Culture, Education, and Future
Volume 3, Number 1, 2025, 46-64
DOI: 10.70116/2980274176
ISSN: 2980-2741
Article
OPEN ACCESS

Examining culturally responsive teaching and assessment in an undergraduate public speaking course

Kexin Jiang [1], **Chad M. Gotch** [1], **Christina Griselda Nickerson** [2]

[1] Washington State University, College of Education, Department of Kinesiology and Educational Psychology, Pullman, WA, USA
[2] Washington State University, Edward R. Murrow College of Communication, Pullman, WA, USA

Abstract

Given the diversified background of students in the United States, the demand for cultural responsiveness in education has increased. Previous research has explored how teachers apply culturally responsive teaching and assessment (CRTA) to reach marginalised students in kindergarten -12th grade classrooms. Higher education has received less attention. This study initiates a promising step for investigating cultural responsiveness through the lens of college students, an area that has not been fully explored in the prior research. Specifically, our research team conducted semi-structured interview with 38 undergraduate students to examine the presence and potential of CRTA in a predominantly white public speaking course. Students spoke positively about how their course instructors created a respectful, welcoming environment and demonstrated care for students' academic success. However, richer aspects of cultural responsiveness were minimal. Similarly, students' perceptions of the potential for CRTA in the course were mixed and largely superficial. These findings can contribute to faculty development and course design across many colleges and universities.

Article History
Received 11.01.2025
Accepted 07.05.2025

Keywords
Culturally responsive teaching; higher education; public speaking; predominantly white institutions; student perceptions

Introduction

Higher education institutions in the United States are struggling to retain students of colour, who now represent majority of college enrolment (National Center for Education Statistics, 2024). Since the mid-20th century, a deficit-oriented approach has dominated teaching and learning multicultural classrooms in the United States (Paris, 2012). This approach compels students of colour to assimilate into white, middle-class norms and pursue a sense of superiority by legitimizing dominant educational practices (e.g., speaking the dominant language and acquiring mainstream knowledge and mindsets) while erasing the racial, ethnic, and cultural identities brought by these students (Davis & Museus, 2019; DePouw, 2007; Gay, 2018; Lee, 2005). The shadow of the deficit approach in American education persists, perpetuated by oppressive (e.g., English-only) educational policies that foster a climate of exclusion and White centralization (DePouw, 2007; Paris, 2012). Therefore, to undermine this biased and detrimental approach, educational pioneers have pursued educational justice, diversity, and equity through investigating, examining, and evaluating the marginalization

Corresponding Author Kexin Jiang kexin.jiang@wsu.edu Washington State University, College of Education, Department of Kinesiology and Educational Psychology, 642136, Pullman, WA, 99164-2136, USA

and stigmatization of students of colour within the predominantly white educational system of the United States.

One movement away from deficit-oriented approaches has been, resource pedagogies (Paris, 2012). Such pedagogies argue "are grounded in the historical and current particulars of students' everyday lives, while at the same oriented toward an imagined but possible future" (Gutiérrez, 2008, p. 154). Therefore, resources shared by students and communities of colour (e.g., linguistic, cultural, and community resources) merit thorough investigation, exploration, and practical application in school (Gay, 2018; Pirbhai-Illich et al., 2017). Leveraging these shared resources in classroom teaching enriches the learning experience for all students by diversifying teaching materials and integrating different perspectives (Paris, 2012). The development of culturally relevant pedagogy (CRP), culturally responsive pedagogy/teaching (CRP or CRT), and culturally sustaining pedagogy (CSP) represent milestones in the field of resource pedagogy (e.g., Ladson-Billings, 1995; Gay, 2018; Khalifa, 2018; Khalifa et al., 2016; Paris, 2012; Pirbhai-Illich et al., 2017; Thomas & Warren, 2015). These three pedagogical approaches are closely related and are applied to achieve educational objectives related to academic success, meaningful learning, cultural awareness, identity and background affirmation, and critical thinking of students who have been marginalized or excluded historically (Khalifa, 2018; Khalifa et al., 2016). This study starts with (and later extends) the term "culturally responsive teaching (CRT)" for three interrelated reasons. First, cultural responsiveness has been perceived as one of the earlier, recognizable, and applied concepts in education (Villegas & Lucas, 2002). Second, aligning with the perspective of Khalifa et al. (2016), this study emphasizes the word "responsive", and perceives an action-based orientation (i.e., the process of acting and responding) from this word as well. The continuous shift from awareness to action has consistently been a subject of attention and advocacy (Gay, 2018; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). Third, CRT reflects an implementation and practice level of CRP in real-life teaching, aligning with this study's aim at exploring course instructions and practices through students' perspectives.

Gay (2018) described CRT as "using the cultural knowledge, prior experience, frames of reference, and performance styles of ethnically diverse students to make learning encounters more relevant to and effective for them" (p. 36). Fundamental to CRT is an intentional effort to value students' senses of identity and background, to leverage students' cultural backgrounds in the educational process, and to cultivate critical consciousness in response to current challenges (e.g., stereotype, discrimination, and bias), creating an engaging, democratic, adaptive, and inclusive classroom for all learners (Ebersole et al., 2016; Kozleski, 2010; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). To implement CRT, existing literature has mentioned three main roles and responsibilities of teachers (Gay, 2002; Villegas & Lucas, 2002, 2007). First, teachers are cultural organizers, who identify the culture(s) represented by students, create a safe and comfortable space for discussing cultural diversity, and honour various forms of cultural expression, highlighting student voice and prior experience. Second, teachers are cultural mediators, who create opportunities for students to critically discuss and analyse contradictions between mainstream and other cultures' systems by actively sharing their identities, listening to others, developing positive attitudes toward cross-cultural relationships with their peers, and reducing stereotypes and prejudices. Third, teachers are orchestrators of social context, who can realize the relevance of culture to students' background as an asset.

