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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This paper reviews the literature on how cultural competency curricula have been introduced into undergraduate university programs to facilitate non-Indigenous students’ development of the requisite knowledge, attitudes/values and skills that will enable them as future service professionals to deliver culturally appropriate services to Indigenous people. Although clients from other culturally and linguistically diverse groups (as well as those in mainstream society) will benefit from this endeavour, the paper is concerned about the service provision for Indigenous Australians because of their unique historical, colonial, social, political, cultural, economic, and contemporary experiences.

Background

The literature does not provide a definition of Indigenous Australian CC, therefore the definition presented is one that is promoted in the health care literature and has been applied to a wide range of service professions.

A commonly cited definition of cultural competency, adopted for the purposes of this paper, is drawn from the health education literature. Cultural competency is defined as set of ‘congruent behaviors, attitudes, and policies that come together in a system, agency, or among professionals and enable that system, agency, or those professionals to work effectively in cross-cultural situations’ (Cross, Bazron, Dennis & Isaacs, 1989 or 1999, cited for example by Campinha-Bacote, Yahle, & Langenkamp, 1996; King, Sims, & Osher, n.d.; National Association of Social Workers. National Committee on Racial and Ethnic Diversity, 2001; The Lewin Group Inc., 2001). The paper also provides a synthesised list of the Principles of Indigenous Cultural Competency, which was set out in a previous literature review (Grote, 2008).

Strategies to introduce cultural competency into universities

The literature suggests that there are two main strategies used to introduce cultural competency curricula into university courses, including a top-down approach, in which cultural competency curricula are mandated by the university administration; and the more common bottom-up approach, in which cultural competency programs are initiated by academic staff at the departmental level. The latter constitutes an Engagement Model in which staff members from Indigenous Studies schools or research centres work to engage those from other disciplines (or in some cases vice versa) to collaborate on the promotion, development and introduction of cultural competency curricula into existing departmental courses which prepare students for the service professions.

Two conceptual models of cultural competency development

Two models of cultural competency development relevant to curriculum development are described, each comprising a six-stage continuum of progressive stages leading toward proficiency in intercultural interactions: Bennett’s Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (Bennett & Bennett, 2004; Hammer & Bennett, 2001; Hammer, Bennett, & Wiseman, 2003) and Wells’s (2000) Developmental Model of Cultural Competency.

Bennett’s model provides a useful framework for understanding and identifying the successive stages in which one’s worldview is restructured through cognitive processes:

Denial → Defence → Minimisation → Acceptance → Adaptation → Integration

In this model, individuals develop progressively more complex and sophisticated understandings of culture (their own and that of others) as their acquisition of knowledge and intercultural experiences provide opportunities to construe (and re-construe) their understandings over time.
Wells’s (2000) model tracks attitudinal and behavioural changes as individuals (organisations, systems, professional associations and mainstream society) develop the knowledge and experience to accommodate Indigenous clientele during intercultural encounters in the provision of human services. The six stages of this model are represented as:

\[ \text{Incompetence} \rightarrow \text{Knowledge} \rightarrow \text{Awareness} \rightarrow \text{Sensitivity} \rightarrow \text{Competence} \rightarrow \text{Proficiency} \]

Both models may be useful. Bennett’s model can provide a tool for self-assessment and for identifying teaching and learning strategies that would stimulate the cognitive development of individual learners. The model proposed by Wells offers a practical structure for identifying and mapping content for cultural competency curricula. Wells’s model has been used for this purpose at Charles Sturt University and the University of South Australia (Charles Sturt University, 2010; McConnochie, Egege, & McDermott, 2008; Ranzijn, McConnochie, & Nolan, 2010).

**Developing cultural competency curricula**

The literature indicates three possible structures for introducing cultural competency programs into existing courses:

1) Stand-alone foundation units;
2) Cultural competency components embedded across course units; or
3) A combination of stand-alone units and cultural competency content integrated across units.

While the literature indicates a lack of agreement about which approach is the best, cultural competency proponents may have limited options depending on the university context. It has been argued, however, that for Indigenous cultural competency, the third option might provide the most coherent approach and enable cultural competency education and training to be reinforced as students progress through their courses (Ranzijn, McConnochie, Day, Nolan, & Wharton, 2008).

**‘Best practice’ models**

Assuming that ‘best practice’ models require that their content and teaching/learning strategies are demonstrated to be effective by rigorous research methods, then true ‘best practice’ models are yet to emerge (Campinha-Bacote, 2006; Cuellar, Brennan, Vito, & de Leon Siantz, 2008; Grant & Letzring, 2005). While some research has shown that some teaching/learning strategies are effective in the short term, many of the assessment tools used have not been shown to be reliable or valid. Moreover, research has yet to demonstrate the long term effectiveness of particular teaching/learning strategies.

Nonetheless, proponents of cultural competency training (for in-service professionals) have used the term ‘best practice’ to describe particular content areas and teaching/learning strategies. These recommendations indicate content and activities which facilitate the exploration of and reflection on the notions of culture, worldview, race/racism, whiteness, white privilege.

**Content**

The literature suggests that the following content be included in cultural competency curricula to facilitate the development of knowledge, values/attitudes and skills:

- Concept and definition of cultural competency and its importance for the relevant profession;
- Concepts of culture, race, ethnicity and worldview;
• Pre-colonial and post-colonial Indigenous history in Australia, (e.g., the European invasion; *terra nullius*, Indigenous wage forfeitures, the 1905 Act, the Stolen Generation, Royal Commission into Black Deaths in Custody)

• The diversity of Indigenous peoples and their cultures;

• Indigenous cultures (including, for example, the Dreaming, models of Indigenous kinship and social structures);

• The effects of federal and state policies and legislation on Indigenous peoples in the past and the present;

• Current statistics regarding demographics and the status of Indigenous people regarding the disparities between Indigenous and non-Indigenous (health, education, socio-economic status, etc. and how these aspects are interdependent);

• Human rights;

• Contemporary issues of concern;

• Indigenous cultures and cultural practices;

• Myths and misconceptions about and stereotypes of Indigenous people;

• Notions of whiteness, white privilege and power;

• Reflection on cultural identity, whiteness, privilege, values, beliefs, attitudes, prejudices and propensity to stereotype.

• Racism and anti-racist practices;

• Cross-cultural communication models and skills; and

• Identifying when interpreters are required and strategies for working with them.

A framework developed for mapping Indigenous content and cultural competency skills onto existing courses is presented. This model uses a matrix which draws on Wells’s model of cultural competency development and a synthesised list of basic content areas which begins with foundational knowledge and extends to understandings specific to the discipline (Ranzijn, Nolan, & McConnochie, 2008).

**Teaching and learning strategies**

A list of the teaching/learning techniques recommended in the literature includes the following:

• Didactic lectures and seminars (delivered by Indigenous and non-Indigenous staff members working in partnership);

• Guest lecturers or speakers (e.g., Indigenous scholars, professionals or prominent members of the local Indigenous community who present alongside other Indigenous colleagues);
Panel presentations (involving prominent Indigenous community members);
- Cultural immersion activities, e.g., visits to Indigenous communities or Indigenous organisations;
- Informal meetings with local Indigenous organisations;
- Guided cultural field trips, e.g., to museums, art centres;
- Workshops prepared and presented by students;
- Case study or ‘paper cases’ (Furman & Dent, 2004, p. 27), i.e., longitudinal case studies for discussion and analysis;
- Scenarios (video-recordings or readings) for discussion and analysis;
- Film excerpts discussed and analysed;
- Readings about life experiences (fiction and non-fiction);
- Critical incident for discussion and analysis;
- Continuous reflective activities, e.g., journaling, identity narratives (about self and others), reflections on readings, presentations;
- Portfolios (e.g., for analysing a media texts collected by students; personal critical incidents; analysing texts for white ‘cultural scripts’);
- Role plays;
- Games simulating cross-cultural encounters (e.g., BaFa BaFa, Welcome to the State of Poverty);
- Use of central website with links to relevant resources, organisations, etc. which can be used for cultural competency foundation and integrated units;
- On-line discussion forums (e.g., available on Blackboard).

As illustrated in the inventories of content and teaching/learning strategies, the literature highlights the importance of engaging students in a wide range of classroom activities, cultural immersion experiences and assignments that develop knowledge and understandings about Indigenous perspectives and promote reflection that renders the dominant (yet ‘invisible’) white Western culture, its values and practices more visible to students.

Assessments

The literature on assessment protocols underlines the importance of using a range of quantitative and qualitative evaluation instruments as well as self-assessment tools. These include the following:

Quantitative:
- Traditional examinations using multiple choice, short answer and true/false questions and essay formats (pre-tests and post-test).

Qualitative:
- Case study analysis (oral presentations or written essays, papers);
- Oral presentations by individual students or groups (e.g., on aspects of culture);
- Choice of essay topics (e.g., 2000 words) requiring students to engage with and reflect on culture and professional cross-cultural interactions;
- Reflections on readings recorded in a journal, chosen at random for marking;
- Written papers or reports;
• Portfolios (analysis of media samples and personal critical incidents);
• Reflective responses to guest speaker presentations.

Practical:
• Client assessments.

Self-assessment:
• Self-evaluations administered at start and end of unit.

The literature also emphasises the need for formative feedback which can include student self-assessments, advice on specific behaviours (rather than perceived attitudes) displayed in simulated intercultural interactions, and responses that helps students progress along the continuum of cultural competency development.

Importance of institutional acceptance and support
The critical role of the institution’s administration in demonstrating its acceptance and support for incorporating cultural competency curricula in university courses is emphasised in the literature. Such support must be inscribed in Reconciliation statements, mission statements, vision statements and other corporate, operational and policy documents so that cultural competency initiatives are not dependent on individual ‘champions’. This is particularly crucial for the Engagement Model and its bottom-up strategies. Unless the university’s support for these programs is inscribed in relevant documents, foundation units and integrated units can be (and in some institutions have been) dropped or diluted when Deans or Heads of School move on to other positions or faculties and schools undergo restructuring.

