



The National and Global Context for Diversity in Higher Education

Diversity is a powerful agent of change. Indeed, diversity is an imperative that must be embraced if colleges and universities are to be successful in a pluralistic and interconnected world. While technology has long been recognized as a transformative element of society, the dynamics of diversity are reshaping the world and its institutions with equal impact. Like technology, diversity offers significant opportunities to fulfill the mission of higher education and to serve institutional excellence, albeit in new ways. By asking what we have learned about the conditions under which colleges and universities can maximize their capacity to function in a pluralistic society, this book sets out to frame the dimensions of diversity within an institutional context.

The question is not whether we want diversity or whether we should accommodate diversity, for diversity is clearly our present and our future. Rather, it is time to move beyond old questions and to ask instead how we can build diversity into the center of higher education, where it can serve as a powerful *facilitator* of institutional mission and societal purpose. Using a broad range of research from multiple disciplines, I hope to underscore not only the imperative of diversity, but also the conditions under which it is best approached to optimize and benefit institutional practice and strategy. This way of understanding diversity and its role for higher education goes significantly beyond individuals and the interactions between individuals and groups. It is centrally related to institutions—their mission, their capacity, and the ways in which they are designed and function.

More than ever before, the discussion about diversity in higher education needs to occur within a global and national context, adding greater urgency and complexity to the topic. Our challenge is that few examples exist of diverse societies that are successful. Sadly, there are far more examples of failure. We have only to look around us at the ethnic violence, religious conflicts, struggles for sovereignty, urban unrest, and challenges to nation-states to know that how we engage diver-

sity has profound national and global implications. At the same time, historic issues of race and gender and continuing concerns about access to higher education for underrepresented minorities and low-income students grow more and more urgent. For American higher education, the question is whether our colleges and universities can become models of diverse institutions that function well. Furthermore, can our institutions help build resources through scholarship and policy that will effectively address inequities that keep the world off balance?

The Context for Diversity

Engaging diversity in higher education requires an understanding of the national and international concerns that set the context for campus approaches. While discussions concerning globalization commonly focus on commerce, it is essential to look beyond market-driven matters to other domains as they emerge around the world, because they introduce important perspectives to the topic of diversity in higher education. Should we choose to address these topics deeply, they will provide us with opportunities to re-envision our questions and reconsider old conclusions. The several topics outlined below reveal the urgency of diversity, the inevitability of having to face questions associated with diversity, and the potential of diversity to create, as Knefelkamp and Schneider (1997) have said, “a world lived in common,” rather than a world lived in chaos and hate.

Changing Demographics

Throughout the world, immigration is transforming the face of nations. With these changes, conflict—and some soul-searching—has emerged concerning increased violence against immigrants, the integrity of borders, national identity, language, religion, cultural patterns, ethnicity, and race. Many of these matters that develop in the context of large-scale immigration are not new. Historically, racist incidents and concerns about the national language, the contributions of immigrants, and assimilation have been common responses to immigration (Bennett, 1998; Giroux, 1998; Hartman, 2006; Macedo & Gounari, 2006). In periods of large-scale immigration, however, especially when the vast majority of immigrants are persons of color, these issues increase in intensity. Furthermore, in the United States, intensifying conflicts over immigration policy may detract from, if not overwhelm, long-standing, unresolved problems concerning race and ethnicity (Frey, 1999).

These themes raise fundamental questions about how a society negotiates plu-

ralism and unity, how communities already suffering from economic or political disenfranchisement react to the introduction of “newcomers,” and in general how immigrants are received (Bean & Stevens, 2003; Gerstle & Mollenkopf, 2001). A recent controversy in France is a case in point. A law passed ostensibly to protect secularism in schools and ensure that everyone was “equally French” forbade “ostentatious” religious symbols on the grounds that they served as “propaganda” that “pressured, provoked, and proselytized.” In order to abide by the law, Muslim women and girls could not wear headscarves in state-run schools, and other visible religious symbols, including crosses, were not to be worn. The sense of threat in a post-9/11 world has undoubtedly exacerbated tensions within and toward the Muslim community, but banning a symbol of culture and religion as a means of protecting secularism generated enormous controversy and has served only to polarize the society.