A successful implementation of CRT in education would support students to find belonging in the learning process, build connections between themselves and schools, and be aware of the impact they create on mainstream knowledge and opinions as unique cultural beings (Gay,

2018; Pirbhai-Illich et al., 2017). Successful CRT also pushes teachers toward cognitive deconstructing and rebuilding regarding students and themselves (Kadir, 2019; Paris, 2012). Yet, teachers inevitably meet challenges when attempting to implement CRT (Gay, 2018). Some resistance may come from students (e.g., students are apprehensive to share their culture), the teachers themselves (e.g., teachers struggle to invite students to share their cultural insights), and the context of educational policy (e.g., standardised testing and curriculum setting) (Epstein et al., 2011; Kadir, 2019; Ukpokodu, 2011).

Taylor and Nolen (2022) specified culturally responsive work within a student-assessment context and proposed two principles. First, teachers should create opportunities for students to demonstrate their learning and the ability to achieve learning standards in ways that appreciate personal background, prior experience, and cultural diversity in general. Second, assessment should be a collaborative process between teachers and students, who work together to set clear, ambitious expectations for learning, and engage in authentic assessment opportunities that are culturally and socially relevant. Walker et al. (2023) further emphasized a power-sharing process in implementing culturally responsive assessment. In this process, students, as one key stakeholder group, are heard by sharing their knowledge and insights to challenge deficit assumptions and narratives. This study leverages the established foundation of culturally responsive teaching and more explicitly incorporates considerations for student assessment, in an extended framework we refer to as culturally responsive teaching and assessment (CRTA).

Much CRTA scholarship has focused on K-12, classrooms comprising large proportions of marginalised students (e.g., Gillispie, 2021; Pewewardy & Hammer, 2003; Stowe, 2017). In contrast, the higher-education context, which has an irreplaceable role in promoting cultural responsiveness and prosperity (Kruse et al., 2018), has received less attention. When researchers have studied CRTA in the higher education context, they have primarily examined instructors' adoption of CRTA strategies and the effectiveness of CRTA-relevant professional development (Awang-Hashim et al., 2019; Garrett et al., 2021; Hutchison & McAlister-Shields, 2020; Sanders O'Leary et al., 2020; Tuncel, 2017). Few studies, if any, have included students' voices in examining the implementation of CRTA.

Public speaking is a commonly required course for undergraduates from a variety of backgrounds and career aims. Public speaking is also an inherently cultural act. Thus, a public speaking course serves as a good entry point into the study of CRTA in higher education. Power and Galvin (1997) criticized that the knowledge and standards of public speaking developed in Europe and North America have been widely adopted by other countries (e.g., China) with different cultural environments. An implication of this phenomenon is the perpetuation of a single view of communicating effectively and professionally, concealing patterns of culture and logic historically present in these countries (Gudykunst & Kim, 1992). A similar dynamic may unfold as students from diverse backgrounds come together in a university public speaking course that is built upon European and North American traditions. In this study, we explored CRTA in an introductory-level public speaking course at a large, predominantly white, comprehensive university in the Northwest United States, through two research questions:

1. What are students' perceptions of the presence of CRTA elements in the public speaking course?
2. What are students' perceptions of the potential of CRTA in the public speaking course?

Method

This study draws from articulations of CRTA, situated within a broader framework of student-centred learning, which positions students as active and powerful constructors of knowledge, tailors learning activities to student needs and reflections, and builds a strong sense of learning community (Singh, 2011). We used semi-structured interviews to deeply explore students' experiences in the public speaking course through the lens of CRTA. The interview protocol was informed by key aspects of CRTA described in our cited literature and by existing instruments designed to measure cultural responsiveness (e.g., Dickson et al., 2016; Rhodes, 2017; Siwatu et al., 2017). All procedures were reviewed by the Washington State University Institutional Review Board and determined to satisfy the criteria for Exempt Research (project #[19902]).

Participants

We recruited 38 students, who were enrolled in the final month of the 16-week public speaking course, through the university's research participant platform, and awarded extra credit for their participation. All students were between 18 and 23 years old, most in their first or second year of college (n=28), assigned female at birth (n=26), and white (n=22, not including multi-racial). Self-identified races and ethnicities included African American/Black, Asian American, Hispanic, Native American, and Middle Eastern. Seven students identified as multi-racial. One student identified as transgender. No international students participated. Three students reported some form of physical or learning disability.

Course Description

The public speaking course is a core undergraduate curriculum requirement. The course's primary objective is to cultivate vital abilities in students that enable them to effectively communicate in different professional environments within a varied society. Students can enhance their communication skills through verbal communication, written communication, and online presentations using internet and social media platforms. At the time of the study, the course was offered across 25 separate sections, taught by 15 course instructors (graduate students and faculty), with most sections enrolling 20-25 students. A faculty member served as a course coordinator. All sections followed the same syllabus and had the same assignments and major in-class activities. Individual instructors had some leeway for how to organize the 50 minutes of class time and how to facilitate discussions.

Positionality

We recognize that our relationships to the subject matter, public speaking course, and participants influenced how we designed data collection instruments, how students responded to us in interviews, and how we analysed the data. In this section, we briefly describe our personal attributes and values that we think were most relevant to the study. The first author, a graduate research assistant in educational psychology, self-identifies as female and Chinese. She values self-awareness and reflections of students in their learning process and perceived CRTA as a pathway to deeply discover students themselves. The second author is a white, male associate professor in educational psychology, who specializes in student assessment. He understands CRTA as a potentially powerful force for effective, appropriate, and humanizing assessment practice. The third author, a doctoral candidate and course

instructor of public speaking and other communication courses, identifies as Hispanic and Asian, growing up under the impact of both Hispanic and Chinese cultural environments. She believes CRTA is critical to fostering learning environments that allow all students to thrive in addition to building knowledge about worldviews and cultures that are equally important, yet possibly unfamiliar to their own upbringing.

Interviews

The one-on-one interviews lasted 25-45 minutes Each author served as an interviewer, with roughly equal allotment across the 38 students. The third author did not interview any students that were in the course sections she was teaching. The interview protocol consisted of four main parts. The first part gathered students' demographic information, such as race and ethnicity, major, and year in school. We also asked students why they were taking the public speaking course. In the second part, we asked students to describe the culture of their classroom, how they related to their peers, and perceptions of how the course connected to their culture. The third section asked for examples of when the course employed multicultural learning materials, emphasized culture generally, addressed intercultural communication, and demonstrated appreciation for different communication styles. We also asked students how cultural relevance could be increased in the course design or lessons and what a culturally inclusive learning environment would look like for them personally. In the final part of the interviews, we asked students in what ways their instructor supported and challenged them, and where the centre of learning activities and goals typically resided. As interviewers, we were responsive to the conversations with the students, sequencing questions and asking follow-up questions as we deemed appropriate.