Displaying symbols of Indigenous culture and knowledge (e.g., artwork) in university buildings also promotes and makes visible the institution’s acceptance and commitment to support the recognition of Indigenous knowledges and cultures. Exhibiting images of Indigenous culture and inscribing the support of the university administration in corporate, operational and policy documents is therefore an imperative to ensure the sustainability of cultural competency programs in Australian universities.

Conclusion
The literature indicates that while cultural competency education and training have been around for some time, mainly in the health care education sector, incorporating it into university undergraduate (and post graduate) programs continues to gain momentum. Because the concept of cultural competency is relatively new in Australia and the Australian Indigenous context, there is a need to develop a definition of Indigenous Australian CC, one that can be applied to a wide range of professions which deliver human services to members of Indigenous Australian communities.

This review suggests that the most common approach to introducing cultural competency education and training is using a bottom-up approach or an Engagement Model in which Indigenous academics engage colleagues in the relevant disciplines to form partnerships to organise stand-alone foundation units and/or integrated units. While ‘best practice’ models are yet to emerge in the university sector, a considerable amount of groundwork exists to provide the basis for introducing CC curricula. Further research is required, however, to ensure that the content and teaching/learning strategies are effective and yield benefits in the long term. Importantly, administrative acceptance and support are integral to ensuring that such initiatives are sustainable.
INTRODUCTION

The limited access that Australia’s Indigenous people have to culturally appropriate education, social, legal, justice, health and other human services is evidenced by the low levels of their educational attainment, health, general wellbeing and the extent to which Indigenous Australians participate in mainstream society and economy (e.g., ABS, 2008; SCRGSP, 2009; Zubrick et al., 2004). It has therefore become increasingly apparent that as Australian universities educate and train non-Indigenous students for the service professions, programs must provide students with the necessary knowledge, attitudes/values and skills that will enable them to engage with Indigenous clientele in culturally competent ways.

Reviewing the literature mainly from the United States (US), Canada, New Zealand and Australia, this paper focuses on the strategies used to introduce and implement cultural competency (CC) curricula at the university level. The background section defines CC and sets out the principles that underpin CC education and training. The discussion then turns to consider the two basic approaches to introducing CC curricula into universities: 1) the top-down and 2) bottom-up strategies, i.e., the Engagement Model. This is followed by a description of two conceptual understandings of CC development, which provide useful frameworks for CC curriculum design.

An overview of CC curricula is then presented. This section first examines three ways in which CC programs can be structured with respect to existing departmental courses. It then looks at the notion of best practice with respect to university courses, workshops as well as the concepts recommended for inclusion in CC curricula. The discussion then turns to identify content, teaching/learning activities as well as the procedures used to assess CC. Before concluding, the critical role of university administrators in supporting CC education and training at the organisational level is presented. The conclusion briefly summarises the main points of the paper, advocating an engagement model for introducing CC education and training at the university level.

It should be pointed out that in the discussions that follow, terms other than CC are sometimes used. While sharing similar understandings and aims as CC, terms such as intercultural competency and multicultural competency appearing reflect the demographic context in which they are applied. Other terms such as cultural awareness, cultural security, cultural respect and cultural safety are used by authors to describe their programs; however, these concepts are largely subsumed into the broader notion of CC. (See Grote, 2008 for further discussion on each of these terms.)

It is important to note that this paper focuses Indigenous CC because Indigenous Australians are uniquely positioned by their historical, colonial, social, political, cultural, economic and contemporary experiences (cf. Weaver, 1999 with regard to Native Americans). However, the CC understandings and skills that students learn will benefit future clientele from other marginalised groups as well as those from mainstream backgrounds.

BACKGROUND

The definition of CC and an outline of the principles that underpin CC pedagogy are presented here to provide the basis for discussing the literature focusing on the strategies to introduce CC curricula in universities; the approaches for structuring the curricula; as well as the content, teaching/learning activities and assessments that constitute CC curricula.
Defining cultural competency and culture

While CC education and training are widely endorsed across the service professions, there is little agreement on how CC can be defined or conceptualised (Sue, 2001). (See Grote, 2008 for a more in-depth review of how CC has been defined and conceptualised in the literature.) As yet, the literature does not provide a definition of Indigenous Australian CC. Therefore, for the purposes of the present paper, the definition presented is one that is promoted in the health care literature and has been applied to a wide range of service professions.

As such, CC has been described as a set of ‘congruent behaviors, attitudes, and policies that come together in a system, agency, or among professionals and enable that system, agency, or those professionals to work effectively in cross-cultural situations’ (Cross, Bazron, Dennis & Isaacs, 1989 or 1999, cited for example by Campinha-Bacote, Yahle, & Langenkamp, 1996; Chun, 2010; King, Sims, & Osher, n.d.; National Association of Social Workers. National Committee on Racial and Ethnic Diversity, 2001; The Lewin Group Inc., 2001). In this view, culture is described as ‘integrated patterns of human behaviour that include the language, thoughts, actions, customs, beliefs, and institutions of racial, ethnic, social or religious groups’ (Cross, Bazron, Dennis and Isaacs 1999, cited by Association of American Medical Colleges, 2005, p. 1).

In the context of service provision, particularly in health care, proponents of CC emphasise the need to address at least three dimensions of CC: 1) the organisational, 2) systemic and 3) individual practitioner (e.g., Betancourt, Green, & Carillo, 2002; Betancourt, Green, Carrillo, & Ananeh-Firempong, 2003; Campinha-Bacote, Yahle, & Langenkamp, 1996; King, Sims, & Osher, n.d.; National Association of Social Workers. National Committee on Racial and Ethnic Diversity, 2001; The Lewin Group Inc., Linkins, McIntosh, Bell, & Chong, 2001; U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Office of Minority Health, 2001).

Other dimensions of CC proposed in the literature include those relating to professional associations and the broader society (e.g., National Health & Medical Research Council, 2006; Sue, 2001). While examining CC at the societal level is beyond the scope of this paper, the role of professional associations is relevant in terms of curriculum approval by professional accreditation boards (e.g., Ranzijn, McConnochie, Day, Nolan, & Wharton, 2008).

In the main, this paper focuses on CC at the level of the individual in terms of how future service professionals can be educated and trained to prepare them for delivering their services in culturally competent ways. However, the role of the organisation is also addressed in terms of the institutional support required for sustaining CC programs. The importance of providing organisational support for CC programs is revisited below.

Principles of Indigenous cultural competency education/training

A set of pedagogical principles that can be used to guide the development of an Indigenous CC curriculum was synthesised and presented in a previous paper (Grote, 2008). The list is presented below because these principles necessarily undergird the development of CC curricula. The principles are drawn from recommendations proposed for university courses in the areas of (physical) health care (Mackean, 2005; Nash, Meiklejohn, & Sacre, 2006; Papps, 2005; Wepa, 2005), mental health (Ranzijn, McConnochie, & Nolan, 2007) and social work (Weaver, 1999). They have been adapted to apply to a broad spectrum of disciplines relevant to the education of the service professions across the university system, including the full range of physical and mental health services, social services, education, law, business and justice studies. The principles are not prioritised. They should be seen only as a starting point and can be refined further to articulate generic and/or discipline-specific requirements.
1. Australian Indigenous people have distinctive needs with regard to service provision because of the unique colonial, social, cultural, economic, political, historical and contemporary experiences that set them apart from others with culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. Indigenous CC should therefore be distinct from multicultural CC.

2. The nature of these factors and their influence on Indigenous communities need to be included in foundational content. These units need to provide opportunities for students to critique the role of their respective (future) professions in the lives of Indigenous people both in the past and the present day.

3. The provision of services to enhance the wellbeing of Indigenous people is an integral component in the education of practitioners (and researchers).

4. Foundational content on Indigenous issues should be introduced in dedicated compulsory units. When this is not possible, at the very least, foundational content on Indigenous matters should constitute half of the material covered in units devoted to multicultural or cross-cultural matters.

5. Adopting a strengths-based perspective of culture, diversity and identity can facilitate learning and reflection on attitudes and values.

6. To maximise learning outcomes, the integration of Indigenous CC content in curricula should be both horizontal and vertical. Issues and concepts introduced in foundational units should be revisited and integrated into a broad range of units taken later in the course.

7. The involvement of Indigenous staff members and formalised partnerships with representatives from Indigenous organisations and communities in the development of curricula is essential. This is to ensure that the teaching of Indigenous content and the presentation of Indigenous perspectives are both appropriate and respectful of Indigenous culture. Furthermore, Indigenous and non-Indigenous partnerships provide models of effective collaboration, bolster the credibility of the program in the eyes of students as well as Indigenous communities and organisations.

8. Learning (and research) settings should aim to foster positive encounters for all Indigenous and non-Indigenous participants.

9. A wide range of teaching and learning strategies, including the use of authentic case studies, should be incorporated into an Indigenous CC curriculum.

10. Different learning styles and methodologies should be taken into consideration when designing assessment instruments. Such evaluation tools should be transparent and reflect articulated learning outcomes.

11. Activities that promote the development of reflective skills, self-awareness and critical analysis should be integral components of learning and assessments.

12. Reflection and self-awareness activities should provide opportunities for non-Indigenous students to explore their understanding of their own cultural values and attitudes along with the concepts of whiteness and privilege.

13. Support needs to be provided for Indigenous and non-Indigenous staff members involved in teaching.

14. Indigenous staff members need to be provided with support and strategies to deal with racism. They should not be routinely delegated the responsibility of dealing with Indigenous matters.