The United States, a country that since its birth has seen wave upon wave of immigrants, is experiencing another influx of new peoples. While the resulting changes in demographics are more visible and dramatic in places such as California, Arizona, Texas, and New York, they are occurring throughout the rest of the country as well. For example, the Southeast, traditionally viewed through a Black and White lens, has long been home to communities of American Indians, as well as increasing populations of Latinos and Asian Americans, many of them immigrants. Minnesota, a state generally thought of as being racially homogeneous, has one of the largest Hmong populations in the United States (Asante & Min, 2000; Farley & Haaga, 2005; Hughes & Seneca, 1999; Smelser, Wilson, & Mitchell, 2001).

The large infusion of immigrants from specific regions within Asia, Latin America, and Africa to the United States has also created critical masses of people who wish to retain their unique cultural identity (Anderson & Lee, 2005; Chin, 2000; Espiritu, 2007; Lee & Bean, 2004; Lott, 1998; Nakanishi, 2001; Root, 1997). Although an overall Asian or African or Latino perspective can be useful in some contexts, homogenous notions of identity across these large regions quickly break down when serious consideration is given to differences in history, culture, and experiences within each group, as well as to generational status (Min, 2002; Rodriguez, 1994). As the Asian American and Latino communities have grown, it has become much more possible to consider the enormous diversity within them and much more likely that such diversity will be taken into account. Not only do Filipinos, Japanese, Chinese, Hmong, Vietnamese, and South Asian Indians (to name only a few groups) have different ethnic, religious, and cultural traditions, they are also characterized by dissimilar conditions of emigration. Such differences mean that

experiences of entry—with respect to legality, visas, asylum, and so on—differ, as do the immigrants' economic and educational backgrounds and needs.

The same is true for Latinos from Central America, South America, Puerto Rico, and the various regions of Mexico. Although there has been great controversy about Mexican immigration, Cubans' entry to the United States has been facilitated by federal policies granting residency. A recent National Research Council study of "Hispanics" (2006) reminds us that the origins of the U.S. Hispanic population predate the founding of the United States and that Latinos are now the largest minority group, encompassing more than twenty nationalities, each of which brings its own history, culture, ethnicity, and experience in relation to the United States. The growing concern about undocumented persons has placed the issue of status and entry at the center of the recent immigration discussions in the United States.

While the influx of immigrants is the greatest contributor to the changing population of the United States, demographic profiles are also affected by age, birthrates, and the ways in which members of various racial and ethnic groups that are already part of the population are counted. In recognition of the increasing complexity of the category system of race and ethnicity, both the Bureau of the Census and the U.S. Department of Education have altered their surveys to permit individuals to check multiple categories indicating ethnic and racial identity. Although the numbers of multiracial individuals, according to the 2000 census, constitute only a small percentage of the U.S. population (estimated at 2.4%), the notion of multiracial identity increasingly challenges us to consider a more complex and dynamic conception of race and ethnicity than could be reflected through the static categories of the past (Farley & Haaga, 2005; Tafoya, Johnson, & Hill, 2005).

The reclassification of the census has been controversial, and the ways in which the new classifications are used will deepen the controversy. The existence of clear and distinct categories has long had economic, political, and social significance for communities and for identity groups (Perlmann & Waters, 2002). For example, if the Department of Education labels those who mark more than one box as multiracial, those persons would be removed from their specific racial categories, resulting in a decline in the counts for communities in which mixed-race identity is common. We would lose important information about patterns across and between racial groups. At the same time, research has documented that when multiple categories are available, some communities, such as American Indians and Alaska Natives, actually increase in their numbers, because individuals have an opportunity to claim more than one heritage (Eschbach, 1993).

Political Structures and Access to Power and Resources

Globally, diversity continues to play a significant role in relation to many political structures, irrespective of whether those structures are democratic. Access to power, government, voting, resources, and decision-making remains a major factor in conflicts around the world. Discord may arise from religious differences, as in Northern Ireland; from ethnic conflicts, as in parts of Africa; or from racial issues, as in the United States. Gender and class issues also emerge in nearly all of these situations. But whatever the external manifestations may be in terms of identity, underlying them all are themes of economic and other inequities, racism, and historic and continuing injustice, played out through struggles over access to power. These issues determine the identities that are salient in the local context—whether they are related to religion, ethnicity, race, gender, sexual orientation, or some other category (W. Brown, 2006; Cross, Mikwanazi-Twala, & Klein, 1998; Macedo & Gounari, 2006; Marx, 1998; Twine, 2005).

