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ABSTRACT

Using King and Kitchener’s model of reflective judgment as a framework, I inquired and examined critical reflective thinking skills of myself and my pre-service and in-service teachers in the process of developing a multicultural autobiographical curriculum in 4 years. I explored, in a narrative inquiry mode, my historical cross-cultural self and how I connected this self to my immediate teaching environment in preparation for the curriculum. In the first two years, I integrated my prior intersubjective self-study method into the multicultural teacher education courses, and developed a narrative inquiry based curriculum to help students better understand their own cultural identities. The complexity of culture and self was emphasized in identifying their relations with six cultural groups: race/ethnicity, social class, religion, gender/sexuality, language, and exceptionality/learning ability. In order to guide the students to make meaning of their multicultural identities in a teaching situation, they reconstructed teacher stories about their most influential teachers. To further connect their identities with theories in multicultural education, they developed personal philosophies of multicultural education. From the reconstructed narrative statement of my experience in preparing and implementing the curriculum, I found myself using critical reflective thinking skills. Based on my evaluation of 400 students’ journal writings and pre-and post-multicultural autobiographies, I found their critical reflective thinking skills increased. In the last two years, I further integrated the tradition
of thick description to help students break through their preconceived assumptions about
themselves. Service-learning and a service-learning recipient’s multicultural biography were
included to bring cultural contrasting relationships into students’ autobiographical experience.
Banks’ typologies of cultural identity development and cross-cultural competence in
multicultural education were introduced to help student better situate themselves
developmentally. Such hybrid curriculum further increased students’ critical reflective thinking
skills. Examining pre-and post multicultural autobiographies from 600 students in the 4 years of
curriculum development, I found the levels of students’ critical reflective thinking skills about
themselves increased significantly, although the average level does not measure up to that in
King and Kitchener’s research.
King and Kitchener’s Model of Reflective Judgment

John Dewey (1933, 1938) provided one of the earliest definitions for reflective thinking. He observed that true reflective thinking recognized real problems that cannot be answered by formal logic alone. A true reflective thinker, according to Dewey, makes a reflective judgment to bring closure to situations where there is uncertainty, controversy, doubt, and concern about the current understanding of an issue, and about preconceived assumptions. In the same works, Dewey used reflective thinking and critical thinking interchangeably. King and Kitchener (1994, p. 8) compared Dewey’s notion of critical reflective thinking mentioned above with other current definitions of critical thinking, and found that the latter neglected two major aspects in Dewey’s notion: the epistemological assumptions on which the thinking person operates and the structure of the problem being addressed, both are tied to Dewey’s observation that awareness of uncertainty must exist prior to the initiation of reflective thinking. King and Kitchener argued, “epistemic assumptions constitute a fundamental difference between children’s and adult’s problem solving and that it is only in adulthood that individuals hold the epistemic assumptions that allow for true reflective thinking” (1994, p. 9). They also noted that the problems were on a continuum from low to high structures. A problem with a high degree of structure has a high degree of completeness, certainty, and correctness. Problems such as overpopulation, hunger, pollution, and inflation have low degree of completeness, and cannot be solved with a high degree of certainty. These are the real-world problems (Churchman, 1971, in King & Kitchener, 1994, p. 11) or multilogical problems since whole frames of reference compete for their solution (Paul, 1990, in King & Kitchener, 1994, p.11).

Based on their theory building, King and Kitchener developed a Reflective Judgment Model (RJM) describing the development of epistemic cognition. This developmental
progression contains seven distinct sets of assumptions about knowledge and how knowledge is acquired. Each set of assumptions has its own logical coherence and is called a stage. Each successive stage represents a more complex and effective form of justification, with more inclusive and better-integrated assumptions for evaluating and defending a point of view. Further, each set of assumptions is associated with a different strategy for solving real-life problems (see my summary of the Model in Appendix I).

Using their RJM, King and Kitchener spent more than 10 years conducting Reflective Judgment Interviews with over 1,700 people, including high school, college, and graduate students and adults who did not receive college education. They found that, among others, those who entered college and earned a college degree have higher reflective judgment scores than those do not. They called instructors who were concerned with reasoning about real-life problems to listen to the epistemic assumptions their students were articulating, and to identify instructional methods that would provide the impetus for those assumptions to evolve (Davison, King, & Kitchener, 1990; King, 1992; King & Baxter, 1996; King & Kitchener, 2002; Kitchener & King, 1990; Kitchener, Lynch, Fischer, & Wood, 1993; King & Wood, 1999; Kroll, 1992a,b; Kronholm, 1993; Lynch, 1996; Lynch, Kitchener, & King, 1994; Thompson, 1995; Wood & Lynch, 1998).

In the past 4 years, I have developed a self-study curriculum, Critical Multicultural Autobiographical Curriculum (CMAC) in multicultural teacher education classes at both teaching credential and Master’s degree levels. While teaching and researching CMAC, I observed that self-study in multicultural teacher education is concerned with two sets of real-world problems. First, a self—the subject of self-study—is developed in particular historical contexts, which include multiple competing frames of references. A self is forever evolving and
self-knowledge cannot be complete. This set of real-world problems is compounded in multicultural teacher education classrooms by students’ preconceptions about countless issues in multicultural education, such as racism, poverty, religious diversity, and educational equity about different genders and various sexual orientations, all of which are real-life problems to which no clear-cut solutions apply.

One of the most important objectives of CMAC is to foster Dewey’s notion of critical reflective thinking. Did the critical reflective thinking skills of students increase through the course of undertaking the CMAC? In an attempt to answer this question, I found King and Kitchener’s well-researched RJM appropriate for inquiring the various phases of my curriculum development and for examining over 600 students’ pre-and post self-study multicultural autobiographies. This article describes and analyzes the study.

**Prelude: Beginning with myself**

I embarked on this journey of self-study 15 years ago while pursuing my Master’s of Arts degree in education at the University of Toronto. I had previously been a teacher educator for 11 years in China and I was teaching adult as well as K-12 students in Toronto. Two years of self-study research in the Master’s program deepened my historical, social, and cultural understanding of my educational practice and beliefs, and empowered my personal growth as a new immigrant, a teacher, and an educational researcher.