15. While Indigenous students can make valuable contributions to enhance learning in the classroom with appropriate support, they should not be assigned this responsibility nor seen as representatives of Indigenous people.

(Grote, 2008, p. 22-23)
STRATEGIES TO INTRODUCE CULTURAL COMPETENCY CURRICULA INTO UNIVERSITIES

Based on a survey of the CC literature, there are two basic strategies used to introduce CC curricula to universities, including top-down and bottom-up approaches.

Top-down approach

The top-down approach is one in which the inclusion of CC curricula is mandated by policy from above, for example, by the Vice-Chancellor and the Academic Senate or Council. This ‘whole-of-institution’ (Charles Sturt University, 2010) strategy requires all (onshore) undergraduate curricula to incorporate Indigenous content and CC components. The approach adopted by Charles Sturt University forms part of its ‘ongoing commitment to reconciliation, social justice and the generation of informed graduates equipped with the knowledge and skills which enhance the development of attributes necessary for active and ethical local, national and global citizenship’ (Charles Sturt University, 2010).

To enable faculties and schools sufficient time to prepare, the integration of CC into curricula coincides with existing five-year course review cycles (Nolan, 2008). A range of options as to how CC content can be incorporated into existing programs is also provided. Governance of this process is undertaken by the Indigenous Board of Studies. The chair of the Board is held by the Director of the Centre for Indigenous Studies while other academic staff at the Centre participate as Board members.

This top-down approach to implementing an Indigenous CC across the university’s undergraduate courses may be unique as other instances a whole-of-university CC initiative could not be found in the literature.

Bottom-up approach: A model of engagement

The bottom-up approach appears to be more widespread in Australia, the US, Canada and New Zealand. This is evidenced by the independent, course specific approaches undertaken by staff in individual university departments, such as those in the disciplines of nursing (Anderson, 2008; Cuellar, Brennan, Vito, & de Leon Siantz, 2008; Guerin, Wyld, & Taylor, 2008; Nash, Meiklejohn, & Sacre, 2006), medicine (Betancourt, Green, & Carillo, 2002; Carter, Lewis, Sbrocco, & Tanenbaum, 2006; Paul, Carr, & Milroy, 2006), psychology (Ranzijn, McConnochie, Day, Nolan, & Wharton, 2008; Ranzijn, McConnochie, & Nolan, 2007), occupational therapy (Goddard & Gribble, 2006; Trentham, Cockburn, Cameron, & Iwama, 2007), law (Falk, 2007), justice studies (Carpenter, Field, & Barnes, 2002; Hudd & Field, 2006) and business studies (Treleaven et al., 2007).

Proponents of CC education suggest that when introducing CC components to existing curricula, it should be done in increments (Campinha-Bacote et al., 2005; Gilbert, 2003). This can be undertaken by organising a stand-alone unit in the first year of the program and then embedding CC content in more sophisticated, discipline specific forms in the advanced levels of the program (Campinha-Bacote et al., 2005; Gilbert, 2003). Once one department introduces CC curriculum into its programs, their program can then be promoted as a model for other departments. As in the approach adopted by Charles Sturt University, course renovations can be undertaken as they are scheduled for review. A foundation unit can be introduced to a cohort of first-year students and subsequent upper level units can be revamped and put in place as the cohort progresses through the system (Paul, Carr, & Milroy, 2006).
CONCEPTUALISING CULTURAL COMPETENCY DEVELOPMENT

CC education and training for future (and present) service professionals should be seen as an ongoing personal ‘journey’ (Ranzijn, McConnochie, Nolan, Day, & Severino, 2005), as students’ learning experiences begin to deepen their knowledge of culture and intercultural interactions and shape how these understandings can be applied during encounters with Indigenous clientele. Two conceptual models of CC development which can be useful for designing CC curricula are presented in this section.

Developmental model of intercultural sensitivity

A conceptual framework proposed by Bennett (1986, 1993, cited by Hammer, Bennett, & Wiseman, 2003) describes the process of CC development as entailing a continuum of six stages. Referred to as the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity, this framework describes the sequential (re)structuring of worldviews as the individual’s responses to cultural difference become increasingly more sophisticated through conscious experience and reflection over time. In this view, it is the structuring of one’s worldview orientation that shapes attitudes and informs behavioural responses to cultural difference (Hammer & Bennett, 2001; Hammer, Bennett, & Wiseman, 2003).

In the context of this model, the term intercultural sensitivity refers to ‘the ability to discriminate and experience relevant cultural differences’; and intercultural competence is described as ‘the ability to think and act in interculturally appropriate ways’ (Hammer, Bennett, & Wiseman, 2003, p. 422). Hammer and colleagues contend that as intercultural sensitivity increases, so does the level of intercultural skills. It is important to note that the definition of intercultural competence is consistent with that describing CC (in relation to the individual) so that Bennett’s framework may be useful for developing CC curriculum models for university courses aimed at preparing service professionals. Because of its focus on cognitive processes and worldview, it may be less suitable for analysing the CC of organisations.

Bennett’s framework draws on personal construct theory and radical constructivism as developed by Kelly (1963, Bennett & Bennett, 2004), which posits that ‘experience is a function of our categorization, or construing, of events’ (p. 153). Individuals must therefore take notice of cultural phenomena in order to experience and make sense of it. The acquisition of such knowledge through the senses is therefore recognised as an active (rather than passive) process by which individuals build on knowledge previously acquired. In this view, it is through cognitive processes that emerging information is adapted in relation to existing understandings about how the world is organised, i.e., in one’s cultural worldview (Hammer, Bennett, & Wiseman, 2003).

As individuals consciously engage in intercultural experiences and more information is provided, their interpretation of their experiences become more complex. The cognitive process of resolving inconsistencies between new information and previous understandings is undertaken, their worldview undergoes restructuring. As this restructuring takes place and their worldview orientation shifts, they progress through sequential stages from initially simplistic understandings to more complex experiences of cultural difference.

In Bennett’s model the sequential development of intercultural sensitivity is viewed as a consequence of cognitive processing. Indeed research with teachers on their ability to develop an understanding of the needs of students from diverse cultural backgrounds has demonstrated that empathetic responses in cross-cultural interactions requires higher levels of cognitive processing (Eberly, Rand, & O’Connor, 2007). Hammer, Bennett and Wiseman (2003) maintain that ‘the more perceptual and conceptual discriminations that can be brought to bear on the
event, the more complex will be the construction of the event, and thus the richer will be the experience’ (p. 423). In this view, the event in the context of cross-cultural interactions is the experience of cultural difference. One of the advantages of this model is that it can be used for assessing one’s own development (Louie, 1996).

The stages of Bennett’s model (Bennett & Bennett, 2004; Hammer, Bennett, & Wiseman, 2003) include the following:

Denial → Defence → Minimisation → Acceptance → Adaptation → Integration

The first three phases are characterised as ethnocentric in that the individual’s own culture continues to represent the reality through which experience is construed. For example, in the denial stage, individuals recognise only their own culture as the ‘real’ one. During the defence stage they begin to acknowledge the existence of other cultures; however, at this stage their worldview structure delimits their understanding so that they see their own culture as the ideal and other cultures as inferior (Hammer & Bennett, 2001).

Hammer, Bennett and Wiseman (2003) point out that in some cases individuals experience a variant form of the defence stage, which they refer to as reversal. These individuals are seen to adopt the culture of the other, valuing it more highly than their own. This is sometimes colloquially referred to “going native” or “passing” (p. 424). It is similar to the defence stage in that the person embraces a polarised understanding of the two cultures; however, it differs in that the individual does not view the other culture as a threat. During the minimisation stage, aspects of one’s own culture are understood to be universal to the extent that they are seen to constitute the underlying basis for all cultures and that the cultural differences perceived are recognised as merely superficial (Hammer & Bennett, 2001).

Unlike the first three ethnocentric stages during which individuals adopt evasive strategies regarding cultural difference, the latter three stages are characterised by ethnorelativism. In these latter stages, cultural differences are consciously sought and the individual’s culture is contextualised by others (Hammer, Bennett, & Wiseman, 2003). During the acceptance stage, the person experiences other cultures as having the same complexity as their own, viewing them as alternative constructions of reality. When individuals progress to the adaptation phase, they are able to switch their perspectives from one cultural understanding to another so that their experience includes both (Hammer, Bennett, & Wiseman, 2003).

The final stage of integration is not necessarily superior to the previous stage in terms of cultural competence, but is useful for descriptive purposes. At this stage the experience of self is expanded, enabling one to shift in and out of different cultural worldviews such that one’s own identities may be at the periphery of two or more cultures, but not central to any (Hammer & Bennett, 2001; Hammer, Bennett, & Wiseman, 2003). Hammers, Bennett and Wiseman (2003, after Bennett, 1993) note that ‘cultural marginality’ (p. 425) can manifest in two ways: In the encapsulated form, individuals tend to distance themselves from their own culture, experiencing a kind of alienation; whereas in the constructive form they are able to shift in and out of different cultural worldviews as needed while associating positive element with one’s own identities.

**Developmental model of cultural competency**

Wells (2000) draws on and synthesises concepts proposed by health care education scholars (Cross, Bazron, Dennis and Isaac, 1989, cited by Campinha-Bacote, Yahle, & Langenkamp, 1996;
Orlandi, 1992/1998) as well as those in Bennett’s model (1986, 1993, cited by Hammer, Bennett, & Wiseman, 2003) to construct a framework of cultural competency that can be used to describe CC development. Unlike Bennett’s model, however, Wells’s framework appears to focus less on underlying cognitive developments in relation to worldview structuring and more on the attitudes and behaviours that manifest in intercultural interactions. This framework can therefore be applied beyond the level of the individual to include the dimensions of organisations, systems, professional associations and society at large.