In the United States, poverty and race are impossible to disentangle. As Hollinger (1995) notes:

Arguments will continue to rage over how racist this society is and the extent to which the degraded conditions experienced in American cities can be attributed ultimately to racism. But a society that will not take steps to help its poor citizens of all ethno-racial groups will have little chance to find out how successful have been its efforts to overcome the racist attitudes of empowered Whites. . . . The members of these groups . . . will have more and more reason to interpret as structural or institutional racism those policies that, even if devoid of prejudicial intent, have a disproportionately negative impact on them. (pp. 167–168)

After the dismantling of apartheid in South Africa, Nelson Mandela pointed out that the victors of revolution are too often transformed into oppressors themselves. He envisioned South Africa as a country that, rather than give in to desires for revenge and retribution, would be able to use its bitter history to understand and resist oppression. As the new constitution was being written, the intersection of race and gender was seen as vital to the country's rebirth. Indeed, representation for women and the rights of gay people were written into the constitution.

The Health of Democracy and Community

Increasingly, many of those who assess the state of society make a direct link between diversity and the health and well-being of democracy (Gutman & Thomp-

son, 2004; Layer, 2005; Nussbaum, 2003). Structural inequity (embedded aspects of society that disadvantage some groups and advantage others), poverty, and uneven access to power structures in communities and institutions are now seen as indicators of ill health for a society. Scholars who study the intersection of politics, economics, and social issues have begun to document connections between inequality and institutional and societal instability more generally (Feng, 2003; "Hispanics," 2006; Lardner & Smith, 2005; Lipset, 1959). Although many of the blatant structural forms of inequity, such as racial segregation, no longer exist in the United States, few would posit that the ideal of a pluralistic democracy has been attained.

Just as race and ethnicity continue to be correlated with indicators of well-being in this country (Adams et al., 2003; Blank, 2001; Conley, 1999; Jacobs & Skocpol, 2005; Kessler, Mickelson, & Williams, 1999; Krieger, Rowly, Herman, Avery, & Phillips, 1993; Oliver & Shapiro, 2001; Orfield, 2004; Tilley, 1998; Valenzuela, 1999; Williams & Swail, 2005), evidence of racism continues to be linked to inequities in housing, banking, and employment (Bertrand & Mullainathan, 2004; Committee on National Statistics, 2004; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). A recent study has documented inequities in income based on skin color alone (Hersch, 2007). Current data concerning education, health care, the criminal justice system, and income suggest that while there has been some improvement in recent decades, significant differences remain between racial and ethnic groups and between genders. In many domains, the extent and degree of inequity become an everyday challenge to the rhetoric of democracy and to the idea that constitutional and legal protections are available to all citizens.

Thus, part of the drive to engage diversity can now be critically connected to national interests (see, e.g., Institute of Medicine, 2004; Milem, Dey & White, 2004). In the introduction to *America Becoming: Racial Trends and Their Consequences*, Christopher Edley underscores the aspirational aspect of democracy in the United States: "Our secular catechism of equality and justice for all, authored at the nation's birth, was belied by practice at the time. Yet these remain the powerful ideals to which we aspire, at least in our nobler moments, and without regard to political party or social status" (Smelser, Wilson, & Mitchell, 2001, vol. 1, p. vii).

One of the challenges of democracy in the United States is that while inequity is strongly associated with differences among groups, the nation's core values are generally associated with individual rights (Ferdman, 1997; Huber & Form, 1973). There has been deep ambivalence about collective responses to inequality. Indeed, part of the reaction against affirmative action is due to the uneasy relationship be-

tween individual and group identity (Astin & Astin, 2000; Huber & Form, 1973; Sumida & Gurin, 2001). In contrast, in other parts of the world there are constitutions that provide special consideration to groups that have been historically excluded. For example, women have been granted minimum quotas for representation in the government in South Africa, in Ghana (Tsikata, n.d.), and in the new constitution of Afghanistan. In India, “set-asides” have been created for members of certain castes (although, as in the United States, there is increasing resistance and controversy about how to respond to the inequities among a growing number of “protected classes”) (Gupta, 2006).

There are, however, contradictions and hypocrisy in the debate that is occurring in the United States around protection of individuals versus protection for groups. Much of U.S. history embeds privilege for Whites in general, and White upper-class men in particular, in voting, landowning, and access to higher education. While this privilege is no longer explicit, as it often was in earlier eras, there is a growing body of literature documenting that the pattern continues, though in subtler and less visible ways.