In my doctoral degree study at the University of Toronto, I continued to develop a cross-cultural arts-informed narrative inquiry method in self-study. This method engages researchers to study intersubjectively themselves and people with whom they interact, using the ancient Chinese Taoist intersubjective thinking as the framework, and Chinese knotwork as a means of representation (author, 2002).
One of the most powerful intersubjective learning in my doctoral research took place between Jenning and myself. Jenning was one of the four adult ESL students who participated in my research. During our narrative inquiry, we learned that we were from starkly different, even warring social classes in China. During the Cultural Revolution, while I witnessed my home ransacked by the Red Guards, she was a Red Guard looting homes of people from my social group. When I was deprived of schooling and sent to a labor camp, at age 15, in a remote countryside, she received an elite education in an academy in the Chinese Air Force and enjoyed such privilege as providing weather forecast for the secret landing of the first visit by a US official—Henry Kissinger—to China since the communist government took power.

The cross-cultural narrative inquiry method provided Jenning and me with a third space to suspend our presuppositions about people from the other’s social class, by listening to and learning from each other’s experiences. We were enabled to cross the cultural borders and humanize each other. Our narratives became intertwined life-stories from opposite cultural perspectives. To use King and Kitchener’s language, our cultural identities and knowledge about the self and the other were reconstructed across our respective cultural and historical contexts. Our resulting outlooks and thinking reached King & Kitchener’s highest stages of reflective thinking. Is this kind of intellectual and attitudinal development generalizable? Can it be developed into curriculum?

In search of an answer to these questions, for the past 4 years, I have developed the cross-cultural narrative inquiry method from my previous research work in Canada into self-study curriculum in my multicultural teacher education courses in urban Los Angeles. The courses of which this self-study curriculum was utilized were about linguistic diversity and multicultural
education at the credential level and cross-cultural education about both US and global perspectives at Master’s level.

Before I began teaching multicultural teacher education classes, I examined my previous research work that was completed in Canada in order to place it in the context of multicultural teacher education in the United States of America. I discovered that the philosophical foundation of my intersubjective cross-cultural method of narrative inquiry coincided with Erickson’s reasoning when he said “… everybody in the world is cultural, even though not all culture is equal in power and prestige” “… everybody is multicultural no matter how isolated a person’s life may appear” (1999/2003, p. 33). Writing one’s cross-cultural narrative acknowledges and affirms such individual approach to cultural and multicultural studies. It is in this individual cultural construction, Garcia (2002) argues, that the educational intervention for change should be established, because it minimizes cultural stereotyping, acknowledges individual uniqueness and opens a path for the individual to make choices to re-assemble his/her cultural constructs and create cultural change—a process of inner and also intersubjective transformation. The intersubjective learning Jenning and I had experienced through my cross-cultural narrative research could serve as an example of such a transformation.

Situating my research in the pedagogical landscape of transformative multicultural education, I searched for possibilities of course reading materials and realized that the multicultural teacher education courses weighed heavily on abstract theoretical foundations. How to teach such courses effectively?

In my experience, in-class critiques and debates of issues such as racism, prejudice, and multicultural education often lead to heated argument by some participants, accompanied by deliberate silence by others. While authentic and honest searching was often overshadowed by
espoused positions, there was also fear of unwittingly hurting someone’s feelings or exposing one’s own “incorrect” position (Conle 2000, p. 367). My cross-cultural method in narrative inquiry seemed promising as a curriculum that would create a safe third space for cultural transformation.

The next factor I considered was the students’ cultural background. Most of our students came from southern California and would be designated to teach in urban public schools. Many of them were already teaching in self-contained classrooms as emergency permit teachers. The course leader informed me that our students had already had abundant exposure to cultures simply because of the ethnically diverse environment they were from. Colleagues advised me about the difficulties to work with these students, because many of them came directly from their inner-city public school classrooms. Very often they were tired, frustrated, and wanted “straight answers” and “quick fixes” to take back to their classrooms the next day. Some warned me that I might encounter requests like “Just tell me what to do!” “Tell me what works. I don’t care why!” I was fully aware of the danger of teaching technical steps instead of conceptual framework, and knowledge transmission instead of knowledge construction in response to such needs. I could easily fall into the pit of training teachers to reproduce what Anyon (1980) called hidden curriculum of working class in urban schools.

I did not have experiential knowledge about urban schools in the United States. I had not lived in the country. How could I reach my students and bring their prior knowledge that I did not know into the knowledge construction process in our multicultural education classes? My cross-cultural narrative inquiry method promotes learning from both the researcher and the participant’s life experiences. If I could adjust it into a teaching method, I would be able to learn from my students about the cultural environments they were from. I believed that such a
curriculum would enable us to capitalize on both their cultural knowledge and mine. I was determined not to be drawn into the hidden curriculum of the social reproduction cycles, but to teach critical thinkers who would exercise their autonomy to construct their multicultural selves, and hopefully would play important roles in educating their K-12 students the same way.

At this initial stage of my curriculum development, I was considering multiple logics and possible conflicts among student teachers’ daily teaching practice, their life experiences, the university’s requirements, and my knowledge base. My understanding of knowledge seemed to be constructed from both the students and the instructor and an inquiry process leading to such a knowledge construction. These characteristics can also be found from Stage Seven on King and Kitchener’s model.

**Phase One: Multicultural Autobiography**

During the first two years, I taught thirteen classes of an average of thirty-five students. I used textbooks of multicultural education theories, multicultural history of the United States, and multicultural approaches currently in use in the US. In order to build the bridge between theory and practice, and connect the myriad of multicultural issues to students’ personal and professional life experiences, I designed the self-study curriculum. This curriculum provided students with a method to systematically develop their multicultural identities and construct their knowledge in multicultural education. Students were engaged in the following activities:

1. A pre self-study multicultural autobiography entitled *My Multicultural Education*;
2. Weekly reading journals in which students record their emotional response to the reading assignment, summarize the reading, pose a good question for in-class discussion, and write their resonating experiences;
3. sharing the weekly reading journals with the instructor, group members and classmates;
4. A story of student’s experience with a significant teacher, to be written and shared with fellow students;

5. A post self-study multicultural autobiography which synthesizes students’ cultural identity with six cultural groups and theorizes their learning into a personal philosophy of multicultural education.

1. Composing pre-multicultural autobiography

On the first day, students were assigned to write a multicultural autobiography. They were instructed to write, using first person singular, what they believed their prior knowledge about multicultural education was. This narrative served as the beginning of an inquiry about each student’s development in multicultural education. My review of these initial self-study narratives revealed that most students considered multicultural education as knowledge drawn from personal, professional, and academic settings.