Wells’s (2000) framework also comprises a continuum of six stages as follows:

Incompetence → Knowledge → Awareness → Sensitivity → Competence → Proficiency

As in Bennett’s model, the six stages are divided into two overarching phases. The first three stages of the process are referred to as the ‘cognitive phase’ (pp. 191-192) because development requires the acquisition of knowledge about the dimensions of culture generally and specifically regarding particular target groups. At the level of incompetence, the individual has no understanding of the cultural impact of their professional practices on health care delivery. During the second stage, ‘cultural knowledge’, the student learns about aspects of culture and their own role in identifying and guiding relevant (e.g., health care) behaviours. In the ‘cultural awareness’ period, the individual recognises and understands the impact of the practices of their profession in relation to culture (Wells, 2000).

The three remaining stages of the model are characterised as the ‘affective phase’ (Wells, 2000, p. 192-193) of CC development to the extent that ‘the goal is attitudinal and behavioural change’ (p. 193). As such it requires professional experience interacting with clients from other cultures as well as ‘an investment and commitment to cultural diversity’ (p. 193).

Stage four in this framework, ‘cultural sensitivity’, is seen as the stage in which knowledge and awareness of the culture is integrated into professional practice. The fifth stage, ‘cultural competence’, is described as the level at which culturally appropriate practices are routinely applied. The final stage of ‘cultural proficiency’ is described as the ability to integrate cultural competency throughout one’s ‘repertoire for scholarship’, including ‘practice, teaching, and research’ (Wells, 2000, p. 193) and a ‘mastery’ (p. 192) of all stages.

In summary, these two models each use a sequence of six stages to describe different but related aspects of CC development. Bennett’s model focuses on individual service providers in an attempt to explain the underlying orientation of their worldview and how this worldview is subject to restructuring from simple to more complex understandings as they consciously engage in intercultural interactions over time. This model may be useful for identifying teaching and learning strategies to promote development.

On the other hand, Wells’s (2000) model describes observable attitudinal and behavioural changes that develop through the acquisition of knowledge, which in turn influences attitudes and behaviours particularly in the latter stages of development. This model has been adapted to identify and map content for CC curricula and is discussed in further detail below. While the processes described by Wells are generally applied to individuals, they may also be applicable metaphors to describe the orientation of organisations as well as that of systems, professional organisations and society at large. Both models suggest that CC education and training should be sustained over a period of time and that knowledge about the target culture should be

---

3 Although Wells (2000) attributes the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity model to Louie (1996), Louie’s presentation of the framework in a textbook chapter appears without attribution or explanation of the cognitive theories that underpin the model. It also post-dates Bennett’s publication of the same model.
complemented by opportunities to engage in intercultural experiences to promote CC development.

DEVELOPING CULTURAL COMPETENCY CURRICULA

This section looks at the literature on CC curricula with regard to possible structures, notions of ‘best practice’, and proposals for CC content, teaching/learning strategies and assessment procedures. Although some of the models presented below also include programs designed exclusively for Indigenous students (e.g., Charles Sturt University, 2010), the focus of the present discussion is on programs targeting non-Indigenous undergraduate university students.

It is important to note that in the development of CC curricula, item 7 in the Principles of Cultural Competency (outlined above) highlights the importance of establishing an Indigenous advisory board to guide any development of undergraduate curricula to ensure they are appropriate and respectful of Indigenous culture.

Possible structures for cultural competency curricula

The literature on CC programs indicates three basic approaches to CC education and training in university courses for non-Indigenous students, including the following:

1) Stand-alone foundation units;
2) Integration of CC components across course units; or
3) Combining a stand-alone foundation unit with CC content embedded across subsequent units.

Different perspectives about which model is best appear in the literature. Some authors argue that a single stand-alone unit cannot provide sufficient training for students to become competent (Sonn, 2008; Tomlinson-Clarke, 2000). With respect to medical education, for example, Furman and Dent (2004) concur, maintaining that for medical students, stand-alone units are likely to compete with the ‘hard’ science units in terms of the way students schedule their study time. They contend that medical students often regard behavioural sciences (and perhaps social sciences) as ‘common-sense information’ (p. 24). (See also Wachtler & Troein, 2003 on this issue.) In the US, mastery of the information is not required for the Medical Licensing Examination, so students may not be able to justify devoting sufficient time to the unit material.

Furman and Dent (2004) therefore support CC as a compulsory ‘curriculum thread’ (p. 23) which should be presented where relevant in a similar way that ethics is incorporated into medical curricula. Calvillo and colleagues (2009) concur, but warn that CC should not simply be tacked onto existing curricula, recommending a complete ‘review and revision’ (p. 139) of units.

They caution, however, that ‘all models require a “champion” to support the idea of integrating these important topics in order to address the usual bureaucratic frustrations associated with changing medical education curricula’ (p. 23). In contrast, Mackean and colleagues (2007) maintain that (medical) CC programs should neither rely on ‘champions’ (p. 544) nor depend on stand-alone elective units; rather, curriculum frameworks should ‘be embedded into the life’ (p. 544) of the course. Moreover, the integration of CC into the curriculum must be done in a systematic and visible way (Wachtler & Troein, 2003).

Ranzijn, McConnochie, Day, Nolan and Wharton (2008) point out that the third option might be best in terms of Indigenous CC. They argue that stand alone units on their own encourage a ‘them-and-us’ attitude (p. 133) and integrating Indigenous content across undergraduate units can put coherency at risk when presenting Indigenous issues.
While the literature suggests that the first two options are the most common approaches, the third structure in which a stand-alone foundation unit is combined with embedded content across the course units is made available to faculties and schools at Charles Sturt University (Charles Sturt University, 2010).

In terms of integrating CC curricula into existing programs, Watts, Cuellar and O’Sullivan (2008) describe a ‘blueprint’ developed for the School of Nursing at the University of Pennsylvania in the US. Introduced over a five year period, the framework entailed eight ‘action steps’ (p. 138) involved in the integration process. These include the following:

1) The appointment of a Director of Diversity Affairs, who oversaw the initiative, developed a plan for recruiting staff and students, and identified strategies for creating a culturally inclusive environment;
2) The identification of a ‘Master Teachers Taskforce on Cultural Diversity’ (p. 138) who were responsible for developing a ‘blueprint’ for integrating CC content, overseeing the curriculum changes, and serving as resource, and disseminating information about the process;
3) The Organisation and implementation of an intensive professional development program, involving a wide range of activities over the five year period, e.g., a series of 35 lectures;
4) Information sharing about CC, in which Master Teachers disseminated information and updates to relevant parties, e.g., the dean, associate dean for education, faculty senate, curriculum committees, course and program directors;
5) Development of ‘innovative teaching approaches’ (p. 139) in the form of a series of 16 short (4-5 minute) clinical films and accompanying facilitators guidelines and handouts for students to be used by staff;
6) Involvement of students in questionnaires and focus groups to get feedback on the curriculum;
7) Development of a *Blueprint for Integration of Cultural Competence in the Curriculum* which was used as a guideline for teaching, but also as the basis for eliciting feedback from staff and students;
8) Surveys of teaching staff over a two year period using the *Blueprint for Integration of Cultural Competence in the Curriculum* to monitor the delivery of the curriculum.

This model provides strategies for a comprehensive approach to integrating CC in individual departments.

‘Best practice’ models of Cultural Competency training curricula

This section looks at the notion of ‘best practice’ in CC training in relation to university education and in-service workshops. The discussion assumes that ‘best practice’ refers to evidence-based practices.

University level

Although training for cross-cultural encounters has been around for more than 20 years and there are signs of progress (Campinha-Bacote, 2006), there is little evidence to support the effectiveness of teaching/learning strategies for CC training in universities (Campinha-Bacote, 2006; Cuellar, Brennan, Vito, & de Leon Siantz, 2008; Grant & Letzring, 2005). This assertion is supported by the corpus of literature describing a range of different undergraduate university courses, none of which use the term ‘best practice’ to describe them (Carpenter, Field, & Barnes, 2002; Cuellar, Brennan, Vito, & de Leon Siantz, 2008; Falk, 2007; Guerin, Wyld, & Taylor, 2008; Hudd & Field, 2006; Nash, Meiklejohn, & Sacre, 2006; Paul, Carr, & Milroy, 2006;
Workshops

Outside the university context, best practice recommendations have been proposed for in-service training workshops in the health sector (Farrelly & Lumby, 2009; National Rural Faculty - Royal Australian College of General Practitioners, 2004). However, these claims are not substantiated by rigorous research. Farrelly and Lumby (2009) note a few evaluation studies, including those relying on participant perceptions (Fredericks, 2003, cited by Farrelly & Lumby, 2009; Valadian, Chittleborough, & Wilson, 2000). They also cite a meta-analytic review of 34 evaluations on CC programs in health care, which indicate that interventions may be effective (Beach et al., 2005). However, Beach and colleagues (2005) point out that the extent to which CC training raises the levels of patients’ compliance with recommended therapies, their health outcomes or equity in service delivery has not been demonstrated. Moreover, another meta-analytic study in which 45 assessment instruments were examined found that most assessment instruments could not be validated (Gozu et al., 2007). (The reliability and validity of evaluation instruments is revisited below in relation to assessment procedures in curricula.)

Several authors highlight the need for research investigating the effectiveness of particular teaching/learning strategies and the content of training (Altshuler, Sussman, & Kachur, 2003; Beach et al., 2005; Grant & Letzring, 2005). Moreover, while some studies show improvements in students’ knowledge and attitudes in pre-test and post-test assessments, research is needed to determine the long term benefits of such interventions (Pilcher, Charles, & Lancaster, 2008).

Because of the lack of substantial research evidence, claims about ‘best practice’ should be taken with caution. Nonetheless, the ‘best practice’ recommendations proposed by Farrelly and Lumby (2009) and the National Rural Faculty of the Royal Australian College of General Practitioners (2004) are included in the discussions below in relation to unit content, teaching/learning strategies and assessment procedures.