Data Analysis

Throughout the weeks during which we conducted interviews, we kept a shared document of reflective thoughts. We also met twice as a group to discuss impressions, commonalities, and differences in what we were hearing from students. After we completed the interviews, the first and second authors independently read a sample of five transcripts, highlighting notable excerpts, and writing analytic memos. They met to discuss tentative ideas for codes. They then repeated this process with a second sample of five transcripts, refining the research questions and developing an initial codebook.

First cycle analysis (Saldaña, 2021) used values, descriptive, and process coding to segment the data corpus, producing 29 codes, each connected to specific passages of writing in the CRTA literature base. The first and second author independently coded a sample of 10 transcripts, then met to discuss how they applied the codes, resolving code definitions and their respective understandings of the codes, before coding the remaining transcripts. Second cycle analysis used pattern coding to organize the codes into 6 categories that framed the findings in relation to the research questions.

We implemented three procedures to validate the qualitative analysis, following Bloomberg (2022). Initially, we employed participant validation procedures, namely member checks, during interviews to ensure accurate understanding and interpretation of their statements. Additionally, we prompted interviewees to speak up and ask any questions they had regarding CRTA (e.g., a final prompt, "Do you have any questions about CRTA for me?"). We

also employed a dialogic involvement technique during the research design and analysis stages. We collaboratively refined and improved the interview prompts based on the first several student interviews. The primary and secondary authors, serving as coders, convened regularly to review the progress of their analysis and address any potential inquiries. At key checkpoints, the third author offered feedback on the ongoing analysis. The final approach for validation was self-reflexivity, an active, continual awareness and monitoring of our positions and emerging understandings of the data (Ravitch & Carl, 2021), which we achieved through ongoing analytic memos.

Findings and Discussion

Presence of CRTA Elements in the Public Speaking Course

From the interview data, we identified three categories of codes: *CRTA-Relevant Instructional Strategies, Instructors' Caring-in-Action, and "Culture Was not a Huge Focus"*. We describe these categories in greater detail in the proceeding sections.

CRTA-Relevant Instructional Strategies

We identified discrete activities and elements of course design—class routines, multiple means of engaging with course content, multicultural representation in course materials, and growth-focused assessment—that defined the public speaking course classroom experience and aligned with descriptions of teaching and assessment offered by CRTA-related references (e.g., Gay, 2018; Khalifa, 2018; Pirbhai-Illich et al., 2017; Taylor & Nolen, 2022). We made these identifications acknowledging that CRTA ought to be applied carefully, flexibly, and contextually, depending on the composition of students and instructional need. We also acknowledge that instructors may introduce new strategies that have not yet been labelled as culturally responsive.

Class routines can signify pedagogical values and build a sense of community among culturally diverse students (Gay, 2018). In the public speaking course, students observed that some instructors started classes with a question to open dialogue to all voices and perspectives. Students said the discussions "brought us a lot closer," aligning with the CRTA articulations of student-teacher relationships advanced by Pirbhai-Illich et al. (2017). Students also provided examples of instructor self-disclosure and the impact of such:

> She has talked about her heritage and her culture. So, I feel like that's something that has been brought up and that no one else in the class is afraid to talk about or bring up [similar topics].

While the heart of CRTA is about integrating students' backgrounds and experiences into instruction and learning materials, Gay (2018) noted that instructors can share personal experiences and their background information early in their teaching to build a safe, comfortable, encouraging environment, where students can overcome any reluctance to share their own stories and interests. This represents the first instance where we observed some presence of CRTA at basic level, but little evidence of instructor practice or course design that embodied the richer, more potentially powerful elements of CRTA.

Students engaged with course content in multiple ways (e.g., demonstration speech, memorable occasion speech, one-way interview, "Shark Tank" pitch, critique of a professional speaker). These projects, along with in-class activities, struck a balance of independent and cooperative work. Almost all students expressed their appreciation for having group work.

They took these collaborations as an opportunity to understand others' perspectives and explore new things, which resonated with the benefits of cooperative learning (Hutchison & McAlister-Shields, 2020; Rahmawati & Ridwan, 2017). Students shared such thoughts as:

> I thought it was a really fun project. I thought it was even better because the person I was working with had similar experiences to me, but kind of with a different perspective.

Multicultural representation substantially impacts students' beliefs of themselves and others, even if the information resource is not always overtly highlighting culture (Gay, 2018; Taylor & Nolen, 2022). Students reflected on homework assignments, and recounted multicultural representation in videos of example speeches they viewed (e.g., a father giving a Quinceañera speech; Amanda Gorman's speech at President Biden's inauguration). They also pointed out that they were able to find more speech resources "where they talked about certain things happening in politics and race" and see "how different people communicate," in their assignments. Through course assignments and class discussions, students also learned the importance of "knowing your audience," which went beyond the techniques of giving a speech and began to explore the social context of public speaking. For example, one student brought up how assignments fostered an awareness of how one might engage with contentious cultural and religious topics in a way that maintained respectful communication with the audience. However, we did not hear how students integrated their prior experience or reflected on implicit biases they may hold, when speaking about such topics or knowing their audience, in general.

When asked to reflect upon assessment in the course, students emphasized that it was more about personal growth and development than comparison with peers. They supported this perspective by pointing to how the course embodied setting goals, self-reflecting, and revisiting goals, as seen in the excerpt below. Consistent attention to personal learning goals and identification of growth in learning are essential strategies that course instructors can adopt to design culturally responsive class activities and assessments (Taylor & Nolen, 2022; Walker et al., 2023).

> The grade book wasn't fully based on, it is not that everybody has to give the exact same quality of speech to get the A. It's your growth, development, and progress throughout the class is what everything was focused on.