However, of the six cultural groups we would study in the classes, only race/ethnicity and languages were included. Gender, religion, social class, and exceptionality were rarely mentioned. Most students regarded multicultural education as teaching about heroes, holidays, food, costumes, music and dance of ethnic groups from non-mainstream American culture. To use Grant and Sleeter’s framework (1999) of the five approaches for multicultural teaching in one of our text books, students had merely touched upon fractions of the first three approaches. The fourth approach of Multicultural Education and the fifth of Social Reconstructionist approach were seldom found. In other words, the kind of multicultural education reflected in most of our students’ initial assessments was not multicultural education in Grant and Sleeter’s framework.
More serious was that more than 90% did not think they needed to take a course on multicultural education, because they were already multicultural in their outlook. Those with minority ethnic backgrounds thought they were born into multiculturalism, whereas those from the mainstream ethnic group believed they lived in multicultural southern California although they did not have a culture themselves. Of the remaining less than 10% who were motivated to learn, half expected to learn cultural specifics about “other” ethnic groups. The following excerpt was typical of the 90% of students mentioned above who believed they already knew what they were going to study.

I am very multicultural. I live in the diverse society of southern California. I am color-blind. I treat all my students exactly the same, and our school had a Black History Month this year. I took my own kids to Chinese restaurants, and drove them through areas like Little Saigon and Korean Town. I don’t need to take this course to study multiculturalism. I don’t believe in bilingual education. If I went to France, I would not expect them to speak English with me.

On King and Kitchener’s Seven Stage Reflective Judgment Model, individuals at pre-reflective thinking stages (1-3) do not acknowledge or even perceive that knowledge is uncertain. As a result, they do not understand that real problems exist for which there may not be an absolutely correct answer. Further, they do not use evidence to reason toward a conclusion. Rather, even when they give reasons, their reasons often do not appear logically connected to the issue under discussion. The above excerpt demonstrates most of the characteristics identified in King and Kitchener’s pre-reflective thinking stages. More disturbing is the certainty in the claim “I am very multicultural” justified by evidences that present superficial understanding of being “multicultural” (Black History Month and driving through ethnic minority areas), an unexamined concept of multicultural education (color-blind), and arbitrary judgment about truth (rejection of bilingual education). Knowledge was perceived as what one believes to be true. The “reasons”
used to support the disbelief in bilingual education were not logically connected to the reasons for bilingual education.

2. Writing weekly reading journals

My weekly reading assignments were accompanied by reading journals. The first part of the journal—the students’ emotional response to the reading—was designed to assist students to reflect on the social emotional aspects of their cultural knowledge. The second part—a summary of the reading—was to help them view the reading from the authors’ perspectives. The third—a question for discussion—provided them with a format to either question the reading or their own multicultural education practice. The last part—resonating experience—connected to students’ personal and professional life experiences. My intention to divide the journals into the four parts was to take the students through an intellectual exercise distinguishing and contrasting their social emotional knowledge from logic reasoning, multicultural theories from practice, and group-oriented cultural studies from individual-oriented cultural studies.

Everybody has a history and has experienced historical events from a certain vantage point. Students’ resonating experiences in reading journals offered our students a method to study history from both the personal experiential approach and the collective archival approach. The required textbooks on historical issues in multicultural education combined with their examination of their own cultural identities provided such a historical dynamic. The students, thus, were locating their own individual cultural identity both in the “web” of their current lives and with respect to historical dynamics of social cultural knowledge.

The following excerpts were examples of resonating experiences from students’ weekly journals on social class in education:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excerpts from course reading</th>
<th>Personal resonating experiences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


...affluent suburbs are almost entirely Caucasian. (p.85)

Student 2
Affluent suburbs, on the other hand, typically have had the tax proceeds to provide and maintain attractive buildings...well-supplied classrooms. (p. 87)

I grew up in XXX Beach, an upper middle class white enclave. I was in college before I even saw a black person.

This is very true for XXX Beach. They just spent a LOT of money remodeling and upgrading their high school. As well, they have a 5-year program where every year one of their five elementary schools moves to their transition site while the whole school is being renovated over a year’s time.

Student 3
Many central-city families do not have the financial resources to provide their children with sufficient food, clean clothes every day, warm coats, medical or dental care, toys, books or other belongings, or a quiet spot at home in which to do homework. (p. 89)

A student, who absolutely annoyed me all the time, stopped me one morning because I had a Jack in the Box breakfast sandwich. I made a deal with him. If he could answer three questions about what content was covered in class he could have my breakfast. He answered the questions and I gave him the sandwich. I was able to turn his behavior and mine around for a sixty-nine cent sandwich.

Such journaling normalized the process of contextualizing students’ individual cultural knowledge, and directed autobiographical writing into self-study research. To put it into King and Kitchener’s frame, such contextualization pushed students’ pre-reflective thinking (Stage One-Three) about themselves revealed in their initial multicultural autobiographies up to quasi-reflective thinking of Stages Four and Five.

3. Sharing the weekly reading journals;

Following such individual exercises, I collected students’ reading journals weekly and reviewed them following the same rules I set for class discussion. I shared my emotional responses and resonating experiences. Such sharing gave me an opportunity to connect with students on an individual basis, to learn from and about their cultural knowledge, to offer my personal and professional multicultural knowledge, and to set an example to individualize and humanize multicultural education.
For example, one African American female wrote in one of her weekly journals that she did not like one of the white male students because “he was racist.” “With such a person in my group, I don’t feel comfortable to share my personal experience.”

My response to her included the story from my previous research that took place between Jenning and myself who learned to understand each other’s opposing perspectives. A few weeks later, she wrote in her journal that she “is beginning to like him, because he brought such a dynamic into the group. Considering what he had gone through in his life, he could have been more racist than he is now.” At the end of the semester, she wrote: “Wow, can my concept about racism, and multiculturalism be more complex! Getting to know the life of him put me into perspective of the complexity of social class, gender, and humanity of multicultural education.”

My input to students’ journals was to help students keep their mind open to uncertainty of situational variables, and reconstruct knowledge with more evidences and more complete understanding of issues at stake. Such sharing of my experiences with students was aimed at increasing students’ critical reflective thinking skills from King and Kitchener’s Stage One to Stages Four, Five and Six. The student in the above example seemed to have benefited from such sharing.

