam, 2009, p. 39).

More specifically, a case study was chosen when the researcher wants to explore a particular issue and chooses to do so within one bounded system (Creswell, 2007). This method matched the purpose of this study in exploring cultural competency in one institution of higher education and was appropriate because it allowed for paradoxes in a study about which little is known. Therefore, if the data did not clearly demonstrate themes, it met the case study criteria of not necessarily having a goal of validating a hypothesis (Merriam, 2009). Case studies are appropriate when the question to be answered is “how” as in the research question of “How do faculty define and demonstrate cultural competency?” (Baxter & Jack, 2008).

For this study, the design evolved to ultimately be a case study during the literature review process. When it began to emerge that there was little data on how faculty defined and then demonstrated cultural competency in the classroom, it seemed that the case was “given” (Stake, 1995, p. 3). It did not make sense to attempt to gather data from more than one institution, and it did make sense to try to have as much depth in
one single unit as possible to attempt to capture the potential wide range of responses.
Insight can be gained when one single case is studied in depth, and that was the purpose of this study. Also, within the framework of a social work perspective, case studies are often implemented in education and social service programs, which fits this study (Stake, 1995).

Sampling

Nonprobabilistic sampling was used in this study. This meant that the sample was not randomly chosen. Purposeful sampling, the most common form of nonprobabilistic sampling, is the intentional selection of a sample from which the most insight can be gained. It enables the researcher to gather information that is rich and meaningful (Merriam, 2009).

In this study, purposeful sampling was necessary as the data was being collected from only one university and the study had been designed specifically to collect data from faculty. Other staff and administration were not included in the study because they may not have had the classroom experience to identify ways in which cultural competency was demonstrated. Stake (1995) pointed out that the questions and purpose of the study lead to the choice of case study design. So the question of definition and demonstration led to faculty being chosen in a nonprobabilistic sample and the purpose of understanding in depth how faculty defined and demonstrated cultural competency led to purposeful sampling in a case study design.

Sampling was conducted through recruiting faculty members by e-mail. An e-mail was first sent out to a target group of faculty members based on a personal connection between the researcher and the liaison at the university. The e-mail informed
faculty that they might be contacted by the researcher with an invitation to participate in this study. This was purposeful sampling as the participants must be faculty members at the chosen university and were initially a small and select group of faculty (Merriam, 2009).

After the initial e-mail, an invitation was sent out inviting faculty to participate in the study to explore how faculty in an institution of higher education define cultural competency and how they demonstrate cultural competency in the classroom (See Appendix B). They were informed that participation would be voluntary and they could refuse to participate or discontinue participation at any time during the study. Most of the faculty contacted responded within a few days replying that they would be interested in participating and offered contact information to schedule an interview.

Faculty participated on a voluntary basis and were asked to engage in a 30-minute to 1-hour interview and then a maximum of three follow-up contacts. Faculty were advised that if they chose to participate in this study, they could cease to do so at any point with no consequences for their decision. No participants in the study requested a withdrawal at any time.

In addition to recruitment through e-mailing, snowball sampling was employed by asking initial participants to refer other potential participants. At the end of each interview, the participant was asked if they knew of any other faculty members who might agree to participate. As names were referred, those faculty members were contacted through e-mail and invited to participate as well. This process generated additional participants, and they were included in the sample (Creswell, 2007).
Recruitment was completed when themes began to emerge and there was no new information being generated in the interviews and therefore saturation had been reached. Saturation is defined as examining the data for new categories as long as new information is found until no further insight can be gained (Creswell, 2007; Merriam, 2009).

This study and research design was approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of Creighton University for the further protection of the participants (See Appendix A). Due to the nature of the research, which did not entail any significant risk to participants, the IRB granted an exempt status for this research.

**Data Collection**

In keeping with a case study approach, data were collected from faculty members through an in-depth, semistructured interview. The interview consisted of structured and open-ended questions with flexibility in the questioning (Merriam, 2009). This method was chosen because a structured format would not be appropriate with so little known about possible responses, and an unstructured format was not appropriate because specific questions had been identified for exploration (Creswell, 2007).

Whenever possible, the interviews were conducted face-to-face and recorded for verbatim transcription. Some interviews and follow-up questions were conducted via Skype or telephone and they were also recorded and transcribed verbatim. A hand-held Sony recorder was used, which remained in the possession of the researcher at all times and allowed for immediate transcription to begin within one to two days of the interview being conducted. The recorder was locked in the personal desk of the researcher and all recordings will be destroyed at the conclusion of the study. While the interviews were
being conducted, the researcher took extensive field notes noting what was being said and observations about the setting, the interviewee, and start and ending times.

Confidentiality was maintained for participants with the researcher being the only person collecting the data. The field notes and tape recordings were not shared with any other individual at any time. No other person had access to the transcripts or tape recordings. During the analysis process, data were only shared with the participant for member checking. No identifying information is recorded and maintained in a location to which anyone has access. Finally, the participants were given alternative identifications to analyze and discuss the content of their interviews (Creswell, 2007; Merriam, 2009).

Beyond the data collected in interviews, documents were reviewed to determine the definitions and demonstration of cultural competency by faculty in the classroom and in professional relationships with students. This included review of syllabi or course assignments, university policies and procedures, and documents provided by faculty being interviewed for data collection. A journal was kept that tracked each document and categories were created for each reference found to cultural competency at the university.

Questions

The study was designed to explore these questions: how do faculty define cultural competency, and how do they demonstrate it in the classroom? These questions were developed during the literature review process. The area of cultural competency of faculty in higher education was first chosen because of personal interest of the researcher (Stake, 1995). Within the theoretical framework of a social work strengths perspective, the questions were designed to explore without making assumptions about whether or not faculty could define cultural competence. The implication that there is only one right way
to define cultural competency was further avoided by asking the participant “How do you define cultural competency?” The emphasis was on the word “you” conveyed an acceptance of anything the faculty might include in that response. This format matched the process Stake (1995) defined for a case study. It was holistic, interpretive, and empathic.

The questions for this study were designed within a semistructured framework to allow the researcher to follow up and ask clarifying questions (Merriam, 2009). The questions asked of the participants were:

1. Please describe your role here at the university.
2. How do you define cultural competency?
3. How have you included cultural competency in the classroom?
4. What else would you like to add about cultural competency at your university that I have not already asked you?

Follow-up questions that prompted further disclosure included:

1. What training have you received in cultural competency?
2. Would you expound on that?
3. Tell me more.
4. How would you describe that in a different way?
5. I would like to hear more about that.
6. Would you clarify that for me?
7. What was the effect of that experience?
8. What were the consequences?
9. What was your reaction to that behavior?
10. Take me through your thought processes during that time.
Data Analysis

The purpose of data analysis is to find meaning in the data (Merriam, 2009). Data were collected primarily in the interview process and through artifact review. Preliminary notes and thoughts were taken during the interviews and a field journal was created. During the same period of data collection, interviews were transcribed by the researcher on the same day as the interview whenever possible. This enabled a preliminary data analysis process to begin to occur simultaneously (Baxter & Jack, 2008). After transcription, the data were analyzed to identify specific themes that answered the research questions of how do faculty define and demonstrate cultural competency in the classrooms. Using the constant comparative approach, as themes began to emerge, codes were assigned to the data to develop patterns and categories. The categories were exhaustive to include all relevant data. This process was completed by reviewing the interviews multiple times. Notes were written in the margins and these were compared to the field notes. Initially the interviews were read while a journal was kept listing each emerging topic (Merriam, 2009). Creswell (2007) recommended starting with five or six categories of coding and increasing them from that point as needed. Seven themes were identified and coded.

As part of the data collection process, documents were analyzed. They were reviewed in a similar manner, with data related to the topic of cultural competency being identified, coded, and placed in appropriate categories. Documents were reviewed for authenticity. Documents included public records, university policies and procedures, and faculty syllabi and presentations (Merriam, 2009).
The data was initially presented for each individual participant and then the process of comparing findings was completed with a brief summary for each theme to interpret the findings (Stake, 1995).

**Trustworthiness**

Trustworthiness refers to the credibility of constructed realities (Creswell, 2007). The first method of validation for this study was the inclusion of multiple means of gathering and analyzing data or triangulation. Data was collected through the interview process and data was also collected through document analysis.

The study was further validated by the researcher’s process of identifying biases and continued awareness of their influence. Part of that self-analysis was the inclusion of peer review. The researcher has previously addressed possible bias in this study. In order to bracket or set aside that bias as much as possible, a number of actions were taken to assure that objectivity was used in the data collection (Merriam, 2009). The framework of social work empowerment and commitment to social justice has a component of “meeting the client where they are” that the researcher implemented in interactions with participants. This required that the researcher set aside personal opinions and also utilized empathy, warmth, and acceptance of answers from participants. The questions were formulated to indicate that there was not one right answer, and during the interviews, the researcher reassured participants who indicated a hesitancy about their answers that all answers were “good” answers.

In the interview, the researcher began with a brief explanation of what the literature review had revealed, including the information that little research had been found that discussed how faculty members defined and demonstrated cultural
competency in the classroom. One purpose of sharing this background was to establish an interaction of exploration. The researcher was better able to set aside personal experiences and beliefs by attempting to begin from a new perspective to explore how others might define and demonstrate cultural competency in the classroom (Creswell, 2007).

The social work framework advocates for ongoing cultural competency in all areas of social work. While this led to an experience for the researcher of incorporating cultural competency as much as possible into teaching, working, and researching, it also led to a curiosity about how other disciplines would define and describe cultural competency. There was an ability to have a fresh perspective based on the reality that the researcher did not know what other disciplines might do beyond social work to incorporate cultural competency into education.

The use of multiple sources of data to include documents, artifacts, website, syllabi, power points helped minimize bias as it provided a holistic perspective on cultural competency in the case study. Having the participants complete member checks on data reduced bias. Whenever appropriate, direct quotes from participants were used, which also minimizes bias. This study was not conducted to draw conclusions or make any inferences of generalizability, which further protects against the bias of the researcher being motivated to draw pre-conceived conclusions.

Participants were given an opportunity to verify that transcriptions of their interviews were true and accurate representations of their interviews. They were asked to add any additional information they felt may have been important. Participants were also
asked to review data as it was interpreted to validate their authenticity as well (Creswell, 2007).

With three methods of validation identified, Creswell’s (2007) recommendation of at least two procedures being implemented is met and exceeded. The use of peer review, member checking, and clarification of bias of the researcher have all been implemented in this study.

**Limitations**

Limitations are the limits that exist in a study based on the methodology that was chosen (Bryant, 2004). The primary limitation of this study will be the lack of generalizability inherent to the case study process of research.

Another limitation is the possible bias of the researcher. The use of interviews as a data collection process leads to the researcher becoming the primary method of collecting and analyzing data, and that can challenge the integrity of a study. The researcher must be aware of and guard against personal bias as much as possible so as not to favorably interpret and code the data (Merriam, 2009).

**Delimitations**

Delimitations are “factors that limit the relevancy of a study to other populations or individuals” (Bryant, 2004, p. 57). Delimitations of this study include the fact that this study was conducted at a faith-based university located in the Midwestern part of the United States. Data were collected during the summer, which created the delimitation of participants all being from programs that offered studies beyond the traditional nine-month framework of most academic programs. Most of the professors taught in programs that taught clinical skills, which included the use of internships and practicum
experiences, thereby adding a different level of engagement that more traditional academic programs might have.

Summary

This study is a qualitative case study research design. It collected data from one unique bounded system. Data were collected through interviews and artifacts. Field notes were kept and data were coded to identify themes to give meaning to the subject matter of cultural competency. This design and procedure was a case study design (Creswell, 2007). Seven themes emerged during the data analysis process and these findings will be discussed in the following chapter.
Presentation of the Findings

The purpose of this study was to explore ways in which faculty members of an institution of higher learning defined cultural competency and how they demonstrated it in the classroom setting. The research site was a private faith-based university in the Midwest. To gather data from faculty, 15 faculty members were interviewed before saturation was reached. In addition to collecting data through interviews, artifacts were identified and analyzed to gather further data on implementation of cultural competency within this university. Artifacts were found through conducting a search of university policies and procedures as well as from an examination of the university website. Additional documents were obtained from faculty members who participated in the interviews.

In this chapter the data that were collected through the interview process and review of artifacts are discussed and analyzed for emerging themes. Each interview of the 15 conducted in the data collection process is reviewed in depth to develop a rich, thick, descriptive account of the information obtained in each interview.

Approximately seven themes emerged from the interview data and will be discussed in each individual interview review. The themes are: awareness and understanding in defining cultural competency, examples of classroom demonstration or putting into action, living the mission of the Jesuit philosophy, the availability of support to faculty members in issues of diversity, training offered and received, the challenges to
providing culturally competent education, and the personal stories that faculty identified as influencing their development of cultural competency.

Interview with Dr. A

Dr. A identified himself as being frequently asked to speak about cultural competency because he has “the three whammies” of being Arab, Muslim, and a Palestinian. He has taught at the university for 18 years, and he is actively involved in his community with various organizations working with diversity and focuses on cultural competency on campus through research, classroom practices, and participation in cultural competency trainings and initiatives. Dr. A defined cultural competency as a “continuum.” He introduced the term “cultural humility” which incorporates sensitivity, knowledge, skills, and a desire to gain cultural competency. It’s about acceptance and “depending on your background, biases, and prejudices, it might take a long time.” Cultural competency is a dynamic process, according to Dr. A, and it is necessary to recognize the power you have or you “might make a mistake.”

Dr. A. demonstrated cultural competency in the classroom through a variety of methods. His program does not currently require a course on cultural competency, but he incorporates cultural competency skills within a skills lab for the professional program which he teaches. He also provided a lecture on cultural competency because he sees it as an ethical duty to do so. In the classroom, he introduced terms and provides definitions for concepts to include race, ethnicity, religion, spirituality, and other key terms. In his skills lab, he provides exercises for students to reflect personally about issues related to race, ethnicity, ageism, and sexism. In addition to classroom activities, Dr. A provided
students with a booklist of resources for a wide variety of cultural issues as they may pertain to his field.