‘Best practice’ concepts


CC programs which provide opportunities for ‘cultural interface’ (Nakata, 2002, 2007) can facilitate the negotiation of the complexities of Indigenous and non-Indigenous understandings from different cultural ‘standpoints’. The provision of such spaces can inform the development of CC curricula and become the focus of classroom discussion. That which constitutes Indigenous perspectives and knowledge is a highly contentious issue which resonates globally among Indigenous people (Nakata, 2007), particularly in the context of mainstream university courses which are dominated by Western colonial understandings. Any attempt at ‘decolonising’ education requires such a debate (McLaughlin & Whatman, 2008). In this view, it is critical to ensure that Indigenous academics and Indigenous advisory boards are involved in determining the nature and presentation of content in foundation units to ensure that the
The use of critical race theory is promoted by Hart (2003) to undergird teaching and learning in order to challenge ‘students’ dominant epistemological and ontological beliefs about themselves, and the world they share with Aboriginal peoples’ (p. 12). Critical race theory is discussed in more detail below in relation to how students can explore the notion of whiteness.

Sonn (2008) states that whiteness studies can complement curriculum decolonisation endeavours in that they provide a vehicle to interrogate and transform understandings associated with the dominant culture as it addresses racism and investigates ‘how white people’s identities and positions are shaped by racialised cultures’ (p. 157). Sonn asserts that this is particularly important in a nation like Australia where whiteness is ‘often invisible...[and] not considered a racial identity’ (p. 160). By focusing on whiteness in the classroom, it can be rendered ‘visible’ as well as ‘complicated’ (p. 160). Although whiteness is usually associated with people of Anglo-Australian background, in the multicultural context of Australia, as in other English speaking countries, there is a hierarchy of whiteness (Sonn, 2008, after Hage, 1998), in which an ‘Anglo-aristocracy’ (p. 160) remains firmly entrenched at the top, followed by those from other European nations. (The ways in which whiteness can be explored in the classroom are discussed below in the section on teaching and learning strategies.)

Kumashiro’s (2000) work on anti-oppressive education, or ‘education that works against various forms of oppression’ (p. 25) is also mentioned as useful to inform the embedding of Indigenous perspectives. Kumashiro’s four-fold approach to implement anti-oppressive education includes: ‘Education for the other, Education about the Other, Education that is critical of Privileging and Othering, and Education that Changes Students and Society’ (p. 25). An important aim of anti-oppressive education is to challenge and destabilise the authority of the dominant culture in determining ‘norms’ and what counts as ‘normal’ with regard to non-mainstream groups.

As previously mentioned, many of these concepts are included in the next section which draws on the literature to describe the content of CC curricula.

**CONTENT**

**Knowledge, values/attitudes, skills**

The literature indicates that three interactive dimensions of curriculum design must be taken into account to facilitate students’ development of CC as future service professionals, including: knowledge, values/attitudes and skills (Association of American Medical Colleges, 2005; Cavillo et al., 2009; Fung, Andermann, Zaretsky, & Lo, 2008; Furman & Dent, 2004; Harms, 2009; Ranzijn, McConnochie, & Nolan, 2010). This tripartite approach is consistent with that adopted for the development of an undergraduate nursing program in a US university in which CC training is integrated (Cuellar, Brennan, Vito, & de Leon Siantz, 2008). Cuellar and colleagues use Bloom’s taxonomy of learning domains to take into consideration the levels of ‘cognitive (knowledge), affective (attitude), and psychomotor (skills)’ (p. 145). (See also Smedley, Stith, & Nelson, 2002.) In this view, students must acquire foundational knowledge about the generic concept of culture and about Indigenous culture in particular as well as other important background information.

Other components of foundation units should provide opportunities for students to identify and critique their own personal values and beliefs, as well as those embraced by their future profession. Equipped with these understandings, they can become aware of how their own
cultural values and beliefs shape their own attitudes about the behaviours of clients from other cultures (Ranzijn, McConnochie, & Nolan, 2010). Students can be exposed to a repertoire of skills that will help prepare them for their roles as professionals to deliver their services in culturally appropriate ways. Some of these skills can be learned in the classroom, e.g., awareness of self can be enhanced by engagement in cognitive tasks requiring critical reflection on one’s own values and attitudes; however, others must be acquired through lived intercultural experience while working in the field (Ranzijn, McConnochie, & Nolan, 2010). All three dimensions of learning (knowledge, values/attitudes, skills) should therefore be addressed in the content of CC curricula.

**Topic areas**

Drawing on the literature on undergraduate courses in various disciplines\(^4\) (Carpenter, Field, & Barnes, 2002; Cavillo et al., 2009; Charles Sturt University, 2010; Cordero, 2008; Cuellar, Brennan, Vito, & de Leon Siantz, 2008; Dolhun, Munoz, & Grumbach, 2003; Falk, 2007; Harms, 2009; Hart & Moore, 2005; Hudd & Field, 2006; McConnochie, Egege, & McDermott, 2008; Mooney & Craven, 2005; Nash, Meiklejohn, & Sacre, 2006; Paul, Carr, & Milroy, 2006; Pilcher, Charles, & Lancaster, 2008; Ranzijn, McConnochie, Day, Nolan, & Wharton, 2008; Ranzijn, McConnochie, & Nolan, 2010; Richardson & Camyer, 2005; Sonn, 2008; Sonn, Garvey, Bishop, & Smith, 2000; Taylor & Guerin, 2010; Tulman & Watts, 2008; Walliss & Grant, 2000), the ‘best practice’ guidelines for CC curriculum content recommended for CC workshops for in-service practitioners (Farrelly & Lumby, 2009; National Rural Faculty - Royal Australian College of General Practitioners, 2004), and the ‘significant literature in best practice’ (McLaughlin & Whatman, 2008, p. 6) associated with embedding Indigenous content, a list of topic areas to be included in CC curricula has been compiled. It should be noted that this list is generic and needs to be adapted appropriately for the relevant discipline and service profession. The inventory of content topic areas includes the following:

- Concept and definition(s) of CC and its importance for the relevant sector;
- Concepts of *culture, race, ethnicity* and *worldview*;
- Pre-colonial and post-colonial Indigenous history in Australia, (e.g., including the European invasion; *terra nullius*, Indigenous wage forfeitures, the 1905 Act, the Stolen Generation, Royal Commission into Black Deaths in Custody)
- The diversity of Indigenous peoples and their cultures;
- Indigenous cultures (including the Dreaming, examples of Indigenous kinship and social structures);
- The effects of federal and state policies and legislation on Indigenous peoples in the past and the present;
- Current statistics regarding demographics and the status of Indigenous people regarding disparities between Indigenous and non-Indigenous (health, education, socio-economic status, etc. and how these aspects are interdependent);
- Human rights;

\(^4\) In the case of medical education, literature on medical schools in the US is included. Unlike Australia, medical education is taught at the post graduate level.
• Contemporary (and local) issues of concern and how these may need to be taken into consideration with regard to the particular profession and their delivery of services (e.g., the need for medical professionals to be aware that they need to seek out information about social or environmental factors that may have negative effects on the health and wellbeing of clientele in a particular locality);

• Indigenous cultures and cultural practices;

• Myths and misconceptions about and stereotypes of Indigenous people;

• Notions of whiteness, white privilege and power;

• Reflection on cultural identity, whiteness, privilege, values, beliefs, attitudes, prejudices and propensity to stereotype.

• Racism and anti-racist practices;

• Cross-cultural communication models and skills; and

• Identifying when interpreters are required and strategies for working with them.

It should be noted that reflections on the construct of whiteness may be questioned by students in the context of increasing diversity in Australian universities (Taylor & Guerin, 2010). Taylor and Guerin point out that students who do not view themselves as either white or Indigenous may not see the value of exploring the concept of whiteness. However, by investigating whiteness and privilege, students can explore the extent to which human service organisations, systems and associated practices are organised on the basis of predominantly white Western perspectives and worldviews (Taylor & Guerin, 2010). Activities for exploring whiteness are discussed in the section on Teaching and Learning Strategies below.

Many of the items on the list above were also identified by Indigenous people in focus groups when asked about the knowledge, skills and attributes that psychologists who work with Indigenous clientele should have. Ranzijn, McConnochie and Nolan (2010) synthesised the findings from this research to identify six basic categories of content that should be incorporated into CC training programs for psychology students as follows:

1. The nature and importance of culture in general;
2. Indigenous Australian cultures and histories;
3. The cultural values and attitudes of mainstream society and of the individual student;
4. Critical investigation of practices within the profession;
5. General skills and strategies for working in Indigenous settings;
6. Specific professional skills and strategies for working with Indigenous clientele.

These general areas of CC have been mapped onto a useful framework for organising content in stand-alone and integrated units in undergraduate and post graduate courses discussed in the next section.

Framework for mapping Indigenous content and Cultural Competency skills training

With the aim of systematising CC training, Ranzijn, Nolan and McConnochie (2008) draw on the research of Weaver (1999) with Native American social workers and the CC developmental framework developed by Wells (2000) to propose a model as a potential
starting point for mapping the content of Indigenous CC on to existing university psychology courses. However, the framework can also be applied to other courses as well.

Figure 1 below has been adapted from a version of this model⁵ which appears on a Charles Sturt University website (Nolan & McConnochie, 2008, cited by Charles Sturt University, 2010). It is suggested that the first four content areas (appearing in ascending order from bottom to top) can be incorporated into an Indigenous Studies stand-alone foundation unit. The fourth content area and aspects of the fifth can be integrated into other undergraduate course units. The authors recommend that the remaining elements of the fifth and those in the sixth content area are more appropriate for embedding in post-graduate programs.