An additional question for some scholars has been whether the conflation of democracy and capitalism in the United States and around the world conflicts with efforts to address inequity and attend to the social well-being of groups in society. As an economic system, capitalism emphasizes individual achievement on the one hand and the greater significance of business interests on the other. For some, this connection makes achieving real equity close to impossible (Darder & Torres, 2003; Wood, 1995). For others, it suggests interrogating the balance among the distribution of social benefits, economic capitalism, individual and group equity, and society’s well-being. Scholars such as Sunstein (1997) point to the limitations of markets in addressing injustice and suggest that capitalism, as practiced in the United States, clearly requires government involvement, not only to protect those with less access to power, but also to preserve the government’s own power. It may be appealing to create a dualistic approach that is both for and against capitalism, but much of the scholarship in this area engages the challenge of balance and the reality that no “pure” system of government has solved the problem of inequality and injustice.

The link between the creation of healthy and thriving democracies on the one hand and diversity, equity, and changing demographics on the other is underscored by *Building Toward Inclusive Communities*, a project of the National League of Cities. Recognizing the increasing diversity of the society and the problems that have developed in cities because of the lack of engagement with diversity—and often explicitly acknowledging historic patterns of injustice—the pro-

gram identifies successful inclusion as crucial to the viability, vitality, and health of cities.

Rather than moving quickly to a rhetorical claim of inclusiveness, the league's program recognizes that developing an inclusive community is an aspiration that must be achieved through intentional approaches, including an honest evaluation of, and taking responsibility for, historical injustices that have influenced the highly segregated and unequal cities we have today. Residential covenants that included clauses forbidding the sale of homes to persons of color are explicitly addressed in the work of many of the cities participating in this program. These covenants set in motion and sustained, for many decades, the segregated communities that exist throughout the country today. By telling the history of communities that were "White after dark," emphasizing class and racial demarcations, the program demonstrates a willingness to deal with both the past and the present. In addition, it encourages cities to establish policies to develop training programs, to require inclusive hiring practices, and to test whether there are practices that continue to limit access to housing and other resources.

The United States stands as perhaps the most racially and ethnically diverse country in the world. Its obligation to demonstrate both the power of diversity and the possibility of developing a pluralistic society that works is crucial in creating a model for what can be done. The tensions between the aspirations and rhetoric of democracy and the reality, however, have existed for a long time. Franklin Roosevelt's 1944 statement on inequity in society encapsulated this issue: "The nation cannot be content, no matter how high the general standard of living may be, if some fraction of our people—whether it be one-third or one-fifth or one-tenth—is ill-fed, ill-clothed, ill-housed, and insecure" (Sunstein, 2004, p. 12). Furthermore, after World War II, Truman's Commission on Higher Education produced a significant report, *Higher Education for American Democracy*, that expressed the urgency of expanding educational opportunities and affordability and increasing social understanding for the future of the nation (Thelin, 2004).

In the eyes of the world, the credibility of the United States as the longest-existing democracy is linked to its record on issues of equality and justice. Gunnar Myrdal, in his classic work *An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy* (1944), makes this connection explicit: "America for its international prestige, power, and future security needs to demonstrate to the world that American Negroes can be satisfactorily integrated into its democracy" (pp. 1015–1016). Dudziak (2000) powerfully develops the link between a domestic record on equality and racism and the international credibility of U.S. foreign policy dur-

ing World Wars I and II: "As the United States held itself out as the leader of the free world, the nation opened itself up to criticism when its domestic practices seemed to violate the nation's principles" (p. 29).

Such connections continue to be salient today. After 9/11, policies to build up "homeland security" were scrutinized throughout the world as the question was asked whether the United States' commitment to democracy—to judicial process, free speech, privacy, and other fundamental rights—was being seriously eroded at home even as the rhetoric of the principles of democracy was being communicated abroad.

Nation-States and Indigenous Peoples

There have been ongoing tensions around the world between nation-states and indigenous peoples concerning rights of sovereignty. These tensions are being addressed—in the United States, Canada, Australia, China, and India, to name only a few countries—in such a way as to recognize historical injustices and present-day claims to identity and autonomy.

The outcomes have significance not only for the sovereignty of indigenous populations and the ability of community members to govern their own lives, but also for how individuals and peoples from indigenous communities are characterized from within and without (Champagne, Torjesen, & Steiner, 2005; La Duke, 2005; Short, 2003; L. T. Smith, 1999). As Champagne (2005) writes, "Contemporary native identities are to a large extent based on relations to nation-states. While native peoples have identities that predate the formation of nation-states, and many aspects of these pre-state identities continue to persist and make their weight felt in everyday life, native identity is largely defined in relation to colonizing cultures and state governments" (p. 3).