Within the context of teaching in a faith-based institution, Dr. A incorporated Jesuit values into his teaching on cultural competency. He had his students analyze outcomes for potential future patients and determine how they demonstrate cultural competency within the Jesuit framework. Students were encouraged to reflect and identify ways in which they can be agents of change as part of the university mission.

Based on his personal interest in the area of cultural competency, Dr. A identified other faculty members as being supportive to the implementation of cultural competency in the classroom. He is participating in research projects to determine health care provider bias and healing practices in his community. He is also analyzing data to determine how the campus environment promotes cultural competency. Through curriculum mapping, his department determines how they are embedding cultural competency into the curriculum.

As a faculty member with a commitment to cultural competence, Dr. A was often asked to speak and to participate in trainings. With regard to training available to him, he discussed the importance of leadership taking a stand and supporting the importance of staff participating in available trainings. Dr. A shared an example of a diversity day at the university that was not well attended a few years previously. He said that 30 to 40 staff out of 2,000 potential participants attended. He links that to the fact that leadership did not stress its importance nor did they offer any type of incentive to attend.

When reflecting on what might be possible barriers to more faculty actively implementing cultural competency in the classroom, Dr. A first identified the issue of
accountability. He stated that some faculty seem to be interested in cultural competency, but are just giving lip service, and there is not substance to what they are doing. There is not accountability with regard to curriculum and so any integration is self-driven by a faculty member who is interested in doing so. Dr. A did participate on a task force to look at cultural competency for curriculum and policies and procedures, and they wrote a proposal for cultural competency, but it did not get the support from leadership that it needed in order to be implemented.

Dr. A identified cultural competency as an issue that is important to him professionally and personally. “Cultural competency, I mean, it teaches you beyond just saying black and white and that’s another issue where people think diversity relates to numbers and black and white issues, but it sensitizes you to a wide range of things. You become a better person whether you are a faculty person, brother or sister.” He said, “For me, I hope all of this has made me a better teacher, person, father.”

**Interview with Dr. B**

Dr. B taught at the university for 6 years in a professional program and, until this year, taught a course specifically on cultural competency as it relates to her field. The course has been phased out and she is working with her colleagues to incorporate the material into the program and in the curriculum of other courses.

When asked how she would define cultural competency, Dr. B cautioned against thinking you can become culturally competent as that would be dangerous, and that as a white person, it would be “bold” to claim that she was culturally competent. She does examine how different professions look at cultural competency and identifies that some professions view cultural competency as a skill while others see it as a behavior. She
thinks it is important that working with an interdisciplinary team, people need to understand how others react to certain things.

As she had specifically taught a course on cultural competency, Dr. B had many examples of how she demonstrated and taught cultural competency. She discussed the need to challenge student perspectives of thinking they were culturally competent when they apparently were not. One student had insisted that she was “color blind” although Dr. B had introduced her to the idea that clients from historically underrepresented populations would not necessarily feel that way. Ultimately, the student could not examine her worldview and was not able to integrate the lessons Dr. B was attempting to share.

Dr. B exposed her students to different cultures through field trips to area agencies that provide services to monolingual Spanish-speaking clients and to Native Americans. She specifically addresses the issue of privilege and gives assigned readings as well as a written self-assessment assignment. She is willing to share personal stories of making mistakes in other cultures because she was not aware of certain values that culture held, but she said, “you have to put yourself out there and not everyone is willing to do that.”

However, Dr. B will not invite people from historically underrepresented populations to come as guest lecturers to her class even though students sometimes request that. She emphasizes that one person does not represent an entire culture and it would not be fair to expect one person to do that.

Twice during the interview, Dr. B identified Jesuit philosophy as having an influence on this subject. When asked a follow-up question about integrating her course
into the program curriculum, she stated that, “being Jesuit, there is a lot of trying to understand the other, and that’s an important piece.” She also stated that Jesuits are open-minded, which is a good thing, according to Dr. B, because she knows she is “pushing buttons.”

For training, Dr. B addressed how she trained an adjunct professor to take over the cultural competency class for her. She said that it takes a lot of preparation and it is important to have close mentoring from someone who has “been there, done that.” She feels her department is supportive of issues and challenges with diversity and that she had a strong mentor who helped her when she was challenged teaching this course.

From a first-hand perspective, Dr. B discussed, at length, the barriers for being able to successfully teach cultural competency in the classroom. She shared her view that having a required course is very hard and that if it was an elective, the people in the class would be passionate and open-minded. “It’s a challenge to meet people where they are at and to challenge them. You have to be blunt when you teach this material.”

From a personal perspective, Dr. B shared that, “Sometimes I read reflections and I would literally have to put them away because I didn’t want to criticize and students feel angry when you are trying to push them to think and others feel like you didn’t do enough and they are angry.” She went on to talk about evaluations can be positive and still you have students who are angry and confronting about the material.

With regard to barriers for faculty members to teach cultural competency, she stated that it takes a lot of personal reflection to teach this course and it is not easy. It is challenging and it can be emotional. She has had to challenge her own worldviews. She
said, “It is hard to teach and I think nobody wants to teach it because it’s so challenging, difficult, emotional, and time intensive – scary.”

**Interview with Dr. C**

Dr. C is a newer faculty member at the university, although he has taught extensively elsewhere in state and private universities. He defines cultural competency as the “ability for people to have some awareness of different backgrounds of people who come to interact with them.” He talked about oppression as being an issue of who holds the power and that needs to be the focus to create change. He sees the issue of lack of equity in populations being a factor of poverty. In his view, the differences in cultural groups are “just little things. By and large, we agree on 98% of everything else. Regardless of race or ethnicity, if you put people under pressure, they are going to act on average in a probabilistic sort of way.”

Within the classroom, Dr. C does not specifically teach cultural competency. He shared that students who have entrenched ideological ideas not founded in research are “perplexing” to him. He believes that arguments for or against any topic, including issues like civil rights and slavery and welfare, must be analyzed from a research perspective. So the focus for Dr. C is to encourage students to be critical thinkers. In his field, he states there is an “overtone of political correctness” and while people may be very liberal, their behaviors are “extremely conservative.”

When asked specifically about including cultural competency in the classroom, Dr. C talked about courses and organizations that develop and address issues of cultural competency. He did share that it seemed that many of the diversity programs exist to comply with politically correct guidelines regarding cultural competency on campuses.
Dr. C has had little training in cultural competency since he entered higher education. In his previous employment situations, he had mandatory trainings because employees needed to be aware of policies, and he felt they were offered to comply with administrative and legal mandates. When asked how they were, he replied, “It was a long time ago. Fine, you had to do it.”

With regard to barriers for faculty, Dr. C did believe that faculty members are afraid of cultural competency in the classroom because they do not want to show vulnerability. His worldview is that it is “a lot of silliness because people are unwilling to reach out and to talk to somebody.” In stating his personal view, Dr. C said, “I just don’t really care about that kind of stuff. I don’t know how to describe race and ethnicity and gender and that kind of stuff. My upbringing and everything I have ever done is who cares about that. It doesn’t matter. So I might not be the best person to talk about this.”

**Interview with Dr. D**

Dr. D has been at the university for 23 years in one of the science programs. He defines cultural competency as “the ability of an individual to understand where other people are coming from and to respect that and to, if necessary, accommodate that.” He goes on to discuss the importance of understanding where people are coming from in relation to issues within a classroom setting, and gives an example as it relates to plagiarism. Some university cultures learn to copy as a means of professional writing, considering that sharing, and do not view that as plagiarism, he points out. So while he will work with the individual based on their cultural worldview, it does not change his expectations for final class outcomes.
Dr. D points out that there is a lack of cultural competency in this approach. He said, “Unfortunately, what I tend to do is ask people to adapt to our standards.” He is teaching his students to be successful in the American educational systems. In science, he is helping students make the transition to be successful within the culture of the field. He shared that some institutions have tried to offer special sessions for students who do not have English as their primary language, but he is not aware of any of those that have been very successful. Science can transcend language and the important piece is understanding that culture. Dr. D does think that it is necessary to work with students individually to help them make a transition from one culture to another.

When Dr. D began to discuss the influence of Jesuit philosophy on the culture of the program and field of science, he talked about everything from training new staff in Jesuit education to creating a positive culture in the science program that reflected Jesuit values. The philosophy is apparent in the classroom in the goal of trying to do what is best for every student, but it extends beyond that to activities outside of the classroom. Every year 3 to 5 Jesuit schools gather from Dr. D’s discipline to have a retreat. In spring, students are included and they choose a Jesuit topic as a focus point to engage students and faculty in communication that “builds bridges in terms of students being able to talk to faculty.” His program also offers an evening of reflection at the end of the semester where he says, “What you discover is the majority of what they talk about is not the things that happened within the classroom, but things that happened outside of the classroom.”

Dr. D went on to compare Ignatius’ rules for teaching with the Carnegie Foundation and said that there is a significant overlap in the philosophies. Both advocate
addressing the student as a whole person. It is a hands-on approach where students are actively engaged and not expected to progress at the same rate. Through these processes, the program creates an appreciation for differences and creates a level of cultural competency that is more implicit than explicit.

Support and training were combined in the department practice of educating new faculty about diversity and what they may encounter in the classroom. There is a focus on different learning styles, which then becomes an ongoing departmental conversation. Faculty conversations combined with the faculty retreats provide faculty members with training and support.

Dr. D does not see cultural competency as an explicit component of his program, but as a part of creating a positive culture within it, and this could be a barrier to learning cultural competency.

From his personal experience, Dr. D found that the culture of science can transcend a language or cultural barrier. As a graduate student in a country that did not speak English as its primary language, Dr. D had to learn to negotiate a different culture from a language perspective and also from the perspective of how things were done. This experience gave him awareness of how to best assist his students in learning the culture of his field.

**Interview with Dr. E**

Dr. E has been in a number of positions at the university during the many years she has been on faculty. She felt that being in the healthcare field gave her a deeper perspective on cultural competency, and also her various roles had enabled her to have a good grasp on how the university incorporates cultural competency into the programs she
has been involved in. When asked to define cultural competency, Dr. E stated, “I think about different racial groups, religious groups, regional groups, and gender, and disability.”

Moving into the discussion regarding implementing cultural competency in the classroom, Dr. E discussed the importance of curriculum and awareness of how different components, including cultural competency, are included in courses. Her program reviews syllabi each semester, and through curriculum mapping, they are able to infuse issues of race and culture and social justice issues. She sees a large part of delivering culturally competent education as being tied to bioethics. Because an emphasis is placed on understanding cultural differences in ethical issues, there is an inherent need to develop cultural competency. Dr. E gave examples of end-of-life issues from a religious perspective or cultural groups’ use of alternative healthcare like in the practice of curanderos or medicine men in the Hispanic and Native American cultures.

In the classroom, healthcare students are required to participate in clinical rotations that engage them in working with diverse populations. The university has programs in other countries that provide students with hands-on experiences and students are encouraged to do rotations around the world, while looking at ethical issues as part of their training.

Dr. E was the first to explicitly introduce the theme of Jesuit values and their impact on the development of cultural competency. She stated that because the university is Jesuit, there are requirements for social justice issues to be taught, and it is part of the school’s mission. Faculty spends a lot of time to be sure that Jesuit philosophy is incorporated into the curriculum. Dr. E wants students and faculty to believe in the value
of service. She shared an example of the university being one of the first schools to accept Jewish students during a time when schools in the United States were banning Jewish students. She went on to talk about the early admission of women at the university, and that as far back as the late 1800s, women were being admitted into the healthcare programs. Dr. E said, “We don’t expect you to be Catholic, and we are not proselytizing, but we would like you to learn more about this and hopefully you will, and we haven’t really known anyone who said no.”

When asked about the support she could find if she were challenged with an issue related to cultural competency, she identified different departments and staff people who would be able to help, which included an office for minority students, the lawyer specializing in affirmative action and various leaders in administration. She shared that there have been a few times when she felt she needed additional support related to a student issue and she called upon some of the people she knew to provide support and advice.

From a personal perspective, Dr. E had traveled extensively and lived in other countries. She is also actively involved in the area of bioethics and continues to debate, analyze, advise, and serve as a consultant with regard to bioethical issues that often contain a component of cultural competency.

**Interview with Dr. F**

Dr. F has been at the university 14 years in the field of education. She defines cultural competency as being comfortable in your own cultural groups and being aware of your own values and beliefs and then being effective and accepting when you deal with people from other cultural groups. She said, “It’s really accepting and celebrating
diversity.” Dr. F did share that upon agreeing to participate in this research project, she had “looked around to make sure she was on the right track.” She felt that what she read about cultural competency simply validated what she had already assumed.

In the classroom, Dr. F includes conversations and lectures about diversity. She talked about diversity classes within her program being taught by African American women who were “classy and professional” and their ability to create a community that encouraged the students to ask questions. Dr. F feels that she does not have the background to bring in the multicultural diversity component in the same way her peers from historically underrepresented populations might be able to do. She values her peers and thinks it is a positive experience for the students to be exposed to these classes. Dr. F pointed out that graduates from her program generally seek employment in high needs poverty areas of local communities instead of the professional middle upper-class neighborhoods. She went on to say if she went back into the field she would seek employment in an inner-city environment.

Dr. F also identified accreditation standards in her field that required coursework in multicultural education, introducing the important aspect of professional program accreditation standards and guidelines as impetus for cultural competency education. In response to those standards, her program offers one specific course and an introductory course that has a strong component of multicultural education. As part of the compliance, her program assigns students to a wide variety of field experiences that require them to see diversity of race, ethnicity, religion, and socioeconomic status.