Instructors' Caring-in-Action

We additionally characterized some descriptions of instructor actions as reflective of care for the students. Existing literature claims that caring is one of the most essential strategies educators can use to work with students effectively, and contemporary teachers are expected to realize the transition from simply verbally caring for students to engaging in *actions* that positively affect students (Gay, 2018; Nieto, 2008; Pirbhai-Illich et al., 2017). In the public speaking course, at a basic level, students felt respected during interactions with their instructors, through instructor actions such as remembering each student's name, addressing them by their preferred pronouns, checking in on students' learning growth to provide tailored support, and expressing the hope of fostering a respectful and non-judgmental environment. One student also said, "My instructor is always there for questions and always willing to talk about things."

Students commonly described respectful classroom environments. Some of this came from instructor self-disclosure, as described above, and some came from explicit effort by instructors to foster mutual interest among classmates and respect for different experiences with the subject matter.

> [We have] a respectful environment that you can be interested in one another. I brought an art thing for mine, which I know none of them would really normally care about, but they still expressed interest in it at the moment.
>
> I think our teacher does give a good leeway for us to be very friendly with each other. She gives us an opportunity to not just take the class but also make jokes, have a conversation with one of the another, and bounce ideas from one another.
>
> [The course instructor] also realized that we all come from different experiences within public speaking.

Ayers (2004) highlighted that caring teachers focus on students' states and relationships with others. In this way, we see respectful classrooms as a manifestation of CRTA. Other authors further articulated that a culturally responsive classroom environment should be more than simply showing basic respect and being nice, and should allow students to share personal experiences that can be incorporated into the teaching and learning process regularly, engage in critical conversation about the difference between the ideals or reality of mainstream cultures and those of different norms and systems regarding the learning content, be responsible for cultural and transformative communication, and celebrate their ethnic identities and affirm others through positive interaction and collaboration (e.g., Khalifa, 2018; Nieto, 2008; Pirbhai-Illich et al., 2017). We did not observe these richer aspects of CRTA in conversations with the students.

Consistent with conceptualization of caring in culturally responsiveness, students reported that the instructors set reasonable learning expectations that accounted for the introductory nature of the public speaking course but also signalled that students were capable of high achievement. No student reported a deficit mindset from the instructor toward them, which aligns with the practice of culturally responsive teachers (Gay, 2018; Khalifa et al., 2016; Taylor & Nolen, 2022). Further, as evidenced in the following excerpt, instructors cared for students by providing honest feedback to further student growth:

> She is respectful in a way by telling my flaws and my strengths, but she also gives quality critiques that allow me to improve myself as a public speaker.

More than half of the students felt safe communicating to their instructors their fear of making speeches in front of classmates. Instructors met these disclosures with encouragement, words of inspiration, and strategies for handling anxiety related to public speaking. We found that instructors also were willing to understand students' out-of-school lives and provide flexible support to fit students' personal needs, such as individual catch-up opportunities and whole-class schedule adjustments. Instructors also showed interest in the students' aspirations outside the course:

> I think overall he just does a good job of helping us succeed in the classroom and outside of the classroom. I am going to take the LSAT (Law School Admission Test) for the law school placement exam. He was asking me more about what I needed help with, and he gave me advice based on some of his friends who had gone to law school.

Based on the overall perception of students, we found that the instructors' caring for the personal well-being and academic success of students aligned with the fundamental expectation of CRTA, highlighting teachers' "caring for" not just "caring about" students with diverse cultural and social backgrounds (Gay, 2018). "Caring for" was embodied by their actions, which acknowledged students' fears and recognized students as whole beings with lives inside and outside the classroom. However, a profound sense of caring for students by instructors, rooted in the recognition of systemic inequalities, biases, discrimination, and underrepresentation within the current educational system, is lacking (Nieto, 2008)

"Culture is not a huge focus"

This category represented a confluence of the student reports across the two previous categories, where some aspects of CRTA were present but a full-fledged implementation of CRTA was not. We chose an in-vivo label (i.e., derived directly from students' original words) for this category, signified by quotation marks, to reflect how consistently students viewed culture as something that might serve as an occasional topic in the course, but not as inherently embedded within the course or within public speaking more generally. When asked about how culture appears in the course, students offered answers such as:

> I do not think it's ever really been addressed in the class.
>
> If the class came to that [i.e., a focus on culture], I think that we would have been understanding and supported with it, but it never came up in the class.

The idea that "culture [was] not a huge focus" was also apparent in a lack of criticality regarding expectations both within the course and in public speaking more generally. One student shared that "we all kind of learn in the same way." Beyond the awareness of "knowing your audience", students could not identify a time when instructors proactively connected students' or listeners' cultural backgrounds to learning topics or when aspects of culture were highlighted and examined in model speeches (e.g., in terms of purpose, style of delivery, or intentional use of a particular vernacular). Interestingly, students often talked about professionalism as a criterion for public speaking, but did not cite any time in the course when the construct of professionalism was looked at critically, suggesting the presence of a passive mindset of accepting standards impacted by mainstream cultures, as seen in this student comment:

> You're given an outline. You're given a set of instructions for the speech. You need to prepare it and give it … I think professionalism is just a given that you kind of have to have, but it's not really taught in the class.

Excerpts like these suggest students' cultural backgrounds, beliefs, and values, as the core of CRTA, were not given much direct attention nor incorporated as a vital part of the public speaking course. Instead, it seems the course positioned students as passive recipients of public-speaking knowledge and standards rooted in the predominant culture. We see in the student remarks a reflection of the *banking education* phenomenon discussed by Freire (1978). In the banking education system, teachers play the role of depositors, and students' learning responsibilities are limited to receiving, depositing, filing, and storing. Such a system gradually separates students from inquiry, discussion of the norms and expectations created by different values and beliefs, and invention and reinvention of knowledge. Furthermore, the uncritical acceptance of dominant (i.e., white) culture-as-standard impedes the

denormalization of Whiteness. Accumulated acceptance of white standards tends to produce dysconscious racism (Randall, 2021), an uncritical habit of mind that tacitly accepts white norms and privileges and can be used to justify inequality and exploitation (King, 1991).

The Potential of CRTA in the Public Speaking Course

To answer the second research question, we identified three categories: The Connection between Student Culture and Education, The Connection between Student Culture and Public Speaking, and Students' Suggestions for CRTA. The first two categories concern the barriers and potential affordances for connecting culture to instruction. The third category covers specific recommendations from students, comprising four sub-categories: Cultural Environment Creation, Cultural Communication Opportunity, Cultural Learning Materials, and Diverse Supporters.