The issues raised, then, are not just political. They are about cultural survival—the survival of language, religion, education, values, and identity.

Dealing with the History and Legacies of Injustice

The question of whether past injustices to groups in society should be addressed and, if so, how to address them meaningfully is tremendously challenging. Increasingly, efforts are being made to engage history and to create ways to bring "victim" and "perpetrator" together to form a narrative that can be shared (Barkan, 2000, 2005; Lederach, 1997; Short, 2003). Through its Truth and Reconciliation Commission, South Africa took the stance that unless the past atrocities were ac-

knowledgeed, it would not be possible to move forward. We have seen similar decisions in Germany's response to World War II, in the Catholic Church's attempts to address its response to the Holocaust, and in a pending legal case where U.S. courts are investigating the clear misuse of funds that the federal government had placed in trust for tribal communities. Even institutions, including college campuses, have begun to address history and injustice. For example, Brown University's attempt to understand its role with respect to slavery prompted a self-study and a formal statement and had some policy implications. It is hard to imagine that merely forgetting and moving on is going to be effective for those whose history has been shaped by these injustices, particularly when their current reality reflects continuing inequality.

In the United States, there is an uneven record in this area. It took decades to include even modest accounts of slavery and transgressions against American Indians in basic history texts. Indeed, making these histories visible continues to be challenged. While reparations to Japanese Americans and expressions of apology indicate some awareness of the need to acknowledge historical injustices, efforts to discuss reparations to African Americans and to monitor treaty rights for Native Americans remain controversial even under circumstances where there appears to be little risk in doing so (Rouhana, 2004).

Moreover, so much history has been ignored or omitted that contemporary ways of framing it can be distorted by ignorance. Robust historical information is needed in order to effectively understand history. For example, the history of school desegregation is framed almost entirely by the 1954 *Brown v. Board of Education* case. What is missing from this history is information that the struggle to end school desegregation for African Americans, Asian Americans, and Latinos had been occurring for a long time in many parts of the country (Aguirre, 2005; Chesler, Lewis, & Crowfoot, 2005). Thus, groundbreaking though the *Brown* case was, it created the impression that segregation was an issue only for African Americans.

Acknowledging a more accurate and just history has political and psychological value and is immensely powerful in the way it can directly and indirectly affect current experience. Increasing evidence suggests that the lower levels of well-being for many racial minorities in the United States, especially African Americans, are based not only on current practices, but also on experiences of discrimination and the fallout from prior decisions (Delgado, Stefancic, & Lindsley, 2000). For example, the weak implementation of *Brown*, along with the dismantling of Black schools and the firing of Black teachers and principals, had a profound impact on schooling that continues into the present (Bell, 2004).

In a well-documented analysis of the ongoing impact of discrimination and the limitations of color-blind policies, Katznelson (2005) argues that the ways in which some policies—particularly Social Security and the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (the GI Bill)—were implemented preserved White privilege and were essentially affirmative action for Whites. The GI Bill in particular is described by Katznelson as "the most comprehensive public policy to that moment in American history" and "the most democratic of public policies because . . . no one was excluded" (p. 118). However, even though the GI Bill was color-blind in the sense that the policy itself did not exclude anyone because of race, the ways in which it was applied denied benefits to enormous numbers of African American veterans. At the time of its passage, White southern politicians exerted their influence to limit the implementation of these policies in such a way as to protect White power and limit African American access to education and home ownership, by insisting that policies be implemented locally, where practices could be controlled. There was deep concern in the South among Whites and their political representatives that providing too much opportunity to returning Black servicemen would alter employment and living patterns. Many Latinos were also denied full use of GI Bill benefits through discriminatory practices (MacDonald, Botti, & Clark, 2007).

Thus, while the GI Bill opened up higher education to hundreds of thousands of service men and women, rigid segregation, discrimination, and the limited resources in historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs) in the South severely limited access for African Americans (Gasman, 2007; Turner & Bound, 2003). The GI Bill also facilitated home ownership for veterans. But here again, though African Americans and Latinos were not specifically excluded—and many did indeed benefit—the decision to implement the bill's provisions through local banks and local administrations meant that many were denied access to home loans, through "redlining" and bank policies. These practices were particularly evident in the South, although they occurred in other parts of the country as well. Most economists agree that the GI Bill and the growth of home ownership were instrumental in building the middle class and the subsequent affluence that Whites, especially, now enjoy. Yet in its implementation, the bill contributed to inequities that persist today.