Jesuit charisms contribute to the sensitivity and understanding her students gain in working with people from historically underrepresented populations. Dr. F believes that
the university also works to actively recruit students from historically underrepresented populations and that the university is “very accepting” of differences.

Support has been important to Dr. F, starting with a personal experience she shared in which she was challenged around an experience of racism and oppression. She spoke about the importance of professional organizations and how they can provide support. At the university, she referenced groups that have expertise in different cultures and said there are “groups for everything on this campus.” Dr. F feels that any of these resources would provide any help she might need if she felt unable to meet a student’s need from a culturally competent perspective. She has personally asked colleagues from different backgrounds to provide students with support when she felt that she was not as culturally competent with a student in individual situations as she would like to be. Ultimately, Dr. F said that if she needed support, it would be “real easy to find.”

Training and reading and being in a supportive environment have been ways in which Dr. F has developed more comfort with addressing students directly. She shared an incident of a student who was from an historically underrepresented population who was making choices that Dr. F felt would jeopardize her success. Dr. F turned to a colleague from the same population that the student identified with and was able to get the help the student needed.

Dr. F has attended trainings through the university and spoke specifically about a training with Ruby Payne, a well-known researcher in the field of cultural competency. She refers to her book, *Understanding Poverty* (Payne, 2005), on a regular basis and said she cannot keep a copy on the shelf because she lends it out so regularly.
She also referenced a retreat her program had offered on diversity. She said it had a positive influence on her because faculty members who identified with historically underrepresented groups from different races, religions, and sexual orientation all participated. These faculty members were available to their colleagues for conversation and group processing. They participated in group exercises and had a lot of physical movement in the retreat. While the retreat was not mandatory, Dr. F said the expectation was that everyone would attend.

Barriers for faculty being able to demonstrate or teach cultural competency in the classroom for Dr. F included comfort level and ability to have difficult conversations. She shared that having been in education for many years, she came from a time when training in cultural competency was not available and it was not considered correct to ask questions about differences. She grew up with learning what was right and wrong and how to be politically correct. She sees the biggest barrier as being that some faculty have a fear of not knowing enough or saying the wrong thing. She also feels that the fact that her department is heavily comprised of faculty members in their early 50s has created a maturity that allows many of them to be more direct with student issues. She believes age is possibly a barrier for younger faculty to feel comfortable enough to address issues of diversity directly.

Dr. F shared a difficult time she had experienced in the beginning of her career in education when she faced allegations as a professional that led to legal action against her. She identified the issue as one of social justice and she talked about the lack of awareness she had at the time. She was shocked at the inequality and discrimination against community members based on race and socioeconomic status. The poverty of the
community was “unbelievable” and was a primarily poor Black community in the South. During the legal process, the lawyers, judges, and doctors would talk about their golf games and racist comments were routinely made as part of the proceedings.

She cited the incident as being extremely difficult, but ultimately, it provided her a foundation to recognize and appreciate strong support systems as well as in understanding the reality of oppression at a personal level. She was able to go on and become employed in a supportive environment with a good supervisor and supportive colleagues that helped her to recover from the incident she had experienced working in the South.

**Interview with Dr. G**

Dr. G has been at the university for approximately 8 years. He defines cultural competency as, “having an appreciation for how influential, how powerful, and how meaningful cultures are. How important the whole culture is to the whole person, to their learning, to their interactions, to their dynamic; dynamics with you, and with each other. You have to have an appreciation for how important and how diverse cultures are.” He goes on to define it as “having understanding and appreciation and developing empathy and respect for the cultures no matter how judgmental we might be from our cultural perspective.”

In the classroom, Dr. G believes that cultural competency is essential, but that it is explicit in his program for beginning students. As he teaches students nearing the end of the program, he sees the demonstration and education of cultural competency as being implicit. In his program, Dr. G has students from around the country and from around the world and from many cultures. He sees cultural differences within communities in the
Midwest that create a complex issue with regard to cultural competency and that provide learning opportunities for his students.

Dr. G identified Ignatian philosophy as creating a built-in component of cultural competency at the university. The charisms serve as an integral framework for cultural competency. He believes students choose the university for a reason and that traditions and pedagogy of Ignatian campuses work in creating a culturally successful campus. He sees one of the primary strengths within Jesuit schools as developing a broad cultural perspective that is nonjudgmental and accepting of where a person is and learning to value whatever belief system students and others may have. He specifically references the charism of “finding God in all things” as being important in serving people from historically underrepresented populations. As a member of the President’s committee, he knows there is a commitment to Ignatian values for all programs in the university.

With respect to training in cultural competency, Dr. G referenced his own educational experiences. As a graduate of a program in the Southwest that focused on cultural competency, Dr. G was specifically prepared in multicultural education. In his undergraduate education, he was on a “tremendously diverse campus.” At the university, he said he has attended trainings in faculty development workshops and if he were to seek any type of support for an issue related to cultural competency, he was “100%” certain it would be available.

Dr. G made the point that the university has an unspoken paradigm and culture that relates to cultural competency as well as explicit attention to cultural competency on campus. He stated there is a strong promotion of cultural diversity and that many
Muslims and people who identify with religions beyond Catholicism are attracted to Jesuit campuses because Jesuit schools “explore God in the conversation.”

When Dr. G shared his personal history with cultural competency, he talked about lived experiences as being a critical component, and he spoke about his undergraduate experience. He said, “I began learning appreciation, sensitivity, being willing to learn, and that’s what you need as long as you can avoid being judgmental and narrow in your own thinking. I learned that with amazement.”

**Interview with Mr. H**

Mr. H has been with the university for 11 years. He has had 30 years of practice in the field in which his program is offered. When asked how he defined cultural competency, he replied that it is a difficult thing to do and that the two terms, “culture” and “competency,” must be defined separately. Culture can be your worldview and how a person chooses to define it. It can include ethnic or geographical culture. Competency can be guided by professional organizations, codes, and ethics. Mr. H does not believe he can tell someone else what to believe or value or think, but tries to frame issues of culture from a context of “respect, dignity, compassion, justice, awareness, and seeking understanding from other people.” He cites Ignatian traditions as being important within the university’s education in cultural competency.

Within the classroom, Mr. H said there is little formal inclusion of cultural competency within the curriculum. However, it is embedded in the practical experiences his students receive. The program has a clinical component and a field component that require the students to encounter people from a wide variety of backgrounds, cultures, and beliefs. It is through the experiential process that he sees cultural competency being
taught. As an instructor, he has to challenge his students when they scapegoat or stereotype clients. He intentionally uses teaching scenarios that will engage students in dialogue about perceived beliefs versus reality of client situations.

Mr. H said that he is not aware of specific trainings being offered on cultural competency but believes they are available as support would be if he felt that he needed it. He could not remember a time when he had either attended a training or sought support for an issue related to cultural diversity. No one had approached him about offering training or support.

He sees barriers to faculty delivering culturally competent education as lack of accountability and an inability to control what happens in the classroom. For the most part, Mr. H believes that faculty in his program recognize the importance of cultural competency and do their best to provide that education.

The program in which Mr. H is an instructor has an accreditation agency that provides guidelines and curriculum standards nationally. He said that the document has no stand-alone component on inclusion of cultural competency or cultural diversity. In response to that finding, Mr. H created a presentation that he now gives to students and to all faculty in his program to increase awareness of diversity issues. He did this because during his life, cultural competency has become important to him at a personal level. Through his own education and life experiences, he realized that this type of education was lacking in his field, and he saw that as a need that should be addressed so he did that by creating the presentation. He has had colleagues challenge him because they do not believe cultural competency can be taught, but he does not accept that.
Mr. H shared about his personal journey towards cultural competency. He said he grew up in an environment that did not value diversity and he could have “followed suit.” However, he formed a different world view and now hopes that he is sharing what he has learned with his children, his students, and the people with whom he interacts. He said, “It really matters because I think engaging students in these types of conversations is important. I am here to say I am going to challenge you in the way you think about the world and should you use some different lenses to explore what you believe and why you believe it and the assumptions you are making about other people. To me it is the only way that we can develop them from a compassion, respect, human kind, kind of thing.”

Interview with Dr. I

Dr. I has been with university for 13 years. She, too, stated that she felt defining cultural competency was a difficult thing to do because of the two concepts of “culture” and “competency.” She talked about culture as being rules, traditions, and ways of thinking. “It’s what makes us human, is really our cultures.” Competency was separately defined as, “A set of tools or skills that have been identified as important in one culture or another.” So cultural competency is being able to use different skills and tools across a variety of cultures.

With regard to demonstrating cultural competency within the classroom, Dr. I said it occurs in many ways. Because of her professional training and her ability to be in tune with others, she tries to suspend judgment and create an egalitarian environment where everyone can have a voice. She implements case studies as a way to bring in conversations about differences and encourages students to become critical thinkers by questioning why things are the way they are. Dr. I has assigned self-reflection,
experiential assignments. When possible, she assigns students to groups that will specifically create diversity. Dr. I has shown the movie “Crash” in her classroom to motivate students to think about things they may not have before. It is clear to Dr. I that many students have little background in understanding diversity, and the university can teach tolerance and empathy. The students can be taught to be more open. She also encourages students to study abroad because of the importance of experiencing new situations and adapting to different environments.

As a professor in many online courses, Dr. I talked about the differences in online education and shared that there is less judgment because at times it is not possible to identify people by their race, ethnicity, religious beliefs, or physical characteristics. Sharing can become more intimate and everyone can have a voice. She said that delivering education this way has “sold” her on online education.

Dr. I said the mission of the university focuses on social justice and the marginalization of historically underrepresented populations. All faculty are trained in the mission and in understanding who Ignatius of Loyola was and what constitutes the Jesuit pedagogy. The Jesuit framework is “you figure out the truth yourself.” It is okay to talk about God. When applying for employment at the university, applicants are given the charisms and are asked to address how they will work with them. She said, “It is not necessarily cultural competency, but it is part of what the university wants to stand for.”

Support and training is available at the university according to Dr. I. There are offices, including a multicultural office, and Dr. I has invited them to interact with her students. There is a Center for Peace and Justice. The President of the university is committed to leadership training for everyone, and there is a component of cultural
competency within that training. The President’s focus of cultural competency as a component of leaderships is leading to a shift from seeing diversity as a separate issue, which Dr. I sees as a positive connotation that could increase support.

Even with the support and training that is available, Dr. I sees the university as still needing to increase efforts in training. Furthermore, there is very little diversity within the student body on campus, and she believes that should be increased as well.

Dr. I identified a number of barriers as existing that prevent faculty from demonstrating cultural competency within the classroom. Sometimes faculty are unaware and they do not understand how to include cultural competency. Time is an issue because faculty must find ways to be trained and develop ways of demonstrating cultural competency. Dr. I said that she does not think that faculty believe diversity is a “good thing,” and that is a barrier to cultural competency. Finally, she identified fear as being a barrier. They don’t know what to do if something happens in the classroom. Ultimately, Dr. I said, “it is easier not to.”

Dr. I said that she is interested in cultural competency personally because she came from a different culture and can appreciate cultural issues. She knows what it is like to live in a different culture, and she has learned to suspend judgment and recognize her own biases when she is working with issues of cultural competency. Also, it took her a while to adapt to the culture she is in now and that made her more sensitive to the struggles of others.

**Interview with Dr. J**

Dr. J has been at the university for a year and a half. She left the corporate world approximately 14 years ago and has been in education since that time. She defines
cultural competency as “being aware of the differences, yet recognizing how they fit together to make the culture and not just the individuals themselves, but also the environment, the history, the history of both the people as well as the organization or the location where the group is coming together.” Coming from a systems perspective, she said it is being aware of the effects of different settings and the ability of a group or system to adapt. It is also important to understand self as a leader. A person must be able to be “outside yourself” to understand the differences. She stated, “Some people look at culture as people, some look at it as the behaviors.”

When asked about demonstrating cultural competency within the classroom, Dr J talked about the energy of a classroom and the importance of being able to bring everyone into the learning process and feel supported and as part of the group. She thinks it is important to not only have difficult conversations, but to embrace them. She shared an example of a student who came from a Hispanic culture and would always prioritize her father’s requests before her own education. She had not experienced some of the same educational support some of her classmates had and struggled as a student. The combination of needing to teach to her level and the interruptions of family obligation demonstrates the need for meeting each student’s need.

From a faculty perspective in the classroom, Dr. J said, “We need to be aware of our own biases and understand our heritage, our culture, and where our biases come from. We need to have appreciation for diversity.”

Dr. J did not identify the Jesuit philosophy as being a part of the cultural competency process at the university nor did she identify any specific support or training she had received. She did speak further about barriers for faculty to bring cultural
competency into the classroom. The first issue is how faculty grade students in a way that is fair when they are coming from diverse educational experiences. She gave the example of the student previously mentioned and went on to say that this student may have worked very hard so the student deserved an “A”, but she might not have done as well academically as another student who did not work as hard.

Another barrier is the perceived lack of time many faculty members have. It takes time to be trained and it takes time to understand each individual student. Finances are an issue, class sizes are large, faculty are required to teach more classes and advise more students. Faculty are trained and have expertise in one field. Doctoral level faculty members are required to publish and their focus is on one small subject. Most do not receive training on ‘how’ to teach in general. She felt that other faculty members are supportive and she is able to get the support she needs from them.

Dr. J shared a story of personal experience with diversity when she first entered higher education. She was asked to develop a class and in her first classroom teaching experience, she had a wide range of diversity from age to backgrounds in that class. She was able to be successful in her role as professor by using innovative techniques and by meeting the students where they were. There were unique circumstances with students who had no prior knowledge of the subject, mature students, students with military backgrounds, and students with personal challenges. She was willing to stay in the experience. She said, “I think about the first year or two I taught and I was as much in the classroom as the students were. I think that the students had to do it all on their own. But that’s okay, sometimes we learn the best that way.”
Interview with Dr. K

Dr. K has been with the university for 8 years. She defines cultural competency as coming from a diverse background geographically or from a religious or spiritual point of view and understanding those differences. She states that she sees society becoming more diverse and “we are going to have to meld together more and assimilate at the same time.”