Following my reading and sharing, students were engaged in group and class activities to share and discuss their reading journals. They shared the emotional responses and the resonating experiences of their journals. In order to ensure all perspectives to be heard and recognized, I adapted and formalized the cross-cultural narrative research method developed through my research (2002), and facilitated the group and class activities with the following suggestions: When sharing, do not judge, criticize, tell or explain for others’ emotional responses or resonating experiences. Learn to be good listeners, try to step into each other’s shoes, and
resonate (Conle, 1996) with your own emotional responses and experiences. These suggestions were meant to create a safe environment for students to learn about themselves and others, to break the isolation of individual self-study, and to capitalize on students’ rich cultural experiences.

The white male student mentioned in the previous example did not consider himself to have a culture at the beginning of the semester, and did sometimes express racial biases in his journaling and group/class discussion. However, following the rules of sharing, he gradually learned to listen to others and more importantly to look at his own life experiences of multicultural education. In one of his journals, he documented his very first exposure to difference—a middle school classmate with an ethnic minority background in an isolated mine town where he grew up. While sharing this experience with his group members, he recalled that he and his brother were actually very friendly with the classmate and her family—“the only colored in town.” They became very sympathetic with her and once fought against a gang of bullies in defense of the “colored girl”. It was his “narrow minded” parents who forbade his brother and him to hang out with the colored girl since the incident.

When this story was retold to the class, the entire class gave him a big applause to congratulate him for his enlightenment in both his heroic deeds to stand up to bigotry and acknowledgement of his mis-education by his parents.

The process of writing his story in the reading journal, telling it in his group and retelling it in our class was an important part of “the telling and retelling” in narrative inquiry (Connelly & Clandinin, 1988, 1990, 1994, 2000). In such activities, “nodal moments” and “inspirations” (Bullough & Pinnegar, 2001, p. 16) between self and others took place. In such social interactions, students were enabled to re-examine the known, their preconceived selves, to
discover the unknown, their long-buried and silenced selves, and to reconstruct their newly known, more complete selves. In such a process, to use King and Kitchener’s terms, knowledge is constructed by comparing evidences on different sides of an issue and across contexts. That is at Stage Six.

4. Reconstructing Teacher Stories

In order to assist students to connect their multicultural identities to their teacher selves and teaching practices, I assigned them to write a teacher story. A teacher story in narrative inquiry is a story about a most influential teacher in one’s life (Connelly & Clandinin, 1988). Most people can easily recall such a person, but many find it difficult to relate such a person to cultures and multicultural education. Therefore, I provided an example of my own teacher story (2002, 2005). My teacher story is about how, in as a first grader I rebelled against a teacher and her “drill to kill” teaching method in China. The story took place in a context where students were from homogenous ethnic and social class cultural background. We then analyzed this seemingly “non-multicultural” teacher story from various approaches of multicultural education and reconstructed it into a multicultural teacher story. Such a process of reconstruction helped me to recall forgotten experiences, to notice overlooked aspects of my life, and to read more literature about the cultural context in which the story occurred. I was able to reconstruct my teacher story from multicultural perspectives. Students were able to observe and participate in such a process.

After such modeling, students told their own teacher stories in groups, and discussed how their most influential teachers in life were multicultural. The group story telling and discussion helped the individuals understand how one’s cultural knowledge, visible or invisible, intentional or unintentional, permeated the individual’s teacher self and teaching practice. Through this assignment, all of them found their model teachers and most discovered their own teaching
approaches that were originated in their model teachers. The following teacher story can serve as an example.

I immigrated to the United States at age seven. A teacher in my after school program spanked me for speaking Spanish during naptime. When my father heard of this, he told me to conform in order to maintain the American way of life. Since then I stopped speaking Spanish at school and at home. Unknowingly, this teacher had a major impact on how I viewed society from the time I was seven to the ripe old age of forty. It was her spanking that transformed me from being a Mexican into an American. From that moment on I espoused the American way of life with vigor and enthusiasm. I became intolerant toward other cultures that were different from the American mainstream. From that moment on I believed that bilingual education was a waste of time and money. From that moment on I believed that celebrating other cultures and their heritage would help destroy the American way of life. I also believed that English was a superior language above all others and henceforth the official language of the country.

My first 2 years as a teacher, I ran my classroom the way she did. Those 2 years were a complete disaster and I had to reinvent myself to fit in with students who I wanted to reach. It has taken me a long time to change and it is a slow and painful process. But slowly I feel that I am changing in my outlook towards others who are on the outside of the American mainstream.

This student was so inspired by such a self-discovery, he pushed himself a step further to invite a colleague from his group to visit his classroom and advise him on how to unlearn the negative teacher model in order to reconstruct his new teacher self.
The process of teacher story reconstruction guided students on a path of inquiry re-evaluating their existing knowledge base. Using relevant information, they drew conclusions that were open for further re-evaluation and more complete understanding. Such a process fosters Stage Seven reflective thinking on King and Kitchener’s model.

5. Composing a post-multicultural autobiography

To synthesize students’ self-study about their multicultural education, a multicultural autobiography was assigned after self-study. In this autobiography, students were to use information from their journals, reflect on their in-class activities, and inquire about their multicultural identities with six different cultural groupings: ethnicity, social class, religion, gender, language, and exceptionality (2002, author et al). In order to help students connect their cultural identity to theories in multicultural education, I assigned them to write a personal philosophy of multicultural education. In this part of their autobiography, they developed a personal philosophy and made future plans. The student who wrote the following excerpt developed a very comprehensive personal philosophy of multicultural education. When she was eventually faced with a future plan, she wrote:

While sorting out my past experiences with multicultural education, I found a contradiction in me. I publicly supported multicultural education, yet held a private skepticism. For a moment, I wanted to give up philosophical inquiry. But I cannot retreat into unreason or illogicality and obey ignorance. Wisdom is worth pursuing. I may not edit my practice right away, yet the inquiry is liberating and frees me from prejudice, self-deceptive, and half-truth reality.

I am confident to say that I am pursuing multicultural education, not quite there yet, but I hope someday I will reach there!
The philosophy development provided students with a tool to generalize and claim knowledge from the systematic and contextual inquiry while keeping their conclusions open to further evaluation. Such thinking reflects Stage Seven on King and Kitchener’s model.