Figure 1. Framework for mapping Indigenous CC content onto university courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTENT</th>
<th>Incompetence</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>Proficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. CC skills &amp; strategies specific to profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. General CC skills &amp; strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Critical investigation of professional practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Students’ own cultural values/attitudes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cultures &amp; histories Indigenous Australians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. General understandings of culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adapted from Ranzijn, Nolan, & McConnochie, 2008)

Although the matrix includes the whole continuum of CC development, Ranzijn and colleagues (2010) note that the starting point for some individuals may not be located at the level of cultural incompetence (lower left corner), but somewhere further along the continuum. Nonetheless, the aim is to provide the necessary content and learning activities to enable students to advance toward cultural proficiency as indicated by the arrow. The authors maintain that the process should not be seen as a linear one and is likely to vary with respect to different content areas. For example, some more skilled students may need to go back to review foundational concepts they are yet to master. Similarly, a student may be very aware of their own cultural values and attitudes because of intercultural experiences with other groups, but have little or no understanding of the cultures and histories of Australian Indigenous people or those in the local area in which they intend to work.

Nonetheless, Ranzijn and colleagues (2010) point out that the process of development is one that is ‘sequential and cumulative’ (p. 10) in that one must have a robust understanding of foundational knowledge (about culture, Indigenous history and culture and one’s own cultural values and attitudes) in order to progress to fully understand and acquire the skills associated

---

⁵ Different versions of this mapping model appear elsewhere (e.g., Charles Sturt University, 2010; McConnochie, Egege, & McDermott, 2008; Ranzijn, McConnochie, & Nolan, 2010).
with the more advanced components in the matrix. Importantly, the authors point out that ad hoc short term workshops on cultural awareness are unlikely to facilitate the development of CC as the ‘journey’ is a commitment requiring experience and learning over extended periods of time.

TEACHING AND LEARNING STRATEGIES

The following list of teaching and learning activities also draws on the literature describing undergraduate courses and includes recommendations from ‘best practice’ models for workshops. It should be noted that this list is generic and that it needs to be adapted to the specific disciplines and their associated service professions.

- Didactic lectures and seminars (delivered by Indigenous and non-Indigenous staff members working in partnership);
- Guest lecturers or speakers (e.g., Indigenous scholars, professionals or prominent members of the local Indigenous community who present alongside other Indigenous colleagues);
- Panel presentations (involving prominent Indigenous community members);
- Cultural immersion activities, e.g., visits to Indigenous communities or Indigenous organisations;
- Informal meetings with local Indigenous organisations;
- Guided cultural field trips, e.g., to museums, art centres;
- Workshops prepared and presented by students;
- Case study or ‘paper cases’ (Furman & Dent, 2004, p. 27), i.e., longitudinal case studies for discussion and analysis;
- Scenarios (video-recordings or readings) for discussion and analysis;
- Film excerpts discussed and analysed;
- Readings about life experiences (fiction and non-fiction);
- Critical incident for discussion and analysis;
- Continuous reflective activities, e.g., journaling, identity narratives (about self and others), reflections on readings, presentations;
- Portfolios (e.g., for analysing a media texts collected by students; personal critical incidents; analysing texts for white ‘cultural scripts’);
- Role play;
- ‘Games’ simulating cross-cultural encounters (e.g., BaFa BaFa, Welcome to the State of Poverty);
- Use of central website with links to relevant resources, organisations, etc. which can be used for CC foundation and integrated units;
- On-line forum discussions (e.g., available on Blackboard).

(Carpenter, Field, & Barnes, 2002; Cordero, 2008; Cuellar, Brennan, Vito, & de Leon Siantz, 2008; Farrelly & Lumby, 2009; Furman & Dent, 2004; Grant & Letzring, 2005; Guerin, Wyld, &
Lectures and Seminars

Lectures generally provide the basic concepts and theories students need to begin to understand and become sensitive to the general and discipline specific issues that form the basis upon which students can extend their understandings about intercultural issues in Australia and develop a ‘socially responsive knowledge’ base (Sonn, Garvey, Bishop, & Smith, 2000, p. 145). The literature highlights the importance of Indigenous and non-Indigenous lecturers working in partnership for the delivery of lectures in stand-alone units so that both perspectives can be presented (Hart & Moore, 2005; Ranzijn, McConnochie, Day, Nolan, & Wharton, 2008; Ranzijn, McConnochie, & Nolan, 2007). The visibility of such partnerships provides a model of collaboration and adds to the credibility of the program. Moreover, the involvement of Indigenous tutors can provide opportunities for students to get to know Indigenous people as individuals in informal ways (Ranzijn, McConnochie, & Nolan, 2007).

Guest speakers, panel presentations

Similarly, the integrity of the program can be bolstered by inviting Indigenous guest speakers who are prominent professionals in the local community or Indigenous lecturers from other disciplines. Planning for guest speakers should include arrangements to ensure cultural safety. One way of doing this is to organise panel discussions. At the very least, organisers must make certain that an Indigenous colleague (or more) can be present to provide support for the guest speakers. (See Grote, 2008 for further discussion on this matter.) Planning should also involve preparing students beforehand so that potential reactions are well managed and to avoid students feeling ‘guilt, self-blame or sentimental pity’ which can be demeaning and counterproductive (Ranzijn, McConnochie, & Nolan, 2007).

Field trips

Cultural immersion experiences are also advocated (e.g., Furman & Dent, 2004; Guerin, Wyld, & Taylor, 2008; Sloand, Groves, & Braeger, 2004). Personal experience in marginalised communities and opportunities for students to develop relationships with individual Indigenous people can be important to enhance student understandings about race and racism (Johnson, 2002). Such interactions can open up what has been referred to as ‘the third space’ (Hart & Moore, 2005, after Bhabha, 1994) in which students ‘rethink long established understandings about culture and identity so that they [can] arrive at more inclusive alternatives’ (p. 4). Guided tours of museums and art centres can extend students’ understandings about Indigenous history and culture (Ranzijn, McConnochie, & Nolan, 2007).

While relatively short visits are unlikely to lead to long-term relationships, they can provide culturally safe environments for initial experiences for non-Indigenous students, most of whom have probably never spent time with Indigenous people. One of the participants in Johnson’s (2002) study of ‘anti-racist’ white teachers observed that learning about the experiences of a marginalised cultural group is similar to learning a language. One must be immersed in the community for an extended period of time to begin to understand their experiences of race and racism. As is the case with Indigenous guest speakers, field trip organisers must ensure that
the learning environment in which the meeting takes place promotes interactions that are positive and culturally safe (National Rural Faculty - Royal Australian College of General Practitioners, 2004; Ranzijn, McConnochie, & Nolan, 2010).

**Reflective activities**

Students should be provided with vehicles such as journals, portfolios (paper or electronic, as available on Blackboard) or online discussion forums to enable students to reflect on and critique their own culture and intercultural experiences (Carpenter, Field, & Barnes, 2002; National Rural Faculty - Royal Australian College of General Practitioners, 2004; Poirier et al., 2009) and others teaching and learning activities. These could include responses to readings, for example, about Indigenous histories, present and past government policies, racism, whiteness and cross-cultural communication (Guerin, Wyld, & Taylor, 2008; Ranzijn, McConnochie, & Nolan, 2007). Readings about life experiences, fiction or non-fiction, which encourage identification with the individuals or characters portrayed are also recommended (He & Cooper, 2009; Sloand, Groves, & Braeger, 2004; Westberg, Bumgardner, & Lind, 2005). Other stimuli for group discussion and personal reflection include case studies (Carpenter, Field, & Barnes, 2002), scenario video-recordings, films or film excerpts (Guerin, Wyld, & Taylor, 2008), print literature, cross-cultural encounter games, media representations of Indigenous people (Carpenter, Field, & Barnes, 2002), personal critical incidents (Cuellar, Brennan, Vito, & de Leon Siantz, 2008), identity narratives (Carpenter, Field, & Barnes, 2002), life history narratives (Johnson, 2002) or cultural portfolios written by the student himself/herself or another students (Johnson, 2002; Lea, 2004).

‘Paper cases’ (Furman & Dent, 2004, p. 27) can also provide stimuli for discussion and reflection. These are a form of case studies in which the lecturer provides students with an initial description of a client’s case for students to discuss. Successive information sheets are then supplied to students, each of which is read and discussed in turn to simulate long term information gathering from a client over a series of encounters.

**Role plays**

Role plays can provide opportunities to practice skills usually in the context of interviews between the service provider and a client. These can offer opportunities for students to experience interviewing and negotiating with clients or what it feels like to being positioned in the role of the client (Cuellar, Brennan, Vito, & de Leon Siantz, 2008; Furman & Dent, 2004). While role plays have been criticised for their ‘artificial and unrealistic’ (Furman & Dent, 2004, p. 7) nature, the classroom setting can provide a safe environment for practicing skills. Furman and Dent (2004) emphasise the need for role plays to be short (approximately five minutes) and that scripts should be brief (maximum one page) to enable students to quickly access the main points. Class discussions can follow to analyse the level of effectiveness of the strategies used.

**Games simulating cross-cultural experiences**

The *Bafa Bafa* game is one that is commercially available to provide opportunities for simulated cross-cultural experience. Participants are divided into two cultural groups (Alpha and Beta), each of which has its own set of cultural rules (Furman & Dent, 2004; Westberg, Bumgardner, & Lind, 2005). The Alpha culture is orientated around relationships, has a patriarchal social structure and stringent rules about social behaviours. The Beta group’s culture is a highly competitive trading society. Participants learn about the cultural group they are assigned to, then send out emissaries to visit the other culture and return with information about the other
culture to share with their own group. Other visitor exchanges take place until all participants have experienced the other culture. The students’ simulated cross-cultural experiences can then become the focus of discussions in groups and in individual reflective journals/portfolios.