In a classroom setting, Dr. K had many examples of demonstrating cultural competency and working with issues related to diversity. She works in a professional program that requires her students to have clinical experiences in working with people from a wide range of backgrounds. One of the first classroom exercises she gives her students is to have them imagine they were 80 years old and to describe what would their lives be like and what would that feel like as an older person. She is encouraging them to be open-minded and to facilitate discussion that will create empathy in her students. She is giving them an understanding of not being able to know what it is like for others because the students have not lived that life yet. She incorporates case studies and places students in clinical situations that will challenge their beliefs.

In the clinical aspect of her teaching, Dr. K has the clients play a role in educating the students. She empowers clients by asking for their feedback and assistance in training the students. She invites clients from different ethnic and religious and socioeconomic backgrounds to talk with students about their experiences. She uses these tools to combat what she defines as student unwillingness or discomfort with working with diverse populations. Dr. K said it is important to her to be patient and give students time to discover what their perspectives are. She wants to help them be successful and sometimes
this means referring them to another faculty person for support. She wants to empower them.

Dr. K feels there is support and training at the university for cultural competency and issues of diversity. She can go to colleagues or to the course leader and continue “up the ladder” if she needs assistance. “There are a lot of very good individuals here so I have a vast group of people I can bounce ideas off of.” There is a diversity training course Dr. K had to take for her program. Barriers for faculty in demonstrating cultural competency within the classroom included lack of time to give extra assistance to students who may need it because of cultural issues.

**Interview with Dr. L**

Dr. L has been with the university for approximately a year. She defines cultural competency as “a set of consistent attitudes and behaviors that enable a person to have effective professional and personal interactions that would certainly include the production of work as well as in later times in other venues.” She prefers the term ‘culturally proficient’ because, “you are somewhere past the place of being able to act and you are really interested in taking opportunities to immerse when you can, take training when you can, and stay up to date.”

In talking about how she demonstrates that in the classroom, Dr. L identified “language as the main thing.” She strives to be a role model and talks in all her classes about the similarities and differences each person has with others. She has intervened in the classroom when students were being disrespectful to others and she has taken students aside to confront them when the situation warranted doing so. While she finds it challenging to have these difficult conversations with students, Dr. L said that it becomes
easier with time and it must be done. Also, Dr. L assigns papers on the topics of equity and diversity. She is hopeful that she is creating an excitement about diversity and cultural competency for her students.

In Ignatian philosophy, Dr. L finds respect for all is an important part of cultural competency as well. She has sought support from student advisors if she has an issue with a student. She thinks the primary barrier for faculty to be able to demonstrate cultural competency is time. The other barrier she identified was the possibility that faculty might not understand how important it is. Dr. L said, “My sense is people don’t always understand how students really do pay attention to what we say and how we say it.”

On the subject of training, Dr. L shared that she has had extensive training in cultural competency, and has also taught classes and provided training in a variety of settings on the topic of cultural competency. As an educator in public schools prior to joining faculty in higher education, Dr. L identifies herself as “one of the first white people” who was invited to attend diversity trainings in her area. Beyond that training, she has attended a number of trainings because it is an area that has always been interesting to her.

Dr. L talked about how cultural competency became a personal interest. She was exposed to other children from different backgrounds and cultures when she was young and developed friendships with children who were differently abled. She had a friend who was legally blind, but played piano and football. When she asked him how he could play football, he educated her on the accommodations available to him, and today they are still in touch.
When she entered graduate school, Dr. L had an internship with responsibilities for assisting her professor on presentations for diversity training. She had a strong mentor and recalled the first time she was challenged in the classroom by a student who became upset by the conversation. The class was discussing the percentage of African American women in prison, and a student who was a female and African American got up and slammed her books down. The professor asked the student to use her left brain and to look at the facts. The student left the classroom and Dr. L’s professor told her to let the student go, she needed to calm down, and she would return. That is what happened, and Dr. L felt she had received good role modeling and an experience of being able to handle the conflict that can occur in diversity training.

**Interview with Dr. M**

Dr. M has been with the university nearly 30 years. When asked to define cultural competency, she said that the term “competency” was challenging to her because she did not feel that anyone can become competent in all of the cultures in the world. She thinks that awareness, respect, an open attitude, and a willingness to learn from others are all important. She thinks, “We can improve our world because there are people and cultures doing things far superior to our own culture.”

Within a classroom setting, Dr. M said it is hard to demonstrate cultural competency because students are often “provincial” with little experience of other places and cultures. She helps them to understand that there are other worldviews and ways of doing things and does this through class assignments, using the Internet to explore different places and cultures, and using her own personal experiences. She would like to have mandatory field trips for children in the U.S. to see other parts of the world as she
does not believe her students have done much traveling. Dr. M tries to create experiences in the classroom and encourages her students to talk with other students around the world. Her program specifically offers a course to students on the subject of cultural competency and that it is a mandatory course. Also, students have the opportunity to study abroad in Dr. M’s program.

Dr. M thinks that Jesuit philosophy has a lot to do with cultural competency at the university. Attending college at the university as a student, Dr. M said it was the first time she became excited about education. She said that her professors encouraged her to be open to women as leaders. Cultural competency is integral to the Jesuit philosophy and the Jesuits have been everywhere in the world and they value others and their differences. She became interested in a world beyond her own country. She believes that most students are pretty open because they would not choose to be at a Jesuit school if they were not. Jesuit philosophy is one of acceptance and tolerance and exploration in a wider world. Dr. M sees it as being aware and accepting of the world, being a good person, and respecting others.

She sees the university as being supportive, and Dr. M has sought support from colleagues with more experience in a certain area of cultural competency when it was needed. She has asked colleagues who shared an ethnicity with a student to help and has found people at the university who have been very willing to help. In her field, the state requires training in cultural competency and so she has attended trainings to meet that requirement. She did not identify any programs or trainings at the university.

Dr. M shared that for her, what inspired her interest in becoming more culturally competent was her father’s love of travel and his providing her with the opportunity to
travel extensively. She has friends in India and China and Canada among other places and she talks with them to share ideas and meets with them when she can.

**Interview with Dr. N**

Dr. N has been at the university for 36 years. She defines cultural competency as, “human behavior, attitude, policies in the classroom, ways of working with different cultural backgrounds, and communication styles.” She thinks that it requires flexibility and willingness to adapt to different needs a person might be having.

In the classroom, Dr. N views students from an individual perspective. She views different learning styles and backgrounds and goals for her students, and then she attempts to adapt her expectations to what she believes will help the student to be successful. Dr. N shared an example of working with a student who was coming from another culture, country, and background who would not be studying in Dr. N’s field, but wanted to take classes in her program. She met with the student to discuss ways in which they could adapt the program to meet this student’s needs. She meets with students in situations like this to “organize things and make it meaningful in their life.”

The Jesuit charisms at the university are compatible with cultural competency for Dr. N and she identified “men and women for others” as well as “magis”, which means for the greater good, as being particularly relevant. She said that all the charisms would fit within the framework of culturally competent education in one way or another.

Dr. N said that her professional background and training provided her knowledge of cultural competency, but that she had not received any training at the university. She does feel that there is support at the university and that, if she needed assistance, she would be able to access that. She gave an example of students from Japan appearing to
not understand what was occurring in the classroom so she sought advice from their advisor who explained it was not appropriate for them to talk directly to the teacher or challenge her.

The only barrier that Dr. N identified for faculty not demonstrating cultural competency in the classroom was an attitude that students need to meet university standards, and that it would not be appropriate to meet individual needs of students because it might create an inequality in expectations. Not everyone shares the same attitude, nor are they flexible, according to Dr. N.

**Interview with Dr. O**

Dr. O has been at the university for 17 years. She defines cultural competency as, “a perception, an attitude, an awareness, an acknowledgement and implementation of skills related to recognizing the differences in people with different cultural backgrounds.”

Dr. O said that she sees cultural competency being demonstrated in the classroom at the university when faculty recognize the differences in students and the fact that they may have different perceptions of how things should be. She shared a recent example of a student becoming upset with her because the student felt that Dr. O was making a classroom policy based on the fact that the student was from a historically underrepresented population. Dr. O had to explain that the policy was for everyone and not racially motivated. She talked about another incident when a student would not make eye contact with her and she perceived that as rude. Through reading, she came to understand that in his culture, it was rude to make eye contact with an elder.
Dr. O has also taught a course on cultural competency and would invite speakers to come in from different historically underrepresented populations to speak to students. She would clarify for students that, “one individual does not speak for an entire culture, but they can speak about their experiences and the importance of cultural competency.” She teaches students that cultural differences are not right or wrong; they are just different.

The Jesuit charisms of cura personalis, which means caring for the whole person, and magis as well as men and women for others, all speak to cultural competency, according to Dr. O. The university strives to “walk the walk and talk the talk that demonstrates real care for the person.” She thinks that the university teaches students how to respond to others through the charisms and helps students to “strive for excellence.”

Training for Dr. O occurred primarily in her professional role prior to entering higher education. She has taken trainings and believes that there is plenty of opportunity at the university for anyone interested in training, but cultural competency is infused throughout the university environment. When she has needed support around an issue of cultural competency, she has found that through colleagues, her department chair, and other university staff as needed. She said that if she became aware of her own perceptions being “off-base,” she was sure there would be someone at the university who would walk her through the changes she needed to make.

In identifying barriers for faculty in higher education to demonstrate cultural competency in the classroom, Dr. O said she saw it as a lack of personal knowledge about
themselves. She thinks that if people have the opportunity to have diverse cultural experiences, they will become more culturally sensitive.

From a personal perspective, Dr. O talked about having colleagues from diverse backgrounds and the experience she was able to gain through those friendships. She has a friend in Brazil who explained to her when she was visiting that personal space is defined very differently in that culture. She also shared an incident when she used a common American gesture that was offensive in the Brazilian culture and her friend was willing to explain to her that it was not appropriate to do that. She, in turn, provided that same level of support and communication to her friend when she was in the United States. Dr. O said that her own experiences have helped her to convey the importance of cultural competency to her students.

Now that a synopsis of each faculty interview has been provided, each theme will be analyzed with a comparative analysis between the interviews of each theme. Again, the seven themes to emerge in this case study included: the awareness and understanding necessary for cultural competency, ways in which faculty members demonstrate cultural competency in the classroom, the impact of Jesuit philosophy on cultural competency, trainings faculty had received, support faculty has available, barriers to implementing cultural competency in higher education, and finally, personal experiences that influenced their development of cultural competency.

The 15 participants in the study came from a wide variety of backgrounds. The faculty members held doctoral degrees with the exception of one, who is pursuing a doctoral degree. They have been in higher education from 1 year to more than 30 years, and they teach across a range of disciplines to include healthcare, science, education,
psychology, and political science. Of the 15 participants, 7 had directly taught coursework on cultural competency.

Table 1

\textit{Awareness and Understanding}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Participant Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. A</td>
<td>Dr. A defines cultural competency as a “continuum.” He introduces the term “cultural humility” which incorporates sensitivity, knowledge, skills and a desire to gain cultural competency. It’s about acceptance and “depending on your background, biases, prejudices, it might take a long time.” Cultural competency is a dynamic process, according to Dr. A, and it is necessary to recognize the power you have or you “might make a mistake.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. B</td>
<td>When asked how she would define cultural competency, Dr. B cautioned against thinking you can become culturally competent as that would be dangerous and that as a white person, it would be “bold” to claim that she was culturally competent. She does examine how different professions look at cultural competency and identifies that some professions view cultural competency as a skill while others see it as a behavior. She thinks it is important that working with an interdisciplinary team people need to understand how others react to certain things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. C</td>
<td>He defines cultural competency as the “ability for people to have some awareness of different backgrounds of people who come to interact with them.” He talked about oppression as being an issue of who holds the power and that needs to be the focus to create change. He sees the issue of lack of equity in populations being a factor of poverty. In his view, the differences in cultural groups are “just little things. By and large, we agree on 98% of everything else. Regardless of race or ethnicity, if you put people under pressure, they are going to act on average in a probabilistic sort of way.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. D</td>
<td>He defines cultural competency as “the ability of an individual to understand where other people are coming from and to respect that and to, if necessary, accommodate that.” He goes on to discuss the importance of understanding where people are coming from in relation to issues within a classroom setting, and gives an example as it relates to plagiarism. Some university cultures learn to copy as a means of professional writing, considering that sharing and do not view that as plagiarism, he points out. So while he will work with the individual based on their cultural worldview, it does not change his expectations for final class outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. E</td>
<td>“I think about different racial groups, religious groups, regional groups, gender, and disability.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. F</td>
<td>She defines cultural competency as being comfortable in your own cultural groups and being aware of your own values and beliefs and then being effective and accepting when you deal with people from other cultural groups. She said, “It’s really accepting and celebrating diversity.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. G</td>
<td>“Having an appreciation for how influential, how powerful, how meaningful cultures are. How important the whole culture is to the whole person, to their learning, to their interactions, to their dynamic; dynamics with you and with each other. You have to have an appreciation for how important and how diverse cultures are.” He goes on to define it as “having understanding and appreciation and developing empathy and respect for the cultures no matter how judgmental we might be from our cultural perspective.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr. H  
It is a difficult thing to do and that the two terms, “culture” and “competency” must be defined separately. Culture can be your worldview and how a person chooses to define it. It can include ethnic or geographical culture. Competency can be guided by professional organizations and codes and ethics. Mr. H does not believe he can tell someone else what to believe or value or think, but tries to frame issues of culture from a context of “respect, dignity, compassion, justice, awareness, seeking understanding from other people.”

Dr. I  
Felt defining cultural competency was a difficult thing to do because of the two concepts of “culture” and “competency.” She talked about culture as being rules, traditions, and ways of thinking. “It’s what makes us human, is really our cultures.” Competency was separately defined as, “A set of tools or skills that have been identified as important in one culture or another.” So cultural competency is being able to use different skills and tools across a variety of cultures.