This was how students reconstructed their multicultural selves in the first two years of my curriculum development. During these two years, every class had experienced difficulties in following the spirit of sharing in narrative inquiry. When they were not able to follow the story-telling methods, conflicts, debates, and subsequent deliberate silence and offense occurred. Half way through each semester, students became more skilled narrative inquirers, better listeners and learners. They claimed to have found the better parts of themselves and others, and many were thrilled to realize that they were cultural and multicultural like everybody else in the world. Some students even began to justify their behavior in both personal and professional lives while taking the class.

Earlier in this paper, I described a white male student who often broke the rule of sharing and was disliked and considered as a “racist” by an African American female student at the beginning of the semester. In the process of telling and writing his multicultural life experiences, this white male student was able to identify his heroic deeds fighting against bigotry towards the only ethnic minority classmate in town and recognize his parents’ prejudice. This story as part of his autobiography became his important multicultural identity. When what he learned from reconstructing his story was synthesized and abstracted in his final multicultural autobiography, he was able to see the previously invisible cultural biases that permeated his own personal and profession life, and began to modify his behavior. He wrote in his last reading journal:

During the week when we were studying gender equity in education, I tallied how I called on my male and female students in my chemistry class. To my
surprise, I was not giving equal opportunities to my students. I called on girls much less frequently and gave a lot more attention to boys, although most were negative attention. Now I am using Popsicle sticks as we were taught to do but stopped doing a long time ago, and I found more girls were participating in class discussion and less boys demonstrated discipline problems.

My wife, who has been a teacher for 8 years, also noticed that recently I talked to her with a less authoritative tone, and she told me that I listened to her better and sometimes, she believed that I could actually hear her. Although I don’t know the difference between listen and hear. I am not into language. I guess multicultural education worked. Nobody would have believed that I would say so only three months ago.

**Phase Two: Critical Multicultural Autobiography**

From over 400 students’ post-multicultural autobiographies constructed through the first 2 years of multicultural autobiographical curriculum, I noticed that although positive results and profound changes occurred like that in the example given at the end of the last part in this paper and in my other works (author, 2002, 2003; author, et al, 2002), about 8% of students’ multicultural autobiographies persistently contained texts that reflect pre-reflective thinking. For example:

I don’t believe in feminism. Men and women are not the same. I was born a female. I am still a female, and I believe I will remain a female for the rest of my life. I don’t know what else to put into this gender autobiography.

The student who wrote this message seemed to have a misunderstanding about gender. After the assigned readings and class discussion on the differences between the biological sexes
and the social cultural genders, the student appeared to have remained confused with the two. Comparing this with multicultural autobiographies that demonstrated high level of reflective thinking skills, I found a highly descriptive language that these 8% pre-reflective autobiographies did not have. In place of the simple statement in the above example, they included a detailed description of students’ gendered life experiences. For example:

I was born and raised a female. My crib, my room and myself were covered completely in pink. My mom stayed home, cleaned the house, cooked dinner, and took care of my brother and me. My dad worked. He made the money and all of the important decisions. My mom never questioned him. Growing up, my brother was daddy’s helper with garbage, lawn, and car repair. I was to stay inside help mom in the kitchen. I had a large collection of Barbies, whereas my brother had toy cars and transformers. Ironically, my parents raised me to believe that I was an independent person and could do whatever I put my mind to.

When I was in elementary school, I recall not wanting to wear pink dresses any more. I asked mom to buy me jeans, jumpers, and running shoes so that I can play soccer with kids in the neighborhood. Mom bought only one set of such tomboy clothes and let me play only once a week. Daddy said: “Boys are boys. Girls are girls.” I guess each has its rightful position.

In high school, I rebelled. I disliked talking about make-ups and boys. Instead, I got myself into a soccer team and constantly violating my parents’ curfew—for me it as 10 pm, for my brother it was 2 am.

....
I am biologically more on the female end of the spectrum, but I am
socialized to possess both male and female characteristics. I am currently trying to
become a balanced gender being in order to serve as a good model for my
students—both females and males, and those outside of such male-female social
norm.

The simple statement about being female repeated the stereotypes of society. No
questions, no doubts, and no uncertainties in such a statement. In contrast, the detailed
description provided specific facts and events that took place in the student’s life. Such detailed
description seemed to have a potential to penetrate cultural biases and stereotypes and to
challenge certainties in students’ self-knowledge.

In his groundbreaking work *The interpretation of cultures*, Geertz (1973) explained
Ryle’s notion of “thick description” to illustrate how detailed and descriptive a cultural
anthropological text should be. This notion has since been developed and used by many cultural
anthropologists to ensure quality and validity of their research, and it has helped cultural
anthropologists to represent their observed cultural patterns in details, free of value-laden
terminologies and culturally biased presumptions, and to better interpret from the natives’ point
of view.

In the discussion of the trustworthiness and validity of self-study, Feldman (2003) also
pointed out the importance of “clear and detailed description of data” (2003, p.27)). Based on my
observation of student autobiographical writing, and my reading of Geertz’ and Feldman, I
adapted Geertz’ thick description to self-study.

I observed from the first phase of my multicultural autobiographical curriculum
development that students who were able to measure their multicultural experiences with a
certain frame of reference found their self-study more valuable and meaningful and many drew concrete plans for their future development of cross-cultural competence. Therefore, I searched for a set of developmental standards to help students make meaning out of their detailed description, locate their cross-cultural competence, and explore a direction for their future development. I found Banks’ six-stage-typology of cultural identity (Banks, 1976, 2001, Tomlinson, 1995, 1996, see Appendix II) appealing. Subsequently, in students’ post-multicultural autobiographies, I required “thick description” of their multicultural experiences and a typology analysis after such a description.

In doing so, I expanded Banks’ typology from focusing on race/ethnicity and a holistic notion of culture to six cultural groups: ethnicity, social class, language, religion, gender, and exceptionality. To keep the coherence of such a pattern of thick description followed by typology analysis, I also utilized Banks’ mapping of various ideologies (Banks, 2001 p.118) in which students could locate where their personal multicultural philosophy would stand ideologically. I believed such fusion will strengthen critical reflective thinking and distinguished the second phase of my curriculum development as “critical”.