In the *Welcome to the State of Poverty* simulation activity, students are assigned to families of different sizes, with various structures, parental ages, ethnicities and resources available to them (Chapman & Gibson, 2006; Furman & Dent, 2004). While engaging with various community service providers, families try to ensure sufficient food and housing to sustain them. Qualitative and quantitative studies have shown that participants increased their level of empathy and understandings about issues faced by low-income families in the short term, though the long term effects have not been determined (Chapman & Gibson, 2006).

Sonn (2008) notes that as a lecturer in units like these, he keeps a reflective journal about his own observations in class so that he may discuss these with colleagues teaching similar units at other universities.

**Exploring whiteness**

Critical race theory offers a range of tools for reflection and analysis of content presented in case studies, scenarios, critical incidents, films and other texts. It encompasses three related content areas identified in the previous section, including the notions of *whiteness, racism,* and the myths, misconceptions and stereotypes of Indigenous people (DeCuir & Dixson, 2004). Referred to as the ‘tenets’ of the theory, ‘counter-story telling’, the ‘permanence of racism’, ‘whiteness as property’, ‘interest convergence’, and the ‘critique of liberalism’ (p. 27) can provide CC students with practical analytical structures for systematically interrogating the narratives presented in various resources used for teaching and learning activities in CC curricula. A useful example of how this can be done is provided by DeCuir and Dixon (2004) who illustrate the use of tools associated with critical race theory to explore the narratives of two middle to upper class African American students in an elite school with mostly white students.

Students can be encouraged to explore whiteness using narratives in different forms (e.g., film segments, personal histories, descriptions of critical intercultural incidents). These different (visual and print-based) texts can be used by students as data for analysis. The literature provides various approaches to how these can be analysed in relation to racial/cultural identity construction and how this informs intercultural interactions in professional practice (e.g., Hyland, 2005; Johnson, 2002; Lampert, 2003; Lea, 2004).

Lea (2004), for example, examines the narratives her white student teachers wrote about artefacts, symbols, family histories or critical events in their ‘Cultural Portfolios’ (p. 120). She critiqued these texts in relation to the (white) cultural scripts which she describes as the ‘different ways of thinking, feeling, believing, and acting... [that] shape our actions’ (p. 116). Lea notes how ‘public cultural scripts’, i.e., those embraced by the dominant mainstream society, shaped the ‘personal cultural scripts’ (p. 120) of the teachers in her study and how these guided their professional practices.

Metaphor analysis is another approach to interrogating whiteness. This method was adopted by Hyland (2005) in her ethnographic study of white schoolteachers who considered themselves to be ‘good’ teachers of minority students. Hyland collected data in a series of interviews undertaken with the teachers over a three-year period and identified various terms the teachers used to describe themselves. These included ‘helper, benefactor, White, Hispanic, role model, cultural interpreter, activist, radical’ (p. 437). She then critiqued how these metaphors were realised in vignettes told by the teachers about their experiences working with minority
students. Despite their good intentions, the teachers’ practices were ‘unwittingly’ found to ‘perpetuate a racist status quo’ (p. 430).

The case study research of Johnson (2002) illustrates at least two teaching and learning strategies that can be applied in the context of CC units. Both involve the analysis of narratives provided in cases studies which elicit the life stories of outstanding professionals. The first approach is one adopted by Johnson in her exploration of teacher attitudes toward race and culture. The participants in Johnson’s study were white American teachers of racially diverse classes who were identified by a panel of lecturers and multicultural trainers who had taught them in classes and/or were aware of their involvement in pro-diversity organisations.

Johnson collected the life stories of the white teachers in a series of successive individual interviews and analysed their narratives to identify and categorise patterns and themes that appeared to relate to their enhanced racial/cultural awareness. Johnson identified three major emergent themes associated with the professional development of the teachers, including personal experiences 1) which fostered the development of insider perspectives, e.g., interracial marriage; 2) in which they worked in interracial organisations promoting social justice; and/or 3) in which they were marginalised, e.g., for sexual orientation or poverty. Similar approaches to analysing case studies could be adopted in the context of CC training.

A second approach would be to use Johnson’s (2002) case studies (or similar life narratives of exemplar professionals) to illustrate and discuss the stages of CC development using Bennett’s model outlined above (1986, 1993, cited by Hammer, Bennett, & Wiseman, 2003). For example, Johnson describes how one participant was asked if she saw herself as ‘color-blind’ (p. 161) after her extensive experience working with African American and immigrant children from other ethnic backgrounds. Refusing to recognise racial (or cultural) difference and claiming to treat all students the same is a common strategy for displaying and practicing what one believes is racial equality (Hyland, 2005). According to Bennett’s model, this stance might be characterised as minimisation.

The teacher in Johnson’s study acknowledged that early in her career, her ‘liberal mentality’ (p. 161) led her to believe that she should not take account of a student’s race. However, she indicated that she had since learned how race, and more importantly, culture shapes one’s experience. She reported that this awareness had led her to understand that children from marginalised groups experienced life differently from those with mainstream cultural backgrounds and that cultural difference must be taken into consideration. In terms of Bennett’s model (1986, 1993, cited by Hammer, Bennett, & Wiseman, 2003), this teacher’s description of her own awareness and approach to teaching minority students suggests that she had moved beyond the minimisation stage of ethnocentric perspectives.

**Internet websites**

Websites can be designed to provide resources for staff (Charles Sturt University, 2010; Nash, Meiklejohn, & Sacre, 2006) and students (Nash, Meiklejohn, & Sacre, 2006; Nash, Sacre, & Meiklejohn, 2008). Website links can provide either on-line sources of information for students, e.g., the Human Rights Commission, or an interactive forum for discussion and reflection (Guenin, Wylde, & Taylor, 2008).
ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES

There are currently at least 85 tools available that have been developed for measuring intercultural competency (Fantini, 2006); however, it is important to identify what is to be assessed in relation to identified learning objectives (Deardroff, 2010). Moreover, Deardorff suggests that more than one assessment methods should be used and that the development of evaluation instruments should build on existing instruments or methods and be undertaken in collaboration with colleagues.

The following list is a synthesis of the evaluation methods identified in the literature which focus mainly on undergraduate courses. Most of these assessment activities are designed to encourage students to engage with and reflect on the literature as well as their own experiences. They are organised in relation to four major categorical approaches to assessment (Gregorczyk & Bailit, 2008):

Quantitative:
- Traditional examinations using multiple choice, short answer and true/false questions and essay formats (pre-tests and post-test);

Qualitative:
- Case study analysis (oral presentations or written essays, papers);
- Oral presentations by individual student or group (e.g., on aspects of culture);
- Choice of essay topics (e.g., 2000 words) requiring students to engage with and reflect on culture and professional cross-cultural interactions;
- Reflections on readings recorded in a journal, chosen at random for marking;
- Written papers or reports;
- Portfolios (analysis of media samples and personal critical incidents);
- Reflective journal entries;
- Reflective responses to guest speaker presentations.

Practical:
- Client assessments;

Self-assessment:
- Self-evaluations administered at start and end of unit.

(Carpenter, Field, & Barnes, 2002; Cuellar, Brennan, Vito, & de Leon Siantz, 2008; Furman & Dent, 2004; Guerin, Wyld, & Taylor, 2008; Nash, Meiklejohn, & Sacre, 2006; Paul, Carr, & Milroy, 2006; Poirier et al., 2009; Ranzijn, McConnachie, & Nolan, 2007; Sonn, Garvey, Bishop, & Smith, 2000)

In Gregorczyk and Bailit’s (2008) review of the four types of CC assessment procedures (used in medical education), the authors indicate that each has advantages and disadvantages. While quantitative exams are easy to administer in classroom settings and can indicate the proportion of material the student has mastered, the content is constrained by including only items that have correct or incorrect answers. They are also unable to evaluate improvements in behaviour in intercultural encounters.

Qualitative assessments can provide a greater range of teaching strategies and learning experiences. Guerin, Wyld and Taylor (2008) make a case for using weekly reflective responses to readings and an essay on one of four topics to encourage engagement with and reflection on issues. They assert that these provide opportunities for staff to assess the changes in student attitudes and understandings about Indigenous (health) issues. Gregorczyk and Bailit (2008)
note, however, that such assessments of the learners’ understandings and attitudes will always be subjective.

Betancourt (2003) proposes a framework for assessing medical students on completion of cross-cultural units which emphasises the importance of changes in students with respect to all three domains - attitudes, knowledge and skills. For example, to assess shifts in attitudes, Betancourt recommends using standardised survey instruments, structured interviews (with actors/clients) and self-awareness assessments. To measure the acquisition of core knowledge, pre-tests and post-tests using traditional examination methods are advised.

Other assessment strategies can be applied for measuring different combinations of the three domain areas. For example, video-taping clinical encounters can be used to assess skills as well as attitudes; and (clinical) case presentations and objective exams can provide the necessary information for evaluating all three domain areas (Betancourt, 2003). While these assessment techniques may not be appropriate for students of all service professions, the model highlights the need to ensure that all three dimensions are evaluated. Moreover, consideration should be given to the value of administering pre-test and post-test assessments.

Furman and Dent (2004) emphasise the value of formative feedback and that it is often best when given in small groups. They advise instructors to keep in mind that the overall aim of feedback is to help the student progress along the continuum of CC. In the sections that follow, the three types of formative feedback recommended by Furman and Dent (2004) are discussed, including: 1) ‘student self-assessment’; 2) ‘behaviour-specific feedback’; and 3) ‘action-based feedback’ (p. 20).