Dr. J  
Cultural competency is “being aware of the differences, yet recognizing how they fit together to make the culture and not just the individuals themselves, but also the environment, the history, the history of both the people, as well as the organization or the location where the group is coming together.” Coming from a systems perspective, she said it is being aware of the effects of different settings and the ability of a group or system to adapt. It is also important to understand self as a leader. A person must be able to be “outside yourself” to understand the differences. “Some people look at culture as people, some look at it as the behaviors.”

Dr. K  
She defines cultural competency as coming from a diverse background, geographically or from a religious or spiritual point of view and understanding those differences. She states that she sees society becoming more diverse, and “we are going to have to meld together more and assimilate at the same time.”

Dr. L  
“A set of consistent attitudes and behaviors that enable a person to have effective professional and personal interactions that would certainly include the production of work as well as in later times in other venues.” She prefers the term culturally proficient because, “you are somewhere past the place of being able to act and you are really interested in taking opportunities to immerse when you can, take training when you can and stay up to date.”

Dr. M  
She said that the term “competency” was challenging to her because she did not feel that anyone can become competent in all of the cultures in the world. She thinks that awareness is important and respect, an open attitude, and a willingness to learn from others. She thinks, “We can improve our world because there are people and cultures doing things far superior to our own culture.”

Dr. N  
“human behavior, attitude, policies in the classroom, ways of working with different cultural backgrounds and communication styles.” She thinks that it requires flexibility and willingness to adapt to difference needs a person might be having.

Dr. O  
“a perception, an attitude, an awareness, an acknowledgement and implementation of skills related to recognizing the differences in people with different cultural backgrounds.”

The first question participants were asked after sharing their background was, “How do you define cultural competency.” It would be expected that a clear theme of definitions would emerge based on the direct approach employed. The participants did
not hesitate and they all spoke confidently about their definition. Three of the participants all stated there was difficulty in the process of defining cultural competency. However, it did not seem to be as much a response to not having a definition or understanding of cultural competency as it did a cautious understanding of the significance of how it was defined.

Awareness of self and others was a common thought within the definitions. Dr. A talked about the importance of understanding the power a person might have, which is a need to be aware. Drs. C, F, J, M, O and Mr. H all specifically use the word “awareness” as being part of defining cultural competency.

Respect was also used by Drs. D, G, M and Mr. H. Skills and knowledge being an important component of cultural competency was mentioned by Drs. A, B, D, I, L, O and Mr. H. Power was an important consideration for Drs. A and C. Understanding as a component of cultural competency was included by Drs. D, G and K and acceptance was deemed necessary by Drs. A and F. Finally, competency in racial, religious, regional, geographical, gender, and disability issues was the list of things specifically identified as areas in which to be culturally competent.

In comparing the definitions given by participants, the definitions closely matched those described in the literature review. Participants talked about attitudes, skills, knowledge, and who has the power when describing cultural competency. Participants identified groups that are impacted by oppression to include racial, ethnic, gender, and others. Some of the literature found that faculty could not even give a clear definition of cultural competency, but within the context of this study, there was consistent and accurate descriptions and definitions given by the participants.
### Table 2

**Putting Into Action**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Participant Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. A</td>
<td>He incorporates cultural competency skills within a skills lab for the professional program in which he teaches. He also provides a lecture on cultural competency because he sees it as an ethical duty to do so. In the classroom, he introduces terms and provides definitions for concepts to include race, ethnicity, religion, spirituality and other key terms. In his skills lab, he provides exercises for students to reflect personally about issues related to race, ethnicity, ageism, and sexism. In addition to classroom activities, Dr. A provides students with a booklist of resources for a wide variety of cultural issues as they may pertain to his field. Through curriculum mapping, his department determines how they are embedding cultural competency into the curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. B</td>
<td>Taught a course on cultural competency. She discussed the need to challenge student perspectives of thinking they were culturally competent when they apparently were not. Dr. B exposes her students to different cultures through field trips to area agencies that provide services to monolingual Spanish speaking clients and to Native American people. She specifically addresses the issue of privilege and gives assigned readings as well as a written self-assessment assignment. She is willing to share personal stories of making mistakes in other cultures because she was not aware of certain values that culture held. Dr. B will not invite people from historically underrepresented populations to come as guest lecturers to her class even though students sometimes request that. She emphasizes that one person does not represent an entire culture and it would not be fair to expect one person to do that. Her program offers clinical experience in other countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. C</td>
<td>Within the classroom, Dr. C does not specifically teach cultural competency. He shared that students who have entrenched ideological ideas not founded in research are “perplexing” to him. He believes that arguments for or against any topic, including issues like civil rights and slavery and welfare, must be analyzed from a research perspective. So the focus for Dr. C is to encourage students to be critical thinkers. Dr. C talked about courses and organizations that develop and address issues of cultural competency. He shared that it seemed that many of the diversity programs exist to comply with politically correct guidelines regarding cultural competency on campuses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. D</td>
<td>He will work with the individual based on their cultural worldview, but it does not change his expectations for final class outcomes. Dr. D points out that there is a lack of cultural competency in this approach. He said, “Unfortunately, what I tend to do is ask people to adapt to our standards.” He is teaching his students to be successful in the American educational systems. In science, he is helping students make the transition to be successful within the culture of the field. He shared that some institutions have tried to offer special sessions for students who do not have English as their primary language, but he is not aware of any of those that have been very successful. Science can transcend language and the important piece is understanding that culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. E</td>
<td>Dr. E stresses the importance of curriculum and awareness of how different components, including cultural competency, are included in courses. Her program reviews syllabi each semester, and through curriculum mapping, they are able to infuse issues of race and culture and social justice issues. She sees a large part of delivering culturally competent education as being tied to bioethics. Because an emphasis is placed on understanding cultural differences in ethical issues, there is an inherent need to develop cultural competency. Dr. E gave examples of end of life issues from a religious perspective or cultural groups’ use of alternative healthcare like in the practice of curanderos or Medicine men in the Hispanic and Native American cultures. In the classroom, healthcare students are required to participate in clinical rotations that engage them in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
working with diverse populations. The university has programs in other countries that provide students with hands-on experiences and students are encouraged to do rotations around the world, while looking at ethical issues as part of their training.

Dr. F

In the classroom, Dr. F includes conversations and lectures about diversity. She talked about diversity classes within her program being taught by African American women who were “classy and professional” and their ability to create a community that encouraged the students to ask questions. Dr. F feels that she does not have the background to bring in the multicultural diversity component in the same way her peers from historically underrepresented populations might be able to do. She values her peers and thinks it is a positive experience for the students to be exposed to these classes. Dr. F pointed out that graduates from her program generally seek employment in high needs poverty areas of local communities instead of the professional middle upper class neighborhoods.

Dr. F also identified accreditation standards in her field that required coursework in multicultural education, introducing the important aspect of professional program accreditation standards and guidelines as impetus for cultural competency education. In response to those standards, her program offers one specific course and an introductory course that has a strong component of multicultural education. As part of the compliance, her program assigns students to a wide variety of field experiences that requires them to see diversity of race, ethnicity, religion and socioeconomic status.

Dr. G

In the classroom, Dr. G believes that cultural competency is essential, but that it is explicit in his program for beginning students. As he teaches students nearing the end of the program, he sees the demonstration and education of cultural competency as being implicit. In his program, Dr. G has students from around the country and from around the world and from many cultures. He sees cultural differences within communities in the Midwest that create a complex issue with regard to cultural competency and that create learning opportunities for his students.

Mr. H

Within the classroom, Mr. H said there is little formal inclusion of cultural competency within the curriculum. However, it is embedded in the practical experiences his students receive. The program has a clinical component and a field component that require the students to encounter people from a wide variety of backgrounds, cultures, and beliefs. It is through the experiential process that he sees cultural competency being taught. As an instructor, he has to challenge his students when they scapegoat or stereotype clients. He intentionally uses teaching scenarios that will engage students in dialogue about perceived beliefs versus reality of client situations. Mr. H created a presentation that he now gives to students and to all faculty in his program to increase awareness of diversity issues.

Dr. I

Dr. I said it occurs in many ways. Because of her professional training and her ability to be in tune with others, she tries to suspend judgment and create an egalitarian environment where everyone can have a voice. She implements case studies as a way to bring in conversations about differences and encourages students to become critical thinkers by questioning why things are the way they are. Dr. I has assigned self-reflection, experiential assignments. When possible, she assigns students to groups that will specifically create diversity. It is clear to Dr. I that many students have little background in understanding diversity and the university can teach tolerance and empathy, teach students to be more open. She also encourages students to study abroad because of the importance of experiencing new situations and adapting to different environments.

As a professor in many on-line courses, Dr. I talked about the differences in on-line education and shared that there is less judgment because at times it is not possible to identify people by their race, ethnicity, religious beliefs or physical characteristics. Sharing can become more intimate and everyone can have a voice.
Dr. J talked about the energy of a classroom and the importance of being able to bring everyone into the learning process and feel supported and as part of the group. She thinks it is important to not only have difficult conversations, but to embrace them. She shared an example of a student who came from an Hispanic culture and would always prioritize her father’s requests before her own education. She had not had some of the same educational support some of her classmates had and struggled as a student. The combination of needing to teach to her level and the interruptions of family obligation demonstrates the need for meeting each student’s need. From a faculty perspective in the classroom, Dr. J said, “we need to be aware of our own biases and understand our heritage, our culture and where our biases come from. We need to have appreciation for diversity.”

Dr. K had many examples of demonstrating cultural competency and working with issues related to diversity. She is in a professional program that requires her students to have clinical experiences in working with people from a wide range of backgrounds. One of the first classroom exercises she gives her students is to have them imagine they were eighty years old and what would their lives be like, what would that feel like. She is encouraging them to be open-minded and to facilitate discussion that will create empathy in her students. She is giving them an understanding of not being able to know what it is like for others because the students have not lived that life yet. She incorporates case studies and places students in clinical situations that will challenge their beliefs. In the clinical aspect of her teaching, Dr. K has the clients play a role in educating the students. She empowers clients by asking for their feedback and assistance in training the students. She invites clients from different ethnic and religious and socioeconomic backgrounds to talk with students about their experiences. She uses these tools to combat what she defines as student unwillingness or discomfort with working with diverse populations. Dr. K said it is important to her to be patient and give students time to discover what their perspective is. She wants to help them to be successful and sometimes this means referring them to another faculty person for support. She wants to empower them.

Dr. L identified “language as the main thing.” She strives to be a role model and talks in all her classes about the similarities and differences each person has with others. She has intervened in the classroom when students were being disrespectful to others and she has taken students aside to confront them when the situation warranted doing so. While she finds it challenging to have these difficult conversations with students, Dr. L said that it becomes easier with time and it must be done. Also, Dr. L assigns papers on the topics of equity and diversity. She is hopeful that she is creating an excitement about diversity and cultural competency for her students.

Within a classroom setting, Dr. M said it is hard to demonstrate cultural competency because students are often “provincial” with little experience of other places and cultures. She helps them to understand that there are other worldviews and ways of doing things and does this through class assignments, using the internet to explore different places and cultures and using her own personal experiences. She would like to have mandatory field trips for children in America to see other parts of the world as she doesn’t believe her students have done much traveling. Dr. M tries to create experiences in the classroom and encourages her students to talk with other students around the world. Her program specifically offers a course to students on the subject of cultural competency and that is a mandatory course. Also, students have the opportunity to study abroad in Dr. M’s program.

In the classroom, Dr. N looks at students from an individual perspective. She sees different learning styles and backgrounds and goals for her students, and then she attempts to adapt her expectations to what she believes will help the student to be successful. Dr. N shared an example of working with a student who is coming from
another culture, country and background who will not be studying in Dr. N’s field, but would like to take classes in her program. She met with the student to discuss ways in which they could adapt the program to meet this student’s needs. She meets with students in situations like this to “organize things and make it meaningful in their life.”

Dr. O

Demonstrated when faculty recognize the differences in students and the fact that they may have different perceptions of how things should be. She shared a recent example of a student becoming upset with her because the student felt that Dr. O was making a classroom policy based on the fact that the student was from a historically underrepresented population. Dr. O had to explain that the policy was for everyone and not racially motivated. She talked about another incident when a student would not make eye contact with her and she perceived that as rude. Through reading, she came to understand that in his culture, it was rude to make eye contact with an elder. Dr. O has also taught a course on cultural competency and would invite speakers to come in from different historically underrepresented populations to speak to students. She would clarify for students that, “one individual does not speak for an entire culture, but they can speak about their experiences and the importance of cultural competency.” She teaches students that cultural differences are not right or wrong; they are just different.

The second theme emerged in response to the question regarding how cultural competency was demonstrated in the classroom. Participants were able to easily identify descriptions and give examples of how they viewed this happening for themselves and in some cases, for other faculty members. All the participants identified some way of demonstrating cultural competency in the classroom. Out of the 15 participants, 5 had taught a course or lecture on cultural competency, and they were Drs. A, B, F, O, and Mr. H. They had assigned exercises and each one seemed to be committed to and passionate about having cultural competence issues addressed in the classroom.

Drs. C, D, and G all stated that the demonstration of cultural competency in the classroom occurred more implicitly. Dr. D felt that as a professor in science, the cultural competency became the need for competency in his field. Dr. G felt that cultural competency had been addressed in introductory program courses and was therefore implicit in upper level courses.

Dr. C is the outlier in this study as he was the only participant to share the idea that he did not necessarily value cultural competency as his worldview is one of not
believing there are ultimately many differences in people and populations. He does not have any other themes within the category of classroom demonstration. Dr. C did stress the importance of grounding beliefs in research and the need for students to be critical thinkers. He was also easily able to give a comprehensive definition of cultural competency and bases the subject as one of examining who has power.