This method was piloted through a summer course. The result was very encouraging. Students no longer wrote one sentence cultural identity such as “I am Christian, and I don’t know what else to include.” Instead, every one was able to write in details, in a variety of ways, about their cultural experiences. Some wrote exceedingly detailed and profoundly touching multicultural autobiographies. The following was from a student’s autobiography from summer class about her religious identity:

…I don’t remember when I was a Christian. I don’t remember I chose to be a Christian. It was given to me. My parents are Christians, and so are their
children. I am one of them, and with their will, I must have immersed in the Holy
water in an act of baptizing sometime in my early months of being a human.

…

“There is a strange man in our village, but he is not Communist officer,”
whispered my oldest sister when our family sat down to eat young corns over the
fire pit. So, when we finished the last corn, and drank the last drop of water that
we cooked the corns in, I crept over to Tuyet’s house, my “besttest” friend, as I
called her. We tiptoed to the house down near the river to spy on this “strange
man” that my sister mentioned. He clothed himself in a long black dress.
Everything about it was black, except a white square in front of his collar that
wrapped around his neck. We giggled. A man wearing dress, he was, indeed, a
strange man. He sat with his legs folded in front; his eyes closed, his right hand
held onto a string with many black beads on it, and his fingers moved from one
bead to another as his mouth mumbled something very familiar. It sounded like
something that my mom mumbled every night. His mouth fell open. He sat there
like a black fly perching in the small room, overpowering with the night heat. In
the light of the candle, once in a while, we could see him opening eyes and gazing
tenderly at the picture of a lady holding a young child in her hands. The child’s
slipper was torn, and almost fell down. “Hail Mary…” he suddenly increased the
volume, like a horse was being hit by a stick. It startled us, and we ran like we
were being chased by a ghost.

The next day, the “Strange Man,” as we had named him, stood at the
village trading place and shouted: “Our Father will not leave your pain
unconsoled. He will heal your wounds. Your pain and hunger shall be filled in
heaven. Blessed are those who hunger and thirst for righteousness. Blessed are
those who mourn, for God will comfort them. Blessed are the poor, the meek the
wronged…” The women, who stood with their empty baskets, pretended they did
not understand what he said. They did not dare to look at him. However, we
c caught them shot a glance at him when they thought someone wasn’t watching.
They shook their heads, “Someone makes him stop, before they get all of us and
himself killed.”

Not too long, an army of officers flew ragingly at him, some with clubs,
some with guns. They raised their long guns and clubs and struck him. His neck
swelled. He tried to crawl out the circle of the army through the legs of the
beating officers. Red liquid poured out his nose. The women threw their empty
baskets. They screamed and ran to their houses. I wanted to run but my feet
buried deeply into the ground. An arm grabbed the back of my shirt and dragged
me to my house. My fourth sister breathed heavily as she cried the event to my
mom. I saw my mom went to the corner of the hut and put her face in her hands,
and growled “Oh God.” I went to the corner to change my pants for I must have
wetted it when the beating happened. As night fell, the village was more quiet
than usual. The moon was rounded, but covered by dark cloud. Hardly a person’s
shadow was seen. We could not go out to sing and play hopscotch with my
friends. My sisters made sure the doors were tightly closed. We all sat in silences.
Outside the chicken crooked, and the dogs howled.
We never heard of the Strange Man again. Some said he died. Some said “they” burned him. Some said they buried him alive; drowned him in the river; chopped him into pieces and used as wild pig baits. People in the village claimed that they had seen his ghost, in a black dress with white collar wrapped round his neck, was seen during the night at the village trading place, and sometimes the ghost wandered up and down the village with the feet never touched the ground.

I was caught in three stages of cultural typology: cultural psychological captivity, cultural encapsulation, and cultural identity clarification. I felt trapped in being a Christian. The incident of the Strange Man created in me an image that I was like a dog laid low in the society. I was being discriminated being a Christian. As a matter of fact, I did not think I had the courage to declare I was a Christian. However, as stated above, I held onto the ideology. What was Christianity that made us bear all the suffering? Why did we have to hold onto the beliefs that no one could explain clearly? These questions I asked brought me into the cultural identity clarification. I learned to accept that being punished was part of being a Christian.

Although not all students had experienced such extreme religious oppression, ninety-eight percent of their thick description followed by typology analysis was similar to this excerpt regarding the demonstrated reflective thinking skills. One student, about two percent, wrote her post self-study multicultural autobiography without many details. She identified herself on Banks’ Stage Three—Cultural Clarification, and stated that she did not intend to learn any new culture neither to move up the stages, because “Banks’ typology is biased.”
In this student autobiography, there was no specific description or analysis that demonstrated any recognition of the positive and negative aspects of her culture as identified in Banks’ Stage Three of Cultural Clarification. From my evaluation based on the information she gave in her writing, she was only on the 2\textsuperscript{nd} stage on Banks’ cultural identity typology, which is Cultural Encapsulation. Reviewing her description, I found that she had lived in a combination of social class, ethnic, gender, and religious cultural groups all of which happened to exclude differences. Her interaction with the rest of the class in learning about others’ cultural experiences was not at all included in her autobiography. Story telling did not seem to be powerful enough to take her out of the culture she had lived in. I believed that students who had lived culturally exclusive lives like this student would need real life experience with differences in order to clarify their own cultural experiences.

Subsequently, I incorporated a service-learning component into the self-study curriculum of one of my classes, and did a comparative study about the power and the effectiveness of service-learning in increasing students’ critical thinking about themselves (author & Lal, 2005). The comparative study showed that the students in the class with the service-learning component had 1.2 additional increases on Banks’ six-stage-typology than the students in the class without a service-learning assignment. I have since included this service-learning component in my critical multicultural autobiographic curriculum.

To complete the service-learning assignment, students volunteered a minimum of 20-hour-service to a local school, a homeless shelter, or a community organization. They wrote biographies of their service-learning recipients’ multicultural lives, using the same structure of the six-micro-cultural groupings and the same language of thick description. They also utilized Banks’ typology of 6-stage-cultural-identity to evaluated how to better develop the service-
learning-recipients’ multicultural identities. Additionally, they were assigned to employ Banks’ typology of four-type-cross-cultural teachers (Appendix III) to evaluate how they were culturally competent in relation to their service-learning recipients.

The service-learning component created for the students an environment similar to the one in which I worked with Jenning in my narrative inquiry research. My students would be able to contrast their own cultural experiences with that of their service-learning recipients, who most often were from dramatically different social cultural environments. In order to write the thick description of their service-learning recipients’ cultural experiences, they needed to become good observers and listeners. In contrast to my students’ own autobiographies, thick description of their service-learning recipients’ cultural experiences pulled my students out of their familiar “home” culture and as a result they understood themselves better in the process of understanding their service-learning recipients. The following excerpt is an example from the multicultural biographies of service-learning recipients.