By 1984, when GI Bill mortgages had mainly matured, the median White household had a net worth of \$39,135; the comparable figure for black households was only \$3,397 or just 9 percent of White holdings. Most of this difference was accounted for by home ownership. Nearly seven in ten Whites owned homes worth

an average of \$52,000. By comparison only four in ten Blacks were homeowners and their houses had an average value of less than \$30,000. African Americans who were not homeowners possessed virtually no wealth at all. (Katznelson, 2005, p. 164)

Today, even as many scholars point to the increases in racial diversity in the middle class using current income as an indicator, others are pointing to racial gaps in wealth as a more powerful gauge of economic well-being (Oliver & Shapiro, 1997, 2001; Wise, 2006). For example, there is far less resiliency in a family that does not own property than in a family that can leverage assets to get through hard times. It is difficult not to speculate whether, if the GI Bill had provided as many African Americans with opportunities for home ownership and higher education as it did Whites, there would be more resiliency, stability, and equity within American society today.

These patterns underscore the need to scrutinize whether “race-neutral” or “color-blind” policies are intentional or unintentional strategies to maintain existing power structures. Katznelson (2005) describes clearly how calls for “color-blind” policies often maintain White privilege rather than opportunity for all. In this context, White privilege, as McIntosh (2008) suggests, is an unearned advantage of being White. One sees this inconsistency when critics of affirmative action suggest that increasing the representation of historically underrepresented African American, Latino, and Native American populations undermines *excellence*, while they present the *diversity* argument when Asian American populations gain access to higher education in great numbers. In each case, the argument furthers the status quo favoring Whites.

The same holds for antidiscrimination arguments concerning admissions. There is no controversy about privileging legacies (the family of alumni) even though the alumni were admitted during periods of segregation in which Blacks could not be admitted, but it is less permissible today to invoke special attention to those who are not able to claim legacy status as a special consideration (Minich, 2005).

Thus, history lives on—and with powerful ramifications. It lives on in the values, language, and policies that intentionally or unintentionally privilege some at the expense of others. It lives on in the legacy of individuals and families, communities and societies. It lives on in covert and overt practices. If historical inequities are not interrupted, they will continue to cascade from generation to generation. Engaging history fearlessly and truthfully is fundamental to transforming institutions.

Institutions as Workplaces

The changing nature of our society, including its increasing diversity, has meant that topics concerning diversity are now visible in the workplace (Miller & Katz, 2002; Pfeffer, 1985). The most obvious examples are in the corporate arena, where “marketing” to diverse communities has become a business mandate. However, building the competence of all organizations to serve communities in areas of social services, education, health care, and religion has also become essential (Jayne & Dipboye, 2004; Johnston & Packer, 1987; Judy & D’Amico, 1999; Loden & Rosener, 1991; Morrison, 1992). The literature on the workplace also includes work on organizational justice and the conditions under which people perceive that an organization treats them equitably (Colquitt, Greenberg, & Scott, 2005; Deitch et al., 2003; Greenberg & Colquitt, 2005; Mowday & Colwell, 2003; Steers & Porter, 1979).

The “business case for diversity,” as it is called, rests almost entirely on what is perceived as the relationship between changing demographics, credibility with diverse markets, and profit. It often includes the claim that diversity directly benefits the organization in terms of credibility, creativity, and productivity (Adkins, 2003; Cox, 1993, 2001; Hayles & Russell, 1997; Nemeth, 1994; Wright, Ferris, Hiller, & Kroll, 1995). Some studies indeed demonstrate a positive relationship between diversity and business outcomes (Catalyst, 2004; Hartenian & Gudmundson, 2000). A study by Catalyst (2004) shows that companies with higher percentages of women in top leadership performed better financially and, significantly, that companies with the highest performance had greater percentages of women. A study by Herring (2006) looking at the relationship between racial diversity and performance showed a consistent and positive relationship in environments in which racial minorities were *not* confined to token positions.

Other research, however, has suggested that while organizations need to engage diversity, the simple presence of diversity is not sufficient to manifest the benefits that are so often suggested and might in fact produce negative results in the form of conflict, lack of trust, and less productivity (Blau, 1977; Colella, 2001; Glaeser, Laibon, Scheinkman, & Soutter, 1999; Kochan et al., 2003; Riordan, 2000; Skerry, 2002; Triandis, Kurowski, & Gelfand, 1994; Williams & O’Reilly, 1998).