Professors who had explicit classroom exercises or assignments on cultural competency include Drs. A, B, F, I, K, L, M, O, and Mr. H. Many assigned personal self-reflections and engaged the students in the critical thinking process. Drs. F and O invite speakers from historically underrepresented populations to the classroom. Beyond the classroom, Drs. B, E, F, G, K, and Mr. H have programs that have clinical or internship components to their programs, which provide students with a direct experience of working and engaging with a diverse group of people. Drs. B, E, I, and M also teach within programs that have study abroad programs, furthering this experiential opportunity for students.

Half the participants, Drs. B, D, E, I, J, L, M, and Mr. H referenced the need for conversations in the classroom, and within that, Drs. D, J, L, N, and O specifically talked about a willingness to intervene individually with students who were either struggling because of personal differences or who were disrespectful of others based on their differences.

The theme within the topic of classroom demonstration of cultural competency is the use of experiential learning. The participants were most commonly engaging students through exercises, practice and dialogue. Only Dr. A and B mentioned specific written material. The fact that each participant could identify ways in which they felt cultural
competency was demonstrated validated their ability to accurately assess the definition of cultural competency and suggests that they are actively demonstrating it in the classroom.

Table 3

_Living the Mission_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. A</td>
<td>Within the context of teaching in a faith-based institution, Dr. A incorporates Jesuit values into his teaching on cultural competency. He has his students analyze outcomes for patients and determine how they demonstrate cultural competency within the Jesuit framework. Students are encouraged to reflect and identify ways in which they can be agents of change as part of the university mission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. B</td>
<td>Twice during the interview, Dr. B identified Jesuit philosophy as having an impact on this subject. When asked a follow-up question about integrating her course into the program curriculum, she stated that, “being Jesuit, there is a lot of trying to understand the other, and that’s an important piece.” She also stated that Jesuits are open-minded, which is a good thing, according to Dr. B because she knows she is “pushing buttons.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. C</td>
<td>Did not mention Jesuit Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. D</td>
<td>When Dr. D began to discuss the influence of Jesuit philosophy on the culture of the program and field of science he talked about everything from training new staff in Jesuit education to creating a positive culture in the science program that reflected Jesuit values. The philosophy is apparent in the classroom in the goal of trying to do what is best for every student, but it extends beyond that to activities outside of the classroom. Every year 3 to 5 Jesuit schools gather from Dr. D’s discipline to have a retreat. In Spring students are included and they choose a Jesuit topic as a focus point to engage students and faculty in communication that “builds bridges in terms of students being able to talk to faculty.” His program also offers an evening of reflection at the end of the semester where he says, “What you discover is the majority of what they talk about is not the things that happened within the classroom, but things that happened outside of the classroom.” Dr. D went on to compare Ignatius rules for teaching with the Carnegie Foundation, and said that there is a significant overlap in the philosophies. Both advocate for addressing the student as a whole person. It is a hands on approach where students are actively engaged and not expected to progress at the same rate. Through these processes, the program creates an appreciation for differences and creates a level of cultural competency that is more implicit than explicit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. E</td>
<td>She stated that because the university is Jesuit, there are requirements for social justice issues to be taught, and it is part of the school’s mission. Faculty spends a lot of time to be sure that Jesuit philosophy is incorporated into the curriculum. Dr. E wants students and faculty to believe in the value of service. She shared an example of the university being one of the first schools to accept Jewish students during a time when schools in the United States were banning Jewish students. She went on to talk about the early admission of women at the university and that, as far back as the late 1800s, women were being admitted into the healthcare programs. Dr. E said, “We don’t expect you to be Catholic, and we are not proselytizing, but we would like you to learn more about this and hopefully you will, and we haven’t really known anyone who said no.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. F</td>
<td>Jesuit charisms contribute to the sensitivity and understanding her students gain in working with people from historically underrepresented populations. Dr. F feels that the university also works to actively recruit students from historically underrepresented populations and that the university is “very accepting” of differences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dr. G identified Ignatian philosophy as creating a built in component of cultural competency at the university. He believes students choose the university for a reason and that traditions and pedagogy of Ignatian campuses work in creating a culturally successful campus. He sees one of the primary strengths within Jesuit schools as developing a broad cultural perspective that is nonjudgmental and accepting of where a person is and learning to value whatever belief system students and others may have. He specifically references the charism of “finding God in all things” as being important in serving people from historically underrepresented populations. As a member of the President’s committee, he knows there is a commitment to Ignatian values for all programs in the university. Dr. G made the point that the university has an unspoken paradigm and culture that relates to cultural competency as well as explicit attention to cultural competency on campus. He stated that there is a strong promotion of cultural diversity and that many Muslims and people who identify with religions beyond Catholicism are attracted to Jesuit campuses because Jesuit schools “explore God in the conversation.”

Mr. H Did not mention Jesuit Philosophy

Dr. I said the mission of the university focuses on social justice and the marginalization of historically underrepresented populations. All faculty are trained in the mission and in understanding who Ignatius of Loyola was and what constitutes the Jesuit pedagogy. The Jesuit layer is “you figure out the truth yourself.” It is okay to talk about God. When applying for employment at the university, applicants are given the charisms and are asked to address how they will work with them. She said, “It is not necessarily cultural competency, but it is part of what the university wants to stand for.”

Dr. J Did not mention Jesuit Philosophy

Dr. K Did not mention Jesuit Philosophy

Dr. L In Ignatian philosophy, Dr. L finds respect for all is an important part of cultural competency as well.

Dr. N The Jesuit charisms at the university are compatible with cultural competency for Dr. N and she identified “men and women for others” as well as “magis” as being particularly relevant. She said that all the charisms would fit within the framework of culturally competent education in one way or another.

The inclusion of Jesuit philosophy within the framework of cultural competency was an unexpected theme and was introduced by participants starting with the first interview. Drs. A, B, E, F, G, and I spontaneously included information on Jesuit philosophy in their responses about cultural competency in higher education. Drs. D, L, M, N, and O were asked follow-up questions during their interviews that solicited responses about the incorporation of Jesuit philosophy as part of cultural competency at the university. Finally, Drs. C, H, J, and K were not asked any follow-up questions about
Jesuit philosophy nor did they spontaneously include information about it in any of their responses.

There are 14 elements within the Jesuit philosophy theme. Dr. A talked about students becoming “agents of change.” Dr. B identified understanding others and being open-minded as being important. Dr. D said the Jesuit philosophy of understanding others and seeing the person as a whole incorporated cultural competency into the university. Dr. E talked about social justice in Jesuit philosophy, and Dr. I also mentioned that along with the charisms. The Charisms were identified by Drs. F, I, N and O and included men and women for others, magis, God in all things, and cura personalis. Dr. G added being nonjudgmental and Dr. L spoke about respect as a Jesuit philosophy. Dr. M included valuing others.

Jesuit education places a strong emphasis on the charisms which are; finding God in all things, cura personalis or care for the person, magis meaning discernment, men and women for others and faith that does justice (Traub, 2008).

Table 4

Seeking Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Participant Responses:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. A</td>
<td>Dr. A identified other faculty members as being supportive to the implementation of cultural competency in the classroom. He is participating in research projects to determine provider bias and healing practices in his community. He is also analyzing data to determine how the campus environment promotes cultural competency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. B</td>
<td>She feels her department is supportive of issues and challenges with diversity and that she had a strong mentor who helped her when she was challenged teaching this course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. C</td>
<td>Did not identify support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. D</td>
<td>Support and training were combined in the department practice of educating new faculty about diversity and what they may encounter in the classroom. There is a focus on different learning styles, which then becomes an ongoing departmental conversation. This, combined with the faculty retreats, provide faculty members with training and support.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dr. E
She identified different departments and staff people who would be able to help, which included an office for minority students, the lawyer specializing in affirmative action and various leaders in administration. She shared that there have been a few times when she felt she needed additional support related to a student issue, and she called upon some of the people she knew to provide support and advice.

Dr. F
Support has been important to Dr. F, starting with a personal experience she shared in which she was challenged around an experience of racism and oppression. She spoke about the importance of professional organizations, and how they can provide support. At the university, she referenced groups that have expertise in different cultures, and said there are “groups for everything on this campus.” Dr. F feels that any of these resources would provide any help she might need if she felt unable to meet a student’s need from a culturally competent perspective. She has personally asked colleagues from different backgrounds to provide students with support when she felt that she was not as culturally competent with a student as she would like to be. Ultimately, Dr. F said that if she needed support, it would be “real easy to find.”

Dr. G
If he were to seek any type of support for an issue related to cultural competency, he was “100%” certain it would be available.

Mr. H
He had not sought support for an issue related to cultural diversity. No one had approached him about offering training or support.

Dr. I
Support and training is available at the university according to Dr. I. There are offices, including a multicultural office, and Dr. I has invited them to interact with her students. There is a Center for Peace and Justice.

Dr. J
She did not identify any type of support.

Dr. K
She can go to colleagues or to the course leader and continue “up the ladder” if she needs assistance. “There are lot of very good individuals here so I have a vast group of people I can bounce ideas off of.”

Dr. L
She has sought support from student advisors if she has an issue with a student.

Dr. M
She sees the university as being supportive, and Dr. M has sought support from colleagues with more experience in a certain area of cultural competency when it was needed. She has asked colleagues who shared an ethnicity with a student to help, and has found people at the university who have been very willing to help.

Dr. N
She does feel that there is support at the university and that if she needed assistance, she would be able to access that. She gave an example of students from Japan appearing to not understand what was occurring in the classroom, so she sought advice from their advisor who explained it was not appropriate for them to talk directly to the teacher or challenge her.

Dr. O
When she has needed support around an issue of cultural competency, she has found that through colleagues, her department chair, and other university staff as needed. She said that if she became aware of her own perceptions being “off-base,” she was sure there would be someone at the university who would walk her through the changes she needed to make.

The issues of support and training were often addressed simultaneously during the interviews and were most often in response to follow-up questions about examples participants gave about addressing challenges in the classroom. All but Drs. C and J had examples of where they had received or would seek for support. Mr. H shared that he had
never sought assistance, and Dr. G said he had never looked, but was “100%” sure it would be there if he needed it.

Places that Drs. A, E, F, K, L, M, N, and O found support included support from other faculty as being the primary resource. Dr. I said that there were offices on campus that provided specific support for cultural competency issues. Drs. B, D, and E identified their departments as being supportive, and Dr. B also mentioned having a mentor for support. Dr. D viewed the trainings available to him as supportive, and Dr. F said her professional organizations had been supportive to her.

Table 5

*Gaining Knowledge*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Participant Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. A</td>
<td>He discussed the importance of leadership taking a stand and supporting the importance of staff participating in available trainings. Dr. A shared an example of a diversity day at the university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. B</td>
<td>For training, Dr. B addressed how she trained an adjunct professor to take over the cultural competency class for her. She said that it takes a lot of preparation and it is important to have close mentoring from someone who has “been there, done that.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. C</td>
<td>Dr. C had little training in cultural competency since he entered higher education. In his previous employment situations, he had mandatory trainings because employees needed to be aware of policies, and he felt they were offered to comply with administrative and legal mandates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. D</td>
<td>Support and training were combined in the department practice of educating new faculty about diversity and what they may encounter in the classroom. There is a focus on different learning styles, which then becomes an ongoing departmental conversation. This, combined with the faculty retreats provide faculty members with training and support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. E</td>
<td>Did not identify trainings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. F</td>
<td>Dr. F has attended trainings through the university and spoke specifically about a training with Ruby Payne, a well-known researcher in the field of cultural competency. She refers to her book on “Understanding Poverty” on a regular basis and said she cannot keep a copy on the shelf because she lends it out so regularly. She also referenced a retreat her program had offered on diversity. She said it made a positive impact on her because faculty members who identified with historically underrepresented groups from different races, religions, and sexual orientation all participated and were available to their colleagues for conversation and group processing. They participated in group exercises and had a lot of physical movement in the retreat.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dr. G With respect to training in cultural competency, Dr. G referenced his own educational experiences. As a graduate of a program in the Southwest that focused on cultural competency, Dr. G was specifically prepared in multicultural education. In his undergraduate education, he was on a “tremendously diverse campus.” At the university, he said he has attended trainings in faculty development workshops.

Mr. H Mr. H said that he is not aware of specific trainings being offered on cultural competency, but believes they are available as support would be if he felt that he needed it. He could not remember a time when he had either attended a training or sought support for an issue related to cultural diversity. No one had approached him about offering training or support.

Dr. I Support and training is available at the university according to Dr. I. There are offices, including a multicultural office, and Dr. I has invited them to interact with her students. There is a Center for Peace and Justice. The President of the university is committed to leadership training for everyone, and there is a component of cultural competency within that training.

Dr. J Did not identify trainings

Dr. K There is a diversity training course Dr. K had to take for her program.

Dr. L On the subject of training, Dr. L shared that not only has she had extensive training in cultural competency, but she has taught classes and provided training in a variety of settings on the topic of cultural competency. As an educator in public schools prior to joining faculty in higher education, Dr. L identifies herself as “one of the first white people” who was invited to attend diversity trainings in her area. Beyond that training, she has attended a number of trainings because it is an area that has always been interesting to her. Dr. L felt she had received good role modeling and an experience of being able to handle the conflict that can occur in diversity training from her internship experience.

Dr. M Did not identify trainings.

Dr. N Dr. N said that her professional background and training provided her with her knowledge of cultural competency, but that she had not received any training at the university.

Dr. O Training for Dr. O occurred primarily in her professional role prior to entering higher education. She has taken trainings and believes that there is plenty of opportunity at the university for anyone interested in that, but cultural competency is infused throughout the university environment.