The Connection Between Student Culture and Education

Conversation with students about the potential for CRTA in the public speaking course first considered what connections students saw between their culture and their educational experiences. We discuss findings from students of colour and then findings from white students. Only a few students of colour perceived advantages of their cultural background in their prior education experience. Noted benefits included "feeling easier to open a conversation with people from diverse backgrounds," "listening to people holding different perspectives," and "shaping my interaction with peers and the world." More students of colour expressed how their cultural background negatively influences their education. Common influences were language barriers, academic bias, and lack of learning resources. For example, a student who identified as Hispanic shared:

> There are definitely barriers to [the role of my race and ethnicity in education]. I have been told [that] I have a certain accent, which makes it hard to understand what I am saying. And then there is also a part where sometimes you cannot understand what is being talked about.

Though not explicitly called for by students, their interview responses suggested an opportunity for culturally responsive course instructors who can explicitly defuse deficit-based perceptions around students from marginalised/non-mainstream cultural, racial, and ethnic backgrounds (Bartell, 2011). Deficit-based perceptions of students could come from external factors (i.e., deviation from the norm's expectation) or internal beliefs (i.e., lower self-confidence). Constant comparison with white standards might cause some negative internal beliefs. Researchers have stressed that it is important for a culturally responsive teacher to be aware of and ready to assist students to see their cultures and combat the deficit mindsets through strength-based perspectives (Gay, 2018; Kumashiro, 2000; Paris, 2012).

More than half of the white students shared that their identities or cultural backgrounds have given them privileges of being educated and accessing resources. In doing so, however, some acknowledged that the specifics of their own culture—and therefore its impact—were imperceptible, as shared by the following student:

> My question is that what is my culture? Like, as a 19-year-old white girl, what do I consider my culture?

The phenomenon that white people are not able to perceive their cultures could be explained by the normalization of Whiteness. Such normalization can be seen as a form of white

supremacy in education (Randall, 2021), where white students lack self-consciousness and "other" people who come from different backgrounds. Therefore, we inferred there is potential in the course to make visible and critique norms and expectations in public speaking that are rooted in Whiteness, assist each student in being aware of who they are and what their cultures mean to them, and integrate students' cultural strengths and assets into their learning process.

The Connection Between Student Culture and the Public Speaking Course

As mentioned earlier, students perceived that "culture [was] not a huge focus" in the public speaking course. When we asked for ideas about the potential participation and contribution of cultures in public speaking, some students held a sceptical attitude. We perceived three reasons that led to the sceptical attitude, in addition to the complication of imperceptible culture noted in the previous section. First, students prioritized learning public speaking techniques. Second, this prioritization led students to attribute success to proficient demonstration of these techniques and failure to a lack of effort or preparation. Therefore, culture was viewed as "irrelevant to performance." Third, our analysis revealed a pattern of response, particularly among students of colour, that we labelled, "Talking culture is not that easy." Students demonstrating this sentiment expressed that they are not ready or comfortable communicating their culture with others. Gay (2018) particularly stressed that it is not easy, especially for students of colour, to share personal stories and thoughts about some issues related to cultural bias, discrimination, and educational inequities. Students tend to keep silent when they feel the topic is sensitive or the environment is unsafe for sharing self-relevant information.

Despite the scepticism and sensitivities, we did observe some building blocks, as students considered how culture could connect to public speaking. At a base level, similar to the base level of respect reported about the classroom environment, a common student sentiment was that it "wouldn't hurt" to bring more cultural awareness into course content. Further, students who had previously taken a course in history or anthropology, where culture was more explicitly interwoven, started to ponder aloud how the public speaking course might do the same. The students may not have achieved clear ideas for such integration, but instructors in the public speaking course could capitalize on students' general level of receptivity and look to instructional strategies from courses in other disciplines to better achieve CRTA implementation.

Students' Suggestions for CRTA

We identified four sub-themes of suggestions students made for a culturally responsive classroom. Under each sub-theme, we articulate the gaps and similarities between students' and scholars' perspectives.

Cultural Environment Creation. Students hoped to further build a comfortable and safe environment to share prior experiences and culture-related topics. One specific method that students mentioned is decorating the class with visual representations of culture, such as national flags and other prominent cultural artifacts. Scholars have emphasized that cultivating a safe and inclusive classroom environment is critical for cultural responsiveness (Barnatt et al., 2014; Gay, 2018). Students are more likely to believe that they have been seen, welcomed, and valued in the classroom when they observe or are encouraged to show their

cultural, racial, or ethnic artifacts in classrooms. Students can use the visual representation of cultures for strengthening mutual understanding with their classmates (Barnatt et al., 2014). For teachers, building an inclusive classroom and using symbolic artifacts to convey important cultural information prepares them well for working with students from diverse ethnic and cultural backgrounds (Gay, 2002).

Cultural Communication Opportunity. When inquiring about students' expectations for instructors to create a more culturally responsive course, many students hoped to have more culture-relevant communication with their peers, such as knowing their classmates through a group project or a series of conversations regarding cultures and having formal speech assignments that allow everyone to introduce personal and cultural backgrounds. Moreover, a few students emphasized the importance of understanding how knowledge of cultural differences shapes who they are as individuals and contributes to their public speaking learning. For example, two students shared:

> I think maybe having a speech involving .... how your culture and traditions assimilated or connected to who you are today and how you interact with the world.

> Maybe have an assignment [that is] specific to your culture. It might be a little more involved in public speaking, rather than just talking about different cultures.

From what students shared above, we perceived that student expectations of cultural communication resonated with culturally responsive scholars who highlighted that the in-depth and formal understanding of personal stories and cultural references among students is imperative in classroom teaching (Gay, 2018; Taylor & Nolen, 2022). We also noted that the suggestions of a few students on communication opportunity in classrooms moved beyond talking about personal and cultural differences to advocating for self-investigation of the impact of cultural diversity on their course learning (e.g., the content knowledge of public speaking) and identity awareness and behaviour. We viewed that these suggestions reflect a deeper level of CRTA, namely making learning more meaningful for each student by cultivating a critical awareness regarding the role of cultural diversity in the educational process (Gay, 2018). Yet, these suggestions from students are limited. This absence reflected the confusion or incomprehension we discussed previously regarding the connection between students' cultural backgrounds and the public speaking course.