A growing number of studies state that it is essential to understand *under what conditions* diversity will enhance or detract from the effectiveness of the organization (Cox, 2001; Cox & Blake, 1991; DiversityInc, 2003, 2006; Ely & Thomas, 2001; Friedkin, 2004; Gardenswartz & Rowe, 2003; Gudeman, 2000; Harrison, Price, & Bell, 1998; Hayles, 2003; McMillan-Capehart, 2006; Milliken & Martins, 1996;

O'Reilly, Williams, & Barsade, 1997; Page, 2007; Pettigrew, 1998a; Smith et al., 1994; Sonnenschein, 1999; Sparber, 2009; Thomas, 1990, 2006; Tushman & O'Reilly, 1996; Williams & O'Reilly, 1998). For example, Ely and Thomas (2001), in a study of the factors that influence outcomes of diversity, found that when diversity is seen as essential to the organization for the variety of perspectives and contributions that can be made, the outcomes are much more positive than when diversity exists simply to increase representation or to gain legitimacy in outside communities.

In some literature on organizations, especially research with an economic framework, the costs associated with diversity are emphasized. Such studies point out that institutional change and transformation require a significant outlay of resources of time, energy, and money.

Rarely is this question studied from the reverse point of view: what is the price of *not* creating the conditions under which diverse institutions can thrive and reap the benefits of their diversity? Studies reveal a significant cost associated with a failure to address diversity at the societal level. What can be said about not engaging it at the institutional level? Less has been written here, though some studies look at the cost of discrimination suits, boycotts, and racism (DiversityInc, 2003, 2006; Feagin & McKinney, 2003). Increasingly, there are cases in which institutions are "embarrassed" by lawsuits, incidents, or public disclosures that expose blatant discrimination or an absence of diversity. Although such cases are relevant, the costs of ignoring diversity or engaging it in inadequate or unproductive ways are probably much larger. Everyday patterns of turnover, dissatisfaction, and conflict affect team-building work and institutional productivity. Success in changing these patterns is contingent on organizational approaches (American Bar Association, 2006; Cox, 1993; Cox, Lobel, & McLeod, 1991; DiversityInc, 2006; Dobbin & Kalev, 2007; Forman, 2003; Friday, Moss, & Friday, 2004; Hawley & Jackson, 1995; Wright, Ferris, Hiller, & Kroll, 1995).

Though a review of the research on the benefits of diversity that has been conducted in the field (e.g., in "business") suggests uneven results, research conducted with quasi-experimental or experimental approaches has yielded more positive conclusions. This may be due to the fact that college campuses are often used as experimental sites and the subjects are college students. However, it is also possible that in an experiment, one can control and/or study conditions such as critical mass, shared goals, and differing kinds of diversity, while field studies in existing organizations are often limited by the presence of larger institutional conditions and the absence of significant diversity in leadership teams.

Moreover, in the research that looks at the impact of the diversity of the group

(in race, gender, age, tenure status, etc.) on productivity, diversity is most often understood to be a characteristic of the individuals in the group. In contrast, Page (2007), in his provocative book on diversity, stresses that identity concerns are not necessarily about the characteristics associated with the individuals but rather about the collective experiences and perspectives that emerge. Sommers (2006), in a study of behavior in juries, demonstrated that the benefits of diversity might emerge because of group composition, not necessarily group interaction. White jurors behaved differently in mixed juries than they did in homogenous ones.

Studying group dynamics in the absence of information about institutional context can influence the results in dramatic ways. Konrad (2003) suggests that many of the diversity issues facing institutions are associated with issues of power and equity related to the groups for whom access and inclusion are lacking. Similarly, Baugh and Graen (1997) point to the difficulty in studying one unit of analysis (the team) in the context of another unit of analysis (the institution). Without attention to structure and situation, the results of studies on group process may inaccurately be associated with the diversity of people, rather than the conditions of institutions (Baugh & Graen, 1997; Ely & Thomas, 2001; Fagenson, 1993; Konrad, 2003; Polzer, Milton, & Swann, 2002; Van Der Vegt, Bunderson, & Oosterhof, 2006; Watson, Johnson, & Merritt, 1998; Watson, Kumar, & Michaelson, 1993).