Most of the participants identified training they had taken in cultural competency either at the university or off campus in roles other than as faculty members. Drs. A, D, F, G, K, and O had all attended trainings at the university and Drs. D and F had also attended retreats that were focused on cultural competency or included it as a component of the retreat. Drs. C, G, L, N and O referenced training they had received in places other than the university. Both Mr. H and Dr. I said they are sure training is available as needed and Drs. E, J and M did not identify trainings in discussing cultural competency.
Table 6

*Challenges Faculty Face*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Participant Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. A</td>
<td>Dr. A first identified the issue of accountability. He stated that some faculty seem to be interested in cultural competency, but are just giving lip service and there is not substance to what they are doing. There is not accountability with regard to curriculum, and so any integration is self-driven by a faculty member who is interested in doing so. Dr. A did participate on a task force to look at cultural competency for curriculum and policies and procedures, and they wrote a proposal for cultural competency, but it did not get the support from leadership that it needed in order to be implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. B</td>
<td>From a first-hand perspective, Dr. B discussed at length the barriers for being able to successfully teach cultural competency in the classroom. She shared her view that having a required course is very hard, and that if it was an elective, the people in the class would be passionate and open-minded. “It’s a challenge to meet people where they are at and to challenge them. You have to be blunt when you teach this material.” She stated that it takes a lot of personal reflection to teach this course and it is not easy. It is challenging and it can be emotional. She has had to challenge her own worldviews. She said, “It is hard to teach and I think nobody wants to teach it because it’s so challenging, difficult, emotional, and time intensive – scary.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. C</td>
<td>Dr. C did believe that faculty are afraid of cultural competency in the classroom because they do not want to show vulnerability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. D</td>
<td>Dr. D does not see cultural competency as an explicit component of his program, but as a part of creating a positive culture within it and this could be a barrier to learning cultural competency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. E</td>
<td>Did not identify barriers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. F</td>
<td>Barriers for faculty being able to demonstrate or teach cultural competency in the classroom for Dr. F included comfort level and ability to have difficult conversations. She shared that having been in education for many years, she came from a time when training was not available, and it was not considered correct to ask questions about differences. She grew up with what was right and wrong and how to be politically correct. She sees the biggest barrier as being that some faculty have a fear of not knowing enough or saying the wrong thing. She also feels that the fact that her department is heavily comprised of faculty members in their early 50s has created a maturity that allows many of them to be more direct with student issues. So age is possibly a barrier for younger faculty to feel comfortable enough to address issues of diversity directly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. G</td>
<td>Did not identify barriers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. H</td>
<td>He sees barriers to faculty delivering culturally competent education as lack of accountability and an inability to control what happens in the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. I</td>
<td>Sometimes faculty are unaware, and they don’t understand how to include cultural competency. Time is an issue because faculty must find ways to be trained and develop ways of demonstrating cultural competency. Dr. I said that she does not think that faculty think diversity is a “good thing,” and that is a barrier to cultural competency. Finally, she identified fear as being a barrier. They don’t know what to do if something happens in the classroom. Ultimately, Dr. I said, “it is easier not to.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first issue is how do faculty grade students in a way that is fair when they are coming from diverse educational experiences. She gave the example of the student above and went on to say that this student may have worked very hard so deserved an “A”. Another barrier is the perceived lack of time many faculty members have. It takes time to be trained and it takes time to understand each individual student. Finances are an issue, class sizes are large, faculty are required to teach more classes and advise more students. Faculty are trained and have expertise in one field. Doctoral level faculty members are required to publish, and their focus is on one small subject, and most do not receive training on how to teach in general.

Barriers for faculty in demonstrating cultural competency within the classroom included lack of time to give extra assistance to students who may need it because of cultural issues.

She thinks the primary barrier for faculty to be able to demonstrate cultural competency is time. The other barrier she identified was the possibility that faculty might not understand how important it is. Dr. L said, “my sense is people don’t always understand how students really do pay attention to what we say and how we say it.”

No barriers identified.

The only barrier that Dr. N identified for faculty not demonstrating cultural competency in the classroom was an attitude that students need to meet university standards and that it would not be appropriate to meet individual needs of students because it might create an inequality in expectations. Not everyone shares the same attitude, nor are they flexible, according to Dr. N.

Dr. O said she saw it as a lack of personal knowledge about themselves. She thinks that if people have the opportunity to have diverse cultural experiences, they will become more culturally sensitive.

Drs. B, I, J, K, and L all said that the primary barrier to faculty for demonstrating cultural competency in the classroom was time. Drs. A and H identified a lack of accountability for faculty. Dr. A also included a lack of leadership support as a barrier. Dr. B talked about the barrier of having a course on cultural competency be a required versus elective course. She said that the emotional aspect of the challenge of teaching cultural competency was another barrier. Fear and lack of comfort as barriers were named by Drs. C, F, and I. A lack of awareness on the part of faculty members was identified by Drs. I, L, and O. Dr. D said a barrier is not having explicit material to teach or in the program. Dr. F said that age made it easier to address the issues whereas younger faculty might not be able to teach cultural competency. Dr. J talked about the difficulty of grading diverse student groups as a barrier as well as finances, class sizes, and the fact
that higher education does not train faculty members how to teach. Dr. N said some faculty think they need to meet university standards and not student’s individual needs, and that some faculty are not flexible.

Table 7

*Developmental Influences*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Participant Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. A</td>
<td>He said he has “the three whammies” of being Arab, Muslim and a Palestinian. He is actively involved in his community and on campus. He said, “For me, I hope all of this has made me a better teacher, person, father.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. B</td>
<td>Dr. B described her personal struggles with teaching cultural competency. “Sometimes I read reflections and I would literally have to put them away because I didn’t want to criticize and students feel angry when you are trying to push them to think and others feel like you didn’t do enough and they are angry.” She went on to talk about evaluations can be positive and still you have students who are angry and confronting about the material. It takes a lot of personal reflection to teach this course, and it is not easy. It is challenging and it can be emotional. She has had to challenge her own worldviews. She said, “It is hard to teach and I think nobody wants to teach it because it’s so challenging, difficult, emotional and time intensive – scary.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. C</td>
<td>Dr. C said, “I just don’t really care about that kind of stuff. I don’t know how to describe race and ethnicity and gender and that kind of stuff. My upbringing and everything I have ever done is who cares about that. It doesn’t matter. So I might not be the best person to talk about this.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. D</td>
<td>From his personal experience, Dr. D found that the culture of science can transcend a language or cultural barrier. As a graduate student in a country that did not speak English as its primary language, Dr. D had to learn to negotiate a different culture from a language perspective and also from the perspective of how things were done. This experience gave him awareness of how to best assist his students in learning the culture of his field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. E</td>
<td>From a personal perspective, Dr. E had traveled extensively and lived in other countries. She is also actively involved in the area of bioethics and continues to debate, analyze, advise, and serve as a consultant with regard to bioethical issues that often contain a component of cultural competency. She presents with a positive, motivated outlook with regard to her field and how well she perceives her department is doing at delivering a well-rounded educational experience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Dr. F       | Dr. F shared a difficult time she had experienced in the beginning of her career in education when she faced allegations as a professional that led to legal action against her. She identified the issue as one of social justice, and talked about the lack of awareness she had at the time and her personal shock at the inequality and discrimination against community members based on race and socioeconomic status. The poverty of the community was “unbelievable” and was a primarily poor Black community in the South. During the legal process, the lawyers and judges and doctors would talk about their golf games and racist comments were routinely made as part of the proceedings. She cited the incident as being extremely difficult, but ultimately, it provided her a foundation to recognize and appreciate strong support systems as well as in understanding the reality of oppression at a personal
level. She was able to go on and become employed in a supportive environment with a good supervisor and supportive colleagues that helped her to recover from the incident she had experienced working in the South.

**Dr. G**
When Dr. G shared his personal history with cultural competency, he talked about experiential being a critical component and he spoke about his undergraduate experience. He said, “I began learning appreciation, sensitivity, being willing to learn and that’s what you need as long as you can avoid being judgmental and narrow in your own thinking. I learned that with amazement.”

**Mr. H**
Mr. H shared about his personal journey towards cultural competency. He said he grew up in an environment that did not value diversity and he could have “followed suit.” However, he formed a different world view and now hopes that he is sharing what he has learned with his children, his students and the people with whom he interacts. He said, “It really matters because I think engaging students in these types of conversations is important. I am here to say I am going to challenge you in the way you think about the world and if you should you use some different lenses to explore what you believe and why you believe it and the assumptions you are making about other people. To me it is the only way that we can develop them from a compassion, respect, human kind, kind of thing.”

**Dr. I**
Dr. I said that she is interested in cultural competency personally because she came from a different culture and can appreciate cultural issues. She knows what it is like to live in a different culture and she has learned to suspend judgment and recognize her own biases when she is working with issues of cultural competency. Also, it took her awhile to adapt to the culture she is in now and that made her more sensitive to the struggles of others.

**Dr. J**
Dr. J shared a story of personal experience with diversity when she first entered higher education. She was asked to develop a class and in her first classroom teaching experience she had a wide range of diversity from age to backgrounds in that class. She was able to be successful in her role as professor by using innovative techniques, meeting the students where they were in very unique circumstances and because of her willingness to stay in the experience. She said, “I think about the first year or two I taught and I was as much in the classroom as the students were. I think that the students had to do it all on their own. But that’s okay, sometimes we learn the best that way.”

**Dr. K**
Dr. K did not share personal stories that involved cultural competency other than to mention the diversity her children are growing up with in her community.

**Dr. L**
Dr. L talked about how cultural competency became a personal interest. She was exposed to other children from different backgrounds and cultures when she was young and developed friendships with children who were differently abled. She had a friend who was legally blind, but played piano and football. When she asked him how he could play football, he educated her on the accommodations available to him, and today they are still in touch.

**Dr. M**
Dr. M shared that for her, what inspired her interest in becoming more culturally competent was her father’s love of travel and his providing her with the opportunity to travel extensively. She has friends in India and China and Canada among other places and she talks with them to share ideas and meets with them when she can.

**Dr. N**
Dr. N did not share personal stories that involved cultural competency.

**Dr. O**
From a personal perspective, Dr. O talked about having colleagues from diverse backgrounds and the experience she was able to gain through those friendships.

Most of the participants shared a personal perspective on their experience with cultural competency. Drs. K and N did not. Drs. A and I talked about their personal
experiences coming from different cultures that required them to adapt to a new one. Drs. B, D, F, J, and L all identified an incident or struggle they had encountered that engaged their interest in cultural competency, while Dr. C and Mr. H referenced their upbringing as influencing their beliefs on cultural competency. Drs. E and M both said travel had motivated them to become interested in cultural competency and Drs. L and O shared stories of having relationships with people from other cultures that led them to become more culturally competent.

In comparing the data collected within each theme, patterns emerged of common descriptions, definitions and explanations for each theme. These themes and their patterns have been described in the section above. Appendix D provides a complete matrix of the data for clarity.

**Document Analysis**

To provide a more comprehensive understanding of the cultural competency at the university, a number of artifacts were analyzed. Documents were collected from faculty members during the interview process and a thorough search was conducted using the university website. The results of the website search were extensive and are discussed in relation to policies, organizations, presentations, research, activities, workshops, and courses offered. A search for “cultural competency” within the university yielded 211 results, while a search for “diversity” yielded 3,970 results. All 211 results for cultural competency were reviewed and the first 200 in diversity were reviewed as well.

The university website states that 7,700 students attend, and the mission statement includes the importance of service, family and worth of the individual. It also identifies the need and appreciation for diversity.
The university defines diversity competency as, “Diversity Competency is defined as a combination of personal attitudes (awareness of personal assumptions about others, openness to change), interpersonal skills (empathy for multiple perspectives, engaging in inquiry), and knowledge of societies (dominant and nondominant groups) that promote an ethic of warmth and welcome toward the diverse groups that make up our campus, local, and national communities” (www.creighton.edu). Policies addressing diversity include a general policy on diversity and inclusion and a policy statement on diversity.

The commitment to providing culturally competent education to a diverse group of students and service to historically underrepresented populations is evidenced by a large number of university organizations. They include The Office of Multicultural Affairs, and The Multicultural Health Information Resource Center which provides students and faculty with resources. There is the Center for Health Policy and Ethics, Health Science, The Multicultural and Community Affairs Office, and The Division of Students Services, which includes the IDEA program or the Initiative for Diversity Education and Action.

The Student Activities Office (SAO) is committed to fostering student leaders in the Ignatian tradition. The mission statement is "to respect and celebrate the commonalities and uniqueness of all" (www.creighton.edu). The university career center has a diversity resources page. The Health Science and Multicultural and Community Affairs office and the ADA committee also focus on issues of cultural competency and diversity.

Organizations on campus include the Asian World Center, Affirmative Action, the Center for Service and Justice, the Committee on the Status of Women, the Lieben
Center for Women, the Institute for Latin American Concern, the Martin Luther King Committee, the Native American Center, the Native American Studies Program, the Office of Equity and Inclusion, the Office of International Programs, the Office of Interprofessional Scholarship Service and Education, the Violence Intervention and Prevention Center, and the Women and Gender Studies committee.

Undergraduate and professional organizations include the African Students Association (AFSA), Asian Student Association (ASA), Chinese Student Association, (CU), African-American Student Association (CUASA), the CU Latino Student Association (CULSA), Gamma Delta Pi, the Gay Straight Alliance (GSA), German-American Club, Hui O Hawaii, Indian Cultural Society (ICS), International Student Association (ISA), Lambda Theta Nu, Native American Association, Phi Beta Sigma, and the Spanish Club. The professional organizations are the American Medical Women's Association, Asian Pacific American Medical Students Association, Black Law Student Association, Latino Law Students Association, Medical Spanish Club, Reproductive Education through Cultural Awareness, the Vietnamese Student Organization, and the Women's Law Students Association (www.creighton.edu).