Exceptionality refers to an individual’s abilities that range either above or below the norm. My service-learning recipient—Cindy—is meeting the math and reading standards, and approaching the writing standards. But she has a lot of scars on her face. You could say that she is physically outside of the norm. Her current teacher and her fourth grade teacher described her as a role model, super citizen, and exceptionally bright.

In fifth grade, Cindy was in a car accident with her uncle. The car caught on fire, and Cindy’s seatbelt would not release. She was severely burned. Cindy remembered feeling very hot, then waking up in the hospital thinking she was dead. Scars disfigured the left side of her face and her left arm. The accident had a
major impact on her life. She had to wear a hat, a special mask, and apply cream to her face every day.

Cindy missed half of her fifth grade year, and returned to school with severe scarring and disfiguration. She was constantly teased by other students in school, and she was self conscious, insecure, and depressed. The school had a special assembly on burn victims. They invited speakers and taught kids about the effects of being burned victims. After the school assembly, the teasing ended, and her peers treated her with respect and kindness.

Since the accident, Cindy put much more effort into school and learning. She completed homework, participated in class discussions, and helped out her peers in class. After school, she came to our homework center to get help from volunteers like me.

Today, Cindy looked very confident and happy. During our tutoring sessions, she was comfortable talking about the accident with me and was very articulate. Her exceptionality is in her abilities to overcome such devastating incident in her life, come to terms with her changed appearance, and persevere to be a model student.

*Cindy is in Stage Four on Banks’ typology regarding exceptionality. In her young life, she has already lived with two faces—one within the norm, the other without. She has accepted the positive and negative aspects of both and made the best out of her current situations. She has successfully dealt with the psychological and physical affects of her burns. She has been transformed from a victim to a leader.*
In contrast, I am an external-outside. My appearance has been considered normal, and I have never needed to fight against school bullies in my life. On the contrary, growing up I sometimes was one of those cruel bullies. It’s almost embarrassing to find out the courage and determination Cindy had possessed. I can’t imagine what and how I would do if something so horrible happened in my life. I definitely learned a lot about myself from Cindy. This made me re-think my position on Affirmative Action. Suddenly, it all made sense to me that Affirmative Action was to acknowledge and recognize such abilities, like what Cindy demonstrated, of people with ethnic minority and low-social class backgrounds.

The contrasting experiences in such biographical writing forced students to examine evidence, to use King and Kitchener’s terms, on different sides of an issue and across contexts. Students’ knowledge about themselves, as well as their service-learning recipients’ cultural experiences were constructed as an outcome of the inquiry process generalizable across issues. That is the highest level of critical reflective thinking on King and Kitchener’s model.

Comparison: Analysis and Discussion of the Critical Multicultural Autobiographical Curriculum

Using King and Kitchener’s model, I examined and compared 621 students’ pre and post self-study multicultural autobiographies from my past four years’ teaching. Following is a summary and discussion of the comparison.

King and Kitchener’s RJM was developed through 10 years. Based on their theoretical development and their interviews with more than seventeen hundred people ranging from fourteen-year-old high school students to retirees over the age of sixty-five, they identified the reflective thinking that is characteristic of different age groups as seen in the simplified grid in Appendix I. Using this
framework, I examined 621 pre self-study multicultural autobiographies. As I demonstrated, earlier in this series of two papers, in the examples and stage analysis of them, I looked for detailed information that supported students’ claims of their multicultural identities and graded the degrees of the similarity between the supporting evidences and the self-identifications on King and Kitchener’s RJM. I also had a colleague from another university campus to re-score random samples of my students’ autobiographies independently, and had two classes of students to score themselves using RJM on a voluntary basis.

From 621 students’ pre self-studies multicultural autobiographies, I obtained an average of 2.4 (sd=1.1), which is pre-reflective of typical K-5 students. Meanwhile the average of the same students’ critical reflective thinking in their post self-study multicultural autobiographies was 5.7 (sd=0.6), which is at the high end of the quasi-reflective thinking of typical teenage students.

According to King and Kitchener’s work, an average of 2.4 is far below the reflective thinking levels expected of adults and university students. I suspect there might be two reasons for such low reflective thinking skills. One is the nature of self-study. Our students were all successful individuals in society. Their education so far through formal educational institutions had focused on solving other people’s problems. When they are called to use their reflective thinking skills to resolve real problems of themselves, it is likely that they would find it more difficult to apply their reflective thinking skills. Second, issues in multicultural education have been highly politicized in the USA and very few people would want to be on the politically incorrect side.

An average of 5.7 in the critical multicultural autobiographies is a significant increase. It took less than one semester for my students to leap an average of 2.3 stages; comparing the several years (K-5 to high school age) it takes for individuals to develop their critical reflective thinking skills, in terms of King and Kitchener’s research. At this rate, the students in our study would reach the highest stages of
the critical reflective thinking skills if they continue the inquiry of their own cross-cultural competence after graduation from the class.

However, in King and Kitchener’s model, 5.7 are only “quasi-reflective”, which is considered typical of teenage students. All our students were adults, and had obtained at least Bachelor’s degrees. Some had graduate degrees and worked in other professions before they entered our programs. In addition, the critical multicultural autobiographical curriculum I developed over the years had incorporated various rigorous reflective critical thinking and knowledge construction instruments in it as described in this paper. Why were these students’ reflective critical thinking does not reflect their age on King and Kitchener’s model? Future efforts to increase reflective thinking about their own multicultural development may provide an answer.

**Summary**

In this paper, I utilized King and Kitchener’s Reflective Judgment Model to examine the Critical Multicultural Autobiographical Curriculum I developed in the past four years. The study focused on the question: Did the critical thinking skills of students increase through the course of undertaking the CMAC? Followed by a narrative of various activities at different stages of my curriculum development, I provided examples of students’ responses, and analyzed the critical reflective thinking skills that were built into such activities. As the students’ critical reflective thinking skills built in the curriculum increased during the years—by introducing thick description, typologies, and service-learning, students demonstrated higher reflective thinking levels in their post self-study autobiographies.