In addition, some of the findings suggest that it may be Whites in relation to minorities, and men in relation to women, in particular, that find the adjustment most difficult, especially when the numbers of those in the minority begin to increase (Aldefer, 1992; Baugh & Graen, 1997; Cohen & Swim, 1995; Ely & Thomas, 2001; Fagenson, 1993; Yoder, 2002). This is not hard to understand if increasing diversity is experienced as a loss of status, power, or privilege—topics to be addressed more fully in chapter 2.

Many approaches related to diversity in the workplace hinge on hiring and retaining diverse workers. The literature on hiring describes how institutional cultures reinforce the hiring of people like those already in power, how to hold managers and leaders accountable for hiring and retaining diverse talent pools, and the challenges of creating more pluralistic and inclusive environments. Questions of power, climate, institutional culture, privilege, and discrimination remain a fundamental part of this literature (Bertrand & Mullainathan, 2004; Committee on National Statistics, 2004; Cummings, 2004; Devine & Elliot, 1995; Elliott & Smith, 2004; Feagin, 2006; Kilian, Hukai, & McCarty, 2005; Kirkman, Tesluk, & Rosen, 2004; Niemann, 1999; Ragins, 1995; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999; Thiederman, 2003). Leadership development, removing sources of inequity such as certain re-

quirements for experience and education, and mentoring each have a separate literature addressing the need to increase diversity and the means by which to do it (Ensher & Murphy, 2005; Kalbfleisch & Davies, 1991; Thomas, 2001).

Research thus suggests that in virtually every sector of work, engaging diversity, building diversity, and taking diversity seriously are imperative for organizations. Because of the need for diversity in leadership and the costs associated with training employees to work in and manage diverse institutions, more and more organizations are looking to higher education to provide not only diversity in leadership, but also people with the competence to work in diverse settings. A RAND study published in the mid-1990s suggested that many companies do not believe that higher education is meeting these objectives (Bikson, 1996; Bikson & Law, 1994). Whether that currently remains the perception of business will require further research.

Building Institutional Capacity

Much like the language of democracy, the language related to the benefits of diversity appears to be aspirational, with success of diversity contingent on *institutional conditions*. Significantly, this conclusion is consistent with fifty years of research in social psychology and management that concludes that simply putting people together from diverse backgrounds does not necessarily lead to positive outcomes. The key questions for research are, *What are the conditions under which positive outcomes emerge from environments in which diversity is present, and which forms of diversity are relevant in these situations?* These questions will be addressed in greater detail in part 2, but the emerging results suggest that success is contingent on context, on how diversity is framed, and on the capacity of the organization to build effective teams.

All of the issues identified in this chapter relate directly to building the *capacity* of institutions in the society to function in a diverse environment, to find ways to capitalize on the benefits of diversity, and to do so in contexts that are too often characterized by inequities. Institutional capacity-building requires the creation of structures that serve institutional purposes and that connect the institution's core purposes with the needs of society. It involves allocating financial and other resources, as well as strengthening human capital, expertise, and culture. An institution's capacity for diversity is measured in the way decisions are made, in how power is distributed, and in the characteristics of institutional culture. Though there may be a substantial cost in building capacity for diversity, there is also a substantial cost for neglecting it.

One of the most striking illustrations of the necessity of building capacity for diversity comes from the automotive industry. Naming a product is a very significant linguistic and symbolic event. Companies spend a great deal of time, effort, and resources to find the right name with the right associations. It is not hard to imagine the marketing appeal of connecting a new car with something new or with a nova—a brilliant star. Nevertheless, with all its resources, how was it possible that Chevrolet named a new model Nova even though *no va* suggests “doesn’t go” in Spanish, Italian, and French? Undoubtedly, there were individuals within the company who recognized the misnomer but did not feel sufficiently empowered, or were not in a position, to point it out.

Clearly, diverse perspectives and cultural values can benefit institutions on structural as well as individual levels and can make the difference between effectiveness and failure. Framing the issue of diversity in this way has extraordinary implications for excellence, leadership, and performance in any kind of setting (Blackwell, Kwoh, & Pastor, 2002; Combs, 2002; Iwata, 2004; Slaughter, 2004).

The concept of identity is both implicit and explicit in each of the literatures that set the global and national context for diversity. Chapter 2 develops the relationship between identity and diversity and, in particular, how it is that some identities become salient for societal and institutional diversity. The next chapter also provides an overview of the recent theoretical and empirical research on identity that will be foundational for the chapters on making diversity work on campus.