In addition, we noticed that some white students placed the expectation of discussing cultural diversity on international students and students of colour, as they perceived these students as the main source of culture. In terms of listening to their peers whose first languages are not English, some white students shared their care through statements of tolerance like, "we need more patience and accommodations for them." In general, white students in this study might not have recognized that CRTA also involves actions such as building self-consciousness, bonding between self and others, promoting care and solidarity in the classroom, and exploring the unique and analytical thinking behind each language system. CRTA is unlikely to be realized if the whole class relies on the contributions of one group of (minoritized) students (De Jesus, 2003) and one language system (i.e., English) (Gay, 2018). Moreover, these white students' perceptions mirrored McIntosh's (1995) claims that it is normal for many white people to experience life without deeply understanding, exploring, and explaining their roles and position within a culture, particularly regarding race. The expectations expressed by white students set the predominant (i.e., white) culture as the norm or standard, "othering" students from different norms, again signalling a dysconscious racism (Randall, 2021).

Cultural Learning Materials. Some students expressed interest in learning more about cultural diversity through speech videos, textbooks, and other learning materials. A few students even hoped to start a critical exploration of public speaking from a social stance. Students shared thoughts such as:

> Maybe [watching] a presentation on cultural communication and why it is crucial to understand that and really push for that in our society.

As mentioned earlier, Gay (2018) stressed the process of selecting inclusive learning materials that can push students to "think about, to wonder what if, and to explain why" (Gay, p.267). Cultivating a critical orientation from learning materials, as some students suggested, is crucial progress toward CRTA, and could help students to challenge the conventional assumptions about learning and standards in public speaking (Ebersole et al., 2016; Gay, 2018; Kozleski, 2010).

Diverse Supporters. Some students believed that culture in the public speaking course could only exist in a classroom with many students with diverse backgrounds and course instructors of colour. In other words, some students did not think culture could be relevant in a predominantly white classroom. Meanwhile, a few students showed a strong, distrustful feeling about their white instructor's ability to build a culturally responsive classroom. A white female student shared:

> I feel like hearing from different people or reading different texts from different places is a lot better than getting it from a white professor who has zero experience with that.

As noted previously, looking to students or instructors of colour to bring CRTA to the classroom ignores the aspects of CRTA that apply to students of all races and reflects an implicit placement of white representations of public speaking as standard and normal (i.e., acultural). Further, students of colour in a predominantly white institution face higher likelihood of negative academic and personal outcomes because of a lack of culturally relevant pedagogy (Hinton & Seo, 2013) and cannot wait on some threshold of diversity to be achieved in the study body and among instructors. Although there are pitfalls in the process and it requires self-critical work (Matias, 2013; Utt & Tochluk, 2020), white teachers can move toward CRTA, and there is evidence of the effectiveness of professional learning in pedagogy (e.g., Devereaux et al., 2010; Rieckhoff et al., 2020; Sanders O'Leary et al., 2020). The student featured in the excerpt above appears to welcome exploration of culture within public speaking and among her classmates, but we also acknowledge that efforts to achieve CRTA can be met with student resistance (e.g., Evans-Winters & Hines, 2020).

Conclusion and Implications

In this study, we examined undergraduate students' perceptions of the presence and potential of CRTA in a predominantly white public speaking course. This study initiates a promising step for investigating cultural responsiveness through the lens of students. Inviting students to share authentic observations and ideas on CRTA within a native inquiry environment produced preliminary insights into the dynamics, possibilities, and challenges of CRTA in predominantly white higher education classrooms that have not been broadly and deeply investigated in prior research.

Although most students spoke positively about their public speaking course, interview data showed the course did not explicitly highlight and respond to students' experiences, strengths, and other cultural references. We found that some students' descriptions of their class environment and their instructors were aligned with CRTA principles. For example, course instructors created welcoming environments and tended to listen, understand, respect, and care not only about students' public speaking learning but also their lives outside school. Instructors demonstrated care for students verbally and via observable actions (e.g., adjusting due dates, setting high expectations). Course instructors also encouraged students to build a learning community, find speech topics that inspired them, and view success in the course through their personal development and growth.

However, we observed instances where CRTA did not go beyond superficial integration of culture. For example, students did not perceive that course instructors worked to build a knowledge base through explicit, intentional leveraging of students' prior experiences, values, beliefs, or other elements of cultural background. Students did not refer to explicit encouragement or course assignments that prompted them to see the contribution of their cultural assets to public speaking. Instead, they stuck to ideas like "know your audience", referenced different settings in which a speech may be given, and cited cases of Black and Latino speakers who spoke of culture (e.g., Amanda Gorman at President Biden's inauguration) or in a distinctly cultural setting (e.g., a father's Quinceañera speech) without any further exploration of how culture intersects with public speaking in these examples.

Student perceptions of the potential for CRTA in the course led to differing conclusions. On one hand, we encountered indifferent or even negative perceptions toward cultures' impact on academic learning, in general, and public speaking, specifically. We heard statements like, "public speaking is not cultural" and "culture is not relevant to my performance in this course." We also heard superficial ideas of how culture could be incorporated in the course, which often placed burden on international students and students of colour, and embodied white-normed dysconscious racism. On the other hand, students did express enthusiasm for learning more about their peers, engaging in more student-centred learning, and having more multicultural representation in course learning materials. We also saw budding thoughts that could be nurtured into a critical CRTA lens of how culture difference is incorporated into self-awareness and public speaking learning.

We posit three significant implications from our study. First, we complement and enrich the CRTA theoretical framework by examining college students' perceptions in a predominantly white setting. Much of the discourse within this framework has focused on teacher actions to implement CRTA in marginalised settings. Second, this study helps fill the research gap of CRTA in higher education since most CRTA research has been conducted in K-12 education (e.g., Brown et al., 2019; Herrera et al., 2012). Moreover, the focus on a public speaking course is transferable to many colleges/universities. Third, our findings can contribute directly to faculty development and course design to sustain positive identity, agency, and learning potential in every student.