Student self-assessments

Self-assessments can be useful for measuring student perceptions of their attitudes toward diverse groups, their capacity to deliver services and their understandings about CC in their discipline area (Cavillo et al., 2009; Gregorczyk & Bailit, 2008; Nash, Meiklejohn, & Sacre, 2006). Furman and Dent (2004) point out that this form of assessment can be useful as a needs analysis to inform teaching. However, Gregorczyk and Bailit (2008) note that the extent to which the results of such tests provide accurate information about students’ progress in developing positive attitudes and development of skills is questionable. This is demonstrated in Gozu and colleagues’ (2007) review of 45 instruments reported in the literature, which indicates that only 6 could be characterised as reliable and valid instruments. Gozu et al. note that ‘arrogance’ or a ‘lack of awareness of one’s limitations’ (p. 187) can lead students to overrate their level of confidence in their abilities.

Behaviour-specific feedback

Assessments based on student performance in simulated interviews or other role play contexts can provide students with experience and feedback on their application of CC skills and identify areas needing further attention. Instruments for assessing student performance in client interviews can be developed to assess strategies introduced in the unit. (An example of one developed by the Saint Louis University School of Medicine which has been shown to be valid and reliable is presented in Abel, 2004, p. 35).

Furman and Dent (2004) caution that instructors should be careful about assuming a student embraces a particular attitude about a client or cultural group. Such stereotyping can be off-target when it is unclear whether the behaviour is due to limited skills in communication or deficiency in cultural sensitivity. The authors suggest that feedback should focus on behaviours rather than attitudes.
Action-based feedback

Furman and Dent (2004) recommend that rather than focusing on specific behaviours that are wrong or inappropriate, feedback should always be constructive. Staff should provide information and opportunities to enable students to advance their skills. They underscore the benefits of including the student in working out a plan to facilitate his/her development and encourage the student’s investment in the process so that CC skills are more likely to be valued and practiced.

INSTITUTIONAL ACCEPTANCE AND SUPPORT

As noted earlier in the paper, there are two basic approaches to introducing CC curricula into universities, the top-down and bottom-up strategies. While the top-down approach almost guarantees adequate levels of acceptance and support, the bottom-up approach experienced in the majority of universities is certainly more challenging for CC advocates. There appears to be a consensus in the (medical) literature that ‘institutional buy-in is as critical as individual buy-in’ (Chun, 2010, p. 617). As Smith and colleagues (2007) note ‘waiting for broader cultural change is not a morally acceptable option, because it is not consistent with our professional responsibilities’ (p. 662). Moreover, Betancourt (2004) maintains that while CC cannot be seen as a ‘panacea’ to address the inequities in (health) services, but is an essential skill set for the delivery of optimum service provision.

Interviews and email communication with key staff members in different Australian universities indicate concerns about sustaining CC programs as they can be dependent on the good will of current Vice-Chancellors, Deans and/or Heads of School (Grote, 2008). In one Australian university, for example, foundation units had been removed from two courses shortly after their introduction (R. Field, email communication, 21 June 2008). Without support for Indigenous CC inscribed in relevant corporate, operational and policy documents, elements of CC curricula can be disappear without recourse.

Most Australian tertiary institutions already include statements indicating the valuing of diversity in their policy documents. However, some have gone further to recognise the unique position of Australia’s Indigenous people by issuing a Reconciliation statement; a mission statement; a Reconciliation Action Plan; and/or Statement of Recognition, Acknowledgement, Responsibility and Commitment to Reconciliation processes between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians (Carey, 2008; Charles Sturt University, 2010; McLaughlin & Whatman, 2008; Sonn, Garvey, Bishop, & Smith, 2000). Other measures, such as policies that require the inclusion of CC as a graduate attribute, can ensure that CC is embedded in learning outcomes, activities and assessments of new units or programs (Treleaven et al., 2007).

In addition to inscribing the valuing of Indigenous culture and knowledges in official university documents, Carey (2008) underscores the importance of displaying visible symbols of Indigenous culture in tertiary institutions. The presence of works by Indigenous artists, the Aboriginal flag and other Indigenous symbols can be ‘read in contradistinction to “the academy” and the role it has played in the colonisation of Indigenous people and knowledges...[so that] Indigenous cultures, knowledges, histories, experiences of colonisation, and desires for “unity and equality” are privileged’ (Carey, 2008, p. 9).
SUMMARY/CONCLUSION

This paper has reviewed the literature on how CC curricula have been introduced into undergraduate programs in universities, mainly in North America, New Zealand and Australia with the aim of facilitating students’ development of the requisite knowledge, attitudes/values and skills to enable students in their future roles as service professionals to deliver culturally appropriate services to Indigenous people.

A brief background on CC is provided in terms of defining the general concept of CC and identifying the principles of Indigenous CC education and training. The two main strategies to introduce CC curricula adopted by universities are a top-down approach, in which CC curricula are mandated by the university administration; and the more common bottom-up approach, in which CC programs are initiated by academic staff at the departmental level. The latter constitutes an engagement model in which staff members from the Indigenous Studies Schools or Research Centres work to engage those from other disciplines (or in some cases vice versa) to collaborate on the promotion, development and introduction of CC curricula into departmental courses which prepare students for the service professions.

Two models of CC development are described, each comprising a six-stage continuum of progressive stages leading toward proficiency in intercultural interactions. While Bennett’s Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (Bennett & Bennett, 2004; Hammer & Bennett, 2001; Hammer, Bennett, & Wiseman, 2003) may be useful for self-assessment of one’s personal progress as well as identifying teaching and learning strategies to stimulate the cognitive development of individual learners, Wells’s (2000) framework offers a practical structure for identifying and mapping content for CC curricula, as has been done at Charles Sturt University and the University of South Australia (Charles Sturt University, 2010; McConnochie, Egege, & McDermott, 2008; Ranzijn, McConnochie, & Nolan, 2010).

The section on developing CC curricula identifies three possible structures for introducing CC programs: 1) stand-alone CC foundation units; 2) embedding CC components across course units; or 3) a combination of stand-alone units and integrating content across units. While the literature indicates a lack of agreement about which approach is the best, academics may have limited options depending on the university context. It has been argued, however, that for Indigenous CC, the third option might provide the most coherent approach and enable CC education and training to be reinforced as students progress through their courses (Ranzijn, McConnochie, Day, Nolan, & Wharton, 2008).

In terms of ‘best practice’ models of CC curricula, assuming that ‘best practice’ models require that their content and teaching/learning strategies are demonstrated by rigorous research to be effective, then true ‘best practice’ models are yet to emerge (Campinha-Bacote, 2006; Cuellar, Brennan, Vito, & de Leon Siantz, 2008; Grant & Letzring, 2005). While research has shown that some teaching/learning strategies are effective in the short term, many of the assessment tools used have not been shown to be reliable or valid. Moreover, research has yet to demonstrate the long term effectiveness of particular teaching/learning strategies.

Nonetheless, some proponents of CC training have used the term ‘best practice’ to describe particular content areas and teaching/learning strategies, including those facilitating the exploration of and reflection on the notions of culture, worldview, race/racism, whiteness, white privilege. A list of the content and teaching/learning techniques associated with these concepts as well as Indigenous perspectives on their cultures, histories and past and contemporary experiences are included in the sections describing these aspects of CC curricula.

A framework developed for mapping Indigenous content and CC skills onto existing courses using a matrix draws on Wells’s model of CC development and a synthesised list of basic
content areas which begins with foundational knowledge and extends to understandings specific to the discipline based on Wells’s model CC development is presented (Ranzijn, Nolan, & McConnochie, 2008). The list of content and teaching/learning strategies highlight the importance of engaging students in a wide range of classroom activities, immersion experiences and assignments that develop knowledge and understandings about Indigenous perspectives and promote reflection that renders the dominant (yet ‘invisible’) white Western culture (Sonn, 2008), its values and practices more visible to students.

The section on assessment protocols highlights the importance of using a range of quantitative and qualitative evaluation instruments as well as practical and self-assessment tools. It also discusses the need for formative feedback which can include student self-assessments, advice on specific behaviours (rather than perceived attitudes) displayed in simulated intercultural interactions, and comments that helps students progress along the continuum of CC development.

The final section of the paper underscores the critical role of the institution’s administration in visibly demonstrating its acceptance and support for incorporating CC curricula in university courses which provide education and training for the service professions. Such support must be inscribed in Reconciliation statements, mission statements, vision statements and other corporate, operational and policy documents so that CC initiatives are not dependent on individual ‘champions’. This is particularly crucial for the Engagement Model and its bottom-up strategy.

Unless the university’s support for these programs is inscribed in relevant documents, foundation units and integrated units can be (and in some institutions have been) dropped or diluted when Deans or Heads of School move on to other positions or faculties and schools undergo restructuring. Displaying symbols of Indigenous culture and knowledge (e.g., artwork) in university buildings also promotes and makes visible the acceptance and commitment to the support and recognition of Indigenous knowledges and cultures. Exhibiting images of Indigenous culture and inscribing the support of the university administration in corporate, operational and policy documents is therefore an imperative to ensure the sustainability of CC programs in Australian universities.

The literature indicates that while cultural competency education and training have been around for some time, mainly in the health education sector, it continues to gain momentum. Because the concept of cultural competency is relatively new in Australia and the Australian Indigenous context, there is a need to develop a definition of Indigenous Australian CC, one that can be applied to a wide range of professions which deliver human services to members of Indigenous Australian communities.

This review also indicates that the most common approach to introducing CC education and training is using a bottom-up approach or an Engagement Model in which Indigenous academics engage colleagues in the relevant disciplines to form partnerships to organise stand-alone foundation units and/or integrated units. While ‘best practice’ models are yet to emerge in the university sector, a considerable amount of groundwork exists to provide the basis for introducing CC curricula. Further research is required, however, to ensure that the content and teaching/learning strategies are effective and yield benefits in the long term. Importantly, administrative acceptance and support are integral to ensuring that such initiatives are sustainable.
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