Every college within the university has specific courses that address cultural competency and there are numerous workshops, activities, presentations, and trainings listed within the university to provide students and faculty and staff with a wide variety of training, education, and experiences. There are a wide variety of research articles that are listed and many are from research conducted at the university on issues related to cultural competency.
The wide range of policies, organizations, activities, research, and learning opportunities all serve as evidence of a positive campus climate as defined in many of the studies. Student engagement and exposure to other cultures is necessary for students to gain in their empathy and understanding of cultural differences (Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Astin, 1995; Gurin et al., 2002).

The document analysis combined with the data collected in the interview process provide a preliminary multidimensional picture of cultural competency at the university.
Discussion

This study began as an exploration of a basic level of understanding of cultural competency in higher education; how do faculty define cultural competency and how do they demonstrate that within the classroom? As previously noted, there was little research on how faculty do either of those things, and it was therefore unknown if faculty would even believe they were able to define cultural competency. Then, if they were able to do so, did those definitions align with one another, and did they align with the definitions found within the literature.

The first question asked of each participant was a very direct one; how do you define cultural competency? Often the emphasis was on the word “you.” Each participant answered with what appeared to be some confidence, and all of the definitions were aligned with each other and those found in the literature. The definition adopted for this study was, “an open, accepting, and welcoming attitude toward other group cultures, defined broadly as other racial, ethnic, gender, and affinity groups’ normative, communicative, and behavior values. Openness is ideally coupled with understanding of the substance and nuances of specific group cultural norms and practices” (Rivera et al., 2010, p. 2). The participants talked about awareness, respect, knowledge and skills, power, understanding and acceptance, language often found in definitions of cultural competency and language that supports the definition given by Rivera et al. The most frequent responses were awareness and understanding as keys to cultural competency.
In the demonstration of cultural competency in the classroom, all of the faculty felt that they were able to do so either explicitly or implicitly. Nine of the participants identified exercises or assignments that directly engaged students in issues of cultural competency, and eight mentioned conversations with students, which indicates a strong classroom component. The data is supported by the literature that states that it is important for a positive campus climate to include classroom discussions and activities initiatives (Hurtado et al., 1999). Many of the participants spoke thoughtfully about their experiences in the classroom, and many talked about challenges with students based on cultural differences that required them to seek support or to engage with the student in a way that created positive outcomes for the student.

Beyond the process of defining and demonstrating cultural competency, many of the faculty referenced the Jesuit philosophy and Ignatius of Loyola as providing a framework for cultural competency. This was an unexpected finding and a powerful one in its implications. In the original formatting of the study, no consideration was given to the possible impact of research being conducted at a Jesuit school. While the literature review was being conducted, the focus was initially on collecting data at a public state institution in the South. When the location for data collection changed, no changes were made in the protocol.

Robert Mitchell, SJ (1998) wrote about the five traits of a Jesuit education. He included one characteristic as the “preoccupation with questions of ethics and values for both the personal and professional lives of graduates.” Jesuit schools focus on all aspects of oppression to include socioeconomic, race, poverty, and
religion. Mitchell (1998) writes that these issues need to be addressed through “learning, research, reflection, and imagination” (p. 112).

The five charisms further the implications of Jesuit philosophy to cultural competency. They are; finding God in all things, cura personalis or having concern for the whole person, magis meaning the highest or greater good, men and women for others, and faith that does justice, which asks that everyone seek justice for the poor and marginalized (Traub, 2008).

These traits and charisms closely match concepts that are included in creating a positive campus climate and in increasing cultural competency in higher education. Hurtado et al. (1999) specifically recommended that students become involved in activities and conversations with each other, with faculty members. Ignatian philosophy provides a powerful framework for the issue of cultural competency and could be considered for universal trainings in higher education.

The next themes in the data to emerge were training and support, which were often intertwined by the participants. Primarily, the participants with the most passion for cultural competency were the ones to talk about trainings, although a few others mentioned them as well. Trainings were sometimes described as being supportive, and this was especially true of retreat settings mentioned by several participants. What is of note is the fact that the artifact analysis identified numerous trainings and offices to provide support for the university, yet only six participants talked about trainings on campus. The search found Creighton Online Diversity Training, Embracing Diversity in the University and the Culture Shock Series, to name a few (www.creighton.edu).
The next theme barriers or challenges to faculty demonstrating cultural competency in the classroom, may, in part, address the lack of attendance at trainings. The number one factor emerging as being a barrier was the issue of lack of time. Another was lack of awareness, which would imply that faculty would not know to seek out training or that they might actually need it. Fear as a barrier was not only the fear of engaging in issues of cultural competency, but all that might go with it such as the personal challenge or the lack of training or the difficulty in managing complex student issues. Five faculty participants said this could be a barrier and it may have the strongest impact in understanding why faculty may not be actively demonstrating cultural competency in the classroom.

In examining the issue of fear in conjunction with trainings, it is important to consider the fact that most trainings do not provide emotional or personal skills in working with cultural competency. Trainings are often focused on skills and knowledge. While trainings must include skills and knowledge, future implications of this study would also indicate a need of a training component in personal support. This is also indicated in the success of the retreat experience identified by two of the faculty participants.

Finally, all but two of the participants shared some type of personal account or experience in their personal or professional lives as an example of engaging in an issue of cultural competency. The implication is the power of the personal experience and of the need to incorporate that into the demonstration of cultural competency in higher education in trainings and within the classroom. The experiences included some that were painful and others that were inspiring, but all had a personal component that held
significance for the participant. Participants easily identified challenging student interactions related to issues of cultural competency as well as personal ones, and it seemed to be meaningful and evoke, for some, an emotional response.

Participants in this study gave generously of their time, ideas, knowledge, and experience. They were surprisingly forthcoming with their own struggles and experiences of dealing with issues in their personal lives as well as in their professional roles, and it seemed that every one of them felt it was an important discussion and area of exploration, although how that needed to occur was sometimes approached from different viewpoints.

Limitations

As stated in the Methodology section, there are a number of limitations in this study. The study was conducted at one university with unique characteristics that would make it difficult to extrapolate any of the findings to the general subject of higher education. The university is a Jesuit school in the Midwest. Enrollment is 7,700 students with 26% identifying as being students of color. According to statistics, higher education is now comprised of at least 40% of students from historically underrepresented populations (U.S. Department of Education, 2010). This would indicate that the university may not be a true sample of a diverse institution of higher education, and research would need to be conducted to determine the influence of this factor.

Furthermore, the data was collected in the summer, which meant that all of the participants were faculty members in programs that offered coursework in the summer. This, in and of itself, limited participation to departments that are primarily professional training programs, and did not include faculty members from the humanities and other traditional academic programs in higher education. As such, the participants were often in
programs that engaged with the public as part of their program. The programs often included clinical and internship experiences that provided faculty with a clear opportunity to engage with people from historically underrepresented populations. Also, most of the participants had been involved in higher education for many years. This, too, could have an impact on their assessment of cultural competency and might be very different had newer faculty members been participants. Without further research, there is no way to generalize that all faculty even at this university would have the degree of cultural competency that was found in faculty in this study.

Another limitation, often found in studies of cultural competency, is the fact that the data was collected in a process of self-report. There was no verification that the participants did, indeed, demonstrate cultural competency in the classroom in the ways that they describe.

**Recommendations**

Due to the limited nature of this research and based on its findings, there are a number of recommendations for future research. The first would be to expand the data collection process at the university to increase the complexity of data and provide a wider basis for analysis. This could include the gathering of data through interviews from faculty in the humanities and liberal arts programs. Additionally, data could be collected from students, administration, and staff to create a fuller picture of cultural competency within this case study.

Beyond the university, further research could be conducted at other Jesuit institutions of higher education for a comparative analysis. Then data could be collected from private and state institutions of higher education to continue that comparative
analysis at a deeper level. Beyond American institutions of higher education, data could be collected in other countries to inform and compare the data collected at the schools in the United States.

All the participants gave descriptions of classroom or personal events that had required a degree of cultural competency or that had caused them to develop an interest in cultural competency. One purpose of this study was to develop ideas that would support the future training of faculty in higher education in cultural competency. It would seem from the data that was gathered in this study, that while the document analysis provided evidence of a wide range of support and trainings, it is the lived experiences that best engaged faculty in a quest for learning and growing in the field of cultural competency. Further research is needed to assess which trainings and workshops are the most effective and can engage faculty members.

Participatory action research would be another next step once a number of the studies mentioned here had provided data to inform the design. In these studies, trainings and interventions could be offered on campuses with active participation in the research process by faculty and/or students, administration, and staff. Participatory action resource seeks to understand and improve the world by changing it. At its heart is collective, self-reflective inquiry that researchers and participants undertake, so they can understand and improve upon the practices in which they participate and the situations in which they find themselves (Baum, MacDougall, & Smith, 2006). This type of research could increase dialogue and include people from all backgrounds and create a powerful movement in improving campus climate.
Conclusion

This study provided data that supports the premise that faculty in higher education at the studied university have a good understanding and ability to define cultural competency. Faculty in this study also exhibited a strong ability to demonstrate cultural competency through examples, exercises, and lessons they delivered in the classroom. A core component of the framework for cultural competency was the Jesuit philosophy.

The primary benefit of these findings is the implications and ideas for future research on cultural competency in higher education. This study can be continued within a variety of frameworks that would lead to deeper understanding. Leaders in the field of higher education should consider the importance of supporting faculty through education, training, support, and inclusion in faculty requirements. As part of a leadership model, leaders can continue to develop ways to improve the cultural competency of faculty in higher education.
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Appendix B

Dear Creighton University Faculty Member,

I am writing to invite you to participate in a research project I am undertaking in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Interdisciplinary EdD in Leadership Program at Creighton University.

This study is titled, “A Case Study: Exploring Cultural Competency in Faculty in an Institution of Higher Education.” (IRB #13-16771). I am collecting data through an interview process from faculty members at Creighton University.

The purpose of this research study will be to explore how faculty in an institution of higher education define cultural competency and how do they demonstrate cultural competency in the classroom and in their professional relationships with students.

You may be eligible for this study if you teach courses at Creighton University. If you are interested in learning more about this study, please contact me at elisabethnichols@creighton.edu or at (434) 270-5589.

It is important to know that this e-mail is not to tell you to join this study. It is your decision. Your participation is voluntary. Whether or not you participate in this study will have no effect on your relationship with Creighton University.

You do not have to respond if you are not interested in this study. If you do not respond, no one will contact you, but you may receive another reminder e-mail which you can simply disregard.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I look forward to hearing from you.

Elisabeth Nichols
Appendix C

IRB # 13-16771

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of Interview:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Place:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer: Elisabeth Nichols</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position of Interviewee:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for agreeing to be interviewed for this research project on cultural competency. I want to remind you that your comments will remain confidential and anonymous. Have them sign the consent form. Let them know they can take a break at any time and that they can ask you if they have any questions, etc.

Questions:

1. Please describe your role here at (redacted) University?
   a. How long have you been here?
   b. What courses do you teach?

2. How do you define cultural competency?
   a. What lead you to your understanding of this definition?
   b. How would you describe it in a different way?

3. How have you included cultural competency in the classroom?
   a. What response have you seen to cultural competency actions in the classroom?

4. What else would you like to add about cultural competency at (redacted) University that I have not already asked you?

Additional questions for depth and breadth to the above questions:
Would you expound on that?
Tell me more.
How would you describe that in a different way?
I would like to hear more about that.
Would you clarify that for me?
What was the effect of that incident?
What were the consequences?
What was your reaction to that behavior?
Take me through your thought processes during that time.
Appendix D

Data Matrix

Theme One: Awareness and Understanding
SubThemes:
  - Awareness: C, F, J, M, H, O
  - Respect: D, G, H, M
  - Knowledge and Skills: A, B, D, H, I, L, O
  - Power: A, C
  - Understanding: D, G, K
  - Acceptance: A, F
Groups: racial, religious, regional, gender, disability

Theme Two: Putting Into Action
SubThemes:
  - Taught course or class: A, B, F, H, O
  - Implicit only: C, D, G
  - Assignments/exercises: A, B, F, H, I, K, L, M, O
  - Speakers: F, O
  - Clinical/internship: B, E, F, H, G, K
  - Study Abroad: B, E, I, M
  - Individual intervention: D, J, L, N, O
  - Conversations: B, D, E, H, I, J, L, M

Theme Three: Living the Mission
Data Collected from: A, B, D, E, F, G, I, L, M, N, O
Spontaneously included: A, B, E, F, G, I
Asked a follow-up question: D, L, M, N, O
Not asked, not included: C, H, J, K
SubThemes:
  - Agent of change: A
  - Understanding others: B
  - Open-minded: B
  - Best for others: D
  - Person as a whole: D
  - Social justice: E, I
  - Charisms: F, I, N
  - God in All Things: G
  - Magis: N
Cura Personalis for Others
Men and Women
Nonjudgmental
Respect

Theme Four: Seeking Support
Data Collected from: A, B, D, E, F, G, H, I, K, L, M, N, O
SubThemes:
Other faculty A, E, F, K, L, M, N, O
University offices I
Departments B, D, E
Mentor B
Professional org F
Never looked H
Sure it would be available if needed G, N
Did not mention C, J

Theme Five: Gaining Knowledge
SubThemes:
Training on campus A, D, F, G, K, O
Mentoring B, L
Outside university C, G, L, N, O
Retreats D, F
Available if needed H, I
Did not mention E, J, M

Theme Six: Challenges Faculty Face
SubThemes:
No accountability A, H
Lack of leadership support A
Required course B
Challenging B
Time B, I, J, K, L
Fear C, F, I
Not explicit D
Age F
Lack of awareness I, L, O
Grading, finances, Class size, no training J
Not a priority N
Not flexible N
Did not mention E, G, M
Theme Seven: Developmental Influences
Data Collected from:  A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, L, M, O
SubThemes:
  Belonging to a different  
    Cultural group  A, I  
    Personal struggle  B, D, F, J, L  
    or experience  C, H  
    Upbringing  E, M  
    Travel  G  
    Education  
    Friends from  
    other cultures  L, O  
    Did not mention  K, N
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