Limitations

This study relied solely on student interviews. While this perspective is valuable to the literature base, it is limited. Future inquiries could include different data sources, such as student surveys, course instructor interviews, and course artifacts (e.g., assignments). Another

limitation is related to authors' positionalities. The second author, who is a white male professor, shared that two students of colour seemed hesitant to express their thoughts about culture's relationship to their academic experiences or tended to provide short answers to questions related to culture that could be rooted in the author's race. More generally, students of all cultural identities may have employed face-saving strategies to preserve their presentation to a professor. Thus, the findings were impacted by social dynamics of power that exist outside the study. Future studies should be aware of this issue and work on minimizing the negative effects of social dynamics of power on data collection.

Declarations

Authors' contributions: All authors contributed to the study conceptualization, material preparation, and data collection.

Competing interests: The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding: This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Ethics approval and consent to participate: All procedures were reviewed by the Washington State University Institutional Review Board and determined to satisfy the criteria for Exempt Research (project #19902). All participants are consented to participate.

Publisher's note: Culture, Education, and Future remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Orcid ID

Kexin Jiang https://orcid.org/0009-0005-5230-2144

Chad M. Gotch https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8302-4301

Christina Griselda Nickerson https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5584-5236

References

Awang-Hashim, R., Kaur, A., & Valdez, N. P. (2019). Strategizing inclusivity in teaching diverse learners in higher education. *Malaysian Journal of Learning and Instruction, 16*(1), 105–128. https://doi.org/10.32890/mjli2019.16.1.5

Ayers, W. (2004). *Teaching the personal and the political: Essays on hope and justice*. Teachers College Press.

Barnatt, J., Winter, M., Norman, V., Baker, D., & Wieczorek, S. (2014). Using cultural artifacts to understand self and other: A global exchange in elementary classrooms. *Ohio Social Studies Review, 51*(1), 7–17. https://ossr.scholasticahq.com/article/978-volume-51-number-1

Bartell, T. (2011). Caring, race, culture, and power: A research synthesis toward supporting mathematics teachers in caring with awareness. *Journal of Urban Mathematics Education, 4*(1), 50–74. https://doi.org/10.21423/jume-v4i1a128

Bloomberg, L. D. (2022). *Completing your qualitative dissertation: A road map from beginning to end*. Sage.

Brown, M., McNamara, G., O'Hara, J., Hood, S., Burns, D., & Kurum, G. (2019). Evaluating the impact of distributed culturally responsive leadership in a disadvantaged rural primary school in Ireland. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 47*(3), 457–474. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143217739360

Davis, L. P., & Museus, S. D. (2019). Identifying and disrupting deficit thinking. *National Center for Institutional Diversity, 1*(1), 1–7.

De Jesus, A. (2003). "Here it's more like your house": The proliferation of authentic caring as school reform at EI Puente Academy for Peace and Justice. In B. C. Rubin & E. M. Silva (Eds.), *Critical voices in school reform: Students living through change* (pp. 133–151). Routledge.

DePouw, C. (2007). [Review of the book *Up against whiteness: Race, school, and immigrant youth,* by S. Lee]. *Urban Education, 42*(4), 373–379. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085907303345

Devereaux, T. H., Prater, M. A., Jackson, A., Heath, M. A., & Carter, N. J. (2010). Special education faculty perceptions of participating in a culturally responsive professional development program. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 33*(4), 263–278. https://doi.org/10.1177/0888406410371642

Dickson, G. L., Chun, H., & Fernandez, I. T. (2016). The development and initial validation of the student measure of culturally responsive teaching. *Assessment for Effective Intervention, 41*(3), 141–154. https://doi.org/10.1177/1534508415604879

Ebersole, M., Kanahele-Mossman, H., & Kawakami, A. (2016). Culturally responsive teaching: Examining teachers' understandings and perspectives. *Journal of Education and Training Studies, 4*(2), 97–104. http://dx.doi.org/10.11114/jets.v4i2.1136

Epstein, T., Mayorga, E., & Nelson, J. (2011). Teaching about race in an urban history class: The effects of culturally responsive teaching. *Journal of Social Studies Research, 35*(1), 2–21.

Evans-Winters, V. E., & Hines, D. E. (2020). Unmasking white fragility: How whiteness and white student resistance impacts anti-racist education. *Whiteness and Education, 5*(1), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/23793406.2019.1675182

Freire, P. (1978). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* From pedagogy of the oppressed. In T. M. Norton & B. Ollman (Eds.), *Studies in socialist pedagogy* (pp. 60–75). Monthly Review Press.

Garrett, S. D., Miller, V., & Gilbert, C. (2021). The challenge of culturally responsive teaching in rural community colleges. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 2021*(195), 107–118. https://doi.org/10.1002/cc.20470

Gay, G. (2002). Preparing for culturally responsive teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education, 53*(2), 106–116. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487102053002003

Gay, G. (2018). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice* (3rd ed.). Teachers College Press.

Gillispie, M. (2021). Culturally responsive language and literacy instruction with Native American children. *Topics in Language Disorders, 41*(2), 185–198. https://doi.org/10.1097/TLD.0000000000000249

Gudykunst, W. B., & Kim, Y. Y. (1992). *Communicating with strangers: An approach to intercultural communication* (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Gutiérrez, K. D. (2008). Developing a sociocritical literacy in the third space. *Reading Research Quarterly, 43*(2), 148–164. https://doi.org/10.1598/RRQ.43.2.3

Herrera, S. G., Holmes, M. A., & Kavimandan, S. K. (2012). Bringing theory to life: Strategies that make culturally responsive pedagogy a reality in diverse secondary classrooms. *International Journal of Multicultural Education, 14*(3). https://doi.org/10.18251/ijme.v14i3.608

Hinton, D., & Seo, B.-I. (2013). Culturally relevant pedagogy and its implications for retaining minority students in predominantly white institutions (PWIS). In D. M. Callejo Perez & J. Ode (Eds.), *The stewardship of higher education: Re-imagining the role of education and wellness on community impact* (pp. 133–148). Brill. http://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6209-368-3_8

Hutchison, L., & McAlister-Shields, L. (2020). Culturally responsive teaching: Its application in higher education environments. *Education Sciences, 10*(5), 124. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci10050124

Kadir, B. A. (2019). Embracing complexity while deconstructing Eurocentric ideologies within classroom practices: Reflecting on culturally responsive teaching [Master's thesis, University of New Brunswick]. *Open Theses & Dissertations*. https://unbscholar.lib.unb.ca/bitstreams/326f9076-2c1d-4761-9640-407c0c44a51b/download

Khalifa, M. (2018). *Culturally Responsive School Leadership*. Harvard Education Press.