This study contributes to self-study research in three ways. First, the study contains a unique combination of qualitative and quantitative research: the qualitative description and analysis about how a cross-cultural narrative inquiry method was developed into a curriculum of
self-study was combined with a before-after statistical examination of the effects of the curriculum. Second, King and Kitchener’s developmental model, which was based mainly upon survey research, was adapted to examine the critical reflective thinking in my curriculum development and the texts of students’ autobiographies. Pedagogically, the method of Ceertz’ thick description in reporting cultures of others was employed to describe cultural experiences of selves. The concept and the implementation of the concepts of Banks’ typology of cultural identity were expanded from ethnicity to include at least, six micro-cultural groupings: race/ethnicity, social class, gender/sexual orientation, language, and exceptionality/non-exceptionality.

The limit of this research is the subjectivity in the assessment of students’ writings on King and Kitchener’s Model. Although I had a colleague for independent random examination of my scoring, we agreed in most cases and worked out our disagreement in other cases, our judgments were based on our reading and understanding of students’ work. I did check with two classes of my students about how they would score themselves on King and Kitchener’s Model, but it was only voluntary and I began to do so too late to provide consistency for meaningful interpretation of the data. In my continuous development of the curriculum, I will consider including King and Kitchener’s Model systematically in class so that my future students would know the expectation and verify my subjective assessment.
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Appendix I

Summary of King and Kitchener’s Model of Seven Stage Reflective Judgment (1994, pp.44-74):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Epistemological Outlook</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>What a person believe is true.</td>
<td>Stage 1, 2, and 3 are pre-reflective thinking. Individuals reasoning with pre-reflective assumptions do not acknowledge—or in some cases even perceive that knowledge is uncertain. As a result, they do not understand that real problems exist for which there may not be an absolutely correct answer. Further, they do not use evidence to reason toward a conclusion. Rather, even when they give reasons, their reasons often do not appear logically connected to the issue under discussion. K-5 students usually demonstrate such pre-reflective thinking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>A person can know with certainty either directly or based on authority.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>In some areas knowledge is uncertain and justification is based on what feels right at the moment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4</td>
<td>Knowledge is uncertain because of situational variables. How we justify belief is idiosyncratic.</td>
<td>Stage 4 and 5 are quasi-reflective thinking. Individuals reasoning with quasi-reflective assumptions recognize that some problems are ill structured and that knowledge claims about them contain an element of uncertainty. As a result, they understand that some issues are truly problematic. Although they use evidence, they do not understand how evidence entails a conclusion; thus they have difficulty when they are asked to draw a reasoned conclusion or to justify their beliefs. Teenage students usually demonstrate such quasi-reflective thinking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 5</td>
<td>Knowledge is contextual; people know via individual contextual filters. Justification is context-specific.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 6</td>
<td>Knowledge is constructed by comparing evidence on different sides of an issue or across contexts. Justification involves explaining comparisons.</td>
<td>Stage 6 and 7 are reflective thinking. Individuals reasoning with reflective thinking assumptions argue that knowledge is not a “given” but must be actively constructed and that claims of knowledge must be understood in relation to the context in which they were generalized. Furthermore, those reasoning with Stage 6 or 7 assumptions argue that while judgments must be grounded in relevant data, conclusions should remain open to reevaluation. This kind of reasoning has the characteristics of thinking Dewey (1933) called reflective thinking or reflective judgment. Such reflective thinking is usually developed in higher education after teenage years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 7</td>
<td>Knowledge is an outcome of an inquiry process generalizable across issues. Justification is probabilistic; evidence and argument are used to present the most complete understanding of an issue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Appendix II**

Summary of Banks’ 6-Stage-Typology of Cultural Identity (2001, pp 134-139)

| Stage 1 Cultural Psychological Captivity | At this stage, an individual holds negative ideologies and beliefs about own cultural group. Consequently, s/he exemplifies cultural self-rejection and low self-esteem. S/he would avoid situations that bring contact with other cultural groups or strive aggressively to become highly culturally assimilated. |
| Stage 2 Cultural Encapsulation | The individual participates primarily within his/her own cultural community and believes that his/her cultural group is superior to other groups. |
| Stage 3 Cultural Identity Clarification | The individual is able to clarify personal attitudes and cultural identity, to reduce intra-psychic conflict, and develop clarified positive attitudes toward his/her cultural group. The individual learns to accept and understand both the positive and negative attributes of his/her cultural groups. |
| Stage 4 Biculturalism | The individual has a healthy sense of cultural identity and the psychological characteristics and skills needed to participate successfully in his/her own cultural as well as in another cultural community. S/he has a strong desire to function effectively in two cultures. |
| Stage 5 Multicultural and Reflective Nationalism | The individual has clarified reflective and positive personal, cultural, and national identities. S/he is able to understand, appreciate, and share the values, symbols, and institutions of several cultures, and function, beyond superficial levels, within several cultures within the nation. |
| Stage 6 Globalism and Global Competence | The individual has clarified reflective and positive cultural, national, and global identities and the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and abilities needed to function within cultures within his/her nation as well as within cultures outside his/her nation. S/he has internalized the universalistic ethical values and principles of humankind and has the skills, competencies, and commitment needed to take action within the world to actualize personal values and commitments. |
Appendix III
Summary of Banks’ 4-Type-Typology of Cross-Cultural Teachers (2001, pp. 242-244)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Teacher</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous-Insider</td>
<td>This teacher endorses the unique values, perspectives, behaviors, beliefs, and knowledge of his or her indigenous community and culture and is perceived by people within the community as a legitimate community member who can speak with authority about it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous-Outsider</td>
<td>This teacher was socialized within his or her indigenous community but as experienced high levels of cultural assimilation into an outside or oppositional culture. The values, beliefs, perspectives, and knowledge of the teacher are identical to those of the outside community. The indigenous-outsider is perceived by indigenous people in the community as an outsider.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External-Insider</td>
<td>This teacher was socialized within another culture and acquires its beliefs, values, behaviors, attitudes, and knowledge. However, because of his or her unique experiences, the teacher questions many of the values, beliefs, and knowledge claims within his or her indigenous community and endorses those of the community in which he or she teaches. The external-insider is viewed by the new community as an “adopted” insider.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External-Outsider</td>
<td>The external-outsider is socialized within a community different from the one in which he or she is teaching. The external-outsider has a partial understanding of and little appreciation for the values, perspectives, and knowledge of the community in which he or she is teaching and consequently often misunderstands and misinterprets the behaviors of others, parents, and others within the community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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