Khalifa, M. A., Gooden, M. A., & Davis, J. E. (2016). Culturally responsive school leadership: A synthesis of the literature. *Review of Educational Research, 86*(4), 1272–1311. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654316630383

King, J. E. (1991). Dysconscious racism: Ideology, identity, and the miseducation of teachers. *Journal of Negro Education, 60*(2), 133–146. https://doi.org/10.2307/2295605

Kozleski, E. B. (2010). *Culturally Responsive Teaching Matters!* ERIC. Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED520957

Kruse, S. D., Rakha, S., & Calderone, S. (2018). Developing cultural competency in higher education: An agenda for practice. *Teaching in Higher Education, 23*(6), 733–750. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2017.1414790

Kumashiro, K. K. (2000). Toward a theory of anti-oppressive education. *Review of Educational Research, 70*(1), 25–53. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543070001025

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal, 32*(3), 465–491. https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312032003465

Lee, S. J. (2005). *Up against whiteness: Race, school, and immigrant youth*. Teachers College Press.

Matias, C. E. (2013). Check yo'self before you wreck yo'self and our kids: Counterstories from culturally responsive white teachers? … to culturally responsive white teachers! *Interdisciplinary Journal of Teaching and Learning, 3*(2), 68–81. ISSN: 2158-592X

McIntosh, P. (1995). White privilege: Unpacking the invisible backpack. In Kesselman, A. V., McNair, L. D., & Schniedewind, N. (Eds.), *Women: Images and realities: A multicultural anthology* (pp. 264–267). Mayfield Publishing.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2024). College enrollment rates. *U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences.* Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator/cpb

Nieto, S. (2008). Nice is not enough: Defining caring for students of color. In Lee, C.-J. (Ed.), *Topical exploration in literacy education* (2nd ed., pp. 171–175). Linus Publishing.

Paris, D. (2012). Culturally sustaining pedagogy: A needed change in stance, terminology, and practice. *Educational Researcher, 41*(3), 93–97. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X12441244

Pewewardy, C., & Hammer, P. C. (2003). *Culturally responsive teaching for American Indian students.* ERIC Digest.

Pirbhai-Illich, F., Pete, S., & Martin, F. (2017). *Culturally responsive pedagogy.* Springer International Publishing.

Power, M. R., & Galvin, C. (1997). The culture of speeches: Public speaking across cultures. *Culture Mandala, 2*(2), 5807.

Rahmawati, Y., & Ridwan, A. (2017). Empowering students' chemistry learning: The integration of ethnochemistry in culturally responsive teaching. *Chemistry: Bulgarian Journal of Science Education, 26*(6), 813–830. Retrieved from https://www.ceeol.com/search/article-detail?id=600081

Randall, J. (2021). "Color-neutral" is not a thing: Redefining construct definition and representation through a justice-oriented critical antiracist lens. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice, 40*(4), 82–90. https://doi.org/10.1111/emip.12429

Ravitch, S. M., & Carl, N. M. (2021). *Qualitative research: Bridging the conceptual, theoretical, and methodological* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.

Rhodes, C. M. (2017). A validation study of the culturally responsive teaching survey. *Universal Journal of Educational Research, 5*(1), 45–53. https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2017.050106

Rieckhoff, B. S., Ockerman, M., Proweller, A., & Wolfinger, J. (2020). Building teacher empathy and culturally responsive practice through professional development and self-reflection. *Journal of Vincentian Social Action, 5*(2), 48–64. https://scholar.stjohns.edu/jovsa/vol5/iss2/8

Saldaña, J. (2021). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Sage.

Sanders O'Leary, E., Shapiro, C., Toma, S., Whang Sayson, H., Levis-Fitzgerald, M., Johnson, T., & Sork, V. L. (2020). Creating inclusive classrooms by engaging STEM faculty in culturally responsive teaching workshops. *International Journal of STEM Education, 7*(32), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-020-00230-7

Singh, N. (2011). Student-centered learning (SCL) in classrooms: A comprehensive overview. *Educational Quest-An International Journal of Education and Applied Social Sciences, 2*(2), 275–282.

Siwatu, K. O., Putman, S. M., Starker-Glass, T. V., & Lewis, C. W. (2017). The Culturally Responsive Classroom Management Self-Efficacy Scale: Development and initial validation. *Urban Education, 52*(7), 862–888. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085915602534

Stowe, R. (2017). Culturally responsive teaching in an Oglala Lakota classroom. *The Social Studies, 108*(6), 242–248. https://doi.org/10.1080/00377996.2017.1360241

Taylor, C. S., & Nolen, S. B. (2022). *Culturally and socially responsible assessment: Theory, research, and practice*. Teachers College Press.

Thomas, E. E., & Warren, C. A. (2015). Making it relevant: How a black male teacher sustained professional relationships through culturally responsive discourse. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 20*(1), 87–100. https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2015.1121217

Tuncel, G. (2017). Improving the cultural responsiveness of prospective social studies teachers: An action research. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice, 17*(4), 1317–1344. https://doi.org/10.12738/estp.2017.4.0269

Ukpokodu, O. N. (2011). How do I teach mathematics in a culturally responsive way?: Identifying empowering teaching practices. *Multicultural Education, 19*(3), 47–56.

Utt, J., & Tochluk, S. (2020). White teacher, know thyself: Improving anti-racist praxis through racial identity development. *Urban Education, 55*(1), 125–152. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085916648741

Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (2002). *Educating culturally responsive teachers: A coherent approach*. State University of New York Press.

Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (2007). The culturally responsive teacher. *Educational Leadership, 64*(6), 28.

Walker, M. E., Olivera-Aguilar, M., Lehman, B., Laitusis, C., Guzman-Orth, D., & Gholson, M. (2023). Culturally responsive assessment: Provisional principles. *ETS Research Report Series, 2023*(1), 1–24. https://doi.org/10.1002/ets